

Sources and technical notes

1.1 *diagrammes* 125, April-June 1998. *diagrammes*, founded in 1973, is a French composition magazine which suddenly took wing in the late 1980s and for half a dozen years was quite the best of the composition magazines which were written in languages that I could read. I was its endgame study columnist for ten years from 1993, but I don't say it was a good magazine because I used to write for it; I was quietly proud to write for it because I thought it a good magazine.

1.2 *EG* 34, November 1973.

1.3 *diagrammes* 149, April-June 2004. The bishop-and-pawn study had appeared in the *British Chess Magazine* in 1947, and I had quoted it in a special number of *British Endgame Study News* devoted to British compositions from the period 1937-49. Unfortunately I didn't notice the unwanted line Bc4 until after the magazine had gone to press, and I was not greatly surprised when readers (Noam Elkies was the first) started writing in to draw attention to the oversight. Noam also noticed, as I did, that **1.3a** was reciprocal zugzwang, but the extension back to **1.3** was my own.

It may be asked whether an exchange on c4 cannot be incorporated into the play, thus avoiding starting in a position where Black's c-pawn is already offside. All I can say is that I have been unable to do so other than by crudely putting a Black piece on c4 and letting White capture it straight away. For a time, I thought it might be possible to move the White king back to f4 and the Black pawn to d5, and to add knights on b2 and a5, with intention 1 Ke5 (1 Nd3 Nc6) Nc4+ 2 Nxc4 dxc4 etc, but 1...Nc6+ proved unexpectedly troublesome. It concedes the d-pawn at once and the b-pawn will soon

follow, but White's h-pawn will go, and can he in fact win the resulting ending? After 2 Kxd5 Kf6 3 Nc4 Ne7+ 4 Ke4 (I don't think anything else is better) Ng6 5 Nd6/Na5 Nxb7 Nf5 my computer initially rated the position as +1.5 to White, but the deeper it analysed the less convinced it became, and by the time it got to about 25-ply it seemed to have conceded that White could not force a win; Black's h-pawn was too great a distraction. In any case, Black's defences outside the main line must be refuted relatively simply if a study is to be aesthetically satisfying, and a sideline needing analysis as deep as this would put the setting out of court even if a win in it were eventually to be found.

1.4 *diagrammes* 126, July-September 1998. No significant backward extension appears possible without adding extra material. Black's last move could obviously have been h5-h6, but g2 is a bad square for White's knight; wherever it might have come from, unless its move was a capture it would have had a better alternative. 3 Nd2+ is given by the computer as an alternative winning move, but it is a blind alley; Black plays 3...Kf4 threatening to bring his knight into play by 4...Ng3, White must play 4 Nf1 to prevent this, and 4...Ke4 repeats.

My first attempt to produce a study by examining the lists of reciprocal zugzwangs in *EG* ended in disaster. I searched the zugzwangs with B + N v N for positions with a similar relationship between the knights and the Black king, again with a view to having a knight promotion by Black in the preceding play, and came up with White Ka2, Bb4, Nd6 (3), Black Ka4, Pd3 (2), win not by 1 Bc5? d2 2 Ne4 d1N but by 1 Ba3! d2 Ne4 d1N 3 Bc5. I published this in *diagrammes*, and the next post brought a

puzzled letter from Harold van der Heijden: “Dear John, what is going on, this had been published by Simkhovich in 1940!” And indeed it had been; he, long before the advent of computers, had discovered the same position of reciprocal zugzwang, and had worked out exactly the same way of exploiting it (64, 1940). As a non-computer production, this was a classic, the play after the reciprocal zugzwang being by no means trivial, and it remains among my favourites even though it embarrassed me by totally anticipating a discovery which I had thought was my own.

1.5 *The Problemist*, January 2005. *The Problemist* is the magazine of the British Chess Problem Society, and since 1968 it has included a column for original endgame studies (edited by Adam Sobey until 2000). In truth, problem magazines provide an environment very far from ideal for endgame studies, but *The Problemist* gave me a platform for my early efforts, and I still try to send it something respectable from time to time.

