

A HISTORY OF INTERNATIONAL MASTER CHESS: 1851-1914,
A STUDY IN MODERN INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

by

Bernard P. Kiernan

Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty of The American University
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
MAY 15 1957
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Signatures of Committee:

Chairman: Ernst Pomy
David J. Brandenburg
Donald H. Mugs-Jr.
Ernst Pomy (for Rudolf von Moltke)
Arthur A. Elrich, Jr.

Date: May 8, 1957

June 1957

The American University
Washington, D.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------|
| INTRODUCTION.....pp. | 1- 27. |
| CHAPTER I.....pp. | 28- 53. |
| CHAPTER II.....pp. | 54- 90. |
| CHAPTER III.....pp. | 91-119. |
| CHAPTER IV.....pp. | 120-147. |
| CHAPTER V.....pp. | 148-168. |
| CHAPTER VI.....pp. | 169-194. |
| CHAPTER VII.....pp. | 195-209. |
| CHAPTER VIII.....pp. | 210-242. |
| CHAPTER IX.....pp. | 243-262. |
| CHAPTER X.....pp. | 263-277. |
| CONCLUSION.....pp. | 278-285. |
| FINANCIAL TABLES.....pp. | 286-289. |
| BIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX.....pp. | 290-302. |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY.....pp. | 303-314. |

INTRODUCTION

I

Chess is one of the oldest games in the history of man, and is the one which has been subjected to the greatest amount of literary attention. A great part of this historical material, however, deals with ancient chess, which was substantially different from contemporary chess. The game we know today is of fairly recent origin. It dates from sometime in the fifteenth century, when the movements of the queen and the bishop were altered, converting what had become a dull and listless contest into the dynamic and seemingly inexhaustible test of skill which is played today.¹ The institutional consequences of this change were not immediately apparent, and the next three centuries could be fairly termed the formative era of modern chess. Although the outline of the modern game had been roughly mapped out in the fifteenth century, chess retained, as late as 1800, a wide variety of unsettled points in the actual play of the game. Chess, in those three centuries, also revealed its infancy in the low

1. H. J. R. Murray, A History of Chess, Oxford: 1913, p. 776.

level of proficiency of its devotees, in its complete lack of organization, and in its status as an amateur pastime. This period was nevertheless one of extreme importance and significance in the development of chess, and represents a necessary prologue to modern chess.

These three hundred years of apparent dormancy, when the new chess chrysalis was preparing for the metamorphosis of the nineteenth century, have already been explored in detail, particularly by two writers, H. J. R. Murray, and A. van der Linde.¹ The neglected period has been the one which should be of greatest interest to the contemporary player, the growth of modern chess, the history of tournament play and the championship of the world, since the first international chess tournament, in London, in 1851.

This neglect has been due partly to the emphasis on the games themselves. Collections of games have been a perennial favorite of chess amateurs, and they require little effort on the part of the compiler outside of his own technical area as annotator. Further, this necessity for accurate annotation has rendered the literature of the game more and more autotelic. The writers on the game are all practitioners, many of them, such as Tarrasch, or Alekhine, outstanding practitioners. This tendency on the part of chess literature

1. Murray, A History of Chess. Antonius van der Linde, Geschichte und Litteratur des Schachspiels, Berlin: 1874; Das Schachspiel des XVI Jahrhunderts, Berlin: 1874.

to be written by chess players has increased the emphasis on actually played games, not merely because these players are more interested in the technical than in the historical aspect of chess, but because they are not normally historians. Their histories consist of anecdotes.

In short, although more books have been written about chess than about any other game, these books are either manuals of instructions, or collections of games, while the few historical works to be found are concerned with ancient chess, or with the first three centuries of modern chess. Very little systematic chess history exists for the period after 1851. Even for the first half of the nineteenth century, Murray's great work is marred by a number of minor inaccuracies. After 1851, the reader has to rely on the personal anecdotes, legends, and stories by hearsay found in games collections, which make up the popular history of chess. These tales are usually unreliable, often contradictory, and provide little substance for the reader seeking a coherent and connected story.

P. W. Sergeant, a British journalist, was one of the first to attempt to correct this deficiency. In the 1930's, he published two volumes, A Century of British Chess (1934), and Championship Chess (1937). The first of these is a history of British chess, roughly from 1831 to 1931.¹ Although it contains much valuable information,

1. Philip W. Sergeant, A Century of British Chess, Philadelphia: 1934; Championship Chess, Philadelphia: 1937.

it is limited to Great Britain, and its style is difficult to follow. It moves stolidly from year to year, listing births, deaths, tournament and match results, and all sorts of minutiae in the history of London chess. It is really more of a year by year reference work than a history. The second work is divided between a selection of games from championship play, and a history of the world's championship up to 1937. The value of this history is seriously impaired, outside of its extreme brevity, by a large number of inaccuracies, misconceptions, and misinterpretations resulting from Sergeant's apparent acceptance of much of the content of popular chess history.

Another attempt to bring system into the disordered house of modern chess history has more recently been made by Mr. Fred Reinfeld. Mr. Reinfeld still places his emphasis on games, and all but one of his books are built around a collection of games. The historical material, unfortunately is not only very thin, but often merely repetition of the tales which have crowded chess books for the past fifty years. His only historical work, The Human Side of Chess,¹ is really a set of biographies of the seven men whom Mr. Reinfeld considers the predecessors of Botvinnik in the world championship. These biographical essays are more in the nature of psycho-technical analyses of the playing styles of these masters than actual biographies, and their historical content is not always reliable.

1. Fred Reinfeld, The Human Side of Chess, New York: 1952.

II

This volume attempts to tell in a coherent, orderly, and systematic manner, the story of international master chess from the first international tournament in 1851, to the outbreak of the First World War, in 1914, and outlines briefly the history of the world's championship from 1919 to 1956. It attempts to be more than a mere record of tournament and match results. In this respect, it is not a technical book on chess, but an interpretive survey of a particular social phenomenon: the development of international master chess.

The most apparent fact in the development of international master chess after 1851 is its close parallel to developments in other sports, and its even closer parallel to the development of nineteenth century internationalism in general. The great era of cultural internationalism was the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth.¹ This cultural internationalism is essentially the same thing as what Pitman B. Potter has called cosmopolitanism. Potter distinguishes between internationalism, the inter-relations of national states, and cosmopolitanism,

1. Pitman B. Potter, Introduction to the Study of International Organization, New York: 1922, p. 308; Jean Claveirole, L'Internationalisme, St. Etienne: 1910, p. 1; "Internationalism does not appear as a distinct phenomenon earlier than the nineteenth century." John C. Faries, Rise of Internationalism, New York: 1915, p. 18.

a spirit of common culture which transcends national boundaries.¹

In 1823, the first international scientific congress was held, in Germany.² This marked the beginning of a new era in international organization. Although there had been intercourse among the scientists and artists of various nations before that date, this was the first such assemblage, the first official international meeting of Europeans for non-political and non-diplomatic reasons. The features of this new cultural internationalism, or cosmopolitanism, were its peaceful intentions, distinguishing it from the history of diplomatic congresses, and the fact that the people engaged in it normally paid allegiance to commercial, scientific, or aesthetic interests, rooted in their common western culture, rather than to the national, or dynastic state.³ By World War I, this development had given birth to 45 international bureaus, including the Postal Union (1863), the Telegraphic Union (1865), the Metrical Union (1875), the Sanitary Union (1892), and the International Office of Public Health (1907).⁴ Besides these official bodies, whose existence was ratified by international convention, there were, by 1914, approximately 500 private international associations representing science, art, religion, etc.⁵

1. "There has developed since the early part of the last [nineteenth] century, a cosmopolitanism which differs from the rather impotent cosmopolitanism of Antiquity and the Middle Ages." Potter, Int. Org., p.302.

2. Encyclopedia Britannica, v. 12, p. 514.

3. "The principal element in modern cosmopolitanism, as it has developed since 1850, is a common economic and scientific culture." Potter, Int. Org., p. 308. This does not mean that these people paid no allegiance to their respective governments, but rather that, in their capacity as members of an international cultural movement, they laid aside temporarily this allegiance.

4. Potter, Int. Org., p. 270.

5. Ibid., p. 270.

The great era of cosmopolitanism was also a great era of international master chess, and its growth can definitely be viewed in the light of the larger movement. International tournaments, which were the institutional backbone of international master chess, were in many ways expression of the nineteenth century spirit of cultural internationalism. They often allied themselves, particularly before World War I, to the most striking phenomenon of cultural internationalism, the international exhibition.¹ The international tournament, in fact, was coeval with the international exhibition, both institutions materializing in 1851, when the first international chess tournament was held in London, in conjunction with the Great Exhibition at the Crystal Palace. After 1851, although an international chess tournament was never made an official part of the program of any international exhibition, such tournaments were held in conjunction with numerous expositions.² Further, the growth of international exhibitions, from

1. "Une des manifestations de l'Internationalisme qui frappent le plus le public, ce sont bien les Expositions universelles." Claveirole, *L'Int.*, p. 29. "The first striking demonstration of the international character of modern civilization was the great exhibition of 1851." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, v. 12, p. 530.

2. Besides London, 1851, the following chess tournaments, were held in conjunction with international exhibitions: London, 1862; Paris, 1867; London, 1872; Vienna, 1873; Philadelphia, 1876; Paris, 1878; Paris, 1900. We also find in conjunction with the Paris exhibition of 1889, and the Columbian Exposition of Chicago, in 1893, tentative plans for international tournaments which, however, failed to materialize. The 1889 event, in Paris, was replaced by a national tournament, while the 1893 Exposition was indirectly responsible for the "impromptu" tournament held in New York that year. Finally, in 1904, the St. Louis World's Fair was the occasion for an American national tournament.

1851 to 1914, tended to develop along cultural, rather than commercial lines;¹ so that the growth of international master chess, insofar as its tournaments were allied to international exhibitions, was a reflection of the general growth of cultural internationalism.

The second major feature of international master chess between 1851 and 1914, besides the institutional growth of international tournaments, was the growing concept of a world's champion. This concept can also be linked to cosmopolitanism. Before 1851, master chess had developed largely along national lines, and claims to individual supremacy had been voiced usually as part of a claim for the national supremacy of a particular country. France, for instance, had been considered, until 1843, the leading chess playing nation in Europe, and its leading players were not so much individual European champions as members of a French team, which as a national team, claimed European supremacy. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the tendency developed, particularly after 1851, to consider players on an individual basis, regardless of nationality, and there rapidly developed the concept

1. Kenneth W. Luckhurst, The Story of Exhibitions, New York: 1951, p. 133. Referring to the Great Exhibition of 1851, Henry Cole, one of its most energetic promoters, commented: "For the first time in the world's history....the men of Arts, Science and Commerce were permitted by their respective governments to meet together to discuss and promote those objects for which civilized nations exist.", quoted in Luckhurst, p. 115.

of an individual champion, transcending national boundaries, and representative of no particular country.¹

Following the First World War, cultural internationalism, after reaching a peak in the formation of the League of Nations and its subsidiary bodies, went into a period of decline. By the 1930's, an intense nationalism was once more evident, and although international organization is still alive today, in the form of the United Nations, the pre-World War I spirit of cosmopolitanism is sadly on the wane.

International master chess did not exhibit the same kind of reversal after 1914 as cosmopolitanism in general, and it was not until after 1939 that it altered its complexion radically. However, I have chosen, perhaps arbitrarily, World War I as the terminus of my study. Even though international master chess between the wars was quite similar to chess before 1914, I feel that the four year hiatus in international play provides a suitable breaking point for the study. Further, I hope to show that the important developments in international master chess had all come to fruition before 1914.

1. Of course, it is possible to say that the development of any competitive sport or game will probably give rise to that sort of individualism; but this is not necessarily true. The Olympic Games are viewed both on the level of individual performance, and as national team competitions. The big annual bicycle race in France, the Tour de France, is another such blend of individual versus team competition. These considerations are particularly interesting in view of the repercussions of the cold war today in the world of chess. International master chess, since World War II, has shown disquieting tendencies to revert to the national orientation of pre-1851, particularly behind the Iron Curtain (Cf. p. 285).

The Fédération Internationale des Echecs was not created until 1923, but it did not function very successfully in the era between the wars, and the revived FIDE has shown, since World War II, a rather different orientation.¹

International master chess did not merely reflect the growth of internationalism generally, it also paralleled developments in many other sports. Of course, the development of these sports can itself be viewed as a symptom of pre-World War I internationalism. It is perhaps significant that many of the sports which give rise to allegiance to individual performers, rather than national teams, displayed their most robust growth in this period. The modern version of lawn tennis was not even invented until the late nineteenth century. The international tournaments at Wimbledon date from 1877, Davis Cup competition from 1903. In boxing, the concept of a world's champion crystallized around the figure of John L. Sullivan, of Boston, in the late 1880's; and it was only with the reign of Sullivan that boxing began to exhibit its characteristically modern orientation: fights of a fixed number of rounds, the use of gloves, uniformity of rules. European football, what is known in the United States as soccer, was also born in the late nineteenth century, at least, the modern rules which govern the game were evolved at that time. In 1904, an international soccer federation was created, and similar organizations were founded to control other sports on an international level. The most

1. Cf. p. 282.

significant of these events, of course, was the revival, in 1896, of the Olympic Games. These games, by their very nature, gave birth eventually to an internationally minded organization which still exists today and has been partly successful in maintaining the pre-World War I spirit of cosmopolitanism.¹

III

Like other sports and games, international chess, while it can be viewed as part of the spirit of cosmopolitanism and cultural internationalism of the era 1850-1914, displayed an internal development of its own. This development can be viewed as part of another typically modern trend, the growth of professionalism. It will be well to define this term as I use it in this dissertation. The distinction involved here is more than that between professional and amateur, although this division is inextricably involved in the larger one, but that between the expert and the dilettante. In other words, professionalism in sports means: first, the growth of a group of performers who are willing and able to devote their

1. The games are still officially held on the basis of individual competition, although the unofficial point systems that measure national achievement have long held the attention of sports fans; today, the games tend to degenerate into a United States-vs-Russia competition, reflecting on the athletic field the cold war of the diplomatic arena.

time to developing their talents to their fullest capacity - in other words, the growth of a body of experts, in contrast to performers who regard the sport merely as a hobby or a source of diversion; secondly, a high degree of organization within the sport itself, in the rules governing play, in the relative strength of the competitors (involving usually the concept of a world's champion), and among the players themselves, whether this organization be along national or international lines. The first concept is the most important one.

If the distinction involved were nothing more than that between amateur and expert, there would be no need to drag in the term professionalism. However, the two concepts are mutually dependent. First of all, the average chess master found it increasingly difficult to become an expert unless he became a professional, that is, played for money. Otherwise, the fact that he was tied to another career did not leave him sufficient time to concentrate his full powers on the game; so that the expert and the professional tended to grow together. Even more important, the professional himself became a decisive factor in speeding up the growth of a body of experts; for the desire to win, which of course would exist in any case, became rooted in economic necessity. The professional player soon converted the game into a subject for clinical research. This has been true also in such sports as tennis or basketball, for instance. The game suddenly becomes "scientific". This does not mean necessarily that the

practitioners are fully aware of what they are up to, but that the intensive study which results from the heightened desire for victory among professional experts, even if it is nothing more than a spontaneous, hit or miss process, when carried on by a multitude of such experts, becomes equivalent to a scientific investigation in which the possibilities offered by the game are stretched to their utmost.

On the other hand, a distinction merely between those who play for glory and those who play for money would not be sufficient. First, such a distinction would leave out of the professional expert class such a man as Paul Morphy, for instance, who, through the accident of birth, was possessed of sufficient financial means not to depend on chess for his livelihood, but who contributed greatly to the growth of professional chess. Second, it ignores that aspect of the matter which I am most concerned with, the growth of a body of experts, and those organizational developments which I listed above, which are directly or indirectly linked to the growth of such a body of experts. Perhaps it would be best to coin a new word to embrace both concepts, specialism, since the specialist, both as professional and as expert, is the particular symptom of the development which I am considering.

Chess, by comparison with such sports as football found its possibilities for spectator interest strictly limited. The professional chess player, therefore, was seldom more than barely self-supporting. He achieved this level largely through private

patronage, rather than spectator support. On the other hand, chess has withstood the test of increasing specialism better than such sports as tennis, or basketball. The excessive skill displayed by the best performers in those two fields is conclusive evidence, I think, that neither basketball nor tennis, as it stands, presents any longer a sufficient challenge to its best players. Although it will be argued that both sports are still popular, I will only say that not only are there other factors involved in their continued popularity, factory divorced from interest in the game as such, but that in both tennis and basketball the amateur player commands a much larger following than the professional. Nothing of this nature can be said of chess. However, chess has exhibited certain similar symptoms. The increasing skill of the best players has resulted in a growing gap between master and amateur comparable to the gap in every other major sport or game in the twentieth century.

Interestingly enough, the technique of the chess master has been an object of suspicion of the part of the chess community at large from the very beginning of our story. Chess amateurs have ever been distrustful, of technique, of published analysis, of "book" play. They have feared that intense analysis of the game would destroy its spontaneity, its capacity for diversion. It would give the specialist, with the time and opportunity to master developments in "book" play, an advantage which natural genius might not be able to overcome.

Although technique has obviously made progress since 1851,¹ and although this progress has had varied effects on the history of chess, we cannot find too close a parallel between chess and other sports. The imminent death of chess, the exhaustion of its possibilities, the dullness of the modern game because of excessive analysis, the dearth of brilliancies in the classical manner, the harking back to a golden age of chess, the "draw to the death", all these complaints are levelled today at the advance of technique. These same complaints were voiced quite as often, these alarms were sounded quite as frequently in 1851 as they are today. We shall find that the remarkable thing about chess history is the constancy of this plaint: technique is ruining chess, play is dull and not what it used to be. One could pick any year between 1851 and 1914, even a year which has become renowned for brilliant chess, and one would quickly find that to contemporaries, it was an age of dull chess. In the same way that many of us are convinced that life in general has deteriorated since "the good old days", chess players have always been convinced that they were living in an era of decline in chess brilliancy.

1. An attempt has been made by Imre Konig to trace the historical growth of technique through actual games. From Morphy to Botvinnik, Drexel Hill, Pa.: 1950. His conclusion is that we can definitely state that there has been such a growth.

IV

The starting point of this study almost dictates itself. The tournament became the symbol of the growth of master play, and the main instrument in its development. Before 1851, chess was unorganized, its literature meager, its patrons few and mostly of the upper class. The orientation of the game was national, rather than individual, the amount of intercourse among players was limited. The game had not yet achieved uniformity in its rules, and analysis was in a primitive stage. As F. J. Wellmuth points out, " [chess was] played for pure amusement, not as part of a gruelling contest and not for the record."¹

The three hundred years of development since the fifteenth century had climaxed in the person of the great French master, André Danican Philidor (1726-1795).² Philidor established himself as the leading player in Europe, and in the process, established France as the leading chess-playing nation. The great centers of chess, in the early nineteenth century, were France and England.³ French chess

1. F. J. Wellmuth, The Golden Treasury of Chess, New York: 1943, p. 17.

2. Philidor was also a noted musician, and the Grande Encyclopédie remembers him only as such. v. 25, pp. 647-648.

3. "The chief characteristics of the period (1800-1840) had been the concentration of master-play in London and Paris." H. J. R. Murray, "Howard Staunton", British Chess Magazine, v. 28, Nov. 1908, p. 466.

centered in Paris, around the Café de la Régence.¹ Unfortunately, the attraction of this hybrid locale was to prove too great competition for any established organization, such as developed in England and Germany. The Cercle des Echecs was domiciled above the Café, and lived, more or less, as an adjunct to it.² The ascendancy of the Café was fatal to French chess. Skittles, odds games, and all sorts of variants of the game itself were the vogue,³ while serious play languished.

France, however, lived on its reputation from the time of Philidor. By 1820,

It was....generally accepted that [Alexandre] Deschappelles was the strongest player of his time....although there was apparently no stronger reason for it than the fact that the general standard of French chess had been higher than that of English chess in the end of the eighteenth century.⁴

Deschappelles himself was soon succeeded by his pupil, Charles de Labourdonnais, retiring when he found himself no longer able to give him odds successfully.

1. For a lively contemporary view of this locale, see the first hand sketch by George Walker, in Chess and Chess Players, London: 1850, pp. 148-184.

2. La Régence, v. 1, 1849, p. 219.

3. We read, in Walker's Chess and Chess Players, in the Chess Player's Chronicle, and in Le Palamède, of a variant of the orthodox game known as la partie des pions (the game of pawns), in which one player relinquishes his queen, and receives either seven or eight pawns in return, which he can place anywhere on his side of the board. This form of chess was very popular at the Régence, and both Labourdonnais and Deschappelles were extremely adept at it. See also La Régence, v. 1, 1849, pp. 132-34; Schachzeitung, v. 4, 1849, pp. 185-189.

4. Murray, A History of Chess, p. 878.

In England, chess was also developing very rapidly.¹ In the 1820's, William Lewis (1787-1870) was the leading English player, and Deschappelles had been unsuccessful in giving him odds when they met for a few games in 1821. By 1830, two newcomers had appeared on the English chess scene, George Walker (1803-1879), a stock-broker and newspaperman,² who was to make his mark more as a writer on the game than as an over-the-board player, and Alexander M'Donnell (1798-1835), who quickly rose to a position as England's strongest player.³

In 1834, the rival claims of England and France were put to the test of an actual combat. The newly formed⁴ Westminster Club, in London, invited France's leading player, Labourdonnais, to engage in a series of matches with M'Donnell. Four matches were completed, and a fifth broken off when Labourdonnais was called back to France by the pressure of business. At that time, Labourdonnais had a substantial lead in the overall wins and losses. It has never been determined

1. This early phase of English chess has been covered in some detail by P. W. Sergeant, in his A Century of British Chess, so that I will refrain from repeating much of what he has said, pp. 19-46.

2. Dictionary of National Biography, v. 20, pp. 517-518; Murray, "George Walker", Br. Ch. Mag., v. 26, May 1906, pp. 189-194.

3. D. N. B., v. 12, p. 496.

4. It was founded in 1831. Murray, A History of Chess, p. 881; Sergeant, Century, p. 32.

just how many games were played between these two champions, but Sergeant, who has gone over the records of George Walker, William Greenwood Walker, and William Lewis, all of whom were present and recording games, comes to a figure of 84 games, with the results: Labourdonnais, 44, M'Donnell, 27, draws, 13.¹ Play was never resumed, the strain of the match probably leading to M'Donnell's early demise, in 1835.

Labourdonnais died five years later, in 1840, but his victory seemed to seal French supremacy. His successor was Pierre de Saint-Amant (1800-1872) who, in his capacity as France's leading player, became self-appointed European champion. Saint-Amant's reign was short-lived, however. In England, a new champion had arisen, Howard Staunton (1810-1874). "Reported to be the natural son of Frederick Howard, fifth Earl of Carlisle"², Staunton was neglected in his youth, receiving little or no education.

On coming of age he received a few thousand pounds under his father's will. This money he rapidly spent....When thrown upon his own resources, he sought a livelihood from his pen.³

In 1841, he founded the Chess Player's Chronicle.⁴ In 1843, he was

1. Sergeant, Century, p. 37.

2. D. N. B., v. 18, p. 1003.

3. Idem. See also, Murray, "Howard Staunton".

4. Staunton resigned his editorship in 1854. After that date, although he never completely left the chess scene, he was employed mainly in the editing of Shakespeare's works.

considered England's strongest player, and journeyed to Paris to challenge Saint-Amant to a match of eleven games up,¹ for \$500 a side.²

Staunton won the match handily, running up a 10-2 lead before he weakened, winning eventually 11-6, with 4 draws. After this, chess supremacy passed quickly to England. Staunton's magazine was the first periodical devoted entirely to chess.³ In 1835, George Walker had initiated the first regular chess column, in Bell's Life in London, a sporting journal. London boasted of two outstanding chess clubs, the Saint George's Club, which succeeded the Westminster Club in 1843, and the London Chess Club, founded in 1807, both patronized by wealthy members of the upper class. In 1841, the Chess Player's Chronicle could already point to six locations for playing chess in the city of London.⁴ Even more significant were developments in the provinces which pointed to a national organization. In January 1841, the Yorkshire Chess Association held its first meeting.⁵ By 1853, it had grown into the Northern and Midland Counties Chess Association, which eventually became the British Chess Association.⁶

1. This expression, which will recur in all provisions for match play, means that the match is to go to the first winner of a stipulated number of games, in this case 11, and draws are not counted in the score.

2. Howard Staunton, The Chess Player's Companion, London: 1896, p. 320. For the sake of convenience, and to facilitate the comparative use of financial data, all money figures have been converted into dollars. For fluctuations in prices and the purchasing power of money, see, Financial Tables, p. 286.

3. Le Palamède was launched in Paris in 1836, but it devoted space to other games besides chess.

4. Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 1, 1841, p. 11.

5. G. W. Medley, in J. Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, London: 1864, p. ix.

6. Bell's Life, May 15, 1853; The Field, v. 1, May 14, 1853, p. 371.

By the 1840's, organized chess was spreading to other parts of Europe. Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia, were developing chess communities, while Italy, which, along with Spain, had been the cradle of chess in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, was experiencing a mild revival. In Berlin, a chess club had existed ever since 1803. In the 1830's it was reorganized by L. E. Bledow (1795-1846), and by the 1840's Germany exhibited a flourishing chess life.¹ The initial momentum was provided by the seven players who are generally referred to as the Pleiade:² Paul Rudolf von Bilguer (1813-1840), whose first edition of the famous Handbuch des Schachspiels came out posthumously, in 1843; L. E. Bledow, accounted in 1841 the strongest player in Berlin,³ one of the co-founders, in 1846, of the Schachzeitung, Germany's first permanent chess periodical; Bernhard Horwitz (1806-1885), who left Germany in the 1840's and settled in England; Wilhelm Hanstein (1811-1850); Carl Mayet (1810-1868), who was to represent Germany at the London Tournament of 1851; K. Schorn (1802-1850); and Tassilio von Heydebrand und von der Lasa (1818-1899), the dean of German chess, its strongest player and leading chess authority, co-editor of the Handbuch, co-founder of the Schachzeitung.⁴

1. Schachzeitung, v. 1, 1846, p. v.

2. See H. J. R. Murray, "The Berlin Pleiades", Br. Ch. Mag., v. 19, Oct. 1899, pp. 407-414.

3. Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 1, 1841, p. 11.

4. Bilguer held a commission in the army which he resigned because of ill-health. He died in poverty at the age of twenty-seven. Bledow was a professor of mathematics. Horwitz and Schorn were painters. Hanstein and Mayet were Prussian government officials. Von der Lasa was in the Prussian diplomatic service.

By 1851, two other players had begun to attract notice, Adolf Anderssen as a problem composer, and Daniel Harrwitz as a blindfold player.

Austria-Hungary had lost three of its leading chess experts during the revolutions of 1848-49, Johann Jakob Lowenthal (1810-1876), Joseph Szen, and Vincenz Grimm. From 1842 to 1846, these three had manned the Budapest team to victory over Paris in a correspondence match.¹ Grimm, who in 1849 went to Aleppo,² faded from the chess scene, but Szen and Lowenthal were two of the strongest players in Europe. Lowenthal eventually settled in England, while Szen returned to Budapest. By 1850, another strong player had appeared in Vienna, Karl Hampe (1814-1876).³

France, by contrast, was entering a period of decline. Its two leading experts, outside of Saint-Amant, were both foreign born, the Livonian Lionel Kieseritzky (1805-1853), and the Italian Ignacio Calvi (1798-1873). France had been the first country to begin a chess periodical, Le Palamède, founded by Labourdonnais and Mery, in 1836. It was discontinued in 1839, but revived, after Labourdonnais' death, in 1841, by Saint-Amant, who edited it until 1848, when it went out

1. Sergeant, Century, p. 36.

2. See a letter from Grimm in Howard Staunton, The Chess Tournament, London: 1873, pp. xxiv-xxv.

3. The Schachzeitung, v. 5, July 1850, p. 264, refers to Hampe as the strongest player in Vienna since the departure of Lowenthal.

of existence permanently.¹ In 1849, Kieseritzky founded a new chess periodical, La Régence, which went out of business in 1851. It was not until 1867 that France was to obtain a permanent and regular chess periodical.

In Russia, three strong players could be found: Alexander D. Petroff (1794-1867), K. F. von Jaenisch (1813-1872), and Elie Schumoff (1819-1881). All three were in government service, Petroff in the foreign service, in Warsaw, Jaenisch as an army engineer, and Schumoff as an administrative officer in the navy department. Petroff was the strongest player of the three,² but Jaenisch was considered the dean of Russian chess, and by 1851, along with von der Lasa and Staunton, one of the foremost chess authorities in Europe.

Despite all this activity, chess, in the 1840's, was still largely nationalistic in orientation. The matches between Labourdonnais and M'Donnell, in 1834, and Staunton and Saint-Amant, in 1843, had been conceived in the spirit of team encounters, and their aim had been to settle an international rivalry between England and France.³ After defeating Saint-Amant, Staunton had been able, through the pages of his Chess Player's Chronicle, and,

1. The political troubles of 1848, in France, apparently commanded too much of the attention of Saint-Amant, who was a captain in the Paris National Guards. La Régence, v. 1, 1849, p. 167.

2. D. W. Fiske reported that Petroff gave Jaenisch odds of pawn and move. The Book of the First American Chess Congress 1857, New York: 1859, p. 126.

3. Staunton, in The Chess Player's Companion, speaks of the 1843 match as "The Great Match Between England and France", p. 315. The Ch. Pl. Chron. speaks of the players as representatives of the French and English teams.

after 1844, through the pages of the Illustrated London News, where he edited a chess column, to conduct a press campaign which goes a long way toward explaining the prevalent notion that Staunton was Europe's leading player.¹ However, there was really nothing in the match of 1843 to indicate that its winner was champion of Europe. Sergeant lists this match as the first that can be considered for the world's championship, and he is surprised that Staunton did not claim such a title after his victory.² Aside from the fact that Staunton was not officially recognized as world's champion, because there was no official body to so recognize him, he certainly did claim the scepter of European chess, as the merest glance at his writings from 1843 to 1858 will reveal. What is more to the point is that this claim in no way gained world wide recognition.³ Saint-Amant's claim to chess supremacy had been highly spurious, and based on nothing more than the fact that he was France's leading player,

1. Murray lists this as one of the most important reasons for Staunton's lofty status in the chess world at that time. "Howard Staunton", p. 467.

2. Sergeant, Championship Chess, pp. 11-14.

3. The Germans, in particular, were unimpressed by Staunton's claims. "Although he [Staunton] once conquered Saint-Amant, this one-sided success....did not give a decided result, the Berlin School, also, had, at that time, produced at least equal powers." Max Lange, Paul Morphy, trans. by Ernst Falkbeer, London: 1860, p. 82. "The Berlin School of the same period....perhaps contained as splendid an individual champion [i. e., von der Lasa], and (more probably) greater collective strength." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 3, Dec. 1883, p. 398.

a position which he had achieved through the defection of Labourdonnais, who died in 1840, and of Deschapelles, who had retired. Staunton's victory had heralded England's chess ascendancy over France, and nothing more.

The personal obligations of chess players had made it difficult to gather them together in one place, until an event "of extraordinary and universal interest"¹ should act as an attraction. There were, in 1851, no real professionals. Certain players were able to devote more time to the game than others, but this was largely through the accident of personal fortune. Chess was a possible source of income only as a journalistic venture. Staunton supported himself as editor of the Chess Player's Chronicle, and of a chess column in the Illustrated London News; Kieseritzky did the same in Paris with La Régence, and supplemented his earnings by playing at the Café de la Régence, where he was hired by the owner as an attraction. Von der Lasa was in the Prussian diplomatic corps, and from the absence of his name from the lists of tournaments in the nineteenth century, we can infer that his duties were much more real than those of another famous chess-playing diplomat, Capablanca. Anderssen was a teacher of mathematics at Breslau; Horwitz was a painter. Saint-Amant was a prosperous wine merchant, later a government official. Jaenisch was also a government official. Charles Stanley, an Englishman considered the strongest player

1. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xvi.

in America, was a consul in New York. J. W. Schulten, a German immigrant, and one of the strongest players in America, was a prosperous businessman in New York. The only players who might be considered professionals were Kieseritzky, Lowenthal, and possibly Staunton. After his expulsion from Vienna, in 1849, Lowenthal had come to the United States where he supported himself solely through his chess activities.¹ But he had certainly amassed a certain amount of cash before he began his career as a chess professional.²

The first suggestion for an international tournament was made by Bledow, in 1843, in a letter to von der Lasa. The letter was not published by von der Lasa until 1848, when the movement for an international chess congress began to acquire momentum.³ By 1850, three main reasons were being voiced for such a gathering: first, as a test of strength between European masters, many of whom knew each other only by reputation;⁴ second, in order to allow these players social

1. J. Lowenthal, in Fiske, American Chess Congress, 1857, pp. 389-396.

2. Although Lowenthal claims his means, in 1849, were slender, he had sufficient funds to travel from Vienna to Hamburg, thence to the United States. On landing in New York, he showed no great alacrity in finding gainful employment, and seemed not only willing, but able, to wait until his chess talents could support him. Idem.

3. Schachzeitung, v. 3, Aug. 1848, p. 350.

4. "The idea of a grand Chess Congress and a Tournament, where the chess champions of every quarter of the globe should meet together to contest for general prizes, and reduce their rival pretensions to superiority to the only infallible test, the actual encounter on the board, has been long a favorite project amongst chess players of every rank." Letter from Edward Cronhelm, leading Yorkshire player, to members of provincial chess clubs. In Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xxxviii.

intercourse, resulting, it was hoped, in a spur to chess activity throughout Europe; third, to draw up a uniform chess code.¹ Although Germany had first suggested the idea, and although France had expressed approval,² the honor of actually implementing such a tournament was to go to England.

1. "the reconstruction of chess legislation, the adoption of some common language." Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xviii. "Uniformity would greatly help to remedy all that remains theoretically defective in the most perfect intellectual pastime ever invented." Ibid., p. xi.

2. Kieseritzky, in 1850, reported a growing demand in French chess circles for an international tournament, and added that if the rumors of such a congress to be held in England were vindicated, "plus d'un soldat français répondra à l'appel", which turned out to be a singularly false prophecy. La Régence, v. 2, 1850, p. 232.

CHAPTER I

I

In January 1850, a letter appeared in the Chess Player's Chronicle, suggesting the Great Exhibition of Industry and Art, to be held the following year in London, as a suitable occasion for a chess tournament.¹ It was signed S. M. N., Trinity College, Dublin, and was possibly a plant of Staunton's.² This tournament, as P. W. Sergeant has said,

1. Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 11, 1850, p. 59.

2. It is necessary here to comment on a peculiarity of Staunton's Chronicle, as well as his column in the Illustrated London News. There appear quite frequently letters from correspondents which are either unsigned, or else signed with a pseudonym, such as "An Amateur", "Oxoniensis", "Cantab", etc. There is reason to believe that these correspondents were imaginary, and that Staunton was in the habit of planting these communications himself. They invariably refer to some personal quarrel Staunton was involved in at the time; their language and wording is typically Stauntonesque, and personal abuse of Staunton's enemies usually forms part of their content. H. J. R. Murray comments: "he [Staunton] hit out at his enemies under the cover of answers to correspondents. There were people who refused to credit the existence of these correspondents." "Howard Staunton", p. 468. In this case, the surmise is strengthened by the fact that another letter from the same S. M. N., Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 11, 1850, p. 317, speaks of "von der Iaza". Staunton, to my knowledge, was the only writer of the day to spell von der Iasa's name with a "z". Of course, it could be that in transferring the letter to the pages of his magazine, Staunton inadvertently reverted to his own spelling. There is no way of establishing beyond doubt the authorship of these letters, but it is probably safe in most cases to assume that Staunton wrote them.

was the brain child of Howard Staunton.¹ This proved in some ways unfortunate. Staunton was the self-ordained high priest of British chess. He was a strong player, although he had reached his peak in his match with Saint-Amant, in 1843, and never again played up to that level.² He was a good annotator, considered, in 1851, the best, along with von der Lasa and Jaenisch. He was the brightest star at the Saint George's Club, in London, and did much to further the cause of the game, for which he undoubtedly had a sincere affection. He was also offensive, pretentious, and highly obnoxious in his personal relations, which always tended to degenerate into personal abuse.³ He was a scurrilous and unreliable journalist, and a pathetically vain person, who strove for almost twenty years after defeating Saint-Amant to claim the scepter of chess on the strength of that ancient victory, rather than on actual over-the-board encounters. Staunton was responsible for the tournament of 1851, and for this we owe him a debt of gratitude. His sponsorship of it, on the other hand, resulted in the sort of ill-will and animosity which led George Medley, in a masterpiece of understatement, to say, eleven years later: "Owing to misunderstandings, it was not so successful as it might have been."⁴

1. Sergeant, Century, p. 70.

2. "between 1846 and 1851 he [Staunton] lost the fine edge of his play, and never regained it." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 4, April 1884, p. 137.

3. Murray, in his biographical essay on Staunton, which is usually considered a favorable portrait of the English master, comments that Staunton's career was plagued by petty likes and dislikes. "I would fain ignore them if I could, but they are far too prominent." "Howard Staunton", p. 468. Further, "Staunton....gave offence by his patronizing airs.", and "It must be admitted that Staunton did not always fight fairly.", Idem.

4. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, p. xvii.

Staunton began by setting the two leading chess clubs in London, his own Saint George's Club, and the London Chess Club, at loggerheads with one another. The Saint George's Club was the aristocrat of British chess clubs, and contained, among its members, some very famous names. In the words of Edward Cronhelm, it was,

the most numerous and influential body of chess players ever banded together, composed of noblemen and gentlemen from all parts of the United Kingdom, and therefore, in every sense of the word, the National Chess Club.¹

In December 1850, this "National Chess Club" proposed that a "universal Chess Tournament, for all comers, should be held by subscription among British amateurs."² A Committee of Management was formed, and its membership is glittering: the duke of Marlborough, Lord Cremorne, Lord Arthur Hay, Sir Charles Marshall; three M. P.'s are found on its roster, J. M. Gaskell, Marmaduke Wyvill, C. R. M. Talbot; the historian Buckle, also served, as well as Staunton and William Lewis, representing the chess-playing community.³ The tournament was to be a sort of adjunct to the Exposition (although it was sponsored separately from it, and at no time developed any formal ties with the Exposition), and received the attention of important British personages as a means to enhance British prestige.

-
1. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xxxviii.
 2. Ibid., p. xvi.
 3. Ibid., pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

The newly-formed Management Committee first approached George Perigal, secretary of the London Chess Club, and suggested that his organization also form a committee and cooperate with the Saint George's Club in promoting the venture. The London Club rather unaccountably turned down this suggestion, and shortly thereafter, George W. Medley, of the London Club, put the quietus on the proposition with the following letter:

It [the tournament] is to be played at the St. George's Club; the committee of management, published in the newspapers, are all members (I believe) of the St. George's Club. There is not a member of any provincial club upon your committee....It is therefore inferred that it is to be, not a national, but a club undertaking, to which the London Chess Club wish every success, but in which they must decline joining, unless its exclusive features are removed, and the management thrown open to the leading English chess players generally, without reference to their connection with any club or clubs.¹

This was not a very enthusiastic reception for what Staunton hoped was going to be an epoch-making event. However, it is fairly clear from the above letter that the London Club feared that the St. George's, particularly in view of its powerful connections, would monopolize the management, that even if the London Club joined the undertaking, it would be constantly overshadowed by its more powerful rival; therefore, it was not anxious to promote a venture which might redound solely to the

1. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xlvi.

advantage of its competitor. This was clearly what Medley feared when he spoke of "exclusive features". Staunton, however, chose to deliberately misinterpret this phrase, ridiculed the application of the epithet "exclusive" to his tournament, which was open to the whole world (upon payment of a \$25 entry fee), and embarked on a campaign of personal invective, both in his own Chess Player's Chronicle, and in the Illustrated London News. This controversy quickly merged into an ancient rivalry existing between Staunton and George Walker, which dated from Staunton's entry into the London chess world, and which had been marked, at best, by temporary truces, at worst, by personal insults of the most outrageous sort. Walker, if not the highly offensive journalist that Staunton was, was himself quite unreliable. His columns were filled with inaccuracies, usually the result of carelessness rather than maliciousness. He would certainly relish a newspaper war more than objective reporting. He took up the cudgel in the pages of Bell's Life, and the passive policy of the London Chess Club was transformed into an aggressive campaign against the "Mock National Tournament",¹ which was heralded by an edifying journalistic war in which Staunton and Walker took turns outdoing each other in vilification and insult.

In spite of this unfortunate controversy, the tournament began to take shape. The Committee of Management contributed a "considerable

1. Bell's Life, June 22, 1851.

sum";¹ the Calcutta Chess Club, under the spur of John Cochrane,² donated \$725.³ Wealthy patrons throughout England, as well as small subscribers, swelled the receipts until the total amount subscribed by the end of the tournament was \$3235.⁴

Although the tournament was open to all comers, the Management Committee had decided to ask no money of foreigners.⁵ In fact, the Committee suggested waiving the entry fee of \$25 in the case of certain foreign players, reimbursing expenses to those foreign masters who would win no prize, and reserving sums of money for matches between "such eminent foreign players as had been unsuccessful in the general Tourney."⁶ It is not too clear how this wish was translated into reality. The entrance fees were returned to Szen, Kieseritzky, and Lowenthal, the latter two failing to win prizes, but no reimbursement was made of their expenses.⁷

Although they did not receive financial aid from abroad, the managers of the tournament received plenty of encouragement. Szen,

1. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xvii.

2. John Cochrane was a strong English master who resided for a considerable portion of his life in India, where an ancient version of chess was still played. Cochrane created great enthusiasm among the natives, as well as among the colonial residents, for Western chess.

3. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xxiii.

4. Ibid., p. lxo.

5. "Ce que nous voulons obtenir du continent, CE N'EST PAS DE L'ARGENT, MAIS DES JOUEURS CELEBRES." Letter from Staunton to La Régence, v. 2, 1850, p. 322.

6. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xvii.

7. An expense fund was raised to cover Anderssen's traveling costs, but it seems to have been a private subscription among individual players and patrons in England, and was unrelated to the tournament funds.

Lowenthal, Jaenisch, von der Lasa, and others, wrote to Staunton, endorsing the tournament. La Régence maintained a steady commentary anent the coming event, and a committee was formed in Paris, including Kieseritzky, Alphonse Delannoy (1806-1883), Paul Journoud (d. 1882), and Francois Jules Devinck, to coordinate the activities of Paris with those of London.¹

Fear that an excessively lengthy tournament would deter foreign entries prompted Staunton and the Management Committee to adopt a rather unfortunate method of play. First of all, the tournament was to be run on an elimination basis, rather than on a round robin basis, in which each contestant plays every other contestant once. Such a tournament is obviously shorter than a round robin affair, and is resorted to in many sports where entries are too large to permit each one to play every other. Further, the individual matches which would lead to the elimination of the loser were restricted to two wins out of three.² This system has been roundly critized by all subsequent historians, and in fact, was deemed inadequate by many of the participants themselves. It is surprising that no one has pointed to the real weakness, in 1851, the absence of ranking, what is termed technically, in an elimination tournament, seeding, among the players. After all, elimination tournaments are commonly staged in many sports. In tennis, for instance, no other system is ever employed. Although the round robin tournament offers a more

1. La Régence, v. 2, 1850, pp. 324-25; Illustrated London News, v. 17, Jan. 11, 1851, p. 32.

2. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. 1.

rigorous test of skill, the elimination tournament can be quite successful, if it is based on accurate seeding, which guarantees that favorites will not encounter each other in the early rounds. In tennis, a complicated system which reviews the past accomplishments of performers determines individual seedings.

In 1851, since this was the first international competition, and its very purpose was to determine the comparative strength of players, it would have been difficult to assign individual rankings a priori. Still, some notion was had by most authorities as to the relative strength of the competing masters, or else there would not have been all the furor over the fact that Kieseritzky, Szen, and Lowenthal, were eliminated in the first two rounds. There is certainly no indication that a seeding of the players was even contemplated, and the Prospectus of the Tournament, which came out in February 1851, announced that pairings would be by lot.¹ This was the real weakness of the arrangement. Only unusual good luck saved the First American Chess Congress, in 1857, which adopted the same system, from repeating the fiasco of 1851.

To obviate in some degree the element of chance, the chief prize winner

was bound to accept the challenge of any of the competitors, and to play a deciding match, which it was understood would consist of twenty-one games, for not less than £100 sterling [~~£~~\$500] a side.²

This was to insure a player eliminated early in the tournament a second chance at the title.

1. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. lvii.

2. Ibid., pp. 1, lvii.

As a final inducement, the prizes were made quite liberal. The Prospectus announced that first prize would represent a sum no less than a third of the net amount of the funds collected, with seven other prizes, graded accordingly.¹ When the final division of the prize money was made, this came to the following figures, first prize, \$915, second prize, \$275, third prize, \$195, fourth prize, \$135, fifth prize, \$100, sixth prize, \$65, seventh prize, \$45, eighth prize, \$35.²

In spite of the general enthusiasm which attended the coming tournament, the greatest problem facing Staunton and his colleagues was how to attract foreign players in sufficient number to justify calling the tournament international. All the enthusiasm in the world could not pay their expenses. After all the hubbub stirred up in France, for instance, Kieseritzky was the only player to represent that country. The Paris committee was apparently more decorative than functional. The drain on Kieseritzky's finances (through the mischance of the elimination system which was used, he failed to win a prize), probably hastened the poverty in which he died two years later. Further, since none of the players were chess professionals, attendance at the tournament meant an extended leave of absence from their professions on the continent.

This aspect of the tournament was Staunton's biggest disappointment. Von der Lasa, whose presence had been keenly anticipated, was a

-
1. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. 11.
 2. Ibid., p. xxxix.

sorely missed absentee. No one from Russia appeared, neither Jaenisch, nor Petroff, nor Schumoff.¹ Pierre de Saint-Amant, the French champion, found the lure of gold greater than that of chess fame, and accepted a post as consul in California.² Ignacio Calvi, the Franco-Italian master, considered a leading authority on the game, failed to accept his invitation, while none of the masters residing in the United States, Eugène Rousseau, Charles Stanley, and John W. Schulten, crossed the Atlantic in 1851.

In all, only six foreign players competed, out of sixteen entries. Of these six, Horwitz was an English resident, so that only five actually crossed the waters to England. Other reasons for the small foreign contingent were inherent in the tournament arrangements themselves. Kieseritzky listed three major drawbacks. First, there was the need to register one month in advance. This, from Staunton's point of view, was necessary to enable his committee to plan with some notion of the number and identity of the competitors. Kieseritzky, however, commented: "Qui voudrait prendre un engagement un mois d'avance, à une époque où nous ignorons ce que le lendemain nous réserve."³ Second, he balked at the \$25 entry fee, which would not necessarily deter poor players, and yet might prevent masters who could not afford it from attending. Finally, Kieseritzky could see no

1. Jaenisch eventually reached London, but after the tournament was well under way, and did not participate.

2. *La Régence*, v. 3, 1851, p. 134.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 134

point to the stipulation that the winner of the tournament had to be open to a challenge for a match.

Car de deux choses l'une, ou le tournoi signifie quelque chose, ou il ne signifie rien. Dans le premier cas, pourquoi détruire l'effet du tournoi, en soumettant le vainqueur à une nouvelle épreuve?....Et dans l'autre hypothèse que la victoire dans le tournoi ne contaste aucune supériorité, ce nouveau défi n'aurait pas de but. En tout cas, il serait gênant pour les étrangers, dont le temps est mesuré.¹

In spite of all these difficulties, the tournament opened on May 27, 1851, at the St. George's Club, in Cavendish Square. Confusion was the order of the day. "Quant aux arrangements pour le tournoi, je regrette de dire qu'il y régnait la plus grande confusion: rien n'était préparé."² Anderssen and Mayet were met by no one when they arrived in London, and spent considerable time wandering aimlessly in the city.³ Since this was to be an elimination tournament, the entry had to total a perfectly divisible number, such as eight, sixteen, or thirty-two.⁴ Sixteen became the magic number in 1851. The foreign entry comprised the following: Carl Mayet, one of the German Pleiade; Adolf Anderssen, "previously....known more as the author of a volume of Chess Problems than as a strong player over

1. La Régence, v. 3, 1851, p. 135.

2. Ibid., p. 194.

3. Schachzeitung, v. 6, June-July 1851, p. 165.

4. In elimination tournaments based on seeding, this is not necessary. Top-seeded players advance automatically, without playing, if the number of players does not comprise a perfect pairing.

the board."¹, and co-editor of the Berlin Schachzeitung;² Johann Jakob Lowenthal, Hungarian master exiled during the political disturbances of 1848-49,³ and recently returned from an extensive tour of the United States, which came to acquire special significance because of the face that Lowenthal had met, played, and lost to the thirteen year old Paul Morphy,⁴ Joseph Szen, and Kieseritzky. Two other foreign entries were expected, the Russians Jaenisch and Schumoff, but neither reached London in time, and their places were taken at the last minute by E. S. Kennedy, and one James Mucklow, an unknown

1. Bell's Life, June 22, 1851.

2. Some controversy has arisen as to whether Anderssen was an "unknown" or not, in 1851. He had been making progress in Berlin since 1848. His only concrete accomplishment, however, was a match with Harrwitz, in 1848, which resulted in a 5-5 draw. Before the match, Harrwitz had played Anderssen a blindfold game. An indication of the relative obscurity of Anderssen at that time was that the Schachzeitung failed to mention, in reporting the incident, that Anderssen was also playing blindfold, and had to have the matter called to its attention. Schachzeitung, v. 3, April 1848, p. 172, June 1848, p. 246. Staunton calls Anderssen, "after Heydebrand der Laza, the best player of Germany." The Chess Tournament, p. lxi. This is quite obviously judging after the fact, and is aimed at refuting the claims of the London Chess Club that Staunton had been unable to obtain any kind of foreign entry. Much more in accordance with the facts seems Walker's appraisal, made after only two rounds of the tournament had been completed: "the last named player [Anderssen] has astonished the chess circles by coming out so strong." Bell's Life, June 22, 1851. This view is also substantiated by the following: "M. Anderssen....était connu avant le tournoi comme auteur d'une charmante collection de problèmes." La Régence, v.3, 1851, p. 194.

3. The Field, v. 48, July 12, 1876, p. 115, P. W. Sergeant, Morphy's Games of Chess, Philadelphia: 1939, p. vii.

4. J. Lowenthal, in Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 394.

British provincial player.¹ These substitutions, made without consulting the other players were resented by some of the foreigners.² The British-domiciled entry included, besides Staunton, Henry Edward Bird (1830-1908), a rising youngster of twenty-one, Thomas Henry Buckle, the historian, and one of England's strongest players, Bernhard Horwitz, briefly a member of the German Pleiade, and resident in England since the mid 'forties,³ Captain H. A. Kennedy, well known amateur, Edward Lowe, another transplanted German, "long and favorably known to the frequenters of the Divan, as a player of unquestionable talent"⁴, Samuel Newham, a veteran of the M'Donnell era, Elijah Williams, and Marmaduke Wyvill, M. P., chess patron, and strong amateur. Ill health and the pressure of work forced Buckle to withdraw, and M. Brodie became the third substitute.⁵

The luck of the pairings was abominable. Kieseritzky, a strong pre-tourney favorite, was paired with Anderssen, the eventual winner, and eliminated in the first round.⁶ Lowenthal, another favorite, was eliminated in the first round by Elijah Williams. After this fiasco, the players, who had resisted a suggestion of Staunton's that the number

1. "a player never heard of....until his appearance in the lists." Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. 18.

2. La Régence, v. 3, 1851, p. 195.

3. The Chess Monthly, v. 7, Sept. 1885, p. 8.

4. Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 8, Dec. 25, 1847, p. 407.

5. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. lxxiv.

6. "Some of these pairs were regretted as singularly unfortunate, because they brought two distinguished players at once into collision, and thus compelled one of them to be thrown out at the first stage of the Tournament. This was especially thought to be the case in the instance of Kieseritzky and Anderssen." Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. lxxv.

of games in the individual matches be increased, relented, and subsequent matches were fought for the best four out of seven.¹ Matters failed to improve. In the second round Szen, another strong favorite, was matched with Anderssen and eliminated. In the course of the match, these two competitors came to a highly irregular arrangement whereby if either should win first prize, he should turn over one third of his earnings to the other.² The motivation behind this arrangement is not clear, since there is no indication that Szen deliberately threw his games to Anderssen, nor would there have been much reason for it, since he certainly had no way of telling whether Anderssen had a better chance to capture first prize than he did. In fact, the apparent absence of sinister purpose seems to indicate that the agreement was born out of frugality in the mind of one or the other. At any rate, this queer and, regardless of motives, highly unethical deal, allowed George Walker and his cohorts at the London Chess Club, who heard rumors of the transaction, to blast Staunton and the tournament. The quarters at the St. George's Club provided limited accommodations for spectators, who attended on an invitation basis. Walker charged that the tournament was being held behind closed doors for the purpose of conducting shady transactions.³

To add to Staunton's woes, Walker ridiculed the size of the foreign contingent, and made great copy of the fact that Jaenisch and Schumoff had been expected up to the last minute, and two extra players,

1. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, pp. lxiv-lxvii.

2. Ibid., p. lxvii.

3. Bell's Life, Aug. 10, 1851.

including the obscure Mucklow,¹ were pressed into service at the last minute. Meanwhile, the unheralded Anderssen refused to be stopped. Despite the increased length of the matches since the second round, he eliminated Szen, and then took the measure of Staunton himself by the decisive score of 4-1. In the finals, he was pitted against Wyvill, another surprise finalist, whom he defeated in an arduous match, 4-2, with 1 draw. It seemed fairly obvious that a new star had appeared in the chess firmament. Unfortunately, Staunton refused to accept this fact. Not only had the tournament been a comparative failure, but he himself had failed to reach the final round; worse, he had been defeated for third prize by Elijah Williams, an English player hitherto little known. The Chess Tournament, therefore, a collection of the games played in the tournament, compiled and annotated by Staunton, with a lengthy introduction relating the organization of the event, and which represented the reward granted subscribers, included a deliberate attempt to tear down the newly-won reputation of Anderssen, and to justify and alibi Staunton's failure.

There can be little question that Anderssen was the best player at London, in 1851, not only on the basis of what we know of his later accomplishments, and of his career as a whole, but on the basis of his performance at London itself. The luck of the pairings was such that, until the final round, Anderssen was pitted against the cream of the entries, Kiesertizky, Szen, and Staunton. Furthermore, the evidence of

1. Mucklow was matched with the other substitute, E. S. Kennedy, in the first round, and defeated him. Thereafter, he did not win another game. According to the tournament rules, however, he took eighth prize, and collected \$35.

the games themselves shows that Wyvill, however little else he may have played, was in fact a powerful antagonist. Anderssen's record of fourteen wins and five losses was compiled against a very strong field.

What impression this victory made on Anderssen's contemporaries is more difficult to determine. Staunton greatly beclouded the issue by the campaign he conducted immediately after the tournament to discredit the German school teacher.¹ There is no indication that Anderssen was hailed throughout Europe as world's champion. Even without Staunton's constant reminders, contemporaries felt that weaknesses in the tournament itself had largely discredited it as an accurate gauge of the relative skill of European masters. Even if one accepted Anderssen's superiority at London, the field had not been sufficiently representative. Despite Staunton's professions of self-esteem, he was not, in 1851, universally acclaimed as European champion, certainly not in Germany. The absence of von der Lasa, Jaenisch, and Saint-Amant, in particular, had weakened any claim Anderssen might have made to European supremacy. Within Germany itself, von der Lasa was long considered Anderssen's superior.²

Immediately following the tournament, Staunton challenged Anderssen to a match of twenty-one games, as per the regulations outlined in the Prospectus.³ Anderssen, however, was expected in Breslau where he had just received a teaching appointment, and the match never materialized.

1. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. lxxii; Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 12, 1851, p. 285.

2. Cf. p. 77.

3. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. lxxi.

In 1853, Staunton issued a general challenge to any player for a match of twenty-one games to determine the European champion. If the challenger was an English player, the stakes should be between \$500 and \$750 a side. If he came from abroad, the stakes should be \$1250 a side.¹ Walker claimed that the higher figure was aimed at Anderssen, who could not raise such a sum.² No one took up the gauntlet. Anderssen steadfastly refused to become embroiled in the dispute, and when Staunton turned to Shakesperean criticism, in 1854, the controversy died out.

