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FOREWORD.

Originally this book was only planned to provide an English version of my *Het Schaakprobleem: Ideeën en Scholen* (1921). The manner of its passage into English, however, besides other causes, led to the introduction of various alterations. I will therefore briefly account for its present shape.

I translated the Dutch text into English, somewhat expanding the chapter on the Bohemian School and that on Decoy. Wherever feasible, I complied with Mr. White's suggestion to substitute fresh problem examples, helpfully supplied by him, for some well-known specimens already occurring in his other Christmas books.

Before handing my translation to Mr. White, who, by previous arrangement, was to apply the finishing touches and to make minor alterations wherever necessary, I submitted it for a preliminary revision to my friend, Mr. G. H. Goethart, of the Hague, to whom I am very thankful for his valuable assistance.

As, in contrast to the Dutch edition, this book is not intended for readers altogether uninitiated in problem matters, Mr. White could afford to drop some rather elementary parts, go more fully into historical details and dwell at greater length on the nicer shades of difference between the various schools. With my concurrence he has also lent more objective expression to those passages which passed rather severe strictures on certain tendencies, letting the reader draw his own conclusions from what are intended to be entirely impartial statements of facts.

The terminology has been brought more closely into conformity with that of the latest publications of the Christmas Series. To Dutch readers alone the different arrangement adopted in connection with the obstruction-theme may prove momentarily puzzling. This, however, was unavoidable.

The portraits of the problem masters illustrating the work I owe to the kindness and untiring initiative of Mr. John G. White, of Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.

An attempt has been made to give, so far as possible, dates of birth and death of the leading problemists mentioned, though full success in obtaining these has not in every case been possible. Help in this connection has been lent by Mr. John Keeble, of Norwich, by Fr. Dedrle, of Brun, Dr. Otto T. Blathy and Prof. J. R. Neukomm, of Budapest, Martin Anderson, of Gothenburg, F. Palatz, of Hamburg, Eugene Kubbel, of Leningrad, and other kind friends; and for some dates I am indebted to Miss Clara Millar's *Chess Lovers'*
FOREWORD.

Kalendar, Berger’s Schach Jahrbuch, Ranneforth’s Schach Kalendar, and to the pages of the British Chess Magazine, The Chess Amateur, and other periodicals. A great many composers have kindly supplied their own birth-date.

Mr. G. Hume has made important alterations, during the later stages of the revision, in concert with me. The correspondence between Holland and England was far less expensive of time than that with the United States. In addition Mr. Hume has corrected the proof-sheets, and attended to the many details incident to the distribution of the book.

To both Mr. A. C. White and Mr. Hume I gratefully acknowledge my deep indebtedness for the great pains they have taken to make my book more widely known.

In conclusion I have the pleasure to mention that the Dutch publishing company, Messrs. G. B. van Goor Zonen, Ltd., Gouda, have raised no objection to the publication of this English edition. For any translation into another language, it will be necessary first to approach the original Dutch publishers.

H. WEEINK.

Amsterdam, 1926.
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PART I.

Historical Development of the Chess Problem.

CHAPTER I.

THE MIDDLE AGES.

The assumption that the chess problem originated from the practical game seems natural enough. With a little imagination we may picture how actual end-games of an interesting character were first recorded and later demonstrated, and how this gradually led to the composition of artificial end-games, or problems. We find the first traces of such a process among the Arabians in the Ninth Century, and probably its origins are even older. Of the Arabian manuscripts which survive, none deal actually with the game. The purpose of the manuscripts was clearly not to preserve entire games, but to select such typical openings or such valuable endings as might be of benefit to the student. Only one manuscript remains dealing with the beginnings of games, but there are many that deal with the endings. The earliest name recorded of any compiler of such manuscript is that of al-Adli, who flourished about 840 A.D. His MS. is lost, but a good deal is known about its contents from later quotations.

The positions in these collections were supposed almost without exception to be the actual endings of games, and in many cases the names are given of the players in whose encounters the situations occurred. Only in connection with a single position is there a statement of the position having been composed. This is a 21-mover in the as-Suli MS., the next oldest known to al-Adli, to which is appended the note: "Al-Mahdi made this; it did not occur in a game." Al-Mahdi was the father of the famous Haroun-al-Raschid and he died in 785. It would be pleasant to consider him as the father of problem composers, but such statements as that just quoted must be taken with a grain of salt, because the manuscripts later increasingly attributed the origin of particular positions to famous personages. Officially, at least, this Caliph looked with disfavour on chess, for he wrote in a letter to the people of Mecca in 780:
"The Commander of the Faithful . . . desires you to abandon . . .
dicing, chess and all vanities that lead astray and from the remem-
brance of God."

But although the MSS. are at pains to emphasize the occurrence
in actual play of the positions given, it is permissible to suppose
that many of them were very much doctored from their game form,
even if they were not actually composed. This can be understood
by looking at No. 1. The note to this position, which is repro-
duced from al-Adli, says: "This happened to Abu'n-Na'am, and
he used to boast of it." This Abu'n-Na'am was one of the
earliest and favourite of the Arabian "composers." This is
corroborated by the note to another position, where the
editor says: "This happened to me when playing a man at odds.
Abu'n-Na'am boasted that he had played a similar game.
There is not, however, one in the
least like it among the Mansubat
of Abu'n-Na'am."

That No. 1 is largely "com-
posed" is clear from the strong
attack of the Black force White
would have been mated on a
previous move, if the position
had been approached in the
course of a game. Yet just such
apparently irresistible attacks,
available to the opponent, are
among the foremost characteris-
tics of the Arabian positions.
For establishing the soundness of a position, since, if the exact solution
is not followed, the opponent can at once counter by an immediate
forced mate.

The name given by the Arabians to their positions is Mansuba,
plural Mansubat. This indeed means: "that which has been
erected, set up, or arranged," "composed," as we would say;
consequently we are free to believe that few Mansubat survive as
ture game endings, in spite of the desire of the compilers of the
MSS. to make this appear the case.

About 1,600 Mansubat are preserved in the MSS., but by eliminat-
duplicates and closely parallel positions, Professor Murray has
reduced their number to about 553. They fall into two classes: Those with few pieces, where interest centres on the accuracy of the play; and those with many pieces, where interest centres on the unexpected mating play. The distinction is roughly that made today between end-games and problems, though the character of the strategy illustrated presents very little equivalent to the modern forms of strategy.

It is the "mating Mansubat," like No. 1, which principally concern us. These problems, as we now call them, are remarkable for their clear-cut themes, however trivial these themes appear to us to-day. Usually some form of sacrifice is involved.

Quiet play, as we know it, is altogether absent from the Mating Mansubat, owing to the threatening mates which impend if the forced solution is not strictly followed. Often these threatening mates are introduced by the addition of actual dead-heads. In No. 1, the Sg6 and Rd7 may be omitted without interfering with the accuracy of a Mate in Three. But the Mansubat were not Mates in a specified number of moves. They were, with some late exceptions, proposed as Wins (or, in the case of the end-game Mansubat, often as Draws). Hence No. 1 would not have been sound as a Win, without the Rd7 and Sg6, because 1. KxRh7 would have been a perfectly effective Mate in Four, and a Mate in four would have been just as sound a Win as a Mate in three. As the problem stands, if White does not mate in Three, he will lose.

The Mansubat were presented impartially as Wins or Draws by White (Red) or by Black, and there was no general convention as to which side was to play from the bottom of the board in the recorded diagrams. Ambiguity was avoided by writing upside-down the pieces playing from the top of the Board. For these reasons, in reprinting the Mansubat to-day, it is often necessary to reverse the colours of the men or the top and bottom of the board, so as to conform with present day usage.

An important characteristic of the Arabian problems, which will be noticed in both Nos. 1 and 2, consists in the purity and economy of the mates. Many of these problems end in what are now termed Model-mates, a fact rather surprising when our attention is drawn to it, and still more of them end in mates which are pure although they are not actually economical, some of the attacking pieces remaining out of use in the mating picture. The principle of economy is intentionally not extended to the Black forces.

The best known of all the Arabian problems is that called Dilaram's Mate, No. 2, or the Maiden's Problem, as it appears first to have been christened. The story goes that a certain nobleman, who was inordinately given to betting on his skill at chess, one day actually staked his wife, the fair Dilaram, on a game. Things were going badly for him and his opponent was about to inflict the final
blow, when Dilaram herself happened to look at the board and cried out to her less talented husband: “Sacrifice your two Rooks and not me!” Although this pleasant fiction is found only after the problem had been copied through several manuscripts, it attained an enormous popularity, and has come down in song and story through many centuries. The problem itself is the basis of some 200 different settings in the European MSS. To understand the solution it is necessary to remember that the old-rule Bishop (Alfil) jumped diagonally to the second square in any direction. At best it could command only four squares altogether. So, in No. 2, the second move is 2. Bf5+, jumping over the Sg4 and assuming guard from f5 over h7. The rest of the solution will be readily grasped.

In many cases the changes which took place in the motions of the pieces about 1475, and which gradually became accepted as we now know them through the standardizing influence of printing, prevent a full enjoyment of the earlier Arabian problems by those who are not actually students. Fortunately the moves of the Kings, Rooks and Knights were not changed, and those of the Pawns only partly so. Problems restricted to these pieces, like No. 1, can be solved to-day as readily as under the old rules. But it is only rarely that the moves of the Bishops in the old problems can be made to coincide with present-day possibilities, and practically never the moves of the Queens. Hence the restrictions imposed on the choice of examples to illustrate this chapter.

The Mansubat held their place in Mohammedan countries for seven or eight centuries. Somewhere around the Twelfth Century their influence began to be felt in European Christian countries. Later, when the new rules of play were generally adopted in Europe, these countries returned the compliment by introducing the new rules into the Mohammedan world, somewhere around the end of the sixteenth century. Under the modern rules the Arabian
composers never attained their former pre-eminence. The only one among their later composers who is remembered to-day is Philip Stamma, who flourished about 1735.

It is very difficult to say exactly when, and how vigorously, the chess problem became engrafted on the European stock, for references to problems outside of the manuscript collections themselves are hardly to be found at all. The game itself was widely cultivated, especially among the nobility, and there are many hundreds of references to its popularity in every branch of the contemporary literature, whereas there are barely two mentions on record of problems. This might be taken to indicate that the problem held a very subordinate place, were it not that the number of problem MSS. is large and that the references in these to betting on the soundness of individual positions point to a popular vogue for wagers of such a character. One argument in favour of our believing that there was a fairly general knowledge about problems is found in the fact that the name given to them (Italian: Partita; French: Jeux Parties) was currently adopted in several different senses quite apart from chess, and survives in use in English to this day in the word: Jeopardy.

At first the purpose of the Partita was the same as had been the purpose of the Mansubat, to help players in learning useful tricks for end play in the game. This is shown by one of the two literary references already referred to. It occurs in Chaucer’s Book of the Duchess:

But god wolde I had ones or twyse
Y-koud and knewed the leupardyse
That coude the Grek Pithagores!
I shulde have pleyd the bet at ches,
And kept my fers the bet therby.

That the Partita derived from the Mansubat, and not from Pythagoras, is soon appreciated from a study of the European MSS. These are usually, especially at first, mere transcripts of Arabian positions, in which is sometimes intercalated a shorter series of European adaptations or innovations. The earliest surviving collections date from the Thirteenth Century, though it is hard to establish approximate dates in many cases.

Some of these collections are largely haphazard, like that of the Alfonso MS., which was executed by order of Alfonso X., the Wise, of Castile, who reigned 1252-1284. This is attributed to 1283, and consists of 103 problems. The majority of these are of Arabian origin, except a sudden little group of fourteen positions which occurs in the second half of the work and which is apparently of European origin. The attempt is made, according to the introduction, to grade the problems according to the number of men used, but this arrangement breaks down after the first 69 problems. Other
compilers classified their selections according to the number of moves, an equally elementary method, but one which has not altogether been superseded at the present day, so we should not be too scornful of it. In this category belong Bonus Socius and Civis Bononiae.

Bonus Socius was the pseudonym of a compiler who was perhaps also the composer of a few of the problems in his collection. At least, among the total of 194 problems in the earliest manuscript of it which has come down to us (now in the National Library at Florence), among the customary transcripts from Arabian sources and the usual European betting problems, there are a few positions, like Nos. 4 and 5 of this chapter, which have a decided individuality not met with in the problems of any of the other mediaeval collections. Also, where problems from other sources are found slightly modified in Bonus Socius, there are occasional little touches which suggest an understanding more skilful than that of other copyists, some of whom certainly knew no more of chess than do some printers of to-day.

Nothing is known of the identity of Bonus Socius or of his reasons for choosing this particular pseudonym. In certain later extensions of the Florentine manuscript, notably in two in the National Library in Paris, the initials N. de N. and later the full name Nicholes de St. Nicholai were substituted in the introduction instead of the Bonus Socius pseudonym, but as these manuscripts are probably fifty years later in date it is possible that this was simply the name of a copyist, who thought his adding of further problems to the original collection entitled him to the claim of full authorship.

There have been numerous efforts to translate this Bonus Socius pseudonym. Some have seen in it a translation of the well-known Italian family name: Buoncompagni; others simply a profession of good-companionship on the part of the compiler, who speaks elsewhere in his introduction of submitting his work to the tolerant notice of his “masters, friends and companions.” Still others, including van der Linde and Murray, have interpreted Socius to mean Teacher, this being said to be a technical use of the word in certain Lombard Universities, and have seen in Bonus Socius a member of one of these institutions of learning, who wished to keep his identity concealed because of the flippant character of chess studies. If such a teacher really was the Nicholas of St. Nicholas of the Paris MSS., the revelation of his name when he sent away copies of his work to other lands, perhaps to his own country, would have been entirely proper.

There is hardly any better evidence of the date of Bonus Socius than there is of his identity. The year 1266 has been attributed to the Florentine MS., because the frontispiece shows a Moor playing at chess with a white man, and the Moor has been supposed
to represent the Saracen blindfold player, Buzetto, who made a triumphant visit to Florence in that year. The architectural features of this frontispiece, however, are thought by others to indicate a date somewhere in the last quarter of the Thirteenth Century and this hypothesis is corroborated by the general hand-writing of the MS.

Civis Bononieae was a later compilation, to all appearances. The compiler tells us that he was a citizen of Bologna, and he intended to reveal his full identity by means of an acrostic; but this has proved beyond the skill of anyone as yet to decipher. His work follows Bonus Socius, but it has not the same accurate division throughout the problems according to the number of their moves, and in several other respects it shows an inferior appreciation of the finer contents of problems. The special interest of the Civis Bononieae collection is the stress it lays on the value of problems for betting purposes. The introduction gives many curious details as to the doctoring and setting up of problems where wagers on questions of soundness were intended. This brings us to what became the definite characteristic of European problems, as contrasted with the value the Arabians laid on their value as training for chess play.

No. 3 will give a good example of a betting problem. It is No. 1 of the Civis Bononieae collection. It is a two-move ending abbreviated from an Arabian five-move Mansuba. The abbreviation was probably made by the Arabs themselves, as the position appears in the Arabian section of the Alfonsine MS., just as in Diagram 3, but with the White King added and also two opponent's Rooks. In this form the problem was a true Mansuba, or demonstration of a forced Win. The European transcription made the problem into a Mate in Two “exactly,” and so did away with the necessity for the opponent’s Rooks and incidentally did away with any necessity for the White King, which was consequently also removed from the Board. So, in our diagram, we have a little miniature which would be familiar to all. The mating trick shown has survived to this day in many a more elaborate setting.
In setting up the problem the proposer of the bet would say: "This is a mate in Two, do you choose White or Black?" that is, do you agree that a two-move solution is possible, or do you bet that it cannot be done?" To this the better would answer: "I recognize your four Knights in a row; I see a mate for White by sacrificing the Rook," and he would win. What then was the betting value of such a position? It lay in the minor modifications which could be made, apparently unintentionally, but which entirely modified the accuracy of the problem. The solution given by Civis Bononiae to No. 3 explains this: "This works, I say, provided there is no white King on the board. But if you place the White King at g4, it will not work, for the capture of the Rook produces check, and so there is no mate on the second move. But again if the King be placed at h3, mate will occur, not by checking with the Rook, but by capturing the black Knight on the first move. Further if a Black Pawn were added at c4, it could not be solved, since you could move the Pawn and then neither Knight nor Rook could mate."

The stage for the little drama is now all set. The gambler remembers the instructions given him in the introduction to the MS. and pretends to be a little confused in setting up the position. His victim is invited to bet whether the position is solvable in two moves. He recognizes the familiar four Knights and at once says the problem is sound. Then the gambler says he has forgotten the King and adds it at g4. The victim says that can make no difference, and a moment later finds himself paying the stakes. Next day he comes around again, and the gambler appears to have forgotten the incident. The same process is gone through, only the King is placed at h3. The victim, nettled by his unfortunate experience of the time before, is careful to satisfy himself, on accepting the challenge, as to whether the white King will suffer an adverse check. Noticing that this will be the case, he bets that the problem is not solvable, and again finds himself a moment later paying the stakes. He has overlooked the new way to mate by RxS. We would not suppose that many victims were gullible enough to bet any more on this particular position, but if they did, the gambler would add the Pawn at c4, and a third disillusionment would be in store for the victim.

The number of permutations which a familiar idea might be made to serve is only vaguely suggested by this simple example. We have already stated that the Dilaram problem, No. 2, gave rise to some 200 settings.

Betting on problems had its good results and its bad ones, the latter predominating. Its best effect was in reducing the number of the moves. While the average length of a Mansuba was eight moves, the European problems, including the transcriptions and modifications from the Arabic, had an average (according to Murray's computations) of only five moves, while in Civis Bononiae
more than half the problems were in two to four moves. The reason moves were so radically curtailed may have been in part owing to the lesser skill of composers, in part to the recognition by a very few of the merits of shorter themes, such as those in Nos. 4 and 5, but chiefly so that guesses as to the soundness or unsoundness of given positions might be made more quickly. The essence of betting on problems lay in the possibility of rapid bets.

No. 4.
Bonus Socius MS.

Mate in two.
1. Rh7-g7.

No. 5.
Bonus Socius MS.

Mate in three.
1. Bd3, Ke6; 2. Kc5, Ke5;
3. Re7 mate.
Kc6; 2. Ke5, Kc5;
3. Rc7 mate.

Another good result was the reduction in the number of pieces used. This came about doubtless partly through the betting influence; but in part it evidently resulted from the changed stipulations of the solutions. Much of the black force necessary to render sound an Arabian Win, was no longer required when the same position had become a specific Mate in N Moves. We have seen that the removal of unnecessary force went so far as to do away on occasion with the White King, as in No. 3. In Civis Bononiæ the problems average only between six and seven pieces each, and the average on the attacking side is 2½ times that on the defending side. The contrast with the very heavy weights of the Mansubat, in which the balance of the two armies was always kept in view, is obvious.
This lessening of the forces and of the length resulted in a few delightful little problems, notably in a half dozen or so found in the Bonus Socius MS., of which Nos. 4 and 5 are examples. An ingenious specimen, possibly from a still earlier source, is No. 102. The Bonus Socius problems have features which do not reappear until we come to the time of d'Orville and J.B. of Bridport, who were seemingly the logical successors of this Bonus Socius manner. The clever try, 1. Kc2(e2), is to be noted in No. 4. No. 5 is the bifurcation of a much earlier mate, the bifurcation resulting from the use of symmetry, a feature unknown to the Arabians. In No. 5 it is to be remembered that the Bishop moves in the old manner, jumping only to the second square on a diagonal. In the initial diagram, the Bishop does not guard b5, so that 1. Re7 is not to be considered as a cook. A curious result of this form of Bishop move is that the mates in No. 5 were both models in the days prior to 1475, a quality which the same mate afterwards could not boast. It is noteworthy that this mate has always remained a favourite, more so than many impure mates of later introduction, showing doubtless the surviving influence of this particular very old problem!

On the whole the European problem shows great deterioration when compared to the Mansuba. The accuracy of the themes became very much clouded by the interest in mere solvability. Thus, to claim that No. 3 with the King at h3 can be compared with the same problem if the King stands at a8 seems to us absurd; yet the value of the former placement from the betting standpoint was far superior, because the solution ensuing would be the less expected.

The publication of problems entirely unsound, for the sake of the unsoundness, is simply an aggravation of the same fashion. Such settings would never have been tolerated by the Arabians any more than we would tolerate them to-day, but among the Partita such problems are constantly cropping up and confusing every attempt at a rational study of themes.

Such methods, which we are tempted to call outside of problem strategy altogether, also resulted in composers losing whatever natural powers they may have had. Probably the European gift for composition was very small compared to the Arabian, anyway, but soon the Europeans reached a stage where they could not even get a problem sound when they wished to do so. Then they took to overloading their positions with conditions, mates with a given piece or pawn, mates on a given square, and what not. This terrible burden, virtually unknown in the Mansubat, except in the late manuscripts, continued down well to 1850.

It has only been since about 1840 that the ground lost by the Partita has been gradually regained. It has been the regaining of this lost ground and the holding on to the good points which they
did introduce which eventually has led to the birth of the Modern Chess Problem. In this process of regaining the ground lost an important factor has been the slow sensing and formulation of the so-called chess problem laws, the Law of Purity, the Law of Economy, and the like. These laws did good service in their day, although their very rigidity helped in turn to fetter anew the growth of the Modern Problem.

It may be well to point out here once for all that chess problem Laws, like everything else concerned with problems, including the very motions of the men, are based on convention, and that a particular Law can only rule those who are willing to obey. But the laws themselves, even where one does not choose to obey them, must be understood if one is to understand the various tendencies which are now to call for our attention, as we rapidly skip over to the first half of the XIXth Century, the epoch of the Chess Problem's triumphant revival, and then trace its development up to the present period of efflorescence.

Note.—Those desiring a deeper insight into the problems of the thousand years outlined in this chapter should go to:—A. van der Linde: "Geschichte und Literatur des Schachspiels," 1874; "Quellenstudien zur Geschichte des Schachspiels," 1881; "Das Schachspiel des XVI. Jahrhunderts," 1874; (there are additional books written by this distinguished Dutch historian and philologist, but they are not mentioned because they are in the Dutch language); T. von der Lasa: "Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Schachspiels," 1897; J. F. Magee, Jr.: "Bonus Socius," 1910; Bilguer (Schlechter and, for the historical part, Kohitz); "Handbuch des Schachspiels," 8th Ed., 1916; H. J. R. Murray: "A History of Chess," 1913.

For the Arabian and European problems, the selections given by Professor Murray are exceedingly complete. Eighteenth century collections are those of Staunza, 1737; Ercole del Rio, 1750; Lolli, 1763; Cozio, 1766; and Pouziani, 1769. These composers were of importance rather as practical players. Later came such lesser lights as Mendheim and Dollinger; but it was left to Bolton, d'Orville, Anderssen and Brede finally to take the lead in the right direction. Problems by all these composers are included in the mammoth collection of Alexandre, 1846.
Chapter II.

THE OLD SCHOOL

By "the Old School" is generally understood the group of composers who flourished around 1840 and who laid the foundations for the modern problem as we now know it. The period terminated, roughly speaking, with the publication, in 1846, of the great collection of over 2,000 problems compiled by A. Alexandre (b. 1766-d. 1850). This is the largest collection of chess problems ever published in a single volume, and it summarized the work of the Old School, besides containing the then known problems by all earlier composers.

The composers of the Old School differ from the composers of the Middle Ages in several respects. The stipulations of their problems call for mates in the shortest possible number of moves, the number usually being indicated. This forms a contrast with the Arabian stipulations of the White to Win type, which were clearly a relic of the time when problems were actually end-games; and it forms a contrast also with the European type of stipulation, which called for a mate in a specified number of moves, not invariably the shortest possible number, and which was clearly based on the betting conventions.

Other survivals from the Arabian standards of composition, which were now gradually given up, though not any too quickly nor without much apparent hesitation, were the game-like positions, the set wins for Black, the equality of forces, and the like. These Arabian standards had survived, through the European Middle Ages, down to the problems of Dollinger and Mendheim, and they continued to survive after 1840, but with constantly diminishing vigour. The standards of the European betting problems, which for a time did so much to establish better economy and shorter lengths of solution, and which laid no stress at all on naturalness or even on possibility of position, had again been subordinated to the long-winded Arabian methods long prior to the opening of the nineteenth century. The problems which survived, both from Arabian and European sources, were largely a matter of chance; for most of the manuscripts, now considered fundamental to our knowledge of Mediaeval composition, had not yet been located or studied. The Bonus Socius manuscript itself was not known until 1854.

Clearly these two factors, the stipulation not to exceed the minimum number of moves and the fashion of using only forces commensurate with the intrinsic character of themes, led to the discovery of combinations much more intricate than were those of
REV. HORATIO Bolton.

JOHN) B(ROWN) of Bridport.

Enlarged from photograph Chess Board entitled the Chess Champions of England published by
the problems composed prior to the emphasizing of these two factors, when the chief requirement was to defeat at any cost a materially stronger opponent. In the pre-Alexandre days, one could hardly hope to achieve any strategy more distinctive than that, say, of Philidor's Legacy (see Nos. 151-152), which might well be accepted as the high-watermark of the modernized Arabian style. It is certainly unnecessary to contrast such a style with what has come since!

One may perhaps word this contrast most distinctly by saying that in the modern problem the fight is, generally speaking, no longer a fight against strength, but against time. And from this fact one may further deduce, that correctness and beauty have become the chief purposes of the chess problem.

The surviving rule that diagram positions must be derivable from actual play, which will be discussed further in Chapter XI, is a direct inheritance from Arabian chess. The setting aside of this rule in the European betting problems, which we have seen went so far as to permit of problems without even a white King, proved to be only a transitory vagary. There have been many other innovations, at one time or another, which have led the chess problem still further afield from the conventions of practical play; but these are to be considered mainly as constituting examples of chess-futurism and they will be dealt with in Chapter XI.

The prominence to-day universally given to the principles of Accuracy and Beauty was only gradually attained during the period of the Old School and of the Transition School which followed. Horatio Bolton (1793-1873) was the first to place emphasis on these two features. He made no profession of his new principles, so that we can only trace their development in his actual problems.

No. 6, for instance, has a game-like position and a slight preponderance of the black force. In an older problem, as of Dollinger, we should proceed by 1. SxQP+, threatening capture of the black Queen; but here

No. 6.
H. Bolton.
Frontispiece, Chess Player's Chronicle, 1842.

 Mate in three.
1. Qf5+, KxQ; 2. Sc5xPd7.
Ke7; 2. QxPd7+.
this would lead to no mate in the three moves allowed us. The solution occurs only when we sacrifice the white Queen: 1. Qf5+, KxQ; 2. Sc5xPd7, with a model mate on the next move by 3. Pg4. This unexpected quiet move, 2. SxP, is another point of difference from the older problems; in other words we are finally leaving behind us the thousand-year long influence of the Arabian pursuits by consecutive checks. To the modern taste this No. 6 is still crude enough, but it is carrying forward a step the germ of evolution which we met for a moment in the European Middle Ages in a few problems of the Bonus Socius manuscript, such as Nos. 4 and 5.

Bolton lived, it must be remembered, at a period when the long-range problem, after being trimmed down for a time in the European betting problem, had regained the full popularity it had enjoyed among the Arabsians. The average in all of Bolton's problems is about eight moves, so that we have to trace the novel symptoms of his style often, indeed almost invariably, in problems of just such lengthy calibre. So No. 7, in spite of its seven moves, is distinctly in the modern trend, containing a clever waiting manœuvre of the white Rook, presented with perfect economy. The passing of the long-range problem followed naturally from the composition of such problems as this, inasmuch as practice in economy soon showed that most themes could be illustrated just as well in much shorter form. Add to this the increasing nervousness of modern life, our growing impatience with anything we consider to be tedious, and it is not hard to see how the popular length of the chess-problem has been destined constantly to diminish, until today in the extraordinary popularity of the two-mover in many countries the solver almost loses the sense of any length whatever in the problems he studies, the sense of breadth, interpreted by a wealth of thematic variations, having become dominant.

Another step forward was taken by Auguste d'Orville, "du Club d'Anvers." We do not know of just what nationality he was. Kohtz assumed him to be French, because, in 1842, he edited a
collection of his problems with French text; but if this were so, what would become of the Antwerp Club? If we suppose that he was born in Antwerp prior to 1830 (probably about 1813), when this city was still a part of Holland, he would have been a "born Dutchman." But French, Belgian or Dutch, his importance to us consists in his having been the first to understand the value of graceful construction and of model mates. He either used his pleasing models as a nucleus for his charming light-weights, as in No. 8, or as the final apotheosis of his elegant mating combinations with quiet moves, as in No. 9. He so shortened the length of his solutions that he may be considered as the first of modern two-move composers. He impresses one constantly with his fine sense of economy of force as well as with his intuitive feeling for the proper length for his solutions.

About the same time, the famous German player, Adolf Anderssen (1818-1879), began his chess career as a composer. He loved brilliant combinations, thrilling keys, all the elements of surprise which the artificial problem could cultivate to a degree never possible in actual play. In his later life, however, Anderssen gave up composition completely in favour of the practical game. His two problem
collections date from 1842 and 1852 respectively. He was one of the most skilful composers of his time, and the very fact that such a great master-player began his career as a problemist helped to stimulate a more general interest in that branch of chess.

Anderssen was the first thematic composer; the combinations his problems contain reveal the beauty of logic, as contrasted with the beauty of form which d'Orville emphasized. We shall meet Anderssen again when discussing the problem themes; in this chapter a single specimen of his impetuous combinations will suffice. The present-day solver may consider that the fantastic key of No. 10 is rather easy after all, on account of the strong impending threat by Black, 1 ... , Pe1(Q)+; but as pioneer work this was fascinating and inspiring, and consequently first-class.

No. 10.
Adolf Anderssen.
Illustrated London News, Jan., 1846.

Mate in five.
1. Qe1, Pd2xQ(Q); 2. Rd4;

No. 11.
Julius Brede.
Schachaufgaben, 1844.

Mate in four.
1. Se2, Bf6+; 2. Qd4, either Sd5;
3. Sc3+, SxS; 4. Qe5 mate.
(1 ... , Sc4+; 2. PxS+, BxP;
3. Sc3+.)
(1 ... , Sb6-d5; 2. Qd3+; 3. Qd4+.)
(1 ... , Sd7; 2. Sc3+; 3. Qd4+.)

A fourth composer of the Old School was Julius Brede (1800-1849). He lacked the elegance of Bolton and d'Orville and the constructive skill of Anderssen, but to a certain extent he was more modern than any of these. Like Anderssen, he loved thematic combinations and
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surprising effects. The cross-check, with pinning and unpinning of a White piece, shown in No. 11, has been given the name of the Brede cross-check. Finding such an early example in his collection of 1844, after this theme had been receiving fresh attention in recent years, makes us realise once more the truth uttered so long ago by the Preacher of Ecclesiastes, that there is no new thing under the sun!
Chapter III.

THE TRANSITION SCHOOL.

The period between 1845 and 1862 is of the utmost importance in the history of the development of the chess problem. It was the trial period of the young art, during which the principal themes found their first clear cut presentation. The old masters, the most important of whom were mentioned in the preceding chapter, showed how the problem technique, the outward form and method for the expression of chess thoughts, could be refined and improved. During the Transition Period, the ideas which deserved expression were discovered. There was no systematic search for new ideas; their very profusion enabled the composer to pick up his themes almost at random; so that, as the number of composers increased, even this unsystematic kind of investigation brought to light the fundamentals of a great majority of our modern themes. In this chapter we will discuss a few of these problems, without entering too far into the study of their thematic details; that may be reserved for the Second Part, where the themes will be treated independently of historical considerations.

To begin with, No. 12 shows us a quite forgotten problem, by an author remembered only under his initials; while No. 13 is without doubt the most famous problem ever composed, the "Indian Problem," so called because it was contributed to the Chess Player's Chronicle from India, and published anonymously. The exact identity of the composer, the Rev. Henry Augustus Loveday (1815-1848), of the Bengal Ecclesiastical Establishment, was only determined some sixty years later, largely through the researches of the English composer, John Keeble (b. 1855).

Both Nos. 12 and 13 have several solutions. No. 13 has nine keys and seventeen alternative move-sequences, a fact which may seem incompatible with our designation of it as the most famous of all chess problems. Most people would maintain that an unsound problem is not a problem at all; and yet here we find great inaccuracy going hand in hand with immortality. To understand the matter, let us go over the solution and afterwards compare it with No. 12.

In Loveday's problem only the black pawns can move, 1. ..., Pb4 and then 2. ..., Pb5. Thereafter Black is stalemated, so that White must prepare a release from this impending stalemate not later than the third move. Now the typical combination effecting this purpose requires only two moves, so that White is not in any hurry and may
begin with any complete waiting move, such as 1. Kb1, or 1. Rd8, or 1. Bh1. Then after Black has played 1..., Pb4, White must begin the typical combination, since a purely arbitrary continuation freeing Black from stalemate would manifestly not lead to the desired mate. The true solution to this puzzling question must have come as a startling revelation to the successful solvers of 1845. The right continuation is 2. Bc1!, Pb5; 3. Rd2!, Kf4; 4. Rd4mate. The third move demonstrates why the Bishop must pass to the other side of the square d2. This manoeuvre is the theme of the Indian Problem. It consists in having a long-range piece cross a critical square (such a move being called a critical move, after the definition given by Kohtz and Kockelkorn in their treatise: Das Indische Problem, 1903) and in subsequently occupying the same critical square with another "intercepting" or "interfering" piece, thus releasing Black from the stalemate. In No. 13 the manoeuvre permits (or we might say: forces) the Black King to move into the line of force of the interfered piece, thus introducing a discovered mate by the interfering piece; but this may be varied by having the interference move unpin a
secondary Black piece. This definition may sound complicated, but it will be readily understood when comparing the play of No. 13.

The importance of Loveday’s discovery of the critical move will be appreciated when we turn back three years to No. 12. Here Black has but one move before he is stalemated: 1... Pe3. We will begin again by a waiting move: 1. Bf7 orBg8, and when Black attempts this stalemating defence (about which he has no choice), we shall find no difficulty in releasing him, as 2. Bc4 is a promising move and the continuation 3. Kb2 is sufficiently obvious. Or we may proceed equally well (and this appears to have been the composer’s intention) by 1. Bf4, Pe3; 2. Pb4 and again 3. Kb2.

In other words we can solve No. 12 move by move. But in No. 13 we must not only find a releasing move, but we must plan the effect of this releasing move in advance. Loveday, then, was the first to demonstrate difficulty of solution resulting from the application of a preconceived strategic sequence consisting of a fixed series of moves as rigorously interdependent and as logically connected as the elements of a syllogism; he was carrying the principles of Anderssen a definite step forward. Problems containing such strategic manoeuvres are not solved by chance; the solver does not stumble upon a whole line of play by groping around some tell-tale feature in the construction, in the manner that the Bd6 would suggest the release by 2. Bc4 in No. 12 or the Be6 the release by 2. Pb4. One must indeed grasp the entire theory of the strategy in No. 13 before so much as the first move in the theme can be played.

So we can understand the difference between the unsoundness of No. 12 and that of No. 13. No. 12 is unsound, not only because there is a choice of first moves, but because these will lead to quite distinct mating combinations, through 2. Bc4 and 2. Pb4. But the choice of keys in No. 13 is immaterial, since the solving combination comes through unimpaired. The problem is simply inaccurate. It is inaccurate because the solution is one move too long. It could be corrected by removing the Pb6 and calling the position a three-mover. Yet the problem did convey, and does still convey to-day, in spite of its faulty construction, the clear and definite message which its composer wished to express, and this message was a vital one, namely, that chess problems could present, not simply ideas built around single clever and surprising moves, but equally well the far deeper ideas which depend on logical sequences of moves. Thus the Indian Problem introduced a new element into the artistic possibilities of the chess problem, the beauty that consists in Order and Design.

After the publication of the Indian Problem, thematic positions appeared in constantly increasing numbers. The English Composers in particular, who became known as the Yorkshire School, W. Grimshaw (1832-1890), H. E. Kidson (1832-1910) and others, were
very active and skillful in developing this style of composition. The *Illustrated London News*, the chess column of which dates from 1842, was the principal medium through which many of these new ideas found their first publication, the editor being the English master, Howard Staunton (1810-1874).

The possibilities of the Critical Move were widely studied, and were used in widely varied ways as elements of new attacking combinations as well as to produce odd effects in the defensive play of Black. Nos. 14 and 15 are the forerunners of a still popular theme; they are related by the black critical moves contained in each as well as by another characteristic which we may well stop to discuss here.

In No. 14, Grimshaw has not attained any special constructive finish, but we will not quarrel with the position on that account, because so pointed an idea could hardly have been shown in a fully graceful presentation in 1850. To understand the theme, we first try 1. Qf6, threatening 2. Pc4 mate. If Black defends by 1. ... Be6 (or
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

Re8), 2. Qe5 is mate; but after 1. ..., Re6, White has no mating continuation within the next four moves. The previous defence mentioned, 1. ..., Be6, interferes with the Re8, allowing mate, interference being the name given to the obstruction of the line of force of a certain piece by some other piece. It will be noticed that 1. ..., Re6 in turn interferes with the line of force of theBg4, shutting off its command of d7 and c8; but this effect does not forward the cause of White, as he finds nothing to do by approaching these squares. On the other hand, if the Bishop stood at the other end of this same line of force, as at c8, and this same Rook interference, 1. ..., Re6, occurred, White would materially benefit by being afforded a free command of f5. Therefore the solution consists in decoying the black Bishop across this critical square e6, by playing 1. Be8, threatening 2. Qe5 mate. Black now has no choice and must play 1. ..., BxB. Thereupon White can play 2. Q66, and when Black replies by his former defence of 2. ..., Re6, the interference of the black Bishop has become effective and White continues with a pretty mating continuation: 3. Qd4+, KxQ; 4. Sf5+ (this being the point of the whole manoeuvre), Kd5; 5. Pc4 mate.

This No. 14 has alike great merits and demerits. The meritorious feature is the demonstration of mutual interference of Black Bishop and Rook. But when the Rook is interfered with (2. ..., Be6; 3. Qe5 mate) a mate on the third move results, so that this variation attracts much less attention than does the beautiful continuation after the interference of the Black Bishop, thematically accentuated by the critical move. In other words, the interferences are presented unequally, and we may take it for granted that Grimshaw himself merely intended to demonstrate the interference by the Rook after the critical move. But as No. 14 is the first problem containing the mutual black interference of Rook and Bishop, this theme has been called the Grimshaw Interference.

The short mate after 2. ..., Be6 has been called a demerit. In this case, where a thematic variation is concerned, such a short mate must certainly be regarded as a defect. But in general, where no thematic principle is offended, it is a question of taste whether a short mate is to be condemned as a defect or not. Where the variation containing the short mate is of minor importance, it becomes negligible. Problems with a sharply-pointed idea often permit of a disregard of constructive details, and in them a short mate can hardly be called a flaw; but in problems with harmoniously interwoven variations a short mate tends to lower the value of the whole result. However, in no case does a short mate constitute unsoundness, so long as other full length variations remain.

No. 14 has still another thematic defect: the length of the problem is excessive in proportion to its theme, which could easily be presented in three moves, while even the Queen sacrifice could have
been retained in a problem of four moves. Thematically the Grimshaw Interference, preceded by a critical move, is a three-move theme, and it is always more economical to present a theme in the least number of moves; but in 1850 the realization that the length of a solution should be in proportion to the theme was only gradually beginning to be recognized; even to-day the recognition is by no means universal.

No. 15 is open to the same criticism of having too long a solution. The introductory moves of White and Black, 1. Sg3, Re8, are irrelevant to the presentation of the theme, which is developed in the continuation, 2. Re2, BxR; 3. QSe4! Following the critical move by the black Bishop, brought about by the decoy sacrifice of the white Rook, the double sacrifice of the white Knight at e4 on the third move shuts off the Bishop from its guard over the square f5 and at the same time shuts off the Rook from e2, besides guarding the white Re5, and so threatening 4. Bc3 mate. If Black meets this threat by capturing the Se4 with either his Rook or Bishop, the "other" officer remains obstructed and the blocking of the square e4 permits of mate by the Sg3 either at e2 or f5 according to circumstances. The relationship between No. 14 and No. 15 is obvious, for in both problems there is mutual interference of the black Rook and Bishop; but in No. 14 this interference occurs on an open square, whereas in No. 15 it follows a white sacrifice upon the square. The latter form of interference is of a lower order, because it is easier to force the black interference moves by the sacrifice on the same square than to force them by an indirect manoeuvre; but the sacrifice adds its own charm, so that certain solvers will prefer No. 15 to No. 14, quite apart from the consideration that the theme is not dimmed by any short mate. This mutual interference, with a white double sacrifice on the square of interference (critical square), is called the Novotny theme.

Two more of Grimshaw's problems are given as Nos. 16 and 17, indicative of the wide range of his artistic skill. The three-mover speaks for itself; the two-mover is not so striking, but was of great importance for the development of thematic composition. It shows the small value still placed on two-movers in Grimshaw's day that so noteworthy a position as this was printed in notation only, as an enigma. Nevertheless this problem, with its Bristol features, had the merit of demonstrating that a sharp and thematic idea could be presented even in the small compass of two moves. The Bristol theme will be discussed when we reach No. 20. It is enough to notice here that No. 17 does not embody pure clearance, inasmuch as the white Queen does not go to g8 solely to open the diagonal b3-f7, but primarily to guard the Ra8 after 1 ..., Bc6, and to pin the Be8 after 1 ..., KxR. The problem contains several elements characteristic of English taste, an admirable key, a pointed idea, a
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

No. 16.

W. GRIMSHAW.

Illustrated London News, 10 June, 1854.

Mate in three.

1. Rf1 threat; 2. Pf3+.
PxR (Q); 2. Sf3.
Pc1 (S); 2. RxB+.
Pf3; 2. Rg1.

No. 17.

W. GRIMSHAW.

Illustrated London News, 5 Feb., 1853.

Mate in two.

1. Qg8.

number of tries, such as 1. Qf7+ and 1. Qe6, and a decided admixture of difficulty. The Bf2 seems a flaw to-day, its sole purpose being to guard c5 in the variation 1. ... Ke6. In the initial position the white Queen guards this square, so the composer probably thought the use of a white Pawn at d4 (with the Rb1 on b2) would draw the solver's attention too closely to the double guard of c5. The modern composer, however, avoids the use of an inactive piece, where the work can be done as readily by a Pawn.

At the head of No. 18 we meet another famous name, the indication "First Prize" showing that we have reached the era of problem tourneys. Appropriately enough, this era opened with the Era tournament of 1856, closely followed by the Manchester tourney. In those days a tourney was an important event, contributing to increase the popularity of problem composition and to advance the standard of excellence. Nowadays, on the contrary, it would be better if there were fewer tourneys; for these have become so numerous that really meritorious compositions cannot be produced in sufficient numbers to justify the number of prizes which have
to be awarded, and often the honours pass to conventional entries, nicely polished and with just enough originality to escape disqualification.

Healey’s No. 18 is a clever problem, but not modern. Its merit lies in the quiet continuation, 2. Qg4. This quiet variation constitutes a good two-move theme, and its presentation in the longer garb of a three-mover may well be criticised as a breach of the stricter interpretation of the “law” of economy. The theme is the ambush of the white Queen behind the Se4, which enables White to give pin-mates with his Knight by 3. Sc5 and Sc3. Pinning, as here, through the agency of a Masked Battery, has become a very hackneyed device, and what seemed so original in 1857 now constitutes a theme no longer likely to yield very much of value. The poor problem editor of to-day has, as one of his troubles, to reject the frequent creations contributed by beginners who have been labouring under the inspiration of Healey’s three-mover!

No. 19.

H. E. Kidson.

Westminster Club Papers, 1868.

Mate in four.
1. Bc7, Re6; 2. Ra8, Re3; 3. Rf8.

No. 18.

F. Healey.

1st Prize, Manchester Ty., 1857.

Mate in three.
1. Qc8, Ra7 or b7; 2. Qg4.
Sc7; 2. Qb7.
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

So many themes were being discovered by the Transition School, that the temptation is great to speak here of several more of them; but it is better to reserve such discussions for our later systematic exposition, when the examples which are thematically the best will arrest the attention and not necessarily those which are the oldest.

One theme however must be spoken of here, that of Healey’s famous prizewinner in the Bristol tourney, No. 20, a problem whose publication caused a sensation recalling that created by the appearance of the Indian Problem. And not without good reason. The key is a bewildering one. The Rook plays at hide and seek, and the other white pieces are so situated that no apparent purpose for its move suggests itself. Of course the further unfolding of the solution reveals the object of the strange key, but the first amazing effect is not lost: 1. Rh1, Bd7; 2. Qb1 (threatening 3. Qb4), Bb5; 3. Qg1 mate. The Queen must mate at g1; hence the Rook must clear the road, and as it cannot go off the first rank, it must go along it and beyond the square g1. Healey showed fine thematic feeling in not using his Rook for any secondary work in any subsidiary portion of his solution (as we have seen that Grimshaw used his Queen in No. 17), but solely withdrawing it to its gloomy post to clear the line. So the key remains thematically pure, a characteristic which the German and some other critics have strongly emphasized and to which they have given the designation of Zweckrein, “pure in purpose.” A great part of the remarkable impression produced by the key of the Bristol Problem lies in the fact that the Queen, which is to benefit by the clearance, is placed far from the scene of the clearance, thus disguising very completely the purpose of such an initial move. Hence some critics have considered it as an essential part of the Bristol theme that the piece destined to follow along the line cleared by the key-move shall not initially be stationed upon that line, but shall move on to it in due course of the solution. In this respect No. 17 is not a Bristol at all, quite apart from any consideration of purity of purpose; and indeed

Mate in three.

1. Rh1, Bd7 or e8; 2. Qb1.
no two-mover can illustrate such a definition of the Bristol theme. The two-mover can very adequately embody clearance strategy; but the intermediary move, required to benefit by a Bristol key, makes the theme, so interpreted, into one of three moves. Frequent confusion occurs owing to the double use of the term, Bristol, meaning either any line clearance at all, or only such line clearances as are utilized in the restricted Healey an sense.

Two additional famous problems of the Transition School are added, Nos. 21 and 22, not because further examples of the composing

---

**No. 21.**

**J. G. Campbell.**


Mate in four.

1. Sh1 threat; 2. Qh3.
   Rb3; 2. Qf1, threat; 3. QxR+ or QxB.
   RxQ; 3. Sf2!
   Bf2; 3. QxB.

Rb1-f1; 2. QxR or Sf2.

Rf5; 2. Rc6-c7+, KxP; 3. Rb7.

Rf3; 2. Rc6-c7+ or QxR.

Qe7; 2. PxQ, KxP; 3. Pd6+
   Rf8; 3. PxR(Q).

Be3; 2. QxB.


PxP; 2. Qh3 or Qa6.

---

**No. 22.**

**J. G. Campbell.**


Mate in five.

1. Rh2, Sg6; 2. Rc1, threat;

3. RxR+.

2. ..., RxR;

3. Sh4+ (or SxS+), SxS; 4. Rc2!

2. ..., Rc7+ or Rc3;

3. RxR.

1. ..., SxS; 2. RxSe7, SxP;

styles of the times are here required, but that due tribute may be paid to J. G. Campbell (1830-1891), one of the foremost composers of the period. And there is yet another man who should be spoken of, who was known simply under his initials: J.B. (of Bridport).

This J.B., or John Brown (1827-1863), had a much lighter style than is typical of most composers of the period, and to this much of his importance to us is due. He may be regarded as the direct successor of d’Orville, in giving concrete and correct form to the latter’s ideals of elegance, which he carried a long distance forward thanks to the greatly improved technique which the passing of twenty years had placed at his command. His influence was very great in keeping before the problemists of the day the charms of sober and graceful construction, and in preventing these from being completely lost in the whirlpool of wild thematic fantasies.

Of the three-movers reproduced herein, No. 23 is of interest, because it may have given Healey an indication of a simple technical arrangement adapted to the needs of his Bristol idea. The position is in no sense an anticipation of No. 20, as it contains no germ of the clearance theme; yet the same two-move ending appears in both problems. In speaking of No. 20, this clever combination was not so much as mentioned, the effect of the key overwhelming all other impressions. But No. 23 offers a welcome opportunity quietly to relish this attractive line of play. It is the sort of chess thought about which no immediate dogmatic decision can be given. All we can do is to enjoy the subtle features, and await whether, as time passes, their impression grows upon us or not, and then to compare this mature impression with that produced, equally long after the first solving, by the much more pithy, though more brute, force of the Bristol itself.

Analogous remarks refer to No. 24. We must wait and see whether its gentle charm appeals to our taste.

So, at the close of this Transition Period, the element of taste
Mate in three.

arises. No word is more frequently misused as a cloak of ignorance, and no element is more frequently forgotten in would-be logical argumentations. To call J.B.'s problems insipid is less a reflection upon them than it is a reflection upon the taste of the solver himself; and to say of any problem, in general, that it does not appeal to one's taste, where the appreciation of what the composer meant is incomplete, shows only one's own limitations. The use of the word should be very carefully made.

The Transition Period has been limited to the years between 1845 and 1862. It should be recalled that 1845 was the date of the Indian Problem and 1846 that of Alexandre's famous compilation of 2000 Problems; so 1861 is the date of the Bristol Problem and 1862 that of the Handbuch der Schachaufgaben by Max Lange (1832-1899). The Indian Problem was the first of the great modern themes to be discovered; the Bristol Problem was the last of these. The great collection of Alexandre summarized an age that had closed; Lange's Handbook is of smaller account, but it is a symptom that the time had come to review what impetuous genius had wrought in a new age, now already closing, the period of adolescence, if one may so call it, of the chess problem.
CHAPTER IV.

TASTES AND SCHOOLS.

In building a chess problem it is manifestly impossible to accentuate equally at all times every element of its make up. One cannot at the same moment stress the similarity of the position to an end-game, and develop the fullest beauties of economy; nor can one attain the greatest variety of play if one insists that every mate shall be a model.

Hence different composers at different periods and in different lands have come, through personal inclination or through a study of different examples, to develop what has been defined in the last chapter as different tastes. And where one predilection has become sufficiently marked, either by wide acceptance or by the striking achievement of a more limited group, it is usually said to constitute the taste of a School. The word is not at all satisfactory, because a School seems to demand a specific teacher and conscious disciples, whereas in the problem Schools the relationships of the several composers to one another is rarely of so convenient a kind. It would be more accurate, perhaps, to speak of Periods or of Tendencies, according to circumstances. What has here been called the Transition School was, in point of fact, the Transition Period. Composers of different countries had small opportunities for any interchange of ideas, yet collectively, as has been shown, the chess problem in the fifteen or twenty years covered by this Period was moving in a clearly definable direction. So in some of the National Schools to be next considered, there will appear National Tendencies, not accepted by every composer of the country nor limited in their influences to the composers of the country, yet sufficiently localized, either in their origin or development, to make the use of the National adjective both very convenient and reasonably accurate.

So long as we keep in mind just what use is being made of the word "School," therefore, it will be found helpful towards getting a ready set of standards by which to place and to judge any particular problem. It should be remembered, as we proceed, that the use of the word in the sense of a Period ends with the Transition School, in about 1862, and that its use in the sense of a Tendency (or as formulating some popular form of Taste) begins about the same time. In the first two periods so far reviewed, under the names of the Old and the Transition Schools, it is clear that the composers were led by no common aesthetic program. It would be just as logical to speak of the years since 1862 as forming one or more
additional Periods; and if one desires one may think of a Third Period, covering the years since 1862, and constituting the Period of National Tendencies. Such a Period might again be divided chronologically, according to the gradual perfecting of the general standards of technique; but the chronological dates in the several countries become very much overlapped and confused. The consideration of the National Tendencies, as Schools and each by itself, is therefore much more convenient, so convenient indeed that the occasional inaccuracies into which such a treatment leads one may well be excused.

To understand the rationale of such a division of a Period of time into a group of co-existing Tendencies, one must always bear in mind that the Schools define the high lights emphasized by certain dominant composers of certain countries, while the many other composers whose influences have happened to be less dominant may have been true disciples or may not have enlisted in the national School, or for that matter in any special School at all. And one must also bear in mind the nature of these widely differing tastes, so that there may be available a general background against which the particular tenets of a particular School may be examined.

Very briefly, and somewhat inaccurately, one may say that the principal elements in the composition of a problem which are likely to arrest the attention of the solver and so to stimulate the energies of the composers include the following: The strategy of surprise moves; the strategy of thematic sequences; economy of force; beauty of mate; variety of play; accuracy of construction; and emphasis on the defensive play of Black rather than on the attacking play of White.

It is easy to understand that what will be perfectly acceptable in forwarding the predominance of one of these elements will actually conflict with the fundamentals underlying the cult of another one of them. If this were not so, as the mastery of technique became perfected, there would have developed a combined style including all the finest features of all the Schools. Some composers have thought that they were working in such a direction. The great Jamaican composer, A. F. Mackenzie (1861-1905), often spoke of the ideal Via Media in composition. But as a matter of fact the Schools to-day are further apart in their tastes than they have ever been, just because the improved standards of technique have permitted the elements featured by each School to be carried to a greater extreme of perfection.

In some instances that such a conflict of tastes should exist is self evident. If one School is aiming at increasing the wealth of variety in its problems, it will admit a free use of pawns which would be utterly distasteful to members of another School which should make the absence of pawns a test of the economy of a
problem's construction. But there are other distinctions which will not be so easily seen. The Queen sacrifice is an instance. Many composers of all time have considered the introduction of a well-chosen queen sacrifice as a great improvement to their problems, because the sacrifice of a powerful piece appears to be good strategy and clearly thematic. Some composers have made the queen sacrifice the chief merit of their problems, to such an extent that others of the same Schools have begun to oppose them as tending to betray the solutions and so to lessen the merits of difficulty. Still other composers have gone much further and have condemned the queen sacrifice as a distinct breach of economy of force, on the grounds (not illogical) that a queen sacrifice proves that an unnecessary Queen has been used in the initial position, since the same theme (so far as the combination of certain model or other mates is concerned) could probably have been combined without resort to the use of the queen.

Attention to similar other divergent views will be given throughout the next few chapters. A single case has been mentioned principally to keep in mind the constant divergence which is still at work widening the separation between School and School, at the same time that other influences are tending to bring them together, influences such as the uniform tourney standards, the interchange of ideas through the enormous diffusion of the chess columns and magazines of importance, and the example of distinguished composers belonging to no definite School who amuse themselves experimenting in many styles and compromising on all kinds of combinations and hybrids.

The use of a nomenclature which defines styles of composition according to National names is very convenient, even where not always strictly exact. So, of the elements spoken of above, it is customary to speak of beauty of mate as characteristic of the Bohemian School; of variety of play and accuracy of construction as typical of the English School; of the strategy of surprise moves as Loydesque; of the strategy of thematic sequences as born again of the modern German problem Renaissance; of the usual tourney standard (at least up to the last ten years) as the Old German, Austrian, or Continental School. These several tendencies will now be taken up in turn; and they will be followed by a short discussion of how far compromises of taste may be successful, which will be illustrated by a review of the Dutch School. The Italian or the Scandinavian might have well been selected instead; but the nationality of the writer will explain the choice made.
B. G. Laws.
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Chapter V.

The English School.

A. Foundation and General Principles.

The importance of the English problem composers prior to 1862 has been shown in earlier chapters. Between that date and 1880, there is a certain diminution in the interest and value of their works; for these no longer have the merit of being pioneers in their respective themes, whilst they are not yet polished enough to be considered as truly representative of the English standard, which the leaders of the next decade first fully established.

The twenty years prior to 1880 were decidedly fertile ones, and their best products are summed up in the collection of 608 problems published in 1876 by James Pierce (1833-1892) and W. Timbrell Pierce (1839-1922), under the title: English Chess Problems. The volume is a treat to the historian, but the modern problem lover is constantly reminded by it of the date of its publication. There is no longer the freshness of the very old problems of the Transition School, a freshness which strikes the modern solver even where the technical skill is poor. Instead there is rather the effort to give a correct and polished presentation, by composers who in the light of later technique seem often immature.

The two examples chosen, Nos. 25 and 26, are both two-movers and both waiting move problems. This is not accidental, for both features are typical of the English School.

The English composers have not, in any way, limited themselves to the two-mover, as a large number of American composers have done in more recent years. Indeed, in the English Chess Problems the proportion of two-movers is extremely small. And yet it is the two-mover alone which best brings out the national characteristics of the English composers. In Section D of this chapter their longer problems will be discussed; it is enough to indicate here that these longer problems owe their best effects to elements characteristic of other Schools, especially to the gradual development of the Bohemian principles of economy, whereas in the English two-mover there is nothing foreign whatever, but the national characteristics are given a pure blend which has steadily raised their standard and gradually made them dominant in other countries as well.

One can profitably trace the principal features of this national style in just such rudimentary positions as our present examples.

(49)
No. 25
J. A. W. Hunter.

Gentleman’s Journal, 1872.

Mate in two.
1. Bh8.

No. 26
J. Paul Taylor.

Illustrated London News, 1875.

Mate in two.
1. Sdt.

No. 25 is the sort of problem a beginner would compose up to the present day. That in doing so, the beginner is not composing a classic will be understood if we demonstrate the weaker points of the problem. But first let us consider the clever points.