1.6 *Moravskoslezský šach*, 1996 (as by “WDE and JDB”). *Moravskoslezský šach* was a short-lived magazine which circulated in the Eastern half of the Czech Republic.

Several further studies appeared in my *diagrammes* column as by “So-and-so and JDB”. This often meant only that I had tested a composer’s contribution by computer and that it had disclosed a flaw for which there was an obvious fix, and wherever possible I tried to persuade the composer that I had done nothing and that he would have found and fixed the fault for himself had he also had access to a computer for testing (a significant amount of what appears in print has been silently influenced by editorial input of this kind). But sometimes the composer insisted, and when the computer-discovered bust was a win or draw for Black and the “fix” consisted of reversing the colours and using

the computer’s discovery as the main line, there was really no other way of describing the result. None of these studies appears here, nor do one or two other joint studies where “my” contribution was discovered for me by the computer, but in the present case I found the key move for myself and felt that my contribution had been a significant one.

1.7 *British Chess Magazine*, November 2008. Baxter’s original took 2nd Prize in the 1961 *New Statesman* Tourney.

1.8 *British Endgame Study News*, September 2004.

1.9 *diagrammes* 139, October-December 2001. It gave my solvers a lot of trouble. One, having played to **1.9a**, sent me one of White’s plausible tries, and I said No, Black plays such-and-such; then he sent me the second try, and again I said No; then he sent the third try, and I said a third No. At that point, I put him out of his misery.

1.10 *diagrammes* 130, July-September 1999.

1.11 Original setting in *The Problemist*, March 1981; version by Christopher Jones, *British Endgame Study News*, September 2000. *BESN* is a quarterly magazine which does not normally take originals unless they are incidental to an article or have been derived from a study already published in it, but it regularly reprints British originals which have appeared elsewhere, and it also carries articles describing how a certain study came into being. **1.11** featured in one of these, and Christopher wrote in to suggest the alternative setting.

The just-in-time Black wins in the lines 3 Nb4 Bxd7 and 4 Nf6+ Ke6 were rare examples of a composer having good luck. The composer has no control over sidelines like this; either they work or they don’t, and all too often they don’t.

66 *Fifty-one flights of chess fancy*

1.12 *The Problemist*, July 1990. Black's answer to the various win-a-piece lines is to try to win or exchange off White's last pawn. If 1 Ne5+ Kg5 2 Nxc6, taking off Black's bishop, Black has 2...Ne3, with 3 Be2 Nf5 4 g4 Ng3 5 Bd1/Bf3 h5 or 3 Bf3 Nf1 4 g4 Nh2. Some other lines allow White to avoid the exchange of pawns by answering ...h4 by g4, but with Black's bishop bearing down on the promotion square his h-pawn then becomes unpleasantly strong. No line is particularly difficult, but there are quite a lot of them, and I was quietly relieved when the computer endorsed my original verdict.

1.13 World Chess Solving Championship, 1994. Gurvich (1st Prize, Tourney of the Dagestan Committee of Physical Culture and Sport, 1952) had White Kb8, Rh5, Bg8 (3), Black Kf8, Be3, Ng1, Pg6 (4), draw by 1 Rh8 Kg7 2 Bh7 g5 3 Bf5 Kxh8 4 Bg4 etc. I dealt with the problem of side variations by announcing in advance that each of the studies to be used in the championship had a clear main line, and that everybody giving it in full would receive full points.

1.14 World Chess Solving Championship, 1996. Tronov (*Shakhmatny vestnik* 1913, corrected in the *British Chess Magazine* in 1995) had White Kf2, Pg5/b4/e4/b3/d3 (6), Black Ke5, Bd1, Pa6/d6/e6/g6/h4 (7), draw by 1 b5 axb5 2 Ke3 d6 3 d4+ Kd6 4 e5+ and 5 b4.