II

The tournament was not a complete failure. The greatest tribute that could be paid to Staunton, was that it had been held. That, in itself, was an accomplishment. Although the gathering had not been as representative as originally intended, it comprised the greatest galaxy of chess stars ever assembled up to that time. The prizes had been liberal, and were not to be matched in a tournament until 1878. Immediately following the event, the London Chess Club sponsored a rival tournament, limited to foreign players. This proved even less

-
1. Ch. Pl. Chron., 2d series, v. 1, 1853, p. 186.
 2. Bell's Life, July 10, 1853.

successful than Staunton's venture. There was only one prize, a \$500 cup.¹ The foreign entry was so small that the provision was stretched to include Lowe and Josef Kling², two Germans long resident in England, and eventually Frederick Deacon, a British player who had been residing in Belgium for a few years. Kling and Lowenthal than withdrew, necessitating a last minute substitution similar to the one in the St. George's event.³ One of these substitutes was Kieseritzky, who had already returned to France when the invitation reached him. He returned to England too late and played only three games.⁴ In order not to repeat the difficulties which an elimination tournament had created for Staunton, the London Chess Club tried a round robin event, the first such event in chess history. It proved no more successful than play by elimination. Several players dropped out when they saw they had no more chance for the single prize,⁵ which was again won by Anderssen with eight wins and one draw.⁶ The elimination system remained in vogue for a decade and was used, not only at New York, in 1857, but in three minor tournaments of the British Chess Association, at Manchester, in 1857, at Birmingham, in 1858, and at Bristol, in 1861. It was not until 1862 that round robin play permanently replaced play by elimination in tournaments.

1. Bell's Life, July 27, 1851.

2. Kling was chiefly known as the co-author, with Horwitz, of a collection of end game studies then considered classic.

3. Bell's Life, July 27, Aug. 3, 10, 17, 1851. Hermann von Gottschall, Adolf Anderssen, Leipzig: 1912, p. 65.

4. La Régence, v. 3, 1851, p. 238.

5. "Cet arrangement était vicieux, car la plupart des joueurs se sont retirés lorsqu'ils ont vu qu'ils n'avaient pas de chance de gagner." La Régence, v. 3, 1851, p. 238. See also Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 65.

6. Bell's Life, Aug. 17, 1851; Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 65.

Whatever the success or failure of the event, insofar as Staunton and his colleagues were concerned, historically, the tournament was a milestone of tremendous significance, not only for what it accomplished, but for what it failed to accomplish. Not only did it launch a new era in chess history, but its very shortcomings helped to shape this new era by focussing attention on a number of difficult problems.

One of these was the use of a time limit. In 1851, there was no method by which to control the time expended by a player on any one move. This situation was clearly unsatisfactory, and might have led to personal abuse, in which one player deliberately stalled to fend off defeat. It also meant that play was somewhat slower than it is today. There is no indication that play was excessively slow, except in rare cases. This is a belief which developed later, and was based apparently on Staunton's recriminations in The Chess Tournament. It has been accepted without question by most contemporary critics.¹

Staunton helped dramatize the need for time control:

Another question of considerable importance is the propriety of assigning some limit to the time consumed by players in the consideration of their moves. When it is a matter of notoriety that upwards of an hour (nay, even two hours!) is expended by some players over a single move, amateurs become justly annoyed, not only at the waste of time involved in such games, but at the substitution of the powers of physical endurance for that quickness of perception which they have been in the habit of regarding as one test of intellectual power.²

1. Cf. Reinfeld, The Human Side of Chess, p. 18; Reuben Fine, The World's Great Chess Games, New York: 1951, in which he reproduces a 9½ hour game between Staunton and Saint-Amant, commenting on its length, but blandly alters the text; where the original score on the 39th move merely says that Staunton won, Fine has Saint-Amant resign, p. 13.

2. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xiv.

However, he had an axe to grind. He was grasping at any straw to explain his failure at London. In this case, he was seeking an alibi for a second defeat at the hands of Elijah Williams, in a match held after the tournament.¹

In the Labourdonnais-M'Donnell series of 1834, no official time was kept, but we have numerous eye-witness accounts, all of which comment on the length of the games. "Many of the games lasted long, long hours."² M'Donnell is reputed to have taken as long as one hour and a half for a move, Labourdonnais fifty-five minutes. The very fact that this inordinate length called for comment would tend to indicate that such protracted encounters were not the order of the day. Further, these two adversaries, during June and July, were able to engage in about eighty-four games, so that the games averaged more than one a day. Although Labourdonnais tended to be a bit impatient of M'Donnell's slow play, there is no record of a serious complaint on either side, and certainly no attempt to explain away a defeat on either side through exhaustion caused by waiting for one's opponent to move.

1. "Mr. Williams' systematic delay over every move called forth the marked animadversion of the looker-on. When games are prolonged to twelve, thirteen, and twenty-four hours each, and single moves occupy two hours and a half, the effect upon an invalid can be well imagined." Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. lxxiii. Williams replied that Staunton himself was the cause of the long games, declaring him "one of the slowest players." Bell's Life, Dec. 7, 1851. Kieseritzky supported this charge: "Si....M. Staunton mérite un blâme, c'est pour l'extrême lenteur qu'il a mise dans ses parties: huit, douze, seize heures pour une seule partie." La Régence, v. 3, 1851, p. 203.

2. Walker, Chess and Chess Players, p. 372.

In 1843, an informal time chart of the Staunton-Saint-Amant match was kept by Captain Wilson, Staunton's second. This chart shows that the longest game lasted nine and a half hours, and the longest single move, by Saint-Amant, consumed forty minutes.¹ It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of moves played in many of the games published at that time, since often, recording ends abruptly with a note to the effect that one of the players resigned in a few moves, or eventually lost. The nine and a half hour game listed above shows thirty-nine moves, followed by the cryptic comment, "White won the game."² So that even for these lengthy encounters, we are likely to overestimate the amount of time spent on each move.

It is significant that Staunton did not complain of Saint-Amant's slowness, although the time chart shows Saint-Amant using up by far the

1. Staunton, The Chess Player's Companion, pp. 320ff. This might be a suitable occasion to clarify an error in Sergeant's, A Century of British Chess. In recording the time chart of Captain Wilson, Staunton's second during most of the match, from The Chess Player's Companion, Sergeant comments that the total time given by Wilson for each game exceeds the total of all the individual moves. What Sergeant has overlooked is the fact that Wilson lists only, in his breakdown, those moves which consumed more than five minutes, so that the time discrepancy is represented by the "short" moves, that is, those that took less than five minutes.

2. Ibid., p. 327. This has led to the rather vicious practice among modern chess editors of altering the text of these scores, without acknowledgement. Cf. p. 46, footnote 1. The worst such offender is probably F. J. Wellmuth, The Golden Treasury of Chess.

greater proportion of time. Staunton won the match. Elijah Williams, however, had not only taken third prize from him, but when Staunton challenged him to a match, seven games up, conceding the odds of three games, Williams proceeded to beat him again, 7-6.¹

In short, we can say that chess was slower then than it is now, and some games lasted about twice as long as they would today; although times in excess of this do not seem to occur, and such long games were by no means the rule. However, there was developing, around 1851, a tendency towards slower play, particularly as more serious encounters replaced skittles chess. Staunton's time difficulties during and after the tournament called attention to the need for some kind of time control. As a result, the first time limit was imposed in the course of a match, in 1853, between Lowenthal and Harrwitz, in which the players were compelled to limit each move to twenty minutes.²

Another troublesome issue which first reared its head in earnest was "book" play. The issue, in 1851, revolved around the comparative merits

1. Illustrated London News, v. 19, Nov. 22, 1851, p. 619. This defeat led to a typical Staunton rejoinder. In a letter signed "A Subscriber to the Tournament", probably by Staunton himself, the writer declares he cannot see how Williams can claim to have won the match from Staunton since, if the odds of three games, which Staunton conceded, are disregarded, Staunton won by 6-4 in games actually played; and no one has ever claimed winning a match when he won less games. Ibid., Dec. 13, 1851, p. 707. No comment is adequate to meet the utter fantasy of this charge.

2. The Field, v. 1, Dec. 24, 1853, p. 620.

of the open game and of the close game. Before 1851, players had been quite convinced of the superiority of the close game over the open game, which was felt to be amateurish.¹ By the time of the tournament, however, it was felt that the adoption of close defences slowed the game unduly, and made it dull. By that time, however, the close game was approved "book" play, and greatly in vogue among most players.² A correspondent, in 1851, wrote:

As the case stands at present, it is allowed to be imprudent for a second player to make an 'open' game by playing for his first move P to K fourth; and, accordingly, I expect that all the contests in the Tournament will be 'close games' (the 'French', 'Sicilian', etc.).³

Many chess players rued this development. Close games required too much attention, and resulted in drawn out strategical battles, of an unexciting nature. Thus the battle against the close game became the first encounter in the never ending war against technique. Although still somewhat primitive, technique was sufficiently advanced that we read, for instance, in the notes to a game appearing in 1850, the

1. George Walker believed that if Black refrained from answering either P-K4 or P-Q4 with the same move, "the first move is altogether valueless.", thus anticipating one of Reti's theories by seventy-five years. Chess and Chess Players, p. 382.

2. "nous avons remarqué que les amateurs du Café de la Régence semblaient avoir tous stéréotypé leur jeu sur la fameuse partie du Pion du Roi un pas....S'il n'est réellement possible de lutter sérieusement qu'en se muant dans cette ennuyeuse ouverture, c'est, à mon avis, à désespérer des combinaisons de l'échiquier." La Régence, v. 1, 1849, pp. 203-4.

3. Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 12, 1851, p. 186. It is difficult to distinguish with complete accuracy between open and close games, but if we consider the original intent of the opening, rather than the type of middle game which evolves from it, we can say that these fears were justified. Of the eighty-five games played in the Grand Tourney, in 1851, only fifteen were open games, while seventy were close games.

comment, "The moves up to this point are all 'book'."¹ Up to this point refers to move number 14!

Since no time limit was used, there developed a tendency to enliven the game by imposing the condition that all games in a match be open. Staunton first suggested that half the games in all important matches be open ones.² Such a solution was urged by other players. A match between Harrwitz and Williams, held shortly after the tournament, stipulated that all games would be open ones, which was accomplished by requiring both players to open every game with P-K4 on either side.³ As late as 1862, we will note a similar attempt to open every game on both sides with P-K4.⁴

Another question which the chess congress considered was the necessity for a chess code, to regulate play and insure uniformity throughout Europe. The chess code of Italy, particularly, differed from that of the rest of Europe.⁵ As far as playing rules were concerned, there was much disagreement over what might seem insignificant points, such as whether a player who accidentally

1. Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 11, 1850, p. 169. On the other hand, a provincial correspondent revealed an amazingly optimistic point of view concerning technique. "A score of pages would suffice for the summing up under the form of theses, all the general results of the actual science." (i. e., technique). Staunton, The Chess Tournament, pp. xxi-xxii.

2. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xiv.

3. The Field, v. 1, Jan. 1, 1853, p. 12.

4. Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, p. xliii.

5. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. li.

knocked a piece off the board was required to play that piece, as if he had touched it intentionally. There was disagreement over what to do in case a king was left exposed to check without either of the players being aware of it, and how to deal with false (i. e., illegal) moves.¹ Odds games were far more popular than they are now, and there was disagreement on castling procedure when a player gave odds of a rook. The general practice was to allow the odds-giver to castle on the side where his rook was missing.² Other points of controversy were more basic. There was some question about the legality of taking a pawn en passant.³ There was very widespread disagreement over pawn promotion. The earliest practice had been for the pawn to be promoted to whatever piece originally occupied the square on which the pawn promoted, so that a rook pawn, for instance, would become a rook, a knight pawn, a knight, etc. Later, this was altered to permit the pawn to be promoted to whatever piece had been removed from the board, and if no piece had yet been taken, the pawn was to wait until such time before it could be promoted. Finally, by 1851, the practice of promoting a pawn to whatever piece

1. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, p. xli. Staunton who, in these controversies, adopted a much more solid and sensible outlook than many of his contemporaries, was opposed to the accepted practice in many circles of allowing a false move to stand if it was not caught by either player within a given number of moves.

2. Ibid., p. xlii. Staunton also opposed this practice, arguing that the giving odds of a rook was the same as assuming the rook had already been captured by the enemy, in which case castling was illegal.

3. There was also a pointless discussion as to whether taking a pawn en passant was compulsory in an otherwise stalemated position.

a player chose, regardless of whether he already had lost such a piece or not, was becoming prevalent. The greatest controversy was to rage over whether a pawn could refuse to be promoted, and remain on the eighth rank, a "dead" pawn.¹ Another rule in a state of flux was the so-called fifty move rule, in the end game, requiring a player, with sufficient material to mate his opponent, to do so within fifty moves. The conditions under which this rule operated were still vague and unagreed upon.²

Finally, there had been hope that a universal system of chess notation could be drawn up, eliminating the confusion resulting from games being scored differently in different countries. Unfortunately, none of these hopes were realized. This was thought to be partly due to the absence of Petroff and von der Lasa, two of the leading continental authorities, and Calvi, the expert on Italian chess, who had just completed a monumental work on the game.³ Staunton charged the London Chess Club with luring foreign players away from the congress in Cavendish Square, leaving them no time, outside actual competition, for such extracurricular duties as drawing up a chess code. The foreign players certainly did visit the London Club as much as the St. George's.⁴ Whatever the cause, nothing was accomplished on the chess code, save that Staunton, Jaenisch, and von der Lasa were asked to draw up codes of rules, which could be used as a basis for a general revision of chess laws in Europe.

-
1. Staunton opposed the "dead" pawn.
 2. Staunton, The Chess Tournament, pp. x-xiii.
 3. Ibid., p. lxxv.
 4. Gottschall, Anderssen, pp. 54-57.

CHAPTER II

I

In 1851, the United States dispatched a number of mechanical marvels to the Great Exhibition of Industry and Art in London, including McCormick reapers and Colt firearms, but no chess players made the long trip across the Atlantic to the International Tournament in Cavendish Square. Organized chess was still very young and very new in the Cisatlantic democracy. "Few or no clubs were then in existence."¹ Neither Philadelphia, New York, nor Boston, the cultural centers of the Eastern seaboard, possessed any regular chess associations.² Chess, however, was not unknown, and in fact, the ingredients for a rapid growth were present and needed only the proper catalyst.

The chess community in America was still, in 1851, as was the case with many other cultural activities, a suburb of Europe, particularly of England. Most of the leading players were European by birth, and many

1. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 50.

2. Ibid., p. 51.

more were European nationals on temporary sojourn in the United States. Three of these imports were among the leaders of American chess, Charles Stanley, a strong British player, Eugène Rousseau, a French master of moderate strength, and J. W. Schulten of Germany, called in 1845 the best player in the United States.¹

Chess had received a certain impetus in 1845 when Stanley defeated Rousseau in a match, in New Orleans, which was the talk of the American chess world for some years thereafter.² Stanley also played four matches with Schulten, between 1844 and 1846, winning three and losing one. The impulse received from the Stanley matches appears to have died out by 1851. In a speech in New York, in 1852, during a dinner in honor of Saint-Amant, Charles Stanley suggested holding a World's Chess Tournament in New York, in conjunction with the Great Exhibition of 1853. Nothing came of this

1. Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 5, 1845, p. 186. Charles Stanley, born in England in 1819, first achieved prominence as a player in 1837, when he contested a match with Howard Staunton, receiving odds of Pawn and two moves, and triumphed at the rate of two to one. He came to the United States in the early 'forties, and after his match with Rousseau, returned briefly to England. In 1852, he was once more in New York, in the employ of the British Consulate, and held that position at the time of the New York Tournament of 1857. "Mr. Rousseau is well known....from the fact that he played in Europe more than one hundred games even with Kieseritzky, of which the great Livonian won only a bare majority." The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Dec. 1857, p. 382. Schulten settled in New York where he successfully engaged in business.

2. Charles Stanley, Thirty-one Games at Chess, pamphlet published by Stanley, comprising all the games of his match with Rousseau, p. 3. The American Chess Magazine, 1847, p. 86. The match was played for a side bet of \$1,000, and Stanley scored 15-8, with 8 draws.

proposal.¹ Shortly thereafter, however, possibly as a belated attempt to follow the example set by the great tournament in London, the pace of American chess life quickened considerably. Already, in 1850, when Lowenthal had toured the United States, he had unearthed evidence of a very large and very thriving population of chess players in this country, who only needed organization, incentive, and proper guidance.² Writing in his chess column in The Era, in 1856, Lowenthal announced that the progress of chess in America, since 1850, had almost equalled that in England.³

1856 proved to be the key year for organized chess in America. The chess club of New York, which had led a fitful existence for thirty-five years, acquired a distinguished set of players: Stanley himself, Theodore Lichtenhein (1829-1874), Frederick Perrin (1806-1889), and, most important, Daniel Willard Fiske (1831-1904).⁴ In February 1856,

1. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 51.

2. Lowenthal, in Ibid., pp. 389-96. Soon after 1845, the chess clubs of Louisville, Lexington, and Frankfort, "had the merit of instituting the well known tournaments which took place every year in the bathing places of Kentucky." Lange, Paul Morphy, p. 50. A letter to the editor of the American Chess Magazine, 1847, advertises the annual "rally or 'tournament'", to be held in Kentucky. p. 182.

3. The Era, October 5, 1856, quoted in F. M. Edge, The Exploits and Triumphs in Europe of Paul Morphy, New York: 1859, p. 65.

4. Edge, Exploits of Paul Morphy, p. 5. Lichtenhein was born in Königsberg, East Prussia, where he was for a time president of the chess club. He now resided permanently in the United States, where he was in the wholesale mercantile business. Perrin, born in London of a Swiss family, started life in a commercial situation in London. He came to the United States in 1845, and became Professor of Modern Languages at Princeton University. Fiske, editor, librarian, book collector, had just returned from an extensive tour of Europe, where he had engaged in philological studies. He was considered "the most distinguished Scandinavian scholar in the United States"; Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper, v. 4, Oct. 31, 1857, and was assistant librarian at the Astor Library, in New York.

the New York club began a correspondence match with Philadelphia, then considered the chess capital of the United States,¹ which the Philadelphia amateurs eventually won 2-0.² In May, the New York club was reorganized with the election of Charles D. Mead³ as president, and Frederick Perrin as secretary. In spite of its match loss, New York began to wrest chess leadership from Philadelphia in the late 'fifties. Other strong players joined the club, led by a French immigrant, Napoleon Marache, who won the first club championship, in 1856.⁴

Chess literature increased rapidly at that time. In 1846, Marache had published the first American chess periodical, The Chess Palladium and Mathematical Sphynx. Perhaps the name frightened prospective subscribers; at any rate, only three numbers were issued.⁵ From 1847 to 1848, Stanley edited The American Chess Magazine. This also went out of business.⁶ Perhaps these publications had come too early.

1. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Jan. 1857, p. 31. Fiske calls Philadelphia the "traditional seat of chess in the United States", with "the most extensive and complete chess library in America." American Chess Congress, p. 55. "The Athenaeum continues to be the grand rendez-vous of Philadelphia amateurs." The Am. Ch. Mag., 1847, p. 48.

2. Gustavus Reichehelm, Chess in Philadelphia, Philadelphia: 1898, p. 7.

3. Colonel Mead, one of the few native American chess players, was born in New York, and was a prominent lawyer. He had achieved fame as a player in 1842 by helping to man the New York team in the victorious correspondence match with Norfolk.

4. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Jan. 1857, p. 31. Marache was born in Meaux, in 1818, and came to America at the age of thirteen. Other strong New York players included Dr. Benjamin Raphael (1818-1880), of Kentucky, W. J. A. Fuller, adventurer and soldier of fortune, Denis Julien, another French immigrant, and the veteran James Thompson (1805-1870), born in London, who came to America with his parents at the age of ten, was now the prosperous owner of a restaurant in New York, and had been Mead's collaborator in the correspondence match between New York and Norfolk in 1842.

5. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 492.

6. Ibid., p. 493.

They had been born of the enthusiasm generated by the Stanley-Rousseau match, an enthusiasm which petered out rapidly. By 1856, on the other hand, chess literature was displaying a robust growth. Four weekly journals in New York devoted space to chess columns.¹ There were chess columns or chess problems appearing in diverse publications throughout the country, the best of which was probably that appearing in Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper. Then, in January 1857, came the most ambitious of these publications, one devoted solely to chess, The Chess Monthly, edited by that great chess enthusiast, D. W. Fiske.

In March 1857, in the pages of this new magazine, the idea of a national tournament was first broached.² The London Tournament was clearly the prototype in the minds of those who were suggesting such a meeting. "In spite of many errors in the details of its management, [it had] made an era in the annals of European chess."³ Like the congress of 1851, a national tournament would serve as a spur to chess activities by bringing in personal contact players from diverse parts of the country. It would determine the relative strength of American players. Finally, the question of a chess code would be considered.⁴

On March 26, the New York club unanimously resolved that,

a committee of five persons be appointed to issue a formal proposal for a general assemblage of American players, at some convenient time and in some accessible locality, and to correspond with other clubs upon the feasibility of such an assemblage.⁵

1. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Jan. 1857, p. 31.

2. "Some half-dozen communications from as many different sources have suggested to us the idea of a National Tournament." The Chess Monthly, v. 1, March 1857, p. 92.

3. Idem.

4. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 54.

5. Ibid., p. 53.

The committee consisted of Colonel Mead, Perrin, James Thompson, Hardiman P. Montgomery, the strongest player in Philadelphia, and chess editor of Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper, and Daniel Willard Fiske, who proved to be the counterpart of Staunton, in his capacity as organizing genius of the tournament.¹ On April 17, a circular issued from this committee, emphasizing the desirability of holding a chess congress similar to the one of 1851. A general fund was to be collected by subscription, "sufficiently large to allow of prizes of respectable amounts."² Fiske surmised that \$1500 would be sufficient.³ Finally, the circular suggested the forming of similar committees in the chief cities, to cooperate with the New York club in preparing the great event and selecting a site for it.⁴ Although the New York Congress consciously copied the London Tournament, and, in spite of the realization that errors had been committed in the handling of the previous event, copied its procedural method quite closely, it was blessed, in contrast with the earlier event, with singular good fortune. No bickering arose among the different clubs. No one charged the New York club with monopolizing the event. No insults were hurled at anyone. Response to the appeal for subscriptions was "in the highest degree satisfactory."⁵ Even the delicate question of locale was settled amicably. Philadelphia, New

1. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 53.

2. Ibid., p. 54.

3. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, March 1857, p. 93.

4. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 54.

5. Ibid., p. 55. In all, \$1117.50 was subscribed, as compared to the \$3235 subscribed in England, in 1851. Ibid., p. 541.

York, and Chicago, were all considered, and New York finally decided upon, probably because the largest number of amateurs resided there.¹ In spite of all this preliminary success, the significance of the tournament might appear slight in the general history of chess; it was, after all, merely a national tournament, in a country which did not boast of very high ranking in the chess playing community.² It was transformed into a memorable event by the presence of one player, making his first public appearance outside of his home town, Paul Morphy.

II

Paul Charles Morphy was born in New Orleans on June 22, 1837, the son of Alonzo Morphy, one of the most distinguished jurists in Louisiana. His paternal grandfather was a native of Spain, and his mother was French. His early environment and training combined the typical upbringing of the ante-bellum South, with a strongly European family background. His family was very rich, and a leader in New Orleans society. It is perhaps important, in view of the unhappy denouement of Morphy's life, to understand the refined and sheltered

1. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, pp. 55-56.

2. According to Lowenthal, the best players in America "were estimated as far inferior to the first rank of Europeans." J. Lowenthal, Morphy's Games of Chess, London: 1860, p. 4. S. S. Boden commented in 1858 that outside of Mead, Thompson, and Lichtenhein, the strength of American players was comparatively unknown in Europe. The Field, v. 12, Aug. 21, 1858.

nature of his early environment, one marked by leisure, slow pace, and an emphasis on good breeding, courtesy, and gentlemanly manners.¹

Morphy was prepared for college at the Jefferson Academy, in New Orleans, and attended St. Joseph's College, in Spring Hill, Alabama, from 1850 to 1854, when he graduated with honors. In April 1857, he graduated from Louisiana University Law School, and was admitted to practice as soon as he should become of age.² He is described in his youth as frail, not much given to outdoor activities, and particularly strong in mathematics.³

Morphy was one of the few genuine prodigies of chess history. He did not quite match Capablanca or Reshevsky in precocity, but his father taught him the moves at the age of ten, and young Paul immediately revealed his amazing capacity for the game. Not only did he defeat his father with ease, but he took the measure of his uncle, Ernest Morphy, generally considered "the chess king of New Orleans".⁴ During 1849 and 1850, while Paul was barely thirteen, he met Eugène Rousseau, then residing in New Orleans, in "over fifty Parties....winning fully nine-tenths."⁵ Morphy capped his youthful successes on May 27, 1850,

1. His mother was an accomplished pianist, harpist and singer, and he, though he did not play an instrument, had a deep appreciation for music. Regina Morphy-Voitier, Life of Paul Morphy, New Orleans: 1926, p. 28.

2. Details of Morphy's early life can be found in a number of volumes: The Dictionary of American Biography, v. 13, pp. 193-4; Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, pp. 504-507; Morphy-Voitier, Life of Paul Morphy; "Biographical Memoir of Paul Charles Morphy", in Louis Albert Morphy, Poems and Prose Sketches, New Orleans: 1921; Lowenthal, Morphy's Games of Chess; Sergeant, Morphy's Games of Chess.

3. Morphy-Voitier, Life of Paul Morphy, p. 9.

4. Lowenthal, Morphy's Games of Chess, p. 3.

5. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Dec. 1857, p. 382.

when J. J. Lowenthal, the Hungarian master, visited the Morphy home and played with the prodigy. Morphy scored one win and one draw against this acknowledged master.¹

Morphy followed this with victories over his youthful chess pupil and lifelong friend, Charles A. Maurian (1838-1911), and over Judge Alexander B. Meek (1814-1865), of Alabama.² In spite of these triumphs, Morphy's reputation was still, in 1857, essentially local. In January 1857, Fiske described him as "the most promising player of the day"³, but since he had never ventured forth from his home, players were inclined to dismiss his claims to fame as largely exaggeration.⁴ Events in New York, in the fall of 1857, were to vindicate the wildest claims concerning this twenty year old youth.

1. Lowenthal, in Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 394. Lowenthal says that he played either two or three games with Morphy, and subsequent chess editors have at times recorded the results of the match as 2-0, with 1 draw. Sergeant, however, claims only two games were played. He bases this on the fact that Lowenthal's collection, the original collection of Morphy games, and the basic source for all subsequent collectors, lists only two games, and that no record of a third game has ever been found. Sergeant, Morphy's Games of Chess, p. 4.

2. Judge Meek was one of the strongest players in the country, and was elected president of the First American Chess Congress, in 1857. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 70.

3. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Jan. 1857, p. 31.

4. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 508. The fact that New York players, in 1857, and, in 1858, European players, hesitated to give Morphy his due until he appeared on the scene, in spite of the fact that the scores of his games were frequently published in The Chess Monthly, is a reflection, not only of the low level of chess criticism of the day, but of the tremendous extent in which Morphy outdistanced his contemporaries.

III

The date for the opening of the First American Chess Congress was set for October 6, 1857. An entrance fee of \$10 was required to play in the Grand Tournament, and four prizes were to be awarded. The tournament committee decided to copy the London Tournament further, and established an elimination tournament, pairings again to be by lot. The matches were to go to the first winner of three games, the final match going to the first winner of five games.¹ The rules of the tournament were patterned after the London rules of 1851, and the games were played in accordance with the code of rules found in Staunton's Chess Player's Handbook.² Insofar as a time limit was concerned, the committee merely inserted the following very liberal clause:

In cases of unreasonable delay, the Committee of Management reserve to themselves the right to limit the time to be consumed on any move, to thirty minutes.³

As it turned out, this clause was unnecessary, play in New York, in 1857, being marked by amazing rapidity. Morphy was one of the game's

-
1. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, pp. 56-60.
 2. Ibid., pp. 63-64.
 3. Ibid., p. 64.

fastest players, and with the exception of Louis Paulsen, the other contestants followed Morphy's lead.¹

In the late autumn of 1857, a great depression struck the country and threatened to dry up the sources of funds of the Congress.

The great commercial panic which commenced its ravages some weeks before the day fixed for the opening of the Congress undoubtedly influenced unfavorably the amount of subscriptions to the general fund.²

The star which guided the fortunes of the Congress did not fail it, however, and the "unfavorable influences" did not prevent the meeting from opening triumphantly as scheduled, nor from running past its scheduled duration.³

Sixteen players comprised the field: W. S. Allison, Lichtenhein, Marache, Perrin, Raphael, Stanley, and Thompson, of New York, Hiram Kennicott, of Chicago, Judge A. B. Meek, of Mobile, Alabama, Morphy, Louis Paulsen (1833-1891), of Dubuque, Iowa,⁴ Calthrop, of Bridgeport,

1. "One attribute of American play struck me forcibly, quickness. Here in Europe a match game occupies a whole day; but in America I have played three or four at the same sitting." Lowenthal, in Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 396. Staunton, in reporting a match between Stanley and Turner, in 1850, was amazed to learn that the seventeen games had been played in three days. He failed to see how such rapid play could produce good chess. Illustrated London News, v. 16, March 9, 1850. See also, Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, pp. 147-240. G. A. MacDonnell had this to say of Morphy's quick play: "I fancy he always discerned the right move at a glance, and only paused before making it, partly out of respect for his antagonist and partly to certify himself of its correctness, to make assurance doubly sure." G. A. MacDonnell, Chess in Life Pictures, London: 1883, pp. 12-14.

2. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, pp. 64-65.

3. The Illustrated London News commented on the success of the Congress in spite of the panic, v. 31, Nov. 21, 1857.

4. Louis Paulsen was born in Blomberg, Germany. He came to the United States in the mid- 'fifties with his brother Ernst. The two settled in Dubuque, Iowa, where they engaged in the wholesale tobacco business. Paulsen's strength was relatively unknown in 1857 (he was only 24), but he quickly impressed everyone with his skill at blindfold chess.

Connecticut, Fuller, and Fiske. The latter two were last minute entries to round off the total number to sixteen.¹

The Congress, which lasted from October 6 to November 11, proved a tremendous success. In sharp contrast to the London Tournament of 1851, it was marked by geniality, harmonious personal relations, and a general lack of acrimonious disputes concerning points of order. The rules of the Congress, for instance, stipulated that play must begin every morning promptly at nine A.M. Yet we find Fiske commenting on the fact that the Congress extended beyond its appointed time in this fashion:

This was due in a great measure to the peculiar situation of the players resident in New York. They were, most of them, engaged in business avocations during the day, and they could consequently give only their evenings to the Tournament.²

This was clearly in violation of the rules. Yet no complaint was voiced, nor over the fact that the tourney extended beyond its anticipated time. The general feeling was one of enthusiasm, with no attempt to hold players or play to rigid rules or a rigid schedule. When Paulsen's exhibitions of blindfold play drew every eye, play was suspended in the tournament, and in view of the extraordinary nature of the event, tickets at one dollar each, good for three days, were sold by the Committee of Management to the general public.³ Attendance, both at the blindfold

1. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, pp. 67-74.

2. Ibid., pp. 63-64, p. 87.

3. Ibid., pp. 77-79.

performances and at other times, was extremely large, and in anticipation of this, extensive apartments were rented at 76⁴ Broadway,¹ where the Congress was held, and a huge telegraphic board was hung at one end of the hall, "for repeating games of more than ordinary interest."²

The reason for the remarkable lack of strife at the Congress was probably the fact that Morphy dominated the event so completely. His great superiority as a player tended inevitably to submerge the rivalries of lesser players; the tournament gradually lost its competitive character, and became a sort of vehicle for the pyrotechnics of the young champion, and a paean of praise to his triumphs. It was clearly impossible to defeat Morphy, so that to lose to him was no disgrace.

Morphy's reputation was still somewhat legendary when he reached New York. He quickly confounded all doubters with impressive triumphs in off-hand games over Perrin, Stanley, and other members of the New York club.³ Morphy continued to sweep aside all comers in such skittles encounters, which formed a constant sideshow to the main tournament. His complete mastery tended to reduce the problem of pairings to an academic one, since Morphy was so obviously the champion. He reached the finals without losing a game. There he met Louis Paulsen, who was giving the first evidence of his strength, and who also reached the finals undefeated. Morphy quickly dismissed any thought of an upset.

-
1. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 68.
 2. Ibid., p. 69.
 3. Ibid., p. 508.

While John Van Buren, the son of the ex-President, Richard Grant White, "the most learned Shakespearean this side of the ocean",¹ Oliver Byrne, the renowned mathematician, Sigismund Thalberg, the famous pianist, and other celebrities looked on, the Louisiana phenomenon routed Paulsen 5-1, with 2 draws.²

On October 19, a National Chess Association was created by the members of the Congress, who adopted articles of union, and elected Charles Mead as president.³ Unfortunately the seeds sown during Morphy's time of glory did not bear fruit immediately. After Morphy's retirement, the Association languished, and the Second American Chess Congress was not held until 1871. This was partly due to the Civil War, however, and the Association created in 1857 proved to be the starting point for a remarkably robust chess life in this country. The Congress concluded with a banquet on the evening of November 11, marked by conviviality and good humor. Marache, Dr. Raphael, and a Mr. Dodge sang songs. The members of the Congress presented a gold medal to Paulsen in honor of his blindfold play. Morphy made the presentation and a brief speech in praise of chess.⁴ A massive service of silver plate was then awarded Morphy as first prize.⁵

1. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Dec. 1857, p. 378.

2. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, pp. 74-91.

3. Ibid., p. 83. The following players were elected honorary members: Lowenthal, Saint-Amant, Jaenisch, Anderssen, Staunton, von der Lasa, and George Walker, an interesting sidelight on how European players were rated in America. p. 84.

4. Ibid., pp. 92-107.

5. The tournament prospectus specified that no less than three fifths of the net profits of the tourney would make up the first prize. The assumption seemed to be that the prize would be in cash, as were the other three prizes awarded. Nowhere is mention made of why Morphy's prize was not in money. In view of his subsequent aversion to being considered a chess professional, it would be interesting to know whether the change was made at Morphy's own request.

Immediately after the tournament, Morphy encountered Stanley, and then Schulten, giving both players odds of Pawn and move. He defeated the former by a score of 4-0, with 1 draw,¹ and crushed the latter 23-1, with 1 draw.² According to Fiske, Morphy "can give the best players of the United States at least the odds of the Pawn and move."³ America could point with pride to a native player who seemed about to embark on the most successful career in chess history.⁴

IV

While Morphy's play dominated the Congress, the young Louisianan did not receive all the attention, part of which was reserved for the two blindfold exhibitions put on by Louis Paulsen, on October 10, and on October 21.

Philidor, in the eighteenth century, had been the pioneer of blindfold chess. He had met two antagonists blindfold, and a third with sight

1. This triumph seemed so unbelievable to Staunton, who had given Stanley slightly stronger odds, when Stanley was still in his 'teens, and lost heavily, that he attributed Stanley's defeat to a combination of grave illness and lack of practice. Illustrated London News, v. 31, Dec. 19, 1857.

2. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Dec. 1857, p. 379; Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, pp. 508-510.

3. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Dec. 1857, p. 383.

4. About the only negative note sounded in New York, in 1857, was in regard to the chess code. Like the London assembly of 1851, this congress failed to come to an agreement on rules or notations. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 123.

of the board. In the early part of the nineteenth century, two blindfold games seemed the maximum,¹ and the level of play, in such encounters, was acknowledged to be definitely inferior.² Labourdonnais, for instance, could play two games simultaneously, if the opposition was third-rate. Playing one game, he could meet on even terms players he would give the odds of Pawn and move, or Pawn and two moves, in over-the-board play.³

George Walker devoted a chapter, in his Chess and Chess Players, to the art of blindfold play, and the instructions he gives illuminate the level of play of the day. Walker's advice includes this charming tidbit: exchange your knights early since their peculiar movements are difficult to follow without sight of the board. The general tone of his advice is, play for simplification, exchange as much as possible, in a word, play for a draw.⁴ This indicates that the art was still in its infancy. By 1851, the greatest exponents of sans-voir chess were the Franco-Livonian master, Kieseritzky, who had twice contested three games simultaneously,⁵ and the German master

1. "To play two simultaneous games without sight of boards or men, was then [1847] thought a stupendous feat." Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, p. xv.

2. Walker, Chess and Chess Players, pp. 106-147.

3. Ibid., p. 132.

4. Ibid., pp. 135-137.

5. "M. Kieseritzky...qui regarde comme une plaisanterie de jouer une partie seule, sans l'Echiquier, en a maintes fois joué deux, et dans deux circonstances, trois." La Régence, v. 1, 1849, p. 330.

Daniel Harrwitz, who, in 1849, played two games, and in 1851, three games simultaneously.¹

There were no blindfold exhibitions at London, in 1851, but the New York Congress was blessed with the two greatest blindfold players of the age, Morphy and Paulsen. Morphy did not attempt any serious blindfold displays until after the New York Congress. His attitude towards sans-voir chess was slightly contemptuous.² He did not keep pace with Paulsen in regard to numbers, but he was probably unmatched with regards to accuracy, level of play, strength of opponents, and a wonderful gift for evolving the most brilliant combinations while engaging several opponents simultaneously.³ Paulsen was the pioneer in the field, and he and Morphy soon left far behind the modest record of three games which Kieseritzky and Harrwitz had set.

1. La Régence, v. 1, 1849, p. 296. Ch. Pl. Chron., v. 11, 1850, pp. 29-30. Schachzeitung, v. 6, Jan. 1851, p. 11. Illustrated London News, v. 18, Jan. 18, 1851, p. 43. This last journal contained the following letter, from "Argus", probably Staunton: "I am inclined to think that too much encouragement should not be given to blindfold chess, an art which, to a certain extent, may easily be acquired, and which only becomes really extraordinary when the play is really scientific." Of course, this can also be explained by the personal animosity which Staunton felt for Harrwitz, and it would be typical of him to refuse to give Harrwitz credit for his performance.

2. "Paul Morphy....attaches very little importance to these displays calling them mere tours de force." Edge, Exploits of Paul Morphy, p. 82.

3. Boden thought that Morphy's blindfold play was considerably stronger than Paulsen's. The Field, v. 12, Aug. 21, 1858.

On October 10, at half-past four in the afternoon, Paulsen began the first of his record performances, engaging four players simultaneously without sight of the board. Morphy agreed to be an opponent if he could also play blindfold.

Paulsen's accuracy astonished the numerous lookers-on. His vast powers of memory seemed never to fail him, and he retained throughout an unerring knowledge of the positions of the pawns and pieces on each board.¹

Paulsen scored two wins, one draw, and lost, as might have been expected, to Morphy.² Then, on October 21st, with Morphy absent from the opposition, Paulsen broke his own record by playing "with perfect ease"³ five games simultaneously, "an unparalleled feat",⁴ scoring four wins and one draw.

These records were not destined to stand for long. In the spring of 1858, Morphy, in New Orleans, reached the number of six, winning all games.⁵ Then, in May 1858, at Chicago, Paulsen placed himself out of reach with the amazing total of ten games, winning nine and losing one.⁶

-
1. Fiske, American Chess Congress 1857, p. 79.
 2. Ibid., p. 80. Frank Leslie's Ill. Newsp., v. 4, Oct. 31, 1857.
 3. The Chess Monthly, v. 1, Nov. 1857, pp. 351-352.
 4. Fiske, Am. Ch. Cong. 1857, pp. 86-87.
 5. The Ch. Month., v. 2, May 1858, pp. 157-158.
 6. Ibid., July 1858, p. 221. In connection with this feat, the following excerpt, from a letter by Paulsen, is extremely interesting. "Ich finde das Schachspielen, ohne zu sehen, durchaus nicht schwierig, und....dass ich so besser und schneller spiele, als wenn ich das Brett sehe." Schachzeitung, v. 13, May 1858, pp. 178-179. In over-the-board play, Paulsen was notoriously slow.

V

The triumph of Morphy in New York had been so complete, he stood so obviously head and shoulders above his countrymen, that we can forgive chess enthusiasts in this country for the exuberant manner in which they voiced claim to chess supremacy for the Louisiana youth. Events were to prove their wildest thoughts but tame in comparison with Morphy's subsequent achievements.

Following his victories in New York, Morphy returned to New Orleans, where he devoted himself to developing his proficiency at blindfold play. The effect of his constant victories was a chess boom throughout the country.¹ The New Orleans club, of which Morphy was president, gained so many new members that it had to be moved to larger quarters.² Morphy's reputation was already going beyond the chess playing world, and on his return to New Orleans, he was acclaimed, wined, and feted. It was inevitable that Morphy's devotees should seek other fields for their idol to conquer. On February 4, 1858, the New Orleans Chess Club extended an offer to Howard Staunton to come to New Orleans and play Paul Morphy. The match was to go to the first winner of eleven games, and was to be played for \$5000 a side. Should Staunton lose the match, \$1000 would be refunded to him for his expenses.³ Although the New Orleans club extended the offer, there is every reason to believe that Morphy selected the opponent. Staunton was called,

1. "The 'grand revival', which resulted from the Congress of 1857, led to the formation of numerous clubs throughout the country." Charles Gilberg, The 5th American Chess Congress 1880, New York: 1881, p. 55.

2. The Ch. Month., v. 2, Jan. 1858, p. 95.

3. Ibid., v. 2, April 1858, pp. 124-125. Fiske, Am. Ch. Cong. 1857, p. 512. The New Orleans club would supply Morphy's half of the stakes.

the acknowledged European champion, in regard to whom there could be no scope for choice or hesitation. The common voice of the chessworld pronounces your name.¹

This must have made exceedingly delightful reading for Staunton, but "the common voice of the chessworld" was a little more dubious as to the American's choice of an opponent. The Field commented,

Staunton is no doubt a high authority on the rules of the game; but that he is now the champion, even of London alone, over the board, we unhesitatingly deny....on the Continent the idea of his being considered the champion of Europe would be ridiculed as the height of absurdity.²

To understand Morphy's choice, two things must be considered. First of all, the traditional inferiority complex of Americans towards Englishmen undoubtedly played a role. America had a champion, and the first impulse was to prove this fact to the overweening mother nation. Secondly, Staunton, in the English-speaking world, even more so in America than in England, was still looked upon as the dean of chess, regardless of his playing skill. His Handbook was the accepted Bible of chess players. His Chess Player's Chronicle had been the prototype for The Chess Monthly. He had arranged the great London Tournament, which the New York Congress had sought to emulate. Finally, he repeated incessantly, in all the media of communication available to

-
1. The Ch. Month., v. 2, April 1858, p. 124.
 2. The Field, v. 11, April 3, 1858.

him, using the best techniques of modern advertising, that he was a peerless player. Ernest Jones, who once delivered a fascinating lecture on the psychology of the Morphy-Staunton controversy,¹ believes that because of his prestige Staunton represented to Morphy

the supreme father image and that Morphy made the overcoming of him the test case of his capacity to play chess, and unconsciously of much else besides.²

The situation in Europe, at the time the defi was issued, is a little more difficult to fathom. Morphy's fame crossed the ocean, but European critics were dubious of it, since he had only met other Americans. This might seem a little surprising in view of the fact that the scores of his games should have been sufficient proof of his skill. Several factors served to lessen the impact of his games. Whatever his relative rank with respect to chess champions of other times, Morphy was so far ahead of his contemporaries that few critics, if any, grasped the quality of his play, and his victories were attributed to a wide variety of reasons. All, curiously enough, stressed what was probably the least important factor, if it was a factor at all, in Morphy's success, his book knowledge.³ His games, therefore, were

1. Ernest Jones, "The Problem of Paul Morphy: A Contribution to the Psycho-Analysis of Chess", in Jerome Salzmann (ed.), The Chess Reader, New York: 1949, pp. 237-270.

2. Ibid., p. 256. It is worth noting that Morphy's father died in November 1856.

3. In a speech at the banquet of the chess congress, in November 1857, Fuller said of Morphy: "Thoroughly conversant with all the openings and endings, he shows that he has laid every writer under contribution to increase his stock of 'book knowledge'". Fiske, Am. Ch. Cong. 1857, p. 103. Lange speaks of his "complete knowledge of the theoretical part of the game." Paul Morphy, p. 14.

an enigma to the majority of European players. Further his games did not penetrate quite as rapidly as one might think. Paris was without a regular chess organ. The Schachzeitung passed, in February, 1858, under the chief editorship of young Max Lange (1832-1899), who was a rabid Germanophile. Under his editorship, the Schachzeitung ignored Morphy, devoting only brief space here and there to his exploits.

Staunton's position is the most interesting. As early as 1857, before any possibility of his having to fend off the young prodigy, Staunton had published some Morphy games, showing a strange reluctance to admit their excellence. In fact, the notes are such as to suggest either that Staunton understood no more than his fellow men the brilliancy of Morphy's style, or understood it too well, and instinctively reacted against this potential threat.¹ In any case, the games which reached the pages of the Illustrated London News were systematically misinterpreted, and their value depreciated.

The challenge to Staunton had been perhaps presumptuous. Morphy, as the challenger, the younger player, the newcomer, the man of leisure, with time and money to travel, was quite obviously the one to make the long journey. Staunton politely declined the challenge.

At the same time his reply was couched in language designed to make the world believe that only the distance between London and New Orleans prohibited his acceptance of the challenge.²

1. Ill. Lon. News, v. 30, Feb. 21, 1857.

2. Fiske, Am. Ch. Cong. 1857, p. 512. In declining the match, Staunton made first mention of his new literary activities, as a Shakespearean editor, which were to prove so useful a shield in eluding Morphy's pursuit. Ill. Lon. News, v. 32, April 13, 1858.

Morphy, who had hesitated, at his mother's insistence, to leave New Orleans, now decided to press the challenge on the opponent's soil. On June 9, he sailed from New York to seek out Staunton in his lair.¹

Chess activity, in Europe, had languished somewhat since the great tournament of 1851. On August 5, 1857, however, an event of some importance came to pass. At Manchester, the Northern and Midland Counties Chess Association officially reorganized itself as the British Chess Association.² Its first meeting was marked by a small elimination tournament, in which one game decided each match. Only eight players competed: Anderssen, Harrwitz, Horwitz, Lowenthal, Kling, R. B. Brien, S. S. Boden, and Pindar.³ Lowenthal and Boden reached the finals, the former eliminating Anderssen, and after playing a draw, Boden resigned when forced to return to London on business. The newly-born Association did not recompense Lowenthal lavishly: his prize consisted of a set of ivory Chinese chessmen, donated by an anonymous contributor.⁴ The next meeting was to be held in the summer of 1858, in Birmingham, and when Morphy reached England, on June 21, he stepped ashore at Liverpool, intending to compete in the tournament.⁵

1. The Ch. Month., v. 2, July 1858, p. 216. Fiske, Am. Ch. Cong. 1857, p. 513.

2. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, p. xxv. Report of the Annual Meeting of the Chess Association, Manchester: 1857, p. 15.

3. R. B. Brien was a professor at Oxford University, and a close friend of Staunton's. Samuel Stanhope Boden (1826-1882), was born in Hull, and was employed by the Southwestern Railway Co. In 1851, he had taken first prize in the Provincial Tournament, limited to English players, held in conjunction with the grand tourney. In 1858, he was considered a worthy candidate for the English chess crown. In June 1858, he became chess editor of The Field, which had the most sober and reliable chess column in London.

4. Ill. Lon. News, v. 31, Aug. 1, 8, 15, 22, 1857.

5. Fiske, Am. Ch. Cong. 1857, p. 513.

In Germany, von der Lasa was still considered the best player.¹ Unfortunately, he sailed on a diplomatic appointment to Rio de Janeiro at the very time of Morphy's arrival,² and these two champions never met. Anderssen was ranked just below von der Lasa, and after him, the three strongest players in Berlin were Carl Mayet, a veteran of the 1851 tournament, and president of the Berliner Schachgesellschaft, Jean Dufresne, co-editor of the Schachzeitung until February 1858, and his successor, the brilliant young Max Lange.³ In Italy, Serafino Dubois (1820-1899), headed a chess revival, and in 1859 began the first chess review in Italy in many a long year, La Rivista degli Scacchi.

In spite of this activity, the great London Tournament had produced no issue, outside of the admittedly minor Manchester meeting, and no great encounter for European supremacy had stirred chess devotees. Morphy's arrival was a veritable bombshell. He had planned to go directly to Birmingham, but on learning that the meeting had been postponed a month, he headed for London. There, at both the St. George's

1. Fiske, at the banquet of the New York Congress, referred to von der Lasa as "invincible as a player." Am. Ch. Cong. 1857, p. 104. Max Lange called him "the first German chess player", and thought he would have made a better match for Morphy than Anderssen. Paul Morphy, p. 311.

2. Lange, Paul Morphy, p. 285.

3. Max Lange was born in Magdeburg. He received doctorates in jurisprudence and philosophy, and was all his life a learned and respected historian in Germany. From 1858 to 1868, he edited the Schachzeitung, but the press of his other duties caused him to resign his post. Although he was connected with chess up to his very death, he never realized his potential as a player, primarily because he steadfastly refused to subordinate to the game his profession as a scholar.

and the London clubs, he quickly asserted his tremendous superiority over Thomas Barnes (1819-1874), the Reverend John Owen (1827-1902)¹, Augustus Mongredien (1807-1888), President of the London Chess Club, Hampton, Boden, Lowe, George Medley, Bird, and others.² At the St. George's, Morphy met Staunton and personally presented his challenge. Now begins a course of evasion, excuses, devious dodges, "of such ungentlemanly behavior as to be explicable only on the score of neurotic apprehension."³ The twists and turns of this famous chase need not detain us in great detail. Staunton was admittedly busy with his newly begun Shakespearean labors. He was possibly out of practice, and certainly nowhere near the playing level of his victory over Saint-Amant, in 1843, which ancient encounter represented almost his sole claim to excellence as a player.⁴ If such was the case, the decent thing would have been to announce publicly his retirement from chess, and explain that he was no longer able to defend any claim he might have left to either English or European pre-eminence. Instead, he selected a course of delaying tactics, conveying the impression, from his very first answer to the New Orleans defi, in April, that given enough time to practice, and given the proper conditions, he would be willing to play.⁵ To make matters worse, when the chess

1. Owen was a rising provincial player who is remembered particularly today because of the fact that when he first came to London, he played under the pseudonym "Alter", in deference to his religious profession.

2. The Field, v. 12, Oct. 16, 1858, where Boden reviews Morphy's accomplishments while in England.

3. Jones, "Paul Morphy", p. 257.

4. Lange agreed with Boden that Staunton could not be considered, by any stretch of the imagination, European champion in 1858. "The surprising results of the great European tournament, in 1851, only serve to corroborate our opinion." Lange, Paul Morphy, p. 82.

5. "Certain statements are made [in the press] with the intention of conveying a false impression to the public as regards Mr. Staunton's desire to play and capability of playing." Letter from "Pawn and Two", in The Field, v. 12, Nov. 6, 1858.

community sided with Morphy in deploring Staunton's tactics, the English master resorted to his favorite trick: defamation and insult of Morphy in the columns of the Illustrated London News, and an attempt to tear down the American's reputation as a player.

The details of this sordid affair are not so interesting as the effect it had on Morphy. His tour of Europe was the most phenomenal popular success a chess player had ever achieved, or ever achieved thereafter. Yet for Morphy, it represented a terrible failure.

While waiting for Staunton to give battle, Morphy continued to add to his list of victories. In July, he met his old adversary, Lowenthal, in a short match, and defeated him 9-3, with 3 draws.¹ In August, Morphy travelled to the Birmingham tournament. Like the previous year's meeting in Manchester, this was another minor affair. Sixteen players were entered, and play was again by elimination, and pairings by lot. Each match was to be a rubber of three games, with the final match going to the first winner of three games. First prize was \$315, second prize, \$105.² Although the field was larger than at Manchester, it was probably not as strong. Anderssen failed to attend, and for reasons that are none too clear, Morphy attended but

1. The Field, v. 12, July 12, 1858.

2. Ibid., Aug. 28, 1858; Ill. Lon. News, v. 33, July 3, Aug. 28, 1858.

did not compete.¹ Instead, he engaged in a simultaneous blindfold exhibition against eight strong amateurs, winning six, losing one, and drawing one.²

At Birmingham, Morphy once more challenged Staunton, and the latter postponed the match until November. In September, Morphy left for Paris. If his reception in England had been enthusiastic, in France it was delirious. He was feted, ogled, lionized, invited into the highest circles of Paris society. The Paris correspondent of the New York Times kept track of his movements and achievements for the benefit of fans at home. The old Café de la Régence had recently been torn down by Baron Haussmann, as part of Napoleon III's program to beautify Paris, and render it more safe from barricades, and the new Café de la Régence had just opened its doors.³ Throngs crowded

1. Frederick Milne Edge, an Englishman who served as Morphy's private secretary during his stay in Europe, and later wrote a short book about Morphy's visit, claims that Morphy's withdrawal was based on the fear that, since Staunton was participating, he might interpret any result as sufficient evidence for cancelling the match. If he won, he would claim he had no more reason for playing Morphy. If he lost, he would claim he was out of play and not ready for a match. Edge, Exploits of Paul Morphy, p. 91. This argues more wile and acumen on Morphy's part than he exhibited in any of his dealings with Staunton. Fiske's explanation is even more farfetched. The British Chess Association had volunteered \$350 to finance Morphy's expenses in attending, which Morphy refused. Since first prize was \$315, Fiske argues that Morphy, after turning down \$350 expense money, would have been deemed hypocritical if he won the \$315 first prize! Am. Ch. Cong. 1857, p. 518.

2. The Field, v. 12, Sept. 4, 1858.

3. La Régence, 2d series, v. 1, Jan 15, 1856, p. 1.

thither to watch Morphy play.¹ All of the leading amateurs of the Café rapidly succumbed in skittles play. Morphy next challenged Harrwitz to a match. Harrwitz had been retained by the owner of the Régence as a successor to Kieseritzky.² He was stronger than the French players, and chess devotees looked upon the encounter as one of Morphy's most severe tests.³ The match, for \$500 a side, was to go to the first winner of seven games. Harrwitz won the first two games, but then lost five and drew one, whereupon he pleaded illness and resigned the match.⁴ On September 27, while the match with Harrwitz was still in progress, Morphy regaled the Paris crowd with an exhibition of eight simultaneous blindfold games, against some of the strongest amateurs at the Café. The seance lasted a mere ten hours, and Morphy scored six wins and two draws. The French went wild with delight, carrying the startled Morphy around the Café on the shoulders of sturdy spectators.⁵

1. "Notwithstanding we are in the midst of the watering season, when all the fashion is supposed at least to be out of town, the Café de la Régence is the scene of a crowd, or rather a mob, of distinguished men, and even women, of all nationalities and all tongues." New York Times, Oct. 1, 1858.

2. La Régence, 2d series, v. 1, Oct. 15, 1856, p. 291.

3. "This contest is exciting immense interest in Paris, and Morphy is already a hero." New York Times, Oct. 14, 1858.

4. Ibid., Oct. 19, 1858.

5. "The frenzy and admiration of the French knew no bounds." Idem. "The extraordinary feat of playing eight games at the same time, without seeing the board, was performed yesterday at the Café de la Régence by Mr. Morphy, the young American player." Galignani's Messenger, Sept. 28, 1858.

In the midst of this jubilation, the tortuous path of evasion which Staunton had followed came to an end.¹ On October 23, after trying to reach Morphy privately, Staunton, in a public letter, officially declined the match because of the pressure of his literary labors as Shakespearean editor. His choice of words was particularly galling:

A match at chess or cricket may be a good thing in its way, but none but a madman would for either forfeit his engagements and imperil his professional reputation.²

In other words, now that he chose to default on his promise, Staunton conveyed the impression that the match was of little consequence anyway.

It may be difficult to understand Morphy's tremendous desire, a compulsion it would seem, to play Staunton. We have already seen plenty of evidence that Staunton was no longer considered champion, if he had been so considered at all at any time.³ Yet, Morphy was possessed

1. Among the more scurrilous tactics of Staunton during the great wait was a letter to the Ill. Lon. News, signed "Anti-Book", branding the proposed Morphy-Staunton match as "bunkum" on the grounds that Morphy had come unprepared with stakes. v. 33, Aug. 28, 1858; and a letter to Bell's Life, scoring off Morphy as a "young adventurer", seeking to wrest from Staunton's fevered brow "the laurels so fairly won in many hundreds of encounters with nearly all the greatest players of the day." Oct. 17, 1858. Edge replied that Morphy's backers could raise \$50,000 if need be. Exploits of Paul Morphy, p. 93.