The problem is a complete Waiter, a mating move being provided for every move Black can make in the initial position. This is not in itself a merit; meritorious, rather, is the arrangement permitting of only one purely waiting move. One might expect several equally effective waiting moves to exist; but they are, all but one, met by some black defence; thus, 1. Bb1 or Bc3 by 1. ..., Pd4 or BxQ; 1. Qc2 by 1. ..., Pd4; 1. Rf8 by 1. ..., Se7 or Sd6; and so on. When an expected possibility (as here, the existence of several keys) is prevented by unexpected means, we say that the problem is subtle. The key of No. 25 is subtle; not too subtle, the defences to the tries being rather obvious.

The interest in fine keys was intensively cultivated throughout the earlier years of the English School; and as waiting-move problems (incomplete waiters as well as complete waiters) readily admit of subtle keys, we find the waiting move style dominating until about 1900. The English style was modified about that time, by a combination of native and American influences, which will be referred to later, and keys creating direct threats of mate became
increasingly popular; but the old adage, that one's first love is the only true love, has been substantiated in the case of English composers by the eagerness with which they have, above all other nationalities, taken up the intensive cult of the Mutate, the complete waiting positions in which no complete waiting moves are present. A discussion of the Mutate is postponed to Chapter XXVIII., but we may wonder here, in passing, whether the English neglect of the Block-threat as compared to their fervent enthusiasm for the Changed mate and Added mate complete waiters is not similarly due to their national tendency to hold back from threat keys wherever this remains possible.

In No. 25, the subtlety of the key is enhanced by the existence of the tries indicated. The English always appreciate a good try. This again is a matter of taste; for there are many composers not at all interested in attempts to deceive the solver, such as the majority of the older Russian composers, like A. W. Galitzky (1863-1921), N. Maximow (b. 1875) and others. Where a solver limits his enjoyment to the actual process of solution, of mastering the difficulties set before him by the composer, it is certain that his enjoyment will be prolonged and heightened by the study of tries and the realization that he has successfully avoided the pitfalls prepared for him; but where a solver is concerned as student in the particular content or theme of the problem, the tries dwindle to minor importance. In general it is safe to say that tries should never be introduced at the cost of adding extra pieces or otherwise offending aesthetic principles. Any such expedient tends to degrade the problem to the level of the puzzle.

In No. 25 there is a two-fold continuation, or dual mate, after 

\[ 1. \ldots, \text{Bc2.} \]

That is a blemish and the English severely condemn it. In certain circumstances a bad dual may totally spoil the effect of a problem, and in a recent international tourney a problem was rejected as unsound because it had a dual! But even the most inveterate dual-haters do not usually claim that duals constitute unsoundness. In No. 25 the dual appears of small importance, though it belongs to the most malicious brand, the absolute duals.

A major or absolute dual has been defined as one in which the choice lies between continuations one or more of which White can never be forced to adopt. A minor dual, on the contrary, is one in which the choice lies between continuations each of which White can be forced to adopt. Thus, in No. 25, after 

\[ 1. \ldots, \text{Bc2,} \]

the mates are 

\[ 2. \text{Rd4 and QxB.} \]

The first of these, 

\[ 2. \text{Rd4,} \]

White is forced to play after 

\[ 1. \ldots, \text{BxQ,} \]

so this is a minor dual element; the second mate, 

\[ 2. \text{QxBc2,} \]

White is never called upon to mate by, so this is the absolute dual element. The distinction is purely formalistic.

There is another division of duals which is more important, the distinction between thematic and unthematic duals. A thematic
dual occurs in any variation essential to the theme of the problem, and an unthematic dual in any variation forming part of the by-play. As the thematic variations are necessarily the backbone of a problem, thematic duals, whether absolute or minor, are of a most serious nature.

Finally there is a third division of duals, in threat problems, the distinction being between duals following black moves defending against the threat and those following indifferent black moves which do not defeat the threat. In the latter the threat continuation is of course always one alternative part of the dual. The former are usually the more serious.

The exact extent to which duals or multiples injure a problem must always remain a matter of taste, and the question has been fruitful of debates at all times. The English School has been very fastidious as regards duals, its more liberal present attitude having only come about very slowly chiefly through the American influence. Even to-day the standard of accuracy demanded by English composers remains far higher than in other countries, and they sanction the addition of pawns and minor black pieces, for the sole purpose of eliminating duals, which would be criticized elsewhere as violating the tenets of economy of force. This English taste arises from the national liking for flawless, exquisite work. The English desire polished results, free from all blemishes, and they are ready to a certain extent to sacrifice piquancy of idea and even purity of mate for this purpose. Any crude detail is to be avoided at all cost.

It will be understood now why opponents of the English School would call such a problem as No. 25 dull, while its advocates would praise it as being of real distinction. If the reader inclines to the argument of dullness, he must bear in mind that we are dealing with a problem of 1872 and remember that at present the English, whose taste for correct finish has led them through a long apprenticeship to a complete mastery of the technique, are able to present much more intricate themes in irrefutable form.

From the modern standpoint, indeed, the contents of No. 25 are rather poor. The blocking variations, i. e., Re3 and Rf3, are the only ones that lend any spice to the play. There is no purity of mate. The economy has its weak points, the Sh3 in particular being of small use. But the composer was not in search of marked variations, nor of model mates, nor of strict economy of force. His ideal was simply what we have already defined, a good working mechanism, with some subtlety, some tries, and no serious blemishes. It is still a long way from such an early piece of work to the present day ideal of the two-mover, the correct presentation of distinctly rich contents without bombast, which has brought the English School its great reputation.
In No. 26 several characteristics of No. 25 will be met again, but there is also a contrast. It is a waiting move problem also, but an "incomplete waiter," as all of Black's moves in the initial position are not provided for. This is a question of technique. More important is the fact that the key is merely perfunctory. The interest centres in the theme, not in the key, for No. 26 is a problem with a distinct theme, the pin-mate after 1. ... KxS. To-day such a theme is extremely hackneyed, but in 1875 it must have been decidedly interesting. The liberal play of No. 25 is replaced in No. 26 by this liberality in the pins, which are fourfold. This cumulative principle we shall encounter increasingly among modern problems. The primitive composer presented his theme in simple, clear-cut form; then gradually it grows two-fold, three-fold, on and on, or combines with analogous or quite different ideas, producing the richer effects of repetition or the gaudy impression of a many-coloured blend. "Simplicitas sigillum veri," say the antagonists of these cumulative problems, and indeed regarding No. 26 it may appear that the pins are overdone so far as the artistic result is concerned; yet it is also true that often the line between simplicity and dullness is hard to draw.

And now let us turn to some English two-movers of a later date, for though the general principles underlying their composition were not changed, there was a very great improvement in their thematic and technical qualities. The change becomes marked towards the close of the 'eighties. About 1885, a number of very important new composers became active, among them B. G. Laws (b. 1861), Dr. C. Planck (b. 1856), T. Tavener (b. 1856), G. J. Slater (1853-1907), and the Jamaican A. F. Mackenzie, most of whose problems appeared in the English press. To care for the fertile output of these and a number of only slightly less important men, many columns instituted regular tournaments, the prize winning entries of which set the English standards we have studied in constantly firmer domination. These toursneys were for both two and three move problems, but those for the two movers were the more numerous and called out the larger entries, and became the more typical, soon overshadowing two-move efforts of any other land; while the three-move tournaments, although graced by many attractive works, did not equal the Bohemian standards of the same period and offered no worthy substitute. This rather peculiar situation was emphasized by the publication of *The Chess Problem Text Book*, in 1886, which contained an introduction of great general value by Planck and Laws, but one in no sense typical of strictly English tendencies. The ideals of these two writers were in close accord with the principles which were taking shape in Bohemia under the leadership of Dobrusky and Pospisil, and it is significant that many a later problem of Bohemian authorship has been found to be anticipated by some of
the early works of Planck and of Laws; but these ideals were not
generally taken up in England until many years later. Just why
this was so is a little hard to see. One weak point about the Chess
Problem Text Book lay in that it included a collection of problems
by H. J. C. Andrews (1828-1887). This distinguished composer had
begun composition in 1848, and his problems were extreme examples
of the Transition School not marked by a sufficient talent to give
them any educational value whatever in 1886, although he was then
still somewhat active in composition; so that a reader, studying
the teachings of Laws and Planck by the light of the problems of
Andrews, can have understood very little of what the Text Book was
intended to convey. Again the English love of accuracy was not
easily compatible with the Bohemian love of economy in mate and
form, so that few, if any, English composers besides Laws and
Planck were able to master the technique necessary to bring the
English three-move School to any outstanding prominence at the
time. We shall see presently how the change did come about much
later, but it is important to notice that the first true disciples of the
Text Book, in the three-move field, were Colonial composers,
Mackenzie in Jamaica and C. A. L. Bull (b. in England, 1869) in
South Africa. Of the dominant composers whom we have men-
tioned in the '80's, Taverner confined himself almost exclusively to
the two-mover, and Slater, while equally fertile in almost every
branch of composition, published a dozen important two-movers
for every three-mover that was of any real value.
Nos. 27 and 28 are representative of the '80's at their best. Both
problems stand out for their surprising keys. In the former every-
thing is concentrated on the key, so that the position has something
of the puzzle character. As the white Rook, at its initial post,
suggests some present usefulness, it must not be counted against the
problem that the piece has been used solely to make the spectacular
opening move. In No. 28 the lack of economy is more serious, as
the Rh4 mars the economy of the pure mate. In his later book,
The Two-Move Chess Problem (1890), Laws omitted the Rh4 and the
Bq4; but it was quite in accordance with the taste of 1885 that even
the leader towards better economy of force and mate should
introduce these idle pieces in such a way. For it should be noted
that these two pieces add to the puzzle character of the position, as
their presence takes the eye of the solver from the Pa7, and the fact
that it is simply the defence 1. ..., Pa6 which requires attention
becomes less obvious. By sacrificing this slight added feature of
difficulty and removing the two pieces, the position becomes a good
little problem, typical of the gradual inclination of the English
towards the Bohemian principles, even in the two-move form.

In Blake's (P. F. Blake, b. 1873) prize-winner of 1894 the popular
style of composition of the next decade finds its ideal representation.
No. 27.

F. Healey.

1st Prize, Chess Monthly, Jan., 1885.

Mate in two.

1. Ra6.

The '90's were the decade when Blake and G. Heathcote and Mackenzie were laying the foundations for the much more intricate black defensive moves, notably interferences and cross-checks, which were to blossom out, beginning about 1898, into the great complex two-movers of the Twentieth Century. No. 29 does not yet show these more elaborate ideas, but it does indicate the mastery of technique which divides the style of Blake and Heathcote from that of Healey or J. Paul Taylor (1843-1923). All the ideals mentioned in discussing No. 25 will be found again in No. 29, but greatly refined. The Sb7, for instance, has only one move, the blocking capture 1. ..., SxP; but the stops

No. 28.

B. G. Laws.

2nd Prize, Jamaica Gleaner, 1885.

Mate in two.

1. Qa5.

No. 29.

P. F. Blake.

2nd Prize, Hackney Mercury, 1894.

Mate in two.

at d8, c5 and a5 are no deadheads. Active pieces are placed on each of these squares, each used for some further definite purpose. The solution contains several pretty effects, for instance the two blocking variations following the captures of the Pd6 by the black Rook and Knight. None of these effects is dominating, but each gives the solver a moment of enjoyment. These pretty minor effects are so familiar to the solver of to-day that they no longer give him any vivid pleasure, and he asks for more thrilling results; and the composer, whose technique has been keeping pace, has no difficulty in gratifying him. One may either say that this all goes to prove the improvement in the problem art, or that the increasing call for complexity is really a pity: it is all a matter of taste!

No. 30 is an example of the work of one of the lesser known English composers, W. Geary (1839-1923), but one whose activity extended well over fifty years and who published some charming works. Its date is in the earlier years of the English School, yet it is typical of one phase of construction in the '90's. Indeed the problem anticipates a Prize winner (Westbury: First Prize, Birmingham News, 1899: 1BR5; 6p1; 1p6; irrkrpSS; 7Q; sp35; 8; 5Kz.) by E. E. Westbury (b. 1881), which was used in the Dutch edition of this book to illustrate the free open setting characteristic of many English problems of the '90's. In waiting move problems, where everything must be well balanced, it is not easy to obtain a construction of this kind. The setting of No. 30 may be said to charm the eye. This may sound paradoxical, as chess problems are not pictures, and one may wonder how the outward aspect of a position can be of aesthetic interest. It cannot be denied, however, that an open and graceful position definitely attracts the solver. This attraction is by no means due to a suggestion of easiness; for an open position like No. 30 has a difficulty of its own, as every line of attack looks equally promising. There is a similar attraction in a pure mate, where the pieces are placed in a harmonious way; and it is not without frequent reason that the Germans call any model mate a Mattbild, or mating picture.
In No. 30 it should also be noticed that several of the mating positions have all the squares of the black King's field vacant, except of course the square he himself stands on. Such mating positions are called Mirror mates, perhaps because the solitary black King, at the point of death, looks about for help and can see in his entire field nothing but a reflection of his own empty hopes. Mirror mates have always been highly valued by English composers, in their longer problems as well as in their two-movers, and some composers, notably the fertile E. J. Winter-Wood (1847-1920), seem to have considered them of even greater importance than model mates.

In No. 30, the Sg3 and Sh6, balancing each other, are of no use in the artistic solution; for which reason they are called a pair of Fringe Pieces. It is always a blemish when, as here, to avoid the look 1. Qf5, a composer has to resort to fringe variations. Of course where a position cannot be made correct by other means, fringe pieces have to be tolerated; but they should never be introduced (as we have seen them in No. 28) without necessity.

No. 30 is spectacular in more than one respect. The white Queen, to ambush herself behind the Rb4 and the Pc7, moves from right to left across the entire width of the board, making a long-range move, or long shot. There is no logical reason why we should like these long shots better than short moves, but the fact remains that most people do like them, especially where several are united in one problem. It is just these small details, unimportant in themselves, which make up the content of most chess problems.

In closing this section of our study of the English two-mover, we must not fail to give an example by the greatest of English composers, G. Heathcote (b. 1870). The problem has a specific program theme, the granting of a double check by the keymove, but it is enriched by so much good by-play and is constructed with such masterly attention to the perfection of all details that it is very much more than an ordinary task-problem. Good key, accuracy, variety of play, and clever tries (which the

No. 31.

G. HEATHCOTE.

1st Prize, Sydney Morning Herald, 1907-08.

Mate in two.

1. Rf5-g5.
reader must investigate for himself), all these English features are here; but the progress made since the features were first emphasized hardly requires comment at all. Now that we have reached this full development of technique, we may turn to examine how it has been used, first to handle the growing interest in tasks, and then to meet the stimuli received from outside and notably from America.

**B. Task Problems.**

In speaking of No. 31, it was said that the admirable construction raised the problem far above the level of an ordinary task-problem. By a task is meant the presentation in problem form of a specific achievement, readily definable in words and usually of a supposedly difficult character so far as the composition goes. The term is very elastic, and has been applied to problems of very varied types. Sometimes a distinction is made between maximum-tasks, where a maximum effect is obtained, and theme-tasks, where a difficult theme is expressed at the frequent expense of other elements of beauty. The task of No. 31 was to introduce a double-check by Black in a position in which initially the white King was not exposed to check at all and in which the key was not made by a capture. This clearly is a theme-task.

In the present chapter the term "task" will, however, be used in the sense of a maximum effort, the accumulation in a single problem of the greatest possible number of any specific chess element, such as variations following moves of a particular black piece, or the like.

Task composition has always had its fascination. The ingenious Brede, the pioneer character of whose problem collection of 1844 has already been mentioned, included in his book a two-mover in which the key was a check by the white Rook, exposing it to capture by six black pieces. This was distinctly a maximum task for those days. The record he established has been surpassed several times since, so that to-day a nine-fold sacrifice is not unusual, and the humble white Pawn has been made to submit to ten-fold capture; but his problem in its day was a true task record, since it achieved a result surpassing in the cumulative sense what any other composer had then done.

Tasks are in no sense limited to two-movers. Early efforts in their sort were largely concentrated upon combining the greatest number of queen sacrifices in the different variations of three-movers. But gradually and unconsciously the task drifted into being principally a two-move feature. The Schools which were leading in the development of the three-mover did not specially
value maximum effects, and little attention was given to them; whereas the English School was strongly emphasizing the cult of variety in the two-mover, and the step from general variety to specific variety was a very easy one to take.

It must not be supposed that task composition is simply an English fashion. On the contrary, it received on the whole less attention in England than in other countries; but it was distinctly a product of the English direction of chess thought, and it did receive its earliest concrete encouragement in England. This occurred about 1887, when T. B. Rowland (b. 1850) published an otherwise unimportant little treatise called: *The Problem Art*. In this book a considerable proportion of the space was devoted to showing the powers of the chess pieces through the medium of positions in which each piece in turn was called upon to “go the limit,” the white pieces delivering as many mates as possible and the black ones creating as many variations as possible by their defences.

It is clear that the artistic merit of a task will vary inversely according to the difficulty of the proposed achievement, if other elements are equal. The harder the task, the more skillful the composer must be to avoid committing some horrible monstrosity. Hence tasks may be considered as beginning with very simple affairs, which do not cause the slightest trouble to a modern composer; these grading gradually into the most elaborate of maximum effects, only realized rarely and at the greatest pains; and these again merging into tasks where it is impossible to decide whether a maximum has been achieved or not.

No. 32 is an early rendering of the task of Four mates by a white Pawn. It is a problem of character; for should the solver overlook that the Pe2 is to be the hero of the battle, the three black pawns will cry out to him that this is to be a “pawny affair.” The long-shot queen mates complete the spectacle, and it will be understood that the problem has long been a great favourite. But this rather enthusiastic description will not keep the modern critic from

![Chess Diagram]

**No. 32.**

**J. C. J. Wainwright.**


**Mate in two.**

asking: "What is that Knight at b8 for?" Well, it keeps the black Rook from defending a8 when the white Queen is called upon to mate there. That is all it has to do. Thereupon some critics will say that the whole problem is humbug, and that very easily the position can be reset to avoid such a horrible feature, while others will remark that it is a "jolly good problem" notwithstanding the idle Knight, and that No. 32 is much more meritorious than any of the suggested revisions. It is in general the weak, as well as the strong, point of many American composers that they do not take the time to polish their problems for fear that their themes may lose their freshness in the process. Their problems are fresh and full of wit, but too often rough and insufficiently elaborated. In the case of No. 32, however, it must be remembered that although J. C. J. Wainwright (1851-1921) is considered as one of the leading American composers, he was of English parentage, and was himself actually born in England.

That the task of No. 32 can be given in a perfectly correct form is shown in No. 33, this being the work of R. L'hermet (b. 1859) one of the most progressive Continental two-move composers in the '90's. The key is fine, as the open setting does not indicate the waiting character of the problem. There is a beautiful pin-model mirror mate, and there are several good tries.

A task, formally related to the four mates by a white Pawn, but intrinsically quite different, is the Pickaninny Task, the creating of four variations by the moves of the black Pawn. Four moves are all that a black Pawn can make, so that the Pickaninny is obviously a maximum task. No. 34 is a two-move rendering, and No. 35 is one in three moves. There are critics, however, who stipulate that in a pure task the maximum effect must be obtained in the minimum number of moves. For them No. 34 would be a real task, but No. 35 would not be one, because the effect of the maximum effort by the black Pawn is tempered by the extra move White needs for mating. It should be noticed, nevertheless, that No. 35 contains strategic devices which are thematically of three-move form, for instance the

No. 33.
R. L'HERMET.
1st Prize, N.Y. Staats-Zeitung, 1894.

Mate in two.
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No. 34.
W. A. SHINKMAN.

*Detroit Free Press, 1885.*

Mate in two.
1. Qh1.

No. 35.
J. HARTONG.

1st Prize, *Western Daily Mercury*,
1920.

Mate in three.
   PxpB6; 2. Bb5.
   Pc6; 2. Sg6.
   Pc5; 2. Sc4.
   PxpD6; 2. Sd3.

obstruction of the black Knight in the variation 1. ..., PxpB6 and
the Switchback after 1. ..., PxpD6; and it should be recalled that
extending the number of moves in a task does not necessarily mean
that the achievement is made much easier. It is, on the contrary,
much more difficult to construct a three-mover in which the eight
possible moves of the black Knight create eight distinct variations
than it is to present the same task in a two-mover.

Let us consider this Black Knight Wheel, as it is called, in two-
move form. No. 36 is one of the Rowland examples to which
reference has already been made. The exact position was duplic-
cated independently and published at practically the same date by
the Swedish composer, K. STahl (*_), a fact better worth
mentioning than is the usual unconscious duplication, because it
indicates that composers of widely separate countries were already
in 1886 amusing themselves with the simpler tasks. This No. 36
shows the task in its barest form, without any artistic variations.
In four cases the black Knight is roughly captured, and only the
pin-mates after the Knight takes either white pawn and the blocks after 1. ..., Sc4 and Sd3 possess any merit. Of very different quality is Heathcote's masterpiece, No. 37, which has been called by some admirers the finest task problem extant. Here the variety is not simply technical, but vitally interesting, every move of the Knight giving rise to a good feature, such as a blocking (c6, e6), an interference (b5, c2, e2, f3, f5) or a self-pin (b3). In no case is the playful Knight captured, a detail no other rendering of the task has ever succeeded in rivalling. Moreover the Knight defences are intrinsically peculiarly thematic; for White threatens 2. Sc3 mate, a mate that did not function before the key because the move would have interfered with the Rc1; hence the key forestalls one white interference, but the moves of the black Knight defeat the threat by vacating d4 and so making effective a new white interference, that of the Bb2. The English influence is seen also in the fact that there is but a single dual, 1. ..., Qe4. The Pa6 proves that the prevention of a dual (1. ..., Ra6) is worth the addition, in Heathcote's opinion, of an otherwise unnecessary Pawn.

The great advance marked in No. 37 over No. 36 must encourage composers to study tasks, in the hope of increasing the interest of their presentations even where the maximum character of earlier
works cannot be surpassed. But there are other tasks where the absolute maximum cannot be stated, and where further study may result not only in better renderings but actually in new records. Such a task, closely related to the Black Knight Wheel, is the Black Knight Interference Wheel. The suggestive name, Knight Wheel, derives from the fact that the eight moves of a Knight reach to squares, which lie on a circle whose centre is the original square of the Knight. The individual moves of the Knight may be called spokes. The regular Knight Wheel, as we have seen, is easily shown to be complete, having all eight spokes operative. In the case of the Interference Wheel the question arises: how many spokes of a Knight's Wheel can be interference moves? No. 37 already contained, as we have seen, five Interferences. Clearly there is a theoretical maximum of eight Knight interferences, but this number has not yet been attained. In No. 38, we find seven interferences, but two of these are followed by the same mate (1. ..., Sd7 or Sf7; 2. QxB mate). This gives a total of only six distinct interferences; and yet this small addition of one interference in excess of those in No. 37 entailed several departures from the artistic principles of construction, for No. 38 has duals and a weak key, the Bishop being brought into play from an off-side position, while the Queen sacrifice indirectly caused by the key offers no equivalent, for it leads to no new variation and only draws the solver's attention from the thematic presentation of the same mate: 2. SxP after 1. ..., Sg6.

In the Dutch edition of this book (Het Schaakprobleem, 1921) the writer said: "Perhaps a seven- or even an eightfold interference Wheel is possible. This cannot be stated a priori. Meanwhile, the six-fold interference by the Knight remains a maximum task that may possibly be surpassed." It is curious that at this very same time No. 39 appeared, showing eight interferences, with seven different mates. The duals and weak key of No. 38 are still present. So No. 38 has ceased to be a task record. Perhaps,
before this book is issued, the full eight-fold Wheel may have been attained. Then at last will the actual record coincide with the theoretical maximum; but until this occurs No. 39 remains a task record-holder.

And here we come to an element of interest in problem composition, the Sporting element. Of course this element makes a different appeal to different composers, and to different solvers. But to many the gratification afforded by overcoming difficulties has a charm all its own, and there are students who especially enjoy seeing how the composer triumphs over such difficulties. In such cases, one should always try to play the game. It is not fair to introduce promoted pieces in one's struggle with even the hardest of tasks. In the case of the Interference Wheel, the use of an extra black Rook or two would make the achievement of a full set of spokes relatively easy; but such a surrender to one's imaginary opponent can never hope to meet with popular approval.

The study of maximum tasks is not exhausted when the task itself has been mastered. A further step consists in discovering all the relative positions of the theme pieces, as they are called, under which the achievement of the task can be retained. In the Pickaninny the theme pieces are the black King and Pawn; in the Knight Wheel, they are the King and Knight, and so on. The different relative position of the Knight to the black King in Nos. 36 and 37 will be noted. In all the examples given of the Interference Wheel the position of the Knight on the square laterally adjacent to the King is retained. This position seems to offer the best prospects for a successful mastering of the task. Yet it is of interest to examine also the possibilities of other relative positions of the Knight, such as the square diagonally adjacent to the King. In general a systematic research of all possible relative positions of the theme pieces in the study of any task or theme must be made, before a composer can claim to have exhausted his subject. Questions of this kind are considered in the Locus-theory, a branch of chess problem study that offers great opportunities for the further
development of the art, but the details of which are hardly appropriate for the present work.

C. American Influences.

It may seem strange to speak of the American influences on English problem composition, for several reasons. In the first place there has never been a definite American tendency, which could as a School exert a clear-cut influence. Secondly, whatever influence has passed between the two countries would in general seem to have been exerted just in the other direction. And finally, the English composers have decried the rougher methods of the Americans and would appear to have resisted the results of any influence. And yet such an American influence on English composers has developed and in certain respects become dominant, especially in the field of two-movers which we are still discussing.

When one speaks of an American tendency, the name of Loyd comes to mind at once. His genius was unique, and it must be considered as a personal influence, not as a national one. So we will reserve a discussion of his work for a later chapter. It is enough to note here that, although he was extremely important in bringing the two-move technique to a high point at a very early date, even before 1860, his problems in a longer style so far outclass his two-movers that it is only in a minor way as a two-move composer that his influence remains.

The disciples of Loyd have been of every country, so that the Loyd influence never led to the growth of a national School. His nearest follower, W. A Shinkman, although he has made his home in America, was born (1847) in Bohemia and spent his boyhood there. Shinkman's style, too, has been manifested in so many different directions that he cannot easily be labelled simply as a Loydesque composer. The same is true, in an even greater degree, of his talented nephew, Otto Wurzburg (b. 1875). The absence of a typical American School is certainly due in great measure to the different national inheritances of the different composers of the country. We have already seen that Wainwright was English born. Mackenzie, the Jamaican composer, was born in that Island it is true, but both his parents were English and he kept so closely in touch with English columns and editors that his relation to the Americans was almost secondary.

By the Americans, indeed, has gradually come to be understood the United States composers. Canada has never produced any great problemist; nor has Mexico; nor had any part of South America, until the advent ten years ago of the meteoric Arnaldo Ellerman (b. 1893) in Buenos Aires.
For many years the Americans continued in their rather anomalous position. They had one great composer, who imposed his curious ideas upon whoever studied his problems, while they themselves were composers of differing tendencies, many of them talented, but with no leader. The authorities were all abroad, in different countries, all rather at variance, so it seemed, as to the true ideals of composition. The important tourneys were all abroad; the important text books were foreign. Loyd, it is true, had written a work on composition, *The Chess Strategy*, 1878-81, earlier than any of the European books except that of Klett; but no one could distinctly follow what he meant, and the teaching of the book was accepted in a negative way, to pay little attention to duals and flaws of economy, rather than in a positive way, to adopt rules or ideas of any constructive sort. So the foreign principles were followed, but in an unconstrained manner, that developed frequent wit and piquancy of one sort or another, but which shocked the foreigners, so far as they paid any attention to it, by its crudeness.

Little by little the Americans got the reputation of actually having a School, something crude, bizarre and barbaric, like their own Indians of the backwoods. Loyd was held responsible for much of this and he himself became rather neglected too, all through the '80's and '90's. Some of the comments written, for instance, by the Bohemians about American ideals at this time and much later too, may be summed up as typical of the foreign attitude: to them American problems were either Humbug or Sensation.

A look at a few products of some of the American two-move problem masters will show just what the Americans were doing, and will explain how the American influence gradually became established in spite of the several handicaps under which it started. No. 40 is an old two-mover of George E. Carpenter (1844-1924). It has a sparkling key and a series of ingeniously separated Knight-disclosures. The first surprise of the solver is that such a display of fireworks comes off without any cook. It is unnecessary to point out that the author

No. 40.
G. E. Carpenter.

Mate in two.

1. Qd6.
Wm. A. Shinkman.

At age 27.
did not care a bit for principles of economy, beyond recognizing that complete freedom from white Pawns would keep his position best alive. The use of many white officers reappears in No. 43, where the greater wealth of the variations testifies to the fuller influence of the English teachings.

Very contrasted are the works of W. Meredith (1835-1903), a pioneer among the Americans in the study of economy and purity, a composer somewhat neglected by his contemporaries, but who was recently honoured by the Good Companion Chess Club of Philadelphia, whose members in 1916 published a selection of 100 Chess Problems by him. The Club also took him as the patron saint for their light-weight tourneys, limited to problems with twelve pieces or less, which they called Meredith Tourneys and which served to draw the attention of the members away from some of the modern heavyweight monstrosities. A more constant cult of the Meredith ideal would not be undesirable.

Meredith was not a Bohemian in any close sense. No true Bohemian would have used the Rf7 in No. 41, which prevents the important mate 1. ..., KxR from being a third model, and no true Bohemian would have put the Sb2 in No. 42, which prevents any single mate in this problem from being a model. Yet Meredith had a more developed sense of economy and elegance than any other Americans before Shinkman and Wurzburg, while he retained a

No. 41.
W. MEREDITH.
Chess Journal, June, 1873.

1. Qh8.

Mate in two.

No. 42.
W. MEREDITH.
Maryland Chess Review, Dec., 1874-

1. Qd8.

Mate in two.
certain element of surprise in his problems, that clearly derived from Loyd. No. 42 has a key typical of much of his work; and while No. 41 is less exciting, it was one of the forerunners of a vast mass of flight-sacrifice problems, the sort of thing which crops up even to-day in every problem tourney as the beginner's ideal of a fine entry.

With the coming of Mackenzie, the tide of influence was destined slowly to turn; no longer was the flow from Europe of teaching and example to keep steadily rising, but instead an ebb set in and presently the European two-move ideals were being imported, perhaps unconsciously, from the western continent. At first Mackenzie was strongly English, even surpassing in massive accuracy the problems of Taverner, W. Gleave (1867-1902) and the rest. No. 43 is typical of this early manner at its height, a waiter, with good variety, no duals and some subtlety. In 1887 Mackenzie published his work on construction, *Chess: Its Poetry and its Prose*, a typically English book, which was not very widely circulated although it is full and very comprehensive. In the '90's Mackenzie gradually lost his sight, and in part withdrew from composition. Gradually he found he could compose in spite of his infirmity, and the second manner that he now developed was in a much more independent vein. He had been very successful in tourney competi-
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A. F. MACKENZIE.

1st Prize, *Mirror of American Sports*,
13 Feb., 1886.
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**No. 44.**

A. F. MACKENZIE.
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1. Sg7.
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1. Rc4.
Arthur Ford Mackenzie.

Pages 47, 68, etc.
tions in earlier days, but now he began an unprecedented series of successes. His style was lighter of touch than before, but still in the English tendency of Slater and the early work of Blake and Heathcote. No. 44 is a good specimen, with white interference mates following the defences 1 ..., Re3, Se3, and Rx6. To win all these prizes, it was obviously necessary that Mackenzie's problems should be in correct English style, at least at first. But in some remarkable way, he was able to modify his style a little at a time, leading the judges along with him, so that he kept winning his prizes and yet kept separating more and more from the standard English tendency; until one day he startled the two-move world by bringing a conscious realization that a new kind of problem had become dominant in the expectation of the judges. The change came in the tourneys of the Sydney Morning Herald, so that the English School of two-movers was directly influenced by the works of one colonial composer contributing to a column in a second distant colony. This change was due primarily to the publication of a series of problems featuring the cross-check in highly cumulative form, almost in the line of tasks, though there was no immediate intention to establish records.

No. 45 is an example of this modern style in its wild, fantastic glory. The solver of to-day, seeing the Ba1, Sc3 and Kg7 all in a nice row, grasps the cross-check theme at a glance, but even he will be surprised to find a second cross-check line on the g-line. The problem thus is a double cross-check, a term not to be confused with the usual double-check already encountered in No. 31.

Cross-checks spread through the English speaking two-move world like wildfire. In due time the solver began to be wearied of them and craved, and obtained, other forms of excitement, presently to be discussed; but the craving for excitement still continues, and few problems of the days before Mackenzie could today compete on even terms with the works of the great host of young composers who have come to the front under the new influence.

No. 45.
A. F. Mackenzie.
3rd Prize, Hampstead and Highgate Express, 1904.

Mate in two.
1. Sf3.
Before leaving the cross-check two more specimens may be given a moment's attention. In No. 46, the cross-check has been combined with the unpinning theme, another of the new themes destined to become so popular. The check, 1. ..., Sf6+, unpins the Se6, enabling 2. Sg5 mate. This sort of combination of sparkling ideas is to-day highly in the fashion, and the skill displayed in harmoniously blending the most intricate ideas is marvellous.

No. 46.
G. H. Goethart.

Mate in two.

1. Rh3.

No. 47.
C. Mansfield.

Mate in two.


In No. 47 there is no blend of ideas, but a cross-check so pointed and brilliant that the problem ranks as one of the very best two-movers extant. The distinguished young English composer, Comins Mansfield (b. 1896), shows a quite un-English disregard of duals in the fact that he has not plugged the minor moves of the Sc4. This enables him to present his theme in a most economical setting. The key is thematic. The reason why White's mate is defined after four of the cross-checks, 1. ..., SxR, SxS, Se5 and Sd2, is well worth studying. The position is not a task record, as it contains only four distinct checks from one black battery, five being the record. There are four batteries in the problem.

Next to the cross-checks, a great number of unpinning themes became very popular, one of them appearing in No. 46. And finally when the unpins were beginning to be exhausted, the half-pin
suddenly jumped into prominence overnight, and still holds the centre of the stage. What further excitement the two-mover still has in store the future only can tell. By a Half-pin is understood an arrangement where two Black pieces stand in line in such a way that if either one of them moves the other becomes pinned by a White piece which has been standing behind both of them waiting to exert its pinning powers. In No. 48 the following effects can be observed: after 1. ..., Sc5, the black Knight guards e4, its move pinning the black Queen and unpinning the white Knight; after 1. ..., Sd6, the Knight guards e4, its move pinning the Queen again and interfering with the Bh2; after 1. ..., Qe6, the Queen guards e4, leaving the black Knight pinned, while herself blocking e6, and abandoning the guard of c5. In these three variations several strategic effects of the most different character are blended, the half-pin dominating and thematically uniting the complex of variations. The half-pin theme is expressed by the fact that the problem contains the variations 1. ..., Sc5 and Sd6, with essential pinning of the black Queen after removal of the black Knight, as well as the variation 1. ..., Qe6, with essential pinning of the black Knight after removal of the black Queen. The variation 1. ..., Qe8; 2. SxR mate, is not a half-pin mate, because the pin of Sb7 is not essential; that the mate would be just as complete if the Knight did not happen to be pinned. Next to the half-pins, the attention is drawn to the unpinning of the Sc4 in the variations 1. ..., Sc5 and Sc3, and to the interferences of the Bh2 in the variations 1. ..., Sd6 and Rf4. The harmonious blending of such complex variations and the fine key (Try: 1. Rf4) make the problem one of the finest of modern two-movers.

No. 49 may be considered as even finer. The key is exceedingly good, the Rook battery being abandoned, instead of being used for the mate after 1. ..., Sb5, as the solver might expect. The half-pin variations are thematically interwoven, 1. ..., Sb5 and Qd3 showing white interference (of the Rf5) in the mates, and the position is absolutely free from duals. In many ways Mansfield's creation
attains the highest place in modern two-move composition.

The gradual, but remarkable, change in the ideals of two-move composition of the English School which has been traced was not due solely to the influence of Mackenzie's style since the development of his blindness. But the universal cult of the cross-check produced an expectation of more complex positions than had before existed, and this expectation made solvers more tolerant of minor weaknesses of construction, such as duals; and in turn this greater tolerance made English tourney judges more appreciative of entries by composers not strictly of the English School, notably of one or two Americans, among whom the work of F. Gamage may be mentioned. Finally in 1913 there was founded in Philadelphia a Club open to two-move composers of all countries, whose special feature lay in encouraging through its Folders (1913-1924) problems of the highest degree of complexity along the modern lines. The unpinning theme and the half-pins were developed largely owing to the constant emphasis of the Good Companions on such features, and while some English critics have regretted the movement as tending to extremes outside of the best English style, it remains a fact that the majority of English two-move composers to-day have felt the Good Companion influence and have themselves carried it to its highest flights, notably in the compositions of Comins Mansfield.

In this way the strictly accurate and restrictive English influence has been in contact with the free and easy and very stimulating American style, and together the two have begotten the latest phase of two-move development, and have imposed it on the composers of practically every other country which gives attention to two-move composition at all.

No mention has been made in the above discussion of the growth in England of the interest in the Mutate, or complete waiting problems with changed or added mates. This also is a style which has come in from America. There the complete waiters with
Dr. Henry Wald Bettmann.
proper inspiration for a sort of devitalized Bohemian hybrid, in which a proper study of models was replaced by a nondescript interest in mates which were neither wholly models, nor wholly mirrors, but which missed the best interest of both. These hybrids were usually constructed with a white force limited to the Queen, a Bishop and a Knight, or to the Queen and two Knights, and the black force to the King and a few frightened Pawns, at best an inactive Bishop or so. Movement, the breath of a living genius, any vestige of interest sufficient to outlast the passing of a half-dozen years, all was equally absent, if obviously not from all the compositions of this period, at least from ninety-five per cent. thereof. Tourneys were held, prizes awarded, reputations rose and fell, but the ripples they produced did not extend far nor did they remain long above the surface.

At the end of the '90's a few figures were already beginning to rise above this level of monotony. Most notable of all was already that of Godfrey Heathcote, and about to follow him was P. F. Blake. From across the ocean loomed the colossal figure of Mackenzie, dominant at the moment in the three-mover as he was

No. 50.
A. F. Mackenzie.
8th Prize, Brighton Society, 1903-04.

Mate in three.
1. Ba2, Pd2 (threat); 2. Qd8.
Pc3; 2. Qc7.
Pg5; 2. Kg7.
Ph4 or Sf4; 2. Sf5+.
Kd4; 2. Sc4.

No. 51.
P. F. Blake.
1st Prize, Aftonbladet, 1907.

Mate in three.
1. Qh3, threat; 2. Sd3.
PnPc5; 2. Bd1.
Pep6; 2. Sg4.
PnPf6; 2. Qf5+.
Godfrey Heathcote.

Pages 57, 75, etc.
in the two-move field. In No. 50 we can study his style, and compare it in No. 51 with that of Blake. Both problems exhibit fine quiet play, ending in models; both problems tend towards the Bohemian style, thanks always to the Laws and Planck influence, but there is a shade greater emphasis on strategy and accuracy, while neatness of position is slightly neglected, very much so as regards Pawns.

Heathcote has achieved better economy of position than other English composers, and in his four-movers he has performed miracles of strategic unfolding of model combinations with perfect retention of control over his forces. In his four-movers indeed, published mainly in the last dozen years, Heathcote has set a new standard of composition, not only for England, but for every other country which holds to the importance of models. No Bohemian four-movers, as yet, have developed such vigour; and none of the Continental countries (which have studied models in rather more complex presentations than the Bohemians) have in any degree approached the finish attained by Heathcote.

In No. 52, the theme is the presentation of a series of model mates by the Pf2 introduced by sacrifices of the white Queen. In each mate the guard of the King's field consists of four squares covered by the white Rook, three by the two Bishops, and one by the white Pawn (or, after 1. ..., SxP; 2. ..., BxQ, by the block of the black Pawn). These mates are practically all echoes of one another, the white Rook being guarded by one of the Bishops after the three lines: 1. ..., Pf5; 2. ..., KxQ; 1. ..., Ke4; 2. ..., BxQ; and 1. ..., SxP; 2. ..., BxQ. Only in the last, as just noted, is a black Pawn block substituted.

**No. 52.**

G. Heathcote.

1st Prize, Westminster Gazette, 1921.

Mate in four.

1. Pe7, threats; 2. Be6+ or 2. Pe8 (Q) or 2. Rf4.

Pf5; 2. QxB+, KxQ;

3. RxPf5+.

Ke4; 2. Qd6, BxQ;

3. Re3+.

KxR; 3. Qd3+.

SxP or Rg6 or h7; 2. Rf4, BxQ;


BxR; 3. QxB.

Bc3; 3. PxB.

BxQ; 2. Rd3+, Ke5; 3. BxB+.

Ke4; 3. Pf3+.

Kc4; 3. Rd4+.

Kc4; 2. Rf4+ or Be6+. 
for the white Pawn guard. In the fourth line, 1. ..., BxQ; 2. ..., Ke5, the white Rook is guarded by a white Pawn, the Bishop assuming guard of another corner square. The first two lines indicated form a perfect chameleon echo (the term Chameleon indicating that the black King, in the two mates, stands on squares of different colour). The third line would be considered as a third echo by all but the most fastidious; while the fourth line terminates in a mate closely analogous, if not actually an echo. The task influence, discussed so fully in dealing with the English two-mover, is here clearly seen, as a four-fold set of Pawn mates with all echo mates would constitute an amazing task record. But the artistic influence is present in that the mates are not absolutely perfect echoes throughout. The distinction is small, but sufficient to raise the problem above task monotony. Then the strategic interest of the Queen sacrifices in every main line of play gives the position a vigour no ordinary task could claim. As already mentioned, the Bohemians might condemn such a series of sacrifices on the grounds that it betrayed the necessity to do away with unnecessary force and consequently that the use of the Queen at all was a breach of economy; but probably no one not fundamentally imbued with the value of economy of force above every other element of construction would share such an extreme view in this case.

If we turn from Heathcote’s masterpiece, which it is important to remember is only one out of a dozen or more such works which he has composed, to No. 53, we can understand more fully the exact progress made in England in the non-two-move field since the publication of the Chess Problem Text Book. Laws’ problem of thirty years before Heathcote’s is strictly a Bohemian. Graceful, elegant, lightly set as to Pawns, with the typical Queen and two Knights force so soon to become dominant in

No. 53.
B. G. LAWS.
1st Prize, Chess Monthly, 1891-95.

Mate in four.
Ke3 or KxP; 3. Sc4+.
KxP; 2. Qf6+, Ke4; 3. Qe6 or 7+.
Kd3; 2. Qc1, Ke4; 3. Qe1+.
Pf4; 3. Qb1+.
Pf4; 2. Qg6+, KxP; 3. Sb4.
Kf3; 2. Qc2.
THE ENGLISH SCHOOL: LONGER PROBLEMS.

England, this little gem, also with its Echo, was a noteworthy example which its contemporaries either did not appreciate or which they were unable to emulate and carry forward. If Laws and Planck had been adequately supported, as were Dobrusky and Pospisil, one wonders whether England would have taken the lead from Bohemia, and if so what would have happened to the English two-mover.

To-day the example of Heathcote and Blake finds a far heartier response than did that of Laws and Planck in the earlier days. Composers like G. W. Chandler (b. 1889), Brian Harley (b. 1883), and many others are actively engaged in three-move work, with great skill and energy. What the direction of their efforts presently will be, what the really national English School of three-move composition may develop into, it is much too early to say. Already a distinct leaning towards the study of pin-models is discernible, as we shall also find it, in the next chapter, in Bohemia, but on the usual broader English lines. Whether this study of pins in the three-mover will lead to the study also of such other elements, heretofore associated with two-move composition, as cross-checks, unpins, half-pins and the rest, cannot be foretold, but there are indications that it is probable. It is noteworthy that the American Good Companion Club in 1922-1924 tried to extend its two-move complex leadership into the three-move field in just such a direction, and there are already composers in England, notably C. S. Kipping (b. 1891), the present problem editor of the Chess Amateur, who place the strategy of interference ahead of the cult of models. But as yet the chief interest in what we may term the Good Companion three-move style is seen more in other countries than in England. V. Marin (b. 1872), of Spain, stands as the foremost advocate of such tendencies to-day, and other active names are becoming familiar from the other continental countries, Italy, Holland, Denmark, and the rest.

Two of the writer's problems along these lines may be quoted here, as illustrations. No. 54 is a modern example of the Brede cross-check of No. 11. The theme is not changed, while the greater elaboration it is hardly necessary to point out. In No. 55 the capture key is typical of the modern disregard of minor conventions. The Pe7 was put on to make the key-move a thematic one, bringing the white King into danger from a position of complete safety. It was not until afterwards that the usefulness of this Pawn in preventing what would otherwise be a cook by 1. QxP+, RxQ; 2. SxQ+, Rd6; 3. Sb3 mate was discovered. It is of course better where a capture key is required to prevent some greater flaw, as turned out to be the case here; but the up-to-the-minute composer takes liberties in the cause of thematic interest which he himself would be first to condemn where they have been taken for other reasons.
In No. 55 nobody can be more surprised than was the composer to find that the white King returns safely from the adventurous course of his mainplay. Not so fortunate is the white King of No. 56, who is knocking about, weary of life, only to come back to his original house or square to meet his end. The name of House instead of Square, by the way, survives to this day in the Italian casa (French case) and in Arabic Bait, both meaning House, having come down, it would seem, from the earliest Sanskrit.

The self-mate, of which No. 56 is an example, has long been a favourite type of problem with the English School. For years some of the Continental magazines and columns, notably the Deutsche Schachzeitung, would not admit a self-mate to its pages, because they were not considered as chess at all. Yet the self-mate is of great ancestry, a couple of examples being found in the old Arabic...
Self-mate in four.
1. Kc4, PxP+; 2. Kd3, Pe2;
3. Ke4+, Kg4 or h4; 4. Kd5+, Sf4
mate.

Mate in three.
1. Bb6, QxP+ (threat); 2. Kc6!
Be2!; 2. Kd7!
Qg2 or QxPc2; 2. Sd6+.
KxP; 2. Bb7+.
Re6 or B else; 2. Sd6+.

manuscripts. In the European Middle Ages it was increasingly cultivated; while among the composers of the Old School and the early Americans it had a continuous and fairly distinguished descent. In America the self-mate was especially studied by T. M. Brown (died 1876), in his day a favourite and very fertile composer, and later it attained its greatest development in the hands of Shinkman, through whose masterpieces it eventually won recognition on the Continent.

In England it was principally the shorter forms of self-mate which became popular, though the long-range single-shoots had their passing vogue. Many two and three-move self-mate tourneys were held in the same years that witnessed the growth of the complex direct-mate two-mover, notably around 1890. Slater and some others gave to the self-mate almost as much attention as they did to the direct-mate, but their results were largely ephemeral. Those interested in the type will find selections from this material in *Les 1001 Muts Inverses*, published as a volume of the Christmas series in 1907.
Strange to say the self-mate has received much more attention in the field of changed mate waiters than has the three-move direct-mate. Dr. Ed. Birgfeld (b. 1887) has recently published, under the title of *Fata Morgana*, 1922, a great store-house of 800 Mutate self-mates; and it seems not unlikely that through a study of these attention will come around presently to an intensive study of the non-two-move Mutate, which would certainly be followed by a wave of popularity for such problems in England and elsewhere.

The composer of to-day uses the self-mate as a convenient vehicle for the presentation of the most up-to-date themes. Indeed, as will be seen in the chapter on Futurist Chess, no medium is now considered as unorthodox by the advanced composers. Sometimes the study of self-mates and other curious inversions of straightforward chess, seems actually to develop mastery over direct-mate composition. Thus G. F. Anderson (b. 1898), the composer of No. 56, has also proved himself to be very clever in handling the modern Good Companion three-move themes. No. 57 is an example of his skill, a splendid problem, illustrating the anticipatory half-pin theme. In the variation 1. ..., Be2; 2. Kd7, KxP; 3. SxP mate, the black Queen becomes essentially pinned; and after 1. ..., OxPc2; 2. Sd6+, KxP; 3. Bc4 mate, the same fate befalls the black Bishop. The theme will be discussed further in Chapter XXXIII.

No. 58.
L. H. Jokisch.

No. 59.

Mate in three.
1. Qa8, Pe4; 2. Qa3. Pg3; 2. Qg2.

Mate in three.
1. Qg1, Pd4; 2. Qh1+. Pf3; 2. Qf2.
In concluding this survey of the English School and of the American influence, a little pair of Twins may be cited, which differ only by the fact that in No. 59 all the pieces stand one square further to the left. The two problems are Miniatures, as are customarily called all problems with not more than seven pieces. The limit is an arbitrary one, but one widely accepted, and Miniatures have received increasing attention in recent years. Those interested in seeing what charming effects have been obtained with small force should obtain E. Wallis’ 777 Chess Miniatures in Three, 1908; Dr. O. Blumenthal’s Schachminiaturen, 2 vols., 1902 and 1903, and Fr. Dedrle’s Böhmische Schachminiaturen, 1922.

In Nos. 58 and 59 the small force used does not permit the difference between the American and the English problems to be strongly accented; yet it is noteworthy that L. H. Jokisch (b. 1851), the American, preferred the surprising key, while Laws chose to replace this by a model mate. The positions form a witty little epigram by which much of the contents of this present chapter may be summed up.
Chapter VI.

THE BOHEMIAN SCHOOL.

A. General Principles.

The Bohemian School is more difficult to understand than the English, because a dominant element in the tendency of the School is based on feeling rather than on any formulated code; and it is much more difficult to make other people "feel" like yourself than to demonstrate by logical reasoning the significance of a particular intellectual code. The strongest argument for Bohemian principles is simply the declaration by the advocates of the School: "We believe certain presentations of model mates, introduced by harmonious combinations of charming variations, and composed with due neatness of construction, form the ideal of problem composition; and we feel when a particular position meets this ideal." Things would be much easier if the Bohemian principles were entirely dissociated from any element that could be rigorously codified; but one element, the model mates, allows of exact definition and formulation, and this makes all the trouble. For composers of other lands, whether friendly or antagonistic to the Bohemian School, often believe that it is only the purity of the mates that constitutes a Bohemian problem. They naturally suppose that any problem with model mates is a Bohemian problem, and they cannot understand how there can be anything typical in the way these mates are combined. Yet it is this very manner of combination, rather than the mates themselves, which constitutes the main principle of the Bohemian standard.

The only way to understand the Bohemian School is to study Bohemian masterpieces. Logical criticism and accurate definitions must be avoided, while an attempt is made to sense the Feeling that such a study will presently reveal even to those least familiar with the tendency. Had such criticism and definitions always been avoided in the past, much intellectual debating would have been spared to the patient world of problem chess.

The Bohemian School has less to tell of history or development than any other of the important problem Schools. There has been some development in technical skill, yet one is surprised at the exceptional maturity of the genius of the earliest masters; and there has been some development in the style of theme most favoured at different epochs, yet one is constantly struck by the manner in which the national Feeling has carried through more.
than fifty years with no radical modification in its basic nature. Next to Feeling, the dominant characteristic of the School, as seen by an outsider, is Consistency.

The Bohemian School derives largely from the work of Anton König (1836-1911) in the middle sixties. There were then few active composers in Bohemia, and they had few means for interchange of ideas beyond two or three rather unimportant columns, the leading one being Světovor, which for twenty years remained the principal problem vehicle of the country, being later supplanted by the supremacy of Zlata Praha (Golden Prague). The work of König led to the interest of Dr. J. Dobrusky (1853-1907), a notary public of Prague, and he was soon joined by J. Pospisil (1861-1916), who later became the chief spokesman in interpreting the ideals of the School.

G. Chocholous (b. 1859), somewhat less Bohemian and somewhat more German or Continental in his tastes, made the third great leader of that first period. Around them rallied a large number of other composers, whose uniform standards of taste and remarkably high general average of merit make it difficult to characterize them individually: but among whom the names of Ladislav Cimburek (1867-1915), J. Drtina (1834-1907), J. Kvicala (1862-1908), J. Smutny (b. 18—), K. Traxler (b. 1866), and L. Vetesnik (b. 1857) are foremost in the appreciation of students in other countries. In 1887 the work of the School had grown to such a point that it was possible for Pospisil to select over 300 masterly examples of the national skill, which he published, with a discussion of the Bohemian principles, under the title of České úlohy Sachové (Czech and German text).

This volume is the best source for a study of Bohemian ideas, and may well be supplemented by the later work of Pospisil: České Melodie (published in the Christmas Series, 1908), with text in English and German, and Kotrc and Traxler's Sachové úlohy, 1910, with text in Czech and German. Pospisil's first work has the interest that it is not restricted to his own compositions. Other important personal collections of Bohemian problems are those of Dobrusky (1907), and of Miroslav Kostal, better known under his pseudonym of M. Havel (1923, in Christmas Series).

The second period in the history of the Bohemian School lies between the publication of Pospisil's first work and the close of the Century. The publication of České úlohy Sachové gave the Bohemians even greater homogeneity, as it furnished a specific set of examples on which the taste of the constantly increasing number of composers was formed. Among the new names to appear in this period were those of V. Cisar (b. 1879), V. Kosek (b. 1861) and F. Skalik (b. 1880). In this period attempts to found a chess magazine were first made. České Listy Sachové is remembered as a very attractive magazine, full of important problems and some critical material, but it only survived four years, 1896-1900. It was followed by Sachové Listy.
whose existence was even briefer, 1900-1903. It was not till 1906
that a permanent magazine was founded, Casopis Sachistů, which
since the war has been rechristened: Casopis Ceskoslovenských Sachistů.

The third Bohemian period is that of this magazine, the Casopis.
The national ideal in this period has aroused even greater enthusiasm
than before, and composers have trooped to the standard in such
numbers that outsiders are almost bewildered. Leadership passed
first to Dr. Z. Mach (b. 1877), the very talented editor of Zlata Praha,
who set new ideals of economy by greatly increasing the work
expected of all his forces. He was ably seconded and very soon
surpassed by Havel, who strongly emphasized the possibilities of
pinned mates. Others of note have been L. Knotek (b. 1892), and
two Moravian composers, Fr. Dedrle (b. 1878) and C. Kainer
(b. 1883). The School has won increased recognition and under-
standing in other countries by the foreign composers who have,
consciously or unconsciously, affiliated their style of composition
with it.

A characteristic of the Bohemian problems, which has not yet
been mentioned, is that they rarely feature a mainplay. In other
words, the national composers instinctively avoid pithy themes,
consisting of one typical combination enriched by incidental
variations or by-play, and prefer instead the blending of equivalent
variations, or what might be called many-coloured ideas. Through-
out the network of theme-variations the School demands purity and
economy in at least one mate in each variation, and this is carried
so far that in printing solutions all variations which do not lead to
models are increasingly omitted. Duals in subordinate variations
are not counted. Difficulty may be sacrificed for the sake of
elegance. Sacrifices they have defined (as we have already seen in
a former chapter) as the riddance of superfluous and consequently
uneconomically employed forces; and anything that savours of
fireworks is scrupulously avoided as characteristic only of unde-
veloped Art. Quiet play is recommended wherever possible.

These general principles, it is to be remembered, are to be
interpreted with Feeling; they are negative rather than positive,
excluding much that the School views as bad art, but suggesting
rather than defining the directions in which good art may be looked
for. As we have said, the real Bohemian School can be judged only
by its fruits.

The first example, No. 60, shows the merits as well as the weak
points of the first period. The key-move is $1. B d 8$. Bringing the
Bishop up from its obviously purposeless position is not pleasing;
only the fact that it does not go to $f 6$ helps to soften the harsh
impression. The key introduces a double threat, a very frequent
Bohemian device, which the English School would have deprecated
but which the Bohemians consider entirely artistic so long as the
Josef Pospisil.
From Deut. Wochenschrift, 1892.
JOSEF POSPISIL.

From Caspia. 1909.
double threat does not create what has been defined as an absolute dual. In No. 60 one of the threats is negligible, as it leads to a crude uneconomical mate, 2. Qh5+ followed by 3. Bf6 mate. Dobrusky used this threat, because he found it necessary to make his problem sound, but it has nothing to do with his idea. The other threat is 2. Ra5+, Kb6; 3. Sc4 mate. This is a pin mate, a feature which the Bohemians have always liked and to which in the third period they have given greatly increased attention. In order to bring such pins within the scope of their ideals, the Bohemians have chosen their definition of purity in such a way as to include them. The point at issue is easy to comprehend. If, in the mate in question, the piece at c7 was a white Pawn, everyone, including non-Bohemians, would be agreed that the mate was a model. If the piece at c7 was a black Knight, everyone, including the Bohemians, would be agreed that the mate was no model. But the use of the Rook simply threatens the white mating Knight; it does not affect the black King's field, which has the square c7 both guarded and blocked. It is therefore merely a matter of convention what such a mate is to be called. The Bohemians have defined it as a pin-model, and though other countries for some time put forward conflicting definitions the Bohemian standard has gradually become universally accepted. Indeed to-day even logical persons need a moment's deliberation to state the inconsistency!