As regards the occasional appearance of such finishes over the board, one leading solver, who was an international master as a player and therefore entitled to be taken seriously, said that in his opinion the draw after 3...Ba2 was obvious, and that a Black player trying to win in real life would play 3...Bxd3. A possible continuation is now 4 Kxd3 e4+ 5 Kc3 Ke5 6 K~ Kf6 7 Kc3 Kg5 8 Kd4 Kxg4 9 Kxe4 Kh4 10 Kd5 g5 11 e4 etc, all White's moves apart from the sixth having been forced. I don't think he found many supporters, but it does illustrate

the difficulties that can arise. Much as I love endgame studies, I consider them unsuitable for really serious competitive solving, where money or prizes are at stake and people will argue over the slightest detail. For such purposes, the precision of "mate within n moves" is essential, and I am fully in agreement with those who say that the WCSC should be openly and unashamedly a problem-solving event and the endgame study round should be dropped.

1.15 *The Problemist*, July 2007.

The White pawn on c5 appears to be necessary in order to give White a tempo move, but can we not manage without the Black pawn on c6? On a 9x9 board, yes, because the Black knight can start at e9, and a version of the study in this form appeared in the German composition magazine *feenschach* in 1973. On an 8x8 board, an unobstructed dark-square knight which can reach b3 in three moves can also reach e2, and this is fatal for White.

I discovered the present setting (or something very similar) in the 1980s or late 1970s, but I omitted to write it down, and when I came to send it off to an editor I was unable to reconstruct it. I rediscovered it two or three years ago. We may note that the interference between the Black knight and pawn is mutual; the pawn blocks the knight at move 3, the knight returns the compliment at the end.

1.16 *The Problemist*, January 1971. Why do I say that the Meyer study outclasses it? Because the starting position is more natural, the White pawn starts right back on the second rank, and the White king moves into position during the play. This last can be achieved in **1.16a** only by introducing some extraneous motivation, such as making the king's move capture something. With the king on g7 instead of g8 in **1.16a**, the move 2 Bg2 would indeed fail, but the unwanted move 2 f5 would work instead.

1.17 *The Problemist*, January 1972.

Mitrofanov (1st Prize, Rustaveli Memorial Tourney, 1967) had White Ka5, Re4, Pa6/g6/b5/d5/h5 (7), Black Ka7, Bd6, Ne5/f3, Ph2 (5), with intention 1 b6+ Ka8 2 Re1 Nxe1 3 g7 h1Q 4 g8Q+ Bb8 5 a7 Nc6+ 6 dxc6 Qxh5+ 7 Qg5!! Qxg5+ 8 Ka6 Bxa7 9 c7 and a remarkable winning position with 2P v Q + B + N. 2...Nc4+ gives Black a difficult draw, but moving the other knight from f3 to g2 is generally accepted as fixing it

My original intention was to have the rook arriving at g8 by underpromotion, the pawn on h7 being absent and promotion to queen being met by ...Qg3+ and stalemate. However, this created difficulties at the end, when Black could play ...Qh7 pinning the pawn. I did eventually get it to work, but only at the cost of some extra material, and the result was not elegant. John Roycroft mentioned my efforts to David Gurgenzidze at a meeting in Tbilisi in 1975, and Gurgenzidze set up a brilliant double-file version with a b-pawn in which White promoted to a rook on f8 and then moved his king up the a-file if Black checked on the g-file and up the b-file if Black checked on the h-file (*EG*, 1976). Unfortunately there also had to be a White pawn on c6, and this created a dual Ka4/Kb4 if Black played ...Qh3+. The idea would work perfectly on a 10x10 board, though at least one extra pawn appears to be needed in the top right-hand corner to give the White king a haven if Black simply lets White's b-pawn promote and plays for perpetual check.