2. Ill. Lon. News, v. 33, Oct. 23, 1858.

3. Immediately following the London Tournament and the Williams-Staunton match, George Walker, in Bell's Life, took great pleasure in referring to Elijah Williams as the champion of England.

by this fixation, and Staunton's final evasion had unexpected results.¹ Morphy was evidently crushed. Ever since his arrival in Paris he had been mildly indisposed.² After Staunton's refusal, his condition grew worse, and he also developed an antipathy to chess.³ When he had sailed from New York, in June, Morphy had intended to visit Germany, possibly even Russia. Now he suddenly cancelled all further trips, and showed disquieting signs of homesickness. Edge tried to prevail on Anderssen to come to Paris, since Morphy was determined not to go to Breslau.⁴ Max Lange became very upset over these attempts to

1. Ernest Jones advances an interesting psychological explanation, based on the fact that chess is a symbolic form of father killing. His explanation, based on the supposed identification Morphy made between Staunton and his father, assumes particular significance when we consider that it was immediately following Staunton's official decline, in which the English champion treated chess somewhat contemptuously, comparing it to cricket, that Morphy began to develop his strange phobia against being considered a chess professional. Jones, "Paul Morphy", p. 253. Sergeant, without making use of psychoanalysis or medicine, states simply that Morphy sailed for Europe with high hopes and optimism, that he was sadly disappointed with some of the personalities he came in contact with, and became thereby disgusted with the game. "He [Morphy] set out, very young, generous, and high spirited, recognizing, as he said himself, no incentive but reputation, and met not fellow-knights but tortuous acrobats of the pen, slingers of mud, and chess sharpers." Morphy's Games of Chess, p. 30. To be considered in any explanation of Morphy's peculiar breakdown is his comparatively sheltered early life and genteel education.

2. Edge, Exploits of Paul Morphy, p. 186.

3. Edge, who was probably too close to these events to grasp their significance, gives us no evidence that he appreciated Morphy's dejection over Staunton's behavior. He was puzzled by the fact that in England, chess was felt to be Morphy's only passion, while in France, they complained of his aversion to the game. Exploits of Paul Morphy, p. 72. Later, he writes: "For two months he has had an antipathy to chess, and I had experienced the greatest difficulty in inducing him to go to the Régence at all." Ibid., p. 186.

4. The secretary of the Breslau club even offered to pay Morphy's traveling expenses in his efforts to induce him to play Anderssen. Morphy indignantly replied that he was not a professional. Lange, Paul Morphy, p. 299.

lure Anderssen to Paris, feeling it was up to Morphy to make the journey to Germany.¹ Anderssen, however, was anxious to test himself against Morphy. When Morphy, in view of his poor health, decided not to risk a winter crossing, and to stay in Paris until spring, Anderssen seized his opportunity, and travelled to Paris during the Christmas vacations.²

This was probably one of the strangest and most amicable matches ever held. No stakes were put up. Very little seems to have gone into preparation, as regards rules, time limit, etc. Because of Morphy's illness, the match was held in his rooms at the Hotel Breteuil, with only a handful of spectators. The first winner of seven games was to take the match. In rapid fire time, from December 20 to December 28, Morphy routed the champion of 1851 7-2, with 2 draws.³ Anderssen was admittedly rusty. Outside of the Manchester meeting he had engaged in little serious play, and his duties at the University in Breslau left him little time to brush up on his game.⁴ Still, Morphy's victory was crushing and Anderssen offered no excuses. Little doubt now

1. Lange was particularly incensed at Edge's French friends who supported him in his efforts to bring Anderssen to Paris. The French, he wrote, "are always most anxious to induce foreign celebrities to congregate in their own city of Paris." Paul Morphy, p. 287.

2. Max Lange sent Anderssen an impassioned letter on December 6, begging him not to go to Paris. Paul Morphy, pp. 301-302.

3. Schachzeitung, v. 14, Jan. 1859.

4. Lange, Paul Morphy, p. 292.

remained that Morphy could defeat any European player.¹ This does not mean that the match was considered by anyone at the time as a world's championship encounter. There is little doubt that Morphy was now considered the champion of the world.² This was the result, however, of the cumulative effect of his triumphs. Not only was the Anderssen-Morphy match not called by anyone a world's championship match, but after Morphy's retirement, there was no reason to assume that the crown, if there had been one, reverted to Anderssen. These are obviously a posteriori conclusions.³

VI

Paul Morphy was only twenty-one. Contemporaries remember him as a short, slightly built young man, standing about five feet four, an immaculate dresser, with dark hair, dark eyes, and a dark complexion. He was regarded by all as a model of courtesy, modesty, and gentlemanly

1. During the Harrwitz match, the Paris correspondent of the New York Times wrote that if Morphy won, "he becomes the champion of the world, for no man in Europe can beat Harrwitz." Oct. 1, 1858. This statement must have sent shudders of rage through Staunton, who cordially hated Harrwitz.

2. As early as August 1858, Boden had written: "he [Morphy] is beyond question, one of the very finest players living, and we fairly question whether he will meet his superior." The Field, v. 12, Aug. 28, 1858.

3. The Information Please Almanac, for instance, lists Anderssen as world's champion from 1862, when Morphy retired, to 1866, when Anderssen lost the match to Steinitz. Information Please Almanac, New York: 1954, p. 825. This misinformation derives from modern chess editors.

behavior.¹ In the Staunton controversy, almost everyone had sided with him,² and now, it was hoped the incident would be forgotten. Only a little more than a year had passed since Morphy's initial triumph in New York, and no one seems to have realized that Morphy's career was almost at an end. Neither his triumph over Anderssen, nor the German champion's generous behavior could stem the drift of his thoughts. Invitations were tendered from clubs in Germany, Russia, England. Public dinners were offered to him. The young American politely declined most of them, and prepared his return to America. On April 4, the day of his departure from France, Parisians gave Morphy a banquet at the Café de la Régence. The sculptor Lequesne, presented Morphy with a bust of himself, which Saint-Amant crowned with a wreath of laurels.³ From Paris, Morphy first went to England, where he gave two more exhibitions of blindfold chess, each time playing eight strong amateurs. He also played five games simultaneously over-the-board

1. Ernest Falkbeer, writing in 1858, describes him thus: "Herr Morphy ist eine sehr interessante Persönlichkeit: jung, geistreich, bescheiden, liebenswürdig, am Brette voll kühnen Selbstvertrauens." Schachzeitung, v. 13, Aug. 1858, p. 336. Lowenthal described him thus: "Morphy is short and slight, with a graceful and dignified, though unpretending bearing. He has black hair, dark brilliant eyes, small expressive features, and a firmly set jaw." Lowenthal, Morphy's Games of Chess, p. 2.

2. Boden, for instance, commented as follows: "we cannot but deplore the humiliating position into which ENGLISH CHESSPLAYERS have been plunged by the proceedings of their champion, Mr. Staunton." The Field, v. 12, Nov. 6, 1858. Fiske wrote: "It is not necessary that we should occupy the pages of this magazine in adding to the torrent of sarcasm and ridicule which will be poured upon his [Staunton's] head." The Ch. Month., v. 2, Dec. 1858, p. 378.

3. The Ch. Month., v. 3, June 1859, p. 194.

against Barnes, Boden, Bird, Lowenthal, and Arnous de Rivière (1830-1905),¹ losing to Barnes, drawing with Boden and Lowenthal, and scoring over de Rivière and Bird.²

The exhibition was of a totally different character from those of the type which have been growing popular recently, where the number, rather than the strength of the opponents makes the single player's task remarkable.³

On April 30, Morphy sailed from England, arriving in New York on May 10. On May 25, a huge testimonial dinner, sponsored by the National Chess Association, was given him at New York University.⁴ A banquet in his honor was given in Boston on May 31, presided over by Oliver Wendell Holmes, and attended by Henry W. Longfellow, Louis Agassiz, James R. Lowell, Jared Sparks, and President Walker, of Harvard.⁵ Morphy attended these and a number of similar receptions throughout the country, but he played less and less, and his whole personality seemed to be shrinking upon itself. His speech at the New York dinner was in sharp contrast to the words of praise he had uttered a little over a year before, at the First American Chess Congress.

1. Jules Arnous de Rivière was born in Nantes. He was first a teacher of mathematics in the public schools, but after his entry into the chess world he turned to journalism. In 1859, he was the most promising player in Paris.

2. The Ch. Month., v. 3, June 1859, p. 197.

3. Sergeant, Morphy's Games of Chess, p. 154.

4. This event received front page coverage in both the New York Times and the New York Herald. The Times devoted four columns, and the Herald three columns, to its write-up. New York Times, May 26, 1859, New York Herald, May 26, 1859.

5. The Ch. Month., v. 3, June 1859, p. 228.

Chess never has been and never can be aught but a recreation. It should not be indulged in to the detriment of other and more serious avocations---should not absorb or engross the thoughts of those who worship at its shrine, but should be kept in the background, and restrained within its proper provinces.¹

There are certainly repercussions here of Staunton's letter of decline.

In January 1858, Morphy had joined Fiske as co-editor of The Chess Monthly. This had been an honorary position, and, particularly while he was in Europe, Morphy acted primarily as a drawing card to subscribers. On his return in 1859, however, readers of The Chess Monthly were promised that the game section would thereafter be exclusively in Morphy's care. The New York Public Ledger hired him to edit a chess column every week. All these hopeful moves proved to be mere gestures. By 1860, Morphy was back in New Orleans. He resigned his position both on the Monthly and with the Ledger. His chess career was at an end.

Morphy did not die until 1884, and the last twenty-four years of his life form a gloomy record. He became more and more antipathetic to chess, finally playing only occasionally with his intimate friend, Maurian. A sort of paranoia had seized him ever since the conclusion of his match with Anderssen, when he announced he would no longer

1. New York Times, May 26, 1859.

play even matches, but only at odds.¹ The disease crept into his everyday life. After the Civil War, which he spent in travels in Cuba and in France, he became a semi-recluse in New Orleans, where he became prey to various persecution delusions.² Just to what extent he became deranged is difficult to determine. As his distant kinsman, L. A. Morphy, points out, he had always been in the popular sense, peculiar. Further, he had always been aloof in his personal

1. Edge, Exploits of Paul Morphy, p. 197. In 1863, when the new star, Ignaz Kolisch, challenged him to a match, Morphy answered: "J'ai pu croire un instant, en apprenant vos premiers succès, que vous étiez supérieur aux joueurs avec lesquels je m'étais rencontré en Europe. Mais depuis....le resultat de vos matchs avec MM. Anderssen et Paulsen ne vous a pas été favorable, et dès-lors, je n'ai plus aucune raison, apres m'etre promis de ne plus m'engager dans ces sortes de parties, de faire pour vous une exception." La Nouvelle Régence, v. 4, April 1863, p. 119.

2. He became embroiled in a law suit with his brother-in-law, whom he accused of trying to swindle him out of his inheritance. Later, he developed the delusion that someone was trying to poison him. Morphy-Voitier, Paul Morphy, pp. 30-32. Although the Staunton affair was the immediate cause for Morphy's breakdown, it is quite obvious that it was only a contributory factor to some more basic cause, or some integral defect in Morphy's personality. Some light on this problem might be shed by the following observation, made by Whitelaw Reid in 1865, while accompanying Salmon P. Chase on a post-war tour of the South: "Among Mr. Roselius's guests that evening was a modest looking little gentleman, of retiring manners, and with apparently very little to say; though the keen eyes and well-shaped head sufficiently showed the silence to be no mask for poverty of intellect. It was Mr. Paul Morphy, the foremost chess-player in the world, now a lawyer, but, alas! by no means the foremost young lawyer of this his native city...They [the legal gentlemen of New Orleans] evidently looked upon the young chess-player as a prosperous banker does upon his only boy, who persists in neglecting his desk in the bank parlor and becoming a vagabond artist." Whitelaw Reid, After the War: A Southern Tour, Cincinnati: 1866, p. 261. In other words, Morphy's problem was that he was unable to live up to the reputation of his father, Alonzo Morphy, the most distinguished jurist in Louisiana. After one brief attempt, he never practiced law, which was his chosen profession.

relations. The aberrations of his later life could be interpreted as a mere accentuation of these traits.¹ He certainly never lost the ability to take care of his everyday needs, and as L. A. Morphy vehemently reiterates, he certainly did not "go crazy playing chess". Although he played less and less, his play, when he did relent was almost as strong as in the days of his fame. Morphy died of an apoplectic stroke on July 10, 1884.

1. L. A. Morphy, "Paul Morphy", p. 116.

CHAPTER III

I

In July 1859, Lowenthal, writing to the Chess Monthly, praised Paul Morphy in these terms: "Let no one be absurd enough to dispute the honors of Paul Morphy. They have been fairly won, and sit easily on his brow."¹ Only two pages further on, Fiske printed the following report:

A new player, Mr. Kolisch of Vienna, has just made his appearance at Paris. Of four games with Harrwitz he won two, drew one and lost one. With Rivière his score stood: Riviere 5, Kolisch 5, drawn 4.²

In July 1859, Morphy was still in the public eye, but already, his period was coming to an end, and two new players, both Jews, and both from Central Europe, were preparing to take the center of the stage: Ignaz Kolisch and Wilhelm Steinitz.

After Morphy, anything was bound to be an anticlimax, and the period from 1861 to 1866 was, outside of the London Tournament of 1862,

-
1. The Chess Monthly, v. 3, July 1859, p. 230.
 2. Ibid., p. 232.

devoid of dramatic encounters, and represented to contemporaries a period of doldrums.¹ In a longer perspective, it was a transitional period of great significance because it saw the birth of modern chess, not in the narrow technical sense in which contemporary chess editors use it, but in the widest historical sense. Many of the changes which occurred in those years, and many of the trends that were set in motion, had been developing for a long time, but all, even if not directly caused by Paul Morphy, received some immediate impact from his brief moments on the stage of chess history. All of them, ironically enough, could be subsumed under the heading: the growing professionalism of chess.

II

There developed after 1920, particularly after the publication of Richard Reti's Modern Ideas in Chess,² in 1923, a distorted concept of chess in pre-Morphy days which has strangely clung to most modern editors of the game. This concept is best epitomized by Reti himself,

1. The "absence of any particularly noteworthy matches or contests now pending", reduced the chess editor of The Field to devoting a number of his columns, in 1863, to that reliable chestnut of chess enthusiasts, games from the Labourdonnais-M'Donnell series. v. 22, Nov. 28, 1863. In 1864, "Among chess players the present season has been an unusually dull one." The Field, v. 24, Oct. 1, 1864.

2. Richard Reti, Modern Ideas in Chess, trans. by John Hart, Philadelphia: 1923.

who voiced the opinion that before Morphy, the sole aim of a chess player was to "make combinations".¹ Reti was undoubtedly a great chess analyst, yet this is not only a misinterpretation of the playing style of the old masters, but has led to even greater misconceptions on the part of later analysts. The picture which is conveyed is of a bold, brilliant, if unsound, and reckless attacking style. Any glance at the games played before 1857 will reveal this view as completely erroneous. Games, as some of the more recent commentators are beginning to point out,² were remarkably dull. The players themselves avoided the open game, which leads to exciting tactical struggles, with emphasis on the attack, and invariably adopted close defenses against P-K4.³ As late as 1862, during the London Tournament, an attempt was made to compel players to open every game on both sides with P-K4.⁴

Further, analysis of all parts of the game, particularly the openings, went on apace, and was considered essential to strong play.

1. Reti, Modern Ideas in Chess, p. 1. "During that period, quite at the beginning of the game a player tried to work out combinations quickly, with the conviction that they were much the most valuable factors in the game." Ibid., p. 2.

2. Particularly Fred Reinfeld and Reuben Fine. Mr. Reinfeld's efforts, in The Human Side of Chess, are unfortunately marred by the fact that he obviously distorts the facts as much as Reti in order to prove a number of romantic theories concerning the actors in his book.

3. "The increasing tendency among players in serious contests to adopt the close games can only be checked, as we have repeatedly remarked, by a mutual stipulation in every match that a certain number of the games shall be open ones." Letter from a Dublin correspondent. Ill. Lon. News, v. 31, Sept. 19, 1857.

4. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, p. xliii. A two thirds vote was required to install the open game provision, but was not obtained. Ibid., p. li.

As we have seen, book knowledge was generally given as the reason for Morphy's successes, and was later thought to be the reason for Louis Paulsen's remarkable tenacity.¹ As early as 1857, we find a suggestion for changing the initial position of the pieces, since analysis has rendered the openings sterile for innovation.² All of this suggests a certain sophistication towards the game not consonant with the naivete which Reti would have us believe marked play in the mid-nineteenth century. On the other hand, the level of analysis, the theoretical knowledge, the grasp of position, were certainly quite below modern standards. The striving for positional advantages went on in a hit or miss fashion, reminiscent of run of the mill players; and if any one has watched such players, even today, with their large theoretical knowledge as to what a winning position consists of (a theoretical bag of tricks far in excess that carried by the masters of 1850, or 1860), he will readily agree that their encounters are marked by a large number of petty stratagems: short range plans aimed at gaining very limited objectives, such as possibly trapping a piece, forking a rook, etc. One would venture to say that such schemes formed a large part of the mode of play, particularly of lesser masters, in the 1850's. As late as 1862, Anderssen wins a game against Barnes, considered then a very strong player, by the simple expedient of trapping his queen, and despite Anderssen's

1. The Field, v. 18, Sept. 28, 1861.

2. Letter to the Ill. Lon. News, v. 30, April 11, 1857. "A player with a good memory is enabled to get an advantage at the outset over another who may be equally strong, but not so well up in the theory." Letter from D. Forbes, Ill. Lon. News, v. 30, May 9, 1857.

reputation for brilliancy, many of his serious games are won through pedestrian tactics involving the capture of pawns or pieces.¹ To call these devices combinations, however, and imply that they are on the same level as, for instance, that immortal combination of Zukertort against Blackburne in 1883, which has even reached the pages of the Encyclopedia Brittanica, is to seriously mislead the reader.

Probably the clinching argument would be to consider the attitude of these "romantic" masters towards the Evans Gambit. This Gambit has come to be synonymous with "romantic chess", with the chess of the great attacking masters and combination makers. Yet the great period for the Evans was the period of Steinitz, and it was neither the Austrian master nor any of his disciples who tarnished its glamour, but a much later antagonist, Emmanuel Lasker. The Gambit had been introduced in England by a certain Captain Evans, in the 1830's. It was first used extensively in serious play during the Labourdonnais-M'Donnell series. M'Donnell first played it, and Labourdonnais was quickly enchanted by its possibilities. Its success, during that series, was uncertain, and, according to contemporaries, "a complete system of defence"² was worked out, making it obsolete. By 1842, Jaenisch, then considered one of the great authorities on the game, pronounced against it as hazardous.³

1. Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, pp. 2-3.

2. Walker, Chess and Chess Players, p. 383.

3. Jaenisch, Analyse Nouvelle du Jeu des Echecs, in The Ch. Month., v. 1, June 1857, p. 163. "The 'Evans Gambit' is now generally considered to give a losing game to the adventurous player who may hazard its adoption." Am. Ch. Mag. 1847, p. 217.

The Evans Gambit was certainly not one of the favorites of pre-Morphy days. The man who revived the Evans, before Morphy adopted it,¹ was Anderssen, and it is this German player, whose career both preceded and followed Morphy's, who has probably led to much of the confusion concerning so-called "romantic chess". Anderssen was undoubtedly a great combination player, although, as Mr. Reinfeld has pointed out, he usually saved his brilliancies for off-hand games.² Reti believes he was at least Morphy's equal, if not his superior, as a combination maker.³ He was, however, a pioneer in the field, and in no way typical of pre-Morphy chess. When contemporary players speak of romantic chess, they really refer solely to Anderssen.

All of this is necessary to grasp accurately the effect Morphy had on chess playing, an effect which reverberated far beyond the technicalities of play itself. Reti, who had quite definitely an axe to grind, and therefore indulged in a number of oversimplifications, calls Morphy "the first positional player",⁴ and attributes his success to that fact, thereby displaying as much confusion as Morphy's contemporaries. Ironically, when he comes to analyzing Morphy's games,

1. The Evans Gambit was a great favorite of Morphy's. However, after losing his first match game to Anderssen on the White side of an Evans, he is reputed to have said "that the Evans is indubitably a lost game for the first player, if the defence be carefully played, inasmuch as the former can never recover the gambit pawn, and the position supposed to be acquired at the outset, cannot be maintained." Edge, Exploits of Paul Morphy, p. 192. This, of course, is the same point of view later held by Lasker.

2. Reinfeld, Human Side of Chess, p. 36.

3. Reti, Modern Ideas in Chess, p. 8.

4. Idem.

Reti drops the involved machinery of his interpretation, and proposes some very keen observations on Morphy's style. The secret of Morphy's success lay largely in his stress on development. Development, however, can only become decisive if you force an open game, and play for an attack. This, Morphy was generally successful in achieving, even against close defenses; but when foiled in this rapid centralization of forces in an open position, he ran into difficulties.¹

The way in which Morphy forced an open game was "to press forward in the centre"², often sacrificing his pawns for the purely positional aim of gaining open lines for his pieces.³ These developments proved of vital significance to chess. As Reti points out, Morphy's principles underlying the attack in an open position eventually became common property⁴, and the attack lost the temporary edge it had gained. But the immediate result was a tremendous speeding up of the game. No longer could a player desultorily arrange and fashion his position behind a "close" defense, rebuffing only the more obvious threats. The age of the gambits really came into its own after Morphy, and

1. "The games lost by Morphy were mostly those that partook of a close character." Reti, Modern Ideas in Chess, p. 8. Reinfeld speaks of his "aversion for the close and semi-close games." Human Side of Chess, p. 33.

2. Reti, Modern Ideas in Chess, p. 22.

3. Ibid., pp. 20-21.

4. Ibid., pp. 27-28.

under the pressure which the gambit player exerted, the second player was forced to become more and more exact in building up his close defenses; he had to become more and more "scientific".¹

III

Anderssen's loss to Morphy made him realize that only constant practice could keep him in playing condition.² During the entire Morphy-Staunton controversy, chess readers had been reminded that lack of practice prevented Staunton from playing. Constant practice and an unrivalled theoretical knowledge were obviously the weapons which Morphy, in the eyes of his contemporaries, had used to conquer America and Europe. In the future, a chess champion would have to devote more time to the game. Morphy had been fortunate enough to come from a wealthy family, and had been able to devote his whole attention to chess without ever depending on it as a means of support. His brief career, however, sowed the seeds of professional chess, using professional not only in the sense of playing chess for money, but also, of making chess playing one's avocation in life; in other words, the specialist as distinguished from the dilettante, rather than the professional as distinguished from the amateur.³

1. Before leaving the subject of Morphy's success, we might mention Jaenisch's opinion that Morphy's great accuracy placed such psychological pressure on his opponents that they usually played below their normal form. Letter to The Ch. Month., v. 4, Sept. 1860, p. 261. The same argument was used later in connection with Capablanca.

2. Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 175.

3. Cf. p. 13.

We have already seen a few players who might have aspired to the title of professional, notably Staunton, Kieseritzky, and Lowenthal. All three tried to support themselves by writing on chess. Staunton, however, after 1854, turned to Shakespearean criticism for the bulk of his support; Kieseritzky was a hired professional at the Café de la Régence, but died in 1853, penniless and unwept;¹ Lowenthal, besides his chess column in The Era, which ran from 1854 to 1866, edited the Chess Player's Magazine, from 1863 to 1867, and collaborated in several chess works, particularly the collection of Morphy games and the book of the 1862 Tournament; further, he served the British Chess Association in various official capacities; in spite of this, English chess players raised a testimonial fund on his behalf, in 1864, to aid him in straitened financial circumstances.² Harrwitz, in the late 1850's, was hired by the owner of the Café de la Régence as successor to Kieseritzky. Even so, as Gottschall points out, he had been a merchant before, and remained one all his life.³

Morphy's tremendous success, however, had shown that chess could become a means of support other than as a literary venture. Exhibitions,

1. "Dieser grosse Schachspieler starb in der Weltstadt Paris arm und verlassen, wie er gelebt hatte, von wenigen gekannt und von niemandem betrauert. Als an einem kalten, regnerischen Morgen die fremden Männer die Bahre hinaustragen, da fand sich keiner von seinem Landsleuten und Freunden ein, um ihm die letzte Ehre zu erweisen, und nur ein Mann folgte dem Leichenzuge, es war dies---der Kellner vom Café de la Régence, dem bekannten Versammlungsorte der Pariser Schachspieler." Wiener Schachzeitung, reprinted in Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 101.

2. The Field, v. 24, Aug. 6, 1864.

3. Gottschall, Anderssen, pp. 16-17.

matches, blindfold play, could all be used as a source of funds. Further, the player who could devote himself to the game in this way seemed to have the edge over the amateur, like Anderssen. In the 1860's, therefore, we find the first two players who attempted to support themselves entirely through chess, Ignaz Kolisch (1837-1889), and Wilhelm Steinitz (1836-1900).

IV

The 1860's were ripe in many developments, all of which tended to quicken the pace of chess life, increase its complexity, and advance its professional aspects. In 1859, Kolisch, a twenty-two year old Hungarian Jew, born in Pressburg, arrived in Paris.¹ By 1860, he had succeeded Harrwitz as the king of the Régence.² In 1861, Kolisch continued a well established tradition by moving to England. For a professional player, England, particularly London, was one of the most favorable chess centers in Europe. Wealthy patrons were willing to open their purses to back their favorites, while a large number of clubs and organizations provided opportunities for employment.³ The Hungarian master quickly established his superiority over English players,

1. Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 176.

2. Ibid., p. 17. La Nouvelle Régence, v. 1, May 1860, p. 136.

3. The West Yorkshire Association, for instance, during its meeting in June 1861, hired Kolisch as a "lion". The Field, v. 17, June 8, 1861. Kolisch also embroidered on Morphy's theme of simultaneous exhibitions over-the-board. In June 1861, he played eight opponents in Liverpool, and declared he intended to play as many as twenty. Ibid., June 15, 1861.

and in April 1861, he challenged Morphy to a match for \$5,000, to be played either in London or New Orleans, at Morphy's convenience.¹

Obviously the twenty-four year old Kolisch did not possess \$5,000, nor did he possess the means for a journey to the United States. English patrons were definitely liberal in the support of their favorites.²

Morphy, of course, refused.³ On the other hand, that indomitable war horse, Anderssen, hearing of Kolisch's successes, and eager to essay a passage at arms, arrived in England unexpectedly in July 1861, during his summer vacation. The London Chess Club promptly arranged a short match, to go to the first winner of four games, and members subscribed \$52.50 as a stake. Anderssen took a very close encounter 4-3, with 2 draws.⁴

Aside from reasserting Anderssen's high ranking among European players,⁵ the match proved to have a further significance, which Saint-Amant called "an innovation, a real progress, without which it is no longer possible to undertake a serious struggle."⁶ This was

1. Wilke's Spirit of the Times, reprinted in The Field, v. 17, April 27, 1861.

2. The strongest club at this time was no longer the St. George, but the London Chess Club. It sponsored innumerable matches, and its members were ever willing to finance the activities of star players.

3. To this first challenge, Morphy gave a highly equivocal answer, stating he might possibly be tempted to play when in Paris, where he contemplated going at the outbreak of the Civil War, but declined playing for stakes. Letter from Morphy in The Field, v. 17, Jan. 29, 1861. When Morphy reached Paris, in 1863, Kolisch renewed his challenge, but this time, Morphy declined altogether. The Field, v. 21, March 28, 1863. Cf. p. 89, footnote 1.

4. The Field, v. 18, July 27, Aug. 3, 1861.

5. "Herr Anderssen has returned to Breslau, leaving London in 1861 exactly as he did in 1851, crowned with a victor's wreath, and wearing it with all the unassumption becoming a valiant knight." The Field, v. 18, Aug. 10, 1861.

6. Saint-Amant in Le Sport, reprinted in The Field, v. 18, Aug. 10, 1861.

the use of a time limit, measured by sand glasses. The method used, which became the universally accepted method, was to have a composite time limit for a number of moves, rather than a specific number of minutes for each move. The limit imposed in 1861 was quite liberal, either twenty or twenty-four moves every two hours, for each player.¹ Anderssen, a very rapid player, was unruffled by the sand glasses, but Kolisch became the first chess player to feel the relentless pressure of the clock.

Another very strong player visited England in 1861, Louis Paulsen. He had decided to return to Germany when the Civil War made it impossible for him and his brother to continue their tobacco business.² He and Kolisch both entered the Bristol Congress of 1861, a minor affair held in conjunction with the B.C.A. meeting of that year. Eight players competed in an elimination tournament, Kolisch, Paulsen, Boden, Horwitz, Stanley, Hampton, Rev. William Wayte, and Wilson.³ Paulsen took first prize, beating Kolisch after two draws, and defeating Boden in the finals. No time limit was imposed, and Paulsen's games with Kolisch lasted interminably, a twenty-four move game stretching to between seven and eight hours.⁴ When the London Chess Club arranged a match between

1. Saint-Amant says twenty-four moves every two hours; The Field says twenty moves, but qualifies this by saying it is not sure, and that it might have been twenty-four moves. v. 18, Aug. 24, 1861.

2. Ibid., Sept. 28, 1861.

3. Ibid., Sept. 7, 14, 1861. One game decided each match.

4. Ibid., Sept. 14, 1861. Paulsen is described as "terribly slow, a defect now, unfortunately, prevalent among our most prominent players." Ibid., Sept. 28, 1861.

Paulsen and Kolisch, therefore, later in the year, sand glasses were again used, and some form of time limit has marked every serious encounter since then. Kolisch and Paulsen, both very slow players, made the time limit fairly slow, twenty-four moves in two and one-half hours. Their match was marked by another distinctly modern feature, a high proportion of draws. Draws had been comparatively uncommon before this, and never counted in the scores of tournaments or matches, being ignored or played over. Kolisch and Paulsen, who were very cautious and tenacious in serious play, found it increasingly difficult to score over each other. The match, begun in September 1861, and to go to the first winner of nine games, was finally called a draw, with Paulsen leading 7-6 in November, when the number of draws reached eighteen.¹ Another indication that we are in another era was the number of what would be called today "grandmaster draws", eighteen and twenty move affairs, in which the two players agree to a draw, usually in a stereotyped, "book" position, before really coming to grips.²

1862 proved to be a high point in this period of transition. The second international tournament was held, again in London, where modern chess had received its initial impetus eleven years before. As we have seen earlier,³ the British Chess Association was formed in 1857. It

1. The Field, v. 18, Sept. 28, Nov. 23, 1861. The contestants called a halt when they decided that the stakes were insufficient for the amount of time expended.

2. The chess editor of The Field commented unfavorably on the lack of "pluck" of the combatants, v. 18, Nov. 30, 1861.

3. Cf. p. 76.

had had only modest aims up to now, holding minor meetings in Manchester (1857), Birmingham (1858), and Bristol (1861). The 1862 meeting was an attempt to launch the Association onto a more ambitious career. An international tournament formed the nub of the Congress planned by the B.C.A. This time, the round robin system of play was used instead of eliminations. Further, sand glasses were used to measure the time limit for moves, so that in two important ways, the 1862 Congress proved to be the first modern international tournament.

As in 1851, an International Exhibition in London was the occasion for the meeting.¹ The members of the B.C.A. threw their entire weight behind the Congress, and the list of its officers is even more impressive than the list of prominent Englishmen who contributed to the 1851 meeting.²

As regards the magnitude of the gatherings, the long duration of the sittings, and the largeness of the sum raised, this meeting stands unrivalled.³

The sum raised by subscription was \$3170, which was somewhat less than the \$3235 subscribed in 1851, and the first prize of \$500 was considerably

1. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, p. xli.

2. The President of the Association had been, since its founding, Lord Lyttelton. The Vice Presidents included Lord Cremorne and Sir John Blunden. The Standing Committee included the Earl Granville, the Duke of Manchester, the Earl of Dudley, Lord Arthur Hay, Lord Ravensworth, Sir Arthur H. Elton, Most Rev. Dr. English, and the Hon. Henry Cooke. The London and Westminster Bank were its bankers. Ibid., p. xl.

3. Ibid., p. xciii.

less than the \$915 Anderssen earned in 1851. On the other hand, there were a greater variety of attractions promised, and a greater variety of prizes.¹ The Congress was further to serve as an indication whether enough support was possible in London to turn the B.C.A. into a permanent organization with headquarters in the capital.

Invitations were sent to all eminent foreign players, but a large number of them were again, as in 1851, unable to come to England. Morphy, who was in Cuba, seeking passage to France, naturally declined. The official duties of von der Lasa and Jaenisch again kept them from the international arena. Saint-Amant's advancing years induced him to stay in Paris. Harrwitz withdrew from the international chess arena after the arrival of Kolisch in Paris, and although he did not die until 1884, played very little serious chess after 1860.² Kolisch was apparently in Russia³, although it is not clear whether he was on tour as a professional chess player, or as private secretary to a Russian count.⁴

1. Paulsen received \$75 for his blindfold exhibition, and Blackburne \$100. There had been no such exhibitions in 1851. Besides the Grand Tournament, there was a Handicap Tournament, a Problem Tournament, and some consultation matches. The Handicap Tournament is of interest chiefly because first prize was taken by a young Scotsman, George H. Mackenzie (1837-1891), who was to eventually achieve great chess fame in the United States. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, pp. lxxiv, xcii.

2. Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 17.

3. "M. Kolisch est redevenu parmi nous après un voyage de plusieurs mois en Russie." La Nouvelle Régence, v. 3, Aug. 1862, p. 249.

4. Indwid Bachmann claims that "trat er als Privatsekretär in die Dienste des Russischen Grafen Kuschelew." Bilder aus der Schachgeschichte, Ansbach: 1920, v. 1, p. 69. His obituary in the Deutsche Schachzeitung makes the same claim. v. 44, June 1889, p. 185. The obituary in The Chess Monthly, however, names his employer as Prince Ourousoff, a strong Russian chess amateur. v. 10, April 1889, p. 258.

As for Max Lange, the editor of the Schachzeitung, he showed throughout his life a reluctance to leave Germany and compete in foreign lands. An entry list of sixteen was finally made up, including six foreign players: Anderssen "the winner in the Tournament of 1851", Arnous de Rivière, "in the first rank of French players", Louis Paulsen "whose reputation acquired in America had preceded him to this country....the winner at the Bristol meeting", Wilhelm Steinitz, "a young player but lately known to fame as the prize holder in a Tournament at the Vienna Club", Serafino Dubois "long....the foremost player of Italy", and Prince Ouroussoff "one of the most skilful amateurs of Russia."¹ Of the ten English players, the most important were Lowenthal, Barnes, who had first attracted notice by turning in the best score against Morphy during the latter's visit to England², the Rev. G. A. MacDonnell (1830-1899), the strongest player in Ireland, the Rev. John Owen, who reached his peak at this tournament, and, for posterity the most important new name, Joseph Henry Blackburne (1842-1924).³

An entry fee of \$25 was levied for play in the Grand Tournament, which began on June 16, and was scheduled to last until July 5. Up to June 30, play was held at the three leading clubs in London, the St. George, the St. James,⁴ and the London Chess Clubs, and at the Grand

1. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, pp. xlv-xlv.

2. Barnes had scored the only win over Morphy in his five board exhibition in 1859. Cf. p. 87.

3. Blackburne was only nineteen at this time, and scored only four wins in the tournament.

4. The St. James club had been created in the 1850's. Lowenthal was its president.

Divan, in the Strand, "admission to the clubs....to be obtained through the respective members."¹ Starting on June 30, the tournament moved into St. James Hall, rented for \$300, and play was thrown open to the public upon payment of sixty-five cents. B.C.A. members, who paid \$1.25 a year, were exempt from this toll. A check on the amount collected at the door reveals that in the six days the tournament was at the St. James Hall, 346 persons paid admission, an average of about 58 per day.² This proved a very successful beginning for a practice which became prevalent in later tournaments as a means of supplementing funds.

Those chess fans who disbursed sixty-five cents for the privilege of witnessing play at St. James Hall were further treated to two blindfold exhibitions. Four years earlier, Paulsen had played a record ten games simultaneously. Since then, he had duplicated that feat several times, and had even essayed eleven games.³ On July 2, he played ten games simultaneously winning six, losing three, and drawing one. This performance, however, was matched by the young Blackburne, who, on July 4, also played ten games simultaneously, winning five, losing three, and drawing two.⁴ Blackburne was soon recognized as even Paulsen's superior as a blindfold player, and his blindfold feats were to assure

1. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, p. xlvi.

2. Ibid., pp. xlvi, xcii.

3. On September 13, 1861, Paulsen had begun eleven games at the Bristol Congress, but eight had to be called off when the seance became too long. The Field, v. 18, Sept. 21, 1861.

4. Paulsen's exhibition was marred by an error in one of the games in which he left his Queen en prise on the thirteenth move. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, p. lviii.

him a lasting fame in chess history.¹

The Congress, unfortunately, also had its bad moments. Its worst aspect concerned the method of play itself. As we have seen, a step forward was taken by changing the mode of play from elimination to round robin. However, the draw was still considered an inadmissible result, so that games had to be replayed until the opponents came to a decision. This helped lengthen the tournament unduly, particularly in view of another procedural technique, or rather lack of technique. Players paired off at their discretion (although of course each contestant was required to meet every other), playing each other whenever, and apparently wherever they wished, with the only stipulation being that a minimum of four games a week were to be played.² This stipulation, apparently, was not adhered to, marring the tournament considerably. De Rivière and Prince Ourousoff failed to appear, but under this vague system, they were not dropped from the field until the tournament was well under way. Dubois did not start playing until the tournament was half over. Lowenthal dropped out in the middle of the tournament, when

1. "He seemed to play with greater ease than even Mr. Paulsen." Medley, in Lowenthal, The Chess Congress of 1862, p. lxi. "It appears to us that Mr. Blackburne plays blindfold more quickly and with somewhat greater ease than Paulsen." The Field, v. 20, July 5, 1862. Joseph Henry Blackburne was born in Manchester. After leaving school, he entered briefly into a business career, but his success at blindfold play decided him to become a professional chess player. In February 1862, he gave an early display of his prowess, playing seven blindfold games at the Manchester Athenaeum, of which he won five and lost two. The Field, v. 19, Feb. 1, 1862. He was called, in 1862, "one of the very first class of English players." Ibid., Jan. 25, 1862.

2. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Ch. Cong. of 1862, p. lli.

his duties as Managing Director became too pressing. Obviously, in the future, a more strict system would have to be devised, scrutinizing the entries to make sure they genuinely meant to play, and fixing the entire schedule of play, so that it progressed evenly among all contestants. As it was, the tournament was marred by twenty-one forfeits, the result of players dropping out at various moments, and did not conclude until the end of July.¹

The genial Anderssen, always eager to play, an entry in both the Grand and Handicap Tournaments, a volunteer in all the consultation matches, and an inveterate skittles player,² was the first to complete his slate. He raced through the opposition with little trouble, winning eight straight before bowing to the Rev. John Owen. In the very next game, Anderssen defeated his only real rival, Paulsen, and finished the tournament with twelve wins and one loss, to take first prize. Only one of his wins came by forfeiture, that over Lowenthal, who forfeited nine of his games. Paulsen took second prize, losing to Dubois as well as to Anderssen. Owen was third, losing to Paulsen, MacDonnell, and Blackburne.³

Another matter which occupied the attention of the players attending the Congress was the perennial problem, a chess code. After lengthy

1. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Ch. Cong. of 1862, p. lxxiv. The Field, v. 20, July 12, 1862.

2. "Considering the powers which he Anderssen puts forth in his tournament games in the day time, it is surprising how he evinces the utmost readiness to contest any number of dashing and ingenious games with other strong opponents in the evening." The Field, v. 19, June 28, 1862.

3. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Ch. Cong. of 1862, p. lxxiv.

wrangling, and much opposition on the part of Staunton,¹ a Chess Code was adopted, based loosely on the code found in Staunton's Chess Praxis. The book of the Tournament was very complacent concerning this chess code, and even listed fourteen leading clubs in England which had adopted it.² This is in obvious contradiction to The Field, which commented that it "was scouted by almost all the clubs both foreign and English",³ and that all chess players in England "have considered the amended laws in question most objectionable."⁴ As for the Germans, "the German players....hold it up to ridicule."⁵ Max Lange criticized it sharply in the Schachzeitung, and the newly formed Westdeutscher Schachbund voted that it was neither suitable nor acceptable for Germany.⁶ Clearly, the end of this difficulty was not yet in sight.

The seeds sown at London in 1862 did not bear fruit immediately, and the B.C.A., far from becoming a permanent organization, did not hold another meeting until 1865. On the continent, however, particularly in Germany, chess was developing rapidly. In 1860, Fiske had noted that Morphy's visit had caused a renaissance in French chess.

1. After the great Morphy flare-up, Staunton faded temporarily from the English chess picture. He re-emerged in 1862 in connection with the question of the chess code.

2. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Ch. Cong. of 1862, pp. lxxii-lxxiii; lxxxvii-xcii.

3. The Field, v. 22, Aug. 1, 1863.

4. Ibid., Aug. 8, 1863.

5. Idem.

6. Schachzeitung, v. 17, Dec. 1862, pp. 353-356. Sept. 1862, p. 260.

France has exhibited a genuine and thorough chess revival. Players who had retired have been drawn into the ranks again, and the venerable Café de la Régence has seen a return of its best days. Arrangements have been made for the re-establishment of the national organ---La Régence---, and many English and German players have visited Paris.¹

France, however, did not experience a genuine revival until 1867. It was in Germany and Austria that the most important developments were taking place. Anderssen, Max Lange, and the returned Paulsen headed a growing list of strong players. New clubs sprang up everywhere, in Frankfurt, Thorn, Emden, Breslau, Leipzig, and in Vienna.²

In September 1861, the Schachfreunde des Rheinlandes held a Congress in Düsseldorf, which was the starting point for a German chess federation.³ In September 1862, another Congress was held in Düsseldorf, and this time, the Westdeutscher Schachbund was created.⁴ The new association held yearly meetings and tournaments in Düsseldorf, and by 1868, had been joined by the Norddeutscher Schachbund, founded in Hamburg.⁵ These organizations flourished particularly after 1868, and became the basis for the German Chess Federation.

Meanwhile, in 1865, the Vienna Schachgesellschaft tried to solve the problem of a chess code in a novel way. As the Schachzeitung pointed out,

-
1. The Ch. Month., v. 4, Jan. 1860, p. 28.
 2. Schachzeitung, v. 16, Feb-July 1861, pp. 60-240.
 3. Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 240.
 4. Schachzeitung, v. 17, Sept. 1862, pp. 257-260.
 5. In 1866, the Association did not hold a Congress because of the war with Austria. Schachzeitung, v. 21, Dec. 1866, pp. 355-56. Gottschall, Anderssen, pp. 240, 335.

Schon seit langer Zeit ist der Wunsch nach einer Reform der Schachgesetze allgemein. Bei jedem Schach-Congress, bei jeder Zusammenkunft hervorragender Schachspieler stand die Abfassung eines neuen Schachcodex mit auf dem Programm, aber jedesmal war es dieser Theil des Programms, der unerledigt blieb.¹

The Vienna players decided to approach the problem differently, and, instead of drawing up a universal chess code, drew up a code for their own particular needs. In this piecemeal fashion, the chess code dilemma might possibly be solved.

V

At London, in 1862, sixth prize had been taken by a young Austrian player, Wilhelm Steinitz. Steinitz was born in Prague, on May 18, 1836. A career as a mathematician was mapped out for him, and in 1858, he went to Vienna, to attend the Wiener Polytechnische Anstalt. In Vienna, he boarded with the family of an impoverished tailor, and his means of support appear to have been meager. He had early become a strong chess player, and as a boy, was considered one of the strongest players in Prague. In Vienna, his early inclination turned into a passion. His biographer, Ludwig Bachmann, tells a story of doubtful reliability concerning Steinitz' entry into the Vienna chess world. According to Bachmann, Steinitz went one day to a café where the Vienna Chess Club was sponsoring a blindfold exhibition. Steinitz was peering

1. Schachzeitung, v. 20, July 1865, p. 193.

through a window into the room where play was in progress, when the president of the club, happening to pass by, asked him in jest whether he understood the moves. Steinitz replied that he, too, could play blindfold chess. The president was incensed at this arrogance, and brought him inside to play blindfold against two of the strongest players there, Nikolaus Falkbeer,¹ and Ernst Pitschel. Steinitz defeated them one after the other. His rise thereafter was rapid. He took third prize in the club tournament in 1859, a second prize in 1860, and first prize in 1861.²

On the basis of these successes, the Vienna Chess Club financed his trip to England, in 1862, to compete in the London Congress. This proved to be the turning point in his life. He was so pleased with his reception that he decided to settle there permanently.³ His score at the Congress was not impressive, but Englishmen had been struck by his brilliant play. Anderssen called his win over Mongredien "die kühnste und schönste Partie des Turniers".⁴ Immediately after the Grand Tournament, the B.C.A., out of the Congress funds, sponsored two

1. Nikolaus was the brother of Ernst Falkbeer (1819-1885), who emigrated for a while to London, and there made somewhat of a name in the English chess world.

2. Ludwig Bachmann, Schachmeister Steinitz, Ansbach: 1910, v. 1, pp. 1-2. The same story appears, with some alterations in details, in Charles Devidé, A Memorial to William Steinitz, New York: 1901, pp. 2-3. The earliest printed version occurs in H. Lehner und C. Schwede, Der erste Wiener internationale SchachCongress im Jahre 1873, Leipzig: 1874, p. 62, where the language almost duplicates Bachmann's later portrait. The story may have originated from Steinitz himself, but it resembles a little too much a dreams of glory fantasy to be taken quite literally.

3. Bachmann, Steinitz, pp. 8-9.

4. Ibid., p. 9.

short matches, in one of which Steinitz defeated the Italian master Dubois, who, in the Tournament, had tied with MacDonnell for fourth, ahead of Steinitz. The score was 5-3, with 1 draw, revealing for the first time Steinitz' amazing talent for match play.¹

From 1862 to 1866, Steinitz built up a strong reputation in England, and a large following at the London Chess Club through a series of match and tournament victories. In December 1862, the London Chess Club arranged a match with Blackburne, for \$75, which Steinitz won 7-1, with 2 draws.² Steinitz followed this with victories over Frederick Deacon, Augustus Mongredien, and Valentine Green, all sponsored for small stakes by the London Chess Club.³ In 1865, he took first prize in a small tournament in Dublin, where his only strong competitor was the Rev. G. A. MacDonnell, the president of the Dublin Chess Club, whom Steinitz defeated in a playoff.⁴ In December 1865, at the London Chess Club again, Steinitz met a rare setback, at the hands of the brilliant young newcomer, Cecil De Vere (1845-1875). Steinitz granted the odds of Pawn and move, and lost 7-3, with 2 draws.⁵

By 1866, Steinitz' reputation was such that he was ready to seek a sterner challenge for his talents. George Walker called him

1. The other match was between Anderssen and Paulsen, and was called off with the score tied 3-3, with 2 draws, when Anderssen had to return to Germany. Steinitz' victory netted him \$50. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Ch. Cong. of 1862, p. lxxv.

2. One of Blackburne's opponents, during his blindfold seance on July 4, had been so charmed with his play that he donated \$52.50 to the Tournament Committee to sponsor a match for the young Englishman. The London Club had then raised the ante to \$75. Medley, in Lowenthal, The Ch. Cong. of 1862, pp. lxi-lxiii.

3. Bachmann, Steinitz, p. 53.

4. Ibid., p. 97. The Field, v. 26, Oct. 21, 1865.

5. The Field, v. 26, Dec. 16, 1865, v. 27, Jan. 27, 1866.

"our first player".¹ As early as February 1866, intimations of a match between Steinitz and Anderssen, whom Walker called "the first player in Europe",² were in the wind.³ The match, unfortunately, became entangled in the petty wars which seem endemic to nineteenth century English chess, a war waged this time around the resurgent British Chess Association, and envenomed by the reappearance of Howard Staunton. Mr. Reinfeld says it is still a mystery how the match was arranged.⁴ This certainly overstates the case. Yet there is no doubt that the match took place in the midst of a journalistic war which makes it difficult to pierce through the distortions and deliberate misconstructions bandied about for the sake of partisanship.

In November 1865, the British Chess Association held its first meeting since 1862.⁵ The fruits of that Congress had been slow in maturing, but now the officers of the Association made plans for a

1. Bell's Life, April 21, 1866.

2. Idem.

3. "We learn that it is not at all improbable that a match in which Mr. Steinitz' friends are prepared to back him against the potent Anderssen, may come off during the Easter, or at furthest the Midsummer vacation. The match, we believe, is to consist of the first eleven or seven games for £50 [\$250] a-side; but farther particulars remain yet to be settled." The Field, v. 27, Feb. 10, 1866.

4. Reinfeld, Human Side of Chess, p. 35.

5. The Field, v. 26, Nov. 18, 1865.

meeting in 1866, which was to mark the beginning of a permanent organization, with headquarters in London. The Association had been supported from the beginning by wealthy chess amateurs, and was generally popular in the minds of English players. Staunton, however, for reasons which are perhaps inscrutable, developed a strong dislike for the Association,¹ and as this gentleman never did things by half-measures, this dislike rapidly took on the typical Staunton features, with hate-the-B.C.A. campaigns in the Illustrated London News, and even a new magazine in 1865, The Chess World, to allow the great man more space in which to vilify his enemies. The supporters of the B.C.A. in London were largely members of the London Chess Club, and George Walker was their self-appointed mouthpiece in the columns of Bell's Life. These people also happened to be the supporters of Steinitz in his career as a professional.

In London, meanwhile, the members of the once mighty St. George's Club, looked with disfavor upon the prosperous good fortune of their rival, the London Chess Club. From this quarter, Staunton was able to get a modicum of support for his campaign against the B.C.A. In June 1866, further, he had little difficulty obtaining widespread support from the St. George's in the formation of a new club, the Westminster, which was to be a rival to the London Club.²

1. This dislike was probably a compound of many things: an ancient bias against the London Chess Club, which dated from the 1851 tournament, personal hatred for George Walker, the mouthpiece of the Association, and personal animosity towards certain members of the B.C.A., including Medley and Lowenthal. Further, the Association had mutilated his chess code, which had become the laughing stock of chess players.

2. Ill. Lon. News, v. 48, June 16, 1866.

The event which the B.C.A. managed to put together for 1866 was not very grandiose. Its two main features were a Challenge Cup,¹ limited to British players, and a Handicap Tournament. The proposed Anderssen-Steinitz match was completely outside its ken, and Walker's assertion that it was sponsoring the match is obviously an invention.²

Steinitz won the Handicap Tournament, defeating De Vere in an even encounter.³ After this victory, Mr. Forster, of the London Chess Club, declared he would back Steinitz against Anderssen to the amount of \$500. Anderssen backers at the St. George quickly matched that amount. It was decided that from the \$1000, \$250 be set aside for the winner. Anderssen, however, would not make the trip from Breslau unless he were guaranteed \$100 for expenses should he lose the match. In the meantime, the Westminster Club had come to life, and all three clubs decided to contribute to the \$100 guarantee, which would go to the loser.⁴ The match would be held in rotation at the three clubs.

1. This Cup was to be the guerdon of British Championship in chess, and to be competed for every two years. Cecil De Vere won it in 1866. J. Lowenthal and G.W. Medley, The Transactions of the British Chess Association for the years 1866 and 1867, London: 1868, p. 6.

2. Bell's Life, July 21, 1866. Walker was not usually guilty of such deliberate distortion as Staunton. His column, on the other hand, teemed with errors of all sorts, the results, largely, of careless journalism.

3. Lowenthal & Medley, Transactions, p. 6.

4. The Field, v. 28, July 21, 1866. Both Sergeant and Reinfeld are under the delusion that the loser's share was \$300 (~~\$60~~). Reinfeld, Human Side of Chess, p. 35; Sergeant, Championship Chess, p. 17. This apparently stems from a misinterpretation of the fact that three clubs contributed to the loser's share. Steinitz vindicated the \$100 figure in 1885: "the...amount of compensation to the loser was £20 [\$100], offered by three clubs." International Chess Magazine, v. 1, Nov. 1885, p. 333.

This financial arrangement became the accepted pattern throughout the nineteenth century, and it deserves a word of explanation. There is general agreement that the stakes, in 1866, totalled \$1000.¹ What is never made clear in any chess book is the fact that the winning player received only one-fourth of the total stakes, in this case \$250. In other words, the backers of a chess match were not spending their money solely for the love of the game.² The stakes in 1866 were \$500 a side. In terms of cash in the players' pocket, Steinitz and Anderssen were competing for a \$250 prize, with \$100 for the loser. In all the matches up to the First World War, where one reads that the stakes were so much a side, one must remember that only one-fourth of the total went to the player.³

Because of the controversy touched off in the English press over the B.C.A., it is difficult to gauge how much genuine interest was generated by the match. Anderssen was a two to one favorite in the betting, which was very brisk.⁴ The Field called the match "the most interesting which has taken place in London in some years past."⁵ This may have been reaction to the dullness of the past two seasons. The Era described the interest as high, but then called its accuracy into question by giving out the wrong score.⁶ Walker praised the games extravagantly,

1. Schachzeitung, v. 21, Sept. 1866, p. 269. Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 296. Bachmann, Steinitz, p. 134.

2. In reporting conditions for his match with Zukertort, in 1885, Steinitz commented: "The terms are as usual upon such occasions, namely, that if I win I shall receive one-quarter of the whole amount of stakes on both sides, while the rest will be returned to the subscribers who...back me at the rate of two to one." Int. Ch. Mag., v. 1, Aug. 1885, p. 244.

3. In 1866 "only ~~£50~~ \$250 was the share of the winning player." Int. Ch. Mag., v. 1, Nov. 1885, p. 133.

4. Schachzeitung, Oct. 1866, v. 21, p. 295.

5. The Field, v. 28, July 21, 1866.

6. The Era, reprinted in Schachzeitung, v. 21, Sept. 1866, p. 269.

Staunton called them dull. In short, the English press, which is the only primary source for this event, was unusually unreliable. The Schachzeitung showed remarkably little interest in a match between two German speaking masters, and far less interest than it had evinced in the 1851 event, when letters from Anderssen had filled its pages.

The result was definitely a surprise. Victory was to go to the first winner of eight games, and the time limit was twenty moves in two hours. The match lasted from July 18 to August 10. With the score tied at six all, Steinitz won two games in a row to take the match.¹ The match was not claimed as a world's championship. In France, it was merely called a "match important".² Walker called Anderssen "the European champion"³, and intimated that the title was at stake in the match. However, Walker's entire coverage of the event is a fantastic tapestry of inventions aimed at enhancing the prestige of the B.C.A., which, as we have seen, he considered the sponsor of the match. Staunton, who had supported Anderssen against Steinitz, claimed, in familiar fashion, that Anderssen was sick. The Field, significantly, said the victory put Steinitz "in the first class of chess players." In other words, he had proved himself worthy of competing with the best. This did not mean that he was necessarily the best. There was no doubt, however, that Anderssen, Paulsen, and Kolisch, the big three of European chess, would have to make room for the "täpferer, kleiner" Austrian.⁴

1. "This final score is the reverse of what was expected by most players conversant with the powers of both combatants, and by achieving this result, Herr Steinitz has placed himself very high up in the first class of chess players; and we may add that as a match player he is probably surpassed by none except Morphy." The Field, v. 28, Aug. 25, 1866.

2. Le Sphinx, v. 2, 1866, p. 92.

3. Bell's Life, June 9, 1866.

4. The Era, reprinted in Schachzeitung, v. 21, Sept. 1866, p. 269.

CHAPTER IV

I

In 1894, when Steinitz defended his world's championship against Emmanuel Lasker, the contemporary press announced that he had acquired the title in 1866, in the match with Anderssen. This legend had been slowly growing since 1886. All subsequent writers on the game have accepted this theory and complacently dated Steinitz' tenure as champion from 1866.¹ Even Philip Sergeant, who should have known better, claimed in 1934 that Anderssen and Steinitz were fighting, in 1866, "for what was recognised to be the World Chess Championship."² It was not until three years later that Sergeant acknowledged the error: "it [the Anderssen-Steinitz match] is not claimed as a World Championship match."³ In spite of this, the belief has persisted that the championship was at stake in 1866. The concept of a world's champion was still vague in

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 20, Sept. 1900, p. 308; Wellmuth, The Golden Treasury of Chess, p. 68; Information Please Almanac, 1954, p. 825.

2. Sergeant, Century, p. 142.

3. Sergeant, Championship Chess, p. 17.

the nineteenth century, perhaps non-existent in the 'sixties, and although Steinitz may have helped create the concept, as Sergeant claims,¹ it was really Lasker, as we shall see, who first invested the title with the prestige which it displayed in the twentieth century, and it would be more accurate to call Lasker, rather than Steinitz, the first world's champion.