In No. 60 the pin-mate threat is forced by 1. ..., Be2 or 1. ..., P(Q); the alternate threat by 1. ..., Pb3. That both continuations are possible after 1. ..., Rc8 does not interest a Bohemian: he cannot even imagine that members of another School would dislike this dual. For the dual is a minor one: both lines appear accurately several times; so it is quite unimportant that after some purposeless black moves the double threat is present. What counts are the real defences. 1. ..., Kb5; 2. Qc6+ leads to a pretty Queen sacrifice, more appreciated by the non-Bohemians than by the actual members.
of the School; and after 1. ..., Kd4; 2. Bf6+ the secondary threat-variation reappears, with inversion of White's second and third moves, now ending in a model. Altogether the problem is a clever and pleasing one, although not a masterpiece.

Dobrusky's mastership is evidenced by Nos. 61 and 62, both classics. The four-mover won only a second prize because the judge preferred an exceedingly ingenious entry by R. Adam, which

No. 61.

DR. J. DOBRUSKY.

2nd Prize, German Chess Association, 1889.

Mate in four.

1. Bb6, Sa6; 2. Qd3+, Ke5;
   Sc2; 2. Qb5+, Kd6; 3. Bc5 +.
   Pe5; 2. Rxe8+, Kd6; 3. Bc5 +.
   Ke4; 3. Rf8.
   Sc6; 2. Rd4 +, Ke5; 3. Qf3.
   Ke5; 2. Qg3+, Kf5; 3. Bd8.
   Kd5; 3. Rd4 +.
   Kd6; 2. QxS+, Kd7; 3. Rc7 +.
   Ke5; 3. Rf4.

No. 62.

DR. J. DOBRUSKY.

Humoristicke Listy, 1882.

Mate in three.

1. Rh4!, Ke4; 2. Og3-
   KxP; 2. SxP +.
   Kd2; 2. Qe2 +.
   Kf2; 2. Qe2 +.

(No. 98) will be noticed in the discussion of the German School. Such an instance proves the necessity of not limiting one's interest in problems to First Prize Winners, for while in many modern contests even the first prize winners are of very ordinary merit, in others the problems which develop the greatest permanent value will be found elsewhere in the award. Some editors feel safest, if
they only quote first prize winners in their columns, but the habit is a bad one in the long run.

No. 61 especially is a typical Bohemian of the earlier style. The solution does not reveal any surprises or witticisms; the impression is simply one of perfect clock-work. Dobrusky has succeeded in developing an extensive complex of variations with few pieces, and the more the problem is studied the more one admires the accuracy of the many lines of play. It is true that duals arise after 1. ..., Sa2, but other variations show the double continuations each in correct form, so that there is no absolute dual. It is worth reiterating the lack of importance placed by the Bohemians on these minor duals, both because it is so characteristic of their work and because of its influence in modifying the constructive ideals of other Schools as well.

The two variations 1. ..., Sc2 and Sa6 contain a feature that became more and more popular with the Bohemian, the echo. In these variations, beginning with the second move, congruent play ensues. Both variations split up into two mating positions, so that the problem contains two pairs of echoes. Thus the mate with black King on d6, after 1. ..., Sa6, is an exact echo of the mate on e5, after 1. ..., Sc2; and the mate on f4, after 1. ..., Sa6, is an exact echo of the mate on c7, after 1. ..., Sc2. The first pair are models; the second are not. The two pairs are closely related, but the guard of the white Queen is slightly altered and gives them their separate character. The echoing of non-model mates, which with the earlier composers was usually an incidental feature, has become a recognized and legitimate theme for later Bohemian composers. It is the principal use which they sanction of non-models as constituting a theme, though the element of economy is always to be retained.

The echoes were clearly the main idea of Dobrusky in No. 61. They are produced in what is an automatical way, by utilizing a diagonally symmetrical position, the reflection of each mate across the axis b3-e6 changing each mate into its echo. This is a less obvious form of symmetry than that on a lateral axis (vertical or horizontal). But any symmetrical type of echo is less attractive than a non-symmetrical one; because in the former we simply see the same variation twice over. The most interesting problems arise where echo mates are obtained by means of independent lines of play, as in Nos. 63 and 64, or as already seen in No. 52.

In No. 53, the echo was on a diagonal axis, as in No. 61, but the symmetry was in a single variation (1. ..., Pd3; 2. Sc7+), and not in two complete lines. This complete congruence of play is an important factor in producing the captivating effect which No. 61 has always been able to stimulate on its solvers.

In No. 63, there are two pairs of variations, ending in model mates. One type of mate, shown in the small diagram A, arises
No. 63.
J. Pospisil.
Zlata Praha, 1885.

No. 64.
W. Pauly.
Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1907.

Mate in three.
1. Qd1, threat; 2. Qf3+.
BxP or Bg4; 2. Qg4+. \{ A.
Kf5; 2. Qf3+. \}
Kd4 or Bf5; 2. Qa4+. \{ B.
Kd5; 2. Qb3+. \}

Mate in three.
1. Bd4, Kd2; 2. Rb3, Pd5;
\{ 3. Be3 mate. \}
Ke4; 2. Rf2, Kd3;
\{ 3. Bc2 mate. \}
Pd5; 2. Rf2.

to No. 63.

A.

B.

after 1. ..., BxP and Kf5; and the second type, shown in the small diagram B, follows 1. ..., Bf5 and Kd5. Of course it is sometimes necessary to turn a mating position through 90 or 180 degrees, or to reflect it as in a mirror, to bring it into the identical perspective with its echo; but such changes do not in any way alter the
interrelationship of the several pieces participating in the mates. These two pairs of echoes, A and B, are both models and very similar, so that the problem is sometimes inaccurately spoken of as containing a four-fold echo; but the small diagrams show the difference clearly enough.

No. 64 is a beautiful miniature by the most renowned of Roumanian composers, W. Pauly (b. 1876). There is only one pair of echoes, which however contain the peculiarity that the colour of the squares occupied by each of the principal pieces is changed in the two mates, as shown in these small diagrams. Echo mates of this kind, with the black King on squares of different colour, are called chameleon-echoes or simply chameleons, a term already encountered in connection with No. 52. Such echoes are more difficult to construct than ordinary echoes, and they are not so readily discovered by the solver, because they are never dependent on a symmetrical arrangement. The Bohemians display great ingenuity in contriving the necessary machinery to produce these chameleons, the echo-theme, being a theme based on mating positions, always attracting the artists of the model-mate.

When judging echo-mates, it is important rigorously to separate thematically pure and impure echoes. By thematical purity is not meant purity of mate; but the identity in the methods used to guard or block all the squares in the black King’s field. The difference between pure and impure echoes is evidenced by Nos. 65 and 66. Both problems contain the same pair of echoes, thematically pure in No. 65, impure in No. 66.

In comparing these two problems, their dates should be noticed. 1909 and 1920 both indicate modern composition, but No. 66 shows a decided advance in technique. In No. 65 the echo is pure, inasmuch as the Pawns at e7 and e3 block a square diagonally adjacent to the black King in corresponding fashion in the two mates which follow 1. ..., S any and 1. ..., P e3. In No. 66, when 1. ..., P e2; 2. Qf7+, Ke4; 3. Re8 mate, d3 is guarded by the white King; whereas in the mate after 1. ..., KS any, the corresponding square is blocked by a black Pawn (d7). Aside from the purity of its echo,
No. 65.
Dr. Z. Mach.
1st Prize, Casopis, 1909.

No. 66.
F. Dedrle.
Casopis, 1920.

Mate in three.

1. Qc1! (waiting move).
   S any; 2. Qc3+, Kd6;
       3. Rd8 mate.
   Pe3; 2. Qc7+, Kd4;
       3. Rd8 mate.
   Pe6; 2. Sf7+, Kd4;
       3. Rd8 mate.
   K any; 2. Rd8+.

Mate in three.

1. Sb5, Pe2 (threat); 2. Qf7+, Ke4;
   3. Re8 mate.
   Sh2 any; 2. Qf3+, Ke6;
   3. Re8 mate.
   Sc5; 2. Sc3+.
   Ke4; 2. Rc5.

the key of No. 65 is better than that of No. 66; but No. 66, on the other hand, contains several features showing the steady progress of Bohemian composition. The flight-giving key is good and the echo, while impure, is interesting; and the problem has two additional variations leading to beautiful models, totally independent of the echo. Of these the mate after 1. ... Ke4 is somewhat commonplace in itself, but it is introduced by a quiet minor sacrifice characteristic of Bohemian charm, while the pin-model after 1. ..., Sc5 is as pretty as it is unexpected. This variety of mating positions is typical of the modern Bohemian tendency, which calls for a harmonious blending of beautiful mates, sometimes of related and sometimes of totally different types. The actual number of the mates is unimportant, for there is no striving after maximum task effects; the paramount feature is the artistic variety in the blend produced. The composer must feel that the combination he presents will ring
true before he can be satisfied with his work. In this respect the
cooperation of King, Queen, Rook and Knight as a major white
force has proved very effective, and many masterpieces have come
from the hands of the modern Bohemian composers constructed in
this manner. The use of the white Rook gives these problems a
vitality sadly lacking, for instance, in many English and German
problems of around 1895, when the use of the Queen, Bishop and
Knight as a major white force was at its height.

No. 67.
J. Scheel.
1st & 2nd Prizes, ex aequo, Casopis,
1916.

No. 68.
L. Knotek.
Besedy Lidu, June, 1919.

Mate in three.
1. Rci, Pc5; 2. Rd1+.
Pc5; 2. Sc5.
Kd5; 2. Qh4.
Kd3; 2. Sc5+.

Mate in three.
1. Kf2, Pg3+; 2. Kf3.
KxS; 2. RxP.
Kx4; 2. Qc6+.
Kd5; 2. Rd8+.

No. 67 is by a noted Norwegian follower of the Bohemian
principles, J. Scheel (b. 1889). It presents a trio of attractive mates
introduced by skilful manœuvring and quiet moves. These quiet
moves often increase the difficulty of a problem, but the Bohemians
do not intentionally introduce them for this reason, but to avoid so
far as possible the crudeness of checking play.

No. 68 is a capital miniature, but here the white Knight is not as
active as in the three previous examples.
B. Non-Bohemian Types of Model Mate Problems.

Bohemian composition is sometimes considered as mechanical work, its sole purpose being the accumulation of numerous modelmates. The noted German critic, A. Bayersdorfer (1841-1901), himself a fine artist, has been largely responsible for this view by his work: *Zur Kenntnis des Schachproblems*, published after his death by Kohtz and Kockelkorn, 1902. The title of the work means: For the understanding of the chess problem; but his analysis of Bohemian ideals no longer appears to have been based on a true understanding. The examples already given in this chapter are not mechanical and will sufficiently demonstrate that Bayersdorfer's objections cannot be generally applied.

There are two easy mechanical processes for obtaining large numbers of models, the mating net and the strangulation process, but neither of these is at all typical of Bohemia.

The mating net, or process of alternating the white moves, is equivalent to placing all the white officers in a mating position and then seeing on how many squares the black King can stand checkmated. The problem will then be reconstructed backward, by providing a solution in the course of which the white forces

No. 69.

H. Weenink.

*De Maasbode*, Oct., 1923.

Mating net of No. 69.

Mate in four.


The Black Kings in the diagram indicate possible mating positions.
reach the mating position through an alternation of moves. No. 69 was composed as a warning example of the utter dullness of this mechanism. The mating net, shown in the accompanying diagram, reveals how the problem was made. Any composer of even slight experience can soon discover where the white pieces must be placed so that they can reach their posts in the mating net and so participate in the solution. So, for instance, the white King's Bishop might have been placed at c2, only then the continuation 2. Rb4 could never have been forced, 1... Kd5 being met by 2. Bf8 as well. This is the only subtlety in the construction; everything else is purely mechanical.

If one only asked for a large number of models, neglecting all thought of variety, then No. 69 would be a good Bohemian problem. But the monotony of the play is a bar to any real enjoyment in solving and completely excludes the position from any claim to be Bohemian at all. In problems by Bohemians themselves the writer has never found a pure mating net with alternation of moves.

---

**No. 70.**  
G. Dobbs.  
Original.

---

**No. 71.**  
Dr. J. J. O'Keefe.  
1st Pr., British Chess Federation, 1922.

---

**Mate in three.**

1. Bb7, any; 2. BxPd5+;

   3. Bg7 mate,

or 2. Bg7+; 3. BxPd5 mate:

according to Black's play.

---

**Mate in three.**

1. Sd1, threat; 2. Se3+.

   Ke4; 2. Rc4+.

   Be4; 2. Pd3.

   Bd3; 2. Sc3+.

   Sc2; 2. Sc3+.

   Pb5 or Kd4; 2. Qe3(+).
dominating a solution. It accidentally occurs, of course, that an incidental mating net, with two alternations, is used as a constructive device to advance some more thematic wealth of variations. This was the case in No. 60, after 1. ..., Kd4 and 1. ..., Pb3; but in the second of these lines it is noteworthy that the mate is not pure, showing that Dobrusky was not giving the mating net even passing notice. In such cases a mating net is entirely harmless and the problem cannot be censured as being mechanical. Real mating nets, then, have nothing to do with the Bohemian School, and where they are found it is certain that the composers will be of other nationalities. The examples given under Nos. 70 and 71 are by G. Dobbs (b. 1867), an American, and Dr. J. J. O'Keefe (b. 1873), an Australian. The scope of a three-move problem allows of less permutations in a mating net than does the four-move form, which was used in No. 69.

The second of the mechanical processes for producing model mates may be called the strangulation process. Problems built by this system can at the same time contain mating nets with alternation of moves, but this is not essential. Strangulation problems are very numerous, and occasional Bohemian compositions belong to the class, but not the best specimens of the School. To demonstrate the strangulation method No. 72 has been chosen, because Bayersdorfer used it as his example in discussing mechanical problems.

No. 72 is not exclusively a strangulation problem, but the distinction between the variations produced by this process and those not so produced is useful to explain matters. After the key has been made, let us consider the squares to which the black King might move, in the two moves allowed him by the length of the three-move solution, assuming for a moment that White made no further moves. There will be found to be eight such squares, including the square originally occupied, which have been plotted on the accompanying Scheme. In a true Strangulation problem the mating process consists in gradually attacking all these free squares, thus strangling the Black King, without introducing any new flight squares. In No. 72 the method is employed in the threat, 2. Qd5+, cutting off d4, e5, and f5; in the variation 1. ..., Kf6; 2. Qg5+, cutting off e5, e7, f5 and f6; and in the variation 1. ..., Be4; 2. Qg7+, cutting off d4, e5 and f6. In the variation 1. ..., Bg8; 2. Qf2, a large number of flights are cut off, but the new flight at e4 is opened. After 1. ..., Kd4; 2. Bg7+, the new square e3 is opened, and after 1. ..., Bf5; 2. Bg7+ the new square f4. Although not a perfect strangulation problem, the general impression that White is strangling his opponent is produced, an impression evidently much less artistic than where the white continuations appear to give freedom as well as to destroy it. All
processes of mating are necessarily brutal in the last analysis, since White must achieve the mate somehow, but the more this brutality can be disguised or postponed to the last move the better. For this reason we distinguish between strategy and crude attack, though the unfortunate Black forces, who always lose, may not clearly see the distinction.

No. 72.
K. ER LIN.

Eskilstuna Kuriren, 1920.

Scheme of No. 72.

Mate in three.
1. Sc7, threat; 2. Qd5+, Kf6;
   3. Qe6 mate.
Kf6; 2. Qg5+, Kf7; 3. Qg7 mate.
Be4; 2. Qg7+, Kf5; 3. Qg5 mate.
Bg8; 2. Qf2, Ke4; 3. Qf4 mate.
else; 3. Qf4 mate.
Bf5; 2.Bg7+, Kf4; 3. Sd5 mate.
Kd4; 2. Bg7+, Ke3; 3. Sd5 mate.
Kc5; 3. Sa6 mate.

The White squares indicate where the Black King may go to in the course of the solution if the guard over the squares is not changed.

No. 72 is not in itself a bad problem; there is sufficient variety in the mates and the accuracy of the play may give pleasure; but the general effect is of cold and automatic work. Bayernsdorfer planned a mechanical system to calculate the value of these mechanical problems; and probably he has not been the only critic, by any means, who has made the mistake of supposing such works to be typically Bohemian.
C. The true Bohemian Problems.

The great charm of the true Bohemian problems lies in their avoiding the pitfalls contained in the mechanical processes outlined in the previous section, and in their developing instead the fullest liveliness in the mating manoeuvres. As we have seen, it is necessary to cut off all flights at last; but during the course of a solution it is decidedly charming when new flights are opened and the white men guarding certain squares interchange their functions. Such play causes true aesthetic variety, and it can only be attained by complete mastery of technique, which has as its highest goal in the Bohemian School the substitution of spontaneity for mechanism.

No. 73 contains good sacrificial strategy, a subtle Rook sacrifice after 1. ..., SxS, and a more surprising one (though introduced by a check instead of a quiet move) after 1. ..., Sf6. But the greatest charm of the problem will be found in the variety of the mates, the white men running to and fro, like actors changing places for a new

No. 73.
J. Pospisil.
1st Prize, German Chess Association, 1889.

No. 74.
M. Havel.
V., Obrazkova Revue, June, 1900.

Mate in three.
1. Rh4, threat; 2. Be4+.
SxS; 2. Re4.
Sf6; 2. Rd4+.
Sf5; 2. Bf7+.
Sg4 or Ke5; 2. Rh5+.
Pc4; 2. QxP +.

Mate in three.
1. Qb8, threat; 2. Sb6+.
Bc4; 2. Qf4.
BxS; 2. Sb6+.
(Kc4; 2. Qb5+).
(KxS; 2. Qd6+).
(PxS; 2. Qc7).
tableau, to regroup themselves in a new and totally different placement for the mate in each of the variations.

No. 74 also shows great activity of the white force, the mates being well varied. This activity of the men is a paramount feature of the Bohemian tendency. It is clearly essential for the construction of distinct mates. It helps to explain the Bohemian dislike of pawns, especially of the white Pawns. For pawns can rarely be very active and they are of small use in the rebuilding of mating positions. This Bohemian dislike of pawns includes also the pawns situated at a distance from the King’s field, where they have no concern in the changing nature of the mates, but only serve as anticooking devices or the like. This comprehensive antipathy to Pawns cannot be explained by any argument about “active actors in the mating-play,” but is based wholly on aesthetic feelings, which like all artistic feelings do not admit of logical discussion.

No. 75.
J. Svejda.
1st Prize, Neues Ill. Blatt., 1897.

No. 76.
K. Traxler.
1st Prize, Tidskrift för Schack, 1897.

Mate in three.
1. Kg1, threat; 2. Qf1.
Sd1; 2. RxP.
Pd3; 2. QxP4+.
Sc4; 2. Bd5+.
Bd8; 2. QxPb5.

Mate in three.
1. Se5, threat; 2. Sg6.
PXP; 2. Bd3.
Sf5 or BxPd5; 2. Qc1+.
Ba6; 2. Sc6.
Kf4; 2. Sg6+.
PxS; 2. Qd3+.
Pb4; 2. Sc4+.
Sg4; 2. SxS+. 
No. 77. J. Fridlizius.
1st Pr., St. Petersburg Zeitung, 1898.

Mate in three.
1. Rf3, threat; 2. Qh4+.
BxP; 2. Pd3+.
SxP; 2. Rd3+.
BxR; 2. Qa1+.

No. 79. F. Matousek.
1st Prize, Casopis, 1915.

Mate in three.
Se3; 2. Sd7.
KxS; 2. Qb6.
S else; 2. Sb4+.

No. 78. J. Kotrc.
3rd Prize, Zlata Praha, 1908.

Mate in three.
1. Qh6, Pd5; 2. Qf8.
Bb4; 2. Bg5.
Bc3; 2. Sa3.

No. 80. J. Drnek.
2nd Prize, Casopis, 1921.

Mate in three.
Bd3; 2. Pe3.
Sc3; 2. Kd2.
Sa3 or d6; 2. Qc5.
Sd4; 2. Sc5+.
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No. 81.
M. HAVEL.
1st Prize, Göteborgs Schacksällskap, 1921.

No. 82.
DR. Z. MACH.
1st Prize. Ces Spolku Sachovniko v Praze, 1921.

Mate in three.
1. Qf8, threat; 2. Rg6.
   Sc6; 2. Sd5.
   Se5; 2. Rd4+.  

Mate in three.
1. Rc5, threats; 2. Qd2+
or 2. Se5+.
   Sb1 or Se3; 2. Se1+.
   Sd5; 2. Rc4.
   Se2; 2. Qe3+.
   Ke4; 2. Sd2 or g5+.

A small collection of Bohemian three-movers, arranged chronologically, will illustrate the qualities that have been discussed and indicate the improvement of the Bohemian technique. It will be noticed that No. 77 is by J. Fridlizius (b. 18—), the finest of Swedish masters. Almost every country to-day has its strong advocates of the Bohemian tendency, and the refining influence of the School may be further traced in many modifications of detail in the works of essentially non-Bohemian composers.

The problems of the Bohemians must be enjoyed at one’s ease, as we saw had to be the case with the works of J. B. of Bridport. For they contain few brilliant colours and no thrilling effects. There is nothing immediate about them, and when the perceptions are tired, so that the fine variegations cannot be appreciated, they may even seem dull. But a lack of appreciation may always be due to the solver as much as to the problems themselves. This is always worth remembering.
No mention has been made hitherto of Bohemian two-movers. Indeed the national ideals are incompatible with the two-move form, for it is impossible to re-arrange the pieces in order to vary the aspect of the mating positions where White and Black only dispose of one move (the key being the same for all the variations). So true Bohemian variety is impossible, and Bohemian composers who have been tempted into the two-move field have simply made the best of the situation, constructing charming light-weights which charm the solver, but nowadays rarely escape the pitfalls of anticipation.

No. 83.

J. Pospisil.

N.Y. Bahn Frei Ty., 1888-90.

Mate in two.

1. Bb5.

No. 84.

W. Ebert.

Oesterreichische Lesehalle, May, 1892.

Mate in two.

1. Rf4.
Chapter VII.

LOYD.

"Go it, Sammy! Don't let him beat you!" Thus did Isaac Loyd encourage his disobedient son, who against his orders had accepted the challenge, issued by a travelling show, to enter in a hundredyards running race; and the pleasant thought, that his father's parental discipline had yielded to his sporting instinct, stimulated young Loyd to finish a victor in the race.

This anecdote shows that Sam Loyd (1841-1911) was something of an imp in his boyhood; and his problems show that he remained one for the rest of his days! And, just as he could make a success of his boyhood disobedience because of his father's encouragement, so all his life he could persist in his facetious roguery because the American people liked it. There may have been differences in Loyd's day between European and American standards of behaviour, which explain why Loyd could only have been an American product, but his sparkling humour laughed away the scruples of the square-toes everywhere, and a new element of beauty was introduced into the problem composition of the world: Humour.

Let us study the five-move problem, No. 85, the Excelsior Theme. Loyd composed it in 1858, at the "Morphy Chess Rooms," and much later he told of its origin as follows: "It was quite an impromptu to catch old Dennis Julien, the problemist, with. He used to wager that he could analyse any position, so as to tell which piece the principal mate was accomplished with. So I offered to make a problem, which he was to analyse and tell which piece did not give the mate. He at once selected the Queen's Knight's Pawn as the most improbable piece, but the solution will show you which of us paid for the dinner."

No. 85.
S. Loyd.
London Era, 13 Jan., 1861.

Mate in five.
(For solution see text.)
The solution is:

1. Pb2-b4

Threatening both 2. Rd5 and 2. Rf5, as Black's reply, 2. ..., Rc5,
is frustrated by 3. PxR.

1. ..., Rc5+

So Black shuts off the fifth row.

2. Pbxxc5, Pa3-a2;

It becomes evident, that the Sa1 will give no mate and only
serves to stop the black Pawn.

3. Pc5-c6,

Again threatening Rd5 and Rf5. But it looks as if Black can
postpone the mate to the sixth move by playing:

3. ..., Bd8-c7;

As 4. Rd5 is met by 4 ..., Bxg3; 5. Rd1+, Be1; and 4. Rf5 by
4. ..., Bf4.

4. Pcsxb7!

"Go it, Sammy!"

4. ..., ad lib.;

5. Pb7xa8 mate!

No further comment is necessary. Any reader from whom the
solution fails to call forth an appreciative smile will please omit
this chapter altogether.

Loyd was a wag and a quiz; for him problems were true puzzles,
which he had the priceless gift of making both difficult and ingeniously thematic. The difficulty born from wit and ingenuity is the
greatest, because, alas, ingenuity is so rare! Even in the two-mover Loyd succeeded in developing considerable difficulty. Nos. 86 and
87 may not appear so difficult to-day, because Loyd often has been
imitated and the imitations have become generally known; but
surpassed such gems will never be!

Loyd was fond of prefacing his problems with mottoes and showed much skill inventing apt and witty names. An example
was No. 85: "Excelsior" is an admirable motto for the Pawn's
advance, undoubtedly inspired by Longfellow's famous poem. The
theme of No. 86 was christened by him after Goldsmith's comedy:
"She stoops to conquer," though the title was first given to a much
older position. No. 90 he called the Love Chase, because the Queen
pursues the Bishop with such pertinacity. These and other mottoes
were simply meant as a joke. The grateful American posterity,
however, exaggerated this habit with the regrettable consequence
that occasional mottoes have been adopted as titles for general
themes, constituting locutions unintelligible to many. A few
especially clever terms have received general recognition, such as
Pickaninny and Horseblock, and these are explained in their proper
places in this book; but the danger of overburdening the problem
vocabulary with strange mottoes is one to be avoided. It corres-
ponds to the danger of naming themes after composers or places of publication, like the Grimshaw, or the Indian, or the Bristol, or the Roman. Such names form admirable short-cuts to identification, in that they save the necessity of a long thematic description, but they require the problem student to memorize a new term. To justify this they must express something which urgently calls for brief expression. No foresight can decide whether a given Motto or a given Proper Name will be accepted; but a few years always will decide the matter beyond all argumentation.

Loyd did not create his Mottoes with any purpose of designating themes, but to add some zest to some particular position. Two more excellent mottoes of his, accompanying brilliant problems, are given in the captions to Nos. 88 and 89.

In the case of No. 88, the motto was meant to delude the solver into the belief that purity and economy of mates was to be sought for; that the problem was one of the lesser efforts of the purists (who in 1867 were coming to the fore in Bohemia and elsewhere), the key of which was excused by the remark that beauty ranks before difficulty. Woe to the unwary solver! The key is the most baffling that could be imagined: the entire problem centres on that one move. The variety is small, but White's manœuvreing to master
the diagonal c8-h3, notwithstanding apparently dangerous checks, is splendid.

No. 88 formed one of a tourney set. This system of tourney competition had its good side in that it made composers enter a number of problems of different lengths, encouraging high average excellence. But the best individual problems often suffered, and

No. 88.
S. Loyd.

“Schönheit lieber als Schwierigkeit.”

2nd Prize Set, Paris Tourney, 1867.

No. 89.
S. Loyd.

“The Steinitz-Gambit.”

1st Prize, Checkmate, 1903.

Mate in four.
1. BxP!, PxP+; 2. Pb7; Qe8;
   3. Qc5; 2. Qe8, Qb6;
   3. QxQ.
Qc2; 2. Be2, QxB;
   3. Qxe8+. threat; 2. BxP, threat;
   3. Qc8+. QxB+; 3. KxQ.

Mate in three.
1. Ke2!, Pf1(Q)++; 2. Ke3.
   Pf1 (S)+; 2. Rf2+.
SxP or KxS; 2. Bd3+.
   Kd4; 2. Rf4+.
Sc1+ or Rd8 (threat); 2. Ke3.
   Re7 (threat); 2. Rf7+.

fine sets were often disqualified because of the unsoundness of a single member. For these reasons, and perhaps because of the increasing impatience which modern times have developed alike in composers and solvers, and to which reference has already been made, the set system is nowadays seldom resorted to.

No. 89 is another of Loyd’s problems composed for the sake of its
key. The motto reveals this key, if only the solver remembers that the typical move of the Steinitz Gambit is (after: 1. Pe4, Pe5; 2. Sc3, Sc6; 3. Pf4, PxP; 4. Pd4, Qh4+) 5. Ke2! The practical player, who encounters this move for the first time, believes that his opponent is joking him, until he realizes that the move is not so purposeless as it looks. The same may be said of No. 89; the key is the last move one would expect, releasing the black Pawn and precipitating an avalanche of checks. After Loyd, the trick has been repeated, but never in so spontaneous and baffling a manner.

Loyd was never a prize hunter. No aesthetic considerations impelled him to give his problems the frequent charming open form; he wished rather to tempt solvers by the neat and attractive setting of a diagram and to set them puzzling over the difficult or bizarre solutions contained in a seemingly innocent position. That a neat lay-out exercises great attraction is demonstrated by Nos. 90 and 91.

No. 90.
S. Loyd.

_Leipziger Ill. Zeitung, 23 Oct., 1869._

Mate in three.

1. Qf1, Bb2 (threat); 2. Qb1.
Bc3 or d4; 2. Qd3.
Be5 or f6; 2. Qf5.
Pg3; 2. Sg6+.

No. 90 is a renowned problem. Loyd composed it during a stay in Dresden and achieved through it an immediate popularity with

No. 91.
S. Loyd.

"God Save the Queen."

_Detroit Free Press, 1877._

Mate in three.

1. Qg3, Bc2 (threat); 2. Qg8.
Ka4; 2. Qe3.
Ka6; 2. QxP.
Bb3 or a4; 2. QxP+.
the German solvers. The problem is a remarkably economical treatment of the opposition-theme, a theme involving the action and counter-action of a white and a black piece. In No. 90 the duel is between the white Queen and the black Bishop. Conrad Bayer (1828-1897), the greatest tourney hero of the period, called it a splendid example of strategy: and that it is. Nowadays the term strategy is loosely employed to indicate insignificant tactical manoeuvres even in the two-mover; but in Bayer's day, when superlatives were not so hackneyed, the qualification included the highest praise.

No. 91 is a nice little affair and unexpectedly difficult. Loyd overflowed the Detroit Free Press section of the American tourney of 1877 with problems containing no white pieces other than the King and Queen; so once more his motto was well chosen.

More than any other single composer Loyd popularized the problem art, notwithstanding the difficulty of his problems. This was due to his sharpness of expression. Once the solution of a Loyd problem has been found, it is not necessary to ask: "What does he mean by this?" Loyd introduced the humoristic element into composition, and at the same time he was a serious thematic composer. In the study of the origins of themes, his early problems are constantly being encountered among the pioneers, and some of these will be referred to in Part II.

Loyd composed in all styles, the Bohemian excepted, and he influenced all schools, even some of the Bohemian composers. His influence was always spontaneous, cropping out unexpectedly and for no apparent reason in certain cases. That his teachings were not more uniformly effective was probably due in great part to the absence of a uniform level of high creative genius able to follow in his footsteps. It was due also to the clouded nature of his book: Chess Strategy, 1878-81. This was the earliest attempt at a comprehensive treatise on composition, but the meaning he intended to convey is never as clear as the purport of his problems, and often it is both contradictory and unconvincing. The result has been that the attention of readers has centred wholly upon the problems. The whole edition of the book was long ago out of print, and copies now command a fabulous price. A revision, containing much additional matter, appeared in the Christmas Series in 1913, under the title: Sam Loyd and his Chess Problems, but this also is now out of print and difficult to secure.
CHAPTER VIII.

THE OLD GERMAN SCHOOL.

Under this heading is included the style of composition advocated by Philip Klett (1833-1910) and Dr. Johann Berger (b. 1845), and exemplified in their problems and in those of Conrad Bayer. The School receives its name from the fact that its precepts have for some fifty years been those advocated in the great German periodical, the *Deutsche Schachzeitung*, the longest lived of all chess magazines, founded in 1846. The composers of this School have not been confined to Germany. Bayer and Berger both count as Austrian; the greatest exponents of the School to-day are also Austrians, including the Viennese Konrad Erlin (b. 1856), Max Feigl (b. 1871) and Ottmar Nemo (b. 1861). The School has had great exponents in many countries, Rev. J. Jespersen (1848-1914) in Denmark, Emil Pradignat (1831-1910) in France. This wide-spread participation has led many to call the School the Continental School; but the name of German School is more appropriate, as it specifies the influence back of the movement. Though so wide-spread, many of the most famous members were Germans, and the tendency produced some of its most noteworthy products among the prize-winners in the tournaments of the German Chess Association, which became the recognized standards for tourney problems in three and four moves in all other countries, except Bohemia and England.

The distinction “Old” German School is added because two of its most noteworthy exponents, J. Kohtz and C. Kockelkorn, left the ranks in the early years of the present century and advocated a new tendency, which has been termed the German Thematic Renaissance and which will be discussed in the chapter on the Modern German School. To-day nearly all German composers have gone over to the New School, and the followers of the Old School are found principally in other Continental countries.

The history of the Old German School is that of a few giants towering high above a great number of lesser composers. This is a natural consequence of the efforts the School made to achieve colossal results, to compose exclusively in the Grand Manner. The national impulse to magnify great compatriots helped in building these splendid reputations, much as it has done in other countries. For these reasons a very good understanding of the School may be obtained from the works of Klett, Bayer and Berger.

In 1878 Ph. Klett edited a collection of his chess problems, prefaced by a discussion of the problem art, under the title: *Ph. Klett’s Schachprobleme*. Its wealth of exceedingly difficult masterpieces (107)
remains a treat for the solver up to the present day, in spite of the somewhat heavy style and antiquated character of the introduction. And even this contains many points of interest and many truths still worth recognition. Klett is always unassuming and, when defending his opinions, he does so with a fine tolerance of the opinions of others. His ideals are: difficulty, finesse, difficulty, economy, difficulty, purity of mate in the mainplays, and again difficulty! Always the element of difficulty is emphasized as the paramount feature in problem composition, though it is indicated that this difficulty must spring from the problem-theme itself, without tricks or jokes. The incompatibility of a Grand Manner with the joking of a Trickster will be self-evident! The cult of quiet moves is a natural consequence of these ideals; but Klett's mastership succeeds in making these quiet moves artistic as well as difficult. Klett does not demand the charming exterior appearance of the position which Bohemians stress so much; he does not feel the full aesthetic appeal of the pure mate, and the models shown in his problems do not exhibit the delightful range of a Bohemian work of art. The strategy and manœuvring, however, are much more robust, more complicated and as well more subtle than will be found in any Bohemian composer's work.

Klett was described by Köhntz as the "giant with the Hun head," a remarkable coincidence of character and appearance. Such a mind hardly recognises the existence of the two-move problem. Like Bayersdorfer after him, Klett considered the two-mover as a combination in one move (the key-move) and consequently no combination at all. He made half a dozen very good two-movers himself, but he apologized for publishing them. Other composers who came after him, who were not so great and therefore cried louder, stressed this insignificance of the two-mover even more. They did not realize that other elements of beauty and of interest exist, besides difficulty, sufficiently attractive to justify even the combinations of one move. The result was that the Old German School neglected the two-mover, omitting it entirely from its tournaments; so that the technique has been largely dormant for some fifty years, and the composers of to-day look with the same astonishment and disgust on the two-movers of the English School that the members of the latter look upon those of the continentals. Klett's ideal of length for a chess problem was four moves; though a later generation, yielding to the tendencies of the time, brought the three-mover into chief favour. Indeed, in his book, Klett even apologizes on several occasions for introducing some four-mover that may be considered too much of a light-weight, justifying its inclusion on the ground that the problem was so attractive, though perhaps too easy. No. 92 is one of the problems excused in this manner, though the solver of to-day may not find it altogether too
PHILOPPE KLETT.

From the "Brot. Wochenschach" 1903, published on the seventieth birthday of Klett.
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easy. Klett’s standard of difficulty was so high, that in many cases his contemporaries failed to solve his problems at all, a result which one may suppose was most gratifying all around! Not so “easy” will be found No. 93; but Klett’s unrivalled mastership of the Grand Manner is most truly evidenced by No. 94. Truly that is “colossal.”

No. 92.
Ph. Klett.
Schachprobleme, 1878.

Mate in four.
1. Bd5, threat; 2. SxP e4 mate.
   Kb4; 3. Bb3!
PxS; 2. Bb7, Ke6; 3. SxP.
   RxS; 3. Rd5+.

No. 93.
Ph. Klett.
Schachprobleme, 1878.

Mate in four.
1. Qd1, threats; 2. Qd4+ or 2. Sf7+.
   RxQ+; 2. Kg2, PxR; 3. Sf7+.
   Pf3 or Rg1+; 3. Kf3.
Pf3; 2. Qd4+, RxQ; 3. Re6+.

Many solvers will not find No. 92 to be very remarkable, though certainly it is worth studying. In No. 93, Klett’s key was thought astonishing by his contemporaries, but Loyd has made such effects seem rather tame. Neither problem is actually very difficult, except as any four-mover with some quiet play is apt to cause trouble. Both problems have short threats. We have already discussed the point, that, in problems with several equivalent variations, short threats are more likely to be blemishes than in problems with pointed themes, where all the interest centres on the “point” and a short threat cannot so well spoil the impression. Hence in No. 93 the short threat is only a very small blemish, if any at all, while in No. 92 the mainplay is not sufficiently brilliant to conceal the weakness in the threat. These considerations of the short threat
Mate in five.

1. Bg4!, PxQ; 2. Rd6, PxR;


Pxc2(Pd5,Re8); 4. Rd5+.

Ke3; 4. Sc4+.


BxS(Ra8); 3. Sc6+.


SxB; 2. Rd6,

SxB; 2. Rd6,

SxQ(Pxc2); 3. Se7+.

Sf3; 2. Rxe4+, KxR;

KxS;

(or 2. Rd6, etc.)

BxB; 2. Qxf4, QxR;

Se6; 2. Rc6xS, QxR;


The impression of a certain degree of crudeness which may have been left by the study of Nos. 92 and 93 will disappear entirely when one turns to the remarkable intricacy of No. 94. Klett composed several such positions, which are to be found in his book. The solver will learn modesty in his own powers from their study, but happily he will learn much else also. Besides the solution given, the problem contains a few minor duals, but these are omitted in view of the length of the solution.
QxR; 2. Pc3+, 3. Pc4+, 4 Sxb3+.
(or 2. Qe1, KxSa; 3. Pc4+.
    Qd6; 3. Qd1+. threat; 3. Qc3+.)
Pf5; 2. Qxf4, BxS; 3. Qxe3+, KxR; 4. Qc3+.

Bc5(Pxc2); 3. Sxb3+.
Qh6(f6); 2. Sf6, KxR; 3. Sc4+, Kd4; 4. Pc3+.
Ra8; 2. Rc4+, KxR; 3. Qxf4+, KxS; 4. Qxe4+.

It is interesting to note what the composer of such a position has

to say in his introduction about Americanism: “That tendency,
which overemphasizes the value of difficulty and considers of minor
importance the blending of beautiful mates, must be qualified as
entirely wrong and as endangering the further development of the
problem art!” Schiller’s teaching that no great achievement is
possible without the sweat of one’s brow, Klett quotes as necessary
to the American tendency; but not to his own problems, oh no! But
one must not suppose that Klett failed to admire Loyd. In
Germany, Loyd certainly found no less estimation than he did else-
where; the aversion surely was to the horrible products of the
Loyd-imitators, which were being labelled, somewhat unfairly
perhaps, with the designation of “American.”

Klett’s own genius was sufficient to embody his ideals. Some few
disciples he had worthy of him in constructive ability. Without
this, the endeavour to compose in accordance with his principles
would soon become a mere waste of strength, and an imitator of
Klett would be as devoid of merit as an imitator of Loyd.

Of these disciples, one, the veteran Johann Berger (Altmaster, as
his pupils fondly call him) formulated the German ideals more
elaborately than Klett and also somewhat more in accordance with
modern views. His book was published in 1884, and was called Das
Schachproblem, und dessen kunstgerechte Darstellung.

Berger’s Book is essentially dogmatic. The opinions which are
set forth are not presented as opinions, but as Laws, and contrary
opinions are not discussed nor even referred to. Such inflexible
verdicts are always less apt to be sympathetically received by
readers whose ideals are, wholly or in part, different than are
principles offered in a more tolerant manner, allowing a natural
discussion of their pros and cons. But Berger was not interested in
the sympathy of readers who did not abide by his verdicts. He was
the spokesman of the great School of Klett and Bayer, the School of
the Deutsche Schachzeitung, the Continental tournaments and the
Grand Manner. These important tourneys required infallible Judges, and the Judge required a definite Code of Statutes, which it was the aim of Berger's book to provide. So far as the Old German School was concerned, the Code was accepted unquestioningly, and for twenty years it regulated composition throughout the territories of the School, which extended far beyond the confines of Germany and Austria. It was only after the New German School arose that the Laws of Das Schachproblem were questioned; but then their inexorable character precipitated a conflict which became extremely violent.

To-day the violence of the conflict has long since subsided, and its details are not worth dwelling upon. Aside from the establishment of the New German School, which will be treated in the following chapter, the result of the battle has been to reduce Berger's Laws to the rank which they should have occupied all along, the rank of a personal opinion, albeit an opinion shared by some very distinguished other composers, and one still welcomed as a guide by many who desire guidance.

Berger's Code may be synopsized in the form of Nine Commandments, as follows:

1. Pure mates are essential in the principal variations.
2. The mates shall be economical, the pieces developing their full activities (for instance, the Queen shall not play and mate simply acting as a Bishop).
3. White's continuations in the principal lines shall be quiet.
4. No more moves shall be introduced than are required for the expression of the theme.
5. There shall be no short threats; no checking threats; if need be a threat with quiet moves throughout; but by preference waiting moves.
6. Variations and tries must be introduced; problems containing duals should be reconstructed to embody the dual play as additional variations.
7. White's moves should increase in strength with the progress of the solution, captures and flight-taking moves being avoided in the keys.
8. Problem-schemes born in embryo in the imagination of the composer must be developed and completed according to the problem Laws (Kunstgerecht).
9. Problems should present a game-like position, ample freedom of attack, and a certain measure of difficulty.

Of all these commandments, the only one which forty years have seen pass entirely into the discard is the first clause of No. 9. The others are all more or less important still, and are still aimed at by great numbers of composers. Berger himself has always tried with admirable consistency to abide by his self-imposed laws. In doing
Prof. Johann Berger.
From Deut Schachzeitung, 1914.

Pages 107, 112, etc.
so he has perhaps sacrificed another characteristic of true art, not mentioned in his list: Spontaneity. He is at his best when treating difficult themes demanding quiet moves. In this field his industry and perseverance brought him perfect mastery, at the expense of charm and plasticity.

A good specimen of his work is No. 95. The theme is expressed in the key, a most unpromising move, accentuating the obstruction of the Bcr. The constructive difficulties have been overcome with great ingenuity; but strange to say what Berger most valued, in discussing the problem, is the game-like position. The few doubled pawns he excuses on the ground that the constructive difficulties prevented their elimination. It is strange to find stressed in this way the point which would be least noticed by the present day student.

Berger's great constructive abilities mark him as a composer especially adapted to handle elaborate task ideas, and indeed he has occasionally tried his hand at certain maximum effects, particularly in obtaining the greatest variety from the moves of certain white pieces. But these task achievements are for him simply exercises; if, like the Etudes of Chopin, they interest the public, well and good. In his heart of hearts, the Grand Manner, ruled by the Nine Commandments, remains the only true Art.

The third problem hero of the Old German School, Dr. Conrad Bayer, published no collection of his problems nor any treatise on composition, but a book of his works is now in preparation by Dr. Josef Schindler (b. 1885). Bayer was a most prolific composer. In his works the ideals of Klett and Berger are incorporated, but adapted to practical use. For Bayer was no theorist. He was perhaps the first of the great line of Tourney Champions, which led down through Mackenzie to the present ascendancy of Heathcote and Blake.

One of his earlier problems, No. 96, strongly reminiscent of Bolton.
was christened the Immortal Problem and for several decades ranked as one of the greatest extant compositions. Such is immortality in the world of chess problems, however, that nowadays many of Bayer's more trifling works will be esteemed where the Immortal Problem, with its checking pursuit, is quite forgotten.

Much more subtle, especially for 1867, is No. 97. This position shows in the mainplay, 1. ..., BxQ, an ending which may distinctly be considered as a two-move idea. The elaboration of two-move endings, of a familiar character and so liable to arouse little interest if presented in the two-move form, became through Bayer a feature of very many problems by composers affiliated with the Old German School. Jespersen and Pradignat won many of their successes with problems of this character, which they brought to a high degree of perfection.

No. 96.

DR. C. BAYER.
The Immortal Problem.

Era, 6 July, 1856.

No. 97.

DR. C. BAYER.

1st Prize, British Tourney, 1867.

Mate in nine.

1. Rb7, QxR; 2. BxP+, KxB;
3. Qg8+, KxS; 4. Qg4+, Ke5;
5. Qh5+, Rf5; 6. Pf4+, BxP;
7. QxS+, BxQ; 8. Re4+, PxR;
9. Pd4 mate!

Somewhat akin is the extension of three-move ideas to four-move form, of which a splendid example is No. 98, by R. Adam (died 1916). The variation 1. ..., Kd4 is here really beautiful; but the rest of the solution is of minor importance, though after 1. ....
DR. CONRAD BAYER.

From a lithograph issued by Velt and Company, of Leipzig.
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KxS and 1. ... BxS there are subsidiary lines of play terminating in model mates. Only a consummate master of complexity could be expected to introduce equivalent variations of as lofty interest into problems of four or more moves. Where, as in No. 98, the backbone of a problem consists of a single variation, it is difficult to find any argument to justify the addition of the extra move in the solution.

This fashion for extending ideas thematically presentable in $x$ moves into serving as the main plays of problems in $x+1$ moves derived unconsciously from Berger's third Law, emphasizing quiet white continuations, which were increasingly treated as key-moves of problems within problems. There is something to be said on both sides. An idea may be very hackneyed in $x$ moves, and yet by presentation in $x+1$ moves may regain some measure of freshness, through an introductory sacrifice, through the unexpected revelation of its presence, or through some other means. But such extension directly opposes that other Law of Berger, the fourth, which insists that no extra moves shall be introduced beyond the exact requirement of any theme.

This conflicting effect of Berger's third and fourth Laws led, unconsciously, to the gradual decay of the Grand Manner, and to an increasing study of strategical themes, expressed in strict accord with the requirements as to length which each theme presented, and expressed also with little or no attention to the possibilities of equivalent collateral variations. This change, which was in slow progress and generally unobserved in the closing decade of the Nineteenth Century, was brought into sharp outline in 1903 by the publication of Das Indische Problem by Kohtz and Kockelkorn, a
work which precipitated a revolution in the German School and which will be discussed in the next chapter.

The present chapter might be prolonged at considerable length to show how the influence of the German Grand Manner passed into nearly all countries, stimulating the composition of problems containing more strategy but less refinement of mate than the problems of the Bohemian School exhibited. It is hardly important, however, to try and trace the small national variations which derived from this great central European inspiration. A single example, the German influence on the Dutch School, will be discussed later in chapter X. and may be taken as typical of what occurred in other lands, slightly modified in each.

To-day the principal stronghold of what survives of the Grand Manner of Klett and Bayer and Berger is in Vienna, where the members of the Viennese School, to which reference has already been made, carry out the traditions of the Masters in the greatly modified style which passing years have brought with them. Of

**No. 99.**

**K. Erlin.**

3rd Prize, Wurzburg Chess Club, 1895.

**No. 100.**

**M. Feigl.**


Mate in three.

1. Qa3, threat; 2. QxPb4+.
   Pxf2; 2. Rce3.
   Pb2; 2. Rc4+.
   KxR; 2. QxPb4+.
   Ke3; 2. Qb2.

Mate in three.

   PxR; 2. Ka7.
   BxR; 2. Qf1.
   Kd5; 2. Qc8.
   Bd4; 2. Sxp+.
this distinguished coterie, Max Feigl stands as the finest exemplar, dividing his popularity with his friends Konrad Erlin and Ottmar Nemo. Nos. 99 and 100 are given as specimens of the work of this School at its highwater mark at the beginning of the century. Erlin's problem will be found closely akin to the Bohemian tendency, but without the super-refinement characteristic of the latter. Feigl in general introduces somewhat greater strategy (note 1. ..., PxB in No. 100) at the cost of the purity in the subordinate variations.
CHAPTER IX.

THE MODERN GERMAN SCHOOL.
(The Problem-Renaissance.)

Germany itself brought forth the reaction against the dogmatic commandments of the advocates of the æsthetic tendency. J. Kohitz (1843-1918) had been one of the early disciples of Bayer. The collection of problems published by him in 1875 in collaboration with C. Kockelkorn belonged distinctly to the school of Klett. After a considerable period of inactivity as a composer, his interest in chess was reawakened at the turn of the century and, in particular, he devoted much attention to a study of the history of the game of chess and to the problems of the early English Transition School. Objections formed in his mind against the commandments which he himself had been leading up to in his problems of thirty years before. He came to realize the many elements of beauty in the almost forgotten problems of the '50's, and he understood that these elements were often in necessary conflict with the commandments and that the problems themselves could not easily be reconstructed to comply with the commandments. Indeed these old problems were mostly imperfect as well as unpolished, and he saw that if the problems themselves could not be reconstructed, their themes might well be modernized; so he actively took up the restoration to honour of the old themes, which developed into an actual Problem Renaissance.

The composers of the '50's had not spent time in any close study of the possibilities contained in single themes. There were so many original themes then available that one had only to pick almost at random from the profusion. We have already seen how, as the first rough exploration of themes developed, other transitional tendencies also developed, which led the attention of composers into other channels before they had had time to acquire the technique necessary for a systematic research into the subtler combinations of given themes. When Kohitz turned his attention back to the early days, the opportunity for any such rollicking among new themes as the composers of that golden age had enjoyed was of course long past; but the years had brought compensation in the form of a developed technique sufficient to permit of a scientific thematic study previously impossible.

It must not be supposed that the period between the close of the Golden Age of Themes and the dawn of the Kohitzian Renaissance was one long blank, so far as any study of these themes was concerned. We know how consistently Loyd had, during such
C. Kockelkorn.

J. Kohtz.

From Deut. Schachzeitung, 1876.
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periods as he composed at all, kept his command of themes in prominence as well as his command of sparkle in the presentation of his themes; and there were others now and then whom any student of detailed problem history must take close account of. American composers, like Meredith and G. N. Cheney (1837-1861); Scandinavians, like J. Broholm ( ); Russians or Letts, like K. Behting (b. 1867); occasional figures everywhere, had toyed more or less seriously with the possibilities of themes in the Kohtzian sense; but there had been nothing in the way of a concerted study of themes, and without concerted study no great progress in problem composition is ever easy.

For a man already advancing in years, Kohtz approached his crusade with an astonishing exuberance. He had the full enthusiasm and singleness of purpose of the newly converted. He was absolutely intolerant of views which failed to go as far as did his own. And his wit and genius soon carried practically a whole nation along with them.

His immediate partner was C. Kockelkorn (1843-1914), his collaborator through more than fifty years altogether. Kockelkorn always remained the fine artist of the days when art had been paramount. His chief duty was ever to polish and advise. It is of course not possible to determine the exact part each of the two men took in the composition of any given one of their problems; but in the period of the Problem Renaissance the share of Kockelkorn in directing the movement was certainly negligible. Much more important was the collaboration given in the earlier years by a number of younger men, such as W. von Holzhausen (b. 1876), F. Sackmann (b. 1888), F. Köhnlein (1879-1916), H. Rübesamen (d. 1916), F. Palitzsch (b. 1889), and a host of others who little by little rallied to the new flag.

It is usual for any reaction, in the first flush of its triumph, to go to extremes. And when Kohtz started the pendulum of fashion swinging back from the side of artistic commandments to the side of thematic science, it did not take long for the change to develop all the bitterness of a revolution. The commandments were torn to shreds, degraded to a set of laughable postulates, to be kicked about as absolutely worthless. The standard of the Renaissance was raised in the Deutsches Wochenschach, an estimable weekly founded in 1888 under the name of Bruderschaft, heretofore rather dull on its problem side. A little later were founded the Deutsche Schachblätter, 1906, which remain an important organ of the movement. Many columns also took up the cry, notably the Münchener Neueste Nachrichten, edited by Köhnlein. And for a year or two at the start the short-lived Offiziers Schachzeitung, edited by F. von Wardener (b. 1873), one of the most eager converts from the extreme artistic camp, helped loudly in the battle.
The forces of conservatism were ranged principally under Berger, editing the Schachzeitung, and G. Marco (1803-1923) and Dr. E. Mazel (b. 1859), editing and collaborating in the Wiener Schachzeitung. It is quite useless to-day to bring up any of the details of the controversy. Some of it is still interesting and instructive reading, but more tends to be personal and not any too relevant. What both sides forgot is that neither of the conflicting views was perhaps better than the other, that they were simply different. Had either the composers of the artistic tendency, who at the time happened to be the conservatives, or those of the thematic tendency, who happened to be the radicals, not done their work in their season and not done it well, the field of problem composition to-day would have been that much narrower, that much less adapted to furnish welcome relaxation to all tastes. That even among the radicals there was distinctly a survival of the earlier influences appears from the great value which they deservedly placed on J.B. of Bridport, the father, one might say, of art in composition, and on Bayersdorfer, one of its most successful disciples.

Some of the themes, which principally drew the attention of the partisans of the Thematic Renaissance, have already been exemplified in the chapter treating of the Transition School, and a systematic survey of these themes must be reserved until Part II. But a couple of subjects may be discussed here, notably the Indian theme, which Kohtz in his book, Das Indische Problem, made the key-note of his revolution, and the Roman theme, which he counted as his great discovery and which formed the incentive to some of the bitterest polemics of the whole movement.

The most typical features of the Indian Problem, No. 13, were a critical move and an interference move. In the Loveday problem both these moves are made by White; they aim at the prevention of stalemate; and after White's interference the Black King must move into the interfered line of force, where he is checkmated by a discovered check. What Kohtz did was to split up the theme into the elements mentioned, and then to modify or to recombine the same elements into new thematic complexes. For instance, the same elements might be combined omitting some one of their number, as by leaving out the requirement of a mate by discovered check; or they might be further modified by introducing the Indian and analogous ideas into the Black defence. The only element common to all the ideas, dealt with in Das Indische Problem, is the critical move followed by an interference move. By including a consideration, entirely logical, of interference moves between pieces possessing identity of motion, Kohtz was able to extend his discussions to embrace the Bristol theme.

Classification work of this character may appear technical, but it is the rigorous method necessary for a discovery of the more intricate
THE MODERN GERMAN SCHOOL.

thematic possibilities, and any composer of the Modern German School must be fully versed in every detail of such classifications, which form an integral part of the craft. With this School, the intellectual enjoyment of creating a new complex of strategic elements precisely replaces the aesthetic pleasure other Schools have derived from beautiful form or purity of mate. The Modern German School considers problems as thoughts, whose form is of minor importance. If the thought, or theme, admits of what the earlier commandments would define as an orthodox expression, thus gratifying the apostles of form too, such an expression may well be chosen, but purity of theme must be secured first of all. Holzhausen states the matter thus: "The question of thematic purity is not aesthetic, but intellectual. It determines the character of a problem, but not its aesthetic value." Whether intellectual and aesthetic values can thus be divorced depends upon one's philosophical system; and, if we admit von Holzhausen's view, we must remember that the Modern German School enjoys problems, even when they are devoid of aesthetic value altogether.

No. 101 is a neat economical Indian, typical of many positions little more than sketches, which Kohtz composed to illustrate his arguments. No. 101 contains a feature, cleverly masking its Indian character: there is no impending stalemate; only if White shall play 2. Ka7, b7 or c7, will a stalemate develop. White's second move, preventing a retreat of the Black King, has an offensive intention not found in No. 13, and the purpose of the critical key is to counteract the excessive effect of this offensive second move.

No. 102 illustrates a Black critical move, followed by a Black interference. This particular theme had already been exemplified in Grimshaw's No. 103, but Rubesamen's setting is far superior and demonstrates that the Problem-Renaissance was much more than a simple imitation of the old masters. For in No. 103 the Black interference and vacating move (1. ..., Bh7 is not a true critical move as it does not cross the square g6, but only vacates it) are hidden.

---

No. 101.

J. KOHTZ AND C. KOCHKORN.

Münchener Neueste Nachrichten, 1901.

Mate in three.

1. Ra8, Kb5; 2. Ka7.
**HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.**

No. 102.

H. Rübesamen.

*Süddeutsche Schachblätter*, June, 1907.

**Mate in three.**

1. Qa7, threat
   - BxQ (or Bc5 or b6); 2. Pf6.
   - Sc5
   - Pe5
   - PxS
   - Bg1
   - Bd4

2. QxB.

No. 103.

W. Grimshaw.

British Chess Club Solving Competition, 1887.

**Mate in four.**

1. Se3, Bh7!; 2. Sg5, PxS; 3. Qc1

among a number of dull variations. It may have been Grimshaw's intention, since he made the problem for a solving competition, that the solver should overlook this defence; and of course the difficulty of recognizing the theme must not count against the problem; but it is a type of difficulty too inartistic to compensate for the heavy position and the superabundance of white material. On the other hand, in No. 102, the thematic mainplay forces itself upon the solver's attention; and yet the problem is not easy to solve, since it is by no means evident what White is to gain by the sacrifice of his Queen. So the key will not be tried at all until the critical nature of the Black Bishop's move has been understood. The by-play, though interesting, is absolutely overshadowed by the thematic variation; which is right enough, because the problem is an illustration of a Black critical move and interference, an idea to be conveyed clearly to the solver, other features being of wholly
minor import. And further, since the idea is a simple one, it should be incorporated in a light-weight problem, establishing harmony between idea and form.