The version used in the 1994 WCSC had White Kg4, Rg8, Bh8, Pg7/a6 (5), Black Ka1, Qa3, Pg6/g5 (4), win by 1 Rb8 Qa4+ 2 Kxg5 Qa5+ 3 Kxg6 Qxa6+ 4 Kg5 Qa5+ 5 Kg4 Qa4+ 6 Kg3 Qa3+ 7 Kg2 Qa2+ 8 Kg1 Qa7+ 9 Kh1. It is of course greatly inferior to the original, but the final twist 8...Qa7+ 9 Kh1 caught one or two.

1.18 *British Endgame Study News*, September 2003.

1.19 *diagrammes*, special number 22, April-June 1998, as "after T. R. Dawson". Dawson had produced an orthodox problem featuring similar out-and-back king play (*Fairy Chess Review*, February 1950, White Kh1, Pb7/c6/c4/e3/e2/g2 (7), Black Ka7, Pc7/e7/g7/b6/g6/c5/e4/g3 (9), mate in "not less than 60" by 1-9 Ka6 10-16 Ka6 etc), but in truth a closer predecessor was Kling, quoted in Alexandre's 1846 collection (original source not known to me), White Kc6, Bh1, Nd6/b5, Pa6/f5/d4/g4/e3/h3 (10), Black Kb8, Pa7/b6/f6/g5/h4 (6), mate in 10 moving only the king (1-3 Kf3 4-6 Kf3 7-9 Kc6 10 Kc7). The "Gare de Lyon" joke, one of the classic bilingual puns, is due to *1066 And All That*.

1.20 *British Chess Magazine*, December 1994.

2.1 *Correspondence Chess*, Summer 2002. The Barden column was in "today's" *Financial Times* (communication from Hew dated 16 February 2002). Apart from the duals in the main line, which occur in all long-range studies using this mechanism, Black can invert the moves ...f6 and ...c2 in the reply to 1 h4. However, if he plays ...f6 earlier, say 3 h6 b4 4 h7 f6, White can play 5 cxb4 c3+ 6 Kd3 c2 7 h8Q c1Q 8 Qxf6+ with a win (Marc Bourzutschky's provisional database for Q + 2P v Q + P confirms, saying that White can promote or convert to a winning 6-man position within 16 moves). Marc's provisional database assumes promotion only to queen, but this is not a position in which Black is likely to have a drawing underpromotion resource.

3.1 *British Chess Magazine*, January 1976. **3.1a** was used in the Belgian national solving championship in either 1991 or 1992, and was subsequently published in *The Hindu*, 20 June 1992. I have moved **3.1** one file to the right, and reflected **3.1a** left to right, to bring the positions into alignment.

3.2 Used in the French national solving championship, 1993, and subsequently published in the *British Chess Magazine*, June 1995.

3.3 *The Independent*, 4 May 1987. The only point of possible originality lay in the hesitant retreat of the White king from f6 to f7 to g7. The piloting of the Black king by making him capture knights had been done many times before.

Another example in which an apparently simple single-line problem created havoc in a solving competition was given by a problem by David Fawcett which appeared in the *Gentleman's Journal* around 1870. (This particular *Gentleman's Journal* was a weekly paper for boys which ran from 1869 to 1872, and Fawcett appears to have been one of its schoolboy readers.) This had White Ke4, Bc2, Nd5/d4, Pf3/a2/e2 (7), Black Kc5, Pf4 (2), mate in six by 1 Ke5 Kc4 2 Bf5 Kc5 3 Bh3 Kc4 4 Kd6 Kxd4 5 Bf1 Kc4 6 e3. I set it in five-move form (White Ke5, Black Kc4) in the solving competition at a meeting of the British Chess Problem Society in 1997, and even in this simplified form it defeated nine competitors out of thirteen.

3.4 5th World Chess Composition Tournament, 1992-95. I am a disbeliever in composition tourneys in general and an emphatic disbeliever in the WCCT, but our captain that year had done me several favours at times not always convenient to himself and I felt I owed him something. In the event, **3.4** gained us a couple of points, but it was really far too light for this tournament, and Michael and I both felt that it would have given more pleasure in an ordinary solving column.