What contributed most to Steinitz' reputation was an unrivalled record in even matches, in which he was undefeated from 1862 to 1894. This was a cumulative process, however, in which the Anderssen match figured as only one such victory, and one coming fairly early in Steinitz' career. By 1886, Steinitz had acquired a sufficient reputation as a match player that his encounter with Zukertort was the first recognized world's championship match.

Sergeant comments:

the period which succeeded [the Anderssen-Steinitz match] was one of big tournaments, after each of which there was a tendency to acclaim the victor as the world's best player.²

This is partially true; although as tournaments multiplied, chess amateurs became more and more conscious of the accidental nature of any one tournament result, taken singly and out of context of a player's total performance. As early as 1867, we find in La Stratégie:

1. Sergeant, Championship Chess, p. v-vi.

2. Ibid., p. 19.

Le rang assigné aux joueurs par le résultat du grand Tournoi [Paris, 1867], n'est pas accepté comme étant l'expression de l'échelle des forces par tous les amateurs du jeu d'Échecs, à plus forte raison par les concurrents.¹

The important thought in Sergeant's comment is that in the 1860's, '70's, and '80's, the tournament was still considered a decisive scale of comparison, if a player's total record was considered.² It was Zukertort's great victory at the London Tournament, in 1883, which finally brought him and Steinitz together, in 1886, in the first world's championship match. When Steinitz defeated Zukertort, however, in conjunction with his unbeaten record, the superiority of match play, which had been the only recognized basis of comparison earlier in the century, was once more given general acceptance.

II

Steinitz did not follow his victory over Anderssen with the kind of overwhelming successes that had marked Morphy's career. In the next few years, although compiling a very creditable record, he failed to consolidate his match victory with the sort of performances which might have established a clear superiority and justified an immediate claim to the world's championship.

1. La Stratégie, v. 1, Aug. 1867, p. 192.

2. Steinitz, in 1885, during the negotiations with Zukertort, insisted that since the days of Labourdonnais, the match had been considered the only fair test. "It was always understood by connoisseurs" that the results of tournaments could in no way affect the superiority established in match play. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 1, Feb. 1885, p. 36. This was more of a plea, however, than a statement of fact.

In the fall of 1866, the new Westminster Club arranged a match with Bird, one of the strongest English masters. In 1858, Staunton had retired as a combatant from the chess arena;¹ in 1862, Buckle, whom Elijah Williams called England's most "profound and accomplished player",² died; Boden was comparatively inactive as a player, and in 1869 had retired as chess editor of The Field;³ Blackburne was still a newcomer, so that Bird was probably considered, along with young Cecil De Vere,⁴ England's most worthy representative in 1866.⁵ The match was for eight games up, draws not counting.⁶ With Steinitz leading 7-5, with 5 draws,

1. Staunton did not bow out of chess altogether until 1869 when his last magazine, The Chess World, went out of business.

2. Elijah Williams, Horae Divanicae, London: 1852, p. vii. Of course, Williams wrote this right after the 1851 Tournament, and his quarrel with Staunton, and he was probably quite happy to discredit his recent antagonist. On the other hand, G. A. MacDonnell states that competent critics were divided, in the late 'fifties, as to whether Boden or Buckle was British champion. MacDonnell, Chess Life Pictures, p. 36.

3. Boden started life in a commercial career. He was also "a water colour painter of no mean skill." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 2, Feb. 1882, p. 55. In his obituary, in The Chess Monthly, we find the following: "As landscape painter our deceased friend was of more than average ability, and as art-critic his opinion was eagerly sought for and appreciated by the best connoisseurs." The Ch. Month., v. 3, Feb. 1882, p. 168. This would suggest that when he left chess, in 1869, Boden may have turned to painting and criticism.

4. Cecil De Vere was never given a chance to fulfill his promise as a chess player. He died of consumption on February 9, 1875, when only thirty years old. The Field, v. 45, Feb. 13, 1875, p. 148.

5. Bird was one of the few chess players who combined an active chess career with a full time profession, and achieved a fair renown. He was an accountant, and came to be considered an expert in his field: "as an authority on the details of railway accounts there was hardly a man in England his equal." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 28, June 1908, p. 251. The irregularity of his play may be traced to this division in his life.

6. A further provision, which became accepted procedure in all subsequent matches, was that the winner had to have a two game margin of victory. This was not settled the way a tennis match is, by having the players continue play until the two game margin is achieved, but by breaking off the match as drawn when both players came to within one victory of the stipulated number, in this case when the score would reach 7-7.

Bird was forced to leave for the United States on business. In view of the closeness of the score, an attempt was made to postpone the match until Bird's return. Steinitz refused, however, Bird was forced to resign, and Steinitz pocketed the stakes. The English press reacted unfavorably, and although Steinitz had kept his perfect record, the match must be scored a moral defeat.¹

In 1867, an international exposition in Paris became the occasion for a third international chess tournament in history. One of the surprising things about chess history before the First World War is the diminishing role played by France. Between 1851 and 1914, the land which had given birth to Philidor, Deschapelles, Labourdonnais, and Saint-Amant, and which had once been considered the foremost chess playing nation in Europe, was host to only three major international tournaments.²

In 1862, Ignaz Kolisch had settled in Paris, followed in 1864 by a Polish exile, Samuel Rosenthal (1837-1902), a chess master who was to become a fixture of French chess life.³ The presence of these two masters coincided with a mild revival of French chess life,⁴ so that

1. The Field, v. 28, Nov. 24, 1866, p. 405. Ill. Lon. News, v. 49, Nov. 24, 1866, p. 515. Steinitz defended himself by saying: "I...claimed the stakes with the full approbation of all the parties concerned in the match." Letter to the Ill. Lon. News, v. 49, Dec. 8, 1866.

2. Paris, 1867; Paris, 1878; and Paris, 1900. The four Monte Carlo tournaments were technically outside France, in the principality of Monaco, while their support and organization came mainly from outside France.

3. Samuel Rosenthal was born near Warsaw. During the Polish insurrection of 1864, he emigrated to France. La Stratégie, v. 35, Oct. 1902, p. 324.

4. Cf. p. 111.

1867 proved to be a propitious year for a tournament. Four newspapers in Paris carried chess columns: Le Monde Illustré, Paul Journaud, L'Illustration, Arnous de Rivière, Le Sport, Saint-Amant, and Le Nord, a political newspaper which entrusted its chess column to Kolisch.¹ In 1867, Jean-Louis Preti, an Italian exile,² launched a chess magazine, La Stratégie, which was to run uninterrupted³ until 1940, and compared favorably with German, British, and Austrian periodicals. Most important, 1867 featured an international exposition, the same attraction which had engendered the London tournaments of 1851 and 1862.

Napoleon III donated a "coupe de porcelaine de Sèvres",⁴ worth \$800, to help insure the success of the event, which was supported by a large number of nobles and other prominent personages, both in France and elsewhere.⁵ The Comte de Casabianca even intervened with the Prussian ambassador in Paris to obtain leave for Anderssen, which was granted by the Minister of Culture and Education. Unfortunately, Anderssen was unable to leave Breslau for personal reasons.⁶

1. La Nouvelle Régence, v. 4, Feb. 1863, p. 37.

2. Jean-Louis Preti (1798-1881), was born in Mantua, Italy. In 1826, he emigrated to France to escape Austrian tyranny. He supported himself for a large portion of his life as a music teacher. La Stratégie, v. 14, Feb. 1881, pp. 34-35.

3. There was a delay of nine months, approximately, in the issue of the magazine, during the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. Preti, however, caught up on all his past issues by combining his numbers.

4. Alphonse Féry d'Esclands, Congrès International des Echecs, 1867, Paris: 1868, p. iv.

5. Ibid., pp. lxxviii-lxxix.

6. Ibid., pp. lx-lxi. I have been unable to ascertain the reasons for Anderssen's failure to attend. Earlier that same year, he had expressed hope of attending the Congress. Neue Berliner Schachzeitung, v. 4, April and May, 1867, pp. 157, 160.

This Congress might be considered the last of the "primitive" tournaments. The organization was still extremely crude, although it marked a step forward from the 1862 tourney. Fourteen players were entered,¹ but again, neither the entry of competitors, nor the progress of play were closely supervised. A modest entry fee of \$10 was the only requirement for play,² and, as in London in 1862, numerous players dripped out along the way, particularly when their chances for the four prizes dwindled.³ In all, forty-six games were forfeited.⁴ Again, as in 1862, play progressed in a very uneven fashion, the competitors meeting one another more or less at will.⁵ On the other hand, certain noteworthy changes were introduced. The round robin system was maintained, but it was felt that a single game between players was an insufficient test, so that two rounds of play were required.⁶ An innovation was introduced in the scoring of draws. The problem of scoring draws was one which worried and nagged tournament promoters right up to the turn of the century. The system used in 1851, 1857, and 1862, had been to ignore draws, and replay them, as one would do in match play.

1. Féry d'Esclands, Congrès, 1867, p. lxi.

2. Ibid., p. xvi.

3. The first prize consisted of the cup donated by Napoleon, plus \$100 cash; second prize was \$160, third prize \$80, and fourth prize \$40. Ibid., p. xc. Computing the first prize as \$900, this gives us a prize list of \$900, \$160, \$80, and \$40, as compared to \$500, \$250, \$150, \$75, \$50, and \$25, at London, in 1862.

4. Ibid., p. lxxvii.

5. La Stratégie, v. 1, June 1867, p. 144, gives a summary of the tournament up to June 15, which indicates that play is progressing in a haphazard fashion.

6. Féry d'Esclands, Congrès, 1867, p. xvi. The two games were played consecutively, a practice which prevailed until late in the century.

However, this entailed added time, and by 1867, a drawn game was a much more frequent occurrence than it had been in 1851. It was decided not to replay draws, but to count them as lost for both sides.¹ In other words, first prize would go to the contestant who scored most wins. After the tournament, the system was roundly criticized, and never used again in a major tournament. Yet, by the end of the century, many players were suggesting once more such a solution to the rising number of draws.²

Four players ranked as favorites before the event, Kolisch, Steinitz, de Rivière, the French champion, and Gustav Neumann (1839-1881), der stärkste Berliner Spieler,³ preceded by a reputation as an outstanding theoretician.⁴ Other strong entries included Samuel Loyd, of the United States, who gained fame largely as a problem composer, Cecil De Vere, of England, and Celso Golmayo, the Mexican champion.

Kolisch took first prize, losing only two games, one to Steinitz, and one to Rosenthal, and scoring twenty wins. Second prize fell to an unknown, Simon Winawer, from Warsaw, "dont la supériorité se révélait pour la première fois."⁵ Steinitz took third prize with eighteen wins, losing games to Kolisch, Neumann, and Jerome Czarnowski, a Polish master resident in Paris. Neumann was fourth.⁶ MacDonnell, some fifteen years

1. Féry d'Esclands, Congrès, 1867, p. xvi.

2. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 12, Aug. 1892, pp. 350-351.

3. Schachzeitung, v. 21, May 1866, p. 140.

4. Neumann was co-editor, along with Anderssen, of the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung.

5. Féry d'Esclands, Congrès, 1867, p. lxxvii. La Stratégie remarked: "Le nom de M. Winavère, inconnu en Europe au commencement de l'année 1867." v. 3, Jan. 1869, p. 4.

6. Féry d'Esclands, Congrès, 1867, p. lxxix.

later, exclaimed enthusiastically that Kolisch "in '67 won the championship of the world....in the Paris International Tourney."¹ This was perhaps overexuberant, and technically inaccurate, but there is no doubt that in 1867 the brilliant Kolisch had the strongest claim to chess pre-eminence in Europe. Neumann, who had been tentatively seeking a match with Steinitz since 1866,² now turned his attention to the new hero and challenged Kolisch to a match.³

Kolisch, like Morphy, preferred to rest on his laurels, although for reasons that were neither as romantic nor as enigmatic. After 1867, Kolisch retired from active play and devoted himself to the stock market in Paris and in Vienna. He amassed a fortune, became a millionaire, and was dubbed a baron by the Austrian Emperor.⁴

1. MacDonnell, Chess Life Pictures, p. 41.

2. The Field, v. 28, Dec. 1, 1866, p. 427.

3. La Stratégie, v. 1, Dec. 1867, pp. 271-276.

4. There has grown up a legend in the chess world that Kolisch owed his financial success to Baron Albert von Rothschild (1844-1911), of Austria, a strong chess player and generous patron of the game in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. As is the case with many episodes in popular chess literature, the story of Kolisch's career as a financier is not quite so simple to unravel. Two things are certain. After 1867, he retired from public play, and shortly thereafter, he reappeared on the scene as a patron and promoter of tournaments, possessed of a large fortune. There is even some question as to where Kolisch obtained his fortune, some saying Paris, others Vienna. It seems probable that Kolisch was in Paris from 1867 to 1873, and obtained his wealth in financial speculation on the Bourse. "Kolisch had the good luck to make a friend of a stockbroker fond of chess, who gave Kolisch an opening as a coulissier, or commission agent, at the Paris Bourse." James Mortimer, "Some Chess Players I Have Met", Br. Ch. Mag., v. 25, May 1905, p. 176. "Mr. Kolisch abandoned public play after his success in the Paris Tournament of 1867, where he won the first prize. Since then he gradually rose as a financier, and is for many years past a banker in Paris." The Ch. Month., v. 3, Nov. 1881, p. 71. In 1873, he returned to Vienna at the occasion of the tournament held that year, and settled again in Austria. For a while he owned a newspaper. He met with financial reverses late in life, his health broke down, and he died on April 30, 1889. He and Rotschild collaborated closely in promoting the Vienna tournaments of 1873 and 1882, but there is no direct evidence that Kolisch's connection with the Rothschild family

In the fall of 1867, the British Chess Association held its second tournament since its reorganization, at Dundee, in Scotland. Steinitz and Neumann were the leading entries, along with Blackburne, MacDonnell, and De Vere. Dissatisfied with the scoring method used in Paris, the British Chess Association became the first to use the system which is today generally accepted for scoring draws, one half point to each contestant.¹ Although losing his individual encounter to Steinitz, Neumann took first prize, scoring seven and one half points to seven for Steinitz, who lost to both De Vere and Blackburne.² Then, in July 1870, the first international chess tournament to be held in Germany was staged at Baden-Baden. A strong field of nine players participated, possibly the strongest entry that had yet been brought together: Anderssen, Steinitz, Neumann, Paulsen, Rosenthal, De Vere, Winawer, Blackburne, and the strong German master Johannes Minckwitz (1843-1901).³

had been his stepping stone to success. Yet at the time of his death, and shortly thereafter, there sprang up a rumor that such a connection had been Kolisch's key to financial success. "Seine durch das Schach vermittelte Bekanntheit mit Baron Rothschild gewann die grösste Bedeutung für sein ganzes Leben." Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 44, June 1889, p. 185. "Fame will have it that Baron Rothschild's influence was the stepping stone of Kolisch's success during the few years he resided in Vienna." The Ch. Month., v. 15, Feb. 1894, p. 162. Leopold Hoffer, who was an informed chess journalist, vigorously denied this connection: "that Baron Kolisch owed his phenomenal success as a financier to the Baron Rothschild is a myth. He admired Kolisch the chess player, but not Kolisch the financier." The Field, v. 117, Feb. 18, 1911, p. 312.

1. "In order to obviate the difficulty experienced at the recent tournament in Paris, it was decided that a 'draw' should be reckoned as half a game to each player engaged in it." Lowenthal and Medley, Transactions, p. 8.

2. Ibid., pp. 61-93.

3. Schachzeitung, v. 25, Sept. 1870, pp. 257-263. Minckwitz was born in Leipzig, in 1843. He attracted attention not only by his performance in various of the regional German Congresses, but by his blindfold exhibitions at these Congresses.

In a double round tourney in which draws were scored as half points, Anderssen took first prize, scoring eleven points to ten and one half for Steinitz, whom he defeated twice.¹ In four years, therefore, in three straight events, Steinitz had come in behind his three principal rivals for European supremacy: Kolisch, Neumann, and Anderssen. There was clearly no world's champion in 1870.

III

One of the most fascinating aspects of chess history, in the period from 1866 to 1882, is the tremendous growth of German chess, a growth which was to enable Germany to displace England as the leader of European chess, and make it for many years a storehouse of outstanding masters. The Westdeutsche Schachbund had missed its yearly meeting, in 1866, due to the Austro-Prussian War.² This had been replaced by a minor tourney in Elberfeld, sponsored by the chess association of Barmen and Elberfeld.³ From August 31 to September 4, 1867, however, it held its sixth Congress at Cologne. The two Paulsen brothers, and a strong newcomer from Berlin, Emil Schallopp, were

1. Schachzeitung, v. 25, Sept. 1870, pp. 257-263.

2. Cf. p. 111, footnote 5.

3. Emil Schallopp, Der Schachkongress zu Leipzig im Juli 1877, Leipzig: 1878, p. 13.

among the competitors, with Wilfrid Paulsen taking first prize.¹ Since the first meeting in 1862, Louis Paulsen had been in the habit of giving a yearly blindfold display at these meetings, and he performed again in 1867.² In subsequent congresses, Emil Schallopp and J. Minckwitz took up the practice which became a yearly feature of the German regional Congresses.³

The revived Westdeutscher Schachbund was quickly followed by other organizations: in 1868, the Norddeutscher Schachbund, in 1870, the Osterreichischer Schachbund, and in 1871, the Mitteldeutscher Schachbund.⁴ All these organizations held frequent meetings. The Westdeutscher Schachbund, with the exception of the war years, 1866 and 1870, and the years of economic depression, 1872-75, held regular yearly meetings.⁵ No foreigners competed in these regional events, but Germany now boasted of enough first rank masters that the caliber of play at these congresses was extremely high:⁶ Anderssen, Louis and Wilfrid Paulsen, Dr. Max

1. Wilfrid Paulsen (1828-1901), was a strong player who competed frequently in Germany. He is at times confused with Louis Paulsen's other brother, Ernst, who accompanied Louis to America, but was a player of only routine strength. Schallopp, Leipzig 1877, p. 13.

2. Ibid., pp. 11-19.

3. Idem.

4. Ibid., p. 10.

5. Idem.

6. The Schachzeitung claimed that the eighth Congress of the Westdeutscher Schachbund, at Barmen, in 1869, boasted a field as strong as the Paris Congress of 1867. v. 24, Sept. 1869, p. 257. The entries at Barmen were: Anderssen, W. Paulsen, Schallopp, Zukertort, Minckwitz, and one Richard Hein, of Magdeburg.

Lange, Neumann, Minckwitz, Schallopp, all competed in these tournaments, and in 1868, the seventh Congress of the Westdeutscher Schachbund at Aachen saw the debut of another famous name, Johannes Hermann Zukertort (1842-1888).¹

The high point of this early development was the Baden-Baden tournament of 1870. The tournament was largely the result of the efforts of Kolisch who acted as secretary. The first international tourney to be held in Germany was also the first to exhibit a coherent organization. Play was marred by the withdrawal of only one player out of the ten original entries, and this was an unavoidable occurrence. Adolf Stern, after playing four games, was called up by the Prussian army, which was preparing for war with France.² In contrast to the practice of earlier tournaments, where the remaining games of a defaulting player were counted as wins by forfeit for his remaining opponents, Stern's four games were discarded, and he was dropped from the tournament.³

1. Zukertort was born in Lublin, in Russian Poland, of a German father and a Polish mother. While Zukertort was still quite young, his family moved to Breslau, where one of his teachers was Anderssen himself. Under the veteran's tutelage, Zukertort grew rapidly into a strong chess player. In the early 'sixties, Zukertort moved to Berlin where he studied medicine. He served in the Army Medical Corps in the Danish War of 1864, and in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. It appears doubtful that he was ever a full-fledged doctor. In the latter part of his life, while living in England, he affected that title, invoking the ridicule of Steinitz. He did not move immediately to the fore-front as a player, losing a match to Anderssen in April 1868, 8-3 with 1 draw, while his performances in the German Congresses were not outstanding. He excelled, however, as an annotator, replacing Neumann as co-editor of the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung in the latter part of 1867, and as a blindfold player, engaging nine opponents simultaneously in 1869.

2. Schachzeitung, v. 25, Aug. 1870, pp. 253-254.

3. The player who reaped the biggest advantage in this case was Steinitz, who had drawn and lost against Stern, and saw a minus one and one half point score erased.

The prizes were not on a par with those of Paris and London: 1st prize, \$600, donated by the Administration des Konversationshauses of Baden-Baden; second prize, \$120, made up of the entry fees of the players; third prize, \$80, donated by the tournament committee, of which Kolisch was a member.¹ The field was smaller, however, so that one third of the entires received prizes, while the first prize, though less than at Paris in 1867, was more than at London in 1862. The progress of the tournament itself was quite successful. Games were played at appointed times, play progressed evenly, and no further entry outside of Stern withdrew from the lists.² Germany could be proud of its debut in the international chess arena.

IV

Zukertort did not compete at Baden-Baden, in 1870, but in 1871, he won a short match from Anderssen, in Berlin, 5-2,³ and his reputation shot up rapidly. In 1872, he journeyed to England, where he was destined to settle for the remainder of his life, to compete in the B.C.A. tourney of that year, in London. The British Chess Association, since its hopeful revival in 1866, had failed to live up to expectations. In late 1868 and early 1869, it held a Handicap Tournament, in London, which

-
1. Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 349.
 2. Schachzeitung, v. 25, Sept. 1870, pp. 257-263.
 3. Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 374.

Steinitz won, and another Challenge Cup Tournament, won again by De Vere. In the fall of 1870, John Wisker triumphed in the Challenge Cup competition, in which Steinitz did not participate; then, in late 1871 and early 1872, Steinitz won another Handicap Tournament.¹ Steinitz, if his claim to European pre-eminence was dubious, was clearly the leading player in England. He had defeated all of the leading players in matches, and had headed all the English players at Paris, Dundee, and Baden-Baden.

For 1872, the British Chess Association had hoped to organize another international tournament along the lines of the meetings of 1851 and 1862. Steinitz, Blackburne, De Vere, John Wisker, winner of the Challenge Cup in 1870, and MacDonnell, were among the English players who responded, but the only foreigner to accept an invitation was Zukertort.² The tournament, however, is significant because it marked the first meeting between Steinitz and Zukertort in what was to become the bitterest rivalry in the nineteenth century. In this first encounter, all the honors lay with Steinitz. He took first prize in the tournament, without losing a game, while Zukertort was relegated to third, behind Blackburne.³ In a subsequent match, sponsored by the St. George and Westminster Clubs, and offering a purse of \$100 to the winner, and \$50 to the loser, Steinitz routed the newcomer 7-1, with 4 draws.⁴ The diminutive foreigner apparently held no threat for Steinitz.

1. The Field, v. 33, March 20, 1869, p. 243; v. 36, Dec. 17, 1870, p. 534; v. 39, May 25, 1872, p. 476.

2. "The interest which attaches itself to the International Chess Tournament of the present season arises mainly from the fact of the appearance from the Continent of a new and brilliant light in the chess world [Zukertort]". The Field, v. 40, July 6, 1872, p. 16.

3. Ibid., v. 40, July 27, 1872, p. 101.

4. Ibid., Aug. 10, Sept. 7, 1872, pp. 155, 235.

V

1873 proved to be the year of triumph for Steinitz. The rapid growth of chess in Germany had spread to Austria, and in 1870, the Osterreichischer Schachbund had been created. The real nucleus of chess life, in Austria, however, proved to be the Wiener Schachgesellschaft, which was blessed with the patronage of Baron Albert von Rothschild, its president, and by 1873, of Ignaz Kolisch, its vice-president.¹ In 1870, already, an attempt had been made to hold an international tournament in Graz. But the Franco-Prussian War had intervened, and only one foreigner, the German, Dr. Karl Goring had entered.² The winner of that tournament was Johannes Berger,³ destined to be one of Austria's leading contributors to chess as an analyst, a problem composer, and a leader in that curious movement of late nineteenth century chess, quality scoring. Berger immediately set to work to bring about the tournament which the war had prevented, but it was not until 1873, when Kolisch returned to Vienna, that the Congress took shape. Kolisch contributed \$250, and Baron Rothschild, \$500. Emperor Franz-Josef was persuaded to contribute \$500. The Emperor's prize, along with Rothschild's donation, made up the first prize, \$1,000. \$300, the sum of the entrance fees, comprised the second prize, while Kolisch's

1. Lehner und Schwede, Wien 1873, p. 13.

2. Schachzeitung, v. 25, Nov. 1870, p. 324. Gottschall, Anderssen, p. 401.

3. Schachzeitung, v. 25, Nov. 1870, p. 324.

donation was divided into a third prize of \$150, and a fourth prize of \$100.¹ These prizes, plus the promise of the generous hospitality of Kolisch and Rothschild,² proved sufficient incentive to lure seven foreign players to Vienna: Anderssen, Paulsen, Blackburne, Rosenthal, Steinitz, Bird, and Karl Pitschel.³ Besides these, five leading Vienna players entered: Dr. Max Fleissig, Oscar Gelbfuhs, Josef Heral, Dr. Philipp Meitner, and Adolf Schwarz (1836-1902).⁴

This made up one of the strongest fields ever assembled. To add even more significance to the meeting, Kolisch devised a unique method of play, which fused round robin and match play in an attempt to reduce the element of chance in a tournament. Each contestant engaged every other one in a match of three games, draws counting. The winner of the most matches, rather than the most games, would be entitled to first prize. Drawn matches would count one half to each.⁵

The results were unexpected. Steinitz smashed through the opposition with amazing success. He lost only one match, to his tournament nemesis, Blackburne. Not only did he win the other ten matches, but he lost no other games, and drew but five. Blackburne, who had been

1. Lehner und Schwede, Wien 1873, pp. 13-27.

2. Bird, in a speech at the banquet after the London Tournament of 1883, commented on Kolisch's "princely hospitality" at Vienna, in 1873 and 1882, and at Paris, in 1878. J. I. Minchin, London International Chess Tournament 1883, London: 1883, p. xxxv.

3. Schachzeitung, v. 28, July 1873, p. 261. Karl Pitschel, not to be confused with his brother Ernst Pitschel, the Vienna master, was a strong German amateur who had competed with varying fortunes in the several regional tourneys in Germany.

4. Idem.

5. Ibid., pp. 200-201.

improving steadily since his debut in 1862, scored his biggest triumph to date; he tied with Steinitz for first, losing only his match to Rosenthal. Unlike Steinitz, however, he lost seven games in the process. The great Anderssen lost to both Steinitz and Blackburne, drew his match with Fleissig, and contented himself with third prize. In the play-off match, Steinitz defeated Blackburne 2-0.¹

Steinitz returned to London a hero. His victory had been so decisive that European chess critics were willing to grant his pre-eminence. He had lost only two games, to Blackburne, and he had subsequently avenged this loss by defeating Blackburne twice in the tie match. Once more, however, the champion retired to his tent without further testing his superiority. Steinitz was offered the editorship of the chess column in The Field which he accepted; thereafter, he retired from public play.² Steinitz, unlike Morphy and Kolisch, was not to make his retirement permanent, nor did his retirement from public play mean his retirement from the chess world. However, with the exception of his match with Blackburne, in 1876, Steinitz did not compete again in the international arena until 1882.

1. Schachzeitung, v. 28, July 1873, pp. 310-311. Apparently Sergeant did not understand the method of play, for he reported that Steinitz had taken first prize over Blackburne because he had lost less games in the tournament. Championship Chess, p. 20.

2. Devidé, Steinitz, p. 5.

VI

The nine years of "retirement", from 1873 to 1882, proved to be the most fruitful years in the career of Steinitz; for it was at that time, in the columns of The Field, that modern chess was born. Steinitz had begun his career as a brilliant sacrificial player, and he had attracted attention in London, from 1862 to 1866, by his dashing play.¹ In the Anderssen match, Steinitz, although not so sacrificially careless as of yore, continued his vigorous attacking play. After that date, one notices a change in his play. This change at first was gradual, but at Vienna, in 1873, the new Steinitz was unveiled. Players were bowled over by bizarre tactics, unorthodox maneuvers, a positional strategy that seemed perversely cramped and undeveloped, but magically transformed itself into a crushing superiority. Chess players were puzzled. Steinitz, having vindicated his new technique in actual play, proceeded to outline its principles.

It is not necessary to go into technical details concerning Steinitzian chess, or what came to be known as the modern school. It has been done before by many competent critics, notably Reti, in Modern Ideas

1. One of his games, in 1863, is described as an "impetuous and daring brilliancy." The Field, v. 21, May 2, 1863, Cf. also p. 113.

in Chess, and Masters of the Chess Board,¹ and Emmanuel Lasker in his Manual of Chess;² all chess players are familiar with what F. J. Wellmuth has called "typical Steinitz constriction".³ The important thing about modern chess, for the historian, does not lie in the principles that it propounded, but in the fact that it quickened tremendously the pace of analysis. As far back as 1851, players had bemoaned the early demise of chess, through an excess of "book" knowledge. All that had gone before, however, proved feeble when compared to the intense analysis which Steinitz brought to bear on the game;⁴ and his analysis resulted in counter-analysis from rival players, particularly from another fine theoretician who was also his bitterest foe, Zukertort.

Modern chess carried technique to a point where every student of chess could absorb a certain minimum of sound positional play. In view of the haphazard method of play which had prevailed for so long, it was inevitable that modern chess would become defensive, rather than offensive. The devotee of the modern school concentrated on creating a position which was free of weaknesses. Although in actual play, many players, including Steinitz himself, met many tactical problems on their own terms, without referring necessarily to a body of principles, the

1. Richard Reti, Masters of the Chess Board, trans. by M. A. Schwendemann, New York: 1932.

2. Emmanuel Lasker, Manual of Chess, New York: 1934.

3. Wellmuth, The Golden Treasury of Chess, p. 120.

4. "As an annotator of games Mr. Steinitz is almost unapproachable. When he took command of the chess column in The Field, there began a new era in the history of chess annotation." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 12, Jan 1892, p. 5.

the basic point of view of modern chess was passive rather than active. Modern chess, therefore, came to be synonymous with dull chess, with overanalyzed chess, with cautious chess. It was in the late nineteenth century, which has been falsely called the age of attacking chess,¹ that the most vociferous outcries arose against the imminent death of chess.

Steinitz' nine years in the wilderness had another repercussion: it made the little Austrian immigrant one of the most hated members of the chess community in London, and finally drove him into exile in the United States. Steinitz, in contrast to his objectivity in actual notes to games, indulged in all types of personal controversies in the rest of his column. The Field became a battleground, not only for his theories, but for clashing personalities. Even players who were adopting his theories in actual play were willing to attack them for the sake of insulting the hated Steinitz.²

In 1876, the West End Chess Club³ arranged a match between Steinitz and Blackburne of seven games up, for \$300 a side. The match grew out of a desire on the part of chess amateurs to test the relative strength

1. Wellmuth, The Golden Treasury of Chess, p. 97.

2. Bird was one such enemy, his antagonism dating from the unpleasantness of the 1866 match. In 1877, one Arthur Jackson, from the United States, wrote to The Field to complain of what he felt was an anti-Bird bias in the chess column. v. 49, June 30, 1877, p. 784.

3. The West End Club was a short lived organization that grew up in the mid-'seventies out of an attempt to establish a West End branch to the City of London Chess Club. The latter refused to sanction such a subsidiary, and the West End Club, attempting to survive independently was eventually compelled to close up.

of the two winners at Vienna in something more decisive than the two game play-off match which Steinitz had won.¹ Steinitz left little doubt of his superiority as he routed Blackburne 7-0, not even granting him one draw.²

VII

While Steinitz was busy vindicating the superiority of his chess principles, J. H. Zukertort, who had migrated to England in 1872, was busy building a reputation as an outstanding over-the-board player. His debut in England had not been too auspicious, but he attached himself to the City of London Chess Club, and began to draw attention by the brilliancy of his tactical play, and by his amazing skill at those exhibitions which particularly thrilled the average amateur, simultaneous and blindfold performances. It was at that time that he met and became closely associated with Leopold Hoffer (1842-1913). Hoffer was born in Budapest and early moved to Vienna. His lifelong profession was journalism. In 1867, he came to Paris and drew the attention of the chess world by the able way in which he assisted de Riviere in the organization of the tournament held that year.

1. Wilhelm Steinitz, Chess Match between Steinitz and Blackburne, London: 1876, pp. 5-7.

2. The Field, v. 47, March 1876, p. 263.

In 1870, at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, he moved to London, preceding Zukertort by two years.¹ As for Zukertort, Murray once said that he acted as London correspondent to "two or three German newspapers."² This may have been true, although there is no evidence to support it. It is more likely that he supported himself as Blackburne did, by a year 'round circuit of exhibitions, in England and abroad.³

The high point of Zukertort's performances came on December 21, 1876, at the West End Club, where he contested the "unprecedented number" of sixteen blindfold games simultaneously, winning twelve, losing one, and drawing three, to set a new record.⁴ Two years later, Zukertort entered the first international tournament since 1873, the Paris Tournament of 1878. Another international exposition provided the setting, and play took place at the exposition grounds themselves, in the Palais de l'Industrie.⁵ The new Republican government proved even more generous than the Emperor, donating three vases of Sèvres porcelain, worth \$800, \$360, and \$360, respectively.⁶ Again, as in 1867, the tournament drew the support of French officialdom. The

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 33, Oct. 1913, p. 396.

2. Ibid., March 1913, p. 98.

3. The Field, v. 48, July 12, 1876, p. 115; Sept. 23, 1876, p. 383; Nov. 4, 1876, p. 558.

4. Only two games were completed the first night, and the seance was postponed five days, at which time Zukertort was able to call off the fourteen remaining positions without a slip. The Field, v. 48, Dec. 23, 1876, p. 758.

5. La Stratégie, v. 11, March 1878, p. 65.

6. Emil Schallopp, Der Internationale Schachkongress zu Paris im Jahre 1878, Leipzig: 1879, p. 2.

committee included the vice-President of the Chamber of Deputies, and a Senator, while a sprinkling of noblemen and generals also appeared in various capacities.¹ The prizes were the most liberal yet, six in all, totalling \$920, plus the three vases, a total of \$2,440.² The field was the most representative yet brought together, and possibly the strongest: from Germany came the veteran Anderssen, winner of a large number of the German regional tourneys, and K. Pitschel; from England came Bird, Blackburne, and Zukertort; from Austria came a new player, Berthold Englisch (1851-1897);³ from Warsaw came Winawer, second prize winner at Paris, in 1867. The French entered their two leading players, Rosenthal and Albert Clerc (1830-1918), and for the first time in a European tournament came two players who had won their spurs across the Atlantic, George H. Mackenzie and James Mason (1849-1905).⁴

1. La Stratégie, v. 11, March 1878, p. 65.

2. Schallop, Paris 1878, p. 2.

3. Berthold Englisch was born in Austrian Silesia. He was employed as a stockbroker by the House of Rothschild. This was reputed to be a merely honorary position, by which Baron Rothschild provided financial support for his favorite chess players.

4. G. H. Mackenzie was born at Belfield, Scotland. After an early try at a business career, he purchased a commission in the army, in 1856, and served in India during the Sepoy mutiny of 1857. After winning the Handicap Tournament at London, in 1862 (Cf. p. 105, footnote 1), he left for the United States to accept a captaincy in the Northern Army. After the Civil War, he settled in the United States and became a professional chess player. By 1878, his successes in match and tournament play in this country had earned him the title of American champion. James Mason was born in Kilkenny, Ireland, but his family moved to New York while he was still a child, possibly as a result of economic depression. Mason came into prominence as a chess player in 1876, when he took first prize in the Fourth American Chess Congress, at Philadelphia, ahead of Bird.

This was to be a double round tourney, and the system initiated at Dundee, in 1867, of scoring draws as half points was once more utilized. Zukertort and Winawer tied for first prize with sixteen and one half points each, and Zukertort won the tie match 2-0, with 2 draws. Blackburne took third prize with fourteen and one half points.¹

Zukertort returned to England to find himself the hero of the hour. Steinitz was forgotten in the presence of the new champion. In 1879, Zukertort and Hoffer launched a new magazine, The Chess Monthly,² to rival Steinitz' column in The Field as the chess arbiter of England and Europe. In 1880, Zukertort resumed his triumphs, defeating the French champion, Samuel Rosenthal, in a match, 7-1, with 11 draws.³ Then, in the summer of 1881, Zukertort met Blackburne in a match for \$500 a side.

Should he [Blackburne] succeed in defeating Dr. Zukertort, he will be entitled....to rank as the champion of the world, unless either Morphy or Steinitz comes forward to reclaim the position which they have abdicated.⁴

Zukertort won 7-2, with 5 draws.⁵ With Steinitz retired, Anderssen dead,⁶ and Paulsen competing but occasionally, Zukertort now had a claim to being the foremost chess player in the world.

-
1. Schallopp, Paris 1878, pp. 7-8.
 2. This is not to be confused with the American Chess Monthly, which Fiske edited, from 1857 to 1860.
 3. La Strategie, v. 13, July 1880, p. 199.
 4. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 1, June 1881, p. 195.
 5. Ibid., Aug.-Sept. 1881, p. 257.
 6. Anderssen died on March 13, 1879.

VIII

In 1876, the Mitteldentscher Schachbund held its second meeting, at Leipzig. Anderssen scored one of his numerous victories in these regional tourneys, and the assembled members decided that Germany's greatest chess hero should be honored in some way. Gottschall points out that in his own youth neither Steinitz nor Paulsen, both of whom defeated Anderssen in match play,¹ ranked on the same level with the veteran from Breslau,² and regardless of the feud brewing in London between Zukertort and Steinitz, Germany still considered Anderssen the leading European chess player. The Leipzig chess club agreed to organize an Anderssen festival tournament for 1877, which would celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of his learning the moves of the game.³

In January 1877, the Mitteldentscher Schachbund issued an appeal to all German clubs to cooperate in the promotion of the Leipzig Anderssen festival. At the same time, it suggested the meeting could serve as the occasion for the creation of an Allgemeiner Deutscher Schachbund, an idea which had been in the air since 1862, when the

1. Anderssen, besides the tie match with Paulsen of 1862, lost two matches to the German master. In 1876, in Leipzig, he bowed 5-4, with 1 draw, while in 1877, also in Leipzig, he lost 5-3, with 1 draw. Gottschall, Anderssen, pp. 446, 477.

2. Ibid., p. 372.

3. Ibid., pp. 431-432.

Westdeutscher Schachbund was created.¹ A minimum subscription of seventy-five cents was required for participation in the Congress. The festival came to pass in the summer of 1877, and was a great success.² Zukertort, the two Paulsen brothers, Schallopp, Winawer, Englisch, and many others attended.³

Even more of a success was the nascent German Chess Association, which the members of the Congress created after the tournament.⁴ It was decided to hold a Congress every two years, beginning in 1879, at Leipzig. Hermann Zwanzig was appointed head of a committee to arrange the first Congress.⁵ In 1879, Zwanzig was elected general secretary of the Association, and under his careful guidance, the Deutscher Schachbund grew rapidly.⁶ The Association was actually a Federation, with clubs and individuals affiliating themselves with the Association through payment of yearly dues.⁷

The Association held its Congresses regularly every two years, and these Congresses came to be the backbone of international master chess until the turn of the century. From 1881 on, they regularly attracted sufficient foreign masters that they can all be considered major international tournaments. Further, each Congress featured a so-called

1. Schachzeitung, v. 32, Jan. 1877, pp. 22-23.

2. Unfortunately, Anderssen was unable to win his own tournament, bowing to an old nemesis, Louis Paulsen. Schallopp, Leipzig 1877, p. 39.

3. Ibid., p. 31.

4. Ibid., p. 67.

5. Idem.

6. Emil Schallopp, Der Erste und Zweite Kongress des Deutschen Schachbundes, Leipzig, 1879-Berlin, 1881, Leipzig: 1883, pp. 1-3.

7. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

Hauptturnier, or minor tournament, and it became the accepted practice that the winner of a Hauptturnier achieved the rank of master, and was eligible for entry in a major tournament.

Anderssen died in 1879, before the Leipzig Tournament. This first Congress was a minor affair, won by the Austrian, Englisch; but in 1881, the Association held its meeting at Berlin, and seventeen players competed, including seven foreign entries.¹ Blackburne, in the greatest performance of his career, scored fourteen points,² losing only one game, to Mason, and took first prize, three full points ahead of Zukertort. The newcomer, Tchigorin, tied with Winawer for third and fourth, one half point behind Zukertort.³

1. These were: Berger and Dr. Josef Noa (1856-1903), Austria; Blackburne, Mason, and Zukertort, England; and Winawer and Mikhail Tchigorin (1850-1908), Russia. Schallopp, Leipzig, 1879-Berlin, 1881, p. 34. Mason, when he returned to Europe, in 1878, settled in England permanently, and never returned to the United States, except as a visitor. Tchigorin was born in St. Petersburg. In 1880, he had defeated Emmanuel Schiffers (1850-1905), considered the strongest player in Russia, in a match, and was now considered Russian champion. This was his first international tournament.

2. The Deutscher Schachbund adopted from the very start the modern system of scoring draws as half points, and never strayed from this practice.

3. Schallopp, Leipzig, 1879-Berlin, 1881, p. 34.

CHAPTER V

I

Immediately following the Blackburne-Zukertort match, the games began to appear in the columns of the leading chess periodicals of London and the continent, including those of The Field and the new Chess Monthly. It soon became evident that the chess editor of The Field did not hold too high an opinion of the quality of the play, and commented accordingly.¹ Zukertort, pleased over his recent successes, was not too happy to have the old master criticize his play, and replied in the columns of his own magazine.² There rapidly developed a sort of analytical warfare between Steinitz on the one hand, and Zukertort and Hoffer on the other. The dispute took on more of a personal and acrid temper, and was climaxed in February 1882 by an extraordinary challenge on the part of Steinitz. With

1. The Field, reprinted in The Chess Monthly, v. 3, Sept. 1881, pp. 7, 11, 18, and 22.

2. The Chess Monthly, v. 3, Dec. 1881, pp. 107-113.

supreme confidence, although out of serious practice for nine years, Steinitz challenged Zukertort and Hoffer to a match in which the two editors of the Chess Monthly would play in consultation against him, for a minimum stake of \$500, and a maximum stake of \$1,250.¹ Zukertort was evidently taken aback, and he sought refuge in the fact that Steinitz had used abusive language in their recent literary controversy:

I shall be ready myself to play you a match,
under any reasonable conditions, as soon as
I receive from you a public apology for your
gratuitous insults.²

Zukertort then changed his mind, and agreed to a match, on the condition that it begin immediately, in early March at the latest, in order that it be completed before the commencement of the great international tournament which was scheduled to open in Vienna in May of that year.³ Steinitz, however, who had played one match, and in no tournaments in the last nine years, required more time for preparation, and asked that the match be postponed until fall, after the Vienna Tournament. Zukertort was evasive in his answer, saying that it was too far ahead to plan for such a contest.⁴

Steinitz was piqued at his failure to bring matters to a decision over the board, and this was probably the reason for his emergence

-
1. The Chess Monthly, v. 3, Feb. 1882, p. 161.
 2. Ibid., p. 162. Possibly he did not wish to burden himself with Hoffer as a consultant.
 3. Ibid., April, 1882, p. 225.
 4. Idem.

from retirement, and his entry in the Vienna Tournament. Baron Rothschild and Ignaz Kolisch, himself recently elevated to the rank of Baron by the Austrian Emperor, were the twin promoters of this latest international congress. The Vienna Schachgesellschaft organized the venture, but Rothschild and Kolisch were the soul of the Vienna club. Emperor Franz-Josef again contributed a prize, of \$1,000, and the total prize list added up to a generous \$2,300,¹ a total exceeded only at Paris, in 1878. Baron Kolisch entertained the players with a banquet before the tournament, and was reputedly lavish in his hospitality throughout the meeting.²

In keeping with the growth of chess throughout Europe, this tournament surpassed most preceding events, not only in the amount of prizes, but in the strength of the field. Eighteen performers entered, including such stars as Blackburne, last year's winner at Berlin, Bird, the English veteran, Englisch, probably the strongest player in Austria, Mackenzie, the American champion, Louis Paulsen, Steinitz, Tchigorin, the new Russian who had scored a creditable third at Berlin, Winawer, Zukertort, the claimant to world supremacy, James Mason, and a young Austrian newcomer, Max Weiss (1857-1927).³

1. A. G. Sellman, Games of the Vienna Tournament 1882, Baltimore: 1882, p. 4.

2. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 2, June 1882, p. 216; Aug.-Sept. 1882, p. 292.

3. Max Weiss was born at Szegedin, Hungary. Like Englisch, he became a protege of Baron Rothschild, and eventually found employment in the House of Rothschild.

The tournament was a double round affair, and for the first time, each player went through an entire round before encountering his opponents a second time, a practice which is usually followed today. The method of counting draws as half points seemed to be working fairly well, and was adopted instead of the complicated match system of 1873.¹

The results were a complete surprise. Steinitz, who had been conceded little chance in view of his lack of practice, scored twenty-four points to tie Winawer for first and second prizes. The great Zukertort was relegated to a tie with Mackenzie for fourth and fifth prizes, one and one half points behind the leaders, and one half point behind Mason, who was a surprising third. The players, exhausted after the thirty-four games of the long tournament, decided to cancel the tie matches, and Steinitz and Winawer divided first and second prizes.² Steinitz had fully vindicated himself, and reoccupied the position of number one player. He had dealt Zukertort's reputation a severe blow, beating him twice in their personal encounters.³

The players had barely recovered from the ordeal of this, "the greatest contest which ever took place in chess history",⁴ when, on October 14, 1882, a General Committee, called together by the secretary

1. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 37, Feb. 1882, pp. 37-38.

2. Ibid., v. 37, Aug. 1882, p. 235. As time went on, the practice of breaking ties with play-off matches held after the tournament fell into disuse. The last tie-match for first place was held at Vienna, in 1898. Part of the aim of quality scoring (Cf. p.), was to break ties without recourse to time consuming play-off matches.

3. Idem.

4. The Chess Monthly, v. 3, July 1882, p. 321.

of the St. George's Club, met in London to plan a similar tournament for the next year.¹ After 1872, the British Chess Association had died a quiet death, and chess in England had reverted to its familiar pattern: a concentration of chess activity in London, around the rich metropolitan clubs, whose independence thwarted the success of an Association; and a number of regional associations for provincial players, but with practically no contacts with London. In London, the two leading clubs were the City of London Chess Club and the St. George's. The City of London Club dated all the way back to 1852, and since that time, it had been slowly developing as the richest club in England.² Practically all the important chess players in London belonged to it, including the arch-rivals themselves, Zukertort and Steinitz. The St. George's, after a period of decline, was again in flourishing circumstances. These two clubs replaced the Westminster Club, which had gone out of existence, and the London Chess Club, which had once been the richest club in London.

The St. George and City of London Chess Clubs took the lead in organizing the new tournament, and subscription lists were opened at both locations. It was decided that a minimum of \$5,000 would have to be subscribed if the tournament were to be a success.³ This was \$2,000 in excess of the total subscribed in 1851, but the tendency

1. Minchin, London 1883, p. ix.

2. In 1874, it had even put out its own publication, The City of London Chess Magazine. In spite of the presence of Zukertort as annotator and contributing editor, the magazine died out in 1876.

3. Minchin, London 1883, p. x.

in recent years had been towards more and bigger prizes. Only in that way could enough masters be attracted to have a successful, first-rate tournament. At Vienna, in 1882, six prizes had been offered, totalling \$2,300, and at Paris, in 1878, six prizes had been offered totalling \$2,440. This contrasted with the \$1,050 offered at London in 1862, and the \$1,765 offered in 1851.

The response was enthusiastic. \$8,375 was subscribed. \$2,405 came from India, where native and colonial chess enthusiasts had already contributed to English chess in 1851 and 1862. J. I. Minchin (1825-1903), the secretary of the tournament, who had numerous friends in India, was said to be responsible for this generous response.¹ The St. George's Club by itself contributed \$3,330.² This enabled the committee to donate six prizes totalling \$3,650, the largest amount ever disbursed.³ An interesting innovation was a \$100 prize, donated by Howard Taylor, for the most brilliant game in the second round.⁴ This marked the beginning of a practice which particularly flourished in the first thirty years of this century, but which today has gone out of fashion.

1. J. I. Minchin, who was honorary secretary of the St. George's Club, had spent a long career in the civil service in India, where he had won the friendship of wealthy Indian nobles. In 1883, the Maharajah of Vizianagram contributed \$1,000, which went towards financing a minor tournament. The Maharajah of Travancore sent \$400. "These must be regarded as personal compliments to Mr. Minchin." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 3, Feb. 1883, p. 59. Western chess had been popular in India since the days of John Cochrane. Cf. p. 33.

2. Minchin, London 1883, p. liv.

3. Ibid., p. xi.

4. Ibid., p. xxvii. Zukertort's famous win over Blackburne came in the first round, and was thus ineligible. The prize went to Rosenthal for his win over Steinitz. Idem.

There were other provisions at London, in 1883, which deserve some notice. It was again a double round affair. Since 1867, it was generally felt that a major tournament could only be a fair test of skill if players met each other at least twice. Only the German Chess Association held out against this tendency, and all its congresses were single round affairs.¹ Most significant was the provision concerning draws. Since the London Congress of 1862, it had been recognized that the method of replaying draws until a result was reached, although possibly the best,² was impractical, and might stretch tournaments to unconscionable lengths. The method used at Paris, in 1867, of dismissing draws as lost to both players was felt to be unfair, since a draw was given no more credit than a loss. The method innovated at Dundee, in 1867, of scoring draws as one half point to each player seemed the fairest, but by 1883, it was under heavy criticism because of the large preponderance of draws in major tournaments.

The difficulty lay in the fact that with the rise in the level of technique, it was becoming increasingly difficult to prevent a player from scoring a draw if he deliberately aimed at such a result.

1. Of course, by 1900, as the number of tournaments increased, many minor events only included a single round of play, while the large entries in the major tournaments made it often impractical to play two rounds. As late as 1898, however, at Vienna, a field of nineteen played a double round event.

2. Minchin believed this to be the best system, but agreed that time considerations rendered it impractical. Minchin, London 1883, p. xiii.

On the other hand, to penalize draws unduly would also penalize those players whose draws were the result of a hard fought battle in which neither side had been able to force an advantage. Under the system of halving the score of a drawn game, and counting the result as final, the strongest masters were particularly penalized. The weaker entries, who had little chance for a prize, and were interested mostly in making a respectable score, often played gladly and systematically for a draw against the favorites. These were then forced, in a sense, to concede the odds of the draw, since victory was necessary to them if they wanted to be among the prize winners.¹ Even more distressing was the tendency of certain masters to openly play for a draw in all circumstances, pressing for a win only when presented with a safe opportunity. Berthold Englisch, of Vienna, for instance, who came to be known as the drawing master, at Vienna, in 1882, drew seventeen out of thirty-three games he played, more than half.² This latter tendency was particularly criticized:

Englisch, Mason, Mackenzie, and Winawer adopted the approved tactics of modern Tournament play. These players, with Blackburne and Rosenthal, made an extraordinary number of drawn games, among which will be found many where the force and position are certainly equal, but where a player determined to win would regard the contest as about to commence in earnest.³

1. "The previous practice by which a drawn game was final and counted one half to each was most unfair to the strongest players, as it compelled them in effect to give the odds of the drawn games to the weaker competitors." Minchin, London 1883, p. xiii.

2. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 60, Aug. 1882, p. 235.

3. Minchin, London 1883, p. xxvi.

It is certain that the percentage of draws had grown rapidly. At Paris, in 1878, there had been 22 draws out of 132 games played, exactly one sixth of the total; at Berlin, in 1881, there had been 31 draws out of 126 games played, almost one fourth; while at Vienna, in 1882, there had been 69 draws out of 269 games played, over one fourth of the total.

These figures may seem low to one accustomed to the score tables of twentieth century tournaments, but to the critics of 1883, they were alarming. They were alarming, not just because the number of draws was increasing, but because they favored what was branded the dull and listless game of the modern school. We are fond, today, of looking back on that period as one of brilliant, dashing chess, of Evans Gambits galore, sweeping attacks, and brilliant tactical play. Zukertort's win over Blackburne, in 1883, epitomizes the sort of chess modern readers have in mind when looking back nostalgically to the nineteenth century. This is due partly to the process of time, which has weeded out all the dull specimens, and left us a few brilliant games. To contemporaries, who had to wade through the entirety of the day by day output of a tournament, the picture looked quite different. Already in 1883, amateurs were complaining about the dullness of play in matches and tournaments, and this was felt to be the result of the excessive analysis of the modern school.¹ Far from being a

1. "that dull chess strategy which risks no attack and struggles pertinaciously to obtain an extra Pawn on the Queen's side against the endgame." Minchin, London 1883, p. xxv.

period of attacking play, it was felt that,

Zukertort by his practice showed his belief that the defence had beaten the attack in all open games, by always as second player playing P to K4 in reply to P to K4.¹

The scheme devised at London, in 1883, the first of many schemes introduced until the early twentieth century to combat the rising number of draws and reinfuse life into the game, was to replay drawn games twice. They would be counted as final, and one half point awarded to each player, only on the third draw.² Another minor innovation, but of some significance, was one which required, aside from the usual entry fee of \$25, a deposit of \$25, to be forfeited if a player withdrew before the completion of either round of the tournament.³

The field was not quite as strong as at Vienna, but fourteen masters of rank made up a powerful entry, including Steinitz, Zukertort, Blackburne, Tchigorin, Winawer, Mackenzie, Bird, and Mason. The Vienna

1. Minchin, London 1883, p. xxviii.

2. Ibid., p. xii.

3. Ibid., p. xi. This was to discourage a practice which had plagued earlier tournaments, of competitors dropping out when they saw they had little chance of winning a prize. This invariably garbled the standings. If the games of the defaulting player were discarded, then a hardship was worked against any competitor who had scored a win against the defaulting player, since such wins were not counted. If the unplayed games of the defaulting player were scored as wins by forfeit for his opponents, then these players were given an unfair boost in their score. The method of requiring forfeit money held sway until the end of the century, when the system was introduced of rewarding tournament competitors for every game they won. By the twentieth century, the competition for entry in tournaments was such that promoters had little to fear any longer from defaulting players.

Tournament of 1873 had been Steinitz' great triumph, and Berlin, 1881, Blackburne's finest victory. The London Tournament of 1883 was Zukertort's most glorious achievement. Scoring a brilliant series of wins, including the famous game against Blackburne, he swept, undefeated, into a commanding lead, virtually clinching first prize with four games to play. At this point, "the long-dreaded breakdown took place."¹ Zukertort was a diminutive person, of fragile health, and neither his nerves nor his constitution was too good. The long strain of the tournament proved too much for him. His health gave way, he lost his last three games, and his doctor admonished him to refrain from chess.² His lead, however, proved insurmountable. He took first prize, three full points ahead of Steinitz, in second place, and five and one half points ahead of Blackburne, in third.³

II

Zukertort's great victory at London reopened the issue of a match with Steinitz. When Steinitz had emerged from retirement in 1883 and tied for first at Vienna, two and one half points ahead of Zukertort,

-
1. Minchin, London 1883, p. xxiv.
 2. Ibid., p. xxv.
 3. Ibid., p. xxix.

the chess world had quickly restored its allegiance to the old master. But now, there could be no question of Zukertort enjoying the spotlight only in the absence of Steinitz. He had scored a brilliant victory, by a decisive margin. Steinitz, his position as leader of European chess shaken, began to press eagerly for that match which he was confident would restore him to the pinnacle of the chess world.

Following the Vienna Tournament of 1882, Steinitz had resigned his position with The Field, and on October 25, had sailed to the United States to fulfill an engagement of several months.¹ Steinitz had grown bitter in the nine years of strife at The Field, and since 1879, there was the constant opposition of Leopold Hoffer in The Chess Monthly. Steinitz, who was morbidly sensitive, possibly exaggerated the difficulty of his position, and pictured himself a martyr.² At any rate, he gladly accepted the offer of an American tour, and resigned his chess column which was immediately turned over to his rival, Hoffer.

On November 7, Steinitz arrived in Philadelphia.³ American amateurs had subscribed the \$500 minimum which Steinitz required for travelling expenses, and the \$250 stake which he had asked for a match with D. M. Martinez, of Philadelphia.⁴ Following the Civil

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 2, Nov.-Dec. 1882, p. 378. Devide, Steinitz, p. 7.

2. Leopold Hoffer described Steinitz as "being of morose and hypochondriac disposition to an intense degree." The Field, v. 96, Aug. 25, 1900.