The composition of problems like No. 102 is a direct consequence of the systematic investigation of strategic, especially of critical, moves. In No. 102 both the critical move and the interference move are made by Black, so we call the idea of the problem a Black Theme. This must not be confused with the term: Idea in the defence, which will be explained in Part II. as being only a subdivision of the Black Themes. There are several White themes which can be somewhat analogously imitated with the black men in either of two ways, as a faulty manœuvre, or as an idea in the defence. In the Indian Problem, critical move and interference are made with the intention of shutting off the line of force of a long-range piece. In No. 102 a line of force is shut off in an analogous manner, by the black moves, but it is not done intentionally, rather through what amounts to a faulty black manœuvre. The critical move is made for the purpose of capturing the white Queen, the interference (2. ..., Sc5 or Pc5) for the purpose of guarding the square e4. That these moves result in a faulty manœuvre is shown by the simple fact that White may now mate by 3. Sf2, the black men having unintentionally deprived themselves of their essential guard over f2.

At first sight it might appear that all black themes, based on analogy to or adoption of specific White tactics, must be developed through some such medium of faulty manœuvres; but this is not the case. Nos. 104 and 105 exemplify the imitation of the Indian theme by moves of the black men as an Idea in the defence. The two problems are not given with any desire to point out an anticipation of No. 105. Much more striking examples of anticipation exist among the works of the Modern German School, as among those of every school. On the contrary, the treatment of the idea in these two problems is not the same, and admits of an instructive comparison.

In No. 104 it is evident that mate must be given at g7 by the Bishop; and at first sight it seems possible for the Bishop to reach this square in four moves by hurrying around via f8. The problem, however, is a five-mover, so there must be something deeper to determine exactly what square the Bishop shall move to in coming out of its corner. This something is the fact that Black can play 1. ..., Bhr, a critical move, and then 2. ..., Pg2, a paralysing move which leads to self-stalemate, allowing White no time for 3. Bf8 and 4. Bg7 mate. Hence the true solution, radically preventing the execution of Black’s purpose; from which we now come to understand that an Idea in the defence means a form of black strategy which, if it could be consummated, would defeat every
effort of White to mate. Just as a Faulty Maneuvre by Black admits of white strategy leading to mate, so an Idea in the Black Defence requires faulty white manoeuvring in the shape of some Try, or unsuccessful solution, which shall lend point to whatever strategy the actual solution may contain.

In No. 105 the Bishop can apparently reach g7 in five moves in either of two ways: Bg5-f4-d6-f8, or Pf3 Be1 (not Bf2, because of Pb6)-b4-f8. If the solver sees both methods simultaneously, he will search for the reason why one of them is wrong. Then he will find the black defensive combination: 1. ..., Pb4; 2. ..., Ba4; 3. ..., Pb5, and see that the Bishop must travel via b4, thus wrecking just in time Black’s cunning intention to produce self-stalemate.

Comparing Nos. 104 and 105, we find that in No. 105 Black’s defence is more hidden, inasmuch as it uses one move more and White must assist in preparing the stalemate position by capturing or blocking the Pf4. Moreover Black is allowed to carry out his intended maneuvre in full, its frustration not taking place until the fourth move. But one regrets that Black’s subtle combination does not in the least affect the fixed turn of the white Bishop. In No. 104 Black had at least the satisfaction of postponing mate by one move. Truly, though they have no living actors, chess problems resemble little dramas, and the spectator wants to see virtue rewarded.
Another drawback of No. 105 is the possibility that one may solve it without noticing the theme; for, if a solver tries 1. Pf3 and follows this up with 2. Be1; 3. Bb4; and 4. Bf8, his solution is correct, though Black's defence may have been totally overlooked. In this respect No. 104 is greatly superior; for the black play must be understood.

Two further examples of Black critical play and interference are seen in Nos. 106 and 107. Loyd's four-mover is known as the Stuck-Steinitz problem, because Steinitz failed to find the complete solution, overlooking the variation 1. Bh1 altogether, an incident which highly amused Loyd, though Steinitz was much incensed that his slip was made public.

No. 106.
S. Loyd.
Mirror of American Sports,
Nov., 1885.

Mate in four.
Bh1!; 2. Pb3, Pg6;

No. 107.
F. Köhnlein.
Deutsches Wochenschach,
1904.

Mate in five.
1. Kc1, threat; 2. Kd1; 3. Ke1;
Ba4!; 2. Kd1, Ra5!; 3. Pb5!.
RxP; 4. Se8.
BxP; 4. Sd5.

These two positions again illustrate the difference between the old-style, with its strategic combination, and the Problem Renaissance, which considered such a strategic combination as the nucleus of a problem. The Stuck-Steinitz four-mover is intended simply for a lark, the paralysing "trick," to use Loyd's term for "strategy,"
being introduced to puzzle the solver. On the other hand No. 107 is not puzzling at all and for a five-mover it is not even difficult. Yet it ranks among the most interesting problems the Modern German School has produced. Its point lies in the fact that Black's critical moves (1 ..., Ba4 and 2 ..., Ra5), intended, as Idea in the defence, to produce a stalemate position by 3 ..., Pb6-b5, bottling up the black Rook and Bishop, prove to be in the meantime a faulty manoeuvre, of which White avails himself by a Novotny-interference move, 3. Pb4-b5! A dramatic illustration in problem form of the Biter Bitten!

Köhnlein was one of the most artistic modern German composers, two more of whose problems may well be quoted here. In No. 108 the key opens a line for a critical move, 1 ..., Bb1, by the Black Bishop, and the second move again shuts off this line by returning the key Knight to its original position. This theme has been called The Mousetrap by the modern Germans, who occasionally adopt the custom of giving their themes motto-like names. This is no longer pure white or pure black strategy, but rather a black-white interference, or shut-off, the critical move being made by Black and the interference by White. The threat involves another black-white interference, 2. Sf2-e4, but without critical move. Together main-play and threat give the problem a beautiful thematic character.

No. 109 illustrates a theme requiring five moves at least. The position of the white Queen and Rook on the h-file must be re-arranged to bring the piece of greater power to the rear in preparation for the final blow. The re-arrangement by means of a critical move of the white Queen leads to the mate in five: one move being required for the Rook to vacate the critical square, a second for the critical move itself, a third for the return of the Rook, and the last two for demonstrating the object of the re-arrangement. If no critical move is used, the
re-arrangement takes only two moves and the idea can be presented in a four-mover. In the task problem, No. 110, this manoeuvre occurs twice, the cumulative effect being reached at the cost of economy. A double rendering with critical moves would produce a six-mover.

In problems like these there is no logical objection to the long-range character of the solution. All the moves are thematically necessary. The objections against long-range problems date from a period before the Problem Renaissance and, considering problems like No. 98, we can easily understand them; but the same objections do not hold against the modern German four and five-movers, a fact sometimes overlooked.

In his discussion of the Indian Problem, Kohtz tried to direct attention to the new ways in which this old principle of critical moves and interferences might be utilized. In his presentation of the Roman Problem, on the other hand, he considered that he was offering an absolutely original form of strategy. This gave persons
who had come into conflict with him on other points an opportunity for many excited claims of anticipations, and in due course it proved that a certain number of earlier problems did exist which fulfilled all the requirements Kohtz could stipulate as constituting the elements of his theme. But this does not in any way interfere with his service in pointing out the characteristics of the theme. And if he analyzed the theme without knowledge of the earlier examples, the credit due him is all the greater as far as achieving an intellectual tour de force is concerned. The most thorough discussion of the Kohtz problem and summary of the anticipations is given by Dr. F. Palitzsch in the Book of the Teplitz-Schönau Congress, 1923. The first presentation of the theme was in 1858 by H. E. Kidson, No. 315. The element of capture occurs for the first time in No. 111, a position which Palitzsch omits from his review. But the theme can best be understood from Kohtz's own position, No. 112, which he dedicated to A. Guglielmetti of Rome (whence

**No. 111.**
E. Sauberlich.
*Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1863.*

**No. 112.**
J. Kohtz and C. Kockelkorn.
*Deutsches Wochenschach, 1905.*

- **Mate in four.**
  - 1. Rd1, RxR; 2. Qh3, Rf1+;
  - 3. QxR.
  - Sf4; 3. Qd7.

- **Mate in four.**
  - 1. Sd6, BxS; 2. Qe2, threat;
  - Bf4; 3. PxN.

the name, otherwise meaningless, of the theme). The theme will be discussed more fully in Chapter XXXI., but a few comments are necessary here to explain the nature of this so-much-talked-of problem.
In a Roman problem White is allowed a plausible try, to which the only defence is by some move of a particular black piece. (In No. 112 the thematic try is 1. Qe2, threatening 2. Bd3 and 3. Qe2 mate. This is defeated by 1. ..., Bg5; 2. ..., BxP.) Now the theme consists in decoying the black piece to a square from which it can still meet the threat in a manner analogous to its former defence, but not without being forced, in doing so, to give White in compensation a new line of attack. (In No. 112 the black Bishop is decoyed, by the sacrifice of the white Knight, to the square d6. After 2. Qe2, the Bishop can still defend against the threat by attacking the Pe3, but in so doing he must play to another square of the diagonal h6-e3, namely to f4 instead of to g5, and this move now is fatal, because at f4 White can capture the Bishop. The weakening of Black's position in No. 112 being due to the necessity of exposing the Bishop to capture, the problem is said to belong to the Capture-Roman type. The other types of Romans will be outlined in Chapter XXXI."

It will be clear from No. 112 that the decoy, which constitutes a theme in itself, becomes in a Roman problem simply an auxiliary manoeuvre. It is often spoken of as the "Roman decoy." The Roman theme therefore consists of a Roman decoy followed by a black faulty manoeuvre. This point is essential to remember, that the Roman decoy in itself is not different from any other decoy; the special name arises simply because of its importance as an auxiliary manoeuvre in a Roman problem. More about decoys in general will be said in Chapter XXXI. Certain German critics, notably Dr. Palitzsch in his essay, Die Ablenkung, 1917, advocate a problem classification based primarily on the decoy principle; but it may not improbably turn out that such a classification will prove too automatic and too much based on a non-essential problem feature.

The efforts of the Modern German School clearly took small account of the two-mover. One of the few composers who became interested in this field was F. von Wardener. His work in longer problems was limited in quantity, but always piquant.

Prior to the publication of Das Indische Problem, von Wardener had been one of the staunchest students of model mate two-movers. He had developed a mathematical system for classifying model mate combinations. All this he threw to the winds with an impetuous acceptance of the new tendency. In his favourite field of the two-mover the opportunity for the use of critical play was extremely limited. But the use of interferences and clearances he studied with all the diligence given previously to the model mate. Indeed in many cases he kept something of the model mate ideal still in view. But for the little attention given by others to the two-mover in Germany at the time, his influence might have been very great. As it was, the problem world had to wait some ten
years before the principles he tried to advocate were made current coin by the Good Companions. His problems did not have the massiveness of the Good Companion style, but he did forecast somewhat closely some of the achievements of the Club in its light-weight Meredith tournaments.

No. 113.  
F. Sackmann.  
Münchener Neueste Nachrichten,  
29 March, 1914.

[Chess diagram with annotations]

Mate in three.
1. Re8-e7, BxR; 2. Kc2, Qc5+; 3. Qc3 mate.
Bc5; 2. Ra7+, BxR; 3. Qd2 mate.

No. 114.  
F. von Wardener.  

[Chess diagram with annotations]

Mate in two.
1. Sh7.

The modern two-move composer, studying No. 114, will remark indeed that the Good Companions have done better. But the date explains the difference. Surely 1906 is not so very long ago, just twenty years, yet what a growth those years have seen. No. 114 is an early example of white self-pinning key followed by black unpinning interference defences, a theme now almost threadbare. Yet, how many times before 1906 had the complaint been heard that there was nothing new to be expected of the two-move field. Nowadays, observing how a dainty trifle, like this No. 114, was among the pioneers of a great mass of complex problems, we may well wonder what limits, if any, there are to even so restricted a form of composition as the two-mover.
Chapter X.

The Dutch School.

The Dutch School tends to avoid extremes and virtually to strive after a compromise between the Schools discussed in the preceding chapters. Hence the reader may consider this chapter as an example of a compromising school, the selection being due to the writer's national preference.

The object of the chapter being to sketch the tendencies of the School, no historical review is necessary nor any enumeration of all the prominent Dutch composers. Those who may be interested in studying a representative collection of Dutch problems will find the field well covered in A. van Eelde's Nederlandsche Schaakproblemen, up to the date of its publication, 1907. Van Eelde (1857-1913) did a great deal to advance the standards of composition in Holland. It is to be hoped that some later collector may do justice to the further advance of the last two decades.

In trying to define a typical national style of composition, it is manifestly wiser to avoid choosing one's illustrations merely from among the prize-winners in foreign tourneys, as these prize-winners must have conformed more or less consciously to foreign taste to attain their successes. This will explain why the problems in this chapter are partly from national columns and tourneys, in spite of the prompting of national pride which would have me adorn the chapter with foreign laurels.

And yet it will be noticed that foreign influences are strong in the works of the Dutch problemists, as they are in those of the composers of all the compromising Schools. In our case this does not seem to me to arise from a snobbish admiration of everything foreign. It is rather due to two good Dutch qualities: impartiality and adaptability. If a foreigner shows us anything useful or beautiful, we are glad to study it with an unbiased mind, and we are ready to accept whatever appears to us desirable. For we are critical too. Thus it is easily understood how the Dutch composers have tried to pick up the sterling elements of foreign schools and how they have sought to blend these elements into a modified national standard. Bohemian purity of mates, English finish, German difficulty and American sparkle are cultivated in Dutch problems with equal attention. Accordingly they have been found too Bohemian for the English and too English for the Bohemians, but nevertheless some of our best have been attractive enough to be accepted by both; and gradually our problems have come to be characterized as polished and charming morsels, not reaching the

(131)
top of the artistic ladder. This judgment sounds somewhat slighting, but it is not taken as such by the Dutch composer. Truly we do not boast a Loyd, a Healey, a Klett or a Dobrusky, but then our artistic aim is not greatness, but balance, not dazzling by extreme features, but charming by graceful harmony. This humble artistic ideal may yield a quiet gratification and inward serenity, sometimes denied to the great!

Simple, economical construction has always been one of the paramount features of Dutch composition. Nos. 115-117 are a few examples. No. 115 is an early specimen, combining economy and variety. It is true that the variety is of minor interest; there is no dominating idea and no special constructive refinement; nevertheless the position shows a constructive skill, rather uncommon for its date.

No. 115.
A. Adamo.
1st Pr., British Chess Magazine, 1887.

No. 116.
L. A. Kuyers.
1st Prize, De Amsterdammer, 1893.

Mate in three.

1. Qh7, Kf4 (threat); 2. Sd3+.
Kd4 ; 2. Qh6.
Kd6 ; 2. Sd3.
Pd4 ; 2. Qe4+.
Bf5 ; 2. Qc7+.
Bb5 ; 2. Qe7(g7)+.
Sf3 ; 2. Sf8xB+.

Mate in three.

1. Ra3, Pf3 (threat); 2. Qb2+.
Ke5 ; 2. Pd4+.
Pc4 ; 2. Qb6+.
Ke3 ; 2. Qb2.

No. 116 is a nice little affair, a true Kuyers-problem. L. A. Kuyers (b. 1864), one of the most prolific elder Dutch composers, is a clever
hand at the elegant combination of all the strategic possibilities which a simple position admits. His problems are always enjoyed by the solver. His weakness, one shared by several Dutch composers, is a rather too great tendency towards economy, almost culminating in avarice. This prevents the execution of any great plan. Fortunately modern task composition, which has taken root in Holland through the composers who were members of the Good Companion Club, has latterly popularized a broader style.

Another example of the hyper-economical manner is seen in No. 117, the work of a typical Dutchman. The problems of W. Korteling (b. 1889) are always finished and dainty rather than great.

No. 117.
W. Korteling.

Mate in three.
   Pe3; 2. Sf3+.
   Kd4; 2. SxP.

No. 118.
A. Verveen.
1st Prize, De Maasbode, 1918.

Mate in three.
1. Sg5, SxB (threat); 2. Se2.
   Pci (S) (threat); 2. Qa1 +.
   Kd4; 2. Sg5xP +.
   Either SxSf4; 2. Sf3 +.
   SxSg5; 2. Bf2.
   Sf2; 2. Qd8.

In No. 118 we come to the deeper and more complex style at which our composers, even those who generally confine themselves to light-weights, may sometimes successfully try their hand.
No. 119, with its varied mates and fine play, is closely akin to the Bohemian School; and indeed among the Dutch composers H. L. Schuld (1875-1920) was one of the most Bohemian, and, next to him, Jos. Opdenoordt (b. 1892), and J. Cauveren (b. 1883). Yet Cauveren's problems show just a little bit of piquancy or brilliancy, distinguishing them from the pure Bohemian work. His liking for strategic pointedness is evidenced in No. 120, one of his older problems.

No. 119.
H. L. SCHULD.

2nd Prize, Handelsblad, 1918.

Mate in three.
1. Qg6, BxS (threat); 2. Qd6+.
Be3  ; 2. Ra3 !
QxP  ; 2. Sa5 +.

A gifted Dutch composer, with strong national characteristics, is J. J. Rietveld (b. 1893), represented by Nos. 121 and 122. He too is not purely Bohemian, as his work blends strategic interest with purity of mate. In many respects I think that Rietveld may be compared with Heathcote, whose genius has perhaps realized in fullest measure the compromise at which the Dutch School has aimed. If Heathcote had only been a Dutchman, he would have been our supreme national representative!

In the problems hitherto quoted, purity of mate has been dominant. We must not overlook the Dutch treatment of themes, in which aspect of the art our younger generation has happily shown increasing interest. At all periods the Dutch have given incidental attention
No. 121. J. J. Rietveld.
4th Prize, Falkirk Herald, 1919.

Mate in three.
1. Sa6, Ka4 (threat); 2. SxPc3+.
   PxP; 2. Sa6-c5.
   KxB or Be7 or f6; 2. SxPc7+.
   PxB; 2. Rb7+.

No. 122. J. J. Rietveld.

Mate in two.
1. Bd3.

No. 123. Dr. L. N. de Jong.
1st Prize, Nederland. Schaakbonds. 1895.

Mate in two.
1. Qd1.

No. 124. J. van Dijk.
1st Prize, Literary Digest, 1903.

Mate in two.
1. Rh5.
to thematic composition, and the Dean of our problemists, Dr. L. N. de Jong (b. 1869), must especially be mentioned in this connection. But the more systematic and exhaustive search for original themes dates naturally from the passing of the too submissive acceptance of Berger's aesthetic commandments.

Of the older problems a couple must suffice, not great problems, but typically national. In both the liking for purity of mates is still traceable. No. 123 even contains a model, after 1. ..., KxR, at the cost of the otherwise useless Ba4. This spoils the general economic charm, but the aesthetic interest of a model mate remains. But the main interest in the problem is produced by the inviting position and its combination of clever mates. The very Bishop at a4 hints perhaps at the approaching relaxation of the inexorable aesthetic laws. A nice little problem at the threshold of a new era.

No. 124, by our popular Frank farmer-composer, J. van Dijk (b. 1866), contains only one pure mate, after 1. ..., QxS, but its fine clearance key, providing a mate after 1. ..., Qa1, the only defence of Black not met in the initial position, preludes the epoch of thematic composition. It has turned out that this problem was anticipated by C. V. Berry (1870?-1914) (Leeds Mercury, Dec. 14, 1901: 6S1 | 1p1R3p | 2p3P1 | 2p1kPR1 | 1S5 | 4BP2 | 1s1P3b | 4QK2. Mate in two. 1. Rh5). The construction of No. 124, however, is much more

---

**No. 125.**
G. H. Goethart.
3rd Prize, Hampshire Tel. and Post, 8 Feb., 1916.

```
1. Sc5.
```

**No. 126.**
P. Feenstra Kuiper.
1st Prize, Good Companions, April, 1916.

```
1. Sd8.
```

Mate in two.
economical and inviting; and moreover the problem is important as one of the first Dutch successes in an international tourney: it produced a very stimulating effect.

Nos. 125-128 bear witness to the Dutch interest in changed mates, either in the complete-waiting-move form (as in No. 126) or in the thematic mainplays.

No. 125 exemplifies a favourite idea of G. H. Goethart (b. 1892), the disturbed black check. In the initial position the set checks, 1. ..., Rc3+ and 1. ..., Rc4+, are answered by 2. BxR and 2. Sc6 mate, respectively. The key disturbs these possibilities and transmutes the two defences of the black Rooks from checks into pinning moves, followed by mates of greater interest than those originally set. It is a problem with a clear-cut theme, artistically rendered; yet it is amusing, and perhaps instructive, to note that at least one solver overlooked the theme altogether and criticized the problem by saying that “it was a pity, that the key prevented the impending checks.”

No. 127.

J. J. P. A. Seilberger and
P. A. Koetsheid.

1st Prize, Good Companions,
Meredith Ty., Nov., 1918.

No. 128.

G. H. Goethart.

2nd Prize, Hampshire Post, 1921.

Mate in two.

1. Qe6.

Precisely the same “criticism” might be made of No. 128, where the two set checks, 1. ..., Qa6+ and 1. ..., Qb6+, are radically prevented by a surprising key. Where set checks are met by new mates, as after 1. ..., BxR+ and 1. ..., Bc3+ in No. 127 by J. J. P. A.
Seilberger (b. 1896) and P. A. Koetsheid (b. 1882), such "criticism" is impossible. Yet though the latter might win general praise and the former be open to discussion, I personally prefer No. 128 for its spontaneity. The case is just one more instance of how opinions in matters of appreciation of works of art may differ, without one opinion being necessarily better than another.

As task composers the Dutch have done excellent work. A few examples are given in Nos. 129-132. No. 129, by J. Hartong (b. 1902) contains a five-fold interference on the single square d5, a difficult task, rendered without apparent effort. No. 130, by de Koning (died 1925), shows high constructive skill. No. 131 resulted from my study of Loyd’s Excelsior problem, No. 85: I tried to bring in a fresh note by complicating the theme, though shortening the journey to be made by my white Pawn. No. 132, by M. Franken (b. 1891) and M. Niemeijer (b. 1902), is a double mutual blocking of black Knight and Bishop (at f2 and f4), a very difficult task in a domain of composition to which the Dutch have paid much attention.

No. 129.

J. Hartong.

2nd Prize, Western Morning News and Mercury, 1921.

Mate in two.

1. Sh4.

No. 130.

Jos. de Koning.

Canadian Courier, 1916.

Mate in three.

No. 131.
H. Weenink.


Mate in three.
Rb5; 2. Qa2+.
Qa7; 2. RxB+.
Pd6; 2. BxR+.

No. 132.
M. Franken and M. Niemeijer.


Mate in three.
Bf4; 2. Rg8+.
Sf4; 2. SxP.
BxR; 2. Bd1.
SxR; 2. Rb8.
CHAPTER XI.

PROBLEM-FUTURISM.

The approaching end of direct-mate problem composition for lack of new ideas has been prophesied on many occasions. Bonus Socius, in the thirteenth century, advised a careful study of existing materials as a means for producing new problems. The great collection of Alexandre, in 1846, was compiled on the assumption that it was to present not only all that had been done in problem composition, but all that it was possible to do. And since then each generation has had its Cassandras, yet the vogue of the direct-mate problem flourishes more lustily than ever. It is true that great numbers of anticipations are being revealed all the time, a fact discouraging to some who have been the victims; but the revelation of such anticipations has been due to the more intensive study of themes in recent years and to the efforts of classifiers, who have made it increasingly impossible for a problem lacking originality to escape detection. The existence of anticipations in great numbers is found at every stage of composition, for the reason that composers at all times have worked according to the dictates of temporary fashions, often leading separate composers to produce similar problems at about the same time. And it is true also that with the constantly increasing output of problems, the achievement of anything entirely new must become increasingly difficult. On the other hand the closer study of themes has revealed fields for composition previously undreamt of. The situation might be summed up by saying, that, while strict originality becomes increasingly difficult, it is by no means impossible and there is no sign that it will become so for a long time; but that the situation would be clarified and problem composition placed on a much higher level if composers, instead of continuing to pour out an increasing stream of problems of gradually declining originality, would strive to produce fewer problems, spending the same time on the attainment of greater individual merit. Not the least benefit of such restraint would be that editors would have the opportunity to give more space in their papers to the reprinting of what is older and very good instead of to the presentation of what is often neither good nor new (save in the minds of the contributor).

Some of the prophets of the downfall of the direct mate have gone to the trouble of suggesting new types of composition which they suggest as desirable to replace the forms which are approaching extermination, and their suggestions have been supplemented by others from persons not concerned with the question of the passing
of one form or another, but interested to investigate what can be done on the chess board by altering the powers of the chess men or the rules governing the stipulations which problems shall be expected to carry out.

To speak of all such modifications of the orthodox Mate in N Moves as chess futurism is to suggest a perspective down which Art may be supposed to lose itself in a series of modified interpretive manifestations unlimited except by the limits of the vagaries of the human mind. Chess Futurism is no new thing. The self-mate, as we have seen in Chapter V., dates from the Middle Ages. Conditionals, such as the formerly universal Mate with a Specified Pawn, are practically as old. These were often resorted to by the composer who was not skilful enough to complete his problem without artificial helps, and they tended to disappear with the increasingly efficient technique of the Transition School. The real stimulus to the growth of chess futurism was given by the popularity of Christmas Problems in the English columns of the middle '80's. Here once a year the bars were let down and fancy ran riot. The example was copied in other countries, some of which clung to the confinement of such imaginations to the Christmas season, while others flirted with futurism at all times of the year. Notably fantastic were the pages of some American magazines, the old Dubuque Chess Journal, 1876-1892, and more than any other, Brentano's Chess Monthly, 1881-82. While practically every composer ventured occasionally into these Lands of Wonder, very few names are remembered to-day as worthy in any respect to stand beside the greater figures in direct mate composition. Doubtless W. A. Shinkman was the most ardent futurist prior to the present century, but, while his works in these strange pastures have all his typical originality and versatility, they do not rank, in quantity or in permanent value, with his direct mates. Early in the present century, Mrs. W. J. Baird (1859-1924), one of the few talented women problemists whom any country has produced, gave much attention to Letter Problems and to Retractors.

In the letter problem the effort is to present an accurate, though rarely intrinsically valuable, problem in which the placement of the men in the initial diagram shall outline some alphabetical character, and the type is readily modified to extend to pictures and other symbolic representations.

In the retractor, moves supposedly made in the game leading to the diagram position must be taken back, by White or Black, or by both, according to the terms of the problem, before the forward-looking part of the solution is carried out. A special type of retractor, the Twentieth Century, was formulated by Mrs. Baird, winning surprising popularity in England.

Soon after 1910, T. R. Dawson took up the retrograde movement,
studying the devices by which so-called legal proof of past moves could be determined. In this way the purely fanciful manoeuvres with which the problems of the Baird movement had familiarized composers were given a logical and greatly more profound basis, which made an immediate appeal to more serious minds. On this double basis of the extremely frivolous and the profoundly analytical, the career of Fairy Chess has made an extraordinary advance in the past ten years. The genius of T.R.D. has multiplied itself in very many columns and fairy departments of magazines, centring around the pages of the Chess Amateur, and to-day perhaps about five per cent. of all problems published are in one respect or another unorthodox. Whether these innovations are wholly due to the continued impulse of one man, so that they will flag when his own interest slackens, or whether King Oberon is entirely to replace the Goddess of Caissa in years to come it is not possible to say. Nor is it possible to explain more than a few of the strange new forms which one encounters daily in the chess press.

Most closely allied to our conventional forms of the chess problem among the popular unconventional forms is the long range problem, to which J. N. Babson (b. 1852) and G. C. Reichhelm (1839-1905), both Americans, and Dr. Otto T. Bláthy (b. 1860), of Budapest, gave a great impetus some forty years ago. These long-range problems, of which No. 133 is a specimen, almost constitute a theme, their characteristic being the repetition of specific manoeuvres, gaining or losing a move each time the repetition is made. There is some of the alluring fascination of the snake charmer in the way the composers of these problems make the folds of their solutions coil and uncoil. The solution of No. 133 begins: 1. Rh1. Black postpones his fate by only moving his pawns when forced to do so; hence 1. ..., Ka7; 2. Ra1+, Kb8; 3. Kg8, Re8; 4. Kh8, Rd8; 5. Kh7 (losing a move, or "tempo"), Re8; 6. Kg8, Rd8; 7. Kf7, Pf3. Now the mechanism of moves 3-7 is repeated until one of the pawns
has reached the bottom rank. This happens at the 57th move: Pd1; 58. RxP, Ka7; 59. Ra1+, Kb8; 60. Kg8. Thus, always repeating the King-walk, White forces all the black Pawns to the bottom rank. At the 96th move the last Pawn has been captured, and the play continues: 97. Ra1+, Kb8; 98. R any, Rxd7; 99. Pxe6xR, Rd8; 100. P6e, Rc8; 101. PxR. A collection of such problems of astonishing complexity will be found in Blathy: Vielzügige Schachaufgaben, 1889 and 1890, and later examples in the modern pages of the Chess Amateur and of the Magyar Sakkvilág.

Dr. Blathy's problems number about 400, and it is interesting to compute that the total lengths of their solutions aggregate something like nineteen thousand moves. This is doubtless a record average, though perhaps the total lengths of Shinkman's problems would surpass Blathy's total, inasmuch as Shinkman is the composer of ten times as many problems, including many of long range, though the general average would be very much less.

Another unusual use of the regular direct mate is in Twin Problems, where two positions with quite different contents are so composed as to have great outward similarity of appearance. Here the interest of the solutions themselves is rarely the case, the interest lying in a determination of the reasons why the solution of each problem fails to solve the other. Slight changes of settings (Nos. 263-264; 274-275; 288-289), or even the shifting of a position otherwise unchanged to a different part of the chess board (as in Nos. 58-59) often result in the most unexpected changes in the solutions. The great specialist in handling Twins at the present time is W. Pauly.

The simplest actual modification of the rules governing the orthodox direct mate refers to what is to be considered as an orthodox initial diagram position. We saw in an earlier chapter that the stipulation that diagram positions must be derivable from actual play is a survival from the Mansubat; but we did not there take time to define what was to be understood by this term "derivable from actual play." Some lively controversies have centred around this matter, and to-day there is no universal agreement. The difficulty has always been to find an interpretation of how demonstrable pawn promotions in the supposed game leading up to a position should be restricted (if at all) which should combine a degree of logic satisfactory to the argumentative with a workable degree of common sense. It is clear that if unrestricted promotion be permitted, as in Loyd's joke, No. 134, the horrible consequences of a literal acceptance of the rules of ordinary chess play might end by killing off absolutely all interest in composition. Yet there are those who maintain that the promotion of pawns should be unrestricted, because as ideas become increasingly scarce new
combinations can be encouraged by the use of the pieces which judicious promotions will allow.

No. 134.  
S. LOYD.  

\[ \text{N. Y. Recorder, July, 1891.} \]

Mate in two.


No. 135.  
H. BOLTON.  

\[ \text{Chess Player's Chronicle, 1841.} \]

Mate in fourteen.


Of course there are many ways in which extra pieces can be used to better advantage than in the clownish No. 134. Old Bolton already provided an example with his Arabians, No. 135, a problem illustrating an interesting possibility, though the story is a trifle long-winded. It is curious to note that at the present time the strongest advocates of unrestricted promotion are to be found among the Bohemians. Yet the reason is logical. The Bohemians have most thoroughly exhausted the available kinds of model mates and have investigated their combinations further than any other School. More than other composers therefore they long for fresh actors in their dramas, so that new situations may be possible, and some clever problemists, like V. Cisar and J. Cumpe (b. 1868), have produced ingenious works, especially with additional Knights or with both Bishops on squares of one colour. The latter device and the use of two or more Queens has also been experimented with by
G. Ernst (b. 1876) and others of the Modern German School in their investigations of certain thematic possibilities regarding the motions of men having similar character of play. The aim of these futurists, not always supported by the artist’s inspiration, is usually rejected or misunderstood. There would seem to be a likelihood that the Task composers of the English-American School should try to extend their achievements by resorting to the use of promoted men, and indeed the Good Companion Club, in its earlier years, did conduct toursneys for problems with extra Queens, until the lack of their success caused their discontinuance. The reason again is clear. The task composer is the sportsman of the problem world. His interest is in tasks and records; but he had the sportsman’s ideal of playing the game. If his antagonist surpasses his achievement by the use of extra pieces, he at once cries: “Foul!” And a rule which he will not allow to his rival he of course will not resort to himself. This is very fortunate, for the task problem is often sufficiently complex to-day to weary the solver. Further exaggerations through promoted pieces would be fatal. Of course promotions during the course of a solution cannot be objected to in any way, and many admirable problems have been composed demonstrating promotion effects. See, for instance, Nos. 163 and 168.

But if an initial diagram may not show extra pieces, what is to be said of positions in which it is clear that some piece, although within the legal limit of numbers, is nevertheless promoted? No. 136 is an example. The solver may let the problem pass him altogether, noticing only the simple Rook promotion, slightly disguised by the key sacrifice. But what was Black’s last move? It can only have been Ka7-a8, so that the Bb8 must be a promoted (or so-called obtrusive) piece, White’s previous move having been Pb7-b8 (B) +. The most frequent case of the presence of obtrusive force occurs where a Bishop is found away from his original square in spite of the fact that the blocking pawns have not been moved (examples are the White Bb6 in No. 106 and the black Bd8 in No. 331A).

No. 136.

A. F. Mackenzie.

Jamaica Gleaner, 1891.

Mate in three.
1. Ba7, KxB; 2. Pd8(R).
One way to dismiss the matter is to say that a position is to be considered as an impossible position when it can be shown that a promotion must have occurred in the course of the supposed game leading up to the diagram position, while another way is to allow such promotions during the antecedent game provided the promoted pieces are no longer present in the diagram. The latter convention allows the pawns in certain problems to occupy squares which they could only have reached by capturing certain promoted pieces of the opponent. (See the P\textsuperscript{f}3 in No. 361.) This is the convention adopted in the Christmas Series, while the stricter regulation is generally favoured by English tourney judges. The barring of past promotions cannot be maintained on logical grounds, yet the matter is one often very seriously argued about.

The important thing to notice here is, that if either of these conventions is adopted, it will mark a departure from the strict principles of chess play, under which there is nothing illegal in a carnival of promotions such as No. 134. If we may modify the rules of past play, which shall define what is a legal position, then we may modify the rules of future play as we will.

The most obvious way of so modifying the rules of play appears in the sui-mate or \textbf{Self-mate}. This is straight chess, except that the players agree that the side mated shall be the winner. The game of chess may be played on the basis of the Loser Wins, but it is a long-winded and dull proceeding. In problems delightful effects become possible, as already intimated in connection with No. 56. But there is nothing to indicate that the self-mate will ever attain the universal acceptance accorded to the direct-mate.

If the self-mate never becomes universal, it is still less likely that conditions even more remote from regular chess will do so. Of the different conditions for play which have their respective adherents mention perhaps most deserves to be made of the Stalemates (or self-stalemates), the Help-mates, and the Reflex-mates.

In the \textbf{stalemate}, White is called upon to paralyze Black without actually mating him; while in the \textbf{self-stalemate}, White forces Black to inflict the paralysis upon him. The chief merit of the stalemate, as of the self-mate, condition is that it permits of an economical presentation of certain strategic themes. No. 137 is an example.

In the \textbf{help-mate}, the first player inflicts mate or self-mate with the \textit{assistance} of his opponent. Collusion has replaced the element of battle. In former times the help-mates of both types were so presented that the player was always White, as in the orthodox direct mates or self-mates. But recently English papers have set the fashion of inverting the colours of the men in the self-help-mates, so that Black moves first and White eventually mates. This completely clouds the relationship of this type of help-mate to the
self-mate; but as these matters are purely conventions, the point is one which cannot be argued. The honour of discovering the helpmate, if it be considered an honour, belongs to Loyd's No. 138.

**No. 137.**

J. HARTONG.

*Tijdschrift Nederl. Schaakbond,*

1921.

Self-stalemate in six.

1. Ba1, Pa4; 2. Qb2, Pa3; 3. Qh8, Pa2; 4. Be4, Pg2; 5. Bg7, any; 6. BxPg6+, QxB stalemate.

**No. 138.**

S. LOYD.

*Chess Monthly, Nov., 1860.*

Black to play; then White to mate in three with Black's help.

1. ..., Kf6; 2. Ra8, Kg7; 3. Bb8, Kh8; 4. Be5 mate.

The **Reflex-mate** is a variety of self-mate, where the condition that Black must be compelled to mate has been replaced by the convention that either side must mate, if an opportunity to do so in one move arises. No explanation has ever been given by devotees of the reflex actions of the chessmen why the compulsion to mate is restricted to mates in one. Players exist, who make deeper combinations! No. 139 is an example showing much acuteness, which proves how seriously some of the most ingenious composers are taking the study of these decidedly fanciful conventions. The solution is 1. Bh7, threat; 2. Re4; 1. ..., Kc5; 2. Sg6; 1. ..., Ke7; 2. Sd3; 1. ..., Ke5; 2. Se4. White's compulsion to checkmate is used in the try 1. Sf7+, Kd7. If White might now play 2. Re4, the puzzle would be solved, but Black's retort has compelled him to mate with 2. Qd8.

Next to changing the conditions of problems, that is, changing the purposes for which entirely orthodox moves of the chess-men
Reflex-mate in two.

Kc5; 2. Sg6.
Ke7; 2. Sd3.
Ke5; 2. Se4.

White to retract his last move; Black to retract his last move; Black to play so that White can force self-mate in one.

(For solution see text.)

shall be played, comes the invention of **new types of moves** themselves. Here fancy can run riot. The first experiment of the kind to get any degree of popularity was the Chancellor, a piece combining the motion of Knight and Rook, about which a nice little volume (*Chancellor Chess*) was published by B. R. Foster (b. 1851) some forty years ago. Besides combinations of moves in new pieces, making for greater powers, restrictions may be imposed, limiting the power of the men. An example is the **Maximummer**, where the pieces on one side are limited to making only that particular move which normally would be the longest-range move on the board. Here accurate geometry becomes necessary to determine whether Qa8-e8 is a longer move than Qa8-d5 or not! Still more difficult to master are the intricacies of **three-dimensional chess**, where the pieces retain their own motions but are permitted to exercise them vertically as well as horizontally, eight boards being stacked one above the other to give the necessary manœuvring fields.

Only one or two types of true fairies have here been singled out for mention. New sprites are born on every fresh breeze from Fairyland, giving pleasure here or there for a moment, or Puck-like
causing some new mischief, only to merge back into the haze as a new figure appears. Sometimes we fear the concoctions brewed in some of the wilder revels will dissolve this entire dream world, as when we are asked to study a help-mate maximummummer in three dimensions!

Only ever, as these dangers appear, King Oberon himself calls us back to sanity by pointing his inventions into a new direction. We are no longer asked to observe new conventions or to experiment with new laws of motion, but simply to come back to the conventional chess of our fathers, but—to think of it backwards. The cult of the retractor has already been mentioned as one of the causes contributing to the great modern popularity of futuristic chess. **Unanalytical retractors** are even more difficult to reconcile with strict chess than the fairies we have yet discussed. Take, for example, No. 140. Here White is supposed to have played Qg1x Ra7, preceded by Black's Kg7xRf6. Instead of this move Black plays Pc2, and now Rf6-f2+ compels Ba5-c3 mate. This last unexpected logic of compulsion is "blamable earnest."

The **Analytical Retractor** is a very different affair. It has been treated in some detail in *Retrograde Analysis*, by T. R. Dawson (b. 1889) and W. Hundsdorfer, published in the Christmas Series in 1915. Retrograde analysis involves a rigorous reconstruction of the play which led up to a given position. Such analysis may be made with or without future purpose. If there is no future purpose, the condition of a diagram will read: "What were the last $N$ moves leading up to the position?" If there is a future purpose, the artistic character of its realization will be entirely subordinated to the analysis of the past play, the latter being the theme of the problem.

An important group of Retros includes the legitimate En-passant Keys. These problems are solved by the capture of a black pawn *en passant*, proof being furnished by the retrograde analysis that this black pawn has just moved from its original square on White's seventh rank. We will limit ourselves to a couple of examples of this one field.

In No. 141, the simplest rendering of this form of Key, it is obvious that the black King cannot have moved last. This leaves the question whether the black pawn has just moved one square or two. That he has come to g5 by capture from f6 or h6 is clearly impossible, since both these squares are occupied. The gist of the En-passant key problems is often to determine just why this single step of the black pawn may not have been legal. The easiest way to show such illegality is to have the White King on the fifth rank, so that it would stand in check if the pawn's move were retracted only a single step. This is patent in No. 141.

No. 142 looks like a bifurcation of the theme. A glance proves
that Black's last move has been either Pd7-d5 or Pf7-f5. The key, therefore, must be either 1. Pxd6 e.p. or 1. Pxf6 e.p. But this symmetrical position contains an unexpected point. The position of the white Pawns is only possible on the supposition that these white Pawns have made ten captures. Black has six men left, so that all his other pieces, the Queen's Bishop included, have been captured by the white Pawns. Hence the Pd7 must have moved out long before the diagrammed position was reached and Pd7-d5 cannot have been Black's last move!

The intricacies of retrograde analysis may be carried very much further than the simple theme of No. 142 would suggest. No. 143 is an example sufficiently difficult for our present purpose, though Troitzky (b. 1866) and others have carried the study of such positions even further in depth. The solution of the self-mate stipulation is of course of no interest; but the proof of Black's last move (Pb7-b5) is extremely ingenious. It looks at first as if Black could have made any arbitrary move, such as Qb1-c1. But then, what was White's previous move? The King cannot have played from a4 or b3, these squares being thrice guarded. The Queen cannot have played to a8, except from a square where it would have been giving an illegal check to the black King. The same holds for the possible moves of Ba7 and Sf8. If Black's last move had been Pg7-g6, to
admit $Sg6\text{-}h8$, then the $Bd6$ is obtrusive and there is no black Pawn missing which could have explained the promotion. If $Pc5$ or $Pd7$ made a capture at the last move, then a second capture must have preceded it to account for the doubled pawns on the c-, d-, or e-file: as only one black Knight is missing no second capture is available. So that it becomes rather puzzling to find any black move which will permit of White having played at all just before. A move of $Be5\text{-}d6$, to make possible $Pd6\text{-}d7$, is of no use as the Black King cannot have been standing in check before it. The only possibility which is left is a move by the $Pb5$. Let us try $1.\ldots\ Pb6\text{-}b5$ first. This enables White's preceding move, $2.\ Ka4\text{-}a3$, by means of $2.\ldots\ Rb3\text{-}b4\text{+}$. But how did the King arrive at $a4$? From $a3$? Then Black would have been giving perpetual checks by $Rb4\text{-}b3$ and $Rb3\text{-}b4$, without any possible previous disentanglement! The white King cannot have come from $b5$, because of the double guard, but he can have come from $a5$, if Black's last move was $Pb7\text{-}b5$. Then the last play can have been (Note the inverse consequence of the moves!): $1.\ldots\ P b7\text{-}b5$; $2.\ Ka4\text{-}a3, Rb3\text{-}b4\text{+}$; $3.\ Ka5\text{-}a4, Sd4\text{-}c6\text{+}$; $4.\ Ka4\text{-}a5, Kc6\text{-}c7$; $5.\ Se6\text{-}f8$, and everything is satisfactorily untangled. This being the only possible explanation of the position, we say that Black's last move must have been $Pb7\text{-}b5$, and that $1.\ P x P e\text{.}f\text{.}+\text{ is a legal solution.}$
PART II.

Bird's Eye View of Problem Themes.

CHAPTER XII.

PROBLEM CLASSIFICATION.

The increase in the number of chess problems extant makes their classification a matter of increasing importance; and this process of classification offers a welcome field of study to problemists with a bent for organization and collecting.

Classified collections are not a novelty. The compiler of the Alfonso manuscript, 1283, planned to arrange his materials according to the number of pieces used, though he failed to carry out this system to the end of his collection. In Bonus Socius, the problems are accurately graded according to the number of their moves, and this classification by moves survived as the only general basis of problem collections until 1900. As early as 1875 there was a manuscript collection of some 15,000 problems by Breitenfeld, arranged according to the kind and number of white officers used. This system was adopted in 1911 by Dr. E. Palkoska (b. 1871) in "Dame und ein Läufer" (Queen and Bishop). But the pieces used to exemplify a theme are seldom intrinsically related to this theme; hence classifications based on material employed are absolutely superficial. For instance the Indian theme can be shown with Rook and Bishop, Queen and Knight, Bishop and Pawn, etc.; in such problems the Indian theme and not the pieces employed is the dominating feature. Only in less pointed ideas does the choice of the material become important. This simply means that, in a system of classification built upon the thematic features of the problems, the material used will serve as a basis of subdivision only in those groups which contain no strategic characteristics.

Classification according to thematic content was first developed in an extensive collection by Alain C. White, some of whose results in the two-move field are known to readers of the Christmas Series through two of the volumes: First Steps in the Classification of Two-Movers, 1911, and Simple Two-Move Themes, 1924. The White (152)
collection is in no way limited to problems of the two-move length, but as yet White has published no comprehensive classification system embracing problems of greater length. When he publishes such a system, it will have a somewhat different scope from that of this book. The reason for this difference must be stated to avoid the impression of intentional confusion.

White's classification intends to point out anticipations as accurately and as rapidly as possible. This intention dominates all decisions regarding methods of grouping themes. But in this book classification is only intended as a guide through the problem domain; the most interesting and beautiful themes must be shown to good advantage and a superficial impression must be given of the other ideas. Hence all ideas are not treated in detail, as White would probably treat them and as true collectors would perhaps like to see them treated; but classification is only employed to dispel the bewildering impression of an endless confusion of themes.

The theme or idea of a problem (I do not make a distinction between these terms) is the chessic thought its composer wished to express. Often the expression is not so clear but that some difference of opinion may arise regarding the composer's intention, and occasionally themes will be recognized by the student which the composer may not have had in mind at all. Thus one solver will call a problem an unpinner, while another will consider it as an interference task. One need not wonder at such disagreements, when one remembers the ever varying interpretations deduced from some passage of a Shakespeare or a Goethe!

Any system of theme classification must function through groups and subdivisions containing analogous ideas. It is a secondary matter just how these groups and subdivisions shall be indicated, provided the end of the classification, the exemplar, is correctly designated. For instance if we are to classify mankind as whites and blacks, men and women, it is immaterial whether we classify: 1. White, 2. Black, with subdivisions, a. Men, b. Women; or: 1. Men, 2. Women, and a. White, b. Black; provided only that everybody understands what is meant by a White Man. Problem classification offers just the same unessential alternatives. Hence the system chosen in this book is only one out of many possible.

I have already indicated that the number of moves is usually not very important. Certain ideas may be expressed in two or three-move form. Then the critic must decide if the longer problem is a thematic extension of the shorter theme, or simply an example using one move too many; but the classifier does not judge: he simply pigeon-holes the problem where it happens to belong. The examples given in this book have passed critical examination, so that the reader will not encounter many un thematic prolongations.

I have chosen three principal groups: 1. White, 2. Black, 3. Mixed
Themes. To this one must not object that, since in all problems both White and Black move, all themes must be mixed. For a White Theme is not a problem in which only White moves, but a problem wherein the moves constituting the theme are made only by White. In a Black Theme the theme is expressed by the moves of Black only; and in a Mixed Theme by the moves of both parties. Nos. 144-146 will serve as examples.

**No. 144.**
W. Greenwood.

![Chessboard](image1)

Mate in three.

1. Bh1, Pd6; 2. Rg2.

**No. 145.**
W. A. Shinkman.
V., 1885.

![Chessboard](image2)

Mate in two.

1. Kg6.

No. 144, a dainty little Indian by W. Greenwood (1836-1922), contains a pronounced White theme. The move of the Black Pawn is of no importance; somewhere on the board an arrangement had to be made giving Black a waiting move, and the composer used the opportunity to prevent the cook: 1. Ke5. But the interest of the solution centres in the White play, quite the contrary from No. 145, which is a monstrous task, showing a full dozen variations by moves of a Black Queen. These Black Queen moves are the nucleus of the problem; the firing of White's Batteries is of subordinate interest. Indeed, the theme of the problem is so intrinsically a Black one, that the bad key does not mar our enjoyment. The setting, with only two Black men, the victim and his active spouse, enhances the thematic character. And when the White King advances towards his opponent, we hear him say:
"Hallo, Governor, how do you do; come along, Auntie, show your skill!"

In No. 146, however, White and Black are equally concerned in the blending of cross-checks, half-pinning, self-pinning, and interference play. Though a slight preponderance of Black interferences could be noted, the thematic key, allowing a check to the White King, is White; while every pinning idea is Mixed, inasmuch as a pinning and a pinned piece of opposite colours are needed.

Generally the Mixed Themes are the most sparkling, whilst those purely White or Black may show rigorousness of style to good advantage.

The following list explains the classification chosen. Each group is discussed and if necessary subdivided in the chapter devoted to it, the most interesting themes being dealt with more elaborately than the dry ones, though these may be thematically of equal importance.

**Classification of Problem Ideas.**

I. **WHITE.**

Without Manoeuvres:

A. Mating Positions ... ... Chapter XIII.
B. Activity of One White Piece ... " XIV.
C. Activity of More White Pieces " XV.
D. Single Batteries ... ... " XVI.
E. Complex Batteries " XVII.

With Manoeuvres:

F. White Strategy ... ... " XVIII.
G. Seemingly Faulty Manoeuvres " XIX.

II. **BLACK.**

Without Manoeuvres:

A. Activity of One Black Piece " XX.
B. Activity of More Black Pieces... " XXI.
C. Black Batteries " XXII.
PROBLEM CLASSIFICATION.

With Manoeuvres:

D. Black Strategy ........................................ Chapter XXIII.
E. Faulty Manoeuvres ................................... " XXIV.
F. Spectacular Problems ................................ " XXV.

III. MIXED.

A. Opposition.................................................. " XXVI.
B. Changed Mates .......................................... " XXVII.
C. Waiters .................................................. " XXVIII.
D. Mixed Batteries (Mixed Clearance) ............... " XXIX.
E. Shut Offs .............................................. " XXX.
F. Decoys; Romans ........................................ " XXXI.
G. Focal Action ........................................... " XXXII.
H. Pinning .................................................. " XXXIII.
I. Checking themes ........................................ " XXXIV.
Chapter XIII.

MATING POSITIONS.

In discussing the theme: Mating Positions, we have only to consider problems in which the mating position is the artistic purpose. Not every problem which embodies some models, can be viewed as a thematic illustration of Mating Positions; and there are problems containing no models which are distinct representatives of the theme. A mating problem becomes thematic when beautiful mates, usually models, are harmoniously blended, no other more pronounced strategy being used. In the chapter on the Bohemian School something has already been said and several examples quoted in connection with this subject. Here it will be sufficient to add a few remarks, regarding three special groups: 1. Echoes; 2. Tasks; 3. Typical Mating Positions.

1. Echoes. Almost every model, however complicated, and a large number of non-model mates, have been made the theme of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 147</th>
<th>No. 148</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Heathcote</td>
<td>M. Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Observer, 1904</td>
<td>Vynalez a Pokroky, 14 April, 1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No. 147

Mate in three.

1. Sa2, PxS; 2. Qc2.
   1. Kd2; 2. Kg3.

### No. 148

Mate in three.

1. Qe3, KxB; 2. Rc2.
   1. PxB; 2. Qb3+.
   1. PxS; 2. Rd2+.
   (KxS or Kc4; 2. Qc5+.)
echo problems, often appearing as chameleons. The echoes of complex models sometimes show constructive tricks, much akin to fantastic tasks, and such problems must, in my opinion, be considered as tasks. But simpler models give rise to many wonderful Bohemian problems. Examples are Nos. 52, 53, 61, 63, 64, 65 and 68. For full measure two more are given herewith, a typical "Heathcote," and a typical "Havel." Both are well-balanced, with interesting play leading up to the echo-models. Nevertheless both contain a thematic weakness, which they share with many other echo-problems: for in both, the white pieces, not used for the echo-models, are captured. These captures involve sacrifices and the admiration of these often prevents a realization of the fact that more pieces are used than the theme, the echo-models, warrants. This is a thematic weakness: in Nos. 147 and 148 these white pieces are used to advantage in providing good additional variety and therefore cannot be regarded as artistic blemishes. But in the best ultra-modern Bohemian work such sacrifices are avoided, the principles of thematic economy being enforced with the utmost strictness.

No. 149.
F. Gamage.
_Checkmate, 1904._

No. 150.
B. Harley.
_Hampshire Post, 18 Sept., 1914._

Mate in two.

1. Sd8.

Mate in three.

1. Qe1, threat: 2. Qc3.
   Ke6; 2. Sc7+.
   BxP; 2. Sc7+.
   K else; 2. Qc3+.
   Pfc4; 2. QxP.
2. **Model Maxima.** The task composer does not even keep his hands off models and pure mates. So No. 149 shows six models in a two-mover, and No. 150 automatically combines twelve models in a three-mover, using seven White Pawns and alternation of moves, thus employing the least elegant means to attain a maximum of elegance!

3. **Typical Mating Positions.** Of course one solver might call typical what another would call dull or self-evident. Hence this group might easily be extended; but I will give only two examples of a single mating theme. This is known to all chess-players, whether problemists or not, and it has been ascribed to Philidor (1726-1795) and named after him: Philidor's Legacy, though No. 151 is probably the first rendering, showing that anticipation existed already in the day of old Philidor's Smothered Mate! Both versions are interesting as typical problem-precursors; No. 152 showing a very game-like position, and No. 151 a seemingly hopeless position of the White King reminiscent of the Arabian style of composition.

---

No. 151.

**Stamma.**

1735.

![Diagram](image)

Mate in six.

1. Rd8+, Be8; 2. RxB+, RxR;
3. Sf7+, Kg8; 4. Sh6++, Kh8;
5. Qg8+, RxQ; 6. Sf7 mate.

No. 152.

"Philidor's Legacy."

![Diagram](image)

Mate in four.

1. Sf7+, Kg8; 2. Sh6++, Kh8;
3. Qg8+, RxQ; 4. Sf7 mate.
Chapter XIV.

ACTIVITY OF ONE WHITE PIECE.

This group subdivides itself. Several books of the Christmas Series deal with the subdivisions, The White King, 1914; The White Rooks, 1910; More White Rooks, 1911; The White Knights, 1917; while Knights and Bishops, 1909; Running the Gauntlet, 1911; Bauernumwandlungsaufgaben, 1907; and the Theory of Pawn Promotion, 1912, emphasize the activities of the White men though also dealing with the Black equivalents. It should be borne in mind, however, that in these books problems are included wherein the title-piece draws the attention by its activity, but that this activity is not always typical of the piece under consideration. For instance a problem may be solved by a fine waiting move of the King without its theme being White-King activity at all, although the White King is the only piece drawing our attention. True thematic White King activity must show a King-maneuvre that cannot be imitated by other White pieces; and the same holds good of the other White men. It is, however, often the case that white piece activity can be closely imitated by the substitution of a different protagonist, making it difficult to decide if any special problem is actually an example of a piece-theme or not. For instance, the white King-theme of No. 154 has been transferred to the scope of a white Pawn by C. A. Gilberg (1835-1898) in No. 154A. It is true that in No. 154 the King could not be replaced by a Pawn, because the guarding power of the King is essential in the short variation 2. ..., Bc4; 3. Sg5, but this variation can hardly be regarded as part of the theme of the problem. The examples in this chapter have been chosen to point out as closely as may be the characteristics of the different pieces.

1. WHITE KING. Typical of the King are his slow movement, his great strength at short range and his incapacity personally to attack his opponent. The White King must always be assisted by other pieces, as in No. 154 where he stumbles along the h-file to enable the Queen to reach h7 with a final mating sweep. When the King himself delivers the mate, it must be by firing a battery. The most typical King problems are those in which the King makes every move, at least of the main-play. Such problems have been christened Durbars. In these, consequently, there must always be one or more batteries. No. 56 was a self-mate example. No. 153 shows the King firing two Rook batteries in turn. Ordinary King batteries, not Durbars, are better classified among the Batteries; while Checking Themes are a Mixed form and will be discussed in Chapter XXXIV.
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*Op de Hoogte, Nov., 1918.*

Mate in three.
Ph6; 2. Kf7.

No. 154.

J. Kohtz and C. Kockelkorn.
Hon. Men., *Palamède, 1865.*

Mate in five.
1. Kh5, Ba2; 2. Kh6, Bb3;
3. Kh7, Ba4; 4. Kh8, BxB;
5. Qh7 mate.

No. 154A.

Chas. A. Gilberg.