(Why am I a disbeliever in composition tourneys? Because I believe that we should compose to entertain, not to gain points or prizes; because the leading places seem too often to go to complicated heavyweights, which will be regarded by subsequent

generations as little more than convenient examples of what not to do; and because their administration and judging soaks up vast amounts of effort, the WCCT particularly so, and if devoted instead to composition this would produce far more of value than is generated by the tournament.)

3.5 World Chess Solving Championship, 1994. A long problem with two variations was needed to complete the selfmate round, and having the manuscript of Jiří Jelínek's book on echoes in Bohemian selfmates for translation, I was able to look for a long-range echo which hadn't been done before. "Bohemian", in this context, refers to multiple-variation problems in which the character of the mates is pre-eminent (each square in the mated king's field is either blocked by a friendly man or guarded by a single enemy man, no square being doubly guarded nor guarded and blocked, and every enemy man left on the board, apart possibly from the king and one or more pawns, takes part in the mate). Selfmates of this kind in which the king is mated on squares as far apart as h5 and h2 are relatively rare.

4.1 *The Problemist*, January 1997. If instead 1 Nc~ (say Nb4) d2 2 N~ (either) then 2...d1B, and while White can now give one knight away Black will soon give his bishop to the other; if 1 Ne1 d2 2 Ne2/Nh3 then 2...d1N.

Evseev (2nd Prize, *phénix* 1992) had White Nb8 (1), Black Pd5/c3/e3 (3), win by 1 Nc6 and either (a) 1...d4 2 Nx4 etc, or (b) 1...c2 2 Nd4 and either 2...e2 3 Nxc2 or 2...c1B 3 Ne2 with several more N v B wins, or (c) 1...e2 2 Ne5 d4 3 Nc4. This was both earlier than mine and more profound, but I have been told that my simpler setting also has its appeal.

4.2 International problemists' meeting, Bournemouth 1989. John Roycroft set a light-hearted tourney for "twin" studies, with the rider that more account would be

taken of the nature of the twinning mechanism than of any subtlety in the play. I submitted 4.2 as a joke entry, and he gave it the prize for sheer cheek.

4.3 *Variant Chess* 27, Spring 1998. *VC* was founded by George Jelliss in 1990 as one of two successors to his magazine *Chessics* (1976-87).

The classic “lose a move with a knight” study in ordinary chess is of course that by H. A. Adamson, *Chess Amateur*, January 1924 (not “1923” as sometimes quoted), White Kb6, Nc2, Pc7/h6/e5 (5), Black Kc8, Bd5, Pb7/e7/h7/e6 (6), win by 1 Na3 Bc6 2-3 Nc3 Bd3 and now 4-5 Nc5 Bd5 6-7 Nf4 Bf5 8 Ne2 Bd3 (to meet 9 Nd4 by 9...Bc4) 9 Nc3! returning to the position after 3...Bd3 but with Black to play. Black now has nothing better than 9...Bc4, and after 10 Ne4 White will soon win a pawn.

As regards the genesis of the present study, I had programmed my computer to generate a definitive database of three-man endings without pawns, and on playing through the longest win with 2N v R I noticed that we seemed to likely have a “lose a move” manoeuvre somewhere in the ending. So indeed it proved.

4.4 *Variant Chess* 34 (nominally “Winter 1999” but not actually published until well into 2000). Its originality is in some doubt, because Laurent Bartholdi had produced a definitive database of three-man endings with pawns a couple of years before, and had he or anyone else trawled this database for positions in which $P = Q$ was the only move to win this position would have been thrown up. However, there is a difference between constructing a computer database and singling out a position within it as worthy of particular attention, and the publication of 4.4 in *VC* 34 did not result in any claim of prior discovery; nor, so far as I know, has any such claim been made since. Other promotions clearly don’t win, and in fact $P = N$ and $P = K$ both lose.