3. Brooklyn Chess Chronicle, v. 1, no. 3, Nov. 15, 1882, p. 26.

4. Ibid., p. 18.

War, chess had revived remarkably in the United States. The Second American Chess Congress had been held at Cleveland, in 1871, and the Third Congress had been held at Chicago, in 1874.¹ These had been fairly small, regional affairs, but the presence of Mackenzie, who won both events, had added lustre to the enterprises.² The prizes at Cleveland aggregated \$285, and at Chicago \$450.³

In 1876, the Fourth American Chess Congress was held at Philadelphia, as part of the Centennial celebration, and in conjunction with the Centennial Exposition of that year. In 1880, the Fifth American Chess Congress was held in New York.⁴ Unfortunately, rivalry between the chess clubs of New York⁵ and Philadelphia had lessened the effectiveness of both events, which were staged as club promoted ventures rather than national tournaments.⁶ Eventually, this rivalry was

1. Gilberg, Fifth Am. Cong. 1880, pp. 81, 90.

2. Ibid., pp. 86, 99.

3. Ibid., pp. 82, 84, and 99.

4. W. Henry Sayen, The Grand International Centennial Chess Congress 1876, Philadelphia: 1876; Gilberg, Fifth Am. Cong. 1880.

5. The Manhattan Chess Club was founded in 1877 by chess habitues of the Café Logeling, in New York, and replaced the old New York Chess Club. It held its first meeting on December 1, 1877. It did not come to be called the Manhattan Chess Club until the late 'eighties. American Chess Magazine, v. 1, Feb. 1898, p. 499.

6. In 1876, New York contributed \$10 to the Philadelphia Congress. Sayen, Cent. Ch. Cong. 1876, p. xvi. In 1880, Philadelphia returned the compliment with a princely contribution of \$5. Gilberg, Fifth Am. Cong. 1880, p. 122. Mackenzie, who was a New York player, and eventually attached himself to the Manhattan Chess Club, did not compete in 1876. Fortunately, James Mason, who won the event, and H. E. Bird, on one of his frequent business trips to the United States, both competed, salvaging the event. At New York, in 1880, Mackenzie again took first prize.

transformed into a healthy competition, and after the Franklin Chess Club was founded at Philadelphia, in October 1885,¹ a match between the Franklin and Manhattan Chess Clubs became a yearly fixture in this country.

In 1882, when Steinitz arrived, there were three particularly flourishing centers in this country: New York, where the leading club was the Manhattan Chess Club; Philadelphia, and New Orleans, which on February 3, 1883 gave birth to the finest newspaper chess column in the United States for many years to come, the chess column in the New Orleans Times Democrat.² Besides these three cities, there was flourishing chess activity in Baltimore, which was the home of A. G. Sellman (1856-1888),³ in Chicago, and in St. Louis, which was the home of Max Judd (1852-1906).⁴ Steinitz stayed until February 24, visiting Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York. After leaving New York, Steinitz stopped in Cuba for two weeks before returning to England to compete in the London Tournament.⁵

1. Reichhelm, Chess in Philadelphia, p. 15.

2. Its editor was James D. Séguin.

3. Alexander G. Sellman, who was called by Reichhelm the "strongest player Maryland ever produced", Reichhelm, Chess in Philadelphia, p. 13, was born in Baltimore. He was one of the strongest players in the country, and competed both at Vienna, in 1882, and London, in 1883. During his visit, Steinitz defeated him in a short match 2-0, with 3 draws. Br. Ch. Chron., v. 1, Jan 1883, p. 71.

4. Max Judd was born in Poland. In 1864, his family emigrated to America. Judd lived for a while in Cleveland, then, after 1871, he moved to St. Louis which became his home for the rest of his life. He competed with some success in the national congresses. His success around St. Louis earned him the title of "champion of the West." Sayen, Cent. Ch. Cong. 1876, p. ix.

5. Br. Ch. Chron., v. 1, March 15, 1883, p. 105.

Steinitz was charmed by his reception in America, and even more so by his reception in Cuba, which remained his favorite chess center until his death.¹ Following the London Tournament, Steinitz returned to America, arriving in New York on October 14, 1883.² This time, he settled permanently, and New York was his home until his death in 1900. In 1888, he became a naturalized American citizen.³

In July 1883, immediately upon completion of the London Tournament, Steinitz reopened negotiations for a match with Zukertort, but the latter was evasive in his answers. He was the hero of the day and knew there was no pressing need on his part to meet Steinitz. Besides, his health was badly impaired, and he was planning a round-the-world tour to recuperate.⁴ In October 1883, Zukertort followed Steinitz across the Atlantic on the first leg of his world tour.⁵ When he arrived on these shores, he was hailed as champion of the world.⁶ The British Chess Magazine questioned Zukertort's claim, and proposed Steinitz as the rightful champion.⁷

1. In 1888, Steinitz wrote: "Havana is the Eldorado of Chess. There you find true amateurs, who really play for the love of the game and the promotion of our noble pastime, for the benefit of the whole Chess community, and without the slightest self interest." Int. Ch. Mag., v. 4, March-April 1888, p. 81.

2. Br. Ch. Chron., v. 2, Nov. 15, 1883, p. 17.

3. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 4, Dec. 1888, p. 364.

4. The Chess Monthly, v. 4, July 1883, p. 323.

5. New Orleans Times Democrat, Nov. 4, 1883.

6. Ibid., Nov. 4, 1883. "The champion, Dr. Zukertort, arrived in New York on Sunday, the 28th of October." Br. Ch. Chron., v. 2, Nov. 15, 1883, p. 18.

7. "We are sorry to see that some of the American and Canadian papers continue to dub him [Zukertort] 'the champion of the world' - a title to which he has no right, and which we think he ought himself to repudiate until he has proved himself superior to Mr. Steinitz in a set match." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 4, Jan 1884, p. 25.

Unfortunately for Steinitz, Zukertort was the more popular of the two. This does not mean merely as a personality, where Steinitz was so deficient,¹ but as a player. His triumph at London, in 1883, had been a refreshing contrast to the dryness of modern chess. Besides this, Zukertort was far more of an attraction than Steinitz in exhibitions. He was a very rapid player,² excelled in tactical finesse which thrilled the average amateur,³ and was a marvelous blindfold performer, regularly playing ten and twelve games simultaneously, while Steinitz never played more than four.

Until September 1884, Zukertort toured the United States, giving exhibitions everywhere. As he progressed triumphantly across the continent, Steinitz' anger mounted. On September 29, 1884, he wrote:

Mr. Zukertort never had, for one moment, and never will have, the slightest claim to the champion title before beating me in a match.⁴

1. The editor of the New Orleans Times Democrat makes reference on several occasions to the "unspeakable Steinitz". Jan 6, 13, 1889. Reichhelm describes Zukertort thus: "Unlike other professionals, Dr. Zukertort liked chess for itself, and played right and left with every player who came along." Chess in Philadelphia, p. 15.

2. In the Blackburne match, played at fifteen moves an hour, Zukertort played so fast and saved so much time, that in one endgame position he was able to devote thirty-eight minutes to one move. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 1, Aug.-Sept., 1881, p. 257. In 1881, the opening repertoire which a player knew by heart was not nearly as extensive as it is today, and the practice of saving time in the opening, so common today, usually extended to just a few moves. Steinitz, during the match of 1886, wrote: "Zukertort plays with great rapidity in the early and middle part of the game, which enables him to economize his time for the difficulties of the position during a crisis." Int. Ch. Mag., v. 2, Feb. 1886, p. 33.

3. "Mr. Zukertort is a consummate master of tactics who has acquired a splendid routine." Ibid., p. 33.

4. W. Steinitz, letter to the New Orleans Times Democrat, Oct. 5, 1884.

In 1884, the biggest obstacle to a match appeared to be Zukertort's determination to play in London, and Steinitz' equally stubborn determination to play any place but there, where he claimed he received unfair treatment.¹

In January 1885, Steinitz launched a new literary venture in the chess world, The International Chess Magazine. Now both contestants had an organ in which to publish their views, and chess amateurs were fearful lest the match lapse into the literary warfare with which English chess, particularly, had been sadly afflicted. At the end of 1884, after reaching San Francisco, Zukertort brought to an end the contemplated round-the-world tour, and returned directly to London. In March 1885, he suddenly altered his somewhat evasive tactics, and showed a new readiness to give combat. In the midst of a highly critical article on Steinitz, Zukertort inserted the following:

I am....ready to play Mr. Steinitz on either side of the Atlantic, and call on him to appoint a second with whom my second may settle all the necessary preliminaries.²

Since Zukertort was yielding on the issue of locale, the way seemed open to bring negotiations to a conclusion. The suggestion of appointing seconds proved to be a God-send, since it considerably lessened the frictions which would have been attendant upon direct negotiations

-
1. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 1, Feb. 1885, p. 39.
 2. The Chess Monthly, v. 6, March 1885, p. 193.

between these two highly combustible chess players.¹ J. I. Minchin acted for Zukertort, while Steinitz chose the Boston veteran Thomas Frère (1820-1900).² Even then, negotiations were quite protracted. Zukertort agreed to play in the United States, but was emphatic in postponing the match until winter if New Orleans should be the site: "'Yellow Jack' would be a big pull against me."³

Finally, on December 29, 1885, Steinitz and Zukertort signed an agreement "to play a match at Chess for the Championship of the World and a stake of Two-Thousand Dollars a-side."⁴ The match was to go to the first winner of ten games, draws not counting, with the stipulation that if the score reached 9-9, the match would be broken off and called a draw. Play was to proceed in three stages: first, in New York until either should win four games, then in St. Louis, until either should win three more games, and the remainder of the match in New Orleans.⁵ The reason for distributing the match over three cities was that no one chess club could finance the expenses of the two masters for the entire duration of play. Zukertort was guaranteed \$750 in travelling expenses should he lose the match, \$500 should he win it, while both were expected to receive \$1200 apiece for

1. "the calm and courteous correspondence of the two seconds proving like oil on the troubled waters." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 5, Oct. 1885, p. 354.

2. Thomas Frère, born in Boston, had been one of the organizers of the First American Chess Congress, in 1857. He had since settled in New York, and was still an important figure in the chess world.

3. Br. Ch. Mag., v.5, Aug.-Sept. 1885, p. 325.

4. The Chess Monthly, v. 7, Jan 1886, p. 136.

5. Idem.

other expenses.¹ The money was provided by the three clubs sponsoring the event: the Manhattan Chess Club, the St. Louis Chess, Checker, and Whist Club, and the New Orleans Chess, Checker, and Whist Club. The time limit was thirty moves in the first two hours, fifteen moves an hour thereafter.²

The conditions of this match are very important because in many ways they formed the prototype for the championship matches that followed, particularly the matches of Emmanuel Lasker. The stakes, for one thing, were the highest ever played for, a total of \$4,000. The highest amount of money previously involved in a match had been the \$1,000 of the Anderssen-Steinitz match. The provisions for expense money were also the most generous ever agreed to. They amounted to a complete payment of expenses for the players while actually in combat. Finally, the chess match was taken out of the privacy of the clubs, and became a public exhibition. Play was divided among three cities and was not confined to the clubs. In New York the Manhattan Chess Club, feeling that its own quarters were insufficient, held the match at Cartier Hall, on lower Fifth Avenue.³ Public attendance, always a side feature of previous matches and tournaments, became now an important matter; so much so that the two contestants were to share the gate receipts evenly.⁴ All these features tended to convert the chess match from a private affair, held at an exclusive club, and

1. New Orleans Times Democrat, Dec. 24, 1885.

2. The Chess Monthly, v. 7, Jan. 1886, p. 136.

3. Br. Ch. Chron., v. 4, Jan 15, 1886, p. 49. "The rooms have been well filled." Idem.

4. The Chess Monthly, v. 7, Jan. 1886, p. 136; Int. Ch. Mag., v. 1, Sept. 1885, p. 262.

limited to privileged spectators, into a public exhibition, depending on public support, and with revenue as one of its objects.

Another novel feature, of course, was that the championship of the world was at stake. Or at least, the two players were in agreement that it was at stake. This does not mean that the chess public was unwilling to accept their claims, or charged the two contestants with creating a private title. On the contrary, the chess public was in greater agreement concerning the respective claims of Steinitz and Zukertort than it had ever been before. On publishing the results of the match, the New Yorker Staatszeitung declared: "Steinitz ist der erklärte champion of the world."¹ Following the match, Bird called Steinitz "the now acknowledged world's chess champion."² The point is that this was not the first official world's championship match, as has been claimed. The first time such an adjective could be applied would be to the Alekhine-Capablanca match of 1927. No international organization gave sanction to the event. More significant, Steinitz was not defending his title against Zukertort. As Sergeant has pointed out,³ part of the difficulty in coming to terms for the match was that both parties wanted the other considered the challenger. The conflict was finally resolved by ignoring the issue of challenge altogether.⁴

1. New Yorker Staatszeitung, reprinted in Emil Schallopp, Der Schachwettkampf zwischen Wilhelm Steinitz und J. H. Zukertort 1886, Leipzig: 1886, p. 7.

2. Letter to the New York Herald, May 15, 1886.

3. Sergeant, Championship Chess, p. 24.

4. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 1, July 1885, p. 226.

In short, this was a championship match because the two players who, by public acclamation, were considered the strongest in the world, were playing one another, not because one player, the official possessor of the title, was defending it against a challenger. The reader who has been conditioned to the idea that Steinitz won the world's championship against Anderssen, in 1866, or against Zukertort, in 1886, would be quite surprised to note that from 1886 to 1894, in the contemporary literature, the notion of a world's champion was still very unstable, and Steinitz' claim, even after he defeated Zukertort, was often in question. It was Lasker, rather than Steinitz, who gave substance and solidity to the concept of a world's champion, and made the title, not a vague honor to be granted to the most successful, or most popular player of the moment, but the possession of a particular person, not to be wrested from him except in a set match.

The Steinitz-Zukertort match opened in New York, on January 17, and closed in New Orleans, on March 29, 1886. In New York, Zukertort played brilliantly, and took a 4-1 lead. After this excellent start, however, Zukertort's frail health told against him. In St. Louis, Steinitz evened the match at 4-4. Then, in New Orleans, he turned it into a rout. "Zukertort, who was still suffering from the effects of his recent illness, appeared nervously weak."¹ Broken in health, Zukertort bowed 10-5, with 5 draws.²

1. New Orleans Times Democrat, March 30, 1886.

2. "The doctor was certainly in bad form yesterday. This was demonstrated by his face which was inclined to be haggard, and by his eyes, which were ringed." Ibid., March 25, 1886. "Towards the close of the match it was evident that Dr. Zukertort was giving way to exhaustion." Br. Ch. Chron., v. 4, April 15, 1886, p. 97.

CHAPTER VI

I

When Steinitz made his debut, in 1862, he and Kolisch had been trail blazers in the field of professional chess. The man Steinitz had beaten in 1866, Anderssen, was an amateur. Although he occasionally earned money at the game, he was an amateur in the fuller sense that he supported himself in another occupation, teaching, and did not depend on chess for his livelihood. As compared to Steinitz, he was a dilettante, playing only when he found time. The man Steinitz defeated in 1886, Zukertort, was a full-fledged professional, deriving his income entirely from the game. In the twenty-six years since Paul Morphy had retired, a great change had come over the game. Whereas in 1860 there had been no chess professionals, in 1886, many ranking players derived their income from chess. More important, most of the leading players were specialists in the game, which was passing out of the hands of the dilettantes. The level of play, under

the scrutiny of Steinitz, Zukertort, of the myriad players who competed in the now frequent tournaments, had risen to such a pitch, that chess pre-eminence was becoming harder and harder to achieve.

From 1886 to 1914, almost all the outstanding names are chess professionals or specialists, and all are intense students of the game. Only three men in that period achieved high ranking in the chess fraternity without allowing the game to interfere with their own profession: Siegbert Tarrasch, who was a doctor of medicine, Ossip Bernstein, who was a lawyer, and, a lesser light at the time, Milan Vidmar, an engineer. Geza Maroczy also followed the engineering profession, but not until 1907 did his career take precedence over chess, and after that date, his name no longer figures among the leaders of tournament play. Capablanca's diplomatic career, of course, was purely honorary, and in no way could we say that he had a chosen profession. In fact, the rather interesting point that comes to light in reviewing the lives of chess masters from 1851 to 1914 is that, even in the heyday of amateur chess, few players had a profession, and few players who became professionals left professional fields. Most were business men, and a few were in non-skilled occupations.

Many players escaped the necessity of supporting themselves entirely by play through the method used in the earlier part of the century, of allying the game with newspaper work. Most ranking masters derived some income from chess columns in various periodicals, but they seldom devoted sufficient time to journalism, or derived sufficient income from it to be dubbed journalists rather than chess players.

A quick review of the situation in 1886, and of the more outstanding names of the chess generation that followed Steinitz, will bear out these points. In England, the four outstanding players, in 1886, were Zukertort, Blackburne, Mason, and Bird. The first three were all professionals, and neither Blackburne nor Mason possessed any other skill. Zukertort served in the Prussian Army Medical Corps in three wars, but there is no reason to suppose that he was a doctor. Bird, of course, was an accountant, but he represented an earlier age; he was a contemporary of Anderssen and Staunton, and after 1886, he failed to keep pace with the new chess generation. Of the two outstanding masters to achieve fame after 1886, Isidor Gunsberg (1854-1930), was a professional, while Amos Burn (1848-1925) was a wealthy retired businessman who could devote all his time to the game.¹

In France, there were few chess professionals outside of Rosenthal, but the level of French players was far below that of England or Germany. It was not until a full-fledged professional appeared, David Janowski (1868-1927), that France had once more a worthy gladiator in the chess arena. The same was true in Italy, where the lack of chess professionals was reflected in the lack of an outstanding Italian master.

1. Amos Burn was born in Hull. He devoted himself to a business career, and was attached to a firm of merchants in Liverpool. He was an occasional chess player in his early days, and achieved some successes in British national tourneys. It was not until after he had made a substantial amount of money in business, however, that he devoted himself fully to chess, and he did not enter the international chess arena until 1886, when he competed in the Nottingham Congress.

In Germany, there were some who prided themselves on the fact that professionalism had made few inroads, and at the same time complained that German chess amateurs were unable to compete with the professionals of other countries.¹ There was some truth to the assertion, and Germany resisted the trend towards professionalism for a long time. Yet even there, the picture showed mixed aspects. Dr. Max Lange, who was a historian, was as adamant as Dr. Tarrasch in placing his profession before chess. As a result, however, he failed to achieve any success on the international scene, in fact played little in any tournaments after the death of his friend, Anderssen. Louis Paulsen was not a chess professional, but neither was he a professional man. He was a business man, a merchant, an occupation which allowed him to play chess when he wished. Emil Schallopp, the strong Berlin player and blindfold expert, was a fonctionnaire in the German government, again not a professional man.

The new chess generation, on the other hand, found it more difficult to resist the lure of professionalism. Curt von Bardeleben (1861-1924), although educated for the law, became a professional, in fact ruined himself in the occupation.² Jacques Mieses drew a thin line between chess and journalism. K. A. Walbrodt (1871-1902), was a professional.³

1. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 36, Nov. 1881, p. 321.

2. Edward Lasker, Chess Secrets, New York: 1951, pp. 20-22.

3. Emmanuel Lasker, of course, presents a difficult problem. He was, in one sense, a professional. Yet, in another sense, his whole career was an attempt to stem the tide of specialism. Cf. p. 205.

In Austria, Kolisch had opened the way for chess professionals. Berthold Englisch, Max Weiss, and Carl Schlechter (1874-1918), were all chess professionals. They were employed by the House of Rothschild, but this was merely camouflage for the fact that Baron Rothschild supported them as chess players. Johannes Berger divided his time between business and chess. Geza Maroczy was employed as a teacher and as an engineer, but until 1907, when he disappeared for some time from the tournament scene, this occupation did not appreciably interfere with his participation in all the major events.

In Russia and Poland, Tchigorin and Winawer were both chess professionals. Winawer, like so many others, also engaged in business and welded the two occupations. Akiba Rubinstein, the great Polish master, was a chess professional. In the New World, the trend was even more pronounced. Steinitz, of course, was strictly a professional, as was Mackenzie, who had given up military life at the close of the Civil War. Max Judd, another strong player, although not a professional, made a fortune as a manufacturer, and was able to devote much of his time to chess. The three outstanding names, after 1886, Harry Nelson Pillsbury, Frank J. Marshall, and Jackson Showalter,¹ were all chess professionals. Capablanca, of course, was a professional and his diplomatic appointments, which were synchronized with the important tournaments,² merely a matter of national prestige.

1. Jackson Showalter (1860-1935), was born in Kentucky. His father was the wealthy owner of a tobacco plantation. Showalter was never compelled to seek employment, and eventually inherited the plantation; so that he fits our category of a specialist in the sense that he was able to devote his entire time and attention to chess.

2. In this way the Cuban Government made it possible for Capablanca to attend the St. Petersburg Congress of 1914, by assigning him to the Russian capital in the fall of 1913.

In short, to succeed in the field of international master chess, it was necessary to devote one's entire attention to the game; either by becoming a professional, like Steinitz, or Lasker, or by making sufficient money in a business career to devote one's time to chess, like Paulsen, or Burn, or else by having the good fortune of a wealthy family which allowed one to devote one's entire attention to the game, without necessarily depending on it for a livelihood, like Showalter, or Alexander Alekhine. The most difficult thing, apparently, and the rarest occurrence, was, like Dr. Tarrasch, to engage in a skilled profession and still excel at the game of chess.

Yet, what was the status of the chess professional around 1886, and at the turn of the century? He certainly made very little money from his calling: "professionals, it is pretty well known, are not sufficiently well off to pay their own expenses to a tournament."¹ In 1891, chess fans in New York raised a testimonial fund for Steinitz, whose finances were not exactly flourishing.² In 1900, Steinitz expressed the opinion that he had never earned much more than \$500 a year, and that in 1898 and 1899, at the age of sixty-two and sixty-three, when he might have been expected to retire in peace, the expense

1. Samuel Tinsley, letter to the Br. Ch. Mag., v. 12, Aug. 1892, p. 350.

2. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 7, March 1891, p. 78. "he [Steinitz] has shared....that lack of financial reward which has fallen to the lot of all Chess apostles." From circular of Steinitz Testimonial Committee. Printed in Idem.

of travelling to Europe to participate in tournaments in the hope of earning some prize money, had reduced his income to \$250 a year.¹ Steinitz also claimed that Zukertort had died of starvation.² Zukertort died of a stroke, in 1888, while playing chess. It is difficult to say what part malnutrition played in his death. It is certain that when Zukertort returned to England in 1886, broken in health, and with no extra cash, since the loser in a match received nothing but expense money, he was unable to take any steps to recover his health, and started once more the round of exhibitions, tournaments, and matches.³

When the reader is told that Zukertort recuperated from the London Tournament of 1883 by touring around the world, he is apt to receive a distorted notion of a chess player's financial means. The curse of the chess professional was that his only means of support was to set out, like the itinerant preachers of old, and "ride the circuit"; that is, play exhibitions throughout the country, and possibly in foreign lands.⁴ This peripatetic tendency on the part

1. Wilhelm Steinitz, My advertisement to Antisemites in Vienna and elsewhere, New York: 1900, p. 15.

2. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 5, Feb. 1889, p. 41.

3. Among other commitments, Zukertort encountered Blackburne in a return match. He lost 5-1, with 8 draws, a measure of his failing powers. The Field, v. 69, May 4, 1887, p. 665; June 11, 1887, p. 815.

4. At worse, a master would be available, at his own club, where he would meet all comers for a stipulated fee. The amount per game averaged approximately twenty-five cents.

of chess players did not denote any particular affluence, but on the contrary was usually their only means of support.¹ Tournaments, although increasingly frequent, were still relatively scarce as a source of income, and with the increased competition, one could not hope to be a consistently high prize winner. Matches were also infrequent, backers had to be found, and clubs willing to pay expense money; so that only the foremost players could hope to make anything from a match. Even then, they had to divide the money with their backers. Steinitz' share of the stakes, in the Zukertort match, was \$1,000.

To sum up, a chess professional at the end of the nineteenth century had to be extremely good, for only the best players made any money. He had to be willing to travel extensively, giving public exhibitions. He had to devote much time to analysis and study of the game, both for his own benefit, and in order to engage in the most common sidelight for a chess professional: a chess column,

1. As an example of the hectic nature of such touring, in 1885, Zukertort, in France and Germany, from April 24 to June 28, toured thirteen cities and played 260 games, including 58 blindfold games. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 40, July 1885, p. 223.

or, if one could manage it, a chess periodical.¹ He had to find patrons to back him in tournament and match play. If he could do none of those things, he needed independent means to afford the time required of a chess master.

II

Steinitz was world's champion for eight years. Yet, even in that brief period, his claim to the championship was by no means secure. One of the reasons for the uncertainty of his status was that Steinitz was past fifty, and the chess world constantly expected him to retire from active play. When Lasker defeated him, in 1894, there was still some question as to whether his victory over an old man of fifty-eight constituted sufficient claim to the title, and

1. The number of chess columns in dailies and periodicals was already very large in 1886, and was to grow apace in the coming years. In England and America alone, at least sixteen newspapers followed the fortunes of the St. Petersburg Tournament, in 1914. The Grand International Masters' Chess Tournament at St. Petersburg, 1914, Philadelphia: 1914, p. 5. The life of chess periodicals, on the other hand, despite their profusion, was very short. The longest lived were the British Chess Magazine, the American Chess Bulletin, La Stratégie, and the Wiener Schachzeitung, all of which lasted through World War I. Some of the casualties were, in England: Hoffer's Chess Monthly (1879-1896), The City of London Chess Magazine (1874-1876); in America: Steinitz' International Chess Magazine (1885-1891), Lasker's Chess Magazine (1904-1909), The American Chess Magazine (1897-1899), the Brooklyn Chess Chronicle (1882-1887), and the Chess Weekly (1908-1910); in Canada: Checkmate (1901-1904); in Austria the Wiener Schachzeitung (1887-1888); in Germany: the Neue Berliner Schachzeitung (1864-1871); in France: Le Sphinx (1865-1867); and in Italy: the Nuova Rivista degli Scacchi (1875-1903).

Lasker's hold on the championship did not become really secure until after the 1908 match with Tarrasch.¹

In 1887, the Deutscher Schachbund held its meeting at Frankfurt-am-Main, and drew its largest entry, twenty-one competitors. "Captain" Mackenzie, scored his greatest triumph, first place, one and one half points ahead of Blackburne and Weiss, in a field which included such strong veterans as Zukertort, Englisch, Schallopp, and Paulsen, and such strong newcomers as Curt von Bardeleben,² and Siegbert Tarrasch (1862-1934).³

The following year, 1888, another international tournament was held at Bradford, England. The British Chess Association had been revived, in 1884, through the efforts of Leopold Hoffer, and on January 20, 1885, a new constitution was adopted.⁴ Lord Alfred Tennyson was elected President. The vice-Presidents were Lord Randolph

1. When Steinitz tentatively accepted Lasker's challenge, in 1893, the New Orleans Times Democrat announced that this acceptance belied the general impression that Steinitz had retired. May 7, 1893.

2. Von Bardeleben was born in Berlin and was one of the strongest new players in Germany.

3. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 42, Aug. 1887, p. 227. Siegbert Tarrasch was born in Breslau. He went to Berlin in 1880 to study medicine, and became a doctor in 1885. He won the rank of master at the Hauptturnier in Nürnberg, in 1883, and in 1885, he astonished the chess world by tying for second prize in his first international tournament, the Deutscher Schachbund Congress at Hamburg. Shortly thereafter, he married and settled in Nürnberg, which was his home for the remainder of his life.

4. The Chess Monthly, v. 5, Aug. 1884, pp. 353-354. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 5, March 1885, pp. 101-104.

Churchill, Sir Robert Peel, and John Ruskin.¹ The new Association, modelled after the Deutscher Schachbund, was described as "a federation of Chess Clubs, Chess Associations, and individual chess players in the British Empire."² The titled names who lent the prestige of those names to the Association contributed little else, and the failure of some of the leading clubs, notably the City of London Chess Club, to federate with the Association, spelled its ultimate failure. The new B.C.A., however, lasted long enough to sponsor three major events: London, 1886, Bradford, 1888, and Manchester, 1890. The winner at Bradford, in 1888, was the fast rising English master, Isidor Gunsberg.³

Steinitz, who did not return to Europe until 1895, competed neither at Frankfort nor at Bradford. After each event, an attempt was made to endow the winner with the title of champion.⁴ Steinitz bridled at these claims, and even offered to play Mackenzie a match, conceding the odds of two games.⁵ Neither Mackenzie nor Gunsberg pressed the issue,

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 5, March 1885, pp. 101-104.

2. Ibid., p. 102.

3. The Field, v. 72, Aug. 25, 1888, p. 291. Isidor Gunsberg was born in Budapest, Hungary. He came to England in 1879, apparently as Mephisto, the hidden player of the Chess Automaton, and soon moved to the forefront of English chess players. In 1885, he won the first national B.C.A. Congress, and that same year won his first international event, the Deutscher Schachbund Congress at Hamburg.

4. Int. Ch. Mag., v.3, Nov. 1887, p. 332-334. The New York Herald commented on Mackenzie's victory at Frankfort, "thereby winning the proud title of the world's chess champion." Aug. 4, 1887. Before the Bradford event, the Wiener Schachzeitung suggested that the tournament was "um die Meisterschaft der Welt." v. 2, Feb. 1888, p. 185.

5. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 3, Nov. 1887, pp. 332-334.

however, and the furor soon subsided. When Steinitz himself, however, sponsored a world's championship tournament, in which he declined competing, the chess world had legitimate grounds for looking for a new, and more active champion.

The Sixth American Chess Congress, held in New York in 1889, was the brainchild of Steinitz, and proved to be the biggest chess event in this country until Cambridge Springs, in 1904. In 1886, Max Judd and Frank M. Teed, the problem composer, at a dinner given by the Manhattan Chess Club, urged holding an international chess congress in this country, "and the general public took up the idea with great enthusiasm."¹ A first attempt to make it a Manhattan Club venture failed to gain national support, and a new committee was organized, "independent of any chess society."² The guiding genius in this new committee was Steinitz, who devised a novel method of financial support. Money was to be obtained, as was usually the case, by subscription. But this time, a minimum subscription of \$10 would be required to obtain the Book of the Tournament. Further, the games of the tournament would appear nowhere else; once the required number of copies was run off, the plates would be destroyed, insuring the exclusivity of the work. Steinitz himself would edit and annotate the games.³

1. Wilhelm Steinitz, The Book of the Sixth American Chess Congress 1889, New York: 1891, p. ix. Steinitz comments: "the interest in the game grew rapidly after the visits to America of Mr. Steinitz in 1882 and of the late Zukertort in the following year, but more especially in consequence of the great match between the two masters for the Championship of the World, which was fought out on American ground in 1886." Idem.

2. Steinitz, New York 1889, p. x.

3. Ibid., p. xii.

Finally,

It is the purpose of the Committee to make the Tournament a contest for the real championship of the world.¹

This would be done by offering a first prize of \$1,000 minimum, equal to the stakes a player would normally win in a championship match, plus a trophy representing the championship, and subject to challenge to a match of at least seven games up. Such a match would form part of the Congress, and players would have the right to challenge in the order of their final score, beginning with the second prize winner.²

Eventually, a total of \$3,750 was offered in prizes, raised entirely by subscription, and representing a greater prize total than had ever been offered before.³ In addition, there were two special prizes, a \$50 prize for the best game, offered by the Committee, and a brilliancy prize of \$50,⁴ offered by Professor Isaac L. Rice (1850-1915).⁵ These

1. Steinitz, New York 1889, p. xii.

2. Idem.

3. Ibid., p. xv.

4. F. Le Lionnais, who made a study of brilliancy games, comments: "C'est au tournoi de New York 1889 que la distinction a été faite pour la première fois entre le brio et la correction." Le Prix de Beauté aux Echecs, Paris: 1939, p. 19.

5. Isaac Leopold Rice was born in Bavaria. In 1856, his family emigrated to the United States and settled in Milwaukee. In 1880, Rice graduated from Columbia Law School, and for six years, he remained as a teacher and graduate student. In 1886, he became a corporation lawyer, and his profession was marked by immediate and great success. In 1889, he retired from the law, having amassed a considerable fortune, and devoted himself to the study of literature and chess. He eventually returned to the business world in an active capacity, and became a millionaire. From 1889 until his death, in 1915, he was a munificent patron of chess in this country and abroad. D. A. B., v. 15, p. 541.

generous sums attracted a large and distinguished entry, including ten masters from abroad.¹

Among the foreign contestants was Mikhail Tschigorin, the Russian master, who had been steadily forging to the front since 1880. After the Berlin Tournament of 1881, The Chess Monthly commented: "Mr. Tschigorin is generally admitted to be the coming man."² In 1888, Steinitz appraised him thus:

Mr. Tschigorin is universally acknowledged as one of the greatest chess masters of our time and he is regarded by many connoisseurs as the coming champion.³

Before the New York Tournament, Steinitz and Tschigorin met in a series of twenty games, in Havana, Cuba. The match was the result of the chess enthusiasm of Havana, which offered fabulously generous terms to the competitors. For reasons which are difficult to ascertain fully, chess enjoyed a tremendous craze in Cuba after Steinitz' first visit in 1883. Wealthy patrons were willing and anxious to pay high prices for the privilege of entertaining chess celebrities.⁴ Mackenzie,

1. These were: Blackburne, Burn, G. H. D. Gossip, Gunsberg, W. H. K. Pollock (1859-1896), Mason, Jean Taubenhaus (1850-1919), Tschigorin, Weiss, and Bird. Steinitz, New York 1889, p. xxii.

2. The Chess Monthly, v. 3, Oct. 1881, p. 34.

3. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 4, Dec. 1888, p. 356.

4. "The Havana, Cuba, Chess Club, has recently been reorganized under the presidency of the famous Cuban champion, Senor Golmayo. A handsome and commodious club house has been secured, and efforts are being made to inaugurate a very active chess campaign." Int. Ch. Mag., v. 1, May 1885, p. 139. In 1913, the American Chess Bulletin commented: "For many years past Havana has been looked upon as an El Dorado of chess and it is well known that no place in the whole world deserves this title more than the metropolis of Cuba." April 1913, p. 73.

as well as Steinitz, had enjoyed Cuban hospitality, and Steinitz was lavish, as we have already seen, in his praise of chess in Havana.¹ In 1889, the Havana Chess Club paid the travelling expenses of both Tchigorin and Steinitz, from New York to Havana and back, and all their expenses while in Cuba.² Tchigorin and Steinitz had arranged to play for \$600 a side, but Cuban enthusiasts raised the stakes to \$1,150 a side.³ Besides this, the Havana Chess Club inaugurated a new practice, that of paying the players for every game: \$20 to the winner, \$10 to the loser, and \$10 to each in case of a draw.⁴

This is usually referred to today as a championship match.⁵ There is no evidence that either the players or the chess public considered the title to be at stake. Nowhere in the contemporary literature is it called a championship match. It was not really a match in any case, but what was known as a series.⁶ That is, instead of playing until a stipulated number of victories was recorded for one of the contestants, a maximum number of games was played, in this case twenty, and victory went to the player with the best score after

1. Steinitz dedicated the Book of the Sixth American Chess Congress in this fashion: "To Senor Don Celso Golmayo, the chess champion of the Spanish nationalities, in his capacity of President of the Havana Chess Club, which by its generous patronage of the game has chiefly caused the great revival of chess in recent years."

2. New Orleans Times Democrat, Jan. 20, 1889.

3. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 4, March 1889, p. 74.

4. New Orleans Times Democrat, Jan. 20, 1889.

5. Sergeant, Championship Chess, p. 27.

6. "The outcome of the match, or more properly series of games." New Orleans Times Democrat, Jan. 20, 1889.

the stipulated number of games. Such a method was considered too chancy for important matches, since the player who took the lead could then systematically play for draws until the maximum number of games was reached. Steinitz was undoubtedly anxious to prove his superiority, since he told Tchigorin he was willing to play for no stakes,¹ but there would have been little point in playing a championship match just before a tournament which had been carefully billed as a tournament for the championship of the world. On the other hand, Steinitz undoubtedly took some of the interest away from the coming tournament by defeating the Russian 10-6, with 1 draw.²

In the spring of 1889, in New York, the foreign contingent dominated play. Tchigorin and Max Weiss tied for first, and after playing four draws in their tie match, agreed to divide first and second prizes. Meanwhile no one made a move to instigate a championship match, either between the two winners, or between either one and another player. No funds had been provided by the Committee for such a match, and the players were evidently unable to find backers on such short notice. The idea was finally dropped, and neither Tchigorin nor Weiss carried home the championship trophy.³

1. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 4, Dec. 1888, p. 356.

2. Ibid., v. 4, March 1889, p. 74. The full twenty games were not played since Tchigorin would have been unable to tie the score in the remaining three games.

3. Steinitz, New York 1889, pp. xxiii, xxvi. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 5, May 1889, p. 129. June 1889, pp. 161-162.

Late in 1889, the Havana Chess Club again invited Tchigorin to Cuba, this time to play a match with Isidor Gunsberg, who had scored third prize at New York. By this time, the status of the championship was indefinite. Steinitz had defeated Tchigorin the year before, but failed to compete in New York, and presumably had retired. Tchigorin, as a result of tying for first in the New York Congress, appeared to have some claim to the championship.

Whether the outcome [of the Tchigorin-Gunsberg match] will have such an important bearing upon the championship of the world as some people imagine, I know not.¹

The stakes were \$600 a side, and play lasted from January 1, 1890 to February 16, 1890. The match, for ten games up, was drawn 9-9, with 5 draws.² Steinitz now stepped forth to do battle again, and a series of twenty games was arranged at the Manhattan Chess Club between Gunsberg and Steinitz. When no backers came forth with stakes, a novelty was introduced. English amateurs subscribed \$375 as a purse to go to the winner.³ The Manhattan Chess Club also paid Gunsberg \$300 and Steinitz \$150, for expenses. In addition, they adopted the scheme introduced in Havana, and paid for every game: \$20 to the winner, \$10 to the loser, and in case of draws, \$10 to each.⁴ Play began on December 9, 1890, and ended on January 22, 1891. Steinitz scored a close victory 6-4, with 9 draws.⁵

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 9, Nov. 1889, p. 415.

2. New Orleans Times Democrat, Oct. 20, 1889, Feb. 23, 1890.

3. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 6, Sept. 1890, pp. 278-279. Lasker tried to revive this system in the twentieth century.

4. Ibid., Oct. 1890, p. 295.

5. New Orleans Times Democrat, Jan. 23, 25, 1891.

In 1891, Tchigorin and Steinitz met once more in a match, and this time, the championship was definitely at stake. Tchigorin was anxious to bring Steinitz to St. Petersburg,¹ but Steinitz refused to make such a long journey. Havana came to the rescue, and the Cuban capital once more played the role of host.² The match was for ten games up, draws not counting: the stakes \$2,000 a side.³ Play began on December 27, 1891, and after an arduous struggle, on February 28, 1892, Steinitz won 10-8, with 5 draws.⁴

III

While Steinitz was busy in the New World, defending his laurels, a far greater threat to his championship than either Gunsberg or Tchigorin was looming on the horizon, in the shape of two young German masters: Siegbert Tarrasch and Emmanuel Lasker (1868-1941).

After his brilliant debut at Hamburg, in 1885, Tarrasch had been a slight disappointment at Frankfort, in 1887, where he could only tie

1. In December 1891, Tchigorin wrote to Steinitz: "Some of the Russian noblemen and other wealthy amateurs are desirous to organize a Chess entertainment for the benefit of the chess world, in a similar manner to those already given in large cities in Europe, America, and Cuba." Int. Ch. Mag., v. 7, Dec. 1891, p. 359.

2. In April 1891, Adolfo Moliner, a Cuban chess enthusiast, wrote to Steinitz that his Havana friends were ready to back Steinitz up to \$2,000 in a return match with Tchigorin, Ibid., April 1891, p. 111.

3. Ibid., Oct. 1891, p. 297.

4. New Orleans Times Democrat, March 6, 1892.

for fifth and sixth, three points behind Mackenzie.¹ His greatest triumphs, however, were just ahead. In 1889, at Breslau, in the sixth Congress of the Deutscher Schachbund, he became the first German national to take first prize in an Association Congress, and he did it without losing a game.² The next year, 1890, Tarrasch entered the British Chess Association Master Tourney at Manchester. Against another strong international field, he won his second straight tournament, again without losing a game.³ In 1891, tentative negotiations were opened for a match with Steinitz, but Tarrasch, who always placed his medical profession before chess, refused to travel to Havana, while Steinitz refused to leave his haven in the New World.⁴ Then, in 1892, at Dresden, in the seventh Congress of the Deutscher Schachbund, Tarrasch made it three straight tournament victories, losing only one game.⁵ Tarrasch's great string of victories electrified the chess world. The young Lasker commented: "as a tournament player, Dr. Tarrasch has perhaps no superior."⁶ Samuel Tinsley expressed the

1. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 42, Aug. 1887, p. 227.

2. H. von Gottschall, J. Metger, und H. Seger, Der Sechste Kongress des Deutschen Schachbundes, Breslau 1889, Leipzig: 1890, p. 16. The other winners had been Englisch, Blackburne, Winawer, Gunsberg, and Mackenzie.

3. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 10, Oct. 1890, pp. 402-403.

4. "Mit Steinitz spielen wird nun freilich Tarrasch voraussichtlich nichtsein ärztlichen Beruf lässt ihm keine Zeit für transatlantische Abenteuer." Albert Heyde, Der Schachwettkampf zwischen S. Tarrasch und M. Tschigorin Ende 1893, Berlin: 1893, p. 5.

5. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 47, Aug. 1892, p. 251. At Leipzig, in 1894, at the eighth Congress of the German Chess Association, Tarrasch won his fourth straight tournament. *Ibid.*, v. 49, Sept. 1894, p. 282. By that time, however, his match with Tchigorin, and the first Lasker-Steinitz match had intervened, and the victory did not receive the same amount of attention as had the first three.

6. London Chess Fortnightly, v. 1, Aug. 15, 1892, p. 5.

view that his claim to chess supremacy was now greater than that of Steinitz.¹

Although Tarrasch would not go to Havana, in 1893, he was persuaded to make the shorter journey from Nürnberg to St. Petersburg to meet Tchigorin in a match.

Seit dem grossen Wettkampfe zwischen Steinitz und Zukertort im Jahre 1886 hat kein Schachkampf in solcher weise das Interesse der Schachwelt erregt, wie der Wettkampf zwischen dem anerkannt stärksten deutschen Schachspieler Dr. S. Tarrasch und dem russischen Vorkämpfer M. Tschigorin.²

Leopold Hoffer commented:

It is no exaggeration to say that the match between Dr. Tarrasch and M. Tchigorin has created no less an interest in the chess world than the memorable match between Steinitz and Zukertort.³

Certainly Tarrasch and Tchigorin, in contrast to Steinitz, were the men of the future. Tchigorin had lost his last match to Steinitz by only two games, and had tied for first in the great New York Tournament of 1889. Tarrasch was the hero of the day, unprecedented winner of three straight major international tournaments. On October 8, in St. Petersburg, play opened in a match of ten games up, draws not counting, for stakes of \$1,250 a side. Tarrasch lost his chance to consolidate his position by allowing Tchigorin to tie the match 9-9, with 3 draws.⁴

1. Samuel Tinsley, "The Dresden Tournament", in Br. Ch. Mag., v. 12, Sept., 1892, p. 383.

2. Heyde, Tarrasch-Tchigorin 1893, p. 3.

3. The Chess Monthly, v. 15, Dec. 1893, p. 99.

4. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 48, Nov. 1893, p. 349.

The other newcomer was Emmanuel Lasker, whose entire career is a fascinating object of study. Lasker was born at Berlinchen, a suburb of Berlin, on December 24, 1868, of a Jewish family. His older brother, Berthold, was given a medical education, and became a doctor, but there was fear that money would not be sufficient in the Lasker family to give Emmanuel a college education. However, his distaste for the commercial career mapped out for him was such that his parents managed to put him through the university in Berlin, where he graduated in 1888.¹ Lasker was no child prodigy, and in fact was overshadowed by his brother Berthold, also a fine player, in the early part of his career.² Emmanuel emerged suddenly on the European chess scene in 1889. At the same Breslau Congress where Tarrasch was beginning his famous series of tournament victories, Lasker won the Hauptturnier and became a master.³ That same year, in his first international master tournament, at Amsterdam, he took second, one point behind the English master Burn.⁴ His play, which included a brilliant win against the Austrian master, J. H. Bauer (1861-1891), which is an anthology favorite, made a strong impression.⁵

1. New York Times, Jan. 12, 1941.

2. In 1890, the German chess masters formed an association of their own, in Berlin. Berthold, not Emmanuel, was elected on the committee. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 45, April 1890, p. 125.

3. Gottschall, Metger, & Seger, Breslau 1889, p. 26.

4. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 44, Oct. 1889, p. 311.

5. "Lasker is only twenty one years old, and like most young players there is much dash and brilliancy in his play, though unlike most young players there is also soundness. We heard....that Lasker is or promises to be the finest player in Europe." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 9, Oct. 1889, p. 389. Of course, this was written before Tarrasch had monopolized the limelight.

After this promising beginning, Lasker failed to emulate the sensational successes of Tarrasch. In fact, he eschewed tournaments to concentrate on match play; and in that field, he compiled an impressive, if limited, record in the next three years. In December 1889, he met Bardeleben at Berlin, in a match of four games up, for \$25 a side. Bardeleben resigned the match while trailing 2-1, with 1 draw.¹ In January 1890, he met the brilliant Jacques Mieses at Leipzig, in a match for \$112.50 a side, and routed him 5-0, with 3 draws.² Later that year, he journeyed to England and scored two more victories. In Liverpool, he turned back the veteran Bird, 7-2, with 3 draws;³ while in Manchester, he scored over the brilliant youngster, N. T. Miniati, 3-0, with 2 draws.⁴ In the fall of 1890, he was in Vienna, where from September 14 to September 18, he won a short match from Englisch, 2-0 with 3 draws.⁵

Lasker then returned to England, and in the summer of 1891, was hired to play exhibitions during the German exposition in London. His play was not particularly outstanding. Playing simultaneously against four strong metropolitan players, he won one and lost three.⁶ Certainly not the performance of a future world's champion.

1. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 44, Dec. 1889, p. 370.

2. Ibid., v. 45, Jan. 1890, p. 28.

3. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 10, March 1890, p. 84.

4. Ibid., April 1890, p. 131.

5. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 45, Oct. 1890, p. 311. There were no stakes in this match. The Vienna Chess Club paid the masters \$3.50 for each win, \$2.50 for each draw, and \$1.50 for each loss.

6. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 11, Sept. 1891, p. 401. It is another curious fact concerning Lasker that he never excelled in simultaneous and blindfold play. Many men who would have had little chance against him in match play compiled much more impressive records in simultaneous displays. As for blindfold play, Lasker gave that up altogether, ostensibly under doctor's orders. "[Lasker] admits that blindfold play is too much for him, and acting under medical advice, he has given up all attempts at it." New Orleans Times Democrat, May 21, 1899.

Lasker now settled definitely in England, and in September 1891, he added one more match victory to his list, scoring 1-0, with 1 draw over F. J. Lee, who resigned the match because of ill health.¹ 1892 proved to be a very successful year. In March, Lasker took first prize in the British Chess Association National Congress.² This was followed by a Quintangular Tourney, held in London, between Lasker, Blackburne, Mason, Gunsberg, and Bird.³ Lasker scored first prize in the double round event without losing a game.⁴ A match was immediately arranged with the veteran English champion, Blackburne, for \$250 a side.⁵ Lasker blanked the English master 6-0, with 4 draws.⁶ Blackburne had not suffered such a defeat since the days of Zukertort and Steinitz. Lasker confirmed his superiority over the English masters with a second match victory over Bird, at Newcastle, 5-0.⁷

Lasker now turned to the victor of Dresden, and challenged him to a match. In 1890, Tarrasch had accepted a challenge from Lasker,⁸

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 11, Sept. 1891, p. 402. "Though never regarded as in the foremost rank of chess masters, Mr. F. J. Lee achieved some distinction in the chess world." Ibid., v. 29, Oct. 1909, p. 447.

2. Ibid., v. 12, April 1892, p. 137. It is evident that Lasker was slowly making an impression, for we find the following comment on his victory: "There is a great chess career before Herr Lasker, should he be minded to devote himself to the game." Ibid., pp. 137-138.

3. Ibid., v. 12, May 1892, p. 201.

4. Ibid., p. 208. \$250 were divided according to the Sonneborn-Berger system of scoring, and Lasker's share for first prize was \$105.42. Idem.

5. Ibid., v. 12, June 1892, p. 272.

6. Ibid., July 1892, p. 293.

7. London Chess Fortnightly, Sept. 15, 1892, p. 23. The Newcastle club provided a purse of \$500, and paid all the expenses of the two masters. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 12, Sept. 1892, p. 389.

8. "Herr Dr. Tarrasch hat die an ihn von Herrn E. Lasker ergangene Herausforderung zu einem Match um einen Einsatz von je 1000 M \$250 angenommen." Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 45, June 1890, p. 188.

but the match had fallen through. Since then, the German doctor's star had risen considerably. He answered Lasker that he would play him a match whenever the latter took first prize in a major international tournament.¹ In other words, he was not overwhelmed by Lasker's reputation. Perhaps sensing that his opportunity lay with Steinitz, in America, rather than with Tarrasch, in Germany, Lasker did not press the point. Shortly after the second Bird match, he sailed for New York.

Lasker scored two victories worth noting on this first United States trip. In the early spring of 1893, he defeated the strong Kentucky master and aspirant to the United States championship, Jackson Showalter, in a match, 6-2, with 1 draw.² In the summer of 1893, an international chess congress was planned for New York, the Columbian Chess Congress, to be held in conjunction with the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. In September, the financial depression brought subscriptions to a halt, and the Congress was indefinitely postponed.³ A few foreign masters had already reached New York in anticipation of the event, however, and the Brooklyn and Manhattan Chess Clubs decided to take advantage of their presence to hold an impromptu Congress with whatever funds were available.⁴ Play opened on September 30, with a fairly strong entry,

1. Deutsches Wochensach, v. 9, Dec. 17, 1893, p. 455.

2. New Orleans Times Democrat, April 23, 30, 1893. This match has since sunk into oblivion. It is never included in Lasker's match record, and games from it have never appeared in any collection.

3. Ibid., Sept. 17, 1893.

4. Ibid., Sept. 24, 1893.

including Adolf Albin (1848-1920), G. H. D. Gossip, F. J. Lee, Eugene Delmar (1841-1909), Harry Nelson Pillsbury (1872-1906), Showalter,¹ and Jean Taubenhaus.¹ Lasker scored an unexpected sweep, winning all thirteen of his games.²

In 1894, Lasker could not have been considered an outstanding challenger. He had participated in no international tournaments since Amsterdam, 1889, with the exception of a minor event at Graz.³ His biggest triumph had been the Quintangular Tournament of 1892, where he had conclusively shown his superiority over the English masters, who included such redoubtable performers as Blackburne, Bird, Mason, and Gunsberg. But he had never crossed swords with either Tarrasch or Tshigorin. His record was impressive in one way: he had never lost a match; but the matches he had played had been very small and of short duration, and Blackburne was his most noteworthy victim.

The biggest thing in Lasker's favor was his availability. He was in America, and he had financial backers. In September 1893, Lasker had

1. Adolf Albin was born in Rumania, but had long since migrated to Paris. He was a player of moderate strength. G. H. D. Gossip was of English birth, but spent the greater part of his life in Australia, where he acquired some reputation as an author on the game. Reichhelm calls him "the well known author and writer on the game." Chess in Philadelphia, p. 19. Eugene Delmar was born in this country, and was a strong New York player. Jean Taubenhaus, although Polish by birth, had migrated to France, and was a strong Parisian player. Pillsbury will reappear later in our pages.

2. New Orleans Times Democrat, Oct. 22, 1893.

3. Lasker had taken third behind J. Makovetz, of Hungary, and J. H. Bauer. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 45, Oct. 1890, p. 313.

issued a formal challenge to the champion.¹ After much delay, Steinitz finally concluded an agreement on March 3, 1894, at the Manhattan Chess Club, for a world's championship match: ten games up, draws not counting, stakes of \$2,000 a side.² As in the Zukertort match, play was parcelled out to three clubs, the Manhattan Chess Club, the Franklin Chess Club, and the Montreal Chess Club. Play began in New York on March 15, and concluded in Montreal on May 26. Lasker ended Steinitz' record of having never lost an even match. He scored 10-5, with 4 draws, and became the new champion of the world.³

1. New Orleans Times Democrat, Sept. 10, 1893.

2. J. G. Cunningham, The games in the Steinitz-Lasker championship match, Leeds: 1894, p. 9.

3. New Orleans Times Democrat, May 27, 1894. Cunningham, Steinitz-Lasker, pp. 9-10.

CHAPTER VII

I

When Lasker defeated Steinitz, in 1894, he received the usual one fourth of the total stakes, which amounted to \$1,000. In addition, Lasker later estimated, the expense money for the two players, plus their portion of the gate receipts, added up to \$600 apiece. Lasker, therefore, had received \$1,600 for his share in the match, Steinitz \$600.¹ This compensation, Lasker felt, for a match which lasted over two months, was much too small. Besides the actual play, as Lasker pointed out elsewhere, there was the preparation for the match, which consisted largely of a physical training program aimed at putting the chess player in perfect health. After the match, there was a necessary period of recuperation before the player could resume a gainful occupation.²

-
1. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 1, Jan. 1905, p. 122.
 2. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 23, Oct. 1903, p. 425.

One need hardly point out that a championship match was not available every year, and that the chess player had to seek support elsewhere in the interim.

Lasker's career during the twenty years from 1894, when he wrested the title from Steinitz, until 1914, when the First World War put a temporary quietus on the bickering over the world's championship, can be understood as part of an attempt to place the professional chess player in general, and the world's champion in particular, on a firmer financial basis than he had hitherto occupied; and Lasker made possession of the title the means by which he sought to assure, at least for himself, financial security.

The plight of the chess professional had not improved in the eight years between 1886 and 1894. Samuel Tinsley (1847-1903),¹ an English professional, complained in 1892 that in answer to his request for backing from friends and patrons of the game to attend the Dresden Tournament in Germany, he had received "no support whatever, or none worth mentioning".² In other words, as competition increased, it was becoming more and more difficult for any but the very most talented masters to obtain necessary support to stay in the profession. P. Anderson Graham, comparing English chess in 1899 and in 1862, commented: "The pursuit of chess is not sufficiently lucrative to attract talented English lads."³ In chess, therefore, we

1. Samuel Tinsley was a master of only moderate strength, and never achieved any particularly brilliant success.

2. "I fondly imagined I had only to quietly mention the matter among a few friends and clubs, to ensure hearty support." Letter to the Br. Ch. Mag., v. 12, Aug. 1892, p. 350.

3. P. Anderson Graham, Mr. Blackburne's Games at Chess, London: 1899, p. 5.

begin to find exhibited that widening gulf between the elite few, for whom the game is a specialty, and the great mass of amateurs and dilettantes, which has marked every major sport and game in our time.

In 1894, it was not just the second rate master who suffered. Soon after the match, Steinitz found himself in straitened financial circumstances, and was forced to return to Europe for the first time in twelve years, in 1895, in an attempt to win some prize money. In 1897, after the second match with Lasker, Steinitz found himself in such financial difficulties that Lasker proposed a fund be raised for the veteran, and himself contributed \$52.50.¹ Such a fund was raised at a grand testimonial dinner and concert in New York, in October 16, 1897.² Yet, shortly before Steinitz died in 1900, he was in "very distressed pecuniary circumstances",³ and the Manhattan Chess Club subscribed \$300 towards his relief.⁴ Four years later, the English master James Mason found himself in similar circumstances when ill health overtook him. An attempt was made to raise a fund on his behalf, but he died in poverty on January 17, 1905.⁵

Lasker, in attempting to place the status of the chess professional on a more secure basis, concentrated, quite naturally, on his own position

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 17, March 1897, p. 101.

2. Am. Ch. Mag., v. 1, Oct. 1897, p. 265.

3. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 20, May 1900, p. 187.

4. Brooklyn Daily Eagle, Feb. 15, 1900. For a while, Steinitz was detained in the insane ward of Harlem Hospital, in New York. "It is more than likely that extreme poverty was largely responsible for the present condition of the famous expert." Ibid., Feb. 8, 1900.

5. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 24, Jan. 1904, p. 16; v. 25, Feb. 1905, p. 25.

as world's champion. In the twenty years between 1894 and 1914, Lasker largely succeeded in his effort to achieve economic independence, but he did this only by asserting an enormous superiority over all his competitors. It was Lasker, rather than Steinitz, who crystallized the concept of a world's champion. In doing so, however, in making the title his own proprietary right, he widened the gap between the master and the amateur, and failed in the very thing he had aimed for, a chess professional whose status was not so intimately linked to his failures and successes over-the-board.