*Brownson’s Ch. Journal, Aug., 1890.*

Mate in five.
1. Pc4, Pd5; 2. Pd5, Pe4;
3. Pcb, Pe3; 4. Pc7, Pe2;
5. Qc6 mate.
2. White Queen. The enormous activities of the White Queen are often found illustrated, the most typical theme of the group being the Queen's Cross Task, combining twelve Queen mates in two-move form, the most that are possible. The name is due to the Locus-theory, the theory of the mutual relations between thematically important squares or lines. The spots represented by Nos. 155 and 156 in the locus are given under the diagrams. In this case the idea is characterized by the positions of Black King and White Queen. All the positions of those pieces which permit of twelve mates by the White Queen fill up a cross with corners at b5-d5-d7-e7-e5-g5-
ACTIVITY OF ONE WHITE PIECE.

This cross is the locus, alike of the Black King and of the White Queen, since in every example of the theme both pieces must occupy squares within the cross. In No. 156 the White Queen is considered as standing at e6, for it is not essential that the Queen only reaches this square after the key. The spot of No. 155 can be put in the position of that of No. 156 by a quarter turn clockwise and a reflection. In a theme so greatly dependent for its execution on the use of Pawns, however, rotation is taken to produce a different spot. The reflection is unessential, and indicates that the cross should really be cut in two by a line between the d- and e-files, all the spots on one side of this line being simply duplications of those on the other side. Besides a difference between Nos. 155 and 156 based on the relationships of the Locus Theory, there is another difference between the two examples, based on the fact that No. 156 presents the theme in threat form, No. 155 using the more automatic waiting-move arrangement. It is also to be

No. 157.
By a correspondent in Constantinople.


No. 158.
H. Weenink.
Oprechte Haarlemsche Courant, 1 April, 1922.

Mate in sixteen.

Mate in nineteen.
noted that, in No. 156, no mate is given by any piece other than the White Queen. This is the only problem extant in which this task has been achieved, twelve mates by the Queen and none by any other piece, and it is a curious coincidence that three composers hit on the same setting at very nearly the same time. The fact that the
Norwich Mercury had offered a special prize for such an achievement doubtless produced this unique result.

The solver who counts up the twelve mates by the Queen will find that, to obtain the full number, it is necessary to count concurrent mates separately. Concurrent mates occur when the mating piece attacks the same squares in the King's field, although itself occupying different squares, and when no change has taken place in the guard or block of the remaining squares of the field. Non-concurrent mates are sometimes called distinct.

3. **White Rook.** Typical of this piece is brute force, which seems very uninviting for artistic composition. The awkward movements of this clodhopper among chessmen often introduce an amusing note. In this respect Nos. 157 and 158 are good examples, the latter illustrating the adage: Like master, like man.

---

**No. 159.**
W. H. Thompson.
*Les Tours de Force, 1906.*

**No. 160.**
A. E. Strömberg.
*Tidskrift, Feb., 1912.*

---

**Mate in two.**

1. Rg5.

**Mate in three.**

1. Ba1, Sf6; 2. Bh1.

4. **White Bishop.** The Bishop is characterized by its weakness, since its motion at best is restricted to squares of one colour. Though the Bishop occasionally functions to good advantage, yet
there are comparatively few problems typical of true Bishop strategy. If we want to make a White Bishop the hero of the play, tasks result like No. 159, where almost the entire White force is mobilized to help the prodigy at f5 show off his poor trick of five direct mates in a two-mover.

The weakness of the Bishop enables composers to handle it easily, cooks being avoided without much trouble. For this reason the Bishops often perform quite spectacular feats, like the two corner-to-corner moves of No. 160.

5. White Knight. The Knight’s leap is so different from all the other moves that it has always attracted composers and has given rise to many thematic, sometimes even eccentric, problems. Among the different types, we may distinguish Knight-errant Problems, like No. 161, and positions based upon the peculiar possibility that White can checkmate with a Sole Knight, provided the Black King has “officious friends,” as in No. 162.

No. 161.
C. A. Gilberg.
V., Crumbs from the Chess Board,
1890.

No. 162.
Bonus Socius MS.

Mate in ten.
1. Sf5+; 2. Se7+; 3. Sc8+; 1. Sc3, Kh1; 2. Sf4, Kh2; 3. Sd2,
4. Sb6+; 5. SxP+; 6. Sb6+; Kh1; 4. Sf1, Ph2; 5. Sg3 mate.
7. Sc8+; 8. Se7+; 9. Sf5+;
10. Pc4 mate.

6. White Pawn. Here we may make three subdivisions: A. Direct Activity; B. Pawn Promotion; C. Captures en-passant.
A. The Direct Activity of a White Pawn is very small, for like the Bishop it needs too much help easily to develop any specially thematic strategy. Where enough assistants are available, the White Pawn can give some interesting direct mates, or it may play the leading part in such spectacular problems as No. 131.

B. Pawn Promotion is by far the most important group. Under our chosen system of classification the reader will find Black Pawn Promotion in another chapter. But the importance of independent study according to other thematic classifications must be emphasized. Here, for instance, a combination of White and Black promotions suggests itself, and in general the student will find that a comparison of analogous ideas (to be found under different heads in this book) gives a more thorough insight into the essentials of problem themes than does a mere classification according to a single system.

White Pawn Promotion may be the aim and culmination of a Pawn-march as in Loyd's Exceior, No. 85; or it may appear in cumulative form in the different transformations of separate variations, No. 163, and in the self-mate, No. 214A, or in transformations occurring on separate squares, No. 164. No. 163 is an interesting

No. 163.

O. WURZBURG (after N. HÖEG).

Pittsburgh Gazette-Times, 4 Jan., 1914.

Mate in three.

1. Pd7, Ke7, f7, f6 ; 2. Pd8 = Q+.
PnP; 2. Pd8 = R.
PxB; 2. Pd8 = B.
Kd6; 2. Pd8 = S.

No. 164.

H. W. BETTMANN.

Good Companions, Jan., 1923.

Mate in two.

1. Rd7.
derivative of the classic example by N. Höeg (b. 1876) which won Hon. Men. in the Scandinavian Chess Association, 1905. In passing one may wonder who to-day remembers the prize-winners in that tourney, which for their conformity to accepted tourney standard were at the time ranked as superior to the Höeg position.

C. En-passant-capture is not a purely White theme, the activity of the Black Pawn which makes the capture giving it a Black touch. On the other hand en-passant strategy is so elementary that one can hardly read into it a duel between two pawns. The whole Theme is nothing but an illustration of a rule in the game, which derives an amusing character from the fact that the pawn is not captured on the square it moved to, but on an empty square. In No. 165 the idea is treated in this way; just a little additional spice to a position showing some nice models. Often the en-passant capture can be used to good advantage as a technical device to master constructive difficulties in other themes; but then the en-passant capture is no longer the idea of the problem. With the help of more Pawns fantasias like No. 169 can be created, which rarely fail to amuse the solver.

No. 165.
Z. Mach.
Bohemia, 1900.

![Chess Diagram]

Mate in two.

Chapter XV.

ACTIVITY OF MORE WHITE PIECES.

Harmonious co-operation of several White Pieces may lead to technical gems, some of which have been quoted in the chapter dealing with the Bohemian School; but as a theme such joint activity is not very striking. Only the two Rooks are strong enough to play a duet with an individual touch, No. 166 being a fine example. The two Bishops are occasionally met with as excellent echoists, as in No. 64. No. 167 is a good specimen of the Charge of the Light Brigade.

No. 166.

F. Köhnlein.

Münchener Zeitung, 1916.

Mate in four.

1. Ra3, Sb5; 2. Ra8; 3. Rg8.
Sc8; 2. Rc6; 3. Rc2.
Pc5; 2. RxS; 3. Rg7.

No. 167.

G. Heathcote.

Special Prize, Hampstead and Highgate Express, 1902.

Mate in three.

Pf5; 2. Se4.
Ke5; 2. Sc5.
Pg3; 2. Pc4+.

The weakness of a single Pawn can to a certain extent be supplemented by a large number of partners. Generally a large number of pawns is very inartistic, but where there is thematic
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unity, interesting and droll results may be obtained, like the four different consecutive promotions of No. 168, a theme especially adapted for self-mates, or the en-passant carnival of No. 169.

No. 168.

K. Hannemann.

Nationaltidende, 10 July, 1921.

Self-mate in four.

1. P b8 = B ; 2. Ph8 = Q+ ; 3. Pg8 = R+ ; 4. Pf8 = S.

No. 169.

F. Lazard.

V., La Strategie, Dec., 1919.

Mate in six.

Chapter XVI.

SINGLE BATTERIES.

One may consider batteries as a technical device or as a theme. This chapter only deals with batteries as a theme.

A few definitions are necessary. In fig. 1 (like the other figures this may be considered as localized in any part of the board) a Bishop-battery is shown, a rook-bishop-battery. The Bishop is the front piece or battery-piece, the rook the rear-piece. Fig. 2 gives a bishop-rook-battery, here the Bishop being rear-piece and the rook the battery-piece.

When a removal of the white battery-piece exposes the Black King to a check from the rear-piece, the battery is called direct. All other batteries are indirect. Fig. 3 shows a direct rook-knight battery; fig. 4 an indirect bishop-king battery; and fig. 5 an indirect rook-bishop battery. In the course of a solution a direct battery frequently becomes indirect, and vice versa.

The definitions given apply to white batteries. If we change the colours, they apply to Black Batteries, so that fig. 6 is a black indirect rook-king battery. Mixed batteries have a white rear-piece and a black battery-piece, or vice versa. These will be discussed later.

The classifier has a lot of purely automatical work properly to arrange all battery problems. The composer is only
interested in two possibilities: the activity of the battery-piece and the activity of the rear-piece. Those are the two thematically different appearances of the battery principle.

In a two-mover the rear-piece cannot have the thematic activity it often obtains in a longer problem. It can make the key-move; or it can give a mate in a non-battery variation, as after 1 ..., PxR in No. 170. But the activity of the battery-piece is the prominent two-move idea of this group. No. 170 is an example, comparable in some respects with No. 145. Nos. 32 and 33 are renderings of the white Pawn battery.

No. 170 is a task-problem, the Rook discovering check on all the fourteen squares of its range. At first glance the solver may consider the five unprovided checks a serious blemish, excusable only because the problem is a task; but actually these unprovided checks are no great flaw. The theme itself is so clear-cut that it will be recognized long before the solver begins to bother himself about these checks, and having recognized the theme, all that remains is to decide where the White King is to be moved to: e2 or g4? In deciding between these two moves, the unprovided checks will no longer be a guide because in either case they have been fully provided for. Indeed if the solver has got the checks on his mind he may go wrong entirely! Then what is to help him instead?

In longer problems the activity of the rear-piece often becomes of interest, and in them indirect batteries can also be used to good advantage. In No. 171, a fine task, the rear-piece and the battery-piece are equally active. The task consists in the combination of two White Knight’s Wheels after the defences 1 ..., Kc4 and Pd2.

No. 172 presents some fine action by the indirect Rook-battery, the ambush by the White Bishop providing a surprising and thematic key. The artistic character of this problem, in which no striving for maximum effects is made, is obviously much greater than it can be in such tasks as Nos. 170-171.

Many problems contain more than one single battery, No. 44 being
a good example. But such plural battery effects must not be confused with complex or multiple batteries, which will be dealt with in the next chapter.

No. 171.
S. Herland.

No. 172.
M. Havel.

Mate in three.
1. Pb4, threat; 2. Qe5+.
   Kc4; 2. Qe4.1
   Pd2; 2. Qd3.1

Mate in three.
1. Bg8, threat; 2. Re7+.
   Kd6; 2. Rb7.
   SxB; 2. Qc7+. 
Chapter XVII.

COMPLEX BATTERIES.

In complex batteries one battery-piece is used with two or more rear-pieces. The moves of the battery-piece therefore open several lines of force at once, which adds considerably to the vivacity of the play and gives many opportunities for interesting developments of flight-square action by the Black King. The effect of a complex battery is usually both direct and indirect. Sometimes the direct element is eliminated, as in No. 173, in which, after 1. ... PxR, the mate by 2. Sd4 produces a double indirect result.

In both examples, Nos. 173 and 174, the keys consist of an ambush by one of the rear-pieces, a type of key particularly thematic in problems of this character.

No. 173.
H. W. Barry.
1st Prize, La Strategie, Nov., 1901.

Mate in two.
1. Qg4.

No. 174.
H. Weenink (after G. Dobbs).
De Maasbode, 1919.

Mate in three.
1. Qd2, Rd6 or a1 or Kf5 (threat);
   2. Sf2+.
   Ra4 (threat); 2. Sc5+.
   Se8-f6; 2. Se1+.
   Kf3; 2. Se5 mate.
   Kd4; 2. Qe1.
   Kd5; 2. Qe3.
   Sg3; 2. Qf4+.
CHAPTER XVIII.

WHITE STRATEGY.

We speak of a strategical idea when the consecutive moves, which express the theme, are directly and logically related. This direct relation means, that there must be a connection between the moves themselves, and not a mere co-operation. For instance, a key-move which takes a flight-square is logically related with all the second and later moves, because these moves would be fruitless without the preparation by the key; but there need not be any direct relation between the key and the later moves. The various direct relations are discussed in this chapter. They form what may be called Necessary Combinations. The next chapter deals with manoeuvres that produce only the spectacular effect of an artistic combination, in which the succession of the moves is not ruled by the necessity of the combination itself, but by quite other fortuitous circumstances.

White Strategy may be subdivided into three sections: Clearance; Support; and Necessary Interference.

A. Clearance.

1. SQUARE-VACATING. This is a very simple strategical idea. A white piece moves to enable another white piece to occupy the vacated square to better advantage. In a thematically pure example of this theme the vacating move must serve no purpose other than the passive one of self-removal. But often the general impression of a problem can be considerably improved if we do not ask for the most rigorous thematic purity. Personally I look upon thematic purity as the Style of a problem, and prefer it to skilful construction and to richness of by-play; but this is purely a personal opinion, and like all personal judgments (no matter how didactically expressed) it must not be taken to indicate an absolute standard of values. Such expressions by me only state what I believe to be sound chess-problem philosophy, and the reader may well be of another opinion.

In the theme under consideration, a thematically pure key must be a neutral move, changing nothing in the activity of the key-piece. The white King is the best performer of neutral play; hence No. 175 shows a fine square-vacating.

In regard to thematic purity a sacrificial vacating move comes next to a neutral move, though the general impression of brilliancy which it may produce sometimes wins it the higher praise. One of
the most interesting sacrificial types of square-vacating is that named after Julius Brede (see Chapter II. for another of his themes), in which the white Queen vacates a square for a white Knight. No. 176 is a cumulative rendering of Brede square-vacating. The square-vacating theme is a two-move one; but in No. 175 an extra move has been added, not improperly, to lend greater difficulty to a simple idea; whilst the cumulative expression of No. 176 would be impossible in less than three moves. Of course No. 176 may be classified as a Queen-sacrifice problem also.

No. 175.
J. Möller.
St. Petersburg Zeitung, 1898.

Mate in three.
1. Kh2, Sb5; 2. Qh1!
   S else; 2. Qe1+.

No. 176.
L. B. Salkind.
4th Prize, Zlata Praha, 1908.

Mate in three.
1. Re2, threat; 2. QxPd4.
   PxP; 2. Qe3!
   RxP; 2. QxR+.
   Pe5; 2. Qe3+.
   Ke5; 2. Qa6!
   Rh1; 2. QxPf3+.

2. LINE-CLEARANCE AND VACATING. In this theme a white piece moves to enable another white piece to move along a line. Sometimes this definition is extended to include cases where White is enabled to exercise its influence along the lines in other ways than by actual moving along it, such as by checking or guarding or pinning along the line. But where actual motion along the line follows, the interpretation is likely to be the more distinct.
When the key-piece simply moves off the line to let pass the other piece, we speak of line-vacating. A clear-cut example is No. 124, whilst No. 44 shows incidental line-vacating. No. 177 is an example in three moves, which combines line-vacating with square-vacating.

When the key-piece itself moves along the line to be cleared, we speak of line-clearance. The famous Bristol-problem, No. 20, was the first example of this group, showing clearance in the same direction as the piece which benefits from the clearance. Presently, when we come to speak of counter-clearance, we shall see that the wizard, Sam Loyd, composed a pure example of this modification of clearance some three years before Healey's classic position was published, No. 181.

In the Healey Bristol problem, No. 20, the clearance key and the mating move, using the cleared line, are separated by an intervening move of the white Queen. As already explained in Chapter III., many writers have considered this historical fact of sufficient importance to restrict the designation of Bristol-theme to examples in three moves or more in which this intermediary feature happened to be present; while others use the designation for all line-c clears, whether in two-moves or any other number.

In this more general sense, the term Bristol may be applied to Nos. 178 and 179, since they contain the thematically most important feature of Healey's problem. The question is merely one of definition and hence of secondary importance. It has proved a welcome subject for those who enjoy polemical discussions. In this book the term (two-move) Bristol will often be used for the sake of brevity. In No. 178 the line-clearance has been combined with changed mates. After 1. ..., Pe6 in the original position a mate is provided by 2. Bf6. No purely waiting key being available we resort to a Bristol key, permitting 2. Qg7 mate. The changed mate rendering introduces a mate by the key Rook, without however making the key thematically impure. After 1. ..., Pf4; 2. PxP is
No. 178.
G. H. Goethart.
Handelsblad, July, 1916.

Mate in two.

1. Rh7.

initially ready as a set mate. The key changes this into 2. Rh5 mate: yet we cannot maintain that the Rook moves towards h7 for the (impure) purpose of providing a mate after 1. ..., Pf4!

No. 179 shows a very economical changed mate treatment of the two-move Bristol key.

The most remarkable position in this curious series is No. 180, which contains consecutive Britsons of the two-move type, ingeniously combined with black Pawn Promotion. The key is a line-clearance for both White's second and third moves; while the second move still further clears the line for the mating climax.

In the Bristol theme the piece, which clears the line, travels in the same direction as the piece,

No. 179.
W. Nanning.
V., Handelsblad, Aug. 4, 1917.

Mate in two.


No. 180.
F. E. Purchas.
Morning Post, 22 June, 1918.

Mate in three.

1. Rh8, Pa1=B; 2. Rh2-h7!
Pb1=S; 2. Sc3.
Pa1=Q; 2. Rc8.
which is to make use of the clearance. If, in the original position, the mating piece is not yet standing on the line which requires clearing, the clearance-move may be made in the opposite (or counter) direction to the mating move. No. 181 is a very famous example, and we have already pointed out that it antedates Healey's Bristol. The key, 1. Ba8, clears the diagonal b7-h1, permitting the white Queen to occupy b7 and to mate at h1, the mating move being in a direction counter to the clearance. Hence the name Counter-clearance has often been given to this theme. It might with entire logic be called Counter-Bristol, as it uses the machinery of the Healey problem in its entirety, only modifying it by reversing the direction of the first of the three moves. But the term Counter-Bristol would be easily confused with the term Anti-Bristol, which has been given to a particular type of obstructive move, which will be discussed later in Chapter XXIV. It will be interesting to bear in mind that the term Anti-Bristol, as we shall define it later, is a reversal of the two-move Bristol concept; while the counter-clearance is a reversal of the more specialized three-move Healey Bristol concept.

No. 181.
S. Loyd.
*Cincinnati Dispatch*, 5 Sept., 1858.

No. 182.
S. Loyd.
*Wilke's Spirit of the Times*, 4 Jan., 1868.

Mate in three.

1. Ba8, threat; 2. Qb7.
Sd6 or b6; 2. Qb6.
Pf4; 2. Qg6.
Kf1; 2. QxP+.

Mate in three.

1. Bc5, SxB; 2. Qa7.
Sd6; 2. Qd7.
S else; 2. Qd7.
Another name, sometimes given to all counter-clearance strategy, is Turton-clearance, the reason being that H. Turton (1856) published an example in which the counter-clearance was used for purposes of support, as will be explained in the next section of this chapter. Here again the question may be debated to one’s heart’s content whether the Turton name should be given to all counter-clearances, including those of the Loyd type, as shown in No. 181, or only to those which happen to present the same element of support shown in the parent example. At first sight it may appear to be illogical to divide Counter-clearances into two formal divisions, according to whether they have this additional element of support or not, while no such division is made of the Bristol clearances, although these too present a choice as to whether or not support is to be involved. On the whole, however, Turton support must be considered so much more typical than Bristol support that it may fairly be separated from the alternative Loyd type of Counter-clearance. We shall therefore treat of it independently, in the next section of this chapter, from the support side; and we shall reserve the Turton name for the examples which have this support.

A last form of clearance-strategy, strictly belonging to the mixed themes, but so closely related to the Bristols and the Counter-clearances as to justify its discussion here, is the Annihilation theme. This is another theme first presented by Sam Loyd, whose rendering, No. 182, remains one of the best. Annihilation consists in moving a white piece along a line, that must be cleared, to a square where it can be captured. White’s second move is an ambush behind the capturing black man. When the black man vacates the line, White is free to mate. In other words Black has helped in removing, by capture and line vacating, a white man which could not complete a Bristol (or a counter clearance) manoeuvre. In No. 182, the diagonal a7-g1 must be cleared, because 1... Sc5 prevents the alternative attack of 2. Qd7. If the Bishop at g1 could move beyond a7, the problem would readily be solvable as a counter clearance, exactly like No. 181. Instead the Bishop is played to c5, where Black is obliging enough to remove it by capture. One can hardly speak of Annihilation as a “sacrifice,” since White has everything to gain and absolutely nothing to lose by his surrender of a piece.

The number of annihilation problems is far smaller than that of the Bristols, though the theme affords opportunity for even greater economy of presentation.

B. Support.

This group may be further subdivided into Doubling and Ambush. There exist other possible forms of support, especially in longer
problems, but they have not been sufficiently studied to make a discussion of them here profitable.

Doubling is one of the few types of problem strategy which is familiar to the player of chess. The concentration of two Rooks, or of Queen and Bishop, to attack a vital square, is the crude form of this theme. This inartistic use of doubling has been very cleverly modified by the problemists, who have intensively studied the subject of re-arranging set doubling positions, in which the wrong piece initially stands in front. Examples of such Interchange have already been seen in Nos. 109 and 110, the former with critical move and the latter without.

No. 183.
O. WURZBURG.


Mate in three.

1. Bh3, threat; 2. Qg4.
Pc5; 2. Qab+.

No. 184.
F. HEALEY.

Between 1866 and 1876.

Mate in three.

Kd5; 2. Qg6.
Bf6 or d6; 2. Qd6+.
KxS; 2. Qb3+.

The Turton doubling, as already explained in the first section of this chapter, is a special case of counter-clearance. In No. 183, 1. Qg4 would be an ordinary doubling move, supporting the Bishop if it desired to check at c8. Such a check would be fruitless; so that an Interchange of this doubling matrix is planned. The Bishop withdraws to h3, crossing the critical square g4, and clearing the line g4-c8. Then on the second move the Queen occupies g4.
and on the third move a doubling mate, 3. Qc8, ensues. There is a neat sacrifice after 1. ..., P a5, but it has no relation to the determination of the key-move and must be regarded as purely by-play.

The problem by Turton, after which this theme has been named, appeared in the *Illustrated London News* a few months before the publication of Loyd’s No. 185; but it proved to be unsound. So the question arose whether Turton was a correct designation for the theme at all, and whether it should not be called after Loyd. Such a claim, of course, was never pressed by Loyd himself, as he was satisfied if his problems proved puzzling to those who tried to solve them.

In this instance the Loyd rendering is not thematically the most simple one (in this respect No. 183 is better), but it certainly excels in difficulty. There is no indication whatever of the solution given by subsidiary variations, since these do not exist. To solve the problem it is necessary to recognize the entire theme.

This No. 185 stands, as to its theme, half-way between Nos. 183 and 109. In the latter Köhnelein used a fifth move to present the “wrong arrangement” in the initial position, thus completing the full-length dramatization of this ingenious plot.

---

We speak of an Ambush when the rear-piece of a battery moves into place from a position not on the line of fire. When the battery is White, the Ambush is called White, and so on through the other types of batteries. Ambushing keys have already been seen in Nos. 173 and 174. But in these problems the ambushes were introduced only for the sake of producing good keys; the themes depended upon the battery play. If we emphasize the ambush, even at the cost of the battery play, much more strategical effects may be obtained. The longer the problem, the better the ambush may be accentuated.

One famous ambushing theme has been named after Th. Herlin,
long better known under his pseudonym of The Anonymous Composer of Lille. In No. 186, if b7 were initially guarded and if Black had two spare moves prior to the establishment of stalemate, the problem could be solved as an Indian: 1. Bb6; 2. Bd8; 3. Kc7, Ka5; 4. Kb7 mate. But to guard b7 it is necessary for White to play 1. Kc7 immediately. Hence the Bishop can no longer reach d8 by crossing the critical square c7, as in this suggested line of play, and instead the Bishop must go around the critical square via f6.

No. 186.

Th. Herlin.

Palamède, 15 April, 1845.

Mate in four.

No. 187.

D. Przezionioka.

Süddeutsche Schachblätter, 1 Nov., 1907.

Mate in four.
1. Bd3, Pg4; 2. Qc7, Pg3;
3. QxPg3.
(KxP; 3. Qc4+.)
PxP; 2. Qc8, Ph3; 3. QxPh3.
(KxP; 3. Qc4+.)

To this round-about manœuvre the name of Pericritical play has also been given. Moving the battery-piece into place, as in Herlin’s key 1. Kc7, is not essential to bring out the roundabout character of a pericritical ambush. Herlin doubtless added the move as a consequence of the tendency towards longer problems which was still in force in his day. The move is by no means thematically pure, inasmuch as it serves primarily to guard the square b7. But this initial move by the front or battery piece is considered by many students as a distinct feature of the complete Herlin theme, just as
the second move of Healey's Bristol (No. 20) is often considered essential to the Bristol theme. And just as Bristol may be considered as a special case of Line-clearances in general, so Herlin may be considered as a special case of Pericritical play in general, the characteristic of a pericritical manœuvre being the more or less roundabout journey of the rear-piece to its ambush position. The more closely the initial and final stations of this rear-piece are brought into line on opposite sides of the square occupied (or to be occupied) by the battery-piece, the more the pericritical idea is suggested, the more one gets the impression of a journey around, instead of across, a critical square. Considered in this respect, No. 189 has more perfect pericritical play than have Nos. 186-188, while in No. 188 the pericritical character of the solution is rendered almost unrecognizable by the reduction to three moves.

But considered from the viewpoint of the Herlin theme, No. 188 contains all the essence of the theme, the key bringing the front piece of the battery to its place, and the second introducing the ambush of the rear-piece. This simple process shows the machinery of battery building reduced to its lowest terms.

No. 188.
K. A. L. KUBBEL.
Deutsches Wochenschach, Feb., 1909.

 Mate in three.
1. Be8, Kh7; 2. Rc8.
   Kf8; 2. BxP.

No. 189.
F. KÖHNLEIN.
Besedy Lidu, 1907.

 Mate in four.
1. Qg3, Rb5; 2. Qg7+, Rb2;
   Rb7; 2. Qe5+, Rb2;
In Herlin’s No. 186, if the Bishop had stood at c5, the problem would have been equally sound, the key having the added feature of being a line-vacating one. This point has been added in No. 187, whose key, moreover, is thematically pure.

No. 189 illustrates still another possibility. The pericritical Herlin manoeuvre remains unshortened, but it precedes the placement of the front battery piece. This effect is obtained by a stalemate trick, obviating the shorter solution of the problem by a mere Indian manoeuvre, 1. Qg7. But the placement of the battery piece differs so greatly in character from a pure Herlin that the problem may well be considered as a transition to the next section.

C. Necessary White Interference.

As the activities of the white pieces are restricted by self-interferences and as such restriction can only be essentially required for the purpose of avoiding impending stalemate, the theme of Necessary White Interference is intimately connected with stale-mating devices. The emphasis on the word “Necessary” in the designation of this theme is extremely important in order to distinguish other forms of Possible White Interference, a subdivision of the seemingly faulty manoeuvres, to be discussed later on. Possible Interference is purely formal, the interfering moves not being made at all for the purpose of interfering, but with some intention unrelated to the accidental interference.

In a two-mover, necessary interference is of small account. To release Black from a ready-set stalemate position by an interference move is very elementary “strategy.” Hence, in two-movers, we hardly ever encounter white interference except as a method of adding a momentary interest to the keys of positions which derive their principal value from other features.

In longer problems it is as uninteresting to release Black from stalemate at the first move as it is in a two-mover. But their increased length gives opportunity for at least two spicy themes not practicable in the two-mover. These are, first: the prevention of a future stalemate by an interference at the first move; and, secondly, the preparation from the beginning of a solution for an interference at White’s penultimate move.

The first of these themes has not drawn any very general attention, and a single example, No. 190, may suffice. Here the key might have been thematically improved by placing the Knight at h5 instead of at e2; then the thematic try, 1. Sg7, would have emphasized the interfering character of the key. But from a general standpoint the key chosen, which removes the Knight from a seemingly active post, is much better.
The second theme referred to embraces a whole group of ideas, beginning with the Indian, and it has been closely studied. In a general way we may define the theme as Battery-building with the condition that the battery-piece shall reach its post at the move preceding the mate. There are many modifications, in which the battery is completed at an earlier stage of the solution, as in No. 192, but in most cases these will prove to be thematically impure. It is not essential to this theme that the battery shall be fired off: that is a matter of subdivision only.

If we restrict our investigations to ideas, where only the battery-piece and the rear-piece operate, the systems of battery-building will fall under three heads: first, the interfering piece takes several moves to reach its place; secondly, the interfered piece moves to its place first and afterwards the interfering piece; and, thirdly, in problems of four moves or more, various combinations of these two principles occur. In dealing with batteries built up in any of these different ways, the terms interfering and interfered piece are used interchangeably with front or battery piece and rear piece, respectively. These terms have the advantage of including more clearly the cases in which the batteries are not fired.

The first of these systems was historically the earliest to be illustrated. However, in Anderssen's famous four-mover, No. 191, there is not a thematically pure expression, the White King's walk serving in the first place purposes of guard as to the squares g6 and h6. But once the stalemate position has been obtained, the King has only to make one further step to release his opponent. This thematic impurity is very frequent throughout this group. Even in No. 192, where the King's journey is strikingly emphasized, it does not serve the sole purpose of interference, as the fatigued monarch may not rest at f6, but must continue his journey and assist at the mate by guarding g6 and h6.

In the second of the systems indicated, opportunities arise to introduce critical play. Thus, when the rear-piece crosses the
Mate in four.

Mate in seven.

square on which the interference is to take place, we have Interference preceded by a critical move. The Indian theme is a further subdivision of this category, a fact to bear in mind in these days when the importance of the Indian sometimes appears in danger of being overrated. Kohtz and Kockelkorn still further restricted the Indian theme proper to problems in which the mate is administered by a discovered check of the interfering piece. I personally consider the discovered check-mate as of minor thematic importance, but it is convenient to adopt this definition, as advocated in *Das Indische Problem*.

The number of thematically pure Indians is relatively small. The original Indian problem, No. 13, and Greenwood's No. 144 are examples. A third is No. 193, by E. B. Cook (1830-1915), which is thematically correct in its four-move form, inasmuch as it contains two different Indian combinations, both thematically pure; the key, moreover, is thematically related to both variations, serving in the line of play 1. ..., P6 as line-vacating and in the line of play 1. ..., P6 as a combination of the Anderssen theme (No. 191) with the Indian. This complex effect will serve a good instance of the third system of Battery-building with interference.

No. 194 opens with a critical move of double purpose, thematically
a three-move theme and one much easier to render than is the combination of two distinct full-length Indians, as just shown in No. 193. No. 194 is thematically not wholly pure, as the key prepares also for 2. Re1 and each of the two interfering moves attack the square e5; but the problem contains a fine pair of echo mates, which come as a surprise in connection with the Indian play.

When, after the interference, the battery is not fired, we speak of Passive Sacrifice (German: Aufopferung der Wirkungskraft). The white piece is not itself sacrificed, but its activity is surrendered. The theme depends on a voluntary waste of power, so that the economy-purists do not approve of it. Loyd composed a bewildering example, No. 195, which he himself called an Indian problem, doubtless because he had not yet read (in 1878!) Das Indische Problem!

A theme, which stands intermediary between the actual Indian and the Passive Sacrifice, is illustrated in No. 196. The interfered piece does not act as rear-piece, but simply as a guard for the interfering piece. Kohtz and Kockelkorn called this Restricted Activity (Eingeschränkte Wirkungskraft).
No. 195.
S. Loyd.
*Cleveland Leader, 24 Aug., 1876.*

Mate in three.
   (Ke4; 2. Qg3.)

No. 196.
J. Kohtz and C. Kockelkorn.
*Das Indische Problem, 1903.*

Mate in three.
Chapter XIX.
SEEMINGLY FAULTY MANOEUVRES.

Strictly speaking this chapter should have been called: Seemingly faulty Moves and Manoeuvres, because ideas are also to be considered which contain only one seemingly faulty move. The subdivision becomes: A. Possible Interference; B. Sacrifices; C. Spectacular Problems.

A. Possible White Interference.

In all the problems of this group the point of the idea may be thus formulated: "How curious, that the solution does terminate, in spite of White's own efforts to frustrate it!" Such an idea is certainly quite different from interference for interference's sake, as we have just been reviewing it!

Under a rigorously thematic classification this group should contain all impure Indians, Passive Sacrifices, etc. In No. 194, for

No. 197.
Dr. J. J. O'Keefe and W. J. Smith.
1st Prize, Good Companions, 22 Feb., 1917.

Mate in two.
1. Rf2.

No. 198.
J. Schel.

Mate in three.
Pb5; 2. Re7,
Sa3 or d2; 2. RxP+.

(189)
instance, we have already seen that the white interferences do not serve the prevention of stalemate only, but also the guarding of $e_5$. Yet the thematic tries (such as 1. ..., $Kd_4$; 2. $Sf_6$?) draw our attention forcibly to the danger of stalemating Black, so that the problem is intrinsically different from the problems now to be discussed.

Possible white interference on the first move, either in two-move or longer form, offers splendid opportunities for thrilling keys. Nos. 197 and 198 need no further comments.

A much more important theme, to which considerable attention has been given by recent composers, is the possible white interference on the mating move. Such interference is of course only of interest in cases where the interfered piece was active before, its activity being no longer required in the mating position. Now a white piece, which does not itself move, may be active in two ways: first, by guarding squares in the black King’s field; and, secondly, by pinning a black piece.

White interference, cutting off a guard, becomes possible $(a)$ after

---

**No. 199.**

M. NIEMELJER

(after K. GRABOWSKI, 1916).


---

**No. 200.**

H. WEENINK.


---

**Mate in two.**

1. Ba2, Sb6; 2. Sd8-b7 mate $(a)$

Bb5; 2. Sd6-b7 mate $(a)$

SxP; 2. Rc4 mate $(a)$

Sa6 or b5; 2. Se6 mate $(b)$

Bd4; 2. Se4 mate $(a)$

**Mate in two.**

1. Qg5, Be4; 2. Be3 mate $(a)$

Re4; 2. Rd2 mate $(a, b)$

(Rf5; 2. Qd2 mate).
self-blocking by Black (blocking-interference) or \((b)\) after moves by
the black battery-piece of a mixed battery, directed at the black
King’s field (ambush-interference). These two subdivisions are
shown in Nos. 199 and 200. The former is a fine all-round problem,
while No. 200 contains the point of a mutual white interference.

The reader will have remarked that I do not use the term Self-
interference. If one white piece moves into the line of force of
another white piece, I speak of White Interference; if a black piece
moves into the line of a black piece I speak of Black Interference;
while if a piece of either colour moves into the line of a piece of
opposite colour I use the term Shut-off. This choice is arbitrary,
but I trust it may become more generally used by problemists, as
anything tending to lessen the burden of a complicated problem
vocabulary deserves adoption. The alternative for Shut-off is to
speak of white-black and of black-white interferences, the side
affected being mentioned first and the side moving to cause the
interference being mentioned last. While possibly more scientific
I find this system too cumbersome for any but the special student.
The terms Obstruction, Blocking and Paralysis will be defined in
Chapter XXIV.

White interference, cutting off a pin, becomes possible whenever
the pinning of the black piece is no longer required. This pinning

---

**No. 201.**

**DR. A. VAN DER VEN.**

*Handelsblad, Aug., 1917.*

Mate in two.

1. Qg6, Bf6; 2. Se7 mate \((c)\)

2. Sf3; 2. Se3 mate \((a)\)

---

**No. 202.**

**C. MANSFIELD.**

*Hampshire Post, Jan., 1914.*

Mate in two.

1. Rg5, Be6+; 2. Sf5 mate \((d)\)

BxPc6; 2. Sb5 mate \((a)\)
may occur in either of two ways: (c) where it is present in the initial position, or (d) where it arises in the course of a solution. No. 201 shows the first form, with an interference-unpin by White's mate in the variation 1. ..., Bf6, the pin being no longer necessary because of the black interference. In the variation 1. ..., Sf3, however, the black Rook may not be unpinned, but the blocking of f3 enables White to mate by a blocking-interference. I consider it as a matter of high thematic importance that in problems of this category the black piece be essentially pinned in at least one variation.

No. 202 shows the more intricate second form, with interference-unpin by White's mate after 1. ..., Be6+. Here Black pins his own Rook and at the same time interferes with it, in such a way that White can unpin it without releasing any serious defensive power. On the other hand, in the variation 1. ..., BxPc6, the pin of the black Rook may not be disturbed, and White is only too glad to find the black Bishop blocking a square in the King's field, thus enabling a blocking interference of the Ba4.

The interference-unpin by White's mate strictly is not a pure white theme. Especially where half-pins are introduced (the second

---

No. 203.

G. H. Goethart.

*Op de Hoogte*, Dec., 1917.

![Chessboard](image1)

Mate in two.
1. Bcl.

No. 204.

A. Bottacchi.


![Chessboard](image2)

Mate in two.
1. Qh4.
type) the theme presents a decided black flavour. But in the examples discussed the white strategy dominates.

The interference-unpin by White’s mate is only possible where the mate is a discovered check. And, quite apart from unpinning features, the theme of White interference by battery-pieces is a very interesting one. No. 203 shows this theme in task form, with four white interferences in the variations, besides its interference threat. No. 204 combines battery interferences with interferences by pieces giving direct mates.

B. Sacrifices.

Possibly sacrifices constitute the oldest problem theme. Certainly they are almost universally valued for the additional sparkle they lend to so many other themes. Only, as we have already seen in Chapters IV. and VI., do some composers of Bohemian tastes consider them as infringements of the strictest principles of economy.

Sacrifices, indeed, are nowadays so generally used that they can only claim our thematic interest in cases where they are exceedingly well handled or represented in cumulative form.

Cumulative sacrifices may be obtained in three ways:

First, by offering a piece to capture by several black pieces simultaneously;

Secondly, by repeating the sacrifice of one piece in different variations, and usually on different squares; and

Thirdly, by sacrificing more than one piece.

Of these three groups only the second is necessarily a three-move theme. The others may be considered thematically as two-move themes, though in longer problems they often attain to effects not possible in the more restricted two-move form.

The first of these groups, as already mentioned in Chapter V., was one of the many themes launched by the ingenious Julius Brede. When the modern task composer turns his hand to such a province, however, the resultant acrobatics make the pioneer appear very unskilful. No. 207 shows a six-fold sacrificial key, the effect of the captures being one not presentable in two-move form, showing how distinctly two-move themes may often obtain thematic presentation in problems of greater length. Multiple initial sacrifices may also be used to good advantage in three and four-movers to introduce quiet continuations along lines that partake less of the task and more of the artistic problem. This style of composition was in vogue for many years, notably between 1880 and 1910, and examples by Jespersen, Fritz Hofmann (1854-1925), F. af Geyerstam (1852-1890),
Pradignat, Marin, and others (of which Nos. 205 and 206 are typical), featured the entry lists of countless tournaments. But the golden age of Jespersen has closed and, though these plural sacrifices continue to appear in every tourney, their success is no longer the foregone conclusion it used to be.

The second group is shown in fine task form in No. 208, with its five Queen sacrifices in the variations. No. 176 was a good example of another branch of this group.

Examples of the third group are very numerous, No. 148 being a good specimen. Perhaps this group should be divided into two, according to whether Black has a simultaneous choice of making the captures or a successive choice in several variations. The latter possibility corresponds somewhat closely to group 2, save that different white pieces are sacrificed in separate variations instead of always the same piece. It is a three-move theme and No. 75 will serve as a sufficient example.
SEEMINGLY FAULTY MANŒUVRES.

No. 207.
H. W. BettiMANN.
Hon. Me., Good Companions,
May, 1922.

No. 208.
O. Wurzburg.


Mate in three.

1. QxP, QxQ; 2. Sc3.
Rb4xQ; 2. Pc4.
Rh4xQ; 2. Pe4.
BxQ; 2. Se3.
Se6xQ; 2. Bf7.
Sf3xQ; 2. Rf5.

Mate in three.

1. Pc7, Ra3 (threat); 2. Qe3+.
QxSe2; 2. Od4+.
QxSf4; 2. Od5+.
Pc2 (threat); 2. Qe5+.
Sg4; 2. Qf5+.

C. Spectacular Problems.

Spectacular problems cannot be seriously classified; for one solver will consider a combination as a marvel of wit, which another will call self-evident. The greatest virtuoso in this field was Sam Loyd, who has been called the Problem-showman. Nos. 85, 86, 88 and 89 were “entirely novel, bewildering tricks” (to speak in Loyd’s own words!). I cannot refrain from reproducing here another “colossal trick,” No. 209, to which I give as a companion a final attraction for the visitors to the problem-fair, a “Merry-go-round,” No. 210.
No. 209.
S. Loyd.

Holyoke Transcript, 1876.

Mate in three.

F. af Geyerstam.

Schachaufgaben.

Mate in four.
1. Qa8, BxR ; 2. Qh8, Ph6xP ;
3. Qh1, KxR ; 4. Qa1 mate.
Chapter XX.

ACTIVITY OF ONE BLACK PIECE.

Many beautiful problems have been built on the theme: Activity of a Black Piece. As the theme is readily understood, only a few examples need be given.

The Black King is the Knight-errant in many a problem. It is rather difficult to state categorically just when flight-squares, as such, are to be considered as an example of activity of the Black King. This depends upon the number of flights and . . . . . . . the inexpressiveness of the rest of the problem's contents. In a two-mover seven flights can be obtained, if a checking key is admitted, and six without a check, as shown in No. 211. Eight flight-squares in a three-mover proves an easy task, No. 212.

No. 211.

B. G. LAWS AND A. F. MACKENZIE.
Hon. Men., Chess Monthly, Jan., 1885.

Mate in two.
1. Rh4.

No. 212.

W. A. SHINKMAN.

Checkmate, 1901.

Mate in three.
1. Rc2, threat; 2. RxP(+) P1; 2. Qxg1+.
Activity of the black Queen was demonstrated in No. 145. The great strength of the Queen tends to offer many difficulties in the composition of Activity-tasks.

The black Rook may cause eleven variations in a two-mover; the black Bishop eight. In longer problems countless possibilities still await the composer, willing and able to search for them.

The black Knight has already been sufficiently discussed: Nos. 36, 37, 38 and 39.

The black Pawn lends itself to use in three principal tasks. Direct activity culminates in the Pickaninny, Nos. 34 and 35; the en-passant captures produce noteworthy effects, as exemplified in No. 213; whilst Promotions are the basis of a large group of problems, of which the self-mate, No. 214, is a striking cumulative illustration, and No. 214A shows the Black promotions being followed by similar White promotions.

No. 213.
H. Weenink.
Westminster Gazette, 3 Sept., 1921.

Mate in three.
1. Qa1, threat; 2. Bc2+.
Bb1; 2. Pd4, PxPe.p.;
3. Qe5 mate.

No. 214. W. Pauly.
Deutsches Wochenschach,
23 March, 1913.

Self-mate in three.
1. Rdr, Pgi = Q; 2. Qg5+;
3. Rc5+.
Pgi = R; 2. Sh5-g3; 3. xR.
Pgi = B; 2. Rf7; 3. xB.
Pgi = S; 2. Sf4; 3. xS.
PxB = Q; 2. Rd5+; 3. Rc5+.
PxB = R; 2. Rg7; 3. xR.
PxB = B; 2. Qg5+; 3. RxP.
PxB = S; 2. Rf7; 3. xS.
ACTIVITY OF ONE BLACK PIECE.

No. 214A.

Dr. H. W. Bettmann.

First Prize, "Babsontask" Contest, 1925-26.

Self-mate in three.
1. Pa8=B, PxB=Q; 2. Pf8=Q.
   PxB=R; 2. Pf8=R.
   PxB=B; 2. Pf8=B.
   PxB=S; 2. Pf8=S.
Chapter XXI.

ACTIVITY OF MORE BLACK PIECES.

The two-move tasks, illustrating the activities of two or more black pieces, are generally very cumbersome and automatic problems; in longer problems other features than the mere activity are usually dominant. Therefore only a couple of spectacular positions need be given, in which the black King is assisted by all eight pawns. The lay-out of No. 215 has been called the Skittles-Theme, though the position of the pawns in No. 216 is perhaps more in accord with the game of nine-pins!

No. 215.
C. C. W. Mann.
Nederlandsch. Schaaktijdschrift, March, 1907.

No. 216.
Les Tours de Force, 1906.

Mate in four.
1. Qa1, Pd3; 2. Qc3, Pe3;
3. PxP.
Pc3; 2. Qa2+, Pc4; 3. Qa5+.
Pe3; 2. Qh1+, Pe4; 3. Qh5+.

Mate in two.
1. Qg2.

(200)
CHAPTER XXII.
BLACK BATTERIES.

In discussing the White batteries, it was noted that much difficulty exists in distinguishing between a purely thematic battery and a battery used as a technical makeshift. Black batteries are still more often used for auxiliary purposes, and it may be questioned whether any purely thematic Black battery problems exist. At best the idea is of small interest in direct mate problems, and no examples need to be quoted.

CHAPTER XXIII.
BLACK STRATEGY.

In connection with No. 107, the difference between Black Strategy and Faulty Manoeuvres has already been emphasized. Black strategy denotes a manœuvre by Black specifically intended to frustrate White's attack; a faulty manœuvre indicates a series of moves that appear to be strategically related, although Black's intention is not to play that combination, but only the several unconnected moves, which fortuitously as it were form that combination. In direct-mate problems White always wins, so that the effect of black strategy as well as of the faulty manœuvres is of no influence upon the actual outcome of the "game." This fact may explain why the number of problems containing black strategy is rather small: for it is somewhat unsatisfactory to find Black losing the game after the performance of a fine strategical manœuvre. Hence thematically the most interesting specimens of this group are those where Black succeeds in deferring the mate by at least one move.

A classic example of black strategy is Kohtz and Kockelkorn's fine four-mover, No. 217, a Black-Bristol. This Bristol combination (the term is used in the general sense of line-clearance) enables Black to prevent mate at the third move, although he is forced to surrender one move later because of the fatal waiting move situation.

(201)
No. 218.  

Dr. N. Höeg.  

Nationaltidende, 15 Oct., 1905.

Mate in three.  
1. Rb2, BxR (threat); 2. Ba6, Be5; 2. Pf4.

No. 218 also contains a black Bristol effect, but it is essentially different from that in No. 217. The difference is not that a diagonal clearance is concerned, but that in No. 217 White permits the Black Clearance and afterwards wins by a waiting move, whereas in No. 218 White prevents the intended Black Clearance: 1 ..., Ba1; 2 ..., Qb2. In other words No. 218 only contains effective black clearance play in the defence to certain tries, such as 1. Rb3.

Several white strategical themes may be shown as “ideas in the defence.” The subject was elaborately discussed, together with white strategy, by Dr. Ed. Birgfeld in an article in the Teplitz-Schönau Congress-Book, 1922, entitled: “Zur Darstellung logischer Kombinationen.” Here two further examples will suffice.

No. 219 shows an attempt at performing a strategical counter-clearance. The black Queen is striving to reach f6, so as to guard d6. But first the black Bishop must vacate h8, so as to allow the black King to take refuge there from the threat. If the Bishop moves, say, to b2 or c3, the black Queen will be prevented from reaching f6. Hence Black plays 1 ..., Ba1, this being the strategical counter-clearance. It is not a black Turton-doubling, in the more
 Mate in five.

1. Qc7, threat; 2. Sd6+, Kf6;
   3. Qd8+, Kg7; 4. Qe7+.
   Bc3; 2. Qd6; 3. Qf6+.
   BxQ; 4. Sd6 mate.
   Ba1!; 2. Pc3, BxP;
   (KxS; 2. Qd6, SxP;
   mate).

 Mate in three.

   Bd3; 2. QxPa6.
   Be4; 2. Sc6.
   Re5; 2. BxR.
   (Be7; 2. QxB+.)

restricted sense explained in Chapter XVIII., because the support
by the black Bishop is not featured. White is now enabled to thwart
the black combination by decoying the Bishop, after it has made its
critical move to a1, back to c3 again by 2. Pc3.

No. 220 is a so-called Grimshaw-anti-Grimshaw. The key
establishes a threat, 2. Qf7, to which Black's replies of 2. ..., Rf5 and
Bf5 produce a true pair of Grimshaw interferences, allowing White
to mate. Black can correct this "faulty manœuvre" by playing
either of the pieces threatened with interference, to the other side of
the critical square f5, only to find that any such move (1. ..., Bd3,
Be4, Re5) will cause fresh trouble.

The terms Strategical black Anti-Bristol (counter-clearance) and
Strategical black Grimshaw-anti-Grimshaw are introduced here in
accord with H. Klüver's (b. 1901) definitions in another article of the Teplitz-Schönauf Congress-Book: "Schnittpunkt-Systematik." It will be clear that the prefix, "anti," in No. 220, means a manœuvre tending to prevent a Grimshaw situation, whilst in No. 219 "anti" means motion in a direction counter to the Bristol clearance. Such ambiguity could only be obviated by the introduction of new terms like: Trans-critical or Cis-critical, as Klüver proposes. But new terms in problematics tend to make simple matters looked upon by many as unduly complex, or else they are greeted with derision, so that for the present the old prefix: anti, even if not entirely consistent, may continue to serve both purposes. But the term Strategic black Anti-Bristol, as used in this paragraph, should not be confused with the use of the term Anti-Bristol in the next chapter.
Faulty manoeuvres may be subdivided into three closely related groups: Blocking, Paralysis and Interference. These three groups comprise the different interpretations which may be given to the principle of Obstruction, and without further definitions one might believe that all three terms mean the same thing. For the sake of easy distinction the meaning of these three terms has been specifically restricted. Thus, Blocking is limited to mean that a square is occupied by a piece so that another piece, usually of the same colour, cannot move to that square; Paralysis is limited to the case when the occupation of a square in this way, shuts up another piece of the same colour so that it cannot move; and Interference is limited to mean that a square is occupied so that another piece of the same colour cannot move across that square.

A. Blocking.

When Blocking between two black pieces occurs in two-movers,

No. 221.
A. J. Fink and Ua Tane.
1st Prize, Good Companions, July, 1920.

No. 222.
H. W. Barry.
Les Tours de Force, 1906.

Mate in two.
1. Rc8.

Mate in two.
1. Qg6.
it is necessarily a flight-square in the King's field that is occupied by another black piece. This form of Blocking (King-Blocking) rivals sacrifices as the oldest problem idea. Several examples are contained in the Bonus Socius MS. Modern composers have been especially interested in the maximum effects of the blocking theme in the two-mover. No. 221 is one of the finest tasks extant, with its beautiful added mate key and clever machinery, producing eight blocks without apparent effort. No. 222, with five blockings by the black Queen, is a comprehensive illustration, in terms of chess, of the snares of marriage.

A more modest task, giving point to several charming two-movers, is the Horse-block, or four-fold blocking by two black Knights. No. 223 is a nice specimen, with changed-mate key.

This theme of blocking the black King offers more restricted opportunities for thematic presentation in longer problems, though it lends itself to charming results in such light-weight problems as No. 224.

Mutual blocking of two Black pieces other than the King (Piece-Blocking), is an old theme (No. 225 dates from 1867) yet it received no adequate attention until the last few years. Perhaps this has been due to the difficulty of its presentation in complete thematic

**No. 223.**

F. JANET.

*Chess Amateur*, May, 1918.

**No. 224.**

J. MÖLLER.


Mate in two.

1. Re8.

Mate in three.

1. Bb3, Sg5
   
   Sf6 or Sg6 or e6; 2. Sf7 +
   
   Sd7; 2. Pg3.
form. For the theme requires a three-move solution with two quiet continuations, because the fact, that a certain square is blocked, can only be thematically turned to account by a second move of White that could have been defeated by playing "another" Black piece to the blocked square. Hence White's thematic second move can never be a check.

B. Paralysis.

No. 225 is the first recorded example of the sort of mutual blocking described in the last paragraph. In the variation 1. ..., Bc7+, the square c7 is blocked so that the dangerous S-check after 2. Kb5 is no longer possible. The variation 1. ..., Sc7, however, already shows a further development of the blocking principle, namely blocking resulting in the total Paralysis (or Bottling) of the "other" piece. The "coup de repos," 2. Rh5, as is called a waiting move in the course of the solution of a threat problem, belongs to a style much in vogue in Bayer's day. If, after 2. Rh5, the Bb8 could but move, White's continuation would be defeated. Hence the paralysis of the Bb8 is really what defeats Black. It will be clear that the thematic

No. 225.

DR. C. BAYER.

1st Prize, British Tourney, 1867.

Mate in three.
1. Sc2, Sc7; 2. Rh5! }
   Bc7+; 2. Kb5. }
   (Kc6; 2. Sb4+ or QxS+.)

No. 226.

J. HARTONG.

Hampshire Post, Jan., 1921.

Mate in three.
1. Sb6, threat; 2. Sc8.
   Ba3; 2. Be8. }
   Pb3; 2. Ra4. }
   PxS; 2. Pc7.
   BxP; 2. SxB.
purity of the Blocking is not influenced by the manner in which White profits by it; yet the blocking of the types "preventing a black piece from going to a certain square" and "preventing a black piece from vacating a certain square" offer sufficiently different characteristics to rank as separate ideas. No. 225 was a blend of blocking and paralysis; whereas No. 226 contains the idea of paralysis in each of the two blocking variations, bottling up the Sb1 after 1 ..., Ba3 and the Ba2 after 1 ..., Pb3.

In No. 227 there is mutual paralysis of Bishop and Pawn, one variation (1 ..., Pb3) containing a coup de repos, whilst the other theme-variation, 1 ..., Bb3, prevents "unblocking" of b4 and is therefore quite styleful.

Recent task achievements are shown in No. 132, with a double mutual blocking of Bishop and Knight (at f2 and f4), and in No. 228, with four-fold blocking at the single square f5.

To prevent confusion it may be emphasized once more, that many authors in the past have made no distinction between Interference, Paralysis and Blocking, other than the blocking of the black King, which they called self-blocking. It is reasonable to suppose that

No. 227.

H. Weenink.

Hampshire Post, March, 1921.

No. 228.

M. Franken.

Hon. Men., Good Companions,
Feb., 1924.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mate in three.</th>
<th>Mate in three.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bb3 ; 2. Rh5.</td>
<td>Sg3-f5 ; 2. Sc6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bc2 ; 2. RxB+.</td>
<td>Sh4-f5 ; 2. RxB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the attention paid to-day to these themes, will make for greater accuracy in speaking of them, but in publications prior to about 1922 ambiguity is frequent.

C. Black Interference.

Black Interference is easily and automatically subdivided into two classes: Interference of pieces with different motions, and Interference of pieces with the same motion. In defining "same motion," one must remember that the black Queen can act either as a Rook or as a Bishop, and that a black Pawn of the seventh rank can mildly imitate the Rook by advancing two squares. In these pages reference to Rook or Bishop motion is always meant to include: "motion of a Queen acting as Rook or Bishop, or of a Pawn acting as Rook."

Although the sacrifice of a white man on the interference square strictly belongs to the mixed themes, the Novotny and Plachutta themes are discussed in this chapter, because they are so intimately related to the Grimshaw and Holzhausen interferences. In general this entire group is one of the easiest to classify. It is only the many names which have been coined to differentiate between different types which appears to lend a certain obscurity, the difficulty of technical nomenclature, to the subject.

C (1). Interference of pieces of different motions.

In No. 229 we encounter the mutual interference of Rook and Bishop, constituting the Grimshaw interference already defined in connection with No. 14. No. 14, it will be remembered, contained a thematic extension by a critical move in one of the variations. No. 229 shows no critical play, that being impossible in a black interference two-mover, but it includes an extra interference of the B a1 by 1. ... P c3. No. 230 repeats the Grimshaw interference, performed by the same black pieces, the R d6 and the B d7, at c 6 and e 6.

If a white piece is sacrificed on the interference square of Rook and Bishop, so that after either capture the "other" black piece remains shut-off in an essential degree, the interference is named after Anton Novotny (1829-1871), whose No. 15 appears to have been the first presentation of the theme. No. 15 took four moves, Black's first move being unessential to the theme, while the second one was a preliminary critical move of the black Bishop. Theoretically the Novotny is strictly a two-move ending, being simply the Grimshaw with an initial sacrifice, and this two-move ending may be developed into longer problems by thematic critical combinations. No. 231
deals with the theme more comprehensively than did No. 15, in that both the black pieces must be decoyed across the critical square, f2, before the Novotny sacrifice is effective. The fact that after the sacrifice two more moves are necessary to bring about a check-mate is a thematic weakness. The fashions of sixty years ago account for this circuitousness. No. 232 has the modern economy of moves, showing four-fold Novotnys, preceded in every case by critical moves of the Bf4.