4.5 *British Chess Magazine*, December 1992 (as part of my annual off-beat solving competition). The refutation of 2 Rxc7+ (Nb7) by 2...Nxc7 (Ra7) mate was due to Graeme Oswald, one of my solvers; I had given 2...Nxc7+ (R off) followed by a 2N v P win (which is sound enough but takes longer). According to the computer, best play after 3 Kxa7 (Nb7) Nc5 4 Kb6 N7xa6 (Pc4) results in mate at move 46.

This, like 1.6 and 1.12, was a chance discovery. I was looking for a variation on the classic mate with a lone knight, and suddenly noticed the bust.

4.6 As a triplet, probably not before *The Classified Encyclopedia of Chess Variants* (2007), page 221, though the failure of 1 a6 in Circular Chess had been noted in *British Endgame Study News*, special number 24, March 2001. The *Classified Encyclopedia* was the second edition of David Pritchard’s *Encyclopedia of Chess Variants* (1994), completed by myself at the request of his widow. Circular Chess is played by a group centred on the Tap and Spile, Hungate, Lincoln, who have held an annual World Championship since 1996. They play to slightly different rules (a1 light, K-side on White’s left and Black’s right, no capturing *en passant*), but the essentials are the same.

4.7 International problemists’ meeting, Bournemouth 1989 (produced for a solving competition). The competition problems, excluding a few found to be unsound, were subsequently published in *The Problemist* in November 1989. Unlike the other twin problems in this book, where a small change in the stipulation produces a radical change in the solution, this is merely two different settings of the same idea. I am quite unable to decide which I prefer.

4.8 International problemists’ meeting, Bournemouth 1989 (solving competition). This problem succeeded in outwitting its own composer. Several solvers claimed

70 *Fifty-one flights of chess fancy*

1 Qa2 etc, and I could neither remember nor recreate the refutation and conceded a cook.

4.9 Inserted in a correction slip to *Some flights of chess fancy*, 1989. Smulders's **4.9a** appeared in *Europe Echecs* in 1970.

This was a sad story. In 1972, not then being aware of the Smulders, I produced an all-promotion setting in which three of the promotions took place on one square and the fourth on another. When the authors of the *Oxford Companion* wanted an example of neutral men for their first edition (1984), they consulted me, and being still unaware of the Smulders I offered them mine. Having become aware of the Smulders, I urged them very strongly to use it as the example in their second edition (1992), but they told me they preferred to put in an example of an entirely different kind.

The result is that the Smulders has not had anything like the exposure it deserved, though I did my small best to put the matter right by using it to exemplify neutral men in the *Classified Encyclopedia*.

4.10 International problemists' meeting, Bournemouth 1989 (solving competition), with knights instead of rooks on a8/b8. My reasoning at the time was that it was a problem about bishops and knights and the imitator wasn't part of a part of a normal set anyway, so why restrict ourselves to the normal two knights and bring rooks into it? But experience has shown that the version with rooks is much easier to set up on a board to show to friends, and today I think I would have decided differently.

5.1 *The Problemist*, January 1972. The original setting had no knight on f6, when White's first move still had to have been b8-a7 but could have been a capture.

5.2 Used in the French retro solving championship, 1998, and subsequently published in *phénix* (a French composition magazine), September 1998. I expected to