II

Lasker had won the championship of the world. That concept was still a vague one in 1894, and Lasker set out to consolidate his claim beyond the shadow of a doubt. In 1894, his victory over Steinitz was considered more the result of infirmity, old age, and diminishing powers on the part of Steinitz, than the result of Lasker's own skill.¹

1. Leopold Hoffer grudgingly granted Lasker's victory. "But he has not risen in our estimation as a player." His opening repertoire was too limited; Steinitz was never outplayed positionally, but lost through blunders, due undoubtedly to old age. The Chess Monthly, v. 15, July 1894, p. 324. Before the match, Max Judd conceded Lasker little chance and predicted a victory for Steinitz. New Orleans Times Democrat, May 28, 1893.

It was with some interest, therefore, that the chess world prepared to witness what amounted almost to Lasker's debut on the international tournament scene at Hastings, in 1895.

Hastings was probably the greatest tournament ever held in England, and one of the most memorable tournaments every held anywhere. It was a triumph for British provincial chess, and something of a revenge for the tyranny of London:

The tournament was largely a simple outgrowth of the constant activity of the flourishing Hastings and St. Leonard's Chess Club.¹

As in 1851, 1862, and 1883, funds were raised by subscription, and once more, the British public gave its support enthusiastically. The four big London clubs, the St. George, the British,² the Metropolitan, and the City of London, lent the weight of their influence, and helped to secure contributions.³ Seven prizes were offered, totalling \$2,500.⁴ This sum had been surpassed in 1883, but the tendency by 1895 was to spread the prize money as broadly as possible, to make the tournament remunerative for all the competitors. In addition to the seven prizes, therefore, the tournament committee introduced a system which had been used in match play since the Steinitz-Tchigorin match of 1889, and which became a regular feature of most tournaments: a fixed price was paid for every won game, \$5, and \$10 if it was scored against one

-
1. Horace Cheshire, The Hastings Chess Tournament 1895, London: 1896, p. 5.
 2. The British Chess Club was founded on December 1, 1885. It was closely linked to the British Chess Association. Sergeant, Century, p. 198.
 3. Cheshire, Hastings 1895, p. xi.
 4. Ibid., p. 6.

of the top three finishers.¹ Further, there were a number of special prizes, brilliancy prizes, etc.²

The field was broadly representative: twenty-two of the foremost players in the world, including Lasker, Tarrasch, Tchigorin, Schiffers, Steinitz, Gunsberg, Blackburne, and Mason, and it was hoped that the tournament might present a clue as to the comparative ranking of these masters, and shed some light on the question of the world's championship.³ Unfortunately, chance intervened. Shortly after the conclusion of the Steinitz match, Lasker had been stricken with pneumonia. For a while, friends despaired of his life, but his own brother nursed him back to health.⁴ By the time the tournament opened, he felt sufficiently recovered to play, but he was clearly not in the best of health for the arduous struggle ahead.⁵ Playing uneven chess, he scored a creditable fifteen and one half points out of a possible twenty-one, to top Tarrasch, "der Moltke des Schachspiels",⁶ who had fourteen, and Steinitz, with thirteen. Tchigorin, playing the best chess of his career,

1. The purpose behind this was two-fold: by distributing prizes among all the players, one could be assured of a better entry, and the chances of withdrawal before the event was completed were lessened; another reason was that to offer cash inducement for a won game, one might reduce the number of drawn games. This was not realized in practice.

2. "On peut considérer la coutume des Prix de Beauté comme bien enracinée à partir du tournoi d'Hastings 1895." Le Lionnais, Le Prix de Beauté, p. 14.

3. Cheshire, Hastings 1895, p. xii.

4. James Mason & W. H. K. Pollock, The games in the St. Petersburg tournament, 1895-96, Leeds: 1896, p. iv. Cheshire, Hastings 1895, p. 347.

5. "Lasker, though scarcely yet robust, would probably be sufficiently recovered from his exhausting illness." Cheshire, Hastings 1895, p. 4.

6. Gottschall, Metger, & Seger, Breslau 1889, p. 19.

was ahead of Lasker, with sixteen points, but even he yielded first prize to a young newcomer who made the most sensational debut since Paul Morphy, Harry Nelson Pillsbury, who scored sixteen and one half points to take first prize in his first international tournament.¹ The results had been extremely close, three and one half points separating first and fifth places, and seemed to emphasize the fact that no one player dominated the field.

In order to settle the question of superiority, and of the world's championship, it was hoped to stage a tournament among the first five prize winners at Hastings. The wealthy chess patrons in St. Petersburg, who had been trying since the entry of Tchigorin into the international arena, to stage a major event in Russia, were finally successful in bidding for the projected tourney. The St. Petersburg Chess Club, under the initiative of Peter Sabouroff, offered to pay the travelling expenses of all the masters, coming and going, and all their expenses in St. Petersburg.² Four of the five accepted the invitation. Dr. Tarrasch, who had just taken leave from his profession to compete at Hastings, and could not consider such another long absence from Germany,

1. Cheshire, Hastings, 1895, p. 342. Harry Nelson Pillsbury was born on December 5, 1872, at Somerville, Massachusetts. He was educated for a commercial career, but gave evidence of great skill at chess. In a simultaneous exhibition put on by Steinitz in Boston, in 1891, Pillsbury scored an impressive win in his game, and then defeated the champion 2-1, in a match in which Steinitz conceded the odds of Pawn and move. Pillsbury made his professional debut at the Franklin Chess Club, in 1893, and was soon a popular performer, particularly because of his tremendous skill at blindfold play. After moving to New York, he became champion of the Brooklyn Chess Club, the strongest club in the United States at that time. It was the Brooklyn Club which financed his trip to Hastings, in 1895.

2. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 50, Dec. 1895, p. 383. The prize list was also generous: first prize, \$250, second, \$150, third, \$100, fourth, \$50. In addition, the masters received compensation for every game played: \$20 for a win, \$10 for a draw, and \$5 for a loss. Idem.

declined. Pillsbury, Tchigorin, Lasker, and Steinitz, began play on December 13, 1895. This tournament represents one more attempt to combine match and tournament play. Each contestant played every other a series of six games.¹ Lasker revealed for the first time, to the chess public, the full power of his talents, taking first prize. Even so, the results were close: Lasker, eleven and one half points, Steinitz, nine and one half, Pillsbury, eight, and Tchigorin, seven, out of a possible eighteen, and Lasker had lost his series to Pillsbury, $3\frac{1}{2}-2\frac{1}{2}$.²

In 1896, the Nürnberg Chess Club, of which Tarrasch was president, sponsored another big international tournament, which brought together once more Lasker, Pillsbury, Tchigorin, Tarrasch, and Steinitz, plus fourteen other very strong entries. This time, Lasker took a decisive first, one point ahead of the young Hungarian newcomer, Geza Maroczy.³ Then, in the winter of 1896-97, Lasker dispelled any doubts as to his superiority over Steinitz by routing the old man in a return match held

1. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 50, Dec. 1895, p. 383. It was also the first attempt to stage a championship tournament by limiting the entry. The Congress which Steinitz had organized in New York, in 1889, had comprised a large and heterogeneous field, including several second rate American players.

2. Ibid., v. 51, Feb. 1896, p. 59.

3. Ibid., Aug. 1896, p. 254. The Br. Ch. Mag. commented, Lasker "vindicated for himself afresh the title to be called the champion of the world." v. 16, Sept. 1896, p. 356. Maroczy had made his debut at Hastings, in 1895, winning the minor tournament.

in Moscow, 10-2, with 5 draws.¹ For this match, Lasker made the financial arrangements himself. Dispensing with stakes provided by backers, Lasker persuaded the Moscow Chess Club to provide a purse for both winner and loser.² This had been done in the Gunsberg-Steinitz match, in 1890, with just a purse for the winner. At the time, however, it had been an impromptu decision dictated by lack of funds. In this case Lasker's decision was deliberate. In his long career, Lasker tried with varying success to introduce this method of financing matches, in order to dispense with the necessity of backers.³

Lasker did not play again until 1899, and then he scored two brilliant victories which confirmed his position as champion. At

1. Deut. Schachz., v. 52, Jan. 1897, p. 29.

2. The winner's purse was \$1,000, the loser's purse \$500, so that Lasker did not break the practice he established of never playing for less than \$1,000. In addition, the Moscow Club paid all the expenses of the two masters. Steinitz also persuaded Lasker to play for a stake of \$250 a side, which the two masters provided themselves. This loss, which reduced Steinitz' share of the purse to \$250 probably precipitated the financial crisis Steinitz found himself in, in the winter of 1897. He suffered a breakdown, and was temporarily confined in the Morosoff Clinical Hospital, in Moscow. Ibid., v. 51, Nov. 1896, pp. 349-350; v. 52, Feb. 1897, p. 60; April 1897, pp. 122-124.

3. In 1903, Lasker commented: "I consider it a hardship that chess champions should be obliged to find their own stakes." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 23, Aug. 1903, p. 342. In 1904, he added, "I cannot see.... why the loser of a championship match should be treated worse than a second prize winner of an international tournament." (When the stakes were supplied by backers, the winner usually took everything). Hereford Times, reprinted in Br. Ch. Mag., v. 24, Jan 1904, pp. 23-24. Walter Penn Shipley (1860-1942), one of the foremost authorities on chess in this country, concurred in Lasker's view. He explained that chess players did not like to back themselves, and that for backers, the returns, at the odds of one to two, were too small to insure certainty of support. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 4, July 1906, p. 130.

London, in 1899, in a strong double round tournament, he finished first, four and one half points ahead of Pillsbury, Maroczy, and Janowski,¹ who tied for second.² At Paris, in 1900, in a single round event, he again took first prize, two points ahead of Pillsbury.³

III

Lasker's career does not match Morphy's in drama, but it is fully as fascinating. It is a unique career for a chess master, and in fact is not representative at all of master chess in the early twentieth century. Yet, Lasker's influence was such, and he was so completely the dominant figure in the world of chess from 1900 to 1914, that it would be impossible to by-pass him.

By 1900, Lasker had given ample proof of his right to the world's championship, and, outside of Germany where Tarrasch still enlisted a considerable following, the chess world was willing to acknowledge Lasker as world's champion.⁴ Yet, his superiority was a difficult

1. David Janowski was born in Russian Poland, but moved to Paris in the early 1890's. By the turn of the century, he was one of the strongest masters in the world.

2. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 19, Aug. 1899, p. 327.

3. La Stratégie, v. 32, June 1900, p. 178.

4. After London, 1899, the Br. Ch. Mag. commented: "His play throughout this tournament, together with his past performances, demonstrates beyond argument that in Herr Lasker we have possibly the greatest chess player who has even lived." v. 19, Aug. 1899. La Stratégie added, "M. E. Lasker remporte une victoire éclatante qui établit une supériorité incontestable sur les autres concurrents." v. 32, July 1899, p. 215.

thing to appraise. His was not a riotous success, like that of Paul Morphy, with wild acclaim over the beauty of his games. His very personality militated against the kind of hero worship which Morphy inspired.¹ As for his playing style, Hoffer, in 1894, had not been impressed, and in the intervening six years, there had been no increase in the brilliancy of Lasker's play. Yet he had defeated Steinitz twice;² while recovering from pneumonia, he had been held to third prize at Hastings, but he had followed this with four straight tournament victories against the strongest players in the world. If Lasker did not play the brilliant chess of the romantic school, neither did he overwhelm his opponents with the bizarre Steinitzian style. In fact, the very fluidity of his style, a fact which modern annotators have particularly stressed, was possibly even more impressive to the critic than either brilliancy or technique would have been. It smacked of black magic and dark powers.

Lasker's entire concept of the game was in direct opposition to the tenor of the day, and to the growing trend of specialism. His career might even be considered as an attempt to stem the growth of specialism in chess. Analysis, "book" knowledge, theory, these were

1. "Like his great rival [Steinitz], he takes chess and life generally in a very serious way, and there seems to be but little fun in either of their natures." Cheshire, Hastings 1895, p. 347.

2. Steinitz, it might be pointed out, did astonishingly well in tournament play after his return to Europe. At Hastings he was fifth and at St. Petersburg second. Further, at Vienna, in 1898, in one of the strongest tournaments ever held, with an entry of nineteen and two rounds of play, the old man of fifty-eight scored fourth prize. Only at London, in 1899, the year before his death, did he fail to secure a prize.

the gods chess players worshipped, partly the legacy of the modern school, partly an inevitable and inescapable refinement of the game. Lasker always tried to avoid this approach, and sought to find general principles that would be eternally applicable to the game, while the fashion in openings, in book theory, in the soundness of various analyses, would vary from year to year.¹ He went further, in fact. He sought to find principles that would apply to any struggle, and wrote a philosophical treatise on the subject, Der Kampf.² While such masters as Tarrasch approached chess "scientifically", and propounded such technical principles as the combined power of the two bishops is greater than the sum of their individual powers, Lasker looked for all the factors, psychological, physical, technical, that might enable one person to triumph over another in a contest.³

1. His namesake, Edward Lasker, summed up his point of view thus: "Lasker was not very familiar with chess literature....He did not think it was worth spending time on reading chess books, because he felt that a thorough understanding of the general principles was the best guide in the struggle over the board." Edward Lasker, Chess Secrets, p. 29. He also describes Lasker's preparations for his match with Tarrasch, which consisted not in play or analysis, but in retiring to an apartment in Gr nwald, near Berlin, "to relax and get into good physical condition." Ibid., p. 37.

2. Emmanuel Lasker, Der Kampf, New York: 1907.

3. Much has been made of this fact by modern annotators, who speak of Lasker playing the man rather than the board. There is no doubt that Lasker often sought to complicate a position, and felt apparently that correct play was not as productive of results as creating difficult tactical problems, which might cause his opponent to lose his grasp of the position. This was done in a general way, however, and it is doubtful whether we can say that Lasker refined his technique to such an extent that he concocted a different set of problems to fit every personality he encountered over-the-board. This would imply not only diabolical skill on his part, but an implausibly restricted range of play on the part of the masters.

After Paris, 1900, Lasker felt that he had accomplished his purpose. His position was such that he could impose on the chess world his own concept of the role of a world's champion. In the fourteen year period from the close of the Paris Tournament, in 1900, to the opening of the St. Petersburg Tournament, in 1914, while chess masters scrambled to enter as many events as possible,¹ Lasker participated in only two tournaments, Cambridge Springs, in 1904, and St. Petersburg, in 1909. He was not unduly active as a match player, either, engaging in six set encounters, of which only four were championship matches, all packed in a three year period from 1907 to 1910. Nor was he on a par with such men as Marshall or Capablanca, in simultaneous exhibitions, for which he apparently did not care very much.² Instead, he devised a new feature for the exhibition schedule of the chess master, lectures. He began in London, on March 4, 1895, with a series which he copyrighted, and which has come down to us in book form as Common Sense in Chess.³ The lectures were well received, and such lectures became a chief

1. Akiba Rubinstein, the Polish master, entered five tournaments in 1912.

2. The lure of his name was great, however, and when he visited Germany, in 1908, to arrange his match with Tarrasch, "the demand for Dr. Lasker's services as lecturer and simultaneous player is extraordinary." Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 7, Feb. 1908, p. 156.

3. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 15, April 1895, p. 169. Emmanuel Lasker, Common Sense in Chess, Philadelphia: 1917.

ingredient in Lasker's exhibition tours. In early 1900, he obtained a Ph. D. in mathematics at the University of Erlangen, and provided himself with one more means of support: teaching.¹ He also studied philosophy, and besides Der Kampf, in 1907, wrote a much more ambitious work in 1913, Das Begreifen der Welt.²

In the early years of the twentieth century, Lasker followed in the footsteps of Steinitz, and settled in America. On the strength of his fame, he had little trouble obtaining a newspaper chess column, in the New York Evening Post.³ Further, from 1904 to 1909, he edited his own periodical Dr. Lasker's Chess Magazine. However, despite a professed desire to make this a more lively publication than other chess periodicals,⁴ the magazine suffered from a pontifical tone on the part of Lasker, and a chronic inability to appear at regular times.⁵ In short, although Lasker was willing to make use of chess as a means of

1. As early as 1893, he had been engaged as a mathematics lecturer at Tulane University, in New Orleans. New Orleans Times Democrat, March 15, 1893. In 1902, he taught mathematics at St. Owen's College, in Manchester. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 22, Jan. 1902, p. 21. In 1903, he taught mathematics in St. Louis, at Missouri State University. St. Louis Globe Democrat, Feb. 22, 1903; New York Clipper, March 21, 1903. All of these teaching posts derived from his reputation as a chess player.

2. Emmanuel Lasker, Das Begreifen der Welt, Berlin: 1913. Lasker was a personal friend of the German philosopher, Ernst Cassirer. Edward Lasker, The Adventure of Chess, New York: 1950, p. 88.

3. The paper traded solely on the attraction of his name. The news, except when it pertained to Lasker's own affairs, was almost non-existent, and the games, as well as the notes, were often taken from other publications.

4. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 1, Nov. 1904, p. 28.

5. In all fairness to Lasker, it should be pointed out that he discussed all the issues of the day in his magazine, and never stooped to the personal abuse which marred the publications of so many chess masters.

support, if in no other way than through the publicity the championship brought his name, he was determined to avoid becoming a slave to the endless round of exhibitions, tournaments, and matches.

Pertaining to his title, Lasker resolved that he would not rush into battle without adequate remuneration, and the main reason for his failure to defend the title from 1897 to 1907 was the difficulty his challengers had meeting his financial terms. Lasker was not enthusiastic about the system of stakes provided by backers. But unless a working substitute could be devised, such as was arranged in his second match with Steinitz, he insisted on large stakes, placing the minimum at \$2,000 a side.¹ When he insisted on these stakes in answer to Marshall's first challenge in 1903, the American press reacted unfavorably.²

The magazine Checkmate commented:

His [Lasker's] insistence upon the extreme limit has materially injured his prestige on this side of the Atlantic, and some of our contemporaries are plainly outspoken in their deprecation of his course.³

By this time, however, Lasker could depend on his prestige, and Marshall found in 1903, as Capablanca did in 1912, that Lasker could dictate his own terms.

1. Since the player received one fourth of the total stakes, this meant, in effect, that he insisted on a minimum of \$1,000 as his own personal share.

2. New Orleans Times Democrat, Aug. 30, 1903; Pittsburgh Dispatch, Aug. 24, 31, 1903; New York Clipper, Aug. 22, 1903.

3. Checkmate, Sept. 1903, v. 2, p. 278.

CHAPTER VIII

I

The great era of international chess, before World War I, coincided with the great era of internationalism. By 1900, the cosmopolitanism we have noted earlier¹ was in full flower. Innumerable international organizations for the promotion of science, the arts, and commerce, were in existence.² Chess profited to some extent from this lowering of national barriers, and continued to do so in the period from 1919 to 1929. Although means of transportation today are better than ever, much international travel is rendered difficult by political considerations. In 1950, for instance, as we shall see, the American master, Reshevsky, was prevented from competing in an important tournament in Budapest because of travel restrictions imposed by the U. S. State Department.³ No such barriers existed for the chess master at the turn of the century.

-
1. Cf. p. 5.
 2. Cf. p. 6.
 3. Cf. p. 282.

Probably the most important phenomenon in master chess after 1894 was the tremendous increase in the number of tournaments. This increase had received its initial impulse from the Deutscher Schachbund, which, from 1879 on, staged a major tourney every two years.¹ Between 1851 and 1878, over a period of twenty-seven years, there had been six major international tournaments,² plus a few lesser events. After 1879, masters could compete at least every two years, and with the interpolation of other events outside Germany, could actually compete every year. After 1900, the pace quickened considerably, so much so that the Congresses of the German Chess Association, the backbone of master chess for so long, were often relegated to the role of second rank tournaments. As many as four international tournaments were staged in one year. In addition to these, the national tournaments of Russia, Austria, and Hungary, boasted of such strong fields, that they were often considered major events. Finally there was a host of minor events, including the national tournaments of Italy, France, England, and the United States.

This tremendous proliferation of tournaments depended mostly on individual patronage. When Kolisch died, in 1889, he left a large sum

1. The 1891 tournament was scheduled for Cologne, but difficulties arose at the last minute, and that city was unable to be host. The Association did not have sufficient time to reschedule the event, which was postponed until 1892, and held in Dresden. From 1892 on, therefore, the German Chess Association Congresses occur on even numbered years, before 1891, they occurred on odd numbered years.

2. London, 1851; London, 1862; Paris, 1867; Baden-Baden, 1870; Vienna, 1873; and Paris, 1878.

of money to be used for the periodical staging of national tourneys in Austria, in his honor.¹ Leopold Trebitsch, wealthy silk manufacturer, not only liberally endowed a number of tournaments during his lifetime, but he also left a large sum for tournaments after his death.² Baron Albert von Rothschild was another wealthy patron of the game. One of the most liberal was Prince André Dadian of Mingrelia, in Russia. Like Rothschild, Dadian was a very strong player, in fact, considerably stronger than Rothschild. He donated freely to all tournaments, but was most particularly associated with the Monte Carlo Tournaments of 1902 and 1903.³

Chess enjoyed, from our vantage point, an unusual popularity at the turn of the century,⁴ and chess patrons could count on support from national figures, and from the government itself. At Nürnberg, in 1896, the Prince of Bavaria donated a prize.⁵ At Budapest, in 1896, the Austrian Emperor offered a silver statuette and \$600,⁶ and at Vienna, in 1898, he donated \$1,200. At Paris, in 1900, the French President donated two Sèvres vases.⁷ In Russia, wealthy chess

1. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 44, Nov. 1889, p. 347.

2. Wiener Schachzeitung, v. 10, Jan.-Feb. 1907, p. 3.

3. He presided over the tournament committee in those two years, and donated most of the prizes, as well as in 1901. La Stratégie, v. 34, Oct. 1901, p. 311; v. 35, Sept. 1902, p. 291. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 23, Aug. 1903, p. 339.

4. In 1897, the Br. Ch. Mag. commented: "In 1837, chess was the pastime of the few only - the leisured and the opulent class - now it is the intellectual recreation of the majority of the vast middle classes, and even the artizan is becoming a votary of the game....Today clubs flourish in hundreds, and no YMCA or Mechanics' Institution is considered complete without some provisions made for chess playing." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 17, July 1897, p. 241.

5. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 51, Aug. 1896, p. 254.

6. Ibid., Sept. 1896, p. 280.

7. La Stratégie, v. 32, Dec. 1899, p. 373.

enthusiasts were so anxious to bring masters to St. Petersburg, that they practically ruined themselves to stage the big tournaments of 1909 and 1914.¹ In 1909, the Russian Czar contributed \$500.² Victor Tietz, an Austrian chess enthusiast, and a member of the town council of Carlsbad, in Bohemia, persuaded that city on two occasions to vote money for the staging of international tournaments: \$2,400 in 1907, and \$3,000 in 1911.³

Other patrons used chess tournaments as promotional ventures. The first of the four Monte Carlo tournaments was sponsored by the management of the gambling casino, ostensibly to inaugurate a new chess club, but more probably to advertise the casino.⁴ The Cambridge Springs Tourney, in 1904, was sponsored partly "by those interested in the development of Cambridge Springs as a health resort."⁵ In France, M. Marquet sponsored international tournaments at Ostend in 1905, 1906, and 1907, and at San Sebastian in 1911 and 1912, as advertisement for his health resorts in Belgium and Spain.⁶

1. In 1914, the St. Petersburg Zeitung reported that although the committee had taken in \$3,000 in receipts, it showed a deficit due to the enormous expenses attendant upon the event. In American Chess Bulletin, July 1914, p. 158.

2. Emmanuel Lasker, The International Chess Congress, St. Petersburg, 1909, New York: 1910, p. vii.

3. Wiener Schachzeitung, v. 10, March-April 1907, p. 72; v. 14, April 1911, p. 110.

4. La Stratégie, v. 32, Nov. 1900, p. 339.

5. Brooklyn Daily Eagle, Sept. 20, 1903.

6. La Stratégie, v. 38, Aug. 1905, p. 246; v. 39, March 1906, p. 83; v. 44, v. 45, Feb. 1912, p. 65.

Along with this increase in tournament play, there was a surprising about-face for chess masters. Before 1879, promoters of chess tournaments were always faced with the problem of obtaining competitors. It is in 1895, at Hastings, that we see the tables turned for the first time. The tournament committee had to carefully pick twenty-two entries among a large number of applicants.¹ At Nürnberg, the next year, the committee had to select nineteen entries among thirty-nine applicants, some of whom were very unhappy at being passed over.² From 1896 on, every congress was faced with the problem, not of obtaining players, but of deciding whom to weed out.

II

In this struggle for survival, chess technique was an important weapon, and the period from 1894 to 1914 accelerated the process of analysis which Steinitz had already entrained. Technical books multiplied: every master achieving a modicum of fame published a book of analysis.³ In 1904, Mordecai Morgan published in this country

1. The German master, Emil Schallopp, for instance, was turned down. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 15, Aug. 1895, pp. 327-328.

2. Ibid., v. 17, April 1897, p. 142.

3. Among these were Dreihundert Schachpartien, by Tarrasch, The Art of Chess, by James Mason, The Complete Chess Guide, by F. J. Lee and G. H. D. Gossip, The Modern Chess Instructor, by Steinitz, The Chess Openings, by F. J. Marshall, and Kleines Lehrbuch des Schachspiels, by J. Dufresne and J. Mieses.

a monumental four volume opus called The Chess Digest, in which he catalogued every known opening variation which had been analysed up to that time.¹ While in 1835, George Walker, in Bell's Life, authored the only chess column in a periodical, by the turn of the century, such columns adorned the newspapers of France, England, Germany, Russia, Austria, Cuba, the United States, Argentina, Brazil, Holland, Italy, and probably elsewhere.² The curious aspect of all this activity, however, was that the general attitude towards book theory and its effect on the game was not very different in 1900 from what it had been in 1850, or what it was to be in 1950. There was the same fear that chess was played out, that soon the game would be impossible. There was the same criticism of master play as cautious and hopelessly dull. There was the same feeling that openings were over-analysed, and that masters tended to repeat the same openings constantly. Finally, there was the same harking back to some fabulous era of bold and brilliant chess. In 1950, it is the early twentieth century, "the age....of the attacking geniuses."³ In 1900, it was the age of Anderssen and Morphy, in 1850, it had been the immortal compositions of Labourdonnais and M'Donnell.

1. Mordecai Morgan, The Chess Digest, 4 vols., Philadelphia: 1904.

2. "In 1897 the chess column is a noted feature of nearly every heading weekly journal." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 17, June 1897, p. 241. At Hastings, in 1895, "Four Dutch papers were represented besides five French and numberless German and British." Cheshire, Hastings 1895, p. 2.

3. Wellmuth, The Golden Treasury of Chess, p. 97.

There appears to be little doubt that the era from 1894 to 1914 was not considered a period of brilliant chess by the men who lived through it; and if it appears so to us, it is obviously because of the distance in time, which allows us to see only the occasional exception, rather than the every day rule. Contemporaries were almost unanimous in deploring the dullness of master play. One Leander Turney, writing in 1914, commented:

Matches and tournaments between first rate players reveal a monotonous slavery to the Ruy Lopez, the Queen's Gambit Declined and the French Defense, with a few other of the more conservative openings.¹

In 1907, Lasker commented: "That the amateur world is tired of the Queen's Pawn opening there is no doubt."² In 1902 we find,

As regards the alleged sameness, or even staleness of the openings adopted in our modern tourneys, there is some truth in the accusation.³

In the Bristol Times and Mirror, a correspondent averred that the limited repertoire of chess professionals was rapidly bringing about the death of chess.⁴ At Nürnberg, in 1896, the Ruy Lopez was played forty-five times, the Queen's Gambit thirty-one times, while the Evans Gambit, the standby of bold and brilliant chess was utilized twice.⁵

1. Leander Turney, "Are the Chess Openings Nearing Exhaustion", American Chess Bulletin, March 1914, p. 65.

2. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 6, May 1907, p. 1.

3. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 22, Sept. 1902, p. 389.

4. Reprinted in Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 7, Nov. 1907, p. 33.

5. Siegbert Tarrasch, Das Grosse Schachturnier zu Nürnberg 1896, Berlin: 1921, pp. 296-300.

There was general agreement that the villain was too much theory, too much "book" play.¹

A modern match, indeed, is largely a trial of patience. Each competitor gets up an opening - a safe and sound one like the Ruy Lopez or the Queen's Gambit - and day after day toils at its variations.²

In order to break this monotony, the chess promoters of the early twentieth century revived an idea from the 1850's, when an attempt had been made to compel players to make every game an open game by opening on each side with P-K4.³ The solution could not be so simple in 1900, since the double P-K4 opening now usually led to the Ruy Lopez, considered as dull as any of the close openings, including the abhorred French Defense. In 1903, the Vienna Chess Club organized a Gambit Tournament, in which every game had to open 1. P-K4 P-K4, 2. P-KB4 PxP, i. e., the King's Gambit Accepted.⁴ Ten masters met in a double round tournament, and Tchigorin won with thirteen points.⁵ The innovation was not very successful. The mandatory moves turned out to be insufficient. Black did not protect the Gambit Pawn through P-KKt4, thereby largely nullifying the effect of the opening. Even the

1. "Fréquemment on entend maints amateurs se plaindre de ce que les Tournois modernes ne produisent plus aussi souvent de ces brillantes parties riches en sacrifices et fécondes en coups imprévus comme on en avait le plaisir d'en revoir sur l'échiquier il y a un demi-siècle." Mario Blixen, Revista del Club Argentino de Ajedrez, reprinted in La Stratégie, v. 43, Jan. 1910, p. 1. Senor Blixen felt that book theory had brought this about, and although modern chess was scientifically superior, ancient chess was aesthetically more pleasing.

2. Graham, Blackburne's Games, p. 9.

3. Cf. p. 51.

4. Wiener Schachzeitung, v. 6, March 1903, p. 79.

5. Ibid., June-July 1903, p. 133.

belated offer of a prize by Professor Rice to the most brilliant game in which Black continued with P-KKt4 failed to bring a response, and the games were found to be not nearly as interesting as had been anticipated.¹

In 1904, following the Monte Carlo Tournament, Professor Rice promoted a Gambit Tournament in the Riviera resort town, in which the Rice Gambit, a particular variation of the King's Gambit Accepted which Professor Rice had devised, was mandatory. This meant that each game opened with Black's ninth move, and left far less room for compromising the intent of the promoter. \$500 was divided into three prizes, and six masters entered the field. Rudolf Sviderski (1878-1909), a "plodding and careful Polish player",² tied with the explosive attacking player, Marshall, for first place.³ The tournament was not very popular and the experiment was not repeated.⁴ In 1911, another Gambit Tournament was held, in Italy, at San Remo. The choice, this time, was extended to three Gambits: the Evans, the King's, and the Scotch. Acceptance of the Gambit was of course mandatory. The event did not attract a very distinguished field and was rapidly forgotten.⁵

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 23, July 1903, p. 316. "Das Königsgambit ist keineswegs interessanter als beispielsweise die spanische Partie, es ist nur leichter verständlich und auch leichter zu führen, weil immer, etwas los' ist." Dr. Tarrasch, in Wiener Schachzeitung, June-July, 1903, v. 6, p. 129.

2. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 24, April 1904, p. 145.

3. The Field, v. 93, Feb. 27, 1904, p. 351.

4. Idem. Although no other Rice Gambit Tournament was held in Europe, the experiment was repeated in the United States, where Professor Rice sponsored a number of tournaments which featured his gambit. These, however, were all very small affairs.

5. La Stratégie, v. 44, Jan. 1911, p. 28; The Field, v. 117, Jan. 14, 1911, Jan. 21, 28, 1911.

One final attempt was made in 1912, at Abbazia, Hungary, where another King's Gambit Tourney was held, limited this time to Austro-Hungarian masters. Once more, the experiment proved unsuccessful, largely through the refusal of the masters to cooperate and play the openings in the spirit in which they were conceived.¹ Chess masters played to win, and they could see little point in deliberately handicapping themselves with gambit openings which theory considered unsound.

III

The problem which most plagued chess amateurs and tournament promoters alike was the tendency for the safe and cautious play of the masters to end in an inconclusive draw. In 1883, at London, the promoters had required that draws be replayed twice. This sort of solution did not appeal to players, who resented the extra burden which they sometimes had to bear, and who felt that the system was unfair because it resulted in different players contesting a different amount of games. Nor did it appeal to promoters who could not usually afford the extra

1. "Tournaments restricted to gambits are unpopular amongst masters." E. A. Michell, The Year Book of Chess, 1913, p. 14.

time involved. The return to the absolute score of a draw, giving one half point to each competitor, was marked by a continuous increase in their proportion in tournament games.¹ Steinitz considered such a system the greatest evil in tournament scoring,² but when the time came for him to arrange a tournament, in New York, in 1889, the best he could do in the face of practical considerations was to require that draws in the second round be replayed once.³ After the Manchester meeting of 1890, the British Chess Magazine commented: "the large number of draws is particularly noticeable."⁴ In 1890, during the Steinitz-Gunsberg match, the Commercial Gazette of Cincinnati remarked sarcastically:

the impression prevails that it [the match] is chiefly for revenue. The manner in which the first game was conducted tends to confirm the latter supposition, for a draw was agreed upon on the 25th move while the board was still full of pieces.⁵

The practice was also introduced of stipulating a given fee for every won game. Its original intent was soon corrupted, however, when

1. At Monte Carlo, in 1904, where a small entry of six played in a double round tournament, the number of draws almost reached half the total, fourteen out of thirty games played. La Stratégie, v. 37, March 1904, p. 83.

2. Int. Ch. Mag., v. 3, Sept. 1887, p. 267.

3. Steinitz, New York 1889, p. xvi.

4. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 10, Oct. 1890, p. 407.

5. Cincinnati Commercial Gazette, Dec. 13, 1890.

tournament and match promoters began to pay for every game, whether won, lost or drawn. In Paris, in 1900, the attempt was made again of replaying draws once.¹ The masters were highly critical of this uneven procedure, but strangely enough, the promoters of the Monte Carlo Tournaments accepted an even more involved scoring method suggested by Lasker. Draws were replayed once before scoring one half point, but with this added feature. If the replay led to a result, the winner was not given one point, but three fourths of a point, while the loser was not given zero, but one fourth point.² The motivation behind this fractional scoring was that a player who required two tries to score a win should not be given as much credit as a player who won the first time out; while a player who had scored a draw before succumbing was superior to the player who bowed on his first attempt. This peculiar system was used for two years before it was discarded.

Selon toute probabilité il y aura un changement dans la manière de compter les parties nulles, car l'essai tenté dans les deux tournois de Monte Carlo....n'a pas donné le résultat cherché.³

This proved to be the last attempt at tampering with draws, which came finally to be accepted as an inevitable evil.⁴ Even more

1. La Stratégie, v. 32, Feb. 1900, p. 33.

2. Ibid., Dec. 1900, p. 373.

3. Ibid., Sept. 1902, p. 291. Marshall, who competed at Paris, in 1900, and at Monte Carlo, in 1901 and 1902, when considering his chess career some forty years later could only find amused contempt for what he considered foolish innovations. Frank J. Marshall, My Fifty Years of Chess, Philadelphia: 1942, p. 16.

4. "with respect to drawn games no fair way exists for preventing them, so they must be reckoned with as such." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 15, April 1895, p. 184.

fascinating were the scoring systems devised partly as a result of this controversy, which came to be known as quality scoring. Quality scoring attempted to refine the scoring technique of tournaments not by throwing out draws, but by measuring the quality of the games. It would take too long to describe in detail all the systems evolved in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, some of which required involved mathematical computations covering several pages to arrive at the score of a competitor. It will suffice to describe briefly the original scheme of quality scoring, devised by the Austrian Oscar Gelbfuhs, and first used in a minor tournament at Vienna, in 1883.¹ All other systems were refinements of the Gelbfuhs system and were based on the same principle. The system, quite simply, first computed the scores on the conventional basis, giving draws one half point. Then, for every won game, the player was given a point total equal to the final score of the man he had defeated. In case of a draw, he received half the final score of the player he had drawn with. In other words, the "quality" of a game was measured by the standing of one's opponent. Johannes Berger, in Austria, W. Sonneborn, in England, and F. M. Teed, in the United States, refined this system endlessly, weighing ever more carefully the point value of each win, each draw, and eventually, each loss. Chess critics had hoped quality scoring might lead them out of the wilderness of draws, but it was soon made clear

1. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 38, Jan. 1883, pp. 12-13.

that the inventors of quality scoring were not really interested in reducing draws.¹

Quality scoring was never a success, although the Sonneborn-Berger system was applied as late as 1938.² Today, it enjoys a revival in the so-called Swiss scoring system which is used occasionally in tournaments with very large entries. Another system which had more success was the Tietz system, devised by Victor Tietz, of Carlsbad. This was not a system for scoring, but for apportioning prizes. The growing tendency was to reward all the participants in a contest, rather than just a few prize winners.

The Tietz system of apportioning prizes.... consists in the division of the prize fund into two portions, one of which is distributed for games won, while the other is given proportionately as prizes to those who win more than half of the games they play.³

Opinion was divided as to whether the Tietz system would decrease the number of draws, by rewarding financially every won game, but it was used, along with certain variations to it, quite extensively in the decade from 1904 to 1914.

1. A correspondent to the Br. Ch. Mag., endorsing the Teed revision of the Sonneborn-Berger system, added this after-thought: "so far as.... results go, they are in favor of the class of players known as the 'drawing masters'." v. 10, May 1890, p. 201.

2. Dr. W. Ahrens, of Magdeburg, reviewed the question of quality scoring in 1901. He pointed out that to measure the quality of a game was not only impossible, but that it involved, not whom it was played against, but the nature of the game itself. "Zur relativen Bewertung von Turnierpartien", Wiener Schachzeitung, v. 4, Oct.-Nov. 1901, pp. 181-192.

3. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 4, May 1906, p. 12.

IV

Amid the turbulence of the scoring question, the chess world was making rapid progress in the matter of a chess code. This progress, before 1914, was mostly along national lines, but there was considerable interplay among the various countries, so that by the turn of the century the chess codes of France, Germany, England, and the United States were in essential harmony. The British Chess Code of 1862 had not been a success, and in 1883, a new code was drawn up by Messrs. Donisthorpe and Woodgate, at the occasion of the London Tournament.¹ It was hoped that it might become the basis for an international code. In France, the chess code used since 1867 was that based on the code of Labourdonnais, which he had published in 1838.² In the United States, the chess code found in Staunton's Chess Praxis was the basis of play until 1880.³ That year, Charles Gilberg (1835-1898), and Thomas Frère, at the occasion of the Fifth American Chess Congress, compiled a new chess code.⁴ In Germany, the Handbuch formed the basis of play.

-
1. Minchin, London 1883, pp. iii-iv.
 2. Féry d'Esclands, Paris 1867, p. lxi.
 3. Gilberg, 5th Am. Ch. Cong. 1880, p. 83.
 4. The Am. Ch. Mag., v. 1, Feb. 1898, p. 506.

In the 1890's, the single issue which still divided the different national chess codes was the so-called fifty move rule. It was felt that in a position which offered no chances, some sort of rule was needed to bring a game to a conclusion and avoid an endlessly senseless shifting of pieces. There were two weaknesses to the rule as it stood. When should it be applied? If a player invoked it on the first move, that was obviously unfair. In practice, the issue was usually resolved by letting the referee in a tournament decide when a position warranted its application. This was much too vague a solution, however, and placed too much power in the hands of the referee. The second weakness was that it became increasingly evident that in certain endgame positions where the rule would have formerly applied a win could be forced in more than fifty moves. In 1891, a correspondent to La Stratégie submitted a problem, two knights-vs-pawn, in which mate could be forced in seventy-five moves.¹ In 1895, in an actual match game between Mieses and Janowski, in Paris, in which Janowski had two knights, and Mieses had two pawns, the German master invoked the fifty move rule, and Janowski finally abandoned the game as drawn.² The editor of La Stratégie questioned the fairness of such a rule, if Janowski had been able to find a line of play, as in the problem of 1891, whereby he could have forced a win in more than the stipulated limit.³ In 1890, in a match between Jackson Showalter and Max Judd, in this country, the contestants decided to abandon the fifty move rule, and stipulated instead that a game would be drawn when 125 moves had been played,

1. La Stratégie, v. 24, March 1891, p. 84.

2. The rule, in France, actually afforded sixty moves.

3. La Stratégie, v. 28, Feb. 1895.

unless after the final move, either player could demonstrate a mate in ten moves. In other words, the upward limit of a game would be 135 moves.¹

The issue did not become clarified until 1897, when a new Revised British Chess Code was released, which provided that a game was drawn if no capture was made during fifty moves.² Then, in 1899, at the occasion of the London Congress, the rule was further amended to read that if after fifty moves "no capture has been made, nor Pawn moved, nor mate given, the game is drawn."³ A further stipulation was added that if a position recurred three times in a game, the game was drawn.⁴

In 1900, at the occasion of the Paris Tournament, Samuel Rosenthal drew up a new French code, closely paralleling the British Code, and including the fifty move rule as found in the Revised British Code.⁵ The United States, in 1897, adopted the British Code as its own.⁶ By the early twentieth century, therefore, the chess codes of France, England, and the United States were essentially similar, and provided a common basis for play in most international tournaments.

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 10, July 1890, p. 269.

2. Ibid., v. 17, Aug. 1897, p. 310.

3. Ibid., v. 19, March 1899, p. 144.

4. Idem.

5. Samuel Rosenthal, Traité des Echecs et recueil des parties jouées au Tournoi international de 1900, Paris: 1901, p. 9.

6. Am. Ch. Mag., v. 1, July 1897, p. 73.

V

The center of gravity of the chess world was steadily shifting away from its former location, at the turn of the century. France, which had been the center of chess life in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, had entered a period of decline shortly after 1848, and had never recovered. French chess suffered from an over-centralization around Paris, and around a few wealthy clubs. This meant, among other things, that no National Association succeeded, although several were attempted in the second half of the nineteenth century. It also meant that chess would remain the private purview of a few wealthy amateurs. The professional needed an active public chess life, in order to stage his exhibitions, or even to stage matches, which were rapidly becoming public exhibitions.¹ France did boast of one of the outstanding and longest lived chess periodicals in Europe, La Stratégie, but it had few masters, and until the end of the nineteenth century, no one who could compete in the international arena.² Even an exposition, in 1889, the traditional lure for chess tournaments, proved insufficient competition for three other major tournaments projected for that year, Amsterdam, Breslau, and New York.³

1. The editor of La Stratégie complained that the Tournament of 1900 would do little to aid French chess, since it was sponsored by the Grand Cercle d'Echecs, an exclusive club, of which Rosenthal, the tournament organizer, was chief member. Attendance would be limited to club members, and the general chess public of France would be effectively locked out. La Stratégie, v. 32, Dec. 1899, p. 373.

2. Edward Lasker, who visited Paris in 1913, commented: "The kind of chess which I saw at the Régence was not very impressive when compared with what I had been up against in Berlin." Lasker, Chess Secrets, pp. 132-33.

3. La Stratégie, v. 22, Oct. 1899, p. 323.

In 1891, the French were fortunate to become host to a Polish exile, David Janowski,¹ who became France's greatest chess ornament in the quarter of a century before the First World War. Not only was Janowski, who settled permanently in Paris, the most successful French master, but his presence in France became the cause for a number of interesting matches, notably his first three matches with Marshall, and two of his encounters with Lasker.

If France was in decline at the turn of the century, so was another ancient chess power, England. England, like France, suffered from an over-centralization of chess life around London, and a few wealthy clubs, and the lack of a National Association. The London chess clubs,² although catering to wealthy Englishmen, failed to promote any major tournaments unaided. Three major tournaments were held in London, in the nineteenth century, through the promotion of London clubs, 1851, 1883, and 1899. All three were ultimately financed through subscriptions. Such subscriptions required a certain amount of enthusiasm from the chess public at large. The English provincial player, unfortunately, was as effectively cut off from the developments of master chess in London, as his counterpart in France.

1. La Stratégie, v. 24, Sept. 1891, p. 274.

2. The five outstanding clubs at the end of the nineteenth century were: the St. George, the British, the City of London, the Metropolitan, and the North London Chess Clubs. London Chess Fortnightly, v. 1, Sept. 15, 1892, p. 17. Of these, the leader was the City of London Club, "undoubtedly the strongest in the world at the present time [1899]." Graham, Blackburne's Games, p. 15.

After the demise of the first British Chess Association, a second one had sprung up in 1884,¹ but by the 1890's, it was already moribund. The inability to obtain the support of the wealthy London clubs, particularly the City of London Chess Club, was the reason usually ascribed to this failure.² In 1903, a fresh attempt was made, which this time succeeded. In July 1903, the British Chess Federation was organized. The scheme devised was a Federation with four affiliates, each with equal representation and equal powers: the Southern Counties Union, the Northern Counties Union, the Midland Counties Union, and as a fourth and separate affiliate, the City of London Chess Club.³ The first congress of the new British Chess Federation was opened at Hastings, on August 22, 1904.⁴ The Federation was very successful, on the national level, and held regular yearly events up to the First World War. It was not able, however, to bring England back into the international arena, nor stage any international tournaments up to 1914.⁵

Germany was the country of the future, in the latter nineteenth century.⁶ Yet she too failed to fulfill her promise. Hermann Zwanzig, the

1. Cf. pp. 178-179.

2. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 22, Sept. 1902, pp. 395-397.

3. Ibid., v. 23, Aug. 1903, pp. 349-350.

4. Ibid., v. 24, Sept. 1904, p. 357.

5. Anthony Guest commented in 1913: "British chess is becoming too self contained, neglecting the stimulus of give-and-take that has so greatly helped the players of other countries." "Notes on 1912", in Br. Ch. Mag., v. 33, Jan. 1913, p. 10.

6. The Br. Ch. Mag., in 1881, reported glowingly on the new German Chess Association. v. 1, Oct. 1881, p. 317. The Germans themselves modestly stated that if the Congresses of the German Chess Association had not made Germany the first chess country in the world, they had certainly put her on a par with England. Gottschall, Metger, & Seger, Breslau 1889, p. 2.

general secretary of the German Chess Association, and the driving force behind its early success, died of a heart attack on January 16, 1894.¹ He was succeeded by the veteran of the Morphy era, friend of the late Anderssen, Dr. Max Lange. Lange was an outstanding scholar, a strong player, and a hard worker. Yet his period at the helm of the Association was marked by a falling-off, due to his fondness for red tape.² The same sort of divisive tendencies between local and national interests which had plagued English and French chess began to develop. In 1895, the Berlin Chess Club broke its ties with the Association.³ In 1896, the Association Congress was to have been held at Nürnberg. Lange and Tarrasch, the president of the host club, quarrelled, and Lange finally withdrew from the program Tarrasch and the Nürnberg Club were organizing.⁴ The Association held its own meeting at Eisenach, a meeting hopelessly overshadowed by the great Nürnberg Congress.⁵ In 1897, the Berlin Chess Club held an international tournament which it hoped would become the nucleus for a rival organization to the National Association, and was able to attract a star-studded field.⁶

Shortly after the death of Max Lange, in 1899, Rudolf Gebhardt became the general secretary of the Association. Gebhardt, professor of philology at the Casimir Institute in Cölogne, revived the Association,

-
1. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 49, Jan. 1894, p. 26.
 2. Paul Schellenberg, "Der Deutsche Schachbund", in Ranke's Schachkalender, 1907, p. 7.
 3. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 50, Feb. 1895, p. 59.
 4. Ibid., June 1896, v. 51, p. 189.
 5. Ibid., July 1896, p. 218.
 6. Rudolf Charousek (1873-1900), the young Hungarian master, took first prize in a field that included Walbrodt, Blackburne, Janowski, Burn, Schlechter, Tchigorin, Winawer, Bardleben, and Englisch. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 52, Sept. 1897, pp. 279, 282. The prize list added up to \$1,455.

so that by 1906 the number of chess associations affiliated with it had risen from 36 to 110, and the total number of members from 1201 to 3526.¹ The Gebhardt era was described in Germany as the golden era of German chess.² Yet even under this talented pedagogue, Germany failed to regain her position in the chess world. The chess congresses of the Association, which had been the hard core of European international chess in the late nineteenth century, were now often overshadowed by other events. The German Association was able to sponsor two of Tarrasch's matches, against Marshall, and against Lasker, only because it was clear that Tarrasch would refuse to play outside of Germany. Lasker was very disappointed over this, since he felt that a much larger financial return could have been obtained in the United States than in Germany.³ Although Germany still supplied a good share of second rank chess masters, the leadership in chess was already passing from her hands.⁴

1. Schellenberg, "Der Deutscher Schachbund", pp. 9-10.

2. Ibid., p. 10.

3. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 3, Jan. 1906, p. 127.

4. Edward Lasker, who was in Germany until 1913, felt that the problems of the Association arose out of a conflict between its officials and the masters. The officials too often were not chess players themselves, or only mediocre ones, and unable to comprehend the problems of the masters. According to him, in 1908, Emmanuel Lasker was "persona non grata" with the Association for criticizing "their officers for failing to exert their best efforts to raise the level of strength of German master tournaments." Lasker, Chess Secrets, pp. 44-45. Dr. Lasker himself commented in 1908 on the growing paucity of German masters. He considered the top four German masters to be Tarrasch, Mieses, his brother, Berthold, and he, himself. Of these, he pointed out, he was the youngest at thirty-nine. New York Evening Post, June 10, 1908.

Although professionalism was on the wane in both England and Germany, the chess associations of both countries did achieve a large amount of success on the national level. The new British Chess Federation emulated its German counterpart and staged yearly mammoth national congresses in which chess amateurs of all ranks would participate. The entries were broken down extensively into separate classes, with even provisions for a women's section, to allow each amateur to play at his own level. For a description of a typical national tourney, in England and in Germany, see, Br. Ch. Mag., v. 26, Sept. 1906, pp. 349-365; Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 59, July 1904, pp. 193-196. This type of chess fair, of course, although very valuable in emphasizing the amateur status of chess, contributed little to the strength of German or English master chess.

By 1905, the region of the future, in chess, was Eastern Europe. We now have a plethora of names from that area among the most promising newcomers. As early as the end of the nineteenth century, there had been the Hungarian Rudolf Charousek, whose brief career ended in death in 1900, at the age of twenty-seven. Still active were the Hungarian Geza Maroczy, and David Janowski, who, although representing France, was born in Poland. In the twentieth century came Milan Vidmar, of Slovenia, Oldrich Duras, of Czechoslovakia, Julius Breyer, of Hungary, D. Przepiorka, Savielly Tartakower, Rudolf Sviderski, who committed suicide in 1909, and Akiba Rubinstein, of Poland, and from Russia, Aaron Nimzovich (1886-1935), Ossip Bernstein, and Alexander Alekhine (1892-1946).

At the turn of the century, there were only three outstanding masters in Russia, Tchigorin, Emmanuel Schiffers, and the noted analyst, Simon Alapin (1856-1923). Russia did not really move to the fore-front of chess until after the First World War, when the influence of the new generation began to make itself felt. The twenty years before the war were nevertheless a period of growth in Russia. After the Quadrangular Tourney of 1895-96, the next international tournament held in Russia was St. Petersburg, 1909. The Russian chess patrons were able to draw Lasker into the arena for the second time since 1900, and a sensational duel ensued between the champion and the young Polish master, Akiba Rubinstein. Rubinstein's tie with Lasker for first prize, and a celebrated win over the champion in their individual

encounter, catapulted him into a position as challenger for the world's championship.¹ The crowning achievement of pre-war Russian chess, however, was to be the historic St. Petersburg Tournament of 1914.

The reasons for this geographical shift away from Western Europe are difficult to ascertain. In France, for instance, the level of play, if we are to believe Edward Lasker², was comparatively low. This might indicate a drop in popularity. Yet such a conclusion cannot be easily drawn. In Great Britain, chess was exceedingly popular, as the national success of the British Chess Federation would indicate, but this popularity was greatest at a fairly low level of playing strength. In Germany, chess was very thoroughly organized, an organization reflected not only in the Deutscher Schachbund, or the Congresses it held, but in the high level of critical analysis in German chess literature as well. Germany was the home of the great Handbuch des Schachspiels, which, in the nineteenth century, was a Bible of chess theory. It might be argued that too much organization harmed the growth of German master chess. Edward Lasker speaks of the bureaucracy of the Schachbund as a source of friction in German master chess,³ while we have spoken of Max Lange's predilection for red tape.⁴ Yet, it is difficult to find a satisfactory explanation for the decline of French, English, or German master chess.

1. Lasker, St. Petersburg 1909, p. xiii.

2. Cf. p. 227, footnote 2.

3. Cf. p. 231, footnote 4.

4. Cf. p. 230.

It is perhaps easier to explain the rise of masters from Eastern Europe. Many of these players were inhabitants of either the Austro-Hungarian or the Russian Empire; and these two decaying organizations, particularly the former, were remarkably generous towards master chess. Both countries still possessed a wealthy and idle aristocracy willing to promote cultural ventures for reasons of prestige.¹

No explanation is conclusive, however, without considering the question of talent. The decline of chess in Western Europe, and its rise in Eastern Europe meant largely a dearth of first class masters in one area, and a plenitude of such masters in the other. In the late nineteenth century, England had four outstanding masters, Blackburne, Mason, Gunsberg, and Burn.² As these men grew older, however, no one arose to take their place. In the opening decades of the twentieth century, only three English masters of note came to the fore, H. E. Atkins (1872-1956), F. D. Yates, and George Thomas. It is possible to say that lack of support in England had brought about a dearth of chess masters, and it might be argued that given a better chance, any one of

1. A good example of this type of patron is Prince Dadian, although he, of course, disbursed his patronage mostly outside of Russia. Austria-Hungary was particularly blessed with the presence of Kolisch, Trebitsch, and Rothschild, and also with the presence of Victor Tietz, who on several occasions persuaded the municipal government of the city of Carlsbad to promote international chess tournaments.

2. Amos Burn did not make his mark on the international chess scene until 1889, when he won the tournament of the Dutch Chess Federation, at Amsterdam. He was already forty-one by then, however. He was one year older than Mason, six years older than Gunsberg, and must be said to belong to the same generation.

these three might have blossomed more fully. As it was none of them became a professional.¹ Yet, these men certainly did play chess at times on the international scene, but they never became outstanding masters, and never gave evidence of being potential champions. France, outside of Rosenthal and Janowski, had no players of strength after 1850. Even in Germany, no player of first rank arose to replace Lasker and Tarrasch until after World War II. It might be argued, therefore, that the lack of a first class player, a potential champion or challenger, may very well have smuffed out the spark of enthusiasm which English amateurs, French amateurs, and German amateurs, had directed at their heroes, imported or otherwise.

The question then arises, is there any explanation for the incidence of chess genius? I do not think this question can be answered successfully. At most, one can say that a certain minimum of opportunity is necessary for the chess master. But the evidence is quite strong that whatever chess genius is, it is an innate quality which will manifest itself given any sort of a chance. In other words, chess genius will not be found where chess is not played at all. But it can be, and is found, wherever there is some sort of organized chess life, and a certain amount of opposition available to the budding champion. Any explanation of the individual genius of chess masters on environmental grounds is open to grave doubts. One need only point to a few cases.

1. Yates, in the 1920's, tried his hand for a time at professional chess, but was not very successful. The depression of 1929 affected chess players as well as everyone else, and Yates' brief fling at professionalism ended with his death, in 1932. He was found asphyxiated in his apartment, and it has never been determined whether his death was accident or suicide.

Not until the advent of Pillsbury and Marshall, many years later, did an American master come close to Morphy in playing strength. Neither Cuba nor Holland has produced a second Capablanca or a second Euwe. These chess stars all blazed quite individually.

Of course, it might be possible to support chess without producing a large number of masters. And this has happened to a certain extent in various places, particularly the New World which, at the turn of the century, was proving the most hospitable land for the chess master. Until the arrival of Steinitz, the chess life of America had been rather fitful. Abortive attempts had been made to establish a National Chess Association, after all but one of the five chess congresses held up to 1880.¹ Geographic factors of distance, however, tended to keep chess associations regional, while the jealousy of both New York and Philadelphia towards a national organization, as well as towards each other, considerably lessened the chances of success for such an organization. All four of these early associations, created in the aftermath of a chess congress, died in a very short time. The advent of Steinitz proved to be the needed spur to American chess.