The possibilities of interference in longer problems are surprisingly numerous, and although much study has been given to them, especially since the publication in 1903 of Das Indische Problem, much yet remains to be done. Apart from the permutations of critical maneuvres, already exemplified, the so-called Forelayed Interferences have recently drawn some attention. No. 233 is a simple, but clever, example, in which the black Pawns interfere with the black Rook, before this Rook has even played to a4, thus giving White opportunity for a quiet continuation in each case.
(Novotny with critical moves.)

Mate in five.

1. Bg1, BxB; 2. Pe4, RxR;
{ 3. ..., RxS; 4. Se3. }
{ 3. ..., BxS; 4. SxPf6. }

(Fourfold Novotny with critical moves.)

Mate in three.

1. Qa5, Bh1; 2. Bf3. 
{ Bh7; 2. Sf5+. }
{ Bb7; 2. Sd5. }
{ Bb1; 2. Bd3. }

In the two-move field there is a profusion of interference possibilities and an enormous list of names. No. 234 is a bifurcation of the mutual interference between black Bishop and Pawn, conveniently called the Pawn-Grimshaw. In the two-mover the black Queen can only act as interfering piece when she is pinned, as in No. 113. No. 235 is a task, illustrating five-fold interference on the single square, e3. No. 236 is a clever blending of various somewhat unrelated interferences, which may well close this section.
No. 233.
E. Ferber.

(Forelayed Interference.)
Mate in three.
1. Rh2, Pc6
   Pe4, f4, a4
   (Ra4+)
   2. Qb6.

No. 234.
J. Scheel (after Smith).
Aftenposten, 21 March, 1909.

(Double Pawn-Crimshaw.)
Mate in two.
1. Bb3, Pc6
   2. Qa4 mate.
   Bc6
   2. Qa7 mate.
   Be6
   2. Qh8 mate.

No. 235.
P. F. Blake.
1st Pr., Western Dy. Mercury, 1906.

Mate in two.
1. Qe2.

No. 236.
C. Mansfield.
3rd Prize, Observer, 1920-21.

Mate in two.
C (2). Interference of pieces with the same motion.

This group does not admit of as many possibilities as the last, because it only contains lateral interference (of two Rooks) and diagonal interference (of two Bishops). As there can never be two Bishops of the same square-colour, except in certain fantasies with promoted pieces, the latter type is reduced to interference between one Bishop and the Queen. Interference between pieces with the same motion can only properly be shown in three-movers and longer problems; in two-movers the effects produced are poor imitations of the longer themes.

As early as 1858, J. Plachutta (died 1883) composed a lateral interference problem with sacrifice of a white piece on the interference square. No. 237, by the Plachutta-devotee, D. J. Densmore (1867-1917), is a much more recent example. If the Ra7 captures the Sb7, the Rb8 is interfered with, so that it cannot capture at b1 on the second move. When White checks by 2. Rb1+, the interfering rook must capture, and it is therefore decoyed away from the seventh rank, allowing mate by 3. Rh7. The complementary variation, 1. ..., Rb8xSb7, is perfectly analogous.

No. 237.

D. J. Densmore.

Gazette-Times, 26 Nov., 1916.

(Lateral Plachutta.)

Mate in three.

1. Sb7, Ra7xS; 2. Rb1+. \( Rb8xS; 2. Rh7+ \).

No. 238.

A. Kraemer.

Deutsches Wochenschach, 1918.

Mate in three.

1. Rd3, BxR; 2. Bh6. \( QxR; 2. Bc1 \).
This No. 237 shows the ordinary type of interference between pieces with the same motion. The interference is mutual, a white man is sacrificed on the interference square, and the two black pieces move on orthogonal lines. These three points are understood by the term: Plachutta. Yet it is curious that, strictly reasoning, the interference character of the strategy is subordinated to a decoy. If, in No. 237, the Ra7 captures the Sb7 and White plays 2. Rb1+, Black is not so much embarrassed by the fact that the Rb8 cannot capture as by the necessity of capturing with the Rb7. Surely, if the Rb8 could capture at b1, the Rb7 would not be removed from the seventh rank; yet it is clear that the interference is shown by means of the decoy. True interference would not be dependent upon such a decoy. It is shown in No. 238. The distinction between this problem and No. 237 which it is important to bring out here does not lie in the fact that the direction of motion between black Queen and Bishop is diagonal instead of in a lateral direction, nor in the fact that in No. 238 the interference is not mutual; but the difference lies in the very character of the interference shown. In No. 238, if White plays 1. Bh6, Qf5; 2. Bf8+, the black Queen can capture the Bishop. But after 1. Rd3, BxR; 2. Bh6, the black Bishop interferes with the black Queen, and Black is defeated, because the interfered Queen cannot reach a square from which she can capture. The distinction involved between having the Queen at d3 or having the Bishop there is based in this case on the differing secondary powers of the two pieces. But it is not essential that the piece interfered with should always be the more powerful Queen. It is possible to illustrate the theme with black batteries, but the renderings are liable to be more cumbersome than where the Queen is employed.

The theme of No. 238 was doubled by J. Hartong in his No. 240. The problem is intricate and difficult, so that few solvers grasped the author’s intention. The true interference occurs after 1. ..., Bg7, when 2. RxS finds the black Queen prevented from reaching e5. There is a blocking obstruction of the same “true” character, after 1. ..., Rh7, when the object of 2. Sg7 (to prevent the Queen from reaching f6) also finds the Queen prevented from occupying h7. True interference in one line, of Queen by Bishop, and true blocking in the other, of Queen by Rook, makes this an extremely complex blend. The historical evolution of the “true” interference is described in, A. Klinke: Das Schwarze Schnittpunktgefuge, 1924.

In No. 239 the Plachutta theme is doubled, a task easily performed by automatic technique. Indeed, as many as four Plachuttas have been combined in several ingenious task problems.

Under No. 240 a new theme-name, Holzhausen, appears. Hence a few historical remarks must be added, as the whole thematic field under consideration is dotted with names.

The interference of similar black pieces without the sacrifice of a
white man on the interference square was first shown, incompletely and somewhat vaguely, by W. Grimshaw, in 1853 (No. 246A), and by A. von Cywinski (1829-1866?), in 1855 (No. 246B), and a further example by the same composer, in 1861, introduced a preliminary critical move (No. 246C). In 1907 von Holzhausen, stimulated by Kohtz and by von Cywinski's problems, published a clear-cut, single representation of the theme. In 1909, Wurzburg gave the complete mutual interference, No. 241, with beautiful economy. Hence the mutual interference without white sacrifice and with the black pieces moving orthogonally is called: Wurzburg-Plachutta; and a single interference of the same character is called: Holzhausen-Plachutta, or for short: Holzhausen. The Holzhausen theme lends itself especially to the production of thematic effects in four and more moves, No. 242 being an admirable seven-move representation.

The distinction between a Holzhausen and a Wurzburg-Plachutta
No. 241.
O. Wurzburg.

(Wurzburg-Plachutta.)
Mate in three.
1. Se5, threat; 2. Qb2.
Rc4-d4; 2. Qd5.
Rd3-d4; 2. Qe4. f

No. 242.
W. von Holzhausen.
Deutsches Wochenschach, 1912.

(Holzhausen-Plachutta.)
Mate in seven.
1. Kf4, Qa4; 2. KxP, Qa8;
3. Sb7, QxS; 4. Kf4, Qb4;

will be understood by going back to No. 240. Here we have two Holzhausen lines, a Holzhausen interference after 1. ..., Bg7 and a Holzhausen blocking obstruction after 1. ..., Rh7, but the two Holzhausens do not constitute a Wurzburg-Plachutta because they are not mutual interferences between two given pieces.

A theme, presenting some likeness with the Plachutta, while employing the unlike motion of the Novotny, has been discovered by E. Brunner (b. 1885), and is known as the Brunner-Novotny, or sometimes as the Brunner-Plachutta. This is shown in No. 243.

It is a Novotny interference, with afterplay reminiscent of the Plachutta decoy. In No. 244 the theme is doubled.

Another whole group of ideas develops where the orthogonal motion we have been examining is changed to motion on a single line. Instead of interfering at a right angle, interferences at an angle of 180 degrees come into play, the black pieces approaching one another along the same line from opposite sides of what corresponds to the critical square. This new group is called the (black) anti-Bristol interference. Here the possible ambiguity in the use of the term “anti” must again be noted. Bristol, it will be
recalled, was defined to mean in a general sense: Line-clearance; but Anti-Bristol does not mean counter-line-clearance, or clearance in a counter direction. For that type of strategy the term counter-clearance was used, or more narrowly the name of Turton was given to it. By Anti-Bristol is meant the reverse of a clearance, namely an interference (or obstruction) caused by motion of one piece down a line headed towards the piece which is to be interfered with. Thus, in No. 217, Black’s first move, 1 ..., Rh8, is a Bristol or clearance of the rook for the benefit of the queen, whereas Black’s second move, 2 ..., Qg8, is an anti-Bristol or line interference of the rook by the queen.

The Anti-Bristol group has not been subdivided according to whether a white sacrifice is present or not, nor according to whether the interference is single or mutual, so that additional new names to be memorized are fortunately absent. The single anti-Bristol has
sometimes been called the incomplete anti-Bristol, to distinguish it from the mutual, or complete, form; yet the single anti-Bristol is a theme in itself, there is nothing missing about it, and to call it incomplete may well cause confusion. Thus we can quite simply refer to such a position as a single anti-Bristol; to No. 245 as a very simple mutual rendering; and to No. 246 as a splendid cumulative task version.

No. 245.
D. J. Densmore.
1916.

No. 246.
K. Hannemann.
1st Prize, Skakbladet, Oct., 1919.

(Mutual Anti-Bristol Interference.)
Mate in three.
1. Sc4, Rb3-d3; 2. Bb4+. }
Rg3-d3; 2. Bh4+.

(Triple Mutual-Anti-Bristol Interference.)
Mate in three.
1. Rh5, Re3; 2. Sb3++. }
Qc3; 2. Qe3++. }
Bd5; 2. Sc6++. }
Qd5; 2. Re4++. }
Rf5; 2. Qg7++. }
Qf5; 2. Qf4++. }

With the use of a black Queen, motion on lines at an angle of 45 degrees or 135 degrees becomes possible, as in the early example of interference previously mentioned, No. 246B, where we find the lines g8-e6 and c6-e6 define an angle of 135 degrees.

Further information regarding the Plachutta and anti-Bristol themes may be found in the Memorial to D. J. Densmore, the 1920 volume of the Christmas series, especially as to the application of the Locus Theory to these themes.
FAULTY MANŒUVRES.

No. 246A.—W. Grimshaw.
Illus. London News, 2 April, 1853.

No. 246B.—A. von Cywinski.

(Holzhausen Interference without preliminary critical move.)

Mate in four.
1. Oe3, PxQ; 2. Be5, Re4-c4; 3. Pc6+, RxP; 4. BxP mate.

(Holzhausen Interference without preliminary critical move.)

Mate in five.
1. Sf2, PxS; 2. Bf1, RxB; 3. Qc8, Qe6; 4. SxP+, QxS; 5. Qh3 mate.

No. 246C.—A. von Cywinski.

(Holzhausen Interference with preliminary critical move.)

Mate in five.
Chapter XXV.

SPECTACULAR PROBLEMS.

Black spectacular problems are rather scarce. As they do not contain a theme pointed enough to class in any of the other chapters of Part II., much must depend upon the personal taste of the solver. So the annexed Battle, No. 247, may amuse some, whilst others will find it utterly unesthetic.

No. 247.

N. SARDOTSCHE.

Nuova Rivista, 1886.

Mate in ten.

1. Ba6+, Sb1;  2. Rxs+, Re1;
3. Rxs+, Sdr;  4. Rxs+, Be1;
5. RxB+, Pg1;  6. BxB+, Rc6;
7. BxR+, Qd5;  8. BxQ+, Pe4;
Chapter XXVI.

OPPOSITION.

The discussion of the Opposition Theme seems an appropriate beginning of the review of mixed ideas. For in this theme the equivalent action of black and white pieces is illustrated. Opposition may be defined as Action and Counteraction of one (or more) White and one (or more) Black pieces. The greater the number of actors in the play, the less pointed the opposition plot will appear, inasmuch as in the last analysis every problem may be considered as containing action and counteraction of the white and black men. But where two or three white and black pieces fight a deliberate duel, this may certainly be called a theme.

No. 248.
W. A. SHINKMAN.
V., Detroit Free Press, 3 June, 1882.

No. 249.
I. Kos.
Schachmatni, March, 1890.

Mate in three.
1. Kh1, Ph4; 2. Qh5.
   Ra6; 2. Qe2.
   Ra4; 2. Qe4.
   RxP; 2. Qf7.
   Rc8; 2. Qf5.
   Rd8 or g8; 2. Qd5.
   Rh8; 2. Qc3.

Mate in four.
1. Qd2, Kb8; 2. Qf4+, Ka8;
   3. Qa4+.
   Rf8; 2. Qd1, Kb8; 3. Qd6+.
   Re8 (b8, c8); 3. Qa4+.
   Rh8; 3. Qa1+.
   (Rg8; 3. BxR.)
   Rf3+; 3. QxR.
   Rh8; 2. Qa5+, Kb8; 3. Qe5+.

(221)
No. 90 already has provided a classic example of a duel between white Queen and black Bishop, in which the white Queen won the decision by a jiu-jitsu trick called "double-attack," a specialty of the white Lady. This trick even enables her to triumph over two black Rooks, as in No. 248. In No. 249 the Queen is matched against only one Rook; yet this miniature requires very accurate procedure by White and cleverly illustrates the strategical interest which a master can obtain with a slender force.

No. 250.

H. Rübesamen.

Münchener Neueste Nachrichten,
28 April, 1907.

Mate in seven.

1. Ka1, Re6 !; 2. Re5, Rd6;
3. Rd5, Rc6; 4. Rc5, Rb6;
5. Rb5, Ra6; 6. Rb1.

No. 251.

F. Sackmann.

Münchener Neueste Nachrichten,
15 Sept., 1912.

Mate in six.

1. Re4, Bd1 !; 2. Re2, Ba4;
3. Rc2, Bb5+; 4. Rc4, BxR+;
5. KxB.

Opposition between two Rooks is shown in No. 250, and of white Rook against black Bishop in No. 251. No. 250 is especially attractive, because of the amusing manner in which the black Rook is brought to bay by his opponent. The black Rook cannot return on his tracks because, for instance, after 4. ..., Re6; 5. Rc1 would prevent 5. ..., Re1 from being a check, so that White would have time to mate by Sg6. On the other hand White cannot play his Rook to the first rank until the black Rook is shut off from reaching that rank; otherwise a check with ensuing stalemate disturbs the plot.

In No. 251 the opposition play is happily combined with a Merry-go-round, both antagonists spinning around the white King.
A subdivision of the opposition theme, which is perhaps the best known of all, though certainly it is not the most interesting group, is the Grab-theme. Here a black piece must be captured, the most brutal form of opposition. Even Loyd's genius did not succeed in giving the theme an attractive form, although No. 252 is perhaps the best of many renderings so far, as it is not at once evident that the Bc8 must be captured.

No. 252.
S. Loyd.
*Cleveland Sunday Voice*, 3 June, 1877.

Mate in three.
1. Sc5, B any ; 2. SxB.

The opposition theme is very elastic and thematic composers will still find much to achieve in this field.
Chapter XXVII.

CHANGED MATES.

The discussion in this book of Changed Mates is intentionally given before that of the complete waiting move problems, because it is necessary to emphasize the fact that waiters with changed mates are only one of the forms in which the changed mates may be presented. Always, when a set mate or mating combination is disturbed by the key and replaced by another mate or combination, one should speak of changed mate or changed mating combination. Yet it is necessary in some way to draw the solver’s attention to the set mate or combination; otherwise he might easily overlook the point of the problem altogether. Often a rendering in complete waiting form will serve this purpose, assuming that every solver, before looking for his key, first tries all Black’s defences in the initial position. Of course, an inexperienced hand will generally use some such solving system; but the more experienced often jumps to his key through observation of some technical detail and therefore easily overlooks the fact that a purely waiting move would have done as well. This is especially the case in waiting move problems of more than two moves. To forestall this solving of changed mate problems without recognition of the changed mates, an effective means of catching the solver’s attention is to provide ready mates after certain particularly evident black defences. This is done in No. 253. Here the most evident black defences are the checks to the white King. After 1..., Qe6+, Qf5+, Sf3+, Rg5+, White has set mates by 2. Bxe6, Bxf5, Pxf3, Qxg5. But after arbitrary moves, like 1..., Sb3, Sc2, Rxc8, etc., there are no set mates. The position is a threat-problem and the key opens an eight-fold wheel of Knight discoveries. But the ingenious introduction of a flight-square at h4 forces White to meet all Black’s checks by other mating moves than

No. 253.
H. D'O. Bernard.
Good Companions, March, 1918.

Mate in two.

1. Qb4.
those noted as the set mates. Such checking effects, heretofore, have been much more numerous among changed mate problems in non-complete-waiting move form. No. 127 has already been seen as a typical example.

No. 254.
G. H. Goethart.

*Handelsblad*, Sept., 1919.

No. 255.
J. K. Heydon.

*Good Companions*, 22 Feb., 1921.

Mate in two.

1. Qf8.

A variation on this theme appears in No. 254, where the checks in the initial position (1. ..., Se6+ and Sf7+, followed by 2. Rd8 mate) are "degraded" by the actual key into unpinning interferences by the black Knight; but the corresponding mates are superior to the original set mate!

No. 255 is a transition to the block-threat with changed mates. All Black's defences, except 1. ..., Sd4, are provided with mates in the initial position, yet they are all turned topsy-turvy by the key. The pointed cross-check, 1. ..., Bxf3+; 2. Se2, which replaces the direct check-mate, 2. Rxf3, is particularly happy.

In closing this chapter my personal taste prompts me to discuss a question bearing on the thematic limitations of the complete-waiting move form. I have chosen No. 256 as my example, because the clever composer is cudgel-proof and in his heart of hearts will perhaps agree with my conclusions. In my opinion this No. 256 is an ugly problem, without proper balance between its contents and the technical rendering. The position is a complete waiter with changed mates. Black has only three moves, of which 1. ..., Pf5
has been added only to ensure soundness and so may be neglected. So that the whole content of the problem may be reduced to the two unpins of the white Queen: 1. ..., Sd5; 2. Qa4, and 1. ..., Sd3; 2. Qe4, which replace the set mates 2. Qc5 and 2. Qxf6 respectively. The commendation of the problem was due solely to the originality of this combination of changed unpin mates, the tourney in which the problem was entered being one limited to complete waiting move two-movers. But the composer, in order to be eligible to compete in this particular tourney, has given himself unnecessary trouble and he has produced a clumsy and restricted position, where the use of a threat in non-complete-waiting-move form would have permitted a much more open position. All that was necessary was to introduce a threat which could be defeated by 1. ..., Sd3 and Sd5, and this might easily be found. Such a presentation would not have lost the changed mates to the solver, since nowadays attention to possible unpins is always keen, and the expert and novice alike would hesitate to surrender the set mates, 2. Qxf6 in particular, without considerable study. In Larsen's problem, as it stands, the unhappy combination of the changed unpin mates (a definite theme) with the technical detail of a complete waiting position has spoiled what might easily have been a little masterpiece, instead of a mere task. The problem is only one of many, in which the composers have failed to note the limitations of the waiting move form. I hope my digression may serve to bring a more common-sense standard to the changed mate domain in composition.
Chapter XXVIII.

WAITERS.

The closing paragraph of the last chapter will have indicated the need to distinguish between waiting themes, and themes rendered in waiting form as a sop to the present day enthusiasm for the waiting move problems. Of course it may often be difficult to determine whether theme or form is dominating, especially when considering all-round waiters with a fine key and no point, such as have already been met with in the discussion of the English School. Perhaps it might be taken as a rule, that the waiting-move form is essential where a complex of mating moves or mating combinations is changed, because the waiting form does not emphasize special variations. On the other hand, the waiting-move form is quite unessential where a pointed line of play is changed or a mating position characteristically affected.

Classification:

Two-Movers: A. Waiters. (1) Complete, or Pure.
(2) Incomplete.
B. Added Mates.
C. Changed Mates. (1) Pure.
(2) Changed mating combinations.
D. Block-threats.

Longer Problems: E. Waiters.
F. Added Variations.
G. Changed Variations.
H. Block-threats.
I. Pseudo-two-movers. (1) Losing a move, usually 4-moves.
(2) New Mating combinations, three or more moves.

K. Cumulative effects.

Subdivisions A and E, and B and F, show close analogies, as do likewise C (2) and G; but I is thematically a theme for three or more moves with no two-move parallel.

Waiters: Types A and E.

In a complete two-move waiter, also called pure-waiter or complete block, a mate is ready after every black move set in the
initial position. The key does not essentially change the mates or the position. Examples are Nos. 27, 33 and 257. It should be noticed here that the use of the word "block" in this connection, is quite different from its use in connection with the blocking of squares. In an incomplete two-move waiter not every black defence is met in the initial position, and the key, though containing no threat, provides for the missing mating possibilities, so that Black, being forced to move, can be checkmated after any move. See Nos. 36, 124 and 258.

No. 257.
F. Schrüfer.
1st Prize, Nuova Rivista, 1877.

Mate in two.
1. Bc1.

No. 258.
Dr. L. N. de Jong.
1st Prize, Bahn Frei, 1891.

Mate in two.
1. Qc2.

Incomplete waiters in more than two moves are rarely of special interest as such. For instance, in No. 175, the vacating of the corner square by the King takes precedence over the fact that a mate must be provided against Black's defence of 1. ..., Sb5. The latter feature is simply a mechanical detail of the construction by which the vacating theme can be presented. No. 233 is another good instance of the same thing.

No. 260 is a fine incomplete block three-er, the waiting move character of the key having an unusual significance. After 1. ..., Sf7 White has no continuation. The key provides for this defence and adds an unexpected variation after the acceptance of the sacrifice.

Complete waiters can more readily be given thematic importance. In general such problems are simple affairs, like No. 259. Here
White's second move happens also to be a waiting move, though not a complete waiting move. This frequent feature of a threatless second move often lends point to a complete waiting key, without however changing the nature of the problem. Whether there be a second move threat or not, the problem counts as a complete waiting mover.

No. 259.
F. H. J. ORMANS.
1905.

Mate in three.
1. Bg7, Kg6; 2. Bh6.

No. 260.
G. HEATHCOTE.
2nd Prize, Swiss Ch. Federation, 1904-05.

Mate in three.
1. Bh5, PxB; 2. Qg3.
Pa4; 2. Bb4.
Bf2; 2. Qa1+.
Pg5; 2. Sf5+.
Sf7; 2. Pc3+.

Added Variations. Types B and F.

In a two-move added-mate waiter, a mate is set in the initial position for every black move; but, no purely waiting key being available, the problem is solved by a key which leaves everything unchanged while allowing some added defences. The theme is not modern at all, although much interest is paid to it at present. A modest affair, like No. 261, will not meet with much admiration nowadays; yet it is thematically and economically pure. In the initial setting Black has only one move. 1. ..., KxS; 2. Bc7 mate. The key adds two new flights, leading to fresh mates.
MIXED (WHITE AND BLACK) THEMES.

No. 261.
J. COLPA.
3rd Prize, Dutch Ch. Association, 1898.

No. 262.
T. KING PARKS.
1st Prize, Football Field, 1908.

Mate in two.

Mate in two.
1. Qa3.

No. 263.
A. TAUBER.
Magyar Sakkvilag, Oct., 1922.

No. 264.
A. TAUBER.
Magyar Sakkvilag, Oct., 1922.

Mate in two.
1. Bg4.

Mate in two.
1. Rg4.
In No. 262 no less than five mates are added, one by the acceptance of the Queen sacrifice and four by the show of joy of the released black Knight.

In modern two-movers added mates are principally introduced in connection with changed mates: only now and then do we encounter a pure added mate. I cannot refrain from quoting a delicious pair of twins from *Magyar Sakkvilag*: Nos. 263 and 264.

Longer problems with added variety are scarce. Their composition is difficult and the solver must be made aware of the set mating combinations before he solves the problem, or he will lose whatever point the composer has succeeded in preparing. For instance, in No. 265 the pawns at a4 and a5 will give the solver a hint that the black King is to be given added freedom to the west, and he is liable to solve the problem without ever recognizing the fact that it is an added mate waiter. This constructive difficulty has served to

No. 265.
**DR. J. DOBRUSKY.**
*Zlata Praha, 1890.*

```
Mate in three.
Pd5 or Pe5; 2. Qg4+.
```

No. 266.
**G. HEATHCOTE.**
*Chess Amateur, Nov., 1921.*

```
Mate in three.
1. Kh8, Sf7+; 2. Kg7.
Sb4 moves; 2. RxSg5+.
RxP; 2. Re4+.
```

limit the composition of added mate ideas to rather simple positions; and the field doubtless offers many opportunities for bolder experimenters. In No. 265, if the solver studies the problem, he will find simple set mates after 1. ..., Pe5, Pd5, depending on the
same continuation in either case. No. 266 looks more complicated, but most of Black's moves cause short mates. Only 1. ..., Sb4 moves and RxP are three-move lines. After 1. ..., Sf7, White may checkmate at once by 2. Re4, or he may wait a bit and play 2. Kg7 first. The latter possibility will be overlooked until the surprising key is discovered. Strictly speaking there is no addition at all, only the correction of a dual, by eliminating a short mate and forcing the full length variation, yet the impression of something new is perfect.

That the added mate theme is indeed a very old one is proved by the four-mover, No. 267, dating from 1856. The added play here is very modest and only appears at Black's third move, but the problem is thematically correct and may be looked upon as the forefather of modern added mates. It will be clear, that in the initial position, after 1. ..., Ke6, White has the continuation 2. Sd6, Kd5; 3. Sb5, Ke6; 4. Sc7 mate. There is no further addition in the actual solution beyond 3 ..., Kc6, followed by a dual mate 4. Sc7 or Sc3. Yet the theme is clear cut and interesting, even today.

![Chess Diagram]

No. 267.
H. Eichstadt.
_Deutsche Schachzeitung_, Oct., 1856.

Mate in four.
1. Ba4, Ke6; 2. Sd6, Kd5;
3. Sb5.

Changed Mates and Variations. (The Mutate).
Types C and G.

If in a problem of two or more moves a mate or mating combination is set after every black move and White has no pure waiting move, the solution clearly must disturb certain of the mates or mating combinations, providing others in their stead. If the key introduces a threat, the problem is called a block-threat, a type discussed in the next section. Where no threat exists, we speak of a changed mate if some change in the mating position is essential; or of a change of mating combination, or changed variation, if the change of an entire line of play is essential. In two-movers the distinction is of small importance, as a true mating combination is
rarely present; but in longer problems it is usually a change of mating combinations which draws the attention.

Nos. 268 and 269 are two examples in two-moves, chosen at random out of the wealth of materials which this theme presents. Both are pure changed mates, not changed variations. In No. 268, 1. ..., Rc5 initially is met by 2. Sxb4 and 1. ..., Pf4 by 2. Qe4. The key may be considered as a static move of the white Knight, that is a move with no strategical effect, yet bringing some change in the guard over the squares in the King's field. After this key, we find 1. ..., Rc5; 2. Qe6 mate; and 1. ..., Pf4; 2. Qh5 mate; besides an added mate after 1. ..., Kc5; 2. Qc6 mate.

No. 268.
H. D'O. BERNARD.

Mate in two.
1. Sb8.

No. 269.
G. C. ALVEY.

Mate in two.
1. Rd3.

It may be left to the reader to puzzle over the more complicated changes contained in No. 269.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the characteristic elements in a changed mate problem, a few examples may be given of two-movers with changed variations.

In Nos. 268 and 269 the changes in the mating positions were of interest, much more than were the actual moves leading to these changes. Nos. 270 and 271 show just the reverse effect. In No. 270 the mates 1. ..., Rd4; 2. Qxd4 and 1. ..., Re3; 2. Qf5, in the actual
MIXED (WHITE AND BLACK) THEMES.

No. 270.
A. C. White.
2nd Prize, Good Companions,
April, 1918.

Mate in two.
1. Kc3.

No. 271.
J. Hartong.
Tijdschrift, Dutch Chess Assn.,
Feb., 1921.

Mate in two.

solution are true copies of the set 1. .... Re3; 2. Qxe3 and 1. ...., Rd4; 2. Qf5; whilst the mate 1. ...., Rh4; 2. Sc5 is identical with the set 1. ...., Re6; 2. Sc5. The whole interest centres on the black play, especially on the change of rôles between the two black Rooks. Hence we may speak of No. 270 as a changed mating combination, or more simply as containing changed variations.

Again, in No. 271 we meet a first class strategical key. It is a line-clearance for the white Queen, allowing 1. ...., Sd3+; 2. QxS; and at the same time it is an anti-Bristol obstruction for the white Rook, preventing 1. ...., Sd3+; 2. RxS. The mating position is unchanged, except that the white Queen has been substituted as the mating piece for the white Rook. There is a slight further effect by the modest pawn key, in that the guard of the Pd2 has been abandoned from e3, at the same time that the square d2 has been vacated. Hence after 1. ...., Bxf2, the set mate 2. Sg5 has been converted into the new mate 2. Sd2. Again the change in the mating position is slight. A comparison of these Nos. 270 and 271 with Nos. 268 and 269 should sufficiently demonstrate the way in which changed variations differ from changed mates.

One of the most interesting groups of changed variation problems are those showing changed themes. While there is artistically no
special reason to present changed themes in complete waiting move form, and occasionally, as in No. 256, some real disadvantage in so doing, yet the fact remains that the majority of changed themes hitherto have been in this complete waiter form. Nos. 272 and 273 are examples of two different changed themes. In No. 272, the theme itself, a black Grimshaw interference, remains the same, while White's mating moves in the thematic variations are changed. In No. 273, the masked Queen-knight battery is converted into a full-fledged Queen-pawn battery.

Some changed mates strike one as particularly pretty or complicated, others only as minor changes. Yet it is possible to attempt a more exact judgment, in spite of the fact that the

**No. 272.**

**L. S. Penrose.**


Mate in two.

Set mates:

1. ..., Rg2; 2. Bf3 mate.
2. Bg2; 2. Qxe3 mate.
3. Pe2; 2. Sd2 mate.

Solution:

1. Kh5, Rg2; 2. Qf3 mate.
2. Bg2; 2. Qg4 mate.
3. Pe2; 2. Qxd3 mate.

**No. 273.**

**H. van Beek.**

*2nd Prize, Haagsche Post, 1921.*

Mate in two.

Set mates:

1. ..., BxP; 2. SxB mate.
2. Ba3; 2. SxB mate.
3. BxR; 2. Be5 mate.
4. Bc3; 2. PxB mate.

Solution:

1. Qa1, BxP; 2. Pb4 mate.
2. Ba3; 2. PxB mate.
4. Bc3; 2. PxB mate.
influence of personal taste will and must always dominate in matters of art. The formula suggested in the following paragraph may interest a few of my readers mathematically inclined. Others are warned to turn the page and proceed to more congenial matters.

The suggested formula is based on the concept that every piece, white or black, may influence the game by its active force (the power exerted upon certain squares), or by its passive force (the fact that it occupies a square, preventing other pieces from occupying or passing across it). Now any move may imply a change of either or of both of these forces; but in our formulas it will be convenient to consider a force only where it is actually essential to the course of the solution. Let us call a gain of active force +A, a loss —A, and an unchanged active force 0A; a gain of passive force +P, a loss —P, and no change 0P: then we can symbolize the effect of every move, white or black, so far as its influence on the solution is concerned, by four letters. For instance, in No. 268, the key brings an important change in the active force of the Sa6, the control over e5 being changed into that over c6. The change of passive force is not interesting, no lines of any importance being obstructed or opened. Hence the key of No. 268 may be formulated: +A, —A; 0P. The reader may verify the formulas for these additional keys: No. 269: +A, —A; +P (+P, because of 1. ..., Pd4; 2. Qxd4 mate); No. 271: —A, +P, —P; No. 273: +A, —A, 0P. In Nos. 270 or 272, and generally in all problems where the white King moves, or where pinning or checking features are introduced, it will be convenient to formulate them as changes of passive King force. Hence: No. 270: +A, —A, +P, —P.

If we give the corresponding formulas for the black moves, in the thematic variations, we get a symbol for the entire problem. For instance, in No. 268, 1. ..., Rc5 is 0A, +P, alike before and after the key, the change in the mate being due solely to the influence of the key-move. On the other hand, 1. ..., Pf4 is before the key: —A, 0P (loss of guard over e4); and after the key: 0A, —P (opening of h5-d5). These results of the black moves may be combined by writing them: 0A, +P and —A, 0P.

Studying all the possible permutations of these formulas, we find that there are nine possible changed mate key groups, and eighty-one permutations for each and every black changed mate. The possibilities for complex problems, with several changed mates, are therefore enormous. While the classifier may enjoy formulating his available materials, and the student may enjoy experimenting to fill gaps in the classification after it has been made, the general reader may content himself with realizing once more the boundless possibilities of the chess problem by wondering at the extent of this single domain as revealed by this single example.
No. 274.
T. R. Dawson.
Gazette-Times, 12 Sept., 1915.

Mate in three.
1. Kb7, Ka5; 2. Sc6+, Kb5;
3. Pc4 mate.

No. 275.
T. R. Dawson.
Gazette-Times, 12 Sept., 1915.

Mate in three.
1. Ka7, Ka5; 2. Sb7+, Kb5;

No. 276.
S. Loyd.
Chess Monthly, April, 1859.

Mate in three.
Set: 1. ..., Ra2, b2, etc.; 2. Rh1+. Set:
Solution:
1. Rg5, Rh1; 2. Rg2.
R else; 2. RxPh5+.

No. 277.
J. Obermann.
1881.

Mate in three.
1. ..., Pd4; 2. Sg1.
Kd4; 2. Qc7.
MIXED (WHITE AND BLACK) THEMES.

In problems of more than two-moves, the changed mate or changed variation offers wide perspectives also. Most of the examples in three and four moves are changed variations; only the very simple Nos. 274 and 275 might still be looked upon as changed mates. They constitute a pretty pair of twins.

Nos. 276 and 277 may surprise the reader by the dates of their publication. No. 278 is a more intricate and a beautiful example; while No. 279 closes our selection with an ingenious change of variation in four moves.

No. 278.
L. SCHOR.
3rd Prize, Good Companions, April, 1923.

No. 279.
B. J. DE C. ANDRADE.
Westminster Gazette, April, 1923.

Mate in three.

Set: 1. ..., Ke4; 2. Bc2+.
Pe4; 2. Re5.

Solution: 1. Rg1, Ke4; 2. Bc2+.
PnP; 2. Sd2.
Pe4; 2. Se3.

Mate in four.

Set: 1. ..., Pd5; 2. Bh7, Pd6;

Solution: 1. Ba2, Pd5; 2. Bb1, Pd6;
3. RxPd2.

Block Threats. Types D and H.

If under the circumstances mentioned at the beginning of the previous section White's key contains a threat, the problem is termed a Block-threat.

In some cases, most of Black's set moves, giving rise to separate variations, remain as defences in the actual solution against the
threat introduced by the key. This is shown very cleverly in No. 280. In other cases, nothing at all is carried over of the original scheme, a feature often met with in miniatures, such as the favourite No. 281.

No. 280.
J. J. Rietveld.
1st Prize, Ostdeutsche Morgenpost, 1923.

Mate in two.
1. Rf5.

No. 281.
H. Weenink.
Good Companions, April, 1919.

Mate in two.
1. Sd5.

Usually in the block-threats, the threat amounts to an added mate, though there are also instances where one of the set mates is converted into the threat. Besides the threat, block-threats usually contain some other changed and added mates. Thus No. 282 introduces a changed mate, after 1. ..., Qf5+, and half a dozen added mates by the released black Queen.

A rare form of block-threat is the block-check, in which the key is a check, and the threat a direct attack to capture the black King! No. 283 illustrates the variety possible even in so violent a style of problem.

Block-threat three-movers, although still rather scarce, are perhaps more numerous than pure changed-variation three-movers. No. 284 is a fine elaborate example, and No. 285 a more strategic one.
MIXED (WHITE AND BLACK) THEMES.

No. 282.—Dr. H. W. Bettmann.
V., Good Companions, April, 1921.

No. 283.—A. Ellerman.
5th Hon. Men., Good Companions, April, 1920.

Mate in two.
1. Qe3.

No. 284.—Dr. N. Höeg.
Deutsches Wochenschach, 1910.

No. 285.—D. Przepiorka.
Schweizerische Schachzeitung, 1915.

Mate in two.
1. Re6+.

Mate in three.
Set: 1. ..., Pg6; 2. Sf6+.
BxP; 2. Qh7+.

Solution:
BxP; 2. QxP+.
KxS; 2. PxP.
PxP; 2. SxP.

Set: 1. ..., S moves; 2. takes S.

SxS; 2. Rh6.
Se3; 2. PxS.
Se5 or h2; 2. RxS.
Pseudo Two-movers. Type I.

A pseudo two-mover is a problem in which the initial position shows a set mate for every Black move, but in which there is no actual two-move solution. The true key converts the position from an apparent two-mover into a problem of three-moves or more. There are two main possibilities. (1) White loses a move and brings about the initial position or its near equivalent, with Black to play. (2) There is a solution in three or more moves having no relationship to the set mates.

The losing of a move requires a solution in at least four moves, and there are frequent cases where much longer lines of play are required (No. 334). Loss of a move may be achieved by King, Queen, Rook, or Bishop, but not by the Knight. If the white King is used, the result is usually triangulation, well-known to end-game players. No. 286 shows this in pseudo-two-move form. No. 287 has a larger triangle, described by the white Queen.

No. 286.
F. SACKMANN.

Akad. Monatshefte, May, 1912.

Mate in four.
1. Ke1, Qa5+; 2. Kf1, Qa6; 3. Ke2.

No. 287.
C. C. W. MANN.

Deutsche Schachzeitung, Feb., 1893.

Mate in four.
1. Qa8, Kh6; 2. Qh8+, Kg5; 3. Qh1.
(Pf5, 2. Qd8+, Kh6; 3. Qh8+.)

The two different classes of the pseudo two-mover are illustrated in the twins, Nos. 288 and 289. The former again is Queen-triangulation; in the latter, though the black force has been strengthened,
No. 288.  
H. WEEINK.  
_Tijdschrift_ Dutch Chess Assn.,  
Dec., 1916.

Mate in four.

1. Qa6, Ke4;  2. Qc4+, Kf5;  

No. 289.  
H. WEEINK.  
_Tijdschrift_ Dutch Chess Assn.,  
Dec., 1916.

Mate in three.

1. Qd6, Ke4;  2. Kg4.

There is a simple three-move solution. If it were not accompanied by its twin brother it would not possess any interest at all.

The losing of a move is an interesting theme, but it does not admit of great variety of treatment. The possibilities of the arbitrary pseudo-two-mover are much more extensive. One of its attractions lies in the fact that the solver is hardly likely to overlook the set mates, as is so likely to occur in the regular changed or added variation three-movers.

Nos. 290 and 291 demonstrate that pointed and strategical play can be presented in the pseudo-two-move form. No. 290 has a beautiful thematic try, almost a theme in itself: 1. Qf6, KxS; and now White is again under obligation to move and no waiting move remains. No. 291 is a pseudo-Indian, by which is meant that the white moves show the strategic sequence of an Indian combination, although the reason for the retreat of the white Bishop is not an impending stalemate, but simply a consequence of the obligation to move. It is one of the many modern elaborations of the theme of No. 267. The change in treatment, between the added mate form of No. 267, and the false two-move setting of No. 291, is very interesting. The latter must travel under the double title: Pseudo-Indian pseudo-two-mover, thus being doubly misleading in its solution.
Cumulative Effects. **Type K.**

The changed mate two-mover always offers certain difficulties to its composer, with respect to its accuracy. These difficulties increase where it is desired to present more than one complete waiting move two-mover by way of continuations in a problem of three or more moves. Yet the task so presented is a suggestive one, productive of unexpected and original results.

The better to understand the meaning of cumulative waiting move efforts, let us analyze the solution of No. 292. Here there is a mate on the second move set in expectation of the withdrawal of the Be8: 1. ... B any; 2. Qh8 mate. But there is no
set mate after 1. ..., Kd4, nor any set continuation. The key provides an immediate mate for this impending defence, namely: 1. ..., Kd4; 2. Sf3 mate; but at the same time the key surrenders the mate set after the moves of the black Bishop. The key however provides a second-move threat, 2. Qg7, which restricts the actual defences of the Bishop to 1. ..., Bd7 and Bf7. After each of these moves there arises a complete waiting position, since, if the Bishop were to move away again, the threat, 2. Qg7, would return into service. But it is only after 1. ..., Bd7 that a waiting move exists: 2. Kb1. This constitutes a complete waiter variation. After 1. ..., Bf7; 2. Kb1, Black could check, so further search is necessary to find 2. Bh6, creating an added mate variation, owing to the new 2. ..., Kf6; 3. Sg4 mate.

No. 293 also contains a pure waiter and an added mate waiter in the two variations 1. ..., Sf3-g5 and 1. ..., Sf3-d2, besides a lot of by-play that some solvers will praise and others will consider as un thematic adornments. Both Nos. 292 and 293 are three-movers.

No. 293.

DR. J. SCHUMER.


Mate in three.

1. Qe2, Sf3-g5; 2. Ka5, j
Sf3-d2; 2. Rh7. j
Se4-g5; 2. Sg6-f4.
Sf6; 2. SxP+.
K6; 2. Sf8+.
Kg4; 2. Sg6-f4+.

No. 294.

J. HARTONG.

Op de Hoogte, 1919.

Mate in three.

1. Ke4, Sf4; 2. Re8, j
Sg7; 2. Sd4, j
containing waiting two-movers as continuations. They have no complete waiting character as three-movers. No. 294, on the contrary, besides containing a complete waiting two-mover (1. ... Sf4) and a changed mate two-mover (1. ... Sg7), is itself, considered as a three-mover, a block-threat, inasmuch as in the original setting White has ready the continuations: 1. ... Sg7+ or Sf4; 2. Ke4, and 1. ... Sf6; 2. Sd2. A very remarkable little affair!
Chapter XXIX.

MIXED CLEARANCE.

One would expect mixed analogies of all the possible white and black clearance themes. Yet the mixed clearance has not often been subjected to problematical renderings. Maybe the field will yet offer some new turns, or perhaps it is actually less fertile than the simple white or black clearances.

Mixed square vacating hardly constitutes a theme, as it is only practicable with pawns.

Mixed line vacating is in most cases identical with mixed batteries or mixed ambushes.

Mixed batteries with a white rear-piece are much more numerous than those with a black rear-piece. In No. 295, there is an ambush of the white Queen behind the black Knight. Yet, the ambush character is not the principal feature, because there is a double mixed battery and therefore the attention is divided between the action of the white Queen and that of the white Bishop. The activity of the black Knight, though decidedly charming, is not developed to the point of becoming the problem idea.

No. 295.

DR. J. DOBRUSKY.

Deutsche Schachzeitung, Mch., 1888.

No. 296.

W. A. SHINKMAN.


Mate in two.

1. Qb1.

Mate in two.

1. Qg1.

(246)
MIXED CLEARANCE.

In No. 296 more stress is laid upon the ambush. There is not a complex mixed battery, as in No. 295, but there are two single mixed batteries, an important distinction. The key ambushes behind both the black Knights.

The mixed battery theme is a prolific one. No. 297, a task, contains four ambushes of the white Rook behind the black Rook, each split up into two or three white battery continuations. As a battery orgy the problem has its fantastic effect, though it is otherwise a dull and automatic affair. Thematically it contains three noteworthy points: (1) The four ambushes on White's second move; (2) the possible white interferences on White's third moves; (3) the white battery mates, complicated in some sub-variations (captures of the black Rook on the diagonal a1-h8) by a masked battery effect: 3...., Pb1=Q; 4. Rook mates. The problem can as well be classified under any one of these three heads.

No. 298 is Loyd's lateral rendering of the theme he called the American Indian, an idea having no relation to the Indian Theme of No. 13. No. 298 shows an ambush of the white Rook behind the

No. 297.

D. J. Densmore and G. Hume.

V., The Problem, 28 Nov., 1914.

No. 298.

S. Loyd.

N.Y. State Chess Assn., 22 Feb., 1892.

Mate in four.

1. Qg8, threat; 2. Rd7, Rd3, 4, 5; 3. RxR.
Re2; 2. Re7, Re4, 5, 6; 3. RxR.
Rf2; 2. Rf7, Rf5, 6, x7; 3. RxR.
Rxg2; 2. Rg7, Rg6, x7; 3. RxR.

Mate in two.

1. Ra6, RxB; 2. RxR mate.
black Ra5, with the spectacular flavour developed by the opposing Rooks making their long journeys in opposite directions: 1. Ra6, RxR! Loyd gave an elaborate description of his theme (see Sam Loyd and His Chess Problems, p. 339) emphasizing all the incidental points shown in No. 298: the capture of the white Bishop, the flight giving key, and the rest. These points are in part unthematic, for instance the fact that the black King can capture the Bishop. Such points constitute pretty features, but they have no connection with the ambush key.

Mixed line clearance is rarely encountered. This appears natural, since Black would not clear a line for the benefit of White, unless forced to do so. Black’s part in such mixed strategy belongs under the head of faulty manoeuvres and so it lacks the aesthetic attraction of a more logical sequence of moves. But we have seen that the black interferences, likewise faulty manoeuvres, nevertheless form one of the most fertile problem groups. Hence the rarity of the mixed line clearances is probably less due to their thematic character than to the fact that composers hesitate to leave the usual trodden paths. The theme is old enough, as witness No. 299. Here the variation 1. ..., QxR; 2. Qb6+, is a pure clearance by Black for the benefit of White. No. 300 is not equally pure, inasmuch as the

---

No. 299.

W. Greenwood.

*Cassell’s Family Paper, 1862.*

No. 300.

Dr. H. von Gottschall.

*Offiziers Schachzeitung, 1905.*

---

Mate in three.

1. Qh6, threat; 2. QxP.
   QxR; 2. Qb6+.
   SxR or Sc6; 2. QxQ.

Mate in two.

1. Qg8, QxQ; 2. Bf7 mate.
MIXED CLEARANCE.

black Queen not only clears the diagonal for the white Bishop, but also surrenders her power to interpose at e5. So this problem is a combination of mixed clearance with decoy.

A rare form of cumulative mixed clearance is a theme I have called the Permutation theme, consisting of a white long-range piece aimed at the black King, or at some other important point, but obstructed from commanding that square by the intervening presence of several white and black men. No. 295 in the Loyd Book is an example. Mate becomes possible after all the pieces obstructing the line in question have been removed. The proper order for the pieces to step off the line, and the variety of squares to which they may go, in the different lines of play, sometimes create numerous variations and sub-variations by the mere principle of permutation. A six-move self-mate by A. C. White is said to comprise about two thousand sub-variations, although it is not established that the count has ever been verified.

In the examples of mixed clearance hitherto discussed, the clearance itself was mixed: a piece of one colour cleared the line for the benefit of a second piece of the other colour. No. 301 shows another form of mixed clearances: Note the plural in speaking of a single problem! Here the two main defences of Black, ... Qd5 and Bd5, constitute an anti-Bristol, while White's continuations are line clearances of the ordinary two-move type. Strictly speaking, No. 301 is a combination or mixture of white clearance with black anti-Bristol (or anti-clearance), but we can think of it somewhat incorrectly as a mixture of white and of black clearances. The number of such problems is not large, and it is perhaps not important to coin a new name for them for the sole purpose of segregating them more distinctly from the problems of the mixed clearance type of Nos. 299 and 300.

No. 301.

C. S. KIPPING.

Chess Amateur, May, 1922.

Mate in three.

1. Pd6, Qd5; 2. Rh8.
   Bd5; 2. Ra1.
Chapter XXX.

SHUT-OFFS.

(Mixed Interference and Mixed Blocking.)

Mixed blocking being possible only with pawns, the shut-off is in actual practice virtually identical with mixed interference. As in all mixed themes, there are two groups: (1) White shuts off Black, and (2) Black shuts off White.

Single shut-offs by White are so frequent as not to constitute a theme, so that we must look for task renderings. Such a one is No. 302, where the key shuts off the Rb1 and by anticipation the Qh2, while the mating move 1. ..., BxR; 2. Sd6, shuts off the Ra6 and the Pd7. No. 303 is complicated by a clearing of the b-file, prior to the final shut-off 3. Rb8 mate.

No. 302.

W. A. SHINKMAN.

Jamaica Gleaner, 1 Jan., 1885.

Mate in two.
1. Bb2, BxR; 2. Sd6 mate.

No. 303.

V. MARIN.

1st Prize, Norwich Mercury, Cornered King Ty., 1903-4.

Mate in three.
1. Qc6, PxQ; 2. Sa3, PxS;
3. Rb8 mate.
RB; 2. Qc1.
Rc8; 2. RxPb4+.

(250)
SHUT-OFFS.

Shut-offs may be combined with black interference to bring about some very surprising effects. In No. 304, Black’s $1, \ldots, Sb6$ and White’s subsequent mate manage to nullify the attack of six black pieces on the line c7-c4, the attack of two of these pieces being double.

Finally the shut-off may be shown to good advantage by a preceding line-vacating with a return of the vacating piece to its initial square after a black critical move across this square. This is one of the most interesting forms of the switchback theme, and may be called the shut-off switchback (No. 305). It has also been called, more picturesquely, the “Guillotine Theme,” and again the “Mouse Trap Theme.” See No. 108.

No. 304.
C. Mansfield.

Good Companions, 22 Feb., 1916.

Mate in two.
1. $Qe5$, $Sb6$; 2. $Sb7$ mate.

No. 305.
F. Köhnelein.

Münchener Neueste Nachrichten,
1908.

Mate in two.
1. $Sc5$, $BxQ$; 2. $Se6$ mate.

A curious subdivision of the shut-off themes is that occurring in No. 306, which the composer defined as follows: “The black Rook and Bishop command a white battery and are so placed that the white Bishop cannot shut-off more than one at a time. The theme consists in decoying these black pieces to squares whence the white Bishop can shut-off both simultaneously.” Of course the theme may be modified by the use of several different combinations of theme pieces. No. 307 gives a three-fold rendering, in which the white Bishop shuts off the black Queen and Bishop. The idea was
No. 306.—G. C. Alvey.
Hampshire Post, 25 May, 1913.

Mate in two.
1. Qa3, RxQ; 2. Bc3 mate.
Bb6+; 2. Bd4 mate.

No. 307.—J. Hartong.
Tidskrift, May, 1921.

Mate in two.
1. Qf2, Bb8; 2. Be5 mate.
QxR; 2. Bc5 mate.
Qb7+; 2. Bb6 mate.

No. 308.—B. M. Neill.
Philadelphia Times, Jan., 1882.

Mate in two.
1. Qh2, BxQ; 2. Bg3 mate.

No. 309.—J. Hartong.
1st Prize, Western Morning News and Mercury, 1922.

Mate in two.
1. Qa8, BxQ; 2. Bb7 mate.
first shown incidentally in a prize-winner by G. Heathcote in the Liverpool Mercury, 1893 (No. 18 in Chess Idylls).

In No. 306, as well as in No. 307, in the initial position, White can already shut off either of the commanding black pieces, but not both. An analogous idea may be given in the form of No. 308, where the black Rook cannot be shut off in the initial position, but where this possibility arises from a black critical move, which is at the same time a mixed line clearance. The main point of difference with problems of the type of Nos. 306 and 307 is that in the latter the sense of the line of action of the decoyed black piece is the same as the sense of the line connecting the initial square of the decoyed piece with the initial point of intersection of the lines of action of the two black pieces, whilst in Nos. 308 and 309 the sense is opposite.

No. 308 is interesting because of the early date of publication. No. 309 extends the theme slightly further by its odd key-move, which in its turn clears the way for both Bishops. It is a happy combination of mixed clearance and shut-off.
CHAPTER XXXI.

DECOY: ROMANS.

In the preceding chapters the decoy device has already been spoken of as an auxiliary manoeuvre. As a theme it has not been cultivated very much by English composers and even to-day the interesting Roman decoy is little understood in England. In order to deal with the subject comprehensively, different names must be used for the different types of decoy. Unfortunately the English language does not lend itself to arbitrary combinations of prepositions and nouns, so that it is difficult to obtain equivalents for the German terms (such as Hinenkung, Einlenkung, etc.) without coining clumsy paraphrases. Hitherto the authoritative literature on the decoy has been principally German, so to establish points of contact the German terminology will be given also as we proceed.

First, it must be well understood that the problematical interpretation of a Decoy is somewhat different from the meaning of the word in ordinary speech. If a black piece is said to be “decoyed,” this need not mean that Black has made a mistake. In most cases the decoy will occur in Black’s best defence, or else the decoy would not be strictly thematic. On the other hand one cannot say that White forces the moves of Black, because in a problem there is not a single line of play, as in a game, but a complex of lines; and if the problem is sound it matters little from the point of view of the ultimate mate which defence Black chooses. Practical players, solving a problem, often reason like this: “The black King cannot go there, because then he is mated thus.” But if Black plays elsewhere, he is mated also. To reason thus of an entire solution would deprive that solution of all movement, and yet it is in the movements of the solution that the theme consists. What the player means is that he looks at the problem in a selective way; for in his games he has become accustomed to making one choice, and disregarding the results of other moves. The problemist does not limit himself to one line of play, actually chosen, but he bears in mind the whole complex of possible variations. Hence the expression “force” or “decoy” means only: “such a move gives Black an opportunity to choose a variation, containing the point of the problem idea.” Sometimes Black’s choice of moves is greatly restricted, as by a checking sacrifice, but the more restricted Black’s choice is made, the less is the aesthetic value of the decoy.

Decoy (Ger.: Ablenkung) is the collective word for problem themes, wherein a black man, the King excepted, is removed from its placement, this removal being essential for the mating process. If (254)
the black King walks to perdition, the Germans speak of Luring In (Hineinziehung), or of Forcing In (Hineinzwingung). This is unimportant as a theme.

Decoy from the original square (Ger.: Weglenkung) consists in enticing a black man from a square, where its presence hinders White's attack.

Decoy to a new square (Ger.: Hinlenkung) consists in enticing a black man to a new square, where its presence will aid White's attack.

The reasons why a black piece must be decoyed from one square or to another may be very different, and upon these varying reasons a further classification of simple decoys may be based. For these details reference must be made to the German booklet treating of the subject: F. Palitzsch: Die Ablenkung, das Element der Indirekten Kombination; Coburg, 1917.

No. 310.
Dr. C. Bayer.
Berliner Schachzeitung, 1858.

No. 311.
A. d'Orville.
c. 1842.

Decoy from a square (Weglenkung). Decoy to a square (Hinlenkung).

Mate in three.
1. Qe3, threat; 2. Qe5+.
   BxQ; 2. Bd8.

Mate in four.
1. Rb6;
2. Pce3;
3. Kc5;
4. PxP mate.

Nos. 310 and 311 will illustrate the decoy in its simplest terms. In No. 310 the black Bishop is decoyed from d2, so that it can no longer parry White's attack: 2. Bd8; 3. BxP mate. This hardly constitutes a theme, and is little more than a technical device to introduce a second Queen sacrifice in the threat.
In No. 311 the black pawn is coaxed to b4, where White can checkmate by capturing it. The problem is so slender that the decoy constitutes its theme, for want of any better; but it clearly belongs to olden times. In No. 310 the decoy acted as a luring away; in No. 311 as a luring in.

The decoy device becomes more vital as it becomes more complex. The simple decoy theoretically needs only two moves: the key decoys and the second move mates. Often, as in No. 310, White takes an extra move to benefit from the advantage offered by the decoy. Or, as in No. 311, the piece decoyed must be allowed further motion before the advantage of the decoy can be availed of. But, if the decoy is to be extended to more than two moves, it is better to introduce some thematic extension, by some consecutive or cumulative effect as in Nos. 312 or 313.

No. 312.
DR. F. PALITZSCH.
_Deutsche Schachblätter, 1911._

(Cumulative decoy.)

Mate in four.
1. Rh2, RxR; 2. Bh3, RxB;

No. 312 is a consecutive simple decoy. 1. Kd6 is defeated by 1... Rd2; hence the black Rook must be decoyed from the second rank. This cannot be achieved in one move, but it may be achieved by two consecutive decoys. The problem itself is very schematic.
This is one of the dangers of intellectual themes, for modern composers, not all as skilful as Kohtz and Kockelkorn, or Köhnlein, often are satisfied with a mere skeleton outline of their themes, neglecting the artistic side. But this is by no means necessary, and a careful handling and polishing of these themes is certain yet to produce many very fine problems.

No. 313 is a cumulative decoy. It is a complicated study. 1. Bg8 is defeated by 1. ..., Re7, not by 1. ..., Sg5, inasmuch as then 2. Bd4+ would mate in three. So it seems sufficient to decoy the black Rook. But if White uses up his moves, trying to decoy the Rook, the black Knight will have time to become dangerous. Hence both pieces must be decoyed, and it is a nice surprise to find the Knight decoyed not only away from its present post but also to c7, where it helps to make the decoy of the Rook effective, by interfering on the line b7-h7.