be told that it had been done already, but as with **4.4** nobody has brought a prior appearance to my notice. "White Ng1 to f4, etc" appeared in *The Problemist* in March 1993, and **5.2a** in *Tsume-shogi Paradise* 1995. Gerd Wilts, at the cost of a more artificial position, subsequently matched Nagano's numerical difference but with a unique game in each part: *U.S. Problem Bulletin*, 1997, White d2/h2/d1/e1/g1/h1 empty, Kf2, Qg4, Re6, Ne2, Pd5/f4/g3 (15), Black b8/e8/g8 empty, Kf7, Nh5, Pf6 (15), play 1-2 d5 Nd4 and now (a) 3 f4 Nxe2 4 Kf2 Ng3 5 hxg3 Nf6 6 Rh6 Nh5 7 Re6 f6 8 Qg4 Kf7 9 Ne2 or (b) 3 Kd2 Nxe2 4 Ke3 Ng3 5 hxg3 Nf6 6 Rh6 Nh5 7 Re6 f6 8 Qg4 Kf7 9 Qh3 Kg6 10 Ne2 Kg5 11 f4+ Kh6 12 Kf2 Kg6 13 Qg4+ Kf7.

5.3 *British Chess Magazine*, December 1992. The reason for the stipulation "find the shortest game" was to try and sort out the top end of a solving competition (I was afraid that if I stated the length required in advance I would get a large number of all-correct solutions), but people have told me they think it was unfair and I have some sympathy. The problem has indeed been quoted with the stipulation "Position after Black's 4th move, find the game", and I have seen no reason to object.

5.4 *Variant Chess* 30, Winter 1998.

5.5 *The Problemist*, November 1978.

6.1 *EBUR*, September 1996. *EBUR* was a Dutch-Flemish endgame study magazine. According to the *Oxford Companion*, the pioneering setting of "dummy pawn to draw" was by Kling, and Dawson, in *Classa's Fairy Tales* (1947), published a position in which White had to do it three times running. There is also a problem by Sam Loyd in which such a promotion is the only way to force mate in three. I therefore remain surprised that nobody had set the task "dummy pawn promotion to win"

before, because once the idea is conceived it is not difficult to realise, but yet again nobody has brought a prior appearance to my attention.

6.2 Originally sent to be pinned up at the international problemists' 1995 meeting as a good-will message, with promotion to GQRBN implicitly assumed and stipulation "Shortest mate" (there were complications in part (b) after 1 Kfl Ga8 2 bxa8Q+ into which I did not feel like going). Paul Byway quoted it as a problem in Grasshopper Chess in *Variant Chess* 20, Summer 1996, which enabled the stipulation to be simplified to "Win": a great improvement, in my opinion.

6.3 *British Chess Magazine*, July 1987.

6.4 *British Chess Magazine*, April 1992. My inspiration for "it's not chess, it's draughts" was a problem by Dunsany in *Fairy Chess Review* in August 1948. The draughts position itself is of course ancient; for example, William Payne's *Introduction to the Game of Draughts* (1756) has White kings d4/f2 (2), Black king c1, man b4 (2), play 1 d4-c3 b4^d2 2 f2-e1.

6.5 *Chess Braintwisters* (subsequently reissued as *Outrageous Chess Problems*), Burt Hochberg, 1999.

6.6 Blue Danube Joke Tourney, 1993 (an event held at the international problemists' meeting that year).

6.7 British Chess Problem Society weekend, Oxford, 1993, reported in *The Problemist*, May 1993. Neither "promotion to king" nor "promotion to a Black piece" was a new idea, though the combination in this form may well have been.

6.8 Original to this book. My original setting was faulty, and Harold van der Heijden suggested a fix. I hope I have remembered it correctly.

6.9 *Chess Braintwisters*, 1999. Again my original setting was faulty.

6.10 *Variant Chess* 56, February 2008, an earlier setting of **6.10d** having appeared in *The Problemist* in November 1989.

One reader was kind enough to describe **6.10d** as one of my best efforts: "pointed, beautifully set, and not too difficult either". "Pointed", yes; I always try to produce something with point, and since I try to realise it as simply as possible "not too difficult" is a natural consequence. But "beautifully set" is in the lap of the gods. We may call ourselves "composers", but in truth we are merely discoverers; all possible "compositions" within a game were created when the rules of the game were laid down, and all we are doing is digging them out. Sometimes we are lucky.