Both Steinitz and Lasker settled in America, and the presence of the latter particularly brought the focus of the chess world on this country. Lasker felt that the New World was the most propitious locale for a match, and that more money could be raised for a chess match west of the Atlantic than in Europe. America and Cuba played host to a large number of important matches from 1886 and 1914. In the United

1. Gilberg, 5th Am. Ch. Cong. 1880, pp. 89, 90, 98, 158.

States, the number of chess masters and of chess clubs was growing rapidly. In New York, the Manhattan Chess Club had a large and wealthy patronage, and helped sponsor the Zukertort-Steinitz match, the first Lasker-Steinitz match, and the Lasker-Marshall match in 1907. In the 'nineties, the strongest club in the country was probably the Brooklyn Chess Club, founded in 1886.¹ Its membership included such outstanding names as Marshall, Pillsbury, Hermann Helms, Hartwig Cassell (1850-1929), and William Ewart Napier.² In Philadelphia, there was the Franklin Club, and there were strong clubs in New Orleans, Chicago, Cleveland, Baltimore, and St. Louis.

After the death of Mackenzie, in 1891, the outstanding American masters on the international scene were Pillsbury and Showalter. After 1900, they were joined by Frank J. Marshall. Marshall was born in New York, in 1877, but in 1885, his family moved to Montreal, and he lived in Canada until 1896. In that year, he returned to New York, and in 1897,

1. Br. Ch. Chron., v. 4, Sept. 15, 1886, p. 177; v. 5, Oct. 15, 1886, p. 1

2. Hermann Helms was born in Brooklyn on January 5, 1870. He was taken to Germany when only three years old, and educated there. In 1887, he returned to Brooklyn, and rapidly became a leading figure, not only in the Brooklyn Chess Club, but in American chess in general. In 1893, he began a chess column in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, which soon rivalled the one in the New Orleans Times Democrat. In 1904, he and Hartwig Cassell helped promote the Cambridge Springs Tournament, and for that occasion, launched the American Chess Bulletin, the longest lived chess magazine in this country. Hartwig Cassell was born in West Prussia. In 1878, he moved to Scotland, and settled in Bradford, where he worked as a newspaperman and helped organize the tournament of 1888. In 1889, he accompanied Gunsberg to Havana as his second in the match with Tchigorin. After this, he settled in New York, where he became chess and sports editor of the German-American newspaper, the New Yorker Staatszeitung. William E. Napier was born in Dulwich, England, in 1881. He came to America as a boy, and was hailed a child prodigy, winning the Brooklyn Club Championship in 1896, at the age of fifteen. He had some moderate successes in international tournament play in Europe at the turn of the century, but soon retired from public play.

took third prize in the championship competition of the powerful Brooklyn Chess Club, behind Napier and Helms. In 1898, he finished second to Napier. Then, in 1899, he finally took first prize, and the Club helped finance his trip to Europe to compete in the London Tournament of 1899.¹ In that event, he was relegated to the minor tournament, but in 1900, he finally made his debut on the international scene, at Paris, where he tied for third prize with Maroczy, behind Pillsbury and Lasker, and defeated the champion in their individual encounter.² His greatest triumph, however, came at Cambridge Springs, in 1904, where he took first prize ahead of Lasker.³ Thereafter, he was a serious contender for the world's championship.⁴

1. Marshall, My Fifty Years, p. 6.

2. La Stratégie, v. 32, June 1900, p. 178.

3. Am. Ch. Bu., June 1904, p. 25.

4. Other leading American players at the turn of the century included Max Judd, Simon Lipschuetz (1863-1905), and Albert Beauregard Hodges. Some confusion seems to have arisen around these three men concerning the American championship. The issue, as with the world's championship, is beclouded by the fact that there was no official champion until 1909. Mackenzie had been generally considered American champion until his death, in 1891, although illness had forced him to retire from active chess as early as 1889. Judd, Lipschuetz, Hodges, and Showalter, were all claimants to the succession, and modern chess editors have been generous in awarding the palm posthumously to various of these worthies. Few of these claims, however, have any basis, with the exception of that of Lipschuetz, who defeated Showalter in a match, in 1892, 7-1, with 7 draws, and was generally acclaimed U. S. champion as a result. (Cf. New Orleans Times Democrat, April 3, May 8, 29, 1892, Jan. 22, Aug. 13, 1893.) Showalter took revenge on Lipschuetz, in 1895, scoring in a match 7-4, with 3 draws. In the interim, Showalter won, then lost in two short matches, in 1894, with Hodges, who subsequently retired. Since Showalter did not win his second match from Lipschuetz until a year later, there is no basis for the claim which has since arisen that Hodges was champion in 1894. (Cf. Information Please Almanac, 1954, p. 825.) The advent of Pillsbury, whose tremendous superiority over the rest of the American players was freely acknowledged, put a temporary halt to the question of the American champion. Pillsbury defeated Showalter in two matches, in 1897 and 1898, and was recognized as champion until 1906. After Pillsbury's death, in that year, a dispute arose as to whether the title should revert to Showalter, or be declared vacant. The issue was finally resolved in 1909, when Marshall defeated Showalter in a match, 7-2, with 3 draws, to become the recognized champion, a title he held until he voluntarily relinquished it in 1936.

VI

The most brilliant product of American chess, after Morphy, was Harry Nelson Pillsbury. After his sensational debut at Hastings, in 1895, he was held to third place at the Quadrangular Tourney of 1895-96, but defeated Lasker in their individual series.¹ After returning to the United States, he asserted his superiority in this country by defeating Showalter in two matches, in 1897, and in 1898.² At Vienna, in 1898, he tied for first prize with Tarrasch in a double round tournament with a redoubtable field of nineteen, scoring twenty-eight and one half points out of a possible thirty-six, but lost the tie match to Tarrasch 2-1, with 1 draw.³ After 1900, his tournament record began to suffer, and in 1904, at Cambridge Springs, he could do no better than eighth place.⁴ In 1905, he suffered a breakdown, and was hospitalized in Philadelphia, where he tried to commit suicide.⁵ After recovering, he went to his home in Somerville to convalesce, and then to Bermuda. He returned to the States early in 1906, but an

1. Cf. p. 202.

2. In 1897, he took a close contest by the score of 10-8, with 3 draws. Am. Ch. Mag., v. 1, June 1897, pp. 35-37. In 1898, he won more convincingly, 7-3, with 2 draws.

3. Wiener Schachzeitung, v. 1, July 1898.

4. Am. Ch. Bu., June 1904, p. 25.

5. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 1, April 1905, p. 267; Am. Ch. Bu., Nov. 1905, p. 339.

apoplectic stroke left him partly paralysed, and he was hospitalized once more, in Frankford, Pennsylvania. He never left the hospital and died on June 17, 1906.¹

There was much speculation, at the time of Pillsbury's death, as to the cause of his breakdown; and his early death, at the age of thirty-four, was attributed by many to too much chess, particularly blindfold chess.² Pillsbury was the greatest blindfold player of his day, and possibly of all time. Although he has been surpassed since in number of games, it would be hard to surpass him in the caliber of his opposition, or the quality of his play.

The record, when Pillsbury appeared on the scene, was sixteen games, set by Zukertort in 1876.³ The biggest deterrent to playing more games appears to have been the time involved. A blindfold seance against more than twelve players might stretch to such lengths that the physical endurance of the blindfold player could not withstand the strain.

1. Am. Ch. Bu., March 1906, p. 54; New Orleans Times Democrat, May 21, 1905, June 24, 1906.

2. "That upon his splendid mental organization Pillsbury put an undue strain is certain." Am. Ch. Bu., July 1906, p. 142. After his feat at Hanover, in 1902, the Br. Ch. Mag., remarked: "We think it a great pity that he should thus overtax his strength." v. 22, Sept. 1902, p. 390. In 1904, Marshall commented: "Pillsbury contends that blindfold play doesn't hurt anyone, but I think it does....I would not make such a specialty of it as Pillsbury does, because the mind during the operation is placed under too great a strain. Pillsbury is a splendid player, but his blindfold exhibitions, I think, have ruined him." Daily Picayune, Nov. 22, 1904.

3. Cf. p. 142. Whenever the name of a blindfold player like Blackburne, or Paulsen, came up, chess editors would glibly say that they were reputed to have played as many as eighteen or even twenty games simultaneously. This was apparently press-agentry, for there is no record of a blindfold seance against more than sixteen opponents until Pillsbury accomplished the feat.

Blackburne, Rosenthal, and the French blindfold expert, Alphonse Goetz, all agreed that thirty to forty games could be played simultaneously, if they could be staged in several seances.¹ Pillsbury set himself the task of playing as rapidly as possible to overcome the time barrier. On February 17, 1900, at Chicago, he matched Zukertort's record, winning eleven, drawing four, and losing one. The most amazing feature of the performance was the time consumed: five hours and ten minutes.² On March 7, in New Orleans, he broke the record, playing seventeen games, winning ten, losing two, and drawing five. On April 28, in Philadelphia, he raised the record to twenty simultaneous blindfold games. In seven hours and thirty-five minutes, he won fourteen, lost one, and drew five.³

In 1902, Pillsbury performed his greatest feat. In the midst of the German Chess Association Congress, at Hanover, in which he himself competed, taking second prize, he engaged simultaneously, blindfold, twenty-one opponents, selected from the competitors in the Hauptturnier. Although his score does not compare with his other performances, his three wins, seven losses, and eleven draws, considering the caliber of the opposition, as well as the record number of players, was amazing.⁴

1. Alfred Binet, Psychologie des grands calculateurs et joueurs d'échecs, Paris: 1894, p. 251. Why several seances were not staged, as suggested, is nowhere made clear. Zukertort's own record performance, in 1876, had been held at two sittings.

2. New Orleans Times Democrat, Feb. 25, 1900.

3. Ibid., March 11, May 6, 1900.

4. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 57, Aug. 1902, p. 262.

He broke his own record once more on December 14, 1902, in Moscow, when he played twenty-two blindfold games simultaneously,¹ a record which stood until Richard Reti played twenty-four games in 1919.

Pillsbury was a phenomenon. He had a prodigious memory, and during his exhibition tours, he would combine a number of memory tricks with the usual routine of simultaneous and blindfold play. He played chess and checkers, blindfold, simultaneously, and also engaged in a hand of whist. He would memorize prodigious lists of names at a glance. He would call all the positions of a previous simultaneous performance, at any given move.² It is doubtful whether chess was the direct cause of his death, but there seems to be a closer link in his case than in Morphy's. He was apparently a highly strung personality. He chain smoked cigars all day long,³ and the physical strain of blindfold play possibly helped weaken his already febrile constitution.⁴ Pillsbury himself admitted that the greatest problem besetting a blindfold player after a performance was insomnia, and that he needed a period of several hours before he unwound sufficiently to sleep.⁵ In that case, blindfold play was certainly no cure for a man in poor physical condition. His early death was the biggest loss to American chess since the unfortunate retirement of Paul Morphy.

1. Deutsche Schachzeitung, v. 58, Jan. 1903, p. 29. The seance lasted ten hours. Pillsbury won seventeen, lost one, and drew four.

2. One reporter explained that he used his gift of memory in "the imitation of tricks of memory and calculations performed by performers in theatres and music halls in various parts of the world." Philadelphia Inquirer, June 18, 1906.

3. Rhoda Bowles, "H. N. Pillsbury's Chess Career", in Br. Ch. Mag., v. 22, Aug. 1902, p. 343.

4. "His death was due to a nervous complaint" from which he suffered many years. Philadelphia Inquirer, June 18, 1906.

5. Bowles, "Pillsbury's Chess Career", p. 343.

CHAPTER IX

I

After defeating Steinitz in their return match, in 1897, Lasker did not defend his title again for ten years. In that long period, the question of the world's championship became the subject of much discussion. Lasker's attitude drew much criticism, but it served to crystallize the position of the champion. Lasker refused to play unless the financial returns were adequate. This meant that high stakes had to be provided, or, barring that, what Lasker felt would be even better, a purse, to be split outright between the contestants, the winner taking the larger share. In that case there would be no interested backers, and the problem was how to raise the money. In the second Steinitz match, the purse had been donated by the Moscow Chess Club. Lasker thought it would be even better if the purse could be raised by public subscription. Further, adequate expense money had to be provided. This meant that Lasker would shop around with various clubs, who would "buy" certain portions of the match, i. e., they would meet the expenses of the two players during that portion of the

match sponsored by the club. This would be done for the edification and pleasure of the members, since gate receipts were also put aside for the players. Finally, the games were not to be freely published in the press, but would be sold to newspapers and periodicals. All these innovations met with strong opposition, and were branded commercialism, but Lasker's commanding position as undisputed champion forced the chess public to accept them all. Lasker believed that only in this way could a chess player obtain adequate remuneration for his labours. By 1914, Lasker had raised the status of the chess champion of the world to that of a financially independent businessman, and a respected professional in the community.¹

In 1899, David Janowski issued a challenge to Lasker but the two masters could not come to terms over the number of games to be played. Janowski held out for the conventional ten games up, while Lasker wanted the number of necessary victories reduced to eight. The match was finally dropped.² Throughout this period, Lasker felt that

1. Lasker was of the opinion that a professional chess player was like a musician. He contributed to the entertainment and refinement of life, and he saw no reason why he should do this gratis, and not be supported in his occupation. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 6, July 1907, p. 135. Nor could Lasker understand why chess masters should be robbed of the fruits of their labor, and have their games become a source of profit for journalists without compensation to themselves. After his first match with Steinitz, Lasker said, two books of the match were published in England. Neither of the editors had contributed anything to the match, yet they were able to make a profit out of it. Ibid., v. 1, Jan. 1905, p. 122.

2. La Stratégie, v. 32, Aug. 1899, p. 243; Oct. 1899, p. 289.

the number of victories required in a championship match should be reduced, or else these matches would last interminably.¹ Soon after 1900, Pillsbury also issued a challenge, but illness overtook the brilliant American before negotiations had progressed very far.

The next challenge came in 1903, from young Frank Marshall. Lasker replied he was ready to play a match of eight games up, draws not counting, but that the minimum stakes would be \$2,000 a side.²

Marshall tried to obtain backers, but his reputation was not sufficient to warrant such high stakes, and he was obliged to pull out. The American press was highly indignant that mere money should stand in the way of Marshall's ambitions, but Lasker was adamant.³

In October 1903, Dr. Lasker and Dr. Tarrasch came to an agreement for a match the following year. It was to be for eight games up, draws not counting, and for stakes of \$2,000 a side. In January 1904, unfortunately, Tarrasch injured himself while ice-skating and requested a postponement. Lasker declined, and suggested negotiations be started afresh when Tarrasch recovered.⁴

1. Lasker expressed the opinion, in 1912, that a first class master lost about one game out of ten, so that championship matches requiring even as many as eight victories were apt to last too long. Am. Ch. Bu., Feb. 1912, p. 26.

2. Brooklyn Daily Eagle, July 26, 1903.

3. Ibid., Aug. 23, 1903; Pittsburgh Dispatch, Aug. 24, 31, 1903; New York Clipper, Aug. 22, 1903.

4. Siegbert Tarrasch, Der Schach Wettkampf Lasker-Tarrasch, Leipzig: 1908, pp. 3-5.

Meanwhile, in 1904, Marshall won the Cambridge Springs Tournament, and his stock rose considerably. He immediately issued a second challenge, stating he was able now to obtain the necessary \$2,000.¹ Lasker, who was possibly not anxious to rush into a match so soon after his comparative failure at Cambridge Springs, acceded, but with certain provisions that seemed to be perverse in their intent. He requested that Marshall deposit \$500 forfeit money, that he name a second who was not a newspaperman, since he could not be impartial, and finally stated that the games would be Lasker's own property.² This last provision was to insure that the revenue from the games would not be undermined should Marshall decide to release them without compensation. Marshall replied that he reserved the right to name whomever he wished for a second, did not see why the games were not the joint property of the two players, and saw no reason for posting a \$500 forfeit unless Lasker did likewise.³ Lasker acceded to the first two points, but insisted on the \$500 forfeit.⁴ Marshall, possibly because he could not obtain the extra cash, withdrew angrily from the match.⁵ The press was again disappointed,⁶ and the cry of commercialism was heard once more:

1. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 1, Dec. 1904, p. 53.

2. Idem.

3. Am. Ch. Bu., Dec. 1904, p. 131.

4. Ibid., Jan. 1905, p. 2.

5. "My friends are of the opinion that your conditions are arbitrary and unnecessarily obstructive and I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that, for the time being, our negotiations must cease." Ibid., p.2.

6. "Eight years have flown by without witnessing a contest for premier honors! Surely there must be some reasonable explanation for this lamentable state of affairs." Ibid., p. 1.

There is certainly an impression prevailing in chess circles that the commercial element looms so large in the minds of the negotiators, on both sides, that the true interests of the game are in danger of being made subservient to pecuniary results.¹

Balked in his attempt at a world championship match, Marshall went ahead with plans for another match, with Janowski, in Paris. The match was for eight games up, stakes of \$500 a side, plus a purse provided by Professor Rice. The match began on January 24, at the Café de la Régence, and concluded on March 7, 1905, in favor of Marshall, 8-5, with 4 draws.² Then, in the fall, from September 18 to October 14, Marshall engaged the redoubtable Dr. Tarrasch in a match eight games up, draws not counting, in Nürnberg, arranged by the Nürnberg Chess Club and the German Chess Association. Tarrasch routed Marshall 8-1, with 8 draws.³ Despite Marshall's anger at Lasker, he stole a leaf from his book, and induced Tarrasch to accede to the scheme of selling the scores of their games.⁴ European chess editors howled with anguish, but it was obvious that the players held the whip hand. The games were avidly sought for by readers and the periodicals paid the price.

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 25, Feb. 1905, p. 59. Lasker had summed up the matter aptly in a letter of 1903: "If the chess world wants to have the pleasure, excitement and instruction which a championship match affords to some hundreds of thousands of chess players, nay even in some degree to the succeeding generations, why should it not pay for it?....Why.... does the chess world expect all the sacrifices from the masters." Ibid., v. 23, Oct. 1903, p. 425.

2. La Stratégie, v. 38, Feb. 1905, p. 33; March 1905, p. 65; Am. Ch. Bu., Feb. 1905, p. 25.

3. Siegbert Tarrasch, Der Schachwettkampf Marshall-Tarrasch im Herbst 1905, Berlin: 1905, pp. 8-12.

4. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 3, Nov. 1905, p. 33.

The one-sided result of the match had been unexpected. Tarrasch was in high glee, and even wondered whether his skating accident had not been a blessing in disguise. He saw no reason now to issue a challenge to Lasker, feeling that such a challenge would be implicit acquiescence of Lasker's tenure of the title. He was still anxious for a match to prove his superiority, but wanted to approach such a match on equal terms with Lasker. He hit on the device of negotiating through the German Chess Association; on November 24, 1905, President Gebhardt wrote to the Manhattan Chess Club, casually asking if they could arrange a match between Tarrasch and Lasker, although he was careful to refrain from making this a challenge.¹ Meanwhile, Tarrasch went on record as claiming the world's championship, explaining that his victory over the young Marshall was more significant than Lasker's over Steinitz.²

The Manhattan Chess Club did not reply to Gebhardt's veiled offer, and, outside of Germany, Tarrasch's claim to the championship failed to obtain much response. On April 20, Gebhardt entered into direct negotiations with Lasker, but Lasker turned down an offer for a match in Germany, sponsored by the German Association, stating that only in the United States could sufficient money be raised to satisfy his needs.³

1. Tarrasch, Tarrasch-Lasker, p. 5.

2. "Es sei gewiss schweren gewesen, den jungen Marshall zu schlagen, als den alten Steinitz." Deutsches Wochensach, v. 22, Feb. 4, 1906, p. 37.

3. Tarrasch, Tarrasch-Lasker, p. 5.

Meanwhile, another challenger stepped forward, Geza Maroczy.¹ Maroczy had made his bow at Hastings, in 1895, winning the minor tournament. Since then, his progress had been rapid: second place behind Lasker at Nürnberg, 1896, second place tie with Pillsbury and Janowski at London, 1899, again behind Lasker, third place tie with Marshall, behind Pillsbury and Lasker, at Paris, 1900; then first prize at Monte Carlo, in 1902 and 1904, and at Ostend, in 1905, and tie for first prize with Janowski, at Barmen, 1905. On April 6, 1906, Lasker and Maroczy came to terms. The match would be for eight games up, drawn not counting, stakes of \$2,000 a side, winner take all, joint ownership of games. Each player was to deposit \$500 forfeit money before June 1, and the match would begin on October 15. Lasker was left free to make all arrangements as to locale.²

Suddenly, in September 1906, Maroczy dispatched a cablegram from Europe explaining he would be unable to go through with the match.³ The reasons for this abrupt withdrawal are somewhat obscure. Maroczy eventually explained that Lasker had arranged to play in Vienna until either should win three games, and then shift the locale to Cuba, where he thought he could obtain more money. Maroczy claimed that Trebitsch and Rothschild, wealthy patrons of the Vienna Chess Club, wanted the whole match or nothing at all, and were prepared to pay for

1. Geza Maroczy was born in Szegedin, Hungary. He was an engineer and mathematician by profession, but engaged little in these activities until after 1907.

2. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 3, April 1906, p. 245.

3. Am. Ch. Bu., Oct. 1906, p. 198.

it.¹ That Maroczy was unable to convince the Vienna Chess Club to accept only part of the match is plausible, but that Lasker should have insisted on going to Cuba unless Vienna failed to meet his monetary demands seems unlikely. When Lasker met Schlechter, another Austrian, in 1910, Vienna was still unable to afford more than five games of the match.

Once more, a match with Lasker had fallen through. When, on September 11, 1906, Marshall offered to substitute for Maroczy, Lasker, who was perhaps afraid that repeated failures to play would weaken his position, accepted the offer.² Marshall had just won the German Chess Association Congress in Nürnberg, in 1906, and repaired somewhat his shattered reputation. To expedite matters, Lasker dispensed with stakes, and decided to try the novelty of a purse by public subscription. If a \$1,000 purse, to go to the winner, could be raised by December 10, he declared himself ready to play.³ The press commended Lasker on his unexpected retreat from minimum stakes of \$2,000 a side, apparently not realizing that to play for stakes of \$2,000, in which the player received \$1,000, or to play for a \$1,000 purse, meant the same amount of money in Dr. Lasker's pocket. On October 26, Marshall and Lasker signed a tentative agreement for a match of eight games up, draws not counting. If the purse should exceed \$1,000, the excess money would

-
1. Deutsches Wochenschach, v. 22, Sept, 23, 1906, pp. 330-331.
 2. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 4, July 1906, p. 133.
 3. Ibid., Aug.-Sept. 1906, p. 147.

be split evenly. As usual, the players shared ownership of the games, and shared the gate receipts evenly.¹

Eventually a purse of \$1,156.10 was raised,² and play began on January 26, 1907.³ Lasker had lost no time in his negotiations with clubs, and play perambulated from New York to Philadelphia, Washington, D. C., Baltimore, Chicago, Memphis, and back to New York. Lasker did about as well as could be expected, shutting out a demoralised Marshall 8-0, with 7 draws.⁴ Despite the one-sided score, the match was a success. The practice of selling games to the newspapers proved a welcome source of revenue,⁵ while the method of public subscription had gone so smoothly that the British Chess Magazine, forgetting its former slurs at Lasker's "commercialism", commented:

This is a much better plan than the previous arrangement of playing for large stakes, which were mainly provided by the supporters of the respective players. The credit for breaking away from this baneful practice, which undoubtedly imparted to the match a strong element of gambling, belongs to Dr. Lasker.⁶

1. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 4, Aug.-Sept. 1906, pp. 147-148. Lasker commented: "For the first time, an attempt is going to be made to obtain the support of the whole of that public which is interested in the game." Ibid., p. 153.

2. Am. Ch. Bu., March 1907, p. 47.

3. Ibid., Jan. 1907, p. 1.

4. Ibid., April 1907, pp. 62-63. "Marshall is not in good form and he shows it at every turn. He needs a rest and will probably take it before the match is resumed in New York City." New Orleans Times Democrat, March 31, 1907.

5. "The sale of scores to the New York papers proved fairly successful and from this source the players derive a not inconsiderable revenue." Am. Ch. Bu., March 1907, p. 41.

6. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 27, Feb. 1907, p. 79,

Lasker had beaten Marshall even more decisively than Tarrasch, thereby taking much of the sting from Tarrasch's claim. In 1907, Tarrasch produced a new claim. The third Ostend Congress was held that year, and it featured an event which had been brewing in the minds of M. Marquet, the tournament sponsor, and Leopold Hoffer, the tournament director, for some time. This was a championship tournament, limited to a few outstanding masters. The players had reacted unfavorably when the idea had been broached at the Congress of 1906,¹ but by 1907, Hoffer had managed to persuade them. It had been originally hoped to induce Lasker to compete, and crown the victor world's champion. When Lasker declined, and even refused to recognize the winner as challenger to his title, Hoffer went ahead with a slightly altered program, in which the winner would be crowned Tournament Champion of the World.² Only six masters were invited, all winners of at least one international tournament: Amos Burn, David Janowski, F. J. Marshall, Carl Schlechter,³ Dr. Tarrasch, and Tchigorin, a last minute replacement for Maroczy, who decided not to compete. These six masters met each other four times, and Tarrasch took first prize with twelve and one half points out of a possible twenty, one half point ahead of Schlechter. Janowski and Marshall tied for third

1. *La Stratégie*, v. 39, March 1906, p. 84, April 1906, p. 122.

2. "Le vainqueur recevra le titre de Champion des tournois internationaux avec une médaille en or et un diplôme." *Ibid.*, v. 40, Feb. 1907, p. 83.

3. Carl Schlechter, who was born in Vienna, had made his debut at Leipzig, in 1894. His progress, since then, had been rather slow. He had finally secured a first prize, at Ostend, in 1906, in a very strong event.

and fourth with eleven and one half points, while Burn, in fifth place with eight points, was four and one half points behind Tarrasch. Only Tchigorin who, at fifty-seven, was a tired old man past his prime, fared really badly, scoring only four and one half points.¹

This close victory was sufficient grist for Tarrasch's mill, and he once more challenged Lasker's claim to the world's championship. In the summer of 1907, Tarrasch proposed the following conditions for a match with Lasker: to be played in Germany, and organized by the German Chess Association, preferably all in one city; \$1,000 to the winner, \$500 to the loser.² Lasker replied that since chess fans evidently desired a match between him and Tarrasch, they should subscribe a purse, so that the masters could dispense with backers.³ As champion, he felt that he should choose the time and the place. In Germany, the Bavarian Chess Association, an affiliate of the German Association, offered the club facilities of the city of Munich, and Tarrasch raised the stakes to \$1,500 a side.⁴ Lasker still hesitated playing in Germany, feeling he could get a purse of as much as \$3,750 in the United States.

1. La Stratégie, v. 40, April 1907, p. 156; June 1907, p. 276.

2. Tarrasch, Tarrasch-Lasker, p. 6.

3. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 6, Sept. 1907, pp. 222-223. Lasker also suggested: "Let the leading chess associations and clubs unite in forming an international committee that will have the prestige and power and be provided with the means of fulfilling the desires and duties of the chess world. Ibid., p. 223.

4. Tarrasch, Tarrasch-Lasker, pp. 7-9.

He finally suggested the following conditions: a match of eight games up, stakes of at least \$2,000 a side, Lasker, as champion, to determine time and place. Tarrasch replied angrily that he was not the challenger, that his claim to the title was as good as Lasker's, and that in this match, to settle their respective claims, Lasker could command no special privileges.¹

As 1908 dawned, the negotiations seemed to be hopelessly deadlocked. The German Chess Association again stepped forward in an attempt to settle matters. Lasker, in Germany on an exhibition tour, met with Professor Gebhardt and other officials of the Association, on June 5, in Cölogne. Tarrasch, it was clear, would not play the match outside of Germany, under any circumstances. He had made it a rule not to unduly neglect his medical profession for chess, and a journey to the United States would take far too long. Lasker finally came to a tentative agreement for a match with a winner's purse of \$1,000, or stakes of \$2,000 a side. In addition, each master would receive \$125 per game.² When Lasker received the final conditions, however, he balked again. He questioned a provision for \$1,000 expense money for Tarrasch in case he lost. He was afraid this would reduce the amount of the prize fund. If there was not sufficient money, he suggested waiting until more funds could be collected from amateurs outside of Germany who were anxious to bring the match to pass.³ After a flurry of

1. Tarrasch, Tarrasch-Lasker, p. 9.

2. Ibid., pp. 10-11. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 8, June 1908 p. 38. Tarrasch, for the privilege of playing in Germany, was expected to renounce his \$125 per game should the funds be insufficient.

3. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 8, Aug. 1908, p. 101.

heated correspondence, Lasker finally came to terms. The final agreement provided for a match of eight games up, draws not counting, a winner's purse of \$1,000, and a loser's purse of \$625, both provided by the German Chess Association. Further, the Association guaranteed an honorarium for Dr. Lasker of \$1,875. The match was to begin in Düsseldorf, where the Association was holding its Congress that year, on August 17. On August 31, it would move to Munich, where the Bavarian Association had originally offered its facilities.¹

As the British Chess Magazine later commented, the match was considered an encounter of giants. "With the exception of Tchigorin, he [Tarrasch] was considered to have no serious rival in the Old World."² The daily press all over the world, as far away as Japan, followed the action. Tarrasch, after his brilliant string of victories, from 1889 to 1894, had not been able to consistently match that pace. This failure was due largely, however, to the fact that he was only a part-time chess player, and lack of practice occasionally handicapped him, particularly in the early part of a tournament. In spite of this, he had scored some impressive victories since 1894: at Vienna, in 1898, where all the leading masters outside of Lasker competed, at Monte Carlo, in 1903, and in the championship tourney at Ostend, in 1907. Besides, he had scored a one-sided match victory over Marshall.

Tarrasch had not much better luck than Marshall. He fell quickly behind and succumbed 8-3, with 5 draws.³

-
1. Tarrasch, Tarrasch-Lasker, p. 21.
 2. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 28, Nov. 1908, p. 486.
 3. Tarrasch, Tarrasch-Lasker, p. 111.

The great honour of chess champion of the world, which Germany, his native land, had hitherto denied his [Lasker's] right to claim, is now acknowledged universally.¹

There was little question, now, of Lasker's superiority. Various German chess periodicals set out to show that the results of the match, if properly analysed, actually proved that Tarrasch was the better player, but even in Germany, chess players had to admit that Lasker was the champion.²

II

Early in 1908, another match had taken place which had passed relatively unnoticed: a return match between Marshall and Janowski. The man responsible for this and many more of Janowski's matches, was a Dutch painter by the name of Leo Nardus. Early in the twentieth century, he settled in France. He apparently had made good money at his trade, for he purchased a villa at Suresne, near Paris, and devoted much time and money to the promotion of chess matches. As early as 1899,

1. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 8, Oct. 1908, p. 174.

2. Frankfurter Zeitung, Oct. 2, 1908. Following the match, Tarrasch came up with one of the most fascinating alibis ever concocted in match play. He claimed that in the first part of the match, the sea air coming down the Rhine to Düsseldorf had had an unsettling effect on his powers of concentration. The Br. Ch. Mag. commented aptly: "Düsseldorf is some 170 miles from the coast. A gift so sensitive to sea influences at that distance is not robust enough to carry the world's championship." v. 28, Oct. 1908, p. 433.

he had become acquainted with Marshall, and had helped finance his trip to London that year.¹ Following the first Janowski-Marshall match, he had offered \$100 for an extra game, \$60 to the winner, and \$40 to the loser. Janowski had won that game,² and from that time, Nardus became particularly attached to the Franco-Polish master, and backed him in numerous matches.³

The revenge match was held at his home, in Suresne, and kept from the press until its conclusion, to insure the privacy of both the players and of Mr. Nardus himself.⁴ Nardus provided all the money, and Janowski evened matters with his American foe, winning 5-2, with 3 draws.⁵ Following this victory, Janowski began looking to a match with Lasker himself. At the conclusion of the Lasker-Tarrasch match, Nardus approached Lasker in reference to a championship match. Lasker answered that he would be unable to defend his title for some time, since he needed to recuperate, and could make no definite plans. Nardus suggested instead a short series of four games, draws counting one half, the winner

1. Marshall, My Fifty Years, p. 7.

2. La Stratégie, v. 38, March 1905, p. 89.

3. Edward Lasker comments that Nardus had deep faith in Janowski's capabilities. At the Scheveningen tournament, in 1913, in which Edward Lasker participated, Alekhine clinched first prize before playing his last game. This game was with Janowski, and according to Lasker, Alekhine played it carelessly and Janowski won. "The result of this game once more convinced Monsieur Nardus, that Janowski could really beat any master in the world if he only half tried." Lasker, Chess Secrets, p. 192.

4. This condition prevailed, Hoffer explains, "partly because M. Nardus is averse to advertisement and partly to avoid the privacy of his house being invaded by reporters and spectators." Leopold Hoffer, The match and the return match, Janowski-v-Marshall, Leeds: no date, p. 2.

5. Idem. Marshall won a third match in 1912, held at Biarritz, in Southern France, by a score of 6-2, with 2 draws. During the First World War, Marshall won two more matches from Janowski, who by that time was past his prime.

to receive \$350, the loser \$150. The title would not be at stake.¹ Lasker accepted, and from May 12 to May 22, 1909, at the villa in Suresne, he and Janowski split evenly, winning two games apiece.² Emboldened by this result, Janowski planned to challenge Lasker again, but in the meantime, another challenge came from Austria.

There has been some speculation as to whether the match between Lasker and Schlechter was really a championship match. This is due to the fact that they played a series of ten games, while championship matches were almost never played under such hazardous conditions. The accepted procedure since the time of Steinitz had been to play until one party scored a stipulated number of wins, draws, of course, never counting. It was felt that in a series with a maximum number of games, the player who took the lead could systematically play for draws until the match ran out. However, the difficulty of the first method was that it was impossible to control the time element. If the two contestants drew repeatedly, such a match might stretch interminably. It was for that reason that Lasker had advocated a smaller number of stipulated wins. When funds were difficult to obtain, therefore, as in the Gunsberg-Steinitz match, in 1890, players were sometimes forced to contest a series of games rather than a full-fledged match. This was partly the reason why a series was decided upon in 1910. Schlechter,

1. La Stratégie, v. 42, May 1909, p. 167.

2. Idem.

at that time, was known as the drawing master,¹ having inherited the title from Englisch, due to the high percentage of draws in his tournament scores.² Fear that Schlechter would score too many draws possibly induced Lasker to risk a series with him, while lack of funds eventually reduced that series to ten games.

Schlechter issued his challenge as preparations were progressing for the four game series between Lasker and Janowski.³ The challenge was to a world's championship match, and was unquestionably accepted as such by Lasker.⁴ "The following are the conditions of a match for the championship of the world between Dr. Lasker and Schlechter."⁵ Lasker and Schlechter agreed to a series of thirty games and to stakes of \$2,000 a side.⁶

Schlechter, like Tarrasch, did not wish to come to the United States, and Lasker opened negotiations with clubs in Europe. Possibly because the match with Tarrasch had so recently concluded, Lasker had difficulty raising funds. On September 15, 1909, he and Schlechter published an open letter requesting subscriptions for their match.⁷ The status of the match had not changed, however:

1. Br. Ch. Mag., v. 26, Aug. 1906, p. 325.

2. Schlechter's strongest claim to a championship match lay in his great consistency, and the remarkable paucity of losses in his tournament scores.

3. Deutsches Wochenschach, v. 24, Dec. 13, 1908, p. 447.

4. "Dr. Lasker and Carl Schlechter have come to....a tentative understanding with regard to their match for the championship of the world to be played by them in the fall and winter of 1909." Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 9, Dec. 1908-Jan. 1909, p. 25.

5. Am. Ch. Bu., Feb. 1909, p. 25.

6. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 9, Dec. 1908-Jan. 1909, p. 33.

7. Am. Ch. Bu., Nov. 1909, p. 245.

The championship match between Dr. E. Lasker and Carl Schlechter appears to be practically a certainty.¹

Lack of funds now forced the contestants to reduce the series to fifteen games.² Finally, unable to obtain support in London, or in St. Petersburg, which had just depleted its funds for the Tournament of 1909, Lasker acceded to a ten game series, five in Vienna, and five in Berlin.³ Its status was still unimpaired, however, and it was called the "Wettkampf Lasker-Schlechter um die Weltmeisterschaft."⁴

Play opened on January 6, at the Vienna Chess Club, in the "Schachwettkampf um die Weltmeisterschaft."⁵ The first four games were drawn, and then Schlechter scored in the fifth game. The match "for the Championship of the World",⁶ now moved to Berlin. Tension mounted as

1. Am. Ch. Bu., Nov. 1909, p. 245. "Le Dr. Lasker et C. Schlechter annoncent qu'ils sont prêts à jouer leur match projeté pour le Championnat du Monde en décembre, janvier, février, et mars prochains." La Stratégie, v. 42, Oct. 1909, p. 353.

2. "It is expected that the chess championship match between Dr. Emmanuel Lasker and Carl Schlechter will be begun in December in Vienna, and continue in Berlin and London. Dr. Lasker was in London last week making arrangements with the City of London Chess Club to have the concluding and most important part of the contest take place there, and is willing to reduce the proposed number of thirty games to fifteen." New York Evening Post, Dec. 1, 1909. "The chess world will now look forward with interest to the forthcoming championship match which will probably consist of fifteen games instead of thirty, as originally proposed, and probably be contested in Vienna and Berlin." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 29, Dec. 1909, p. 543.

3. Am. Ch. Bu., Feb. 1910, p. 25. "The European chess clubs have shown no eagerness to see the match." New York Evening Post, Jan. 8, 1910.

4. Wiener Schachzeitung, v. 12, Dec. 1909, p. 409.

5. Ibid., v. 13, Jan. 1910, p. 1. "The first of the ten games now being played between Lasker and Schlechter for the chess championship came to a conclusion January 10, in Vienna." New York Evening Post, Jan. 22, 1910.

6. Chess Weekly, v. 4, Jan. 29, 1910, p. 141.

Schlechter drew the sixth, then the seventh, then the eighth, and then the ninth game. He was now one game away from victory. In a wild encounter which is a classic of chess literature, Lasker won the tenth game, drew the match, and saved his title.¹

Later that year, an article appeared in the American Chess Bulletin, by Robert J. Buckley, claiming the title had not been at stake in the late match.² If this is the original basis for the doubt which has since arisen it is only fair to say that Mr. Buckley presented not a shred of evidence for this fantastic claim, and that no one even took the trouble of commenting on his story.³

1. The Am. Ch. Bu. referred to the conclusion of the "Lasker-Schlechter Championship Match", March 1910, p. 49. "Lasker's title.... hung in the balance and almost had slipped from his grasp." Ibid., p. 50. The Chess Weekly announced that Lasker had retained his championship. v. 4, Feb. 19, 1910, p. 165. La Stratégie recorded the results of "cette lutte pour le Championnat du Monde", v. 43, Feb. 1910, p. 59. When E. A. Michell compiled his year book for 1910, he wrote: "There were two matches for the Championship of the World, Lasker-vs-Schlechter, and Lasker-vs-Janowsky." Year Book, 1911, p. 1. As conclusive proof, Lasker himself, near the end of the match, when he thought he would lose, commented "a good man will have won the world's championship". New York Evening Post, Feb. 19, 1910.

2. Robert J. Buckley, "Lasker-Schlechter", in Am. Ch. Bu., June 1910, p. 155.

3. Mr. Buckley was a regular contributor to the American Chess Bulletin. He was an early proponent of the "inside" school of journalism, which purveys sensational, never before revealed, eye witness accounts: a sort of Washington confidential of chess. All his articles were of an extremely fanciful nature.

III

In the course of the preparations for the Lasker-Schlechter match, Janowski had renewed his own challenge. Lasker replied that he could not negotiate with him on the basis of a championship match until he had fulfilled his obligation to Schlechter. Nardus, however, induced Lasker to play a ten game series while they came to terms for a championship match.¹ If there is no question that the title was at stake in the Lasker-Schlechter match, there is equally no question that the title was not at stake in the second Lasker-Janowski encounter. Nardus contributed \$1,200, while another patron, M. Tauber, contributed \$200. The winner was to receive \$900, and the loser \$500. Play opened on October 19, 1909, at the Grand Cercle, in Paris, and this time, Lasker won easily, 7-1, with 2 draws.²

Immediately upon conclusion of these games, Lasker came to terms with Janowski for a Championship Match of eight games up, to begin in October or November of 1910. Leo Nardus guaranteed a subscription for

1. *La Stratégie*, v. 42, Oct. 1909, p. 352. "Le Champion ne pouvant accepter le défi qu'après avoir répondu à celui antérieur de Schlechter, il fut arrangé de courtes rencontres sans esprit de championnat." *Ibid.*, v. 43, Feb. 1910, p. 59.

2. *Ibid.*, v. 42, Oct. 1909, p. 352. Nov. 1909, p. 406. During the first Steinitz-Tchigorin match, and the Steinitz-Gunsberg match, play had ended when Steinitz' lead had become insurmountable for the number of games left to be played. In this case, the series was played out, further indication of the growing public nature of chess matches. To have stopped the match when Lasker's lead became insurmountable would have meant cancelling a public exhibition which was making an appeal to a paying public.

a winner's purse.¹ The match took place at the Café Kerkau, in Berlin, from November 8 to December 8. Lasker utterly crushed Janowski 8-0, with 3 draws.²

The match received little attention. All eyes were turned on the amazing Schlechter, who had come so close to wresting the crown from the invincible Lasker.³ A much greater peril, however, was approaching Lasker from a different quarter.

1. La Stratégie, v. 43, Feb. 1910, pp. 60-61.

2. Ibid., Nov. 1910, p. 401; Dec. 1910, p. 441.

3. "So deep is the wizardry ascribed to the present champion, it is probable that even to Schlechter himself the question that presented itself to him at the outset was rather by how little he would lose than how near he might get to winning." Br. Ch. Mag., v. 30, March 1910. Of course, the main reason Lasker came so close to losing was the stipulation that the match would consist of a fixed series of games, and an extremely short one at that. It is certainly an open question whether Schlechter could have done as well in a set match up to a given number of victories. In the heat of the moment, however, contemporaries were so shocked that the great Lasker had been on the brink of defeat that they willingly forgot the circumstances in order to relish the unusual flavor of the occurrence.

CHAPTER X

I

In 1905, the following notice appeared in Lasker's Chess Magazine:

A young and promising player has been found by M. A. Ettlinger, of the Manhattan Chess Club, in the person of Jose Raul Capablanca, of Cuba.¹

Capablanca was the youngest child prodigy in the world of chess. If we are to believe his own testimony, and no one has ever raised any doubt concerning it, he learned chess at the age of four, while watching his father play, and when allowed to play, immediately proceeded to trounce his father.² Capablanca was born in Havana, Cuba, on November 19, 1888. At the age of thirteen, he defeated Juan Corzo, the champion of Cuba, in a match.³ In 1905, he came to New York to attend Columbia

-
1. Lasker's Chess Magazine, v. 1, Feb. 1905, p. 154.
 2. Jose Raul Capablanca, My Chess Career, New York: 1920, p. 2.
 3. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

University, and quickly made an impression on the chess devotees of the Manhattan Chess Club. He was described as "a young Cuban chess player, 16 years old, who possessed unusual aptitude for the scientific pastime."¹ He was particularly adept at rapid transit chess, a novelty lately introduced at the Manhattan Chess Club, in which the contestants had to move every ten seconds, and even defeated Lasker at this game.² By 1908, his reputation had so grown that he was "recognized one of the leading players in America."³ The American Chess Bulletin took the youngster under its wing and promoted an exhibition tour for him in the winter of 1908-09. Upon his triumphant return, the Bulletin organized a match with Marshall, the leading player in the United States.⁴ It is interesting to note how Lasker's handling of his matches had already rendered obsolete the conventional practice of seeking backers who put up their money at one to two. The provisions in the Capablanca-Marshall match were that the net income of the match would be divided, two thirds to the winner, one third to the loser.⁵ To the astonishment of the chess world, Capablanca, in his first important contest, nearly matched the performances of Lasker and Tarrasch, defeating Marshall 8-1, with 14 draws.⁶ Overnight, Capablanca was a sensation. Before he had scored his eighth victory, the Bulletin called him a master "in the very front rank of the world's greatest players."⁷ The German Chess Association extended an invitation to its congress at Hamburg, in 1910.

1. Am. Ch. Bu., May 1905, p. 204.

2. Ibid., Dec. 1908, p. 250. Capablanca, My Chess Career, pp. 12-13.

3. Am. Ch. Bu., Dec. 1908, p. 250.

4. Ibid., Feb. 1909, p. 26; March 1909, p. 58.

5. Ibid., April 1909, p. 82.

6. Ibid., Aug. 1909, p. 169.

7. Ibid., June 1909, p. 121.

Capablanca, however, delayed his entry into European chess, and instead took immediate advantage of his newly-won reputation by touring the United States extensively, compiling an amazing record in simultaneous exhibitions.¹ This one year delay unexpectedly led to an even more sensational debut. A major event of the year 1911 was to be the San Sebastian Tournament. M. Marquet, who had sponsored the congresses at Ostend, in 1905, 1906, and 1907, now decided to hold yearly congresses at his new resort in San Sebastian. The idea of making these tournaments exclusive by inviting only first rank masters had already been put into effect at Ostend, in 1907, in the championship tourney. For his first San Sebastian event, M. Marquet restricted the entries to those masters who had won at least two fourth prizes in the past ten years. He made an exception in the case of Capablanca, however, and the young Cuban made his European debut in one of the strongest events in recent years.²

Only Lasker, and the English champion Atkins, declined invitations.³ Besides Capablanca, fourteen other players entered: Paul Leonhardt

1. Am. Ch. Bu., June 1909, p. 121.

2. La Stratégie, v. 43, Nov. 1910, p. 402.

3. Henri Delaire, Le Tournoi d'échecs de Saint Sébastien: 1911, traduit et augmenté du International Schachturnier zu San Sebastian 1911, von J. Mises und Dr. M. Lewitt, Paris: 1911, p. xiii.

(1877-1935), a strong German master, Oldrich Duras, who had tied for first prize at both Vienna and Prague, in 1908, Aaron Nimzovich, a surprising third in the master's tournament at Ostend, in 1907,¹ Karl Schlechter, Geza Maroczy, Rudolf Spielmann (1883-1942), a rising young Austrian master, Akiba Rubinstein, who had tied Lasker for first at St. Petersburg, in 1909, and was considered the leading challenger for his title, Richard Teichmann (1868-1925), a German master residing in England, who had competed successfully on the international scene for many years, Milan Vidmar, a strong master from Austrian Slovenia, Ossip Bernstein, who had tied Rubinstein for first in the master's at Ostend, in 1907, Frank Marshall, Amos Burn, Siegbert Tarrasch, and David Janowski.²

The phenomenal Cuban calmly took the measure of this formidable field, lost only one game, to Rubinstein, and won the \$300 first prize by one half point.³ The chess public immediately clamored for a match with Lasker.⁴ Here was a gladiator who could test the steel of the champion. On October 26, 1911, while on a triumphant tour of Europe, Capablanca formally challenged Lasker by letter.⁵ The champion replied that he was ready to defend his title, but that he would require a little time to consider terms for what would probably be the most arduous

1. A regular masters tournament was held at Ostend, in 1907, concurrently with the championship event. Rubinstein and Bernstein tied for first prize.

2. La Stratégie, v. 44, Feb. 1911, p. 66.

3. Ibid., March 1911, p. 106.

4. Chess enthusiasts in Cuba were reported ready to bid \$5,000 for a match between Lasker and their hero. Am. Ch. Bu., April 1911, p. 75.

5. Ibid., Dec. 1911, p. 267.

struggle of his career.¹ Two weeks later, he published the conditions he required for a match with Capablanca. They manifestly favored the champion. The match was to be for six games up, but no more than thirty games could be played. Unless the challenger had at that time a margin of two wins, Lasker kept his title. There had often occurred a provision in previous matches that the margin of victory would have to be two games. But those conditions had applied in a match up to a stipulated number of victories, and the match was broken off when the score became tied, one victory short of the stipulated number.² In this case, however, such a provision was to be introduced in what really amounted to a series, and the possibility was created of a tie match with Capablanca actually ahead by one game. The stakes were left undetermined, with the provision that they should be at least \$2,000 a side, and the only provision for the loser was that if Lasker kept his title, he would pay Capablanca \$250 for every game he won, and \$75 for every draw. Further, the games were to be Lasker's exclusive property, the usual time limit of fifteen moves an hour was reduced to twelve moves an hour, and an enormous \$2,000 forfeit was required of Capablanca.³

The admirers of Capablanca, on the one hand, maintain that the conditions are harsh and, to some extent unprecedented. Those of Dr. Lasker believe that the latter yielded much in noticing a challenge from a youth, but recently of age, who desired a short cut to the championship without first taking into consideration the other candidates to the title.⁴

-
1. New York Evening Post, Nov. 8, 1911.
 2. Cf. p. 123, footnote 6.
 3. New York Evening Post, Nov. 22, 1911.
 4. Am. Ch. Bu., Feb. 1912, p. 25.

Capablanca replied that several of the conditions were unacceptable.

In reference to the provision for calling the match after thirty games, and requiring his holding a margin of two victories to secure the title, Capablanca commented, "the unfairness of this condition is obvious".¹ He could not have selected a more unfortunate phrase. Lasker chose to consider it a personal insult, broke off negotiations with Capablanca, and for the next two years continued to represent himself as a deeply injured party. Friends attempted to heal the breach, and for a while, it seemed as if Lasker might relent. But after deep communion with his soul, he decided that Capablanca's insult was too great for him to forgive, and in the absence of an apology, he could not bring himself to enter negotiations with the Cuban. He was dropping the match.²

Capablanca's hot Latin blood seethed with anger. If he could not meet Lasker in direct combat, he decided he would claim the title by default. His business manager, F. D. Rosebault, saw another solution to the dilemma. In the fall of 1911, the American Chess Bulletin had taken the first steps towards organizing an international tournament in New York. Rosebault induced them to enlarge the scope of the event. The first part would be held in New York. The top four prize winners would then meet in Havana in a double round tournament, the winner to be declared champion of the world.³ The new tournament was placed

1. Am. Ch. Bu., Feb. 1912, p. 26.

2. Ibid., June 1912, p. 121.

3. Ibid., p. 122; July 1912, p. 145; Oct. 1912, p. 221.

under the management of Rosebault, who sent out invitations to all the leading masters. Lasker politely declined and explained that such a tournament could in no way be deemed a championship affair.¹

The tournament was a complete fiasco. Rosebault was unable to raise sufficient funds to bring European masters over, and the lure of a mythical championship proved of little interest to them. The event finally had to be cancelled, and in its place was substituted a National American Master's Tournament, which opened in New York on January 19, 1913.² Only three first rank masters competed, Janowski, Marshall, and Capablanca, who took first prize, one half point ahead of Marshall. The first six prize winners then left on February 8, for Havana, to compete with a select field of Cuban champions. This time Marshall topped Capablanca by one half point.³

Capablanca had attempted to circumvent Lasker and had failed. "The champion holds the field, and may, if he pleases, continue to do so

1. "The plan unfolded....is fantastic. No good will come from confounding the complaints of Capablanca with a tourney that should be the affair of all the masters." New York Evening Post, Aug. 24, 1912.

2. Am. Ch. Bu., March 1913, p. 49.

3. Ibid., p. 49; April 1913, pp. 73-77. "The fiasco of the New York-Havana Tournament projected for December 12, was in some measure atoned for by the success of the National American Tournament held in New York, in which Capablanca confirmed his position as the leading master of the Western world, though his score was only half a point more than Marshall's in a field which contained no other player of world-wide repute except Janowsky; and Marshall's admirers had good cause for exultation when the two-round tournament, which followed at Havana, resulted in Marshall heading Capablanca by the same narrow margin, with Janowsky one point behind. It cannot be said, however, that these tournaments established anything beyond the fact that, apart from Capablanca and Marshall, no American player of the present day is capable of contesting on equal terms with European masters." E.A. Michell, Year Book of Chess, 1913, pp. 6-7.

without further contest."¹ Lasker's prestige had once more won the day.² It was clear, however, that the situation was unsatisfactory. The champion held the title as a proprietary right, and defended it when and against whom he pleased. He could set his own terms, and was responsible to no one. Until now, Lasker had so obviously distanced the field that there could be little quarrel with his claim. But should the situation alter, and should the superiority of the champion cease to be manifest, then possession of the title would have to be governed by some sort of orderly procedure.³

In the meantime, Lasker had turned back to an older challenger, Akiba Rubinstein. The Polish champion had been pressing for a match since the St. Petersburg Congress of 1909, in which he had tied Lasker for first prize. Finally, in August 1912, the two came to a tentative agreement. The match would be by subscription. Rubinstein, less demanding than Capablanca, accepted essentially the same conditions as those offered to the Cuban.⁴ Preparations for the match, however, progressed at a snail's pace. Rubinstein wanted to play during the day.

1. Anthony Guest, "Notes on 1912", in Br. Ch. Mag., v. 33, Jan 1913, p. 8.

2. Guest, commenting further on the "Lasker-Capablanca comedy", added: "The affair [the New York-Havana Tourney] was unfortunate. It arose on the one hand from a legitimate desire to place the championship of the world on a settled basis, and on the other from a commendable ambition of the Havana amateurs on behalf of their champion." Idem.

3. A correspondent to the Am. Ch. Bu., Albert E. Seibert, suggested that a body be created to govern the championship, and put an end to the present anarchy. He could not understand how either of the parties could possibly have anything to say about the conditions which were going to rule an event in which they themselves participated. April 1912, p. 75.

4. New York Evening Post, Aug. 21, 1912.

Lasker wanted to play in the evening, when they could draw a large crowd of spectators. Funds were slow coming in.¹ Lasker announced that the match would take place when subscriptions for the purse reached \$2,500. By January 1914, he had contracted for fourteen of the games with clubs in Berlin, Frankfurt, Moscow, Lodz, and Warsaw. Lasker was confident the match would take place that summer, following the St. Petersburg Tournament.² The World War intervened, and Rubinstein never had his chance at the title.

II

Early in 1913, the St. Petersburg Chess Club began making plans for an international tournament in their city to celebrate the tenth anniversary of their founding:

A jubilee international tournament on a large scale is planned by the St. Petersburg Chess Club, to be held next winter, and at which the greatest players of the day are wanted.³

It was at St. Petersburg, in 1895-96 that the practice had first been introduced of holding a tournament with an exclusive entry. This was based on the fact that the entries in the average tournament were very uneven in strength. This presented an element of chance, for a

1. "If the chess world should show itself interested, the match between Rubinstein and myself will probably come to pass....it is difficult to raise funds for any public purpose where one has to address chess players." New York Evening Post, Aug. 31, 1912.

2. Am. Ch. Bu., Oct. 1913, p. 220; Jan. 1914, p. 3.

3. Ibid., May 1913, p. 105.

weak player was an unpredictable quantity. He might, on certain days, be a push-over, while on others, he might play over his head and score an occasional upset which scrambled the tournament results. Then there were the weak players who systematically played for a draw when encountering a strong master. The ideal situation, of course, was a match; but a match was apt to have less public appeal than a congress of many stars, while the play was usually very dull for the spectators. The solution seemed to be tournaments with entries limited by a high standard of qualification. At St. Petersburg, in 1895, the method used had been very simple. The committee had invited the first five prize winners at Hastings, the previous international tournament. At San Sebastian, in 1911, entries had been limited to the winners of at least two fourth prizes in the past ten years. It was at Ostend, in 1907, in the championship event, that the principle had first been utilized of choosing only first prize winners in a major international tourney. Only six such masters had participated on that occasion, and the absence of Dr. Lasker had robbed the event of much of its significance. The St. Petersburg Chess Club was determined not to repeat that mistake, and to move heaven and earth to obtain Lasker, whose presence would insure a success.

Tarrasch considered that there had been twenty-four grandmasters, i. e., winners of a first prize in a major international tournament, up to 1914. Of these, eight were dead: Anderssen, Charousek, Kolisch,

Mackenzie, Pillsbury, Steinitz, Tchigorin,¹ and Zukertort.² The St. Petersburg Chess Club extended invitations to the remaining sixteen: Bernstein, Rubinstein, Winawer,³ Lasker, Tarrasch, Teichmann,⁴ Duras, Schlechter, Weiss, Maroczy, Janowski,⁵ Blackburne, Burn, Gunsberg, Marshall, and Capablanca. Eventually, nine accepted. Winawer, at seventy-six, and Weiss, at fifty-seven, decided they were too old, and too long out of practice, and declined. Burn, although six years younger than Blackburne, who accepted, felt that at sixty-six he was also too old, and attended only as a reporter. Schlechter, Teichmann, and Duras, were also unable to attend. Maroczy drew the criticism of Tarrasch for not attending, but he had by now changed his attitude towards professional chess, and concentrated on his career as an engineer.⁶ Lasker at first declined, but the St. Petersburg Club eventually made things so attractive that he relented, and the success of the event was assured.