The Roman Theme.

One of the subdivisions of the decoy theme which has proved very elastic and fertile is the Roman decoy, often simply called the Roman Theme.

The distinction between an ordinary decoy, No. 310, and a Roman is as follows: In an ordinary decoy of a black piece away from a square, the decoyed piece cannot prevent any longer a threat of White, which it could prevent in the initial position. In a Roman decoy the decoyed piece can still defend against an initial try in an analogous way, but such a defence develops a weakening of the black position that would not have developed before the decoy.

A comparison between Nos. 310 and 314 will make this clear. In No. 310, the try 1. Bd8 is defeated by 1. ..., Ba5. After the decoy: 1. Qe3, BxQ, the threat 3. Bxb6 cannot be prevented by any move of the decoyed Bishop. In No. 314 the try 1. Qb1, threatening 2. Qb8 mate, is defeated by 1. ..., Bg3. The key, 1. Qg7, with the threat 2. QxQd7 decoys (in the problematical sense of the word) the black Bishop to e7. Thereupon the white Queen can occupy the b-file: 2. Qb2, threatening 3. Qb8 mate, as before. The black Bishop can still defeat this threat, exactly as it could before, by 2. ..., Bd6, but its decoy now causes this defence to bring it to the unfortunate square d6, where it interferes with the Pd7, permitting the new mate 3. Qg2. This interference with the Pd7 is the weakening of Black's position which, being caused by a decoy, constitutes a Roman Theme.

The Romans are subdivided, according to the character of the weakening caused by the defence after the decoy. In No. 315, the oldest Roman extant, the try 1. Qh8 is defeated by 1. ..., Bf6+. After the decoy of the black Bishop (the checking key is typical of
MIXED (WHITE AND BLACK) THEMES.

No. 314.
J. Möller.
_Skakbladet, 1911._

No. 315.
H. E. Kidson.
_Cassell’s Family Paper, 1858._

![Chessboard diagrams showing Mate in three moves for each.]

1. Qg7, threat; 2. QxP.
   Be7; 2. Qb2, Bd6;
   3. Qg2 mate.

1. Qh2+, Bf4; 2. Qh8, Be5+;
   3. Rc3 mate
   (Sf4; 2. Qb2.)

the date of composition) 1. Qh2+, Bf4; Black can still play:
2. Qh8, Be5+; but the defence now causes a new weakening effect,
namely the blocking of e5, and White can mate by 3. Rc3. Hence
we call No. 315 a Blocking-Roman, just as we might have called
No. 314 an Interference-Roman. The complete classification is as
follows:

A. Obstruction-(Blocking-, Paralysing-, and Interference-
Romans, a group German authors indicate by the collective term:
Verstellungs-Römer.

B. Capture-Romans. (Ger.: Schlag-Römer): in which the
weakening consists in the exposure of the decoyed piece to capture,
when it defends against the threat.

C. Clearance-Romans. (Ger.: Räumungs-Römer): the defending
Black piece, after its decoy, captures a White piece, thus clearing a
line for the benefit of White.

D. Waiting-Romans. (Ger.: Zugzwang-Römer): Not Romans
in waiting-move form, as the name might suggest, but decoys
culminating in waiting move endings, a theme best explained with
the examples.
DECOY: ROMANS.

A. Obstruction Romans.

This group is by far the largest. In particular the subdivision Interference Romans again contains several specific themes. For instance No. 314 was a Pawn-Grimshaw Roman, while No. 317 is a Grimshaw Roman. The examples, with their solutions, will doubtless be sufficiently clear. In each case the thematic try must be noted. Thus, in No. 316, 1. Kb7, Bf6; and, in No. 317, 1. Qh2, Rc7. These tries always reappear, sometimes in slightly modified form, as the second move of White in the mainplay, and the Roman interest lies in finding the particular weakening caused when Black still endeavours to thwart them with the decoyed piece.

No. 316.
K. A. L. KUBBEL.
Deutsche Schachblätter, 3 July, 1910.

King-Blocking Roman.

Mate in three.
1. Sg3, BxS; 2. Kb7, Be5;
3. Pxe4 mate.

threat; 2. Qb5+.

No. 317.
J. BRUSK1.
Deutsches Wochenschach, 1906.

(Crimshaw)-Interference Roman.

Mate in three.
1. Sg6, Rxe5; 2. Qh2, Rc6;
3. Sb5 mate.

threat; 2. Qf2+.

Kc3; 2. Qe1+.

One of the possible effects of black interference is the unpinning of a white piece. This is given a Roman interpretation in No. 318, where 2. ... Bf6, instead of the initial 1. ..., Bxg5, as answer to White's Qd5, causes the unpinning of the Se6.

No. 319 has the try: 1. Sd3, Be7. After the decoy: 1. Rg3, BXR;
No. 318.
J. Möller.
Skakbladet, 1911.

Unpin (by interference). Roman.
Mate in three.
1. Qh1, Bb2; 2. Qd5, Bf6;
3. Se6xP mate.
(BxP; 2. Qh8+.)

2. Sd3, Bd6, the black Bishop obstructs the Se8. Inasmuch as a blocking obstruction of a black piece (Piece-Blocking) always needs two moves to be illustrated in a problem, as mentioned in connection with No. 225, this kind of obstruction Roman is necessarily a four-mover at best.

Cumulative efforts will be treated in the closing section of the chapter.

B. Capture Romans.

The classic example of the Roman Theme, No. 112, is a capture Roman, and it has already been discussed. Another fine problem by the same authors is No. 320. Here the thematic try is 1. Qh8, frustrated by 1. ..., Rb4. Hence the decoy of the black Rook, so that it can be captured at the third move.

No. 321 is a cumulative rendering, containing two capture Romans, one with decoy of the black Bishop, the other with decoy of the black Rook. Besides, there is this peculiarity, that the white
DECOY: ROMANS.

No. 320.

J. KOHTZ and C. KOCKELKORN.

*Deutsches Wochenschach*, 1906.

![Chessboard diagram](image)

**Capture-Roman.**

Mate in four.

1. Sc5, RxS; 2. Qh8, Rco4; 3. SxR.

(Rb6; 2. Qe5+, Kh6; 3. Qh8+.)

---

No. 321.

J. KOHTZ and C. KOCKELKORN.


![Chessboard diagram](image)

**Double Capture-Roman.**

Mate in three.

1. Qf2, BxQ; 2. Sf4-e6, Bo5; 3. SxB mate.

RxB; 2. Sd5, Rf6; 3. SxR mate.

---

C. Clearance Romans.

The clearance Roman, also called Roman sacrificial-clearance (Ger.: Römische Opfer-Räumung) or Annihilation-Roman, is shown in No. 322. The thematic try: 1. Sb3, is defeated by 1. ..., Bb4. After the decoy: 1. Rg3, BxR; 2. Sb3, the black Bishop, still endeavouring to defeat: 3. Sc5+, KxS; 4. Qd7 mate, plays 2. ..., Bxd6, but now the white obstacle at d6 is removed and after 3. Sc5+, Bxc5; 4. Qd7 mates.

In No. 323, White need not wait until the fourth move, because it is not necessary that the line h4-b4 be absolutely cleared; it suffices, that the black Bishop pins itself, when trying to defend against the
Clearance-Roman.
Mate in four.

Self-pin-Roman.
Mate in three.
1. Sf5, BxS; 2. SxPf4, BxP + ;
3. Sd3 mate.
(threat; 2. Qe1++; PxS; 2. Qf6.)

threat. This theme belongs in the present subdivision only by analogy. Further the example chosen is not thematically pure, because the defence after the decoy, 2. Bxe4, is not perfectly parallel to the defence before the decoy: 1. Sxf4, Bfr. The key has an element of simple decoy away from h3 in it.

D. Waiting Romans.

Problems of this group are very rare. The idea is attributed to D. Przepiorka (b. 1880), but No. 324 may be selected as the best rendering. If White tries: 1. Sxb5, Black mates, an unusual retort to a thematic try! But even the simple decoy: 1. Rh7, RxR; 2. Sxb5, is not sufficient, because of 2. ... Rd7, preventing both 3. Sa7 and Sd4. If White now had a waiting move he could mate at his fourth move, but such a waiting move does not exist. Hence the black Rook is first decoyed to the d-file, before the decoy away from
the first rank begins. In this way the black Rook reaches d7 before White's 3. Sxh5. Thus the burden of making a passive move is transferred from White's shoulders to Black, and the problem is solved.

The solver should note that there is really a consecutive Roman effect here. The decoy of the black Rook from the first rank to the seventh rank, substitutes 3. ..., Ra7+, instead of 1. ..., Ra1+, as an analogous effect if White plays Sxb5; but this is only a capture Roman decoy, such as we have already met in three move form in No. 321. The waiting manœuvre is brought about by decoying the Rook from the h-file to the d-file.

Waiting-Roman.
Mate in four.
1. Rd5, Rd1; 2. Rd7, RxR; 3. SxP.

E. Cumulative and Complex Renderings.

The most frequent way to accumulate Roman effects in a problem is by the presentation of collateral decoys in separate variations, as has already been shown in the double Capture Roman, No. 321. No. 325 contains an unpin-interference Roman, 1. ..., Bxf8, combined with a capture Roman, 1. ..., Bd6; No. 326 contains two unpinning-interference Romans. In this problem the method of decoying the black Bishop is simply by having a waiting key, allowing Black to decoy himself, as it were. This system is frequently adopted, but it has no connection with the Waiting Romans of section D. The key of No. 326 provides for the continuations; in the initial position 1. Sf1 and Sd1 are no tries, a thematic weakness due perhaps to the difficulty of the theme. There are several authorities who would argue that the problem was not a Roman at all.

In both Nos. 325 and 326 the two decoy variations are brought about after defences by the same black piece. In Nos. 327 and 328, as well as in No. 321, the two Roman lines follow moves by separate black pieces. No. 327 combines a capture Roman, 1. ..., Rh1xh4,
No. 325.—H. Rübesamen.
V. Münchener Neueste Nachrichten, 1907.

Mate in three.
1. Rf8, BxR; 2. Sc6, Bg7;
3. Sh4 mate.
Bd6; 2. Kh8, Be5+ ; 3. SxR mate.
RxS ; 2. Kh7.

No. 326.—M. Niemeijer.
Oprechte Haarlemsche Courant, 28 July, 1922.

Mate in three.
1. Rh2, Be7 ; 2. Sf1, Bb4 ;
3. Se5 mate.
Bf6 ; 2. Sd1, Bd4 ;
3. Sd2 mate.
B else ; 2. QxP.
Pb2 ; 2. Sc2.

No. 327.—F. Köhnlein.
Süddeutsche Schachblätter, 1907.

Mate in three.
1. Rh4, Rh1xR; 2. Se3, Ro4 ;
3. SxR mate.
Rh8xR; 2. Sc1, Rb4 ;
3. Ra2 mate.

No. 328.—F. Köhnlein.
Münchener Neueste Nachrichten,
19 May, 1907.

Mate in three.
1. Rh5, BxR; 2. Sa3, Be2 ;
RxR; 2. Se5, Rf5 ; 3. Qd3 mate.
DECOY: ROMANS.

with a blocking Roman, 1. ... Rh8xh4. No. 328 blends two interference Romans, with the strategic point that the decoy Bishop interferes with the Rook, and in turn the Rook, when he is decoyed, interferes with the Bishop. It is a mutual interference Roman, in spite of the fact that the interferences occur on different squares.

We have already met a consecutive Roman in No. 324. Another instance, built on very different lines, is No. 329. Here the try: 1. Sg3, is defeated by 1. ..., Bb5 as well as by 1. ..., Bh5. After the first decoy of the black Bishop: 1. Pd7, BxP, the try 2. Sg3 is no longer defeated by 2. ..., Bg4, owing to the Roman interference of the Rh4, but it may still be defeated by 2. ..., Bb5. After the second decoy: 2. Re6, BxR, both of Black's retorts have been provided for, since 3. ..., Bc4 is also a Roman interference.

No. 329.  
E. ALTMAN.  
Deutsches Wochenschach, 26 Nov., 1916.

Mate in four.  
1. Pd7, BxP; 2. Re6, BxR; 3. Sg3, Bc4; 4. BxP mate.

No. 330.  
H. RÜBESAMEN.  
Münchener Neueste Nachrichten, 1909.

Mate in four.  
1. Rf1, Rb1; 2. Be1, RxB; 3. Rf7, Re7; 4. Rf6 mate.

No. 330 shows Roman play complicated in a new fashion. The play is no longer consecutive, as in Nos. 324 and 329, since it is a single defence of the black Rook only which must be met, namely 1. ..., R to seventh rank, after 1. Rf7. The Roman student will see easily that the Rook must be decoyed to the e-file, so that 3. ..., Re7
will be a Roman interference of the Bd8. But to force the black Rook across to the e-file it is necessary first to decoy him to the lower regions of the board. There the white Bishop can assist in the good work by sacrificing at e1. This initial move: 1. Rf1, Rb1 is not a separate Roman manoeuvre, but only a preliminary single decoy to the first rank (a non-Roman "Hinlenkung").

Chapter XXXII.
FOCAL ACTION.

This theme, discovered, like so many others, in the English Transition Period, by C. Stanley in 1849 (see No. 331A), was re-animate by von Holzhausen, who dealt with it in a booklet entitled: Brennpunktprobleme, 1908 (enlarged edition, 1926.) No. 331 shows the idea in its simplest form. The Sd3

No. 331.
Dr. O. Dotterweich.
1st Prize, Münchener-Zeitung. 1906.

No. 331A.
C. Stanley (of the Brighton Chess Club).

Mate in two.
1. Sg7.

Mate in three.
1. Sf5, Pgl—Q; 2. Bg2.
FOCAL ACTION.

threatens mate on b2 and e5, if the guard of the black Queen on both squares is relaxed in either direction. Hence the black Queen must continue to guard both squares as long as she can. Such squares von Holzhausen called Foci. In focal problems it is usually possible for the principal black piece, often the Queen, to guard these foci from several squares, and the play consists in obstructing these guards or in otherwise neutralizing them. In No. 331 it will be noticed that the Queen could guard b2 and e5 from b8, were it not for the pawns on the b-file. The presence of these pawns eliminates 1. ..., Qb8 as a focal defence. The only focal defence in the initial position is 1. ..., Qb8, and the solution consists in interfering on the line h8-b2 by the key 1. Sg7. Black is now forced to move, and any possible move of the Queen (there is no other free black piece) surrenders one of the two guards and admits mate.

There are three ways to solve a focal position: (1) The access to new squares from which the foci may be guarded is shut off and the obligation to move becomes fatal to Black; (2) The available squares are made useless to Black and Black is again put under obligation to move; (3) The original square, from which the foci are guarded, is made impracticable (threat). No. 331 was clearly an example of (2), inasmuch as the key left Black free to play 1. ..., Qb8, but made such a move useless. The same problem, after the key, could be solved again by 1. Sh5. (The cooks 1. Se8 and Sf5 need not concern us.) This move of Sg7-h5 would open the diagonal h8-b2, making Qb8 a focal defence; but placing the Knight at h5 prevents access to this square, and brings the problem within group (1). No. 332 is a cumulative rendering, with two thematically pure threat variations, after 1. ..., Re1 and Rf1, both of type (3). There are also two impure variations. After 1. ..., Qg7; 2. Rf6+ is not merely a shut-off of the diagonal g7-a1, but a check also; whilst 1. ..., Qg1; 2. Pd4, introduces a threat, 3. Rd6 mate, apart from the focal interference.

No. 332.

E. Brunner.

Deutsches Wochenschach, 28 June, 1908.

Mate in three.

1. Rf3, Re1; 2. Ra3.
Rf1; 2. Re3.
Qg7; 2. Rf6+.
Qg1; 2. Pd4.
MIXED (WHITE AND BLACK) THEMES.

No. 333.
F. KUNTZE.
1st Pr., Deutscher Schachbund, 1887.

Mate in three.
1. Qg3, QxQ; 2. Se8-d6.
PxB; 2. Sb5-d6.
KxR; 2. RxPf7+.

No. 334.
J. KOHTZ and C. KOCELKORN.
Deutsches Wochenschach, 1907.

Mate in seven.
1. Be6, Qh5; 2. Bh3, Qe5;
3. Bf5, Qe8; 4. Bg4, Qe5;

For so early a problem, No. 333 is already decidedly complex. It has a double set of foci and two guarding black pieces. The black Queen guards d4 and g7; the Bishop guards c7 and g7, and also d4 and c7. The key removes the black Queen’s guard from d4 and g7 in turn, according as Black captures the white Queen with his Queen or with his Pawn, this being focal attack of type (3), although no immediate mate is in view. Either capture leaves one of the pairs of foci controlled only by the black Bishop, so that White can then renew the type (3) attack against the Bishop, playing either of his Knights to d6 according to need, and the problem is solved.

In problems of more than three moves, focal mechanism can be adapted in some ingenious ways to restrict the black Queen’s powers. No. 334 is a fine pseudo-two-mover. No waiting move being available, White manoeuvres with his Bishop, who finally outwalks the Queen. At the sixth move the initial position is resumed, but with Black to play.

The modern tendency for changed mates has not left the focal theme untouched. In No. 335 the initial foci are changed by the key from c4 and g4 to d5 and g2, a flight square being added for good measure; and there is also a changed mate after 1. ... Sf2. In
FOCAL ACTION.

No. 336 the black Rook guards d2 and g3. When the solver has realized that, notwithstanding the light, open setting, there is no waiting move, he will try to change the foci and at first he will suspect that the new foci are to be d2 and g5. It will come as a true surprise to find e2 and g6 serving as such.

No. 335.
C. Promislo.
2nd Pr., Boston Transcript, 1919.

Mate in two.

No. 336.
C. Mansfield.
Morning Post, May, 1923.

Mate in two.
1. Qa6.
CHAPTER XXXIII.
PINNING.

The enormous output of pinning and unpinning two-movers composed in the past ten years might give the impression that this theme has been worked out in all respects and that a classification only had to sort the wealth of existing renderings. But those who consider themes not only with regard to their expression as two-movers, know that in the field of three-movers and longer problems very much yet remains to be done with the pinning principle. Here the possibilities are so numerous and the examples so few that any classification would leave all too many blanks. Hence the classification adopted must be somewhat superficial, passing the various thematic groups in a general review, without going into details regarding the strategic possibilities in longer problems.

Classification of Pin-Problems.

I. Pinning a Black Piece:
   A. White unpins Black;
   B. Black unpins Black;
   C. White pins Black;
   D. Black pins Black;
   E. Prevention of pinning or unpinning.

II. Pinning a White Piece:
   A. White unpins White;
   B. Black unpins White;
   C. White pins White;
   D. Black pins White;
   E. Prevention of pinning or unpinning.

I. Pinning a Black Piece.

The pinning themes are easy to understand, so that the examples hardly require explanation. In No. 339, Black defends against the threat, 2. Qe4 mate, by unpinning his Pd5 in several ways, at the same time blocking again the flight square which White's generous key released. In No. 340, the key admits the threat: 2. Qa4 mate. The somewhat violent character of the pinning key is mitigated by the consideration that White's strongest piece is used against Black's feeble Pawn, an unexpected combination which is not availed of until Black endeavours to defend the threat by such moves as 1. ..., Pe5, Pe6, and Se3, whereupon a series of ingenious pin-mates (270)
No. 337.—L. A. Kuyers.
2nd Prize, Haagsche Post, 1917.

I.A.
Mate in two.
1. Rf3.

No. 338.—H. Weenink.
Hon. Men., Tidsskrift för Schack, 1917.

I.A.
Mate in three.
1. Bf3, Qb6 (threat); 2. Qd5+.
Qc5 (threat); 2. Qf7+.
Qd4+; 2. BxQ.
QxB; 2. RxQ+.
Kf4; 2. Qf8+.

No. 339.—A. Ellerman.
Good Companions, July, 1917.

I.B.
Mate in two.
1. Qa4.

No. 340.—H. E. Knott.

I.C.
Mate in two.
1. Qe8.
develops. The effect of this anticipatory pinning is much more subtle than if the key at once introduced, 2. Sd6, as the threat.

No. 341.
A. LUDANYI.
1st Prize, Neugkeiten Weltblatt, 1912.

I.C.
Mate in three.
1. Pd3, PxP (threat); 2. BxPd7.
RxP ; 2. Od2.
RxP ; 2. QxP.
Bb1 ; 2. Qh1.
SxP ; 2. SxP.

In No. 341, a thematic three-move extension of the idea of No. 340, the Queen-sacrifices atone for the aggressive pinning of the black Rook.

The subdivision, I-D, black self-pins, contains the multiple pin-mates, like No. 26, now very much out of fashion, as well as the more modern tasks, like No. 342, in which six black pieces in turn are pinned on the square e4. But chief of all in this section are the Half-pins. The reader, acquainted with the predominant position of this style of strategy in modern problematics, will understand from the small number of examples illustrative of these half-pins, how rigorous have been the forces shaping this book. Just when a subject is sure to interest many, the kaleidoscope must be turned round to show another pattern.
The definition of the Half-pin has already been given in Section C of Chapter V. (page 71). Suffice it to indicate here that the criterion for thematic purity in the half-pin consists in having both of the half-pinned pieces in turn essentially pinned in different variations by the removal of the "other" black piece. In this sense No. 343 is a clear-cut half-pin. After 1. ..., Bxd4; 2. Qxh4 mate, the Be6 is essentially pinned, while the Bf6 is so after 1. ..., Bd5; 2. Qe7 mate, and after 1. ..., Bd7; 2. Qe5 mate. Where only one of the two pieces is essentially pinned, a problem is called an Incomplete Half-pin.

Nos. 344 and 345 are no combinations of ideas, but plural representations of the same idea, the half-pin.

The half-pin principle is capable of varied extension to problems in three or more moves. By adding a third black piece on a half-pinning line, one advances naturally to the third-pin, as in No. 346, where two moves by Black are required to develop actual pinning situations.

Problems, based on the prevention of pinning or unpinning, are rare. The concept is less a theme than a point, used to give spice to positions embodying other thematic effects. No. 347 is a nice
MIXED (WHITE AND BLACK) THEMES.

No. 345.
C. W. Sheppard.

I.D. **Triple Half-pin.**
Mate in two.
1. **Rf8.**

No. 347.
DR. A. van der Ven.
Tijdschrift N. S. B., July, 1913.

I.E. **Prevented Unpinning.**
Mate in two.
1. Pf5.

I.D. **Third-pin.**
Mate in three.
1. Bg5, SxP; 2. Sg7+, BxS;
   3. Pe4 mate.
Se6; 2. Pe4+, BxP; 3. Rf7 mate.
Be4; 2. Sg7+, BxS; 3. PxP mate.
Be6; 2. Pe4+, SxP; 3. Sg7 mate.

specimen. Here mates are set after all possible Black moves, except 1. ..., Bd7. To prevent this unpinning-defence White allows the black King a flight.

II. **Pinning a White Piece.**

Unpinning of White by his own forces is not a very artistic means of opening a solution. As a give-and-take key (namely, a key combining a good with a bad element, in most cases the granting of a flight and the cutting off of another) such an unpin
may sometimes appear. It may also be found in longer problems, such as Nos. 242 and 286, where the pin is restored in the later course of the solution. In No. 348, the improbability of an unpinning key in face of the set cross-check; 1. ..., RxR+; 2. Sb4 mate, adds a surprising note to the remarkable key.

No. 348.
G. H. Goethart.
Hampshire Tele. and Post, 1920.

II.A.
Mate in two.

1. Kb5 !

Unpinning of White by Black has been one of the most prolific modern themes, especially among two-movers. Nos. 349 and 350 are two fine examples out of many, both tasks deserving of close study, because of their constructive merits and of the varied technical devices which they introduce. The former has five interference unpins of the white Queen, a task record, while No. 350 has four withdrawal unpins with a fifth (after 1. ..., Bd7) due to interference.

Unpinning of other pieces than the Queen cannot show more than two direct mates by the unpinned piece, as in the case of the white Bishop in No. 351. Where the mates are by discovery, as in No. 352, the variety in the unpinning lines may be much greater. Indeed one of Bottacchi's Knight-battery problems holds the task record with eight separate unpinning variations. In general the unpinning of minor white pieces, in the two-movers, is used to best advantage in the composition of light-weight problems, which are often of a charming character.

No. 349.
DR. H. W. Bettmann.
Good Companions, May, 1919.

II.B. Interference-Unpin.
Mate in two.

1. Be8.
The group II-C, White pinning himself, is a theme rarely, if ever, presented in direct-mate problems, without subsequent unpins. Usually this theme appears only as a thematic key for problems in group II-B, as in Nos. 330 and 332. The reason for this limitation in the use of the theme lies in that the self-pinning is of small interest in itself and can serve to little purpose unless the subsequent release is introduced.

The only thematic use of self-pinning keys, without unpinning, would be in connection with line-pins. A line-pin consists in the pinning of a long-range piece by one of the opposite colour but of the same kind of motion. Thus in No. 357, the white Queen is line-pinned, and can mate at g6 without being unpinned. As a matter of fact the white Queen

No. 351.
A. C. WHITE.
1st Prize, Good Companions, Meredith Ty., May, 1918.

II.B. Direct Unpin.
Mate in two.
1. QxPd5.

No. 352.
F. GAMAGE.
1st Prize, Tidsskrift för Schack, Sept., 1914.

II.B. Unpinning of Battery-piece.
Mate in two.
1. Rg7-g5.
can never be more than line-pinned; she always retains a certain freedom of motion, but this is not generally made use of. Occasionally it lends itself to minor effects. Thus in No. 356 one would praise the line-pinned key; while in No. 350 there is a rather obvious line-pinned threat: 2. QxQ. But in general the line-pin is subordinated to actual unpinning. Thus No. 357 would hardly have been composed solely on the score of the line-pin threat already mentioned. The composer doubtless had in view the blend of a white unpins, after 1. ..., Sd6, with a black unpins, after 1. ..., P3. If he had planned to feature solely the line-pinning, he would perhaps have introduced a true pinning key, let us say a move of the white King from g5 to h6. But except for such very rare studies the self-pinning key may be disregarded as a theme in itself.

The pinning of White by Black, on the other hand, has become a recognized theme. It may be treated as a two-move task, giving seven thematic variations without any apparent effort (No. 353).

The prevention or avoidance of Black pinning White, is again rather an incidental point than a theme. It is prettily used in the several white King tries of No. 354.

---

**No. 353.**

H. Weenink.

_Tidskrift för Schack, Dec., 1917._

![Chess Diagram](image)

**II.D.**

Mate in two.

1. Re5.

**No. 354.**

M. Niemeijer.

_Tijdschrift N. S. B., Jan., 1919._

![Chess Diagram](image)

**II.E.**

Mate in two.

III. Cumulative and Complex Pinnings.

The problems hitherto discussed have been single pin-themes. But the modern two-mover has developed pinning combinations to an almost distracting degree. Often, too, the modern composer does not content himself with pins alone, but blends cross-checks as well. Such combinations are held over to the final chapter; but a selection of pure pin-combinations now follows.

No. 355.
G. Plant.

![Chessboard diagram]

**I.A. + II.D.**

Mate in two.

1. Qg3; Re3; 2. PxR mate.
2. Re4; 2. Sc2 mate.
3. Rd5; 2. Sc6 mate.
4. Rc5; 2. Bc3 mate.

In the two-mover, for instance, the pin effect may be connected with White's first move, with Black's reply, or with White's mating move. Here already are many possible combinations. Admitting arbitrary combinations in separate variations, the number of total possibilities becomes bewildering.

No. 355 shows the same theme as No. 353, the pinning of White by the black defence, in both cases by the moves of a black Rook. But note that in No. 355 the key is itself an unpin of the black Rook, and further an anticipatory self-pin by White, inasmuch as the white Queen moves on to the line of pin.

Nos. 356 and 357 both have unpinning of Black by the black defences. But again distinct possibilities are at hand. In No. 357, the unpinned black piece (in the variation 1. ..., Pe3) is identical with the pinning black piece (in the unpinning variation 1. ..., Sd6), thus bringing out the point of the white unpinning in a separate variation from the one which shows the black unpinning. Whereas in No. 356, 1. ..., Bd4 and 1. ..., Sd4 are complex variations, each move unpinning both of the Queens. Finally, in No. 358, the white unpinnings, 1. ..., Sc6 and 8c6, combine with black pinning (half-pins).

There are four ways to give thematic extension in longer problems to any theme:

1. Presentation of a typical x-move theme in x+y moves, without strategic complications, but with the purpose of having more time for the "mise-en-scène"; see No. 98.
No. 356.—K. A. K. Larsen.
1st Hon. Men., Good Companions.
July, 1920.

I.B. + II.B.
Mate in two.
1. Qd3, Bd4; 2. Qe4 mate.
Sd4; 2. Qg3 mate.

No. 357.—Dr. A. van der Ven.
Good Companions, June, 1915.

I.B. + II.B.
Mate in two.
1. Kh6, Sd6 or f6; 2. Qc1 mate.
Pc3; 2. Rg2 mate.

No. 358.—C. W. Sheppard.
H. V. Tuxen & A. Ellerman.
Argentine Tourney, 1920.

I.D. + II.B.
Mate in two.
1. Be3, Sc6; 2. SxPc4 mate.
Se6; 2. Sd7 mate.
2. Cumulative presentation of analogous $x$-move ideas in the separate variations of an $x+1$ move problem, producing a collateral effect. Echo-mate problems are only one sub-division of this style of composition.

3. Presentation of analogous ideas, expressed by the consecutive repetition of the theme in a single variation. If the theme in its simple form requires $x$ moves, and is repeated $a$ times, with $y$ additional moves necessary for the key, mating moves and other subordinate moves required for soundness, the problem will show a total of $ax+y$ moves. The more nearly the $y$-moves can be eliminated, the purer the $ax$ interpretation of this consecutive cumulation will be.

4. Presentation of the theme in thematic extension. Instead of $x$-moves in the shortest possible expression of the theme, we have a

No. 359.
L. Knotek.
1st Prize, Casopis, 1918.

No. 360.
M. Havel.

Chameleon-pin-echo.
Mate in three.
1. $Sf4$, $Qg4$; 2. $BxB+$, $Sf6$; 3. $RxQ$ mate.

Pin-echo.
Mate in three.
1. $Rc8$, threat; 2. $Qg4$.

$Bc5$; 2. $Sf6+$, $Kc4$; 3. $Re4$ mate.

$Be5$; 2. $SxP+$, $Ke4$; 3. $Rc4$ mate.

$SxS$; 2. $Qf3+$.
($Be3$; 2. $QxB$.)
new factor \( x^3 \), whose relation to \( x \) depends upon the particular theme in question. If the extended theme is also pure the new presentation will have \( x^3 \) moves. If it is impure, the problem will belong in part under (1) and it will have \( x^3 + y \) moves.

Returning to the pinning themes, we find that Nos. 359 and 360 belong to (1) as well as to (2); for the mise-en-scène of a good model practically demands a solution in at least three-moves, although technically the model is a two-move, or even a one-move affair; and again the echo-presentation in collateral variations demands three-moves at least.

The name of pin-models is given to mates which are both pins and models. Thus one may say, of No. 359, that the pin-model echo is produced after black half-pinning moves; of No. 360, that it is produced by black (anticipatory) self-pinning moves; and, going back to No. 341, that the echo results from direct pinning of Black. In discussing these three positions one should not overlook the chameleon character of the echo in No. 359.

White unpinning Black may be presented in cumulative collateral form as well as the pinning. No. 361 will serve as a task example.

No. 361.
C. S. KIPPING.
2nd Prize, Westminster Gazette,
6 June, 1914.

Mate in three.
1. Qa5, Rg3; 2. Bb5.
Rg8; 2. Sb5.
Bg6; 2. Bd5.
Rg5; 2. Sd5.

No. 362.
H. Weenink.
Schweizerische Schachzeitung,
1918.

Mate in three.
1. Pa7, QxPa7+; 2. Sb7+, Qc5+;
QxPc3; 2. Sb3+, Ke4;
3. P=Q mate.
Consecutive pinning and unpinning has already been shown in No. 54, in which Black's first move, 1. ..., Qxc2+; 2. Sg6, produced a pinning situation, which Black's second move, 2. ..., Sf5+; 3. Se7 mate, converted into unpinning again. This theme, to which the name of the "Brede cross-check" has been given, from No. 11, appears in still more clear-cut form in No. 362. Here the first move pinning effect: 1. ..., Qxa7+; 2. Sb7, corresponding to the variation

No. 363.

G. W. Chandler.

Natal Mercury, 1919.

Anticipatory Half-pin.
Mate in three.
Pd4; 2. Sg2+, Ke5;
3. Qe6 mate.
Sc5 moves; 2. Se6+, Ke5;
3. Sc4 mate.
(SxR; 2. Sg2+.)

No. 364.

G. F. Anderson.
Special Prize,

Anticipatory Half-pin.
Mate in three.
1. Qg5, threat; 2. Sb4+.
Sg4; 2. Qf4, KxS;
3. QxP mate.
Sh5; 2. Qe3, KxS;
3. QxP mate.
SxP; 2. Be6+, KxS;
3. Bd5 mate.
RxP; 2. BxR+, Kd6;
3. Qd2 mate.
Re6; 2. Qd2+.
RxS; 2. Bg4+.
KxS; 2. Qc1+.
SxR; 2. Se7+.
Pf3; 2. QxPg2+. 
just noted, i. .... Qxc2+ in No. 54, is itself an unpinn of the white Knight; while the subsequent unpinn, 2. .... Qc5+; 3. Sd6 mate, corresponding to 2. .... Sf5+ in No. 54, is itself a double pin of White and Black. Hence this problem interprets the Brede cross-check, which normally requires a single pin and a single unpinn, with not less than three pins and two unpins.

The thematic strategic extension of the pinning themes offers many difficulties to the classifier, for the field is so rich that classifying becomes almost identical with the invention of new themes. It may be argued that the third-pin, No. 346, belongs to this group, since it is properly an extension of the half-pin by the insertion of a third thematic black piece on the pinning line. However, the third-pin is a correct x-move idea, since it cannot be presented except in three moves, and it may conceivably some day be shown bifurcated in the variations of a four-mover (x+1 moves). More specifically a strategic extension of the half-pin is to be found where the half-pins are effective on a line not occupied in the initial position by the black King. This theme is called the Anticipatory Half-pin, provision being made for future motion of the black King. Nos. 57, 363 and 364 are examples. In all three positions provision is made for mates with the black King on a single square in each of the half-pinned variations. This square is d3 in No. 57, e5 in No. 363 and c6 in No. 364. Of course the black King, in the anticipatory half-pin theme, might be mated on separate squares, say on e5, f5 and g5, in No. 363, if the composer had chosen so to work out his variations. This mobility of the black King admits of effects in the anticipatory half-pin field which cannot be paralleled in the half-pin two-mover. For instance, in No. 364, the King is mated (in the variation i. .... RxP) on the square d6, a square initially occupied by the half-pinned Rook. Whether such a mate, with the King on the square initially occupied by a half-pinned piece, is a true half-pin mate, as though it had been a square originally “beyond” both half-pinned pieces, is purely an academic question. It is sufficient to note the original effects such a thematic extension as the Anticipatory half-pin theme readily permits. Throughout the domain of problem composition the difference between thematic extensions (of the form x^1) and unthematic extensions (of the form x+y) is of utmost interest.
CHAPTER XXXIV.

CHECKING THEMES.

A rigorous definition of checking moves proved a stumbling block to classifiers for many years. The division of checks into three types, as proposed in the Denimore Memorial (Christmas Series, 1920) is now generally accepted, and it is as follows:

1. Direct Checks: Here the opponent defends by capturing the checking piece, which, in the case of a check from a battery, is the rear-piece;

2. Royal Checks: Here the opponent defends by a withdrawal of his King, not by capture of the checking piece (as defined above); and

3. Cross Checks: Including all others.

In general this division of checks into three kinds is applied to checks by Black; but in problems of more than two moves (and especially in the self-mate) the same distinctions are sometimes interesting to make regarding checks by White. It will be noticed that this division of checks into classes is based on the defences used by the opponent to meet the checks. In the direct-mate two-mover, where the checks are made by Black, these defences coincide with the mates. At first glance it would seem that a division of the checks would be more logical where attention was paid first to the sort of move by which the check was given, whether directly or from a battery, but in classifying themes it has proved advisable to consider the reply as more important than the character of the check itself. It is often of interest, however, to bear in mind the character of the check as well. In doing this, an easy possibility for ambiguities is presented by the somewhat confusing use of the term: direct check, since this means, not only the check answered by a capture, but also the check delivered by a non-battery move. This is one of the ambiguities which the problematic vocabulary has not yet done away with.

Thus No. 365 is an example of direct-checks, although all the mating moves are given by battery discoveries and the white King is very active: but the important point is that the black Queen is always captured. So, again, under the present definitions, No. 31 is not a cross-checker, but an example of royal-checks.

Particular interest attaches thematically to the cross-checks, whose importance since about 1898 has already been discussed in Chapter V. No. 366 is a cross-check of the special category: Single-piece cross-checks with battery, all the checks being discovered from (284)
the bishop-rook battery and in no case resulting in a capture of the rear-piece. The best single-piece cross-checkers extant is generally admitted to be No. 47. Single-piece cross-checkers rarely dispense with the battery, though in the case of the black Queen they must do so! A little thought will show that the Queen cannot discover check, hence where she intends to create several cross-checks they must be by direct moves. No. 372 shows her single-piece action (1..., Bb7+ may be neglected) resulting in four cross-checks, besides varied direct-checks.

In cross-checks, thematic purity is much more important than in many other themes. A thematic key is one enabling Black to deliver the checks, not possible in the initial setting; such keys are found in Nos. 47, 365, 366 and several other problems of the present chapter. A further thematic detail, often neglected, is that White's mating move must be forced by the fact that Black's defence was a check. So, in No. 366, 1..., RxBc5+; 2. Rd6 mate. Rx6, 2. Sf5 mate. Rxe2, 2. Re5 mate. Rd5+; 2. Se5 mate. Rx6, f5+; 2. Sf4 mate.
same problem: 1.... RxBe2+; 2. Re5 mate, is not thematic, because it is the threat. Black's check in this variation is merely accidental, although it prevents dual moves. This aspect of cross-checking variations is the only one in which any criticism may be brought against the claim of No. 47 to be the greatest of existing cross-check problems: for in No. 47 the mate after 1...., Sd2+ is again the threat. It is however extremely rare to find any problem with as many as four cross-checks without at least one of them being unthematic in the sense under discussion.

An interesting division of the cross-checks occurs where the checks are discovered by the black King. These may be called flight-square cross-checks. No. 367 shows the theme with lateral, No. 368 with diagonal flights. Both problems have fine thematic keys.

No. 367.
C. G. Watney.
1st Prize, Kent County Chess Association, 1920.

![Chess diagram]

Mate in two.
1. Rd3.

No. 368.
A. G. Stubbs.
1st Prize, Good Companions, Feb., 1918.

![Chess diagram]

Mate in two.
1. Qg7.

Cumulative renderings of various checking themes have given rise to numerous beautiful problems, in which the most improbable keys introduce a fancy of sparkling variations. Nos. 369 and 370 are among the lesser known prize-winners belonging to this category.

Along task lines also many interesting results have been obtained, though sometimes there is more juggling than real merit. Nevertheless, No. 371, where the white King steps from absolute safety
CHECKING THEMES.

No. 369.
G. Guidelli.

Mate in two.
1. Be5.

No. 371.
A. Waterhouse.
Norwich Mercury, 1907.

Mate in two.
1. Ke3.

No. 370.
C. Mansfield.
1st Prize, Queensland Chess Assn., 1919.

Mate in two.

No. 372.
H. F. L. Meyer.
After Wainwright's Tours de Force, 1906.

Mate in two.
1. Rb2.
into a whirlpool of adverse checks, and No. 372, a black Queen’s Cross, may amuse the reader.

Checking themes in longer problems, partly combined with pinning features, have been shown in Nos. 54, 55, 57, 88, 89 and 362.

Two complex two-movers, each of them combining many thematic elements besides the cross-checks and forming intricate complexes of the most modern character, may close the chapter and the book.

No. 373.
A. Ellerman.
1st Prize, Handelsblad, 15 Dec., 1917.

Mate in two.

1. Qc6.

No. 374.
P. Ten Cate.
1st Prize, Austral Tourney, 1923.

Cross-check + Half-pin + I.A. + I.B.
Mate in two.

1. Qe7.
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Alexandre, Rabbi Aaron, b. 1766 at Hohenfeld a M., in Bavaria; d. 1850;
pp. 27, 28, 45, 140.
Alfonso X. of Spain, b. 1226; d. 1284; pp. 21, 23, 152.
Allander, John (of Sweden), d. 12 Dec., 1919.
Allen, Prof. George, b. 17 Dec., 1808, in Milton Township, Chittenden Co.,
Vermont, U.S.A.; d. 28 May, 1876.
Allgaier, Johann, b. 19 June, 1763, in Wurtemberg; d. 3 Jan., 1823.
Allingham, G., b. 17 Dec., 1808; d. 1891.
Al-Mahdi, d. 785; p. 17.
Almay, Joseph, b. 29 Nov., 1901, at Arad, Hungary.
Altman, E., d. 18 Oct., 1916; No. 329.
Alvey, G. C., b. 1890; Nos. 269, 306, 344.
Ameling, Fried. Ludw. Balt., b. 23 Mch. 1842, at Katharina, near Dorpat;
d. 9 Mch., 1909; No. 141.
Andersen, Erik (of Denmark), b. 10 Apr., 1904.
Anderson, Gerald Frank (of Sheringham, England), b. 24 Feb., 1898, at
Newcastle, Natal, S. Africa; Nos. 56, 57, 139, 364; p. 80.
Anderson, Martin, b. 4 Sept., 1853, at Gothenburg, Sweden; p. 9.
Anderssen, Adolf, b. 6 July, 1818, at Breslau; d. 14 Mch., 1879; Nos. 10, 191;
pp. 27, 31, 32, 36, 185, 186; portrait p. 30.
Andersson, Erik (of Eskilstuna, Sweden), b. 1885.
Andrade, Barry J. de C., b. 27 July, 1904, at London; No. 279.
Andrew, Frederick William, b. 12 Sept., 1864.
Andrews, Henry John Clinton, b. 3 June, 1828, at Croom's Hill, Greenwich;
d. 26 Feb., 1887; p. 54.
Angas, Silas, b. 8 Jan., 1814, in West Brandon, Durham; d. 30 July, 1867.
Anonyme de Lille, see Th. Herlin.
Ansell, Lt.-Col. G. K., d. 1914.
Ansidei, Conte Francesco, d. 1873.
Ariano, Vincent (of Kingston, Jamaica), d. 25 Dec., 1898.
Armstrong, James Septimus, b. 5 Oct., 1891, at Tubbercurry, Co. Sligo,
Ireland.
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Arnell, Alfred Wilhelm Theodor (of Gothenburg, Sweden), b. 28 Dec., 1849; d. 17 July, 1922.
Aseharin, Andreas, b. 24 June, 1843; d. 24 Dec., 1896.
Askwith, Rev. E. H., b. 1864.
Aspa, Rosario, b. 1829 at Messina, Sicily; d. 1905.
As-Suli MS., No. 2; p. 17.

Babbitt, George Harris, b. 15 July, 1883, in Providence, Rhode Island, U.S.A.
Baird, D. G., d. 8 Oct., 1913.
Baird, Frederick, b. 16 Feb., 1860, in Manchester.
Baird, Mrs. W. J. (née Edith Elina Helen Winter-Wood), b. 1859, at Hareston, Paignton, Devonshire; d. 1 Feb., 1924; pp. 141, 142.
Baker, L., b. 1905.
Banks, Ralph Dwight, b. 2 Sept., 1881, at Grand Rapids, Mich., U.S.A.
Barber, Mrs. J. G. B. (Lillian Letitia), b. 5 Sept., 1872, in Manchester.
Barbier, George Emile, b. 24 Feb., 1844, in Besancon, Doubs, France; d. 17 Dec., 1895.
Barroso, Victor Manuel Diez, b. 1890, at Mexico, D.F.
Barrow, John Hugh, b. 12 Nov., 1891, at Weaste, Lancashire.
Barry, John F., b. 12 Dec., 1873.
Barton, Benjamin Grinell, b. 3 Feb., 1828, at Saratoga Springs, New York; d. 6 Dec., 1906.
Bartsch, Janos (John), b. 12 Aug., 1858, at Brasso, Hungary; d. 28 Nov., 1905.
Batley, W., b. 15 May, 1874.
Batori, Alberto, b. 1884; d. 5 Nov., 1923.
Bauer, Johann H., b. 30 June, 1861, at Kotopek, Bohemia; d. 5 Apr., 1891.
Baxter, C. M., d. 1881.
Bayer, Dr. Conrad, b. 10 Nov., 1828; d. 15 Oct., 1897; Nos. 96, 97, 225, 310; pp. 106, 107, 111, 113, 114, 116, 118, 207; portrait p. 114.
Bayersdorfer, Adolf, b. 7 June, 1841, at Erlenbach a M. in Bavaria; d. 21 Feb., 1901; No. 231; pp. 92, 94, 95, 108, 120.
Beach, Lennox E., b. 7 March, 1875, at Springfield, Mass., U.S.A.
Beck, Gyula (Julius), b. 30 Jan., 1889, at Aszod, Hungary.
Beckers, Franz, d. 24 Feb., 1917.
Beddall, Miss E. M., see Mrs. Brian Harley.
van Beek, H., b. 19 May, 1872; No. 273.
Behling, Karl (of Riga), b. 27 Oct., 1867, in the Bershofsche Gemeinde in Courland; p. 119.
Bell, Rev. John, d. 1883.
Belli, Niccolo, b. 1879.
Benbow, Charles William (of New Zealand), b. 13 Feb., 1842, in Birmingham, England; d. 9 March, 1903.
Bennett, C. G., d. 27 Sept., 1925.
Bennett, Frederick, b. 16 March, 1867, at Drayton, Queensland, Australia.
Berger, Prof. Johann N., b. 11 April, 1845, at Grazt, Styria, Austria; No. 95; pp. 10, 107, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 120, 136; portraits p. 112.
Bergkvist, E. (of Eskilstuna, Sweden), b. 1873.
Berhausen, Fritz, b. 25 December, 1880, at Cologne.
Bernard, H. D'Oyly, b. 2 March, 1876, in Devonshire; Nos. 253, 268.
Berry, O. Vincent, b. 1870; d. 1914; problem p. 156.
Bertram, Robert H., d. 1924.
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Bettmann, E., b. June, 1866; p. 73.
Betts, F. C., b. 1866.
Betts, Frederick Pimlott (of London, Canada), b. 31 Aug., 1853, at Stourbridge, England.
Bezzel, Max Friedrich Wilhelm, b. 4 Feb., 1824, in Herrnhertsgem; d. 30 July († 1 Aug.), 1871.
Bhattacherji, Amar Nath, b. 12 June, 1885.
Bihar, Aladár, b. 15 June, 1892, at Miskolc Hungary.
Bileck, Sobyeslav (of Bohemia), b. 1884; d. 1906.
Bilgner, P. Rudolf von, b. 21 Sept., 1815, in Ludwigslust; d. 16 Sept., 1840; p. 27.
Billington, Thomas Henry, b. 28 Aug., 1865, at Welshpool.
Birgfeld, Dr. Eduard Adolf Heinrich, b. 12 Sept., 1887, at Hamburg; pp. 80, 202; portrait p. 80.
Birtwhistle, Thomas, b. 9 Feb., 1885.
Blackburne, Joseph Henry, b. 10 Dec., 1841, at Manchester; d. 1 Sept., 1924.
Blackburne, Stewart Shirley (of New Zealand, etc.), b. 1857, at Sydney, England.
Blake, Percy Francis, b. 6 Dec., 1873, at Rusholme, Manchester; Nos. 29, 51, 220, 235; pp. 54, 55, 69, 74, 75, 77, 113.
Blakemore, J. T., b. 1844, at Birmingham.
Blanshard, Charles T., b. 26 Jan., 1852; d. 1824.
Bláthy, Dr. Otto Titus, b. 11 Aug., 1860, at Tata, 40 m. W of Budapest; No. 133; pp. 9, 142, 143.
Blumenthal, Dr. Oscar, b. 13 Mch., 1852, in Berlin; d. 24 Apl., 1917; p. 81.
Boardman, Harry, b. 27 May, 1863.
Bobrow, Paul P. (of Moscow), d. 23 Dec., 1911.
Boer, G. L. de, b. 16 Nov., 1823; d. †.
Bolton, Rev. Horatio, b. 2 June, 1793; d. 15 Aug., 1875; Nos. 6, 7, 135; pp. 27, 29, 30, 32, 113, 144; portrait p. 28.
Bolton, Joseph H. (of Stockport), b. 9 Apl., 1862; d. 1922.
Bolus, Andrew, b. 1856, at Wolverhampton.
Bone, William, b. 31 Aug., 1810; d. 15 Dec., 1874.
Bonnet Socius, Nos. 4, 5, 162; pp. 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 140, 152, 206.
Booth, Henry, b. 29 May, 1866.
Bordes, R. W., b. 1866.
Borgatti, Carlo, b. 2 May, 1879, at Ferrara, Italy; d. 5 Dec., 1915.
Boros, Sándor (= Alexander), b. 31 Aug., 1907, at Budapest.
Bottacchi, Antonio, b. 1900, in Algiers; Nos. 204, 350, 366; p. 275.
Bourne, Stanley, b. 18 Sept., 1875, at Nottingham.
Branch, W. Shelley, b. 4 July, 1854.
Brandis, Dr. A. (of Hamburg), b. 9 Jan., 1892.
Braune, Robert, b. 13 Apl., 1845; d. 7 Mch., 1924.
Brede, Julius, b. 1800; d. 1849; No. 11; pp. 27, 32, 33, 58, 175, 193.
Breuer, Ernő (= Ernest), b. 8 Dec., 1890, at Budapest.
Breuer, Joseph Johann, b. 7 Jan., 1903, at Cologne.
Breyer, Gyula (=Julius), b. 1895; d. 8 Nov., 1921.
Bridgewater, Ralph Herbert, b. 24 Feb., 1874, at Saltley, Birmingham.
Brock, Frederick, b. 24 Aug., 1880, in London.
Bródy, Nikolaus, b. 30 Mch., 1877, in Nagy-Karoly, Hungary.
Broedeker, Gustav von, b. 27 Dec., 1854, in Torgau, Prussia.
Broholm, J. A., p. 119.
Brouwer, H. H., b. 16 Apl., 1885.
Brown, B. Goulding, b. 1881.
Brown, John ("J.B. of Bridport"), b. 30 May, 1827; d. 11 Nov., 1865; Nos.
23, 24; pp. 26, 44, 45, 99, 120; portrait p. 28.
Brown, R. A., b. 20 June, 1812, at Doncaster; d. 187—.
Brown, Theodore Morris, d. 25 Sept., 1876; p. 79.
Brownson, O. A., b. 18 Apl., 1826, at Ithaca, New York; d. 23 Apl., 1892.
Brunfitt, George, b. 5 Apl., 1854, at Ilkley; d. 15 Sept., 1920.
Brunner, Eric, b. 11 Dec., 1885; Nos. 243, 332; p. 216.
Bruski, J., No. 317.
Buckley, Major E. D. H., b. 2 Aug., 1860.
Buckley, Robert John, b. 17 July, 1847, at Kilmore, Monaghan, Ireland.
Ruhelt, Vald, b. 20 June, 1879, at Tversted, Denmark.
Bukofzer, Maxwell (of U.S.A.), b. 9 July, 1875, in Berlin, Germany.
Bull, Capt. T. Porter (of Detroit, Mich.), b. 1839 (?1856), in Yorkshire,
England; d. 12 Dec., 1890.
Bulman, Thomas, b. 24 Apl., 1878, at Hexham.
Bunting, Joe, b. 8 Feb., 1898, at Newbold, nr. Chesterfield.
Burkill, H. R., b. 1869, at Winterton, N. Lines.
Buzzeica, p. 25.

Caine, Walter Edmund, b. 28 Nov., 1898, at Southsea, Hampshire.
Callander, Charles, b. 25 Mch., 1854, near Simla, Punjab, India.
Calvi, Ignace, b. 1798; d. 1873.
Campbell, Lt.-Col. A., b. 1848.
Campbell, Joseph Graham, b. May, 1830, in Cookstown, Ireland; d. 1 Jan.,
1891; Nos. 21, 22; p. 44; portrait p. 44.
Capablanca, J. R., b. 19 Nov., 1868.
Capraez, Friedrich, b. 7 Feb., 1830; d. June, 1891.
Carlson, Lars Richard (of Maynard, Minn., U.S.A.), b. 6 Feb., 1885, at Vasa,
Skaraborgs Lan, Sweden.
Carpenter, George Edward, b. 25 Mch., 1844, at Ashford (Ardlesley), near
Tarrytown, N.Y., U.S.A.; d. 17 Feb., 1924; No. 40; p. 66.
Carrera, Don Pietro, b. 1571; d. 1647.
Cate, P. ten, b. 23 July, 1902, at Leeuwarden, Holland; No. 374.
Cauveren, J., b. 17 Mch., 1833, at Haarlem, Holland; No. 120; p. 154.
Cavrel, Edouard, b. 1 Mch., 1847, at Elbeuf, Seine Inf., France.
Ceriani, Ing. Luigi, b. 24 Jan., 1894, at Milan.
Challenger, Alfred C., b. 24 Oct., 1870.
Chandler, Guy Wills, b. 21 Aug., 1869, at Weymouth; No. 363; p. 77.
Charlick, Arthur (of Adelaide, Australia), d. 1910.
Charlick, Henry (of Adelaide), b. 8 July, 1845, in London; d. 1916.
Charlick, Henry Walter, b. 12 Dec., 1870.
Chatto, James Thomas, b. 30 Apr., 1854, in Hackney, London.
Cheney, George X., b. 2 Apl., 1837; d. 1861; p. 119.
Chittenden, Simeon B., b. 1845, in Brooklyn; d. 15 Sept., 1922.
Chocholous, Ing. Jiri (—George), b. 9 Dec., 1856, at Prague; p. 83.
Cimburek, Ladislav, b. 24 Sept., 1867, at Strakonice; d. 23 Feb., 1915; p. 83.
Cisar, Vaclav, b. 4 Oct., 1879; pp. 85, 144.
Civis Bononiae M.S., No. 5; pp. 22, 23, 24, 25.
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Codazzi, Edgardo (of Milan), d. 22 Feb., 1921.
Collin, Ludvig (of Stockholm), b. 20 Nov., 1879.
Collins, Francis Charles, b. 19 Feb., 1843, in London; d. 29 July, 1893.
Colpa, J., b. 22 June, 1874; No. 261.
Come, J. W. le, b. 1846; d. 22 Nov., 1923.
Conkle; Ira Lewis, b. 21 Nov., 1859; d. 20 Sept., 1915.
Conway, W., b. 1820; d. 5 Feb., 1891.
Cook, Eugene Beauharnais, b. 19 May, 1830, in New York City; d. 19 Mch., 1915; No. 193; p. 186; portrait p. 186.
Cooper, Arthur Richard, b. 8 Jan., 1883, at Dartmouth, Devon.
Cornelis, H. W., b. 1864.
Corrias, Antonio G., b. 16 Mch., 1872, at Ozieri, Sardinia; d. 1924; No. 229.
Coultaus, J. A., d. 1923.
Cozzo, Carlo (book dated 1766); p. 27.
Crane, George A., b. at St. Louis, Mo.
Crespi, Eduardo, b. 5 Oct., 1849, at Milan; d. 1910.
Crosskill, A. (pseudonym "Euclid"), d. 1902 or 1903.
Crum, John, b. 1842; d. 17 (or 27) Apr., 1922; No. 156.
Cruseman, Richard, b. 6 Sept., 1865, in Bremen.
Cullag, Antal, b. 21 Feb., 1906, at Budapest.
Cudmore, Henry, b. 1856, at Torrington, Devonshire.
Cumpe, Jos., b. 16 Aug., 1866, at Mladá Boleslav, Bohemia; p. 144.
Cunningham, James G., b. 19 Jan., 1838; d. 13 Aug., 1905.
Curnock, A., No. 192.
Curiss, Freeman H., b. 2 Dec., 1844, in New York State; d. 3 Nov., 1923.
Cushworth, J., b. 1 May, 1881.