7.1 According to David Pritchard, this was a game invented by T. Sturgeon and patented in 1890. His burglar started on c3 and moved first, and there were six policemen on a1, c1, e1, a5, c5, and e5. The demonstration that only five policemen were needed appeared in *Variant Chess* 53, October 2006.

7.2 *Variant Chess* 53, October 2006.

7.3 *The Games and Puzzles Journal* 30, December 2003 (with the knight on c1 instead of g1). George Jelliss, who was the magazine's editor, attributed it to myself without qualification, but it owed a lot to a problem by him in *The Problemist* in November 1989 and to his exposition of chessboard hypercubes in up to six dimensions in *Chessics* 13 (January-June 1982) and 14 (July-September 1982). When quoting it in *diagrammes* I gave its authorship as "GPJ, version JDB" on the grounds that all I had done was make a cosmetic alteration to the presentation, but when I quoted it again with this attribution in *Variant Chess* 45, George demurred, and

72 *Fifty-one flights of chess fancy*

on reflection I think “JDB after GPJ” is more accurate. My contribution may have been merely cosmetic, but the cosmetics of a problem are important.

The pattern in the diagram is that of a two-dimensional projection of a four-dimensional hypercube, and the problem provides an illustration of how a figure which at first sight is quite abstruse can turn up perfectly naturally.

8.1 *The Games and Puzzles Journal* 30, December 2003, with a decorative text. **8.2** the same.

8.3 *Colson News* Volume 4 Number 3, August 1989. *Colson News* was a magazine edited by Cedric Smith, and although primarily devoted to the idea of “two-way numbers” (the digits 9, 8, 7, 6, and sometimes 5 are replaced by upside-down digits representing -1 , -2 , and so on) it carried a fair bit of recreational material. The next issue carried not only my official solution but a tour-de-force version in verse by Blanche Descartes, which according to Richard Guy was a nom-de-plume adopted by Smith, Leonard Brooks, Arthur Stone, and Bill Tutte. These were the four who first solved the problem of dissecting a square into smaller squares no two of which were the same size. Richard gives the formal reference for this as “*Duke Math. J.*, 1940”, but I think most of us know it through the “as it happened” story in one of Martin Gardner’s early books.

9.1 Original to this book. The general idea of using marked pegs, and stipulating that these and no others are to be the pegs left on the board at the end, seems to me to enrich small-board solitaires even more than it enriches ordinary solitaire. The first writer to have suggested their use appears to have been C. Bizalion in the *Gentleman’s Journal Recreation Supplement* in 1870-71 (this was a monthly puzzle and pastime supplement to the *Gentleman’s Journal*

which was mentioned in connection with **3.3** above), and the David Fawcett who composed the problem mentioned there was surely the same as the “D. Fawcett” who made at least one excellent contribution to Bizalion’s solitaire columns.

9.2 A puzzle embodying this board and giving two of these problems with others was on sale in London in the late 1980s or early 1990s under the title “The Crystal Palace Wheel Puzzle”. I have seen only a photocopy of an eight-page descriptive booklet (A6 size) which contains neither solutions nor acknowledgement, but it is possible that there was a separate leaflet or booklet containing these. All the problems were in fact supplied by myself.

9.3 Original to this book.

10.1 *The Games and Puzzles Journal* 4, March-April 1988. I was inspired by a hand from *Bridge in the Menagerie*, where the Hog bluffs his opponents into continuing clubs against 3NT, unblocks an obstructive AK of diamonds from dummy, and runs off six diamonds from hand to land an impossible contract.

10.2 The deal itself was published in *Bridge World* in 2004, but the editor rewrote the text to take account of what would be assumed by the magazine’s readership and to conform to its house style (which was fair enough) and then printed a version greatly reduced even from that which I had approved. This is the first time that my original text has been published. The gimmick of overlooking the opening bid and imagining that partner’s Two Club overcall was a Two Club opener had of course already been exploited by the Rabbit, with markedly better results.

10.3 Original to this book as far as publication is concerned, though I have sent it informally to various like-minded friends.