All the players received travelling expenses to and from St. Petersburg, and living expenses while in residence.⁷ In addition, stiff

1. Tchigorin had shared first prize at New York, in 1889, and at Budapest, in 1896.

2. Siegbert Tarrasch, Das Grossmeisterturnier zu St. Petersburg, Nürnberg: 1914, p. xiii. By that definition, Morphy could not qualify since he had never participated in an international tournament.

3. Winawer's first prize had come in the third German Chess Association Congress, at Nürnberg, in 1883.

4. Teichmann had finally won a first prize, at Karlsbad, in 1911.

5. Janowski had won first prize at Monte Carlo, in 1901, at Hanover, in 1902, and had shared first prize at Barmen, in 1905.

6. Tarrasch, St. Petersburg, pp. xiii-xiv.

7. Ibid., p. xiv.

honorary fees were paid out to secure the services of Lasker and other outstanding masters.¹ The prizes offered totalled \$1525. In addition, players who did not win one of the five prizes would be compensated, not only for every win, but for every half point scored.²

Besides the nine grandmasters who had accepted invitations, the St. Petersburg Chess Club conferred a tenth entry on the winner of the All-Russian Master's Tournament, held in 1913. This event ended in a tie between Aaron Nimzovich and the young star Alexander Alekhine, and when their tie match threatened to extend indefinitely, without coming to a result, it was decided to invite both masters, increasing the field to eleven.³ With a view towards shedding possible light on the world's championship situation, the committee organized the tournament in a novel way. The eleven entries would first meet in a single round. The top five winners would then engage in a double round event for the five prizes, and although the tournament was not called a championship event, many felt that the presence of both Lasker and Capablanca, the unusual caliber of the field, and the selective method of play, all would tend to confer on the winner an unofficial championship.⁴

As play opened, on April 20, Tarrasch forecast the possible outcome in this way. Blackburne and Gunsberg, he felt, were old men past their

1. St. Petersburg Zeitung, in Am. Ch. Bu., July 1914, p. 158.

2. Tarrasch, St. Petersburg, p. xiv.

3. Tarrasch, St. Petersburg, p. 9.

4. "Die Anwesenheit so vieler Interessenten will der Petersburger Schachverein benutzen, um endlich eine brennende Frage zu lösen, nämlich die der Weltmeisterschaft." Ibid., p. xiv.

prime,¹ and although they adhered technically to entry requirements, should not have been invited. Their presence would introduce an element of hazard, since although neither had a chance for a top prize, they would both probably have an occasional good day, and possibly score a brilliancy, to the misfortune of the performer unlucky enough to face them on that particular day. Four others, he felt, definitely had no hope for first prize. Alekhine and Nimzovich were youngsters, and in too fast company. Marshall and Janowski were both dangerous, but too erratic for such a gruelling and lengthy test of strength. Of the remaining five, Lasker, Rubinstein, Capablanca, Bernstein, and Tarrasch himself, the first three had a tremendous advantage in their firm conviction that they would win.²

In the single round opener, Capablanca was in splendid form. He won six games, lost none, and drew four, for a total of eight points. In his first encounter with Lasker, he drew. The tournament rules provided that scores in the first part of the tournament should carry over into the second part. Capablanca, therefore, stood a full point and a half ahead of Lasker, whose long absence from the game possibly affected even his amazing talent. He won four, lost to Bernstein, and drew five, for a total of six and one half points, good enough for a second place tie with Tarrasch. Tied for the last two qualifying places, with six points each, were Marshall and the unheralded Alekhine. Rubinstein was an inexplicable failure.³

1. Blackburne was seventy-two, Gunsberg was sixty.

2. Tarrasch, St. Petersburg, p. iv.

3. Ibid., p. xxiv. Among Rubinstein's losses was one to Alekhine which greatly helped the young Russian replace him in the final round, since Rubinstein scored only one point less than Alekhine and Marshall.

On May 10, therefore, the five men who had shown themselves to be the five strongest players in the world began a double round of play. Lasker was now playing magnificently. He scored over Alekhine, Marshall, and Tarrasch, but was held to a draw by Capablanca, and after one round of play, had closed the gap by only one half point. In the first game of the second round, Lasker beat Alekhine again, while Capablanca had the bye. This tied the score at eleven-all, but Capablanca had one more game than Lasker left to play. Lasker's next opponent was Capablanca himself; in a magnificent struggle, the world's champion handed the Cuban his first defeat to take the lead, 12-11. Lasker had the bye for the next game, and Capablanca could move back into a first place tie by winning. Possibly unnerved by his loss to Lasker, Capablanca blundered horribly, losing a piece outright to Tarrasch on the twelfth move. Capablanca fought desperately, minus a piece, for eighty-four moves, before resigning: a magnificent but futile achievement. Capablanca scored two more wins, but Lasker, with a win and a draw, kept a margin of one half point to take first prize.¹ He scored thirteen and one half points to Capablanca's thirteen. In the final section of play, he had scored six wins and two draws against four formidable opponents. A surprising third was the young Alekhine with a creditable ten points. Tarrasch and Marshall were badly distanced. They scored eight and one half and eight points respectively, but were able to score only two of these points in the final section.²

1. Tarrasch, St. Petersburg, pp. 155, 159, 165, 170, 175, and 180.
2. Ibid., p. xxiv.

In the long and brilliant career of Dr. Emmanuel Lasker, since he acquired the championship of the world in 1894, no achievement of his has surpassed the one that has just been written to his credit at the conclusion of the international tournament at St. Petersburg.₁

1. Am. Ch. Bu., June 1914, p.121.

CONCLUSION

I

The Capablanca-Lasker match finally came to pass in 1921. After his championship match with Janowski, in 1910, Lasker had returned to Berlin where he settled once more. He was caught there by the First World War, and in the course of that passionate conflict, he earned the enmity of the Allied World by an open display of his pro-German feelings. The armistice of 1918 found Lasker a disillusioned and sick man, in dire need of funds, but apprehensive of his reception in the post-war world.¹ After trying to resign his title without a match, he was finally induced by the lure of an \$11,000 guarantee to defend it against Capablanca in 1921, at Havana. Trailing 4-0, with 10 draws, Lasker resigned the match and the title.²

1. It was claimed that Lasker's failure against Capablanca, in 1921, was partly the result of privations he suffered in the camp of the Central Powers during the war. Am. Ch. Bu., May-June 1921, p. 101.

2. Lasker eventually recovered from the ordeal of World War I, and from 1923 to 1936 made an unprecedented come back. In New York, in 1924, at the age of fifty-five, against ten of the strongest masters in the world, including Capablanca, and the cream of the hypermoderns, Alekhine, Tartakover, Reti, and Efraim Bogolyubov, Lasker took first prize over Capablanca by one and one half points, and over the third place Alekhine by four points. In a double round event he was able to score thirteen wins in twenty games, at a time when draws were becoming the most common tournament results. As late as 1935, at the age of sixty-six, Lasker took third prize at Moscow, without losing a game, in a tournament which included Capablanca, Salo Flohr, and Mikhail Botvinnik.

Lasker never attempted to recapture the title he had held for twenty-seven years. His successor, Capablanca, was champion for six years. During that period, he enjoyed the same kind of superiority that had marked Lasker's reign. His tenure as champion was also marked by the first serious attempt to regulate the title. As has been pointed out already, the growth of international master chess coincided with the great era of cultural internationalism, or cosmopolitanism. After World War I, this trend was sharply reversed. However, the attempt at international organization continued to wage a losing battle, and still does today. It was against the background of the League of Nations, therefore, that the chess world gave birth, in 1923, in Zurich, to the Fédération Internationale des Echecs (FIDE). In 1924, this body established permanent headquarters at The Hague, and most of the national organizations became affiliated with it. In 1927, it sanctioned what might be regarded as the first official world's championship match. Capablanca, that year, made his first and last defense of the title. The Franco-Russian master, Alekhine, scored a stunning upset, 6-3, with 25 draws, to become champion. Save for a two year hiatus, from 1935 to 1937, he remained champion until his death, in 1946. His tenure brought the issue of the championship to a crisis. Between 1927 and 1935, Alekhine refused to grant Capablanca a return match. He defended, instead, twice against Bogolyubov, in 1929, and 1934, and defeated him both times.

The only grounds for the second match were that Alekhine wished to play a match with someone he felt certain of beating and that Bogolyubov could raise the necessary funds.¹

The FIDE found itself unable to coerce Alekhine into a match with Capablanca, particularly because it lacked funds. Alekhine supported himself as a professional from 1919 to 1939 partly by playing matches for very large stakes. If the FIDE could not supply the funds for these matches, it was in no position to dictate terms to the participants.

In 1935, Alekhine again by-passed Capablanca to defend against the Dutch master, Max Euwe. Alekhine lost the match by the odd game. It was hoped that Euwe might be more amenable to control by the FIDE, and the Dutch champion indicated his willingness to turn the administration of the championship over to the international body. First, however, he insisted on granting Alekhine a return match. In 1937, having stopped drinking and trained intensively, Alekhine routed Euwe and recaptured his title. He showed no inclination to recognize the authority of the FIDE, and when the war broke out, in 1939, the question of the championship was still unresolved.

When Alekhine died, in 1946, it enabled the post-war chess world to reconsider the championship unfettered by any previous commitments. The title was placed in the custody of the FIDE, and ceased for the

1. William Winter and R. G. Wade, The World Chess Championship 1951, London: 1951, p. 4.

first time to be the proprietary right of the champion. It had largely ceased to be a source of income, and that obstacle to international control of the championship applied no longer. It soon became a source of international prestige, and the post-war FIDE was to stumble over that barrier while the pre-war FIDE had been neutralized by economic considerations.

In 1948, the FIDE chose the six masters it considered the leading aspirants to the vacant title,¹ to meet in a World Championship Tournament. It was held in The Hague, and in Moscow, where the Russians displayed great hospitality to the masters. Botvinnik won the event and became world's champion.

In 1949, the FIDE, now relocated in Paris, devised a hopeful plan for dealing with the chess championship in the future. Every three years, a Candidates' Tournament would be held under the auspices of the FIDE. Its contestants would be selected in a series of zonal eliminations, similar to the Davis Cup competition in tennis. The winner of the Candidates' Tournament would be entitled to challenge the champion the following year.

This plan, unfortunately, became enmeshed in the complicated tangle of the cold war. Russian players dominated the immediate post-war situation, and Russia still boasts of the finest array of chess talent in

1. These were Botvinnik, Euwe, the two American masters, Samuel Reshevsky and Reuben Fine, the Estonian master, Paul Keres, now playing for Russia, and the young Russian, Vassily Smyslov. Fine declined the invitation, and the tournament was held among the remaining five.

the world today. Western players soon complained of the unfair advantage given to the Russian masters, who are state subsidized, and are, therefore, professionals. The Americans, however, possess one master who is on a par with the strongest Russian players, Samuel Reshevsky.¹ Much of the criticism which has emanated from the West has centered around the fact that Reshevsky has not yet had a match against Botvinnik. In the very first Candidates' Tournament, in Budapest, in 1950, the American State Department refused to grant Reshevsky a passport to attend, because travel was forbidden to Westerners in Hungary. The Americans immediately questioned the validity of the claim of the winner at Budapest, David Bronstein, of Russia.² Botvinnik, however, accepted Bronstein's challenge and made no attempt to consider the unfortunate plight in which Reshevsky had found himself.

Since then, the situation has rapidly deteriorated. According to Western masters, the Russians flood the field in the Candidates' Tournaments, help each other by illegal analysis of adjourned games, and throw games to their leaders when their position is threatened. Under the 1949 arrangement, three challengers have been selected, and all three are Russians: David Bronstein, in 1950, and Vassily Smyslov in 1953 and 1956. Reshevsky did not even trouble to enter the 1956 Candidates' Tournament.³ He has been trying to gain support for a separate championship

1. Reuben Fine is another very strong American master who was at one time considered a world's champion candidate. He has, however, retired from international play, and plays only occasionally in this country.

2. Am. Ch. Bu., May-June 1950, p. 64; Sept.-Oct. 1950, p. 112.

3. Botvinnik defended his title successfully both in 1951, and in 1954, but both matches were drawn. Some Western critics feel these matches might possibly have been rigged to provide maximum dramatic interest for chess followers in Russia.

of the Western World. If this should come to pass, the cold war split in the political world would have become perfectly mirrored in the world of chess.

II

Lasker's loss of the title did not bring to an end the era of professional chess. Chess remained the source of a still somewhat precarious and often hand to mouth existence for a number of its devotees until 1939. Nor did it bring to an end the trend towards specialism, which still goes on unabated today. However, by 1918, international master chess had been so affected by professionalism and specialism that it had been completely transformed from its status of 1851. Before 1851, master chess had been largely national in orientation. Its organization had been largely amateur, and its players mostly dilettantes. By 1914, it had become international, its organization professional, and its leading players specialists. In 1851, there had been no chess champion of the world, and this concept existed only in the vaguest form. In 1914, not only was there such a champion, but he had made possession of this title the basis of a large part of his livelihood. In 1851, there were no chess professionals. Players might stake some money on a game, or occasionally on a match, but only Lowenthal, Kieseritzky, and Staunton, made any attempt to support themselves through chess. In 1914, not only was there a large number of professionals, but the leading players were almost all professionals, and devoted their entire time and attention to the game.

In 1851, the first international chess tournament in history had been held. In 1914, such tournaments were a common occurrence, with several congresses meeting every year. The prize lists had increased rapidly, the caliber of the entry was far greater than that of 1851, the organization was far more complex. In 1851, matches were held in the privacy of a club, and at best, limited stakes formed the prize. In 1914, matches were public exhibitions, held in locales accommodating large audiences who followed the play on demonstration boards. More than public exhibitions, they were in many cases business ventures. The players shared the gate receipts and the revenues from the sale of games to newspapers, and competed for either very large stakes, or a purse provided by chess patrons. In 1851, the literature of chess was small and restricted. By 1914, almost every leading periodical had a chess column, chess magazines existed in profusion, and most chess masters derived part of their income from this source.

We have noted already the peculiar attitude of chess amateurs towards technique and brilliancy. It is safe to say, however, that by 1914, master chess had largely become the purview of the expert and the specialist, and that refinements in technique necessitated far greater study on the part of masters than had been the case in 1851. Finally, chess masters were treated on an individual basis, by 1914. The champion of the world represented only himself, not any particular nation. Right up to 1939, chess masters incarnated the spirit of pre-1914 cosmopolitanism in their disregard for national boundaries.

Since 1939, chess has exhibited a pattern strangely reminiscent of pre-1851 chess. It tends once more to be oriented along national lines, so that we speak of the superiority of the Russians as a group, for instance, rather than of the superiority of individual players. The professional master in the West is becoming a rarity. Behind the Iron Curtain, the chess master is state subsidized, but this support is quite different from the private patronage which prevailed before 1939. It emphasizes national characteristics, and is used to develop a Russian team, rather than individual stars. This renewal of nationalism in chess has coincided with a certain restriction in the facilities for intercourse among players, particularly between representatives of Eastern and Western countries. These restrictions are reminiscent of the lack of intercourse which prevailed among players before 1851, although the reasons then were quite different.

In short, chess, after reaching a certain climax in 1914, and again in 1939, has come around full circle to approximate once more the conditions of 1850. As for play itself, there seems to be no indication that the death of the game through excessive analysis is in any way imminent.

FINANCIAL TABLES

In the period from 1850 to 1914 the fluctuations in international exchange were so minor that they have been disregarded for the purpose of this paper. Further, the course of prices was roughly similar in the United States, England, and on the Continent.¹ There are three distinct periods in these price fluctuations. From 1850 to 1873 prices tended to move upward; from 1873 to 1896 there was a steady downward movement; from 1896 to 1914 there was a renewed upward movement.² Table A indicates the decennial averages of wholesale price index numbers in England, Germany, the United States, and France. Table B indicates the annual fluctuation in money wages in England and the United States, using 1936 as the base year.

1. "In England, Germany, and the United States, the course of prices between 1840 and 1914 was roughly similar in the three countries, particularly since the seventies." Walter T. Layton and Geoffrey Crowther, An Introduction to the Study of Prices, London: 1938, pp. 25-26.

2. Layton & Crowther, Study of Prices, p. 24.

Table A

Index of Wholesale Prices¹
(Base: 100 = 1891-1900)

| | <u>England</u> | <u>Germany</u> | <u>U.S.A.</u> | <u>France</u> |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1851-60 | 145 | 130 | 131 | 155 |
| 1861-70 | 151 | 130 | 140 | 151 |
| 1871-80 | 144 | 132 | 137 | 145 |
| 1881-90 | 113 | 108 | 115 | 114 |
| 1891-1900 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1901-10 | 110 | 115 | 117 | 111 |
| 1911-14 | 127 | 129 | --- | 129 |

Table B

Index of Money Wages²
(Base: 100 = 1936)

| | <u>England</u> | <u>U.S.A.</u> | | <u>England</u> | <u>U.S.A.</u> |
|------|----------------|---------------|------|----------------|---------------|
| 1850 | 28 | --- | 1853 | 31 | --- |
| 1851 | 28 | --- | 1854 | 32 | --- |
| 1852 | 28 | --- | 1855 | 32 | --- |

1. Layton & Crowther, Study of Prices, p. 26; S. B. Clough and C. W. Cole, Economic History of Europe, Boston: 1952, p. 662.

2. Layton & Crowther, Study of Prices, pp. 273-274; Edwin G. Nowse & Horace B. Drury, Industrial Price Policies and Economic Progress, Washington, D.C.: 1938, pp. 284-285.

| | <u>England</u> | <u>U.S.A.</u> | | <u>England</u> | <u>U.S.A.</u> |
|------|----------------|---------------|------|----------------|---------------|
| 1856 | 32 | --- | 1876 | 42 | 39 |
| 1857 | 31 | --- | 1877 | 42 | 37.5 |
| 1858 | 31 | --- | 1878 | 41 | 36 |
| 1859 | 31 | --- | 1879 | 41 | 35 |
| 1860 | 32 | --- | 1880 | 41 | 36 |
| 1861 | 32 | --- | 1881 | 41 | 37 |
| 1862 | 32 | --- | 1882 | 41 | 38 |
| 1863 | 32.5 | --- | 1883 | 41 | 39 |
| 1864 | 34 | --- | 1884 | 42 | 39 |
| 1865 | 35 | --- | 1885 | 41 | 38 |
| 1866 | 37 | --- | 1886 | 41 | 38 |
| 1867 | 36 | --- | 1887 | 41 | 39 |
| 1868 | 36 | --- | 1888 | 42 | 39 |
| 1869 | 36 | --- | 1889 | 43 | 39 |
| 1870 | 37 | 43 | 1890 | 45 | 40 |
| 1871 | 38 | 43 | 1891 | 45 | 40 |
| 1872 | 41 | 43 | 1892 | 45 | 40 |
| 1873 | 43 | 43 | 1893 | 45 | 38 |
| 1874 | 43 | 43 | 1894 | 45 | 35 |
| 1875 | 43 | 41 | 1895 | 45 | 38 |

| | <u>England</u> | <u>U.S.A.</u> | | <u>England</u> | <u>U.S.A.</u> |
|------|----------------|---------------|------|----------------|---------------|
| 1896 | 45 | 37 | 1906 | 49 | 46 |
| 1897 | 46 | 37 | 1907 | 51 | 47 |
| 1898 | 46 | 37 | 1908 | 50 | 43 |
| 1899 | 48 | 39 | 1909 | 50 | 47 |
| 1900 | 50 | 39 | 1910 | 50 | 50.5 |
| 1901 | 50 | 41 | 1911 | 50 | 49 |
| 1902 | 49 | 43 | 1912 | 51 | 50 |
| 1903 | 48 | 44 | 1913 | 52 | 52 |
| 1904 | 48 | 43 | 1914 | 53 | 52.5 |
| 1905 | 48 | 45 | | | |

BIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX

This listing attempts to include all the names which appear in the text of the dissertation. A few obscure persons, however, have been omitted.

Alapin, Simon Russian chess master and analyst of note. (1856-1923).

Albin, Adolf Rumanian chess master of moderate strength. Emigrated early to Paris. In 1893, settled in United States. (1848-1920).

Alekhine, Alexander Russian chess master, world's champion, 1927-35, and again, 1937-46. After the First World War, emigrated permanently to France. Doctor of law, although he was a chess professional and did not practice law. (1892-1946).

Anderssen, Adolf German chess master of outstanding strength. Teacher of mathematics by profession. Lived the greater part of his life in his birthplace, Breslau. (1818-1879).

Atkins, H. E. British chess master. British champion, 1905-11. (1872-1956).

Bardleben, Curt von German chess master. Educated for the law, but practiced it little. Supported himself as chess professional. (1861-1924).

Barnes, Thomas W. Nineteenth century British master. School teacher. (1819-1874).

Bauer, J. H. Austrian chess master. (1861-1891).

Berger, Johannes Outstanding problem composer, and leader in movement for quality scoring. (1845-1933).

Bernstein, Ossip Russian chess master. Lawyer. Still active as player. (1882-).

Bilguer, Paul Rudolf von One of the German Pleiade. Briefly held a commission in Prussian Army. (1815-1840).

Bird, Henry Edward Nineteenth century British master. Accountant. (1830-1908).

Blackburne, Joseph Henry British chess master and professional. Blindfold player of outstanding strength. (1842-1924).

Bledow, L. E. One of the German Pleiade. Professor of mathematics. (1795-1846).

Boden, Samuel S. British chess master. Engaged in business, then turned to painting and criticism. (1826-1882).

Bogolyubov, Efferaim Twentieth century Russian chess master. In late twenties, emigrated permanently to Germany. Contested two world championship matches against Alekhine, in 1929, and in 1934. (1889-1952).

Botvinnik, Mikhail Russian grandmaster. Present world's champion, a title which he has held since 1948. Engineer. (1911-).

Breyer, Julius Hungarian chess master. Early leader in hypermodern revolt. (d. 1921).

Brien, R. B. Strong British provincial player of mid-nineteenth century. Friend of Staunton.

Buckle, Thomas Henry British historian, considered one of the strongest chess masters in England around 1855. (1822-1862).

Burn, Amos Strong British master born in Hull. Businessman. (1848-1925).

Calvi, Ignacio Italian master. Emigrated to France in late 1840's. Noted author on the game. (1798-1873).

Capablanca, Jose Raul Cuban master. World's champion from 1921 to 1927. Held honorary post in Cuban foreign service. (1888-1942).

Cassell, Hartwig American chess editor. Born in Germany. Moved to Scotland in 1870's. Settled permanently in New York in 1889. (1850-1929).

Charousek, Rudolf Hungarian chess master. (1873-1900).

Clerc, Albert Late nineteenth century French master. (1830-1918).

Cochrane, John Mid-nineteenth century British master. Resided a large part of his life in India. (1798-1878).

Corzo, Juan Cuban chess champion. Lost memorable match to thirteen year old Capablanca, in 1901. (b. in 1873).

Czarnowski, Jerome Polish master, resident in Paris, in mid-nineteenth century.

Dadian, André Prince of Mingrelia, in Russia. Resided large part of his life in France. One of the most generous patrons of the game, as well as a strong player. (d. 1910).

Deacon, Frederick British master, born in Belgium, where he spent part of his life. (d. 1876).

Delannoy, Alfonse French journalist, associated with various chess periodicals. (1806-1883).

Delmar, Eugene American master of moderate strength. Lived in New York. (1841-1909).

Deschappelles, Alexandre Pioneer of nineteenth century French chess. Considered strongest player in Europe until advent of Labourdonnais. (1780-1847).

De Vere, Cecil British master of great promise. Died of consumption. (1845-1875).

Devinck, Francois Jules French chess patron, and player of moderate strength. Member of French Chamber of Deputies. (d. 1878).

Dubois, Serafino Strongest player in Italy in latter half of nineteenth century. (1820-1899).

Dufresne, Jean German chess master, writer, and editor. (1829-1893).

Duras, Oldrich Chess master born in Czechoslovakia. (b. 1882).

Edge, Frederick Milnes British journalist and historian. Private secretary to Paul Morphy during latter's visit to Europe.

Englisch, Berthold Austrian master. Employed as stock broker by House of Rothschild. (1851-1897).

Euwe, Max Strongest player of Holland. World's champion, 1935-37. (1901-).

Falkbeer, Ernst Austrian chess master and writer on the game. Lived for some years in England. (1819-1885).

Falkbeer, Nikolaus Brother of the former. Strong player in Vienna in mid-nineteenth century.

Fine, Reuben One of strongest American masters before the Second World War. Since the War, he has gradually withdrawn from public play, and is now employed in New York as a psycho-analyst. (1914-).

Fiske, Daniel Willard American linguist, bibliophile, and pioneer of nineteenth century chess. (1831-1904).

Fleissig, Max Austrian master of moderate strength in latter half of nineteenth century. (b. 1845).

Flohr, Salo Outstanding master from Czechoslovakia before the Second World War, and for a time considered a candidate for the world's championship. Since the war, has lived in Russia. (1908-).

Frère, Thomas Early patron of chess in Boston and New York. (1820-1900).

Fuller, William James Appleton American journalist, chess editor, and patron of the game. (1822-1889).

Gebhardt, Rudolf German professor of languages and philology. President of German Chess Association in early twentieth century. (1859-1929).

Gelbfuhs, Oscar Austrian chess player. Devised original system of quality scoring. Doctor of law. (1852-1877).

Gilberg, Charles A. American chess editor and patron of the game. (1835-1898).

Goetz, Alphonse Alsatian player, settled in Paris, remembered primarily as a blindfold expert. (b. 1865).

Golmayo, Celso Cuban chess champion, and one of the most generous patrons of the game. (b. 1841).

Goring, Carl Theodor German master of moderate strength. (1841-1879).

Gossip, George Hatfield Dingley British journalist, chess author, and editor, born in the United States. Resided a large part of his life in Australia. Mid-nineteenth century.

Green, Valentine Mid-nineteenth century British master of moderate strength.

Grimm, Vincenz One of the three strongest Hungarian players in first half of nineteenth century. Emigrated to Turkey during the political revolution of 1848. (d. 1869).

Gunsberg, Isidor One of strongest British masters in late nineteenth century. Born in Hungary. Chess professional and journalist. (1854-1930).

Hampe, Karl One of strongest Austrian masters in mid-nineteenth century. (1814-1876).

Hanstein, Wilhelm One of German Pleiade. In Prussian government service. (1811-1850).

Harrwitz, Daniel Strong German master. Emigrated to Paris in 1850's, where he was hired as professional at Café de la Régence. Retired from chess in early 1860's. Merchant. (1823-1884).

Helms, Hermann American chess editor. Educated in Germany. (b. 1870).

Heral, Josef Mid-nineteenth century Austrian master of moderate strength. (d. 1877).

Hodges, Albert Beaugard Considered at the close of the nineteenth century one of strongest American masters. Played little public chess after 1894. (1861-1944).

Hoffer, Leopold British chess journalist, born in Hungary. (1842-1913).

Horwitz, Bernhard One of German Pleiade. Emigrated to England in 1840's. Landscape painter. (1806-1885).

Jaenisch, Karl von Russian player, writer, and outstanding authority on the game. Professor of mathematics and engineering at St. Petersburg. (1813-1872).

Janowski, David French master, born in Russian Poland. Emigrated to France in early 1890's. During First World War, emigrated to United States. Once considered a candidate for the world's championship, played one championship match against Lasker, in 1910. (1868-1927).

Journoud, Paul French journalist and chess editor. (d. 1882).

Judd, Max One of the strongest American masters in late nineteenth century. Born in Poland. Resided in St. Louis, where he was a wealthy manufacturer. Served briefly in American diplomatic service towards the end of his life. (1852-1906).

Kennedy, Hugh A. Strong British provincial player. (1809-1878).

Keres, Paul One of strongest masters in the world today. Born in Estonia, he now plays for Russia. (1916-).

Kieseritzky, Lionel Strong French master and editor, born in Livonia. Noted as a blindfold player. (1805-1853).

Kling, Joseph German master and analyst, emigrated to England around 1850. Organist. (1811-1876).

Kolisch, Ignaz Austrian master of the nineteenth century. Retired from public play after 1867, and became a millionaire in a business career. Elevated to rank of baron around 1881. (1837-1889).

Labourdonnais, Charles de Strong French master remembered for his match series with M'Donnell in 1834. (1795-1840).

Lange, Max German historian, chess writer, and editor, and strong player. (1832-1899).

Lasa, Tassilio von Heydebrand und von der Outstanding German authority on chess, one of German Pleaide. Engaged little in public play. In Prussian diplomatic service. (1818-1899).

Lasker, Berthold Brother of Emmanuel. Doctor of medicine. Although he engaged little in public play, was one of strongest masters in Germany in the estimation of his brother. (1860-1928).

Lasker, Edward American master, born in Germany. Emigrated to the United States shortly before the First World War. (1885-).

Lasker, Emmanuel Philosopher, mathematician, and chess master. World's champion, 1894-1921. (1868-1941).

Lee, F. J. British master of moderate strength. (d. 1909).

Leonhardt, Paul Saladin Strong German master before World War I. Played little after the War. (1877-1935).

Lewis, William Pioneer of British chess. Friend of Staunton. (1787-1870).

Lichtenhein, Theodore Strong American master, born in East Prussia. (1829-1874).

Lipschuetz, Simon American master born in Hungary. One of the strongest players in this country toward the end of the nineteenth century; was considered, from 1892 to 1895, American champion. (1863-1905).

Lowe, Edward German master, migrated to England, where he became the owner of the Imperial Hotel, a rendez-vous for many chess players. (1794-1880).

Lowenthal, Johann Jakob Hungarian chess master. Emigrated during political revolution of 1848, eventually settled permanently in England. (1810-1876).

Loyd, Samuel American problem composer, and player of some strength. (1841-1911).

MacDonnell, George Alton Irish cleric, one of strongest players in that country in nineteenth century. (1830-1899).

Mackenzie, George Henry British master born in Scotland. Held commission in British Army until 1863, then joined United States Army. After Civil War, settled in this country as professional. Considered American champion until 1889. (1837-1891).

Makovetz, Julius Heinrich Hungarian journalist and chess master. (b. 1860).

Marache, Napoleon Early American master born in France. (1818-1875).

Maroczy, Geza Outstanding Hungarian master in early part of twentieth century. Mathematician and engineer. (1870-1951).

Marshall, Frank J. American chess champion 1909-1936. Contested world's championship match against Lasker in 1907. (1877-1944).

Mason, James Strong nineteenth century British master. Born in Ireland, migrated to United States as a child. Returned to England in 1878, where he settled permanently. (1849-1905).

Martinez, D. M. Cuban linguist, and strong chess master. Emigrated to Philadelphia in latter half of nineteenth century. (d. 1928).

Maurian, Charles Amédée Lifelong friend of Paul Morphy, lived in New Orleans. (1838-1911).

Mayet, Carl One of German Pleiade, born of French parents. Employed in Prussian civil service. (1810-1868).

M'Donnell, Alexander British master from Northern Ireland. Merchant. Contested immortal match series against Labourdonnais in 1834. (1798-1835).

Mead, Charles D. Pioneer of American chess in New York City. Player of moderate strength. (b. 1815).

Medley, George British chess patron. Secretary of London Chess Club. (d. 1898).

Meek, Alexander B. American jurist. Strong chess player and patron of the game. (1814-1865).

Meitner, Philipp Strong Austrian master. (d. 1910).

Mieses, Jacques German master and journalist. Renowned as an exhibition player. (1865-).

Minchin, James Inness British chess patron and editor. Civil servant in India for a large part of his life. (1825-1903).

Minckwitz, Johannes German master and outstanding blindfold player. (1843-1901).

Mongredien, Augustus British chess promoter. (1807-1888).

Montgomery, Hardiman P. Strongest player in Philadelphia around 1855. Chess editor and journalist. Mid-nineteenth century.

Morphy, Ernest Uncle of Paul, considered the strongest player in New Orleans until the advent of his nephew. (1807-1874).

Morphy, Paul The greatest American chess player. Educated as lawyer. Retired from active life after the Civil War, and began to suffer from paranoiac delusions. (1837-1884).

Napier, William Ewart Strong American master, born in England, emigrated to United States as a youngster. Played little after 1905. (1881-1952).

Nardus, Leo Dutch painter. One of the most generous patrons of the game. Supported Janowski and Marshall in particular. Settled in Suresne outside Paris.

Neumann, Gustav R. Strong German master and writer on the game. (1839-1881).

Newham, Samuel Early nineteenth century British provincial player.

Nimzovich, Aaron Russian master, born in Latvia. (1886-1935).

Noa, Josef Austrian master of moderate strength. Doctor of medicine. (1856-1903).

Ourousoff, Sergei Russian Prince. One of the strongest Russian amateurs of the mid-nineteenth century. Reputed to have acted as backer of Kolisch.

Owen, John English cleric, strong provincial player with a long and good tournament record. (1827-1902).

good tournament record

Paulsen, Louis One of strongest of nineteenth century German masters. A merchant, he migrated to the United States in the mid-1850's, to engage in the wholesale tobacco business. He returned to Germany at the outbreak of the Civil War. Was a pioneer in the field of blindfold chess. (1833-1891).

Paulsen, Wilfrid Brother of the former. Also a strong German master in the late nineteenth century. (1828-1901).

Perigal, George Pioneer in early nineteenth century British chess.

Perrin, Frederick Pioneer in nineteenth century American chess, born in London of Swiss parents. (1806-1889).

Petroff, Alexander The strongest Russian master of the first half of the nineteenth century. Employed in Russian foreign service in Warsaw. (1794-1867).

Philidor, André Danican The outstanding master of the transitional period between the primitive chess of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, and the modern chess of the nineteenth century. Also a noted French musician. (1726-1795).

Pillsbury, Harry Nelson The greatest American chess player of the end of the nineteenth century. One of the greatest blindfold players of all time. (1872-1906).

Pitschel, Ernst Lived most of his life in Austria. Painter and photographer. (d. 1872).

Pitschel, Karl Brother of the former. German master of the nineteenth century. (d. 1883).

Pollock, William Henry Krouse Irish master. Emigrated to Canada in 1889. Received medical training but supported himself as chess professional. (1859-1896).

Preti, Jean Italian by birth, famous French chess editor. Migrated to France in the 1820's, and was employed as a school teacher for a while. (1798-1881).

Przepiorka, David Polish master, reportedly killed as a Jew by the Nazis during the Second World War. (d. 1940).

Raphael, Benjamin Early American player, born in France. Doctor of medicine. (1818-1880).

Reshevsky, Samuel One of the few chess prodigies, played chess against masters at the age of five. Now considered the strongest player in this country, and one of the strongest in the world. (1911-).

Reti, Richard Master from Czechoslovakia, noted writer on the game. (1889-1929).

Rice, Isaac Leopold Wealthy American lawyer and businessman, born in Germany, one of the most generous patrons of the game. (1850-1915).

Rivière, Arnous de French chess master, journalist, and editor. (1830-1905).

Rosenthal, Samuel French chess champion through latter half of nineteenth century. Born in Poland, emigrated during revolution of 1863. (1837-1902).

Rothschild, Albert von Head of the House of Rothschild, strong chess player, and one of the most generous patrons of the game. (1844-1911).

Rousseau, Eugène French master of moderate strength in mid-nineteenth century. Lived for a time in New Orleans, where he was an opponent of Paul Morphy.

Rubinstein, Akiba The strongest Polish master of the early twentieth century. Was robbed of his chance at the title by the First World War, after which his play weakened somewhat. Retired from public play after 1931. (1882-).

Sabouroff, Peter A. Russian chess patron in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. President of St. Petersburg Chess Club.

Saint-Amant, Pierre de French master, reached his zenith around 1840. Wine merchant and French government official. Lived out his last days in Algeria. (1800-1872).

Schalloppe, Emil Strong German master, outstanding blindfold expert. Employed in German civil service. (1843-1919).

Schiffers, Emmanuel Strongest player in Russia, after the retirement of Jaenisch and until the advent of Tchigorin. (1850-1905).

Schlechter, Karl One of the strongest masters ever produced in Austria. Held Lasker to a tie in a world championship match in 1910. Employed by the House of Rothschild. (1874-1918).

Schorn, K. One of the German Pleiade. Painter. (1802-1850).

Schulten, John W. American master, German by birth. Prosperous merchant in New York. (d. 1875).

Schumoff, Elie Strong Russian master around 1850. In Russian navy department as administrative officer. (1819-1881).

Schwarz, Adolf Austrian master of the latter half of nineteenth century. (1836-1902).

Séguin, James D. American chess editor, and lawyer, in New Orleans. Late nineteenth century.

Sellman, Alexander G. American master from Baltimore. (1856-1888).

Shipley, Walter Penn American authority on the game, patron and journalist. Lawyer. (1860-1942).

Showalter, Jackson One of strongest American masters in late nineteenth century. Was considered American champion from 1895 to 1897. Wealthy plantation owner in Kentucky. (1860-1935).

Smyslov, Vassily One of the strongest masters in Russia today. Considered the strongest challenger in Russia for Botvinnik's title. (1921-).

Sonneborn, W. British inventor of various scoring systems, in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Bank official.

Spielmann, Rudolf Austrian master, early twentieth century. (1883-1942).

Stanley, Charles British master, nineteenth century. Resided a large part of his life in the United States, where he was stationed in the British Consulate. (b. 1819).

Staunton, Howard Dean of British chess around 1850. Editor, promoter, patron, journalist, critic, and authority on the game. Retired from public play in 1858 to devote his time to Shakespearean criticism. (1810-1874).

Steinitz, Wilhelm Chess master from Bohemia. World champion 1886-1894. Moved early to Vienna; thence, in 1862, to London. In 1883, he settled permanently in New York. One of the outstanding authorities and masters in the game. (1836-1900).

Sviderski, Rudolf Polish master of moderate strength. Committed suicide. (1878-1909).

Szen, Josef One of the strongest Hungarian masters of the early nineteenth century. (d. 1857).

Tarrasch, Siegbert One of the greatest masters of German chess. Outstanding writer on the game. Doctor of medicine. (1862-1934).

Tartakover, Savielly Polish master, lived in Paris after World War I. Noted journalist. (1887-1956).

Taubenhaus, Jean Parisian player of some strength, born in Poland. (1850-1919).

Tchigorin, Mikhail The greatest Russian master of the nineteenth century. Employed for a time in government service, became a chess professional shortly after 1880. Contested a world championship match against Steinitz in 1892. (1850-1908).

Teed, Frank Melville American problem composer, inventor of scoring techniques and promoter of the game. Employed in life insurance company. (1856-1929).

Teichmann, Richard Strong German master, who lived in England for about a decade (1895-1905). Noted linguist. (1868-1925).

Thomas, George Alan Baronet. One of strongest of twentieth century British chess masters. Also an outstanding badminton player. (1881-).

Thompson, James American chess master, born in London. Prosperous owner of a restaurant in New York. (1805-1870).

Tietz, Victor Austrian chess enthusiast, promoter, and patron. Responsible for great Karlsbad Tournaments of 1907, 1911, 1923, and 1929. Inventor of Tietz system of dividing prizes. (1859-1938).

Tinsley, Samuel British master of moderate strength. Bookbinder. (1847-1903).

Trebitsch, Leopold Wealthy silk manufacturer, generous patron of the game in Austria. (d. 1906).

Vidmar, Milan Strong master from Slovenia, now part of Yugoslavia. (1887-).

Walbrodt, Karl Augustus German master of promise, born in Holland. (1871-1902).

Walker, George Early pioneer of British chess. Journalist, editor, patron, and player of moderate strength. Stockbroker. (1803-1879).

Wayte, William English cleric, player of moderate strength. (1829-1898).

Weiss, Max Strong Austrian master of late nineteenth century. (1857-1927).

Williams, Elijah British master in early nineteenth century.

Winawer, Simon Polish master of considerable strength. Businessman. (1838-1920).

Wisker, John British master of moderate strength. (1846-1884).

Wyvill, Marmaduke British player of mid-nineteenth century. Member of Parliament. Played little public chess. (1815-1896).

Yates, Frederick Dewhurst Strong twentieth century British master. (1884-1932).

Zukertort, Johannes Hermann German master, born in Poland, migrated to London in 1872, where he lived the rest of his life. Educated in medicine. Noted blindfold performer. (1842-1888).

Zwanzig, Hermann German chess promoter, first general secretary of the German Chess Association. (1837-1894).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography by no means intends to be exhaustive on the subject of chess. The volumes on chess are literally countless. The vast majority of this literature, however, is composed of technical manuals, handbooks on openings, on the end game, on combination play, etc. Another large portion of this literature comprises collections of games, most of which are of little or no value to the type of history this study represents.

This bibliography, quite the contrary, is highly selective, including only that material which can be of any possible use to the historian. This material is very difficult to come by. The best historical sources on this subject are periodicals and tournament and match books. The finest collection of such material, and the largest chess collection in the United States, and probably in the whole world, is the John G. White collection, which is in the Cleveland Public Library. This collection is particularly helpful for the period 1851-1914. The second best collection is probably

the Frank Marshall collection in the New York Public Library. This collection is heavily weighted towards the twentieth century, and is not quite as complete as regards periodicals. Another fine collection is the one in the Los Angeles Public Library. The Library of Congress, in Washington, has a large and widely representative collection, but it is an uneven one. It is particularly spotty for foreign periodicals and tournament and match books in the nineteenth century. Some of the early historical material can be found in the libraries of Princeton and Harvard Universities. Finally, I would like to extend thanks to Mr. Donald H. Mugridge, of Washington, D. C., for allowing me use of his private collection.

I. REFERENCE WORKS

Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie.

Dictionary of American Biography.

Dictionary of National Biography.

Encyclopedia Britannica.

Grande Encyclopédie.

Information Please Almanac 1954.

II. GENERAL WORKS

- Bachmann, Ludwig Bilder aus der Schachgeschichte, Ansbach: Verlag von Carl Brugel & Sohn, Heft 1, 1920.
- Bachmann, Ludwig Schachmeister Steinitz, Ansbach: C. Brugel & Sohn, erster Band, 1910.
- Berger, Johannes Schachjahrbuch, Leipzig: Veit & Co., 1900.
- Binet, Alfred Psychologie des grands calculateurs et joueurs d'échecs, Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie., 1894.
- Bird, H. E. Chess history and reminiscences, London: Dean & Son, Ltd., no date.
- Capablanca, Jose R. My Chess Career, London: G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1920.
- Chadwick, Henry (ed.) DeWitt's American Chess Manual, New York: DeWitt Publisher, 1880. (Revision of a manual compiled by Charles Stanley.)
- Chernev, Irving & Reinfeld, Fred The Fireside Book of Chess, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1949.
- Chernev, Irving Curious Chess Facts, New York: The Black Knight Press, 1937.
- Claveirole, Jean L'Internationalisme, St. Etienne: Imprimerie A. Waton, 1910.
- Clough, S. B. & Cole, C. W. Economic History of Europe, Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1952.
- Crowther, Geoffrey & Layton, Walter T. An Introduction to the Study of Prices, London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1938.
- Daley, Arthur & Kieran, John The Story of the Olympic Games, New York: J. B. Lippincott, Co., 1948.
- Davidson, Henry A Short History of Chess, New York: Greenberg, 1949.

- Devidé, Charles A Memorial to William Steinitz, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901.
- Drury, Horace B. & Nowse, Edwin G. Industrial Price Policies and Economic Progress, Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1938.
- Edge, Frederick M. The Exploits and Triumphs in Europe of Paul Morphy, New York: J. Appleton & Co., 1859.
- Euwe, Max Meet the Masters, trans. by L. Prins & B. H. Wood, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1940.
- Faries, John C. Rise of Internationalism, New York: W. D. Gray, 1915.
- Fine, Reuben Basic Chess Endings, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1941.
- Fine, Reuben The World's Great Chess Games, New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1951.
- Fine, Reuben & Reinfeld, Fred Dr. Lasker's Chess Career, New York: Black Knight Press, 1935.
- Fiske, Daniel Willard Chess tales and Chess miscellanies, London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1912.
- Gottschall, Hermann von Adolf Anderssen, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Co., 1912.
- Graham, P. Anderson Mr. Blackburne's Games at Chess, London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1899.
- Harley, Brian Chess and its stars, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1936.
- Jones, Ernest "The Problem of Paul Morphy: A Contribution to the Psycho-Analysis of Chess", in Jerome Salzmänn (ed.) The Chess Reader, New York: Greenberg, 1949, pp. 237-270.
- Klahre, Alfred C. Early Chess in America, Middletown, N. Y.: The Whitlock Press, 1934.
- Koltanowski, George Adventures of a Chess Master, New York: David McKay, 1955.
- Lange, Max Paul Morphy, trans. by Ernst Falkbeer, London: J. H. Storie, 1860.

- Lasker, Edward The Adventure of Chess, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1950.
- Lasker, Edward Chess for Fun and Chess for Blood, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1942.
- Lasker, Edward Chess Secrets, New York: David McKay, 1951.
- Lasker, Emmanuel Das Begreifen der Welt, Berlin: H. Joseph, 1913.
- Lasker, Emmanuel Common Sense in Chess, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1917.
- Lasker, Emmanuel Der Kampf, New York: Lasker's Publishing Co., 1907.
- Lasker, Emmanuel Manual of Chess, New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1934.
- Le Lionnais, F. Le Prix de Beauté aux Echecs, Paris: Payot, 1939.
- Linde, Antonius van der Geschichte und Litteratur des Schachspiels, Berlin: J. Springer, 1874.
- Linde, Antonius van der Das Schachspiel des XVI Jahrhunderts, Berlin: J. Springer, 1874.
- Lowenthal, Johann J. Morphy's Games of Chess, London: Henry G. Bohn, 1860.
- Lowenthal, Johann J. & Medley, George W. The Transactions of the British Chess Association for the Years 1866 and 1867, London: Longmans, Green, Reader, & Dyer, 1868.
- Luckhurst, Kenneth W. The Story of Exhibitions, New York: Studio Publications, 1951.
- MacDonnell, George A. Chess Life Pictures, London: Kelly & Co., 1883.
- MacDonnell, George A. The Knights and Kings of Chess, London: Horace Cox, 1894.
- Marshall, Frank J. My Fifty Years of Chess, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1942.
- Morgan, Mordecai The Chess Digest, Philadelphia: Patterson & White Co., 4 vols., 1904.

- Morphy, Louis A. Poems and Prose Sketches: With a Biographical Memoir of Paul Charles Morphy, New Orleans: Louisiana Printing Co., Ltd., 1921.
- Morphy-Voitier, Regina Life of Paul Morphy, New Orleans, 1926.
- Murray, H. J. R. A History of Chess, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Potter, Pitman B. Introduction to the Study of International Organization, New York: The Century, 1922.
- Potter, Pitman & West, Roscoe L. International Civics, New York: Macmillan Co., 1927.
- Reichhelm, Gustavus C. Chess in Philadelphia, Philadelphia: The Billstein & Son Co., Printers, 1898.
- Reid, Whitelaw After the War: A Southern Tour, Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, & Baldwin, 1866.
- Reinfeld, Fred The Human Side of Chess, New York: Pellagrini & Cudahy, 1952.
- Reinfeld, Fred The Treasury of Chess Lore, New York: David McKay, 1951.
- Report of the [6th] Annual Meeting of the Chess Association, Manchester: Cave & Sever, 1857.
- Reti, Richard Masters of the Chessboard, trans. by M. A. Schwendemann, New York: McGraw Hill, 1932.
- Reti, Richard Modern Ideas in Chess, trans. by John Hart, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1923.
- Sergeant, Philip W. A Century of British Chess, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1934.
- Sergeant, Philip W. Championship Chess, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1937.
- Sergeant, Philip W. Charousek's Games of Chess, London: G. Bell & Sons, 1919.
- Sergeant, Philip W. Morphy's Games of Chess, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1939. (First published, 1916.)
- Sergeant, Philip W. Morphy Gleanings, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1932.

- Sergeant, Philip W. & Watts, W. H. Pillsbury's Chess Career, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1937.
- Staunton, Howard The Chess Player's Companion, London: George Bell & Sons, 1896. (First published, 1849.)
- Steinitz, Wilhelm The Modern Chess Instructor, New York: G. Putnam's Sons, 1889.
- Steinitz, Wilhelm My Advertisement to Antisemites in Vienna and Elsewhere, New York: W. Steinitz, 1900.
- Tarrasch, Siegbert The Game of Chess, trans. by T. G. Bone & G. E. Smith, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1940.
- Walker, George The Art of Chess Play, London: Sherwood, Gilbert, & Piper, 1846.
- Walker, George Chess and Chess Players, London: Charles J. Sheet Pub., 1850.
- Wellmuth, F. J. The Golden Treasury of Chess, New York: Chess Review, 1943.
- Wenman, Percy Frank J. Marshall, Leeds: Whitehead & Miller, Ltd., 1948.
- Wenman, Percy H. N. Pillsbury, London: The Mitre Press, 1948.
- Williams, Elijah Horae Divanianae, London: Elijah Williams, Grand Divan, 1852.
- Winter, William Kings of Chess, London: Carroll & Nicholson, Ltd., 1954.

III. TOURNAMENT AND MATCH BOOKS (Listed chronologically)

- Stanley, Charles H. Thirty-one Games at Chess, no publishing data. (Comprises the Stanley-Rousseau match of 1845.)
- Staunton, Howard The Chess Tournament, London: Bell & Daldy, 1873. (The Tournament of 1851.)
- Fiske, Daniel W. The Book of the First American Chess Congress 1857, New York: Rudd & Carleton, 1859.

- Lowenthal, Johann J. The Chess Congress of 1862, London: Henry G. Bohn, 1864.
- Féry d'Esclands, Alphonse Congrès International des Echecs 1867, Paris: Imprimerie Générale de Ch. Lahure, 1868.
- Lehner, H. & Schwede, C. Der erste Wiener internationale Schachcongress im Jahre 1873, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Co., 1874.
- Sayen, W. Henry The Grand International Centennial Chess Congress 1876, Philadelphia: Claxson, Remsen, and Haffelfinger, 1876.
- Steinitz, Wilhelm Chess Match between Steinitz & Blackburne, London: The Field office, 1876.
- Schalloppe, Emil Der Schachkongress zu Leipzig im Juli 1877, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Co., 1878.
- Schalloppe, Emil Der Internationale Schachkongress zu Paris im Jahre 1878, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Co., 1879.
- Schalloppe, Emil Der erste und zweite Kongress des Deutschen Schachbundes, Leipzig 1879-Berlin 1881, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Co., 1883.
- Gilberg, Charles The Fifth American Chess Congress 1880, New York: Brentano's Literary Emporium, 1881.
- Potter, W. N. Games Played in the Match between Messrs. Blackburne & Gunsberg, London: G. C. Heywood, 1881.
- Sellman, A. G. Games of the Vienna Tournament 1882, Baltimore: Torsch Bros., 1882.
- Minchin, J. I. London International Chess Tournament 1883, London: James Wade, 1883.
- Minckwitz, J. Der Entscheidungskampf zwischen W. Steinitz und J. H. Zukertort um die Meisterschaft der Welt, Leipzig: Adolf Rogner, Schach-Verlag, 1886.
- Schalloppe, Emil Der Schachwettkampf zwischen Wilhelm Steinitz und J. H. Zukertort, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Co., 1886.
- Steinitz, Wilhelm The Book of the Sixth American Chess Congress 1889, New York: Committee of the Sixth American Chess Congress, 1891.

- Gottschall, H., Metger, J. & Seger, H. Der Sechste Kongress des Deutschen Schachbundes, Breslau, 1889, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Co., 1890.
- Heyde, Albert Der Schachwettkampf zwischen S. Tarrasch und M. Tschigorin Ende 1893, Berlin: Verlag von W. T. Bruer, 1893.
- Cunningham, J. G. The Games in the Steinitz-Lasker Championship Match, Leeds: Whitehead & Miller, 1894.
- Cheshire, Horace The Hastings Chess Tournament 1895, London: Chatto & Windus, 1896.
- Mason, James & Pollock, W. H. K. The Games in the St. Petersburg Tournament, 1895-96, Leeds: Whitehead & Miller, 1896.
- Tarrasch, Siegbert Das grosse Schachturnier zu Nürnberg 1896, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1921.
- The Book of the London International Chess Congress 1899, London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1900.
- Rosenthal, Samuel Traité des Echecs et Recueil des Parties Jouées au Tournoi International de 1900, Paris: P. Mouillot, 1901.
- Reinfeld, Fred The Book of the Cambridge Springs International Tournament 1904, New York: The Black Knight Press, 1935.
- Tarrasch, Siegbert Der Schachwettkampf Marshall-Tarrasch im Herbst 1905, Berlin: Schachverlag B. Kagan, 1905.
- Tarrasch, Seigbert Das Champich-Turnier zu Ostende im Jahre 1907, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Co., 1907.
- Hoffer, Leopold The Match and the Return Match, Janowsky-v-Marshall, Leeds: Whitehead & Miller, no date.
- Ranneforth, H. Der sechzehnte Kongress des Deutschen Schachbundes, 1908, zu Düsseldorf, Potsdam: A. Stein, 1908.
- Tarrasch, Siegbert Der Schachwettkampf Lasker-Tarrasch, Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Co., 1908.
- Lasker, Emmanuel The International Chess Congress, St. Petersburg, 1909, New York: Press of Dr. Lasker, 1910.
- Hoffer, Leopold Lasker-v-Schlechter, Leeds: Whitehead & Miller, 1911.

Delaire, Henri Le Tournoi d'Echecs de Saint-Sébastien 1911,
traduit et augmenté du International Schachturnier
zu San Sebastian 1911, von J. Mieses und Dr. M.
Lewitt. Paris: Librairie de La Stratégie, 1911.

----- The Grand International Masters' Chess Tournament at St.
Petersburg 1914, Philadelphia: David McKay, 1914.

Tarrasch, Siegbert Das Grossmeisterturnier zu St. Petersburg, Nürnberg:
Dr. Tarraschs Selbstverlag, 1914.

Fine, Reuben & Reinfeld, Fred A. Alekhine vs. E. D. Bogolyubov,
Philadelphia: David McKay, 1934.

Alekhine, Alexander The World's Chess Championship, London: Sir
Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1938.

Golombek, H. The World Chess Championship, London: G. Bell & Sons, 1949.

Wade, R. G. & Winter, William The World Chess Championship 1951,
London: Turnstile Press, 1951.

IV. PERIODICALS

American Chess Bulletin: New York, 1904- .

American Chess Magazine: New York, 1897-1899.

British Chess Magazine: London, 1881- .

Brooklyn Chess Chronicle: Brooklyn, 1882-1887.

Checkmate: Prescott, Canada, 1901-1904.

Chess Monthly: New York, 1857-1860.

Chess Monthly: London, 1879-1896.

Chess Player's Chronicle: London, 1st series 1841-1852, 2d series
1853-1856, 3d series 1859-1862.

Chess Player's Magazine: London, 1863-1867.

Chess Weekly: New York, 1908-1910.

Chess World: London, 1865-1869.

City of London Chess Magazine: London, 1874-1876.

Deutsches Wochenschach: Berlin, 1885-1925.

International Chess Magazine: New York, 1885-1891.

Lasker's Chess Magazine: New York, 1904-1909.

London Chess Fortnightly: London, 1892-1893.

Neue Berliner Schachzeitung: Berlin, 1864-1871.

Nouvelle Régence, La: Paris, 1860-1864.

Palamède, Le: Paris, 1st series 1836-1839, 2d series 1841-1847.

Palamède français, Le: Paris, 1864-1865.

Philidorian: London, 1837-1838.

Régence, La: Paris, 1849-1851, 2d series 1856-1857.

Schachkalender: edited by H. Ranneforth, Potsdam: A. Stein, 1907-1914.

Schachzeitung: Berlin, 1846-1878. In 1879, becomes Deutsche Schachzeitung: Leipzig, 1879- . .

Sphinx, Le: Paris, 1865-1867.

Stratégie, La: Paris, 1867-1940.

Wiener Schachzeitung: Vienna, 1887-1888.

Wiener Schachzeitung: Vienna, 1898-1938.

Year Book of Chess: edited by E. A. Michell, Leeds: Whitehead & Miller, 1907-1916.

V. NEWSPAPERS

Bell's Life in London, 1835-73.

Brooklyn Daily Eagle, 1893-1914.

Daily Picayune, 1904.

The Era, 1851-1867.

The Field, 1853-1914.

Frankfurter Zeitung, 1908.

Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper, 1857-60.

Galignani's Messenger, 1858.

Illustrated London News, 1844-1914.

L'Illustration, 1858-59.

London Times, 1851-1914.

Le Monde Illustré, 1884-1914.

New Orleans Times Democrat, 1883-1914.

New York Clipper, 1900-14.

New York Evening Post, 1908-14.

New York Herald, 1887-1900.

New York Times, 1851-1914.

Philadelphia Inquirer, 1906.

Pittsburgh Dispatch, 1903-07.

St. Louis Globe Democrat, 1870-1900.

La Vie Moderne, 1883-1914.