Dahl, A. M., d. 20 Aug., 1907.
Damm, Leo Godfried van, b. 2 June, 1902.
Danman (books from 1512).
Daniel, Arthur William, b. 30 Sept., 1878, at Fenton, Stoke-on-Trent.
Davis, Henry Hosey, b. 31 July, 1855, in Bristol.
Dawson, Thomas Rayner, b. 29 Nov., 1859, at Leeds; Nos. 142, 274, 275; pp. 141, 142, 149.
Deacon, Frederic H., d. 1876.
Deane, Rev. Canon Arthur Macreth ("East Marden"), b. 1 Jan., 1837, at Knutsford, Cheshire; d. 4 July, 1926.
Decker, Dr. Adolph, d. 21 Nov., 1915.
Dedrie, Frantisek, b. 13 Oct., 1878, at Tisnov, Czechoslovakia; No. 66; pp. 9, 81, 84.
Dehler, Georg, d. 10 May, 1915.
Dehler, Otto, b. 10 Feb., 1887, in Volksstedt, bei Rödelstadt (Thüringen).
Demonym, Antoine; d. 1895.
Denecke, Dr. H., b. 3 June, 1864.
Densmore, Darso James, b. 24 Jan., 1867, in Meadville, Crawford, Pa., U.S.A.; d. 24 June, 1917; Nos. 237, 239, 245, 297; p. 213.
Deutsch, Dr. Samuel Martin, b. 19 Feb., 1837, in Warsaw.
Devineck, M., b. 1804; d. 20 Nov., 1878.
DIJK, J. van (of De Rier, Holland), Anz. ( = A. van Diik), b. 17 Feb., 1866; No. 124; p. 136.
Dilaram’s mate, No. 2; pp. 19, 20, 24.
Dixon, Joshua Walter, b. 28 Nov., 1869, in Leeds.
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Dobbs, Rev. Gilbert, b. 6 Dec., 1867: Nos. 70, 174; p. 94.
Dobrusky, Dr. Jan (pseud. "Novaka," Tours de Force, No. 1), b. Aug., 1853, at Skutec, Bohemia; d. 31 May, 1907; Nos. 60, 61, 62, 265, 295; pp. 55, 77, 83, 85, 86, 67, 94, 132; portrait p. 82.
Dodd, William Clarence, b. 23 Nov., 1831, at Auburn, Sangamon Co., Ill., U.S.A.
Dolde, Howard L., b. 24 Dec., 1884, at Pittsburgh, U.S.A.
Dollinger, Joseph (book 1806); pp. 27, 28, 29.
Donaldson, Rev. John ("Delta"), b. 27 Mch., 1817; d. 19 Apr., 1892.
Dotterweich, Dr. Otto, No. 331.
Doye, Capt. James Bernard Harvey, b. 16 Mch., 1893, in Mayfair, London.
Driver, Philip Brognaud, b. 24 June, 1879, at Chester, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
Drnek, Josef, b. 3 July, 1875, at Kocelovie; No. 69.
Droby, Franz, b. 1 Dec., 1865.
Dritta, Jan, b. 4 Apr., 1854, at Hvepin; d. 30 June, 1907; p. 83.
Dubbe, Friedrich, b. 7 May, 1845, at Hagenow; d. 17 Apr., 1897.
Duben, Capt. Gustav Henrik von, b. 7 Nov., 1856, in Upsala, Sweden.
Dubois, Serafino, b. 10 Oct., 1817; d. 15 Jan., 1899.
Dudeney, Henry Ernest, b. 10 Apr., 1857, at Mayfield, Sussex.
Dudley, Harold B., b. 1891.
Duffy, Patrick Thomas, b. 14 Oct., 1834, in Dublin; d. 11 Apr., 1888.
Dufresne, Jean, b. 14 Feb., 1829; d. 13 Apr., 1893.
Duncan, Frederick Samson, b. 1886.
Dunford, J. H., b. 1870.
Dunka, George Justin, d. 29 Feb., 1915.
Durand, Albe Philipp Ambroise, b. 1799; d. 11 Feb., 1890.
Duras, Oldrich, b. 30 Oct., 1862.
Dusold, Johann, b. 6 Feb., 1871; No. 323.

Easter, Norris, b. 12 Feb., 1886, at Thurlton, Norfolk.
Ebermann, Emil, d. 7 Dec., 1893.
Ebersz, Dr. Cornelius, b. 29 Jan., 1890, at Budapest.
Ebert, W., No. 84.
Eder, Steph., b. 7 Mch., 1889, at Nemescso, Hungary.
Eelde, A. van, b. 13 Dec., 1857; d. 21 Jan., 1913; p. 131.
Eggert, Carl, b. 25 May, 1824, at Danzig; d. ?
Ehrenstein, Moritz, b. 18 Dec., 1856, in Szakolsza; d. 18 (28) Apr., 1923.
Eichstadt, H., No. 267.
Elbogen, Arpad, b. 18 May, 1906, at Budapest.
Elekes, Dr. Deziderius, b. 11 Nov., 1889, at Kezdvasarhely, Hungary.
Elkan, A. A., d. 15 Feb., 1913.
Elson, Jacob (of Philadelphia), b. 8 Apr., 1839, in Wurzburg, Bavaria; d. 1909.
Engerth, Adolf, b. 6 Feb., 1860, at Signowka, near Lemberg.
Englund, Fritz Carl Anton, b. 22 Feb., 1871, at Vestervik, Sweden.
Erdey, Dr. Aladar, b. 31 Mch., 1879, at Nagykaroly, Hungary.
Erlin, Konrad (K. Erlinger), b. 10 Feb., 1856; Nos. 72, 99; pp. 107, 117, portrait p. 116.
Ernst, Georg, b. 26 Dec., 1876, at Augsburg; p. 145.
Erskine, John Angus, b. 29 Jan., 1872, at Invercargill, New Zealand.

Fahndrich, Hugo, b. 3 July, 1851, at Budapest.
Fawcett, David, b. 24 Nov., 1854.
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Feast, Dr. Frederic Bonner, b. 12 Feb., 1872, at West Bromwich.
Fechter, Ludwig, b. 3 Aug., 1852.
Feenstra Kuiper, P., b. 9 Aug., 1888, at Meppel, Holland; No. 126.
Fegan, Bert. George, b. 12 Dec. 1869, at Deniliquin, N.S.W., Australia.
Fehér, Dr. Gyula (Julius), b. 4 June, 1885, at Budapest.
Feigl, Max, b. 5 Mch., 1871, in Vienna; No. 100; pp. 107, 117.
Ferber, Eugene, b. 16 July, 1875, in Forbach; No. 233.
Ferris, William J., b. 1856; d. 1917.
Fiala, Karel, b. 3 Feb., 1864, at Kalesov; d. 2 Jan., 1916.
Finch, J. G., d. 1881.
Fink, A. J., b. 19 July, 1890; No. 221.
Finlayson, William, b. 10 May, 1855.
Finlinson, J. Henry, b. 23 Oct., 1845.
Fischer, Conrad, b. 30 June, 1831; d. 23 May, 1907.
Fischer, Hieronymus, b. 30 Sept., 1843.
Fison, Bernard, b. 16 Oct., 1860, at Hendon, Middlesex.
Flatt, Karl, b. 23 Nov., 1895, at Basle.
Flechsig, Dr. Ernst, b. 5 Oct., 1852; d. 11 Oct., 1890.
Fleck, Kurt, b. 1869; d. 24 July, 1897.
Fleckner, Otto, d. 21 Nov., 1914.
Forsyth, David (of Dunedin, New Zealand), b. at Alness, Ross-shire, Scotland; d. 30 Dec., 1909.
Foster, Ben R., b. 13 Feb., 1851; p. 148.
Fothergill, P. G. L., b. 12 July, 1868.
Franken, M., b. 9 Oct., 1891; Nos. 132, 228; p. 138.
Frankenstein, Edward Nathan, b. 1840, in Liverpool; d. 13 Mch., 1913.
Franz, Robert, b. 10 May, 1822; d. 19 Jan., 1865.
Fraser, Dr. George Brunton, d. Dec., 1905.
Freerborough, Edward, b. 18 Aug., 1830, at Hull; d. 14 Sept., 1896.
French, Richard John, b. 7 June, 1883, in South London.
Freseco, S. D., b. 1888.
Fridlizius, Joel (of Gothenburg), b. 31 Dec., 1870; No. 77; p. 99; portrait p. 96.
Funk, Jacob E., b. 20 Apl., 1889, in Manitoba, Canada.

Galitzky, Dr. A. W., b. 21 Feb., 1863; d. 18 Nov., 1921; p. 51.
Gamage, F., Nos. 149, 352; p. 72.
Gardner, John Carey, b. 1856; d. 8 Apl., 1920.
Geary, William, b. 1839; d. 1923; No. 30; p. 56.
Gelbfuhs, Dr. Oscar, Junr., b. 9 Nov., 1832, at Sternberg, Moravia; d. 27 Sept., 1877.
Gerlach, Dr. Rudolph, b. 1861.
Geyerstam. Fritz af, b. 1852; d. 18 Oct. 1890; No. 210; p. 193.
Gianutii della Mantia, Horatio (book 1597).
Gibbins, N. M., b. 15 Oct., 1882, at Brighton.
Gilberg, Charles Alexander, b. 17 June, 1835; at Camden, New Jersey; d. 21 Jan., 1898; Nos. 154A, 161; p. 160.
Gittins, Frederick Richard, b. 9 July, 1867, at Birmingham.
Gleaves, Walter, b. 15 Feb. (7 Jan.), 1867, in London; d. 15 Sept., 1902; p. 68.
Gledhill, Walter, b. 13 June, 1854, in Leeds; d. 19 Jan., 1917.
Glynn, James Joseph (of N.S.W., Australia), b. 21 Dec., 1847, at Mal Bay, West Clare, Ireland; d. 7 Mch., 1925.
Goethart, G. H., b. 4 Sept., 1892; Nos. 46, 125, 126, 178, 203, 254, 348; pp., 9, 137.
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Gold, Dr. Samuel, b. 2 July, 1835, at Koevagoors, Hungary; d. 9 Nov., 1920.
Gorgias, Victor, b. 25 May, 1839, in Vienna; d. 5 May, 1914.
Gottschall, Dr. Herrmann von, b. 16 Oct., 1862, at Posen; No. 300.
Gottschall, Dr. Rudolf von, b. 30 Sept., 1823, at Breslau; d. 21 Mch., 1909.
Goulty, A. H., b. 1895.
Grabowski, K., No. 199.
Grant, H. E. (of Australia), b. 1854, in Hidgglee, Bengal.
Greenwood, William, b. 25 Dec., 1836, at Glusburn, Yorkshire; d. 11 July, 1922; Nos. 144, 299; pp. 154, 186.
Grimshaw, Percy, b. 1888.
Grimshaw, Walter, b. 12 Mch., 1832, at Dowsbury; d. 27 Dec., 1890; Nos. 14, 16, 17, 103, 246A; pp. 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 121, 122, 215; portraits p. 32.
Grosdemange, E., b. 1795; d. 2 Sept., 1878.
Gross, Isidor, b. 25 July, 1866, at Kis Leta, Hungary.
Guarinus, Paulus (book 1512).
Guest, Antony, b. 1856; d. 29 Jan., 1925.
Guest, Thomas, b. 2 Sept., 1843, at Penstett, Staffordshire.
Guglielmetti, A., p. 128.
Guidelli, Dr. C. b. 1868; No. 105.
Guidelli, Count Giorgio, b. 14 Mch., 1897, at Serravalle d’Asti, in Piedmont; d. 6 Jan., 1924; No. 369.
Gundersen, Gunnar (of Toorak, Melbourne, Australia), b. 11 Mch., 1882, at Bordeaux, France.
Guretzky-Cornitz, Bernhard von, b. 24 Feb., 1838, in Berlin; d. 17 Oct., 1873.
Gygli, F., b. 1896.

Haglund, John (of Eskilstuna, Sweden), b. 1888
Hallgren, Dr. Erik (of Gothenburg, Sweden), b. 13 Nov., 1862.
Haliwell, Ernest, b. 1864, at Bolton, Lancashire.
Hamilton, C. D. P., b. 10 Dec., 1851.
Hamilton, Rev. Thomas, b. 19 July, 1865, at Manchester.
Hannemann, Knud, b. 16 Feb., 1903; Nos. 168, 232, 246.
Hansen, Lorenz (of U.S.A.), b. 18 Mch., 1850, near Flenisburg, Schleswig.
Hanshew, John K., b. 5 Jan., 1847.
Harce, Károly, b. 21 Oct., 1877, at Körnend, Hungary.
Hardiman, C. B., b. 29 Mch., 1871.
Harley, Brian, b. 27 Oct., 1863, at Saffron Walden, Essex; No. 150; p. 77.
Harley, Mrs. Brian (née Ella Margaret Beddall), b. 5 May, 1892, at Finchfield, Essex.
Harlin, Thomas (of Australia), b. 24 Oct., 1832, at Belfast, Ireland.
Harmonist, Max, b. 10 Feb., 1864; d. 16 Oct., 1907.
Haroun-al-Raschid, p. 17.
Harris, Arthur Ed., b. 16 Mch., 1855.
Harris, Jordan William, b. 21 Dec., 1850, at Jefferson, Culpeper, Co. Virginia, U.S.A.
Harris, William, b. 10 Mch., 1813, in Shelton, Bedfordshire; d. 5 Mch., 1881.
Harris, William Alfred Philidor, b. 14 Feb., 1848; d. 2 Mch., 1914.
Hart, J. Y., b. 1884.
Hart, Robert Andrew, b. 12 Oct., 1858, at Baton Rouge, La., U.S.A.
Hart, Tom G., b. 1857; d. June, 1921.
Harvey, Col. P. F., b. 12 Dec., 1844.
Havasi, Arthur, b. 7 Jan., 1864, at Pettend, Hungary.
Havel, M. (Miroslav Kostal), b. 7 Sept., 1881, at Teplitz, Bohemia; Nos. 74, 81, 145, 172, 560; pp. 83, 84, 159.
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Hawes, Frederick Thomas, b. 29 Mar., 1866, at Ryde, Sydney, Australia.
Hawkins, E. Varwell, b. 1845; d. 5 Apr., 1906.
Hazeltnine, Miron James, b. 13 Nov., 1824, in Rumney, New Hampshire, U.S.A.; d. 24 Feb., 1907.
Head, Arthur James, b. 1 Aug., 1884; at Chelsea, London.
Healey, Frank, b. 19 Nov., 1829; d. 17 Feb., 1906; Nos. 18, 20, 27, 184; pp. 41, 42, 44, 55, 132, 176, 178, 183; portraits p. 32.
Healey, Percy E., b. 1873.
Heathcote, Godfrey, b. 20 July, 1870, at Manchester; Nos. 31, 37, 52, 147, 156, 167, 260, 266; pp. 55, 57, 62, 69, 74, 75, 76, 77, 115, 134, 158, 253; portrait p. 74.
Helfman, Hyman, b. 1907.
Helm, Hermann, b. 5 Jan., 1870.
Henderson, John (of Canada), b. 17 Nov., 1836; d. 25 Apr., 1896.
Henrikssen, Thorlef Camillo, b. 23 Dec., 1881, in Fredrikstad, Norway.
Herland, Sigmund (of Bucharest), b. 27 Sept., 1865, at Vienna; No. 171.
Herlin, Th. ("Anonyme de Lille"); No. 166; pp. 181, 182, 183, 184.
Herr, Odin Arvine, b. 5 Mch., 1882, at Philadelphia.
Herrmann, Sándor (= Alexander), b. 29 Sept., 1906, at Breszta-Novce, Hungary.
Heycop ten Ham, Dr. ("Mr.") van, b. 30 Oct., 1856; d. 29 Jan., 1925.
Heydon, J. K. (of Sydney, Australia), b. 13 Jan., 1884; No. 255.
Heywood, George Caun., b. 22 Oct., 1853, in Winkleigh, N. Devon; d. 8 Mch., 1895.
Hinsken, Johann, b. 1 Feb., 1895, at Gladbeck, Recklinghausen, Westphalia.
Hoege, Dr. Niels, b. 19 Feb., 1876; Nos. 163, 218, 294; p. 167.
Hoffenreich, Sándor, b. 25 Jan., 1907, at Ujpest, Hungary.
Hoffmann, Emil (of U.S.A.), b. 1852 in Brandenburg, near Berlin; d. 16 Sept. 1921.
Hofmann, Dr Fritz, b. 1854; d. 14 May, 1925; p. 193.
Holm, Ernst, b. 23 Dec., 1879, at Ystad, Sweden.
Holst, Victor, b. 16 Aug., 1844; d. Mch., 1924.
Holt, Ethelbert, b. 1866, at Rawtenstall, Lancashire.
Holzhausen, Baron Walthher von, b. 29 May, 1876; Nos. 242, 313; pp. 41, 119, 121, 215, 266, 267; portrait p. 214.
Hopwood, Thomas Henry ("Toz"), b. 20 Aug., 1828, in Manchester.
Horwitz, Bernard, b. 10 May, 1806; d. 29 Aug., 1885.
Howard, Kenneth Samuel, b. 12 Apr., 1882, at Le Roy, N.Y., U.S.A.
Hubert, Franz, b. 15 Feb., 1832, in Weimar, Saxony.
Hüslen, Bernhard, b. 1 Nov., 1864.
Hume, George, b. 16 Dec., 1862, at Leith, Scotland; No. 297; p. 10.
Hundsdorfer, W., p. 149.
Hunt, Dr. J. W., b. 1851; d. 1920.
Hunter, J. A. W., No. 25.
Hunter, R. G., b. 17 Jan., 1876, at Toronto.

Inwards, Richard, b. 22 Apr., 1840, in London.
Isaacs, L. E., b. 6 Dec., 1849, in Philadelphia.
Iversen, L., d. 18 Aug., 1924.

Jakab, Arpad, b. 15 May, 1896, at Szegedin, Hungary.
Janet, Frank, b. 23 Apr., 1875; No. 225.
Jensen, Th., d. 22 Dec., 1877.
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Jerrard, Ernest Haslam Harvey, b. 30 Jan., 1890, at Rochdale, Miles, Queensland.

Jespersen, Rev. J., b. 1 Aug., 1848, at Copenhagen; d. 7 Aug., 1914; No. 205; pp. 107, 114, 193, 194.


Johnson, George Stillingsfleet, b. 27 June, 1851, at Wolburn Square, London.

Johnson, Richard Wright, b. 24 Apl., 1844, at Ulverston, Lancashire.

Jokisch, L. H., b. 15 Mch., 1851, at Beardstown, Ill.; Nos. 56, 59; p. 81.

Jong, Dr. Leonard Nicolaas de, b. 30 Mch., 1869, in Utrecht; Nos. 125, 258; p. 156.

Jonsson, Herman Leonard, b. 20 Feb., 1860, at Partille, Sweden.

Juchlí, Josef, b. 11 Jan., 1847, d. 2 Jan., 1905.

Julien, Dennis, b. 1806, in Les Beaumettes, S. France; d. 1868; p. 101.

Kainer, Cenek, b. 22 May, 1883, in Holesov, Moravia; p. 84.


Kaiser, Karl, b. 8 July, 1867, in Strassbourg i. E.

Kálnieczky, Dr. Gejza, b. 7 Apl., 1862, at Satóralja-Ujhely, Hungary.

Kane, John Laurence, b. 21 July, 1876, at Carnegie, Pa., U.S.A.

Karsch, Wilhelm, b. 21 June, 1899, at Essen, Ruhr.

Karstedt, Max, b. 1868.


Kaunders, Dr. Albert, b. 20 Jan., 1854, at Prague; d. 27 Apl., 1912.

Keeble, John, b. 27 Aug., 1855; No 216; pp. 9, 34.

Keim, Jacob, b. 1865; d. 25 Oct., 1903.

Kelly, Reginald, b. 1834, at Kelly, Devonshire.

Kemp, Charles Edward, b. 18 Nov., 1901, in Manchester.

Kemp, W. C., b. 20 Nov., 1864.

Kennedy, Capt. Hugh A., b. 1809; d. 22 Oct., 1878.

Kent, Horace Greeley, b. 6 June, 1871, at Springfield, Ill., U.S.A.

Kels, Josef, b. 25 Nov., 1866, at Netonice; d. 20 June, 1900.

Keyser, William Ellis, b. 20 Jan., 1891, at Omaha, Nebraska, U.S.A.

Kidson, Henry E., b. 1832, in Leeds; d. 24 Mch., 1910; Nos. 19, 315; pp. 36, 41, 128; portraits p. 32.

King-Parks, Thomas, b. 20 Aug., 1884, in Dublin; d. 23 Nov., 1918; No. 262.

Kintzig, Robert, b. 9 May, 1881, at Ujszentanna, Hungary.

Kipping, Cyril Stanley, b. 10 Oct., 1891, in London; Nos. 301, 361; p. 77.

Kiss, Béla, b. 3 May, 1906, at Csákvár, Hungary.


Kling, Joseph, b. 19 Mch., 1811, at Mainz; d. 1 Dec., 1876.

Klinke, A., p. 214.

Klir, Dr. Antoniu, b. 1864, at Straceci.

Klüver, Hans, b. 4 Mch., 1901; p. 204.

Knobek, Ladislaw, b. 27 June, 1892, at Prague; Nos. 68, 359; p. 84.

Knott, H. E., b. 1892; No. 340.

Kockelkorn, Carl, b. 26 Nov., 1843, at Cologne; d. 16 July, 1914; pp. 118, 119; portraits p. 118; also see under Kohtz and Kockelkorn.

Koetscheid, P. A., b. 8 June, 1882; No. 127; p. 138.

Kohlhase, Fritz, d. 1881.


INDEX OF COMPOSERS.

Kolisch, Baron, b. 6 Apr., 1837; d. 29 Apr., 1889.
Kondelik, Karl, b. 4 Nov., 1848; d. 2 Sept., 1905.
Konig, Anton, b. 1836; d. 1 Oct., 1911; p. 83.
Koning, Jos. de, d. 23 Oct., 1925; Nos. 54, 130; p. 138.
Korschelt, Oskar, b. 18 Sept., 1853, at Berthelsdorf, near Herrnhut, Saxony;
Korteling, W., b. 8 May., 1889; No. 117; p. 133.
Kos, Ivan, No. 249.
Kosek, Vojtech, b. 8 Sept., 1861, at Bohumilice; p. 83.
Kostal, Miroslav, see M. Havel.
Kotrc, Jan, b. 22 Aug., 1862, at Bielitz; No. 78; p. 83.
Kovács, Florián, b. 9 Mch., 1901, at Budapest.
Kovács, Dr. Norbert, b. 16 May, 1874, at Vienna.
Kraemer, Dr. Adolf, b. 23 Mch., 1898, at Büdingen, in Hessen, Germany;
Nos. 238, 244, 365; portrait p. 216.
Krämer, Wilhelm, b. 18 Oct., 1898, at Borbeck, Essen.
Krome, H. A., d. 1856.
Kubbel, Arvid, 12 Sept., 1889, at Leningrad.
Kubbel, Eugene, b. 23 Oct., 1894, at Leningrad; p. 9.
Kubbel, K. A. Leonid, b. 25 Dec., 1891, at Leningrad; Nos. 188, 316, 342.
Kündig, Dr. A. (of Basle), d. 1913.
Kunetzky, Otakar (Ing. Dr. Ot. Grössl), b. 5 Nov., 1881, at Pardulice.
Kuntze, F., No. 333.
Kürschner, Max, b. 28 Mch., 1853, in Nuremberg; d. 26 Aug., 1917.
Kuskop, Friedrich Amandus Leopold (of Wellington, New Zealand), b. 23
Oct., 1844, at Wismar, Mecklenburg, Germany.
Kvicala, Dr. Antonin, b. 1847; d. 20 Jan., 1908.
Kvicala, Dr. Johann, b. 1868.
Kvicala, Dr. Josef, b. 1862, at Prague; d. 6 Sept., 1906; p. 83.

Lamare, Marcel (pseudonym "Un Amateur de l'Ex. U.A.A.R."), b. 14 Jan.,
1856.
Lamouroux, D., b. 1821; d. 10 Feb., 1895.
Lancel, Edmond Emile, b. 3 July, 1888, at St. Josse-ten-Noode, Brussels.
Lane, H. F. W., b. 8 Oct., 1878.
Lange, Dr. Max, b. 7 Aug., 1832, at Magdeburg; d. 8 Dec., 1899; p. 45.
Langstaff, William, b. 7 Nov., 1897, at Ramsgate.
Larsen, Karl Adolf Kofoed, b. 2 May, 1896, in Holstebro, Denmark; Nos.
256, 356; p. 226.
Larsen, Peder Andreas, b. 1 Apr., 1869, in Bornholm Island, Denmark.
Larsen, R. P., d. 23 Apr., 1921.
Lasa, Baron von Heydebrand und der, b. 17 Oct., 1816; d. 27 July, 1899;
p. 27.
Lasker, Emanuel, b. 24 Dec., 1868.
Lane, Kurt, b. 7 Mch., 1887, at Dresden.
Lauritzen, Oskar Georg, b. 30 July, 1899, at Copenhagen.
Lawns, Benjamin Glover, b. 6 Feb., 1861, in London; Nos. 26, 53, 59, 211;
pp. 53, 54, 73, 75, 76, 77, 81; portrait p. 48.
Lazard, Frederic, b. 20 Feb., 1833, at Marseilles; No. 169.
Lazarus, Dr. Leo, b. 19 Oct., 1891, at Budapest.
Lee, Charles C., b. 16 Sept., 1868, at Charlestown, Mass., U.S.A.
Legrain, Gaston, b. 3 Aug., 1870, at Rueil (Seine et Oise), France.
Lehner, Hermann Foedor, b. 27 June, 1842, in Vienna; d. 15 Mch., 1897.
Lembcke, C. F., b. 8 June, 1850, in Enköping, Sweden; d. 1878.
Le Mieux, Dr. Lucius A., b. 1853; d. 1917.
Léon-Martin, Captain, b. 29 Oct., 1885, at L'Orient, France.
Leprettel, H., b. 1844; d. 1882.
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Lester, William Edward, b. 1 Feb., 1893, in London.
Letchford, Rev. Thomas, b. 1832, at Maidstone.
Letzen, Einar Larson, b. 26 May, 1898, in Malmö, Sweden.
Lewis, William, b. 9 Oct., 1787; d. 22 Aug., 1870.
Lewitt, Dr. Moritz, b. 12 Aug., 1863, at Posen.
Lhermet, Rudolf, b. 28 Dec., 1859, in Magdeburg; No. 33; p. 60.
Liddell, Donald M., b. 28 Feb., 1879.
Linde, Dr. Antonius van der, b. 14 Nov., 1833, at Haarlem, Holland; d. 12 Aug., 1897; pp. 22, 27.
Lindquist, C. E., b. 27 Aug., 1848; d. 1925.
Linschoten, H. Strick van, b. 23 Jan., 1879, at The Hague.
Lissner, Morris, b. 1845; d. 7 July, 1912; No. 229.
Locock, Charles Dealtry, b. 27 Sept., 1862, at Brighton.
Lolli, Giambatista (book 1763); p. 27.
Lord, Frederick William, b. 1856, in London.
Lord, Rev. Walter Smith, b. 24 Sept., 1865, at Rochdale.
Loretto, H., b. 15 Feb., 1863.
Loveday, Rev. Henry Augustus, b. 3 Aug., 1815, at Barrackpore, India; d. 9 Jan., 1848; No. 13; pp. 34, 36, 120. Illustrations p. 32.
Lloyd, Thomas, b. 8 Sept., 1830, at Philadelphia; d. 7 Mch., 1914.
Lucena (MS. about 1497).
Ludanyi, Antal (= Anton), b. 1882; d. 17 Nov., 1912; No. 341.
Landkivist, Alrik (of Eskilstuna, Sweden), b. 1890.
Lyons, William Henry ("Will H. Lyons"), b. 15 Feb., 1849, at Cincinnati, Ohio.

McAllister, George W. ("G.W.M."), b. 16 June, 1864, at Philadelphia.
Macdonnell, Rev. George Alcock ("Mars"), b. 16 Aug., 1830; d. 3 June, 1899.
McGregor, Ernest Augustus Murray ("E.A.M.M. of India").
Mach, Dr. Zdenek, b. 2 May, 1877, at Loucen, Bohemia; Nos. 65, 82, 165; p. 84.
McIntyre, Donald Glenoe, b. 19 May, 1889, at George, Cape Province, S. Africa.
Mackay, Donald, b. 27 May, 1866, at Chelsea, London.
Mackenzie, Arthur Ford (of Kingston, Jamaica), b. 6 Oct., 1861; d. 23 June, 1905; Nos. 43, 44, 45, 50, 136, 140, 211; pp. 47, 53, 54, 55, 65, 68, 69, 72, 74, 113; portrait p. 68.
Mackenzie, A. J., b. 1871.
Madsen, Arthur Valdemar, b. 5 Nov., 1900, at Odense, Denmark.
Magee, James F., Junr., b. 7 Jan., 1867, at Philadelphia; p. 27.
al-Mahdi, d. 785; p. 17.
Malmquist, Oscar Theodor, b. 4 Nov., 1848, at Copenhagen; d. 26 Oct., 1874.
Malmstrom, A. W. (of Eskilstuna, Sweden), b. 1871.
Malmstrom. Gustaf Emanuel, b. 2 Dec., 1874, at Eskilstuna, Sweden.
Malpas, Louis, b. 8 Mch., 1893, at Liège, Belgium.
Mann, C. C. W., Nos. 215, 257.
Mansubat, pp. 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 143.
Marble, Murray, b. 17 Feb., 1885; d. 17 Feb., 1919; No. 156.
Marco, Georg, b. 29 Nov., 1863, at Czernowitz, Bukowina; d. 29 Aug., 1923; p. 120.
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Mari, Alberto, b. 13 June, 1892, at Ferrara, Italy; No. 39.
Marin y Llovet, Valentin, b. 17 Jan., 1872, at Barcelona; Nos. 206, 303; pp. 77, 194.
Marks, William, b. 3 Sept., 1860, at Belfast.
Markwick, Frederick Winter, b. 14 May, 1863, at Brighton.
Markx, B. J. M., b. 20 Aug., 1874.
Marriott, Arthur T., b. 1859; d. 21 Nov., 1884.
Martinale, F. W., b. 27 Dec., 1854.
Massmann, Wilhelm Karl Hinrich, b. 6 July, 1895, at Preetz in Holstein.
Matousek, Frantisek, b. 17 Jan., 1879, at Smichov; No. 79.
Mauvillon, F. W. von, b. 1 May, 1774; d. 29 June, 1851.
Maximow, Nikolai Sworowitsch, b. 13 Feb., 1875, at St. Petersburg (Leningrad); p. 51.
Mazel, Dr. Eduard, b. 24 Dec., 1859, at Brun; p. 120.
Meiners, W. B. H., b. 19 Feb., 1862, at Amsterdam.
Meister, Theophil, b. 31 Mch., 1881, at Berne.
Mendelssohn, Felix, b. 2 March, 1843; d. 24 Nov., 1847.
Mendelssohn, Julius, d. 23 Aug., 1856; p. 27, 28.
Meredith, William, b. 1835 at Philadelphia; d. 10 Aug., 1903; Nos. 41, 42; pp. 67, 119.
Mérou, Lajos (= Lewis), b. 23 Jan., 1894, at Budapest.
Meurs, A., b. 4 Dec., 1904, at Rotterdam.
Meyer, H. F. L., b. 6 June, 1839, near Hanover; No. 372.
Meyer, Max J., b. 27 Mch., 1865; d. 2 Nov., 1917.
Michl, Joseph, b. 25 Mch., 1902, at Marcali, Hungary.
Miles, John Augustus, b. 4 Dec., 1817; d. 23 July, 1891.
Millar, Miss Clara, b. 17 Sept., 1866, at Bowdon, Cheshire; p. 9.
Millins, Edgar, b. 2 Feb., 1910, in Manchester.
Millins, Edward, b. 16 Oct., 1877, in Manchester.
Millins, James Lever, b. 14 May, 1904, in Manchester.
Miskoleczy, Dr. Antal, b. 29 Mch., 1882, at Nagytopolesány, Hungary.
Mitchell, David Andrew, b. 27 Dec., 1883, at Philadelphia.
Mitcheson, W., b. 1834; d. 4 July, 1888.
Moller, Ferdinand (of Barsinghausen, Germany), b. 1 Jan., 1853, in Hollige, near Walsrode, Hanover.
Möller, J. (of Copenhagen), b. 4 Feb., 1873, in Fyen (Fionia), Denmark; Nos. 175, 224, 314, 318.
Monck, W. H. S., b. 21 Apl., 1839.
Montgriédi, Alfred W. (of France), b. 1 Sept., 1877, in London.
Moon, Rev. J. F., b. 9 Dec., 1833; d. 9 Dec., 1905.
Morphy, Paul, b. 22 June, 1837; d. 10 July, 1884.
Morris, George Charles, b. 1874, at Brighton.
Morlimer, Rev. Ernest Clement, b. 1888, at Colyton, S. Devon.
Mosely, Arthur James, b. 11 Feb., 1867, at Brisbane.
Moses, Geo. W., b. 15 Apl., 1888.
Monterde, Anastole, b. 1874, at Lyons.
Mudlak, No. 109.
Muller, W. C., Jun., b. 25 Feb., 1892.
Munck, Dr. A., d. 5 May, 1924.

Nagy, Odon, b. 15 June, 1892, at Ercsi, Hungary.
Nanning, W., b. 7 June, 1870; No. 179.
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Nash, William, b. 23 Feb., 1841; d. 22 Mch., 1922.
Nehmeier, Georg, b. 22 Aug., 1875, at Nuremberg, Bavaria.
Nell, Rev. Benjamin Milnes, b. 15 Apr., 1853, at Pottsville, Pennsylvania; d. 16 Feb., 1923; No. 306.
Neilson, Archibald Johnston, b. 31 Oct., 1871, at Glasgow.
Neilson, Nels (of Hopkins, Minn., U.S.A.), b. 8 May, 1871, at Odense, Denmark.
Nemo, Ottmar (Ottmar Weiss), b. 31 Oct., 1861, at Brun, Moravia; pp. 107, 117.
Neukomm, Prof. Jules R., b. 22 Apr., 1892, at Versecz, Hungary; No. 291; p. 9.
Nicholas of St. Nicholas, p. 22.
Nicklin, John Joseph, b. 21 Feb., 1878, at Featherstone, Yorkshire.
Nield, Joshua, b. 3 May, 1866, at Royton, near Oldham.
Nielsen, Carl Christian, b. 7 Feb., 1906, in Ribe, Denmark.
Nielsen, V., (of Copenhagen), b. 26 Mch., 1830; d. Feb., 1918.
Niemeijer, Dr. ("Mr.") M., b. 18 Feb., 1902; Nos. 132, 199, 220, 326, 343, 354; p. 138.
Nix, John G., b. 21 Dec., 1843; d. 17 Feb., 1911.
Noack, Ludwig, b. 5 June, 1853.
Noble, Joseph H., b. 11 Apr., 1873.
Norlin, Major Adolf, b. 30 Sept., 1859; d. 15 Aug., 1921.
Novaka, see Dr. J. Dohrinsky.
Novotny, Dr. Anton, b. 1829; d. 7 Mch., 1871; No. 15; p. 209.

Oberhansli, Albert, b. 1 June, 1842; d. 12 Jan., 1913.
Obermann, Johannes Hugo Wilhelm, b. 28 May, 1857, in Leipzig; d. 25 July, 1888; No. 277.
O'Keefe, Dr. John James, b. 5 Jan., 1873, at Toowoomba, Queensland, Australia; Nos. 71, 197; p. 94.
Olaz, Imre, b. 15 Nov., 1830, at Szered, Hungary.
Onittu, Valerius, b. 8 Apr., 1872, at Szepsi-Szent-György.
Oosterholt, C. J., b. 16 Jan., 1889, at Diemen; No. 324.
Opdenoordt, Jos., b. 16 Sept., 1892; p. 134.
Orlimont, P. A. (Dr. Ernst Krieger), b. 8 June, 1867, in Wolfstein, Bavarian Palatinate.
Orsini, Dr. Emilio, b. 13 Jan., 1839; d. 27 Feb., 1898.
Orrmans, F. H. Jos., No. 259.
D'Orville, Auguste, b. about 1815; Nos. 8, 9, 311; pp. 26, 27, 30, 32, 44.

Packer, G. F. H., b. 28 Jan., 1886.
Paltz, Franz Ferdinand Ludwig, b. 18 July, 1896, in Hamburg; p. 9.
Palitzsch, Dr. Friedrich, b. 1889, in Dresden; No. 312; pp. 119, 128, 129, 255.
Palkoska, Dr. Emil, b. 11 May, 1871, in Prilepy, Bohemia; p. 152.
Paluzie y Lucena, Jose, b. 26 Nov., 1860, at Barcelona.
Pape, Edouard, b. 18 Apr., 1870, at Paris.
Papp, Jenö, b. 29 July, 1904, at Arad, Hungary.
Partita, pp. 21, 26.
Pater, Karl, b. 1849.
Patzelt, Josef, b. 29 Apr., 1845, at Slané, Bohemia; d. 10 Feb., 1916.
Pauly, Wolfgang (of Bucharest), b. 15 Aug., 1876, at Dohna, near Dresden; Nos. 64, 194, 214; pp. 89, 143; portrait p. 68.
Pearson, Rev. A. Cyril, b. 1838; d. 1914.
Peeters, Dr. Franciès, b. 10 Dec., 1900, at Antwerp.
Petrose, Lionel S., b. 1898; No. 272.
Pelastozzi, Max, b. 1856; d. 1925.
Petenyi, Dr. Geza, b. 26 Oct., 1869, at Budapest.
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Pfaunmüller, Dr. L., d. 4 Aug., 1917.
Pheips, Frank B., d. 16 May, 1916.
Phidias, André Damisch, b. 7 Sept., 1726, at Dreux, near Paris; d. 24 Aug., 1785; No. 152; pp. 29, 159.
Pickering, Frank R., b. 1 Apl., 1873.
Pierce, James, b. 1 July, 1835, in London; d. 27 Apl., 1892; p. 49.
Pierce, William Timbrell, b. 30 Mch., 1839, in London; d. May, 1922; p. 49.
Pirnie, Duncan, b. 13 June, 1885, in Westminster, London.
Pittler, Wolfgang von, b. 1900, in Leipzig.
Plachutta, Joseph, d. 22 July, 1885; p. 213; portrait p. 212.
Planck, Dr. Charles, b. 1 Nov., 1856; pp. 53, 54, 73, 75, 77; portrait p. 52.
Plant, George, b. 1831, in Birmingham; No. 355.
Pongracz, Count Arnold ("The Hermit of Tyrau"), b. 18 July, 1810, at Nedeck, Hungary; d. 17 July, 1890.
Ponziani, Domenico Lorenzo, b. 9 Nov., 1719; d. 15 July, 1796; p. 27.
Poole, John, b. 28 Jan., 1882, in Glasgow.
Portilla, Vincente Maria Norberto, b. 6 June, 1849, in Mexico; d. 1878.
Pospisil, Josef, b. 1 Nov., 1861, at Bestvin, Bohemia; d. 30 Dec., 1916; Nos. 63, 73, 83; pp. 53, 77, 83; portraits p. 84.
Potter, William Norwood, b. 28 Aug., 1840; d. 13 Mch., 1895.
Powell, Alfred Peter, b. 19 Aug., 1908, at London.
Pradignat, Emil, b. 1831; d. 2 Jan., 1912; pp. 107, 114, 194.
Pratt, Rowland, b. 21 Dec., 1885, in Clerkenwell, London.
Preti, Jean Louis, b. 1798; d. 27 Jan., 1881.
Preti, Numa, b. 27 Feb., 1841, at Bordeaux; d. 1908.
Prokop, F. J., b. 18 July, 1901, at Prague.
Promislo, Charles (of Philadelphia), b. 25 Apl., 1898, at Kiev, Ukraine, Russia; No. 355.
Przepiorka, D., b. 22 Dec., 1880, in Warsaw; Nos. 187, 285; p. 262.
Puig y Puig, Dr. Esteban, b. 15 Apl., 1879, at Barcelona.
Purchas, Francis Eastwood, b. 5 May, 1855; No. 180.
Puttkamer, Bernhard von, b. 20 Dec., 1872, in Kl. Gansen, Pomerania.
Pythagoras, p. 21.

Ranken, Rev. C. E., b. 5 Jan., 1828, in Brislington, near Bristol; d. 12 Apl., 1905.
Ramseforth, Heinrich, b. 18 Mch., 1864, in Westphalia; p. 10.
Rayner, James, b. 16 July, 1859, at Topcliffe, Yorkshire; d. 4 June, 1898.
Ruduch, Francis de, I.L.D. ("Dr. F. Ruduch"), b. 1886, at Lemberg, Pola.d.
Reichhelm, Gustav C., b. 6 Nov., 1839; d. 30 Nov., 1905; p. 142.
Reilley, William Henry ("W. Reilley"), b. 1892, in Manchester.
Renaud, Georges, b. 8 Jan., 1893, at Nancy, France.
Renoir, G., b. 1843.
Rice, Isaac Leopold, b. 22 Feb., 1850, in Bavaria; d. 2 Nov., 1915.
Rice, William Bayard, b. 13 July, 1895, at Philadelphia.
Richards, Charles, b. 1840; d. 1922.
Richards, J. B., b. 1837; d. 9 Nov., 1902.
Richardson, Philip, b. 12 Oct., 1841, in London; d. 1920.
Rietveld, J. J., b. 6 Aug., 1893, at Kesteren, Holland; Nos. 121, 122, 289; p. 134.
Rinaldini, Angelo, b. 11 Nov., 1891; d. 1923.
Rincz, Henri, b. 10 Jan., 1870, at Lyons.
Ringier, Adolf, b. 1840; d. 1925.
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Rio, Ercole del (Anonymous von Modena), book 1750; p. 27.
Risser, Dr. Frederick William, b. 1 Jan., 1863, in Troy, Illinois.
Robbins, A. H., b. 1846: d. 21 Feb., 1906.
Robbins, H. M., b. 1860, in Indiana, U.S.A.
Roepp, Willibald Erich Hermann Hugo, b. 10 Jan., 1894, in Schüttersdorf, nr. Bromberg, Posen.
Rohr, Prof. Dr. Hugo, b. 16 Sept., 1865, at Posen.
Rosmann, J., b. 1797; d. 10 June, 1879.
Roth, Emil b. 26 May, 1904, at Szekázard, Hungary.
Rowland, Thomas B., b. 1 June, 1850, at Dublin; No. 36; pp. 59, 61.
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Ablenkung, 254; "Die Ablenkung" (The Decoy), 129, 255.
Absence of Pawns, 47, 97.
Activity of one white piece, 160; more white pieces, 168; one black piece, 197; more black pieces, 200.
Activity-tasks, 198.
Added variations, 229; added-mate waiter, 229.
Alfil, the old-rule Bishop, its move, 20, 26.
Alternation of moves, 93.
Ambush, 181; ambush-interference, 191.
American Indian theme, 247.
American influences, 65.
Analytical retractors, 149.
Anderssen theme, 185-6.
Annihilation, 179; Annihilation-Roman, 261.
Anti, ambiguity of the prefix, 204, 216.
Anticipations, 100, 140.
Anticipatory Half-pin, 80, 283.
Appreciation, lack of, sometimes due to solver himself, 99.
Arabian manuscripts, 17.
Arabians Problem, the, 144 (No. 135).
Aufopferung der Wirkungskraft, 187.
Auxiliary manoeuvre, decoy as, 129, 251, 254.
Avoidance of Black pinning White, 277.

Backsort task theme, 199.
Batteries, single, 170; plural, 172; complex or multiple, 173; definitions, 170, 181; black, 201; direct and indirect, 170; mixed, 246, 247; single and complex mixed, 247.
Battery-piece, 170; battery-building, 183, 185, 186.
Battle Problem, 229.
Betting Problems, 23, 24, 25.
Black Bristol, 201, 202.
Black clearance, 202.
Black critical move, followed by Black interference, 121; followed by paralysing move, 123.
Black interference, 121, 191, 209.
Black King flights, 173.
Black Knight Interference Wheel, 63, 64.
Black Knight Wheel, 61, 62, 63, 64.
Black pins White, 277.
Black strategy, 201—204.
Black Theme defined, 123.
Block-check, 239.
Blocking, definition of, 205; mixed-blocking, 250.
Blocking-interference, 191.
Blocking obstruction, Holzhausen, 216.
Blocking of square, 39, 52, 55, 56, 206.
Block problem, complete, 227; incomplete, 228.
Block-threat problem, 73, 238, 239; three-mover, 239, 245; English neglect of, 51.
Bohemian dislike of pawns, 97.
Bohemian problems, true, 96.
Bohemian School, the, 82.
Bohemian tendency, the modern, 90.
Bohemian two-movers, 100.
Book of the Duchess, quotation from, 21.
Books—About the History of Chess and Problems, 27; Alexandre, 28, 45;
Anderssen, 31; Brede, 33, 53, 175; Dobrusky, 83; d’Orville’s
Problems, 30.
Bauernwandlungsauflagen, 160.
Bohemian Garnets, Havel, 83.
Böhmische Schachminiaturen, Dedrze, 81.
Brennpunktleme, 266.
Ceske Melodie, Pospisil, 83.
Ceske Ulohy Sachove, 83.
Chancellor Chess, 148.
Chess Idylls, Heathcote, 253.
Chess; its Poetry and its Prose, 68.
777 Chess Miniatures in Three, 81.
Chess Problem Text Book, 53, 54, 76.
100 Chess Problems, Meredith, 67.
Dame und ein Läufer, 152.
Das Schachproblem, Berger, 111.
Das Schwarze Schachspielfische, 214.
Densmore Memorial, 218, 284.
Die Ahlenkung, 129, 255.
English Chess Problems, 49.
Fata Morgana, 80.
First Steps in the Classification of Two-movers, 152.
Het Schaakprobleem, 9, 63.
Knights and Bishops, 160.
Les 1001 Mats Inverses, 79.
Memorial to D. J. Densmore, 218, 284.
Nederlandsche Schaakproblemen, 131, 318.
Retrograde Analysis, 149.
Running the Gauntlet, 160.
Sachove Ulohy, Kotrc and Traxler, 83.
Sam Loyd and his Chess Problems, 106, 248, 249.
Schachminiaturen, Blumenthal, 81.
Schachprobleme, Klett, 107.
Simple Two-move Themes, 152.
Teplitz-Schönau Congress Book, 128, 202, 204.
The Problem Art, 59.
The White King, 160.
The White Knights, 160.
Theory of Pawn Promotion, 160.
Two-move Chess Problem, Laws, 54.
Vielzügige Schachaufgaben, 143.
Zur Kenntnis des Schachproblemes, 92.
Bottling, 126, 207.
Brede cross-check, 33, 77, 282, 283.
Brede multiple sacrifice, 58, 193.
Brede square-vacating, 175.
Bristol Problem, the, 42 (No. 20), 45.
Bristol theme, 39, 42, 43, 120, 176, 177; black Bristol, 201, 202.
Bristol theme (two-move form), 43, 177; with anti-Bristol, 249.
Brunner-Plachutta or Brunner-Novotny theme, 216.
Byplay, 57, 122.

Catching the solver’s attention, 224.
Chancellor, combining Knight and Rook motion, 148.
Changed foci, 268.
Changed mate problems, formula for, 236.
Changed mates, 157, 224; in focal theme, 268; in non-waiter problems, 224; in complete block problems, 232.
Changed variations, 232, 233, 238; changed themes, 234, 235.
Charge of the Light Brigade, 168.
Chaucer, quotation from, 21.
Checking themes, 284.
Checks “degraded” into interferences, 225.
Checks, direct, royal and cross, 284.
Chess problem “laws,” 27, 41.
Chess problems resemble little dramas, 124.
Chief purposes of modern problem, accuracy and beauty, 29.
Christmas problems, 141.
Cis-critical move, 204.
Classification of problem ideas, 155.
Clearance, white, 174; mixed, 246; clearance key, 136.
Complete block, 227, 232; on second move, 244.
Complete-waiting move (complete block) form, thematic limitations of, 225.
Concurrent mates, 164.
Congruence of play, 87.
Consistency in Bohemian problems, 83.
Continental or German School, 48, 83, 107.
Corner-to-corner moves, 165.
Counter-clearance, 176, 178.
Coup de repos, 207.
Critical move, 35, 37, 39, 122, 186; critical square, 35, 39; critical key, 121.
Critical play impossible in black interference two-mover, 209.
Cross-checks, 69, 70; defined, 284.
Cross-checks, thematic purity in, 285.
Cumulative effects in: checking themes, 266; decoy, 256; pinning themes, 273; Romans, 263; waiting move problems, 243.

Decoy, 254, 210; consecutive, 256; cumulative, 256, 257; from and to, 255.
Diagram positions derivable from actual play, 29, 143.
Direct checks, 284; ambiguity of the term, 284.
Disturbed Black check, 137.
Double attack, White Queen’s, 222.
Double mutual blocking, 138.
Doubling, 179.
Duals, 51, 52; major or absolute, 51; minor, 51; thematic, 51; unthematic, 52; in threat problems, 52; in Bohemian problems, 84, 85, 87.
Durbars, 160.
Dutch characteristics, 131, 132.
Dutch School, the, 131.

Echoes, 77, 87, 88, 157, 280, 281; chameleon, 76, 89, 281; symmetrical and non-symmetrical types, 87; thematical purity and impurity of, 89.
Economy of force in Arabian problems, 19.
Eingeschränkte Wirkungskraft, 167.
English School, the, 49; themes discovered by, 73, 266.
En-passant capture, 167, 169; consecutive, 169; en-passant keys, 149.
Excelsior theme, 101, 102, 138.

Fairy chess, 142.
Faulty manoeuvres, 123, 124, 126, 205; compared with Idea in the Defence, 124.
Faulty manoeuvres, seemingly, 189.
Feeling, in Bohemian problems, 82, 83, 84, 97.
Five-fold interference, 138.
Flight-square cross-checks, 286.
Flight-squares, maxima, 197.
Focal action, 266; three kinds of focal positions, 267; foci, 267.
Forelaidy interferences, 210.
Four-fold blocking on one square, 208.
Four mates by a white Pawn, 59, 60.
Fringe pieces, 57.
Front or battery-piece, 170.

German School, the Modern, 118; the Old, 107.
Give-and-take key, 274.
Good Companion Club, 67, 72, 77, 80, 130, 133, 145.
Grab theme, 223.
Grimshaw interference, 38, 39, 209; Grimshaw Roman, 259.
Guillotine theme, 251.

Half-pin theme, 71, 272; plural representations (double, triple), 273; incomplete, 273.
Help-mate problems, 146.
Herlin pericritical maneuvre, 181—184.
Hineinzuepng and Hineinzwingung, 255.
Hinlenkung, 255, 266.
Horse-block, 206.
Humour in problems, 101, 106.

Ideal Via Media, 47.
Illustrations, see page 11.
Immortal Problem, the, 114 (No. 96).
Impossible position, 145.
Improvement in technique, 53.
Indian Problem, the, 34, 35 (No. 13), 36, 120, 123, 127.
Indian theme, 154; thematically pure, 186; impure, 189; modified, 121.
Indian theme (black), shown as Idea in the Defence, 123—125; as a faulty maneuvre, 126.
Initial diagram position, rules governing, 143.
Interchange (re-arrangement of doubling), 126, 180.
Interference, definition of, 205; black, 121, 191; white, 62, 71, 191; black-white, 126, 191; white-black, 191; mixed, 250; mutual (R and B), 39; five-fold, 138, 211; forelaidy, 210 (No. 233); true, 214; unrelated, 211 (No. 236).
Interference. Anti-Bristol, definition of, 216—218; combined with clearance, 249; a confusing usage of term explained, 178.
Interference at an angle of 180 degrees (Anti-Bristol), 216; at 45 or 135 degrees, 218.
Interference of pieces of different motions, 209; with the same motion, 213.
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Interference, Grimshaw, 38, 39, 209; Holzhausen, 41, 214, 215, 216; Novotny, 39, 126, 209, 210; Novotny, with two critical moves, 210 (No. 231); Novotny, four-fold, 210 (No. 232); Pawn-Grimshaw, 211 (No. 234); Plachutta, 215—215, 218; Wurzburg—Plachutta, 215, 216. Interference-unpin by White’s mate, 192, 193.


Naming themes after composers or places or mottoes, danger of, 103. Necessary combinations, 174; Necessary white interference, 184. New types of moves, 148. Non-Bohemian types of model mate problems, 92. Novotny theme, 39, 126, 209, 211.

Obtrusive pieces, 145 ("the white Bd6 in No. 106 and black Bd8 in No. 331A").
Officious friends, 165.
Old School, the, 28.
Opposition theme, 221; definition of it, 221.

Paralysing move, 123, 125.
Paralysis, definition of, 205, 207; mutual, 208.
Passing of long-range problem, 30.
Passive sacrifice, 187, 189.
Pawn-Grimshaw, 211, 212; Pawn-Grimshaw Roman, 259.
Pawn promotion, 166, 198, 199; consecutive, 169.
Pawns, dislike of, 97.
Pericritical play, 182.
Periods and Tendencies, 46, 47.
Permutation theme, 249.
Philidor's Legacy, 29, 159.
Pickaninny task, 60, 64; in three-mover, 60.
Piece-blocking, 206, 214; Piece-blocking Roman, 260.
Pin-models, 77, 85, 281; definition of, 85.
Pinning (and unpinning) a Black piece, 270; a White piece, 274.
Pinning problems, 270; classification of, 270.
Pinning through masked battery, 41.
Plachutta interference, 213—215, 218; doubled, 214.
Possible white interference, 189.
Prevented black check, 137.
Prevention of pinning or unpinning, 273, 277.
Prize-winning problems, not always of the most permanent value, 86, 167.
Problem classification, 152.
Problem-Futurism, 140.
Problem-Renaissance, the, 118.
Problem tourneys, 55.
Pseudo Indian, 242.
Pure-waiter or complete block problem, 227.

Queen, black, produces twelve variations, 154.
Queen sacrifice, various views regarding, 48, 85.
Queen sacrifice problem, 175.
Queen's Cross task, white, 152, black, 288.

Räumungs-Römer, 258.
Rear piece of a battery, 170.
Re-arrangement of "Wrong Arrangement," 126, 181.
Reflection in Locus theory, 88, 165.
Reflex-mate problem, 147.
Restricted Activity, 187.
Roman decoy, 129, 254.
Roman Problem, the, 127-8 (No. 112), 260.
Roman theme, 129, 254, 257—266; classification of, 258; obstruction, 259;
capture, 260; clearance, 261; waiting, 262; cumulative and complex
examples, 263.
Römische Opfer-Räumung, 261.
Rook mates on fourteen squares, 171.
Rotation in Locus theory, 88, 165.
Royal checks, 284.
Sacrifices, 193; cumulative, 193; multiple, 193; in Bohemian problems, 84.
Same motion, definition of term, 209.
Schlag-Römer, 258.
Seemingly faulty manoeuvres, 189.
Self-blocking, 206.
Self-interference, 191.
Self-mate, the, 78, 79, 80, 146.
Self-pinning, black, 272; white, 276.
Self-stalemate problems, 146.
Set system in tourneys, 104.
Short mate, 58.
Short threats, when blemishes, 38, 109.
Shut-off, 126, 191.
Shut-off Problems, 250; multiple, 250; shut-off switchback (Guillotine or Mouse-trap theme), 251.
Skittles Theme, 200.
Smothered mate, 159.
Sole Knight, checkmate with, 165.
Spectacular feats, 165; move, 57; problems, 195, 220.
Sporting element, 64.
Spots in Locus theory, 162.
Square, some nations call "house," 78.
Square-vacating, 174.
Stalemate, release from and prevention of, 184.
Stalemate problems, 146.
Steinitz Gambit Problem, the, 104 (No. 89).
Strangulation process, 94.
Strategical black Anti-Bristol, 203.
Strategical black Grimshaw-anti-Grimshaw, 205.
Strategical counter-clearance, 202.
Strategy, white, 174; black, 201.
Stuck-Steinitz Problem, the, 125 (No. 106).
Support, 179.
Switchback theme, 61.

Task problems, 58; maximum and theme, 58.
Taste, the element of, 44.
Tastes and Schools, 46.
Thematic extension of themes, its possibilities, 278.
Thematic purity, 174; try, 242.
Theme, or idea, 155.
Themes, definitions of White, Black, and Mixed, 154.
Third-pin, 273, 283.
Three-dimensional chess, 148.
Three-movers with waiting two-movers as continuations, 245
Trans-critical move, 204.
Transition School, the, 34.
Triangulation, 241.
Tries, 51.
Turton-clearance, 179.
Turton doubling, 180.
Twentieth Century Retractor, 141.

Unanalytical retractor, 149.
General Index.

Unblocking, 208.
Unnecessary Pawn, 62.
Unpinning themes, 70, 270, 274, 275, 278.
Unpins of white Queen, five by interference, 275; four by withdrawal, 275.
Unprovided checks, 171.
Unsound problems, intentional, 26.

Vacating move not a true critical move, 121.
Verstellungs-Römer, 258.

Waiter, complete, 50, 227; incomplete, 50, 53.
Waiters, 227; classification of, 227.
Weglenkung, 255.
White interference, 190, 191; "necessary" as contrasted with "possible," 184; possible, 189-193.
White King activity, true thematic, 160.
White Knight's Wheel, 171, 224.

Zugzwang-Römer, 258.
Zweckrein, "pure in purpose," 42.
NOTES.

Page 9, line 4 from bottom, for "Brun" please read "Brunn."

Page 10, top line, for Ranneforth's "Schach Kalendar" please read "Schachkalender."

Page 125, in problem No. 106 there appears to be the following dual: 1. ..., Bh1; 2. Bb8 (threat 3. BxPa7), Pg5; 3. Pb3 (threat 4. Sf5), Be4; 4. SxPb5 mate.

Page 145, line 2 from bottom, "white Bb6" should read "white Bd6."

Page 165, the solution to No. 162 should continue: "Or 1. Sd4; 2. Sf5, Kh2; 3. Se3; 4. Sf1 as before."
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