JOURNAL

OF

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

ART. I.—*On the Persian Game of Chess.*

By N. BLAND, ESQ., *M.R.A.S.*

[*Read June 19th*, 1847.]

WHATEVER difference of opinion may exist as to the introduction of Chess into Europe, its Asiatic origin is undoubted, although the question of its birth-place is still open to discussion, and will be adverted to in this essay. Its more immediate design, however, is to illustrate the principles and practice of the game itself from such Oriental sources as have hitherto escaped observation, and, especially, to introduce to particular notice a variety of Chess which may, on fair grounds, be considered more ancient than that which is now generally played, and lead to a theory which, if it should be established, would materially affect our present opinions on its history.

In the life of Timur by Ibn Arabshah[1], that conqueror, whose love of chess forms one of numerous examples among the great men of all nations, is stated to have played, in preference, at a more complicated game, on a larger board, and with several additional pieces.

The learned Dr. Hyde, in his valuable Dissertation on Eastern Games[2], has limited his researches, or, rather, been restricted in them by the nature of his materials, to the modern Chess, and has no further illustrated the peculiar game of Timur than by a philological

---

[1] كتاب عجايب المقدور في اخبار تيمور تاليف احمد بن عربشاه
Edited by Manger, "Ahmedis Arabsiadæ Vitæ et Rerum Gestarum Timuri, qui vulgo Tamerlanes dicitur, Historia. Leov. 1772, 4to;" and also by Golius, 1736.

[2] Syntagma Dissertationum, &c. Oxon, MDCCLXVII., containing "De Ludis Orientalibus, Libri duo." The first part is "Mandragorias, seu Historia Shahiludii, Horis successivis olim congessit Thomas Hyde, S.T.P."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

disquisition on the names of its pieces, as preserved in Ibn-Arabshah's narrative. It might be reasonably supposed that the more extended knowledge now possessed of Eastern literature might open to us other sources of information than those on which Dr. Hyde has drawn[1], and which could not be expected to yield anything important after the able and laborious manner in which he has exhausted their supply.

In the various collections which have been examined for the present object, five works present themselves, of which one belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society, two to the British Museum, and two are in the private library of a distinguished amateur.

Of these, the treatise bequeathed to the Society by that eminent Orientalist, Major David Price[2], is by far the most remarkable and important; its contents not being limited, as in the other works named, to the usual short game of Chess, but comprehending also the longer game, supposed to have been that of Timur, and possessing also much both of historical and critical interest. The notice of this valuable, and, probably, unique Persian manuscript, which, indeed, originated the present inquiry and for many years directed its objects, may properly precede the examination of the other four works, which, having chiefly reference to the common Chess, are of but subsidiary interest.

By a fate attached to all manuscripts, and especially those of any great age, this volume has been mutilated so as to have lost a considerable portion of its original contents, and even what remains has

---

[1] Dr. Hyde does not give a complete table of his Oriental authorities; but in the list of works on Chess, at the end of his Dissertation, page 156, are named the following:—

1. Lib. Arab. في تفضيل الشطرنج على النرد De excellentiâ Shahiludii supra Nerdiludium, Autore Sokeiker Damasceno.

2. Lib. Arab. De Shahiludio, Autore Al Sûli.

3. Lib. Arab. De Shahiludio, Autore Al Damîri.

4. Lib. Arab. في عذر من اشتغل بالشطرنج Apologeticus pro Ludentibus Al Shatrangj, Autore Al Râzi, qui vulgò Rasis.

8. Ala-eddîn Tabrizensis شرح Commentarius de Ludo Shatrangj. Vide Timûri Hist. Arab., p. 428. Hic fortè is sit qui apud Saphadium ut optimus Lusor celebratus est, quando tandem cœcus esset.

[2] It contains also the signature of H. Ross, with the addition "the gift of Robert Holford." I give these particulars to indicate, by the names of its former possessors, its history, or from whence it came. It is numbered 250, according to the present arrangement of the Society's Manuscripts, in Mr. Morley's Catalogue.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

been put together in so ignorant or careless a manner as to present, on first inspection, a mere mass of confusion. In some awkward attempt at collation, false catchwords have been added, seeming to establish the present order of the pages, and it was only by copying out the entire text on separate leaves, and, as it were, shuffling them till they produced a consecutive sense, that an approach could be made to a restoration of the original plan.

The MS., in its present state, is composed of sixty-four leaves, of which exactly one half are occupied by paintings, the remainder containing the text. The beginning and end are, unfortunately, lost, and we are thus deprived of two very important portions, especially the information which would have been afforded us in the preface, from the only remaining leaf of which, though it contains some curious matter, we neither obtain the author's name nor the date of his composition. This fragment seems to continue the subject of Talismans, but in what connection with Chess, the abruptness of the transition does not allow us an inference[1]. Then follows the only passage in the work which personally concerns the author, stating him to have travelled from the age of fifteen years till the time at which he wrote, when he was in the middle period of life, in the two Iracs, Khurasan, and Mawarannehr; to have been acquainted with many masters of the art of Chess, and to have been engaged in trials of strength with the best players; on all which occasions he came off victorious; "and whereas in those days the greater number of professors were deficient in the art of playing without looking at the board, he himself played so against four adversaries at once, and at the same time against another opponent in the usual manner, and, by divine favour, won all the games."

Háji Khalfa, under the head of Works on Chess, "Kitáb el Shitranj," after naming two Arabic treatises on the subject by Al Sauli and Abúl Abbás al Serakhsi, mentions also a work by "a

[1] To facilitate inquiry for a more perfect copy of the work, and to enable it, when found, to be identified, the first few lines are here given of the fragment which commences the MS.:—

و بسیار کس‌را فرح آمده است از غمهاء بزرگ بدین طلسمات
وگفته است که محمد زکریا رازي همین معني در کتاب خواص
اشیا آورده است * و علي بن فردوس الحکیم آورده است و من
شرح هر یك اندر آخر این کتاب بواجبي بدهم &c.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

writer of later date, who composed in Persian, and who boasts himself to have been the greatest player on earth in his time; adorned with plans and figures, and a notice of authors who had preceded him[1]." This would appear to be the same work with the manuscript now under notice, and the arrogant style of pretension alluded to is supported also in the continuation of his preface:

"And I invented several Positions (Mansúbát) in the Great Chess, and several Tâbíahs[2], which were unknown to former professors; and many of those which had been left imperfect by the older players, I defended or rectified; and improved and completed what had already been discovered in Chess; and whatever wonders and beauties of the game had occurred to me, I collected and arranged in the present form." He then states, generally, the matters of which he intends to treat; but as the arrangement is not given according to the heads of chapters into which the work is divided, and is recapitulated in many parts of the book with more or less variation, it may be preferable to anticipate the details by a general division.

The fragment just abstracted is quite an isolated portion of the work, and an idea may be formed of the confusion in the MS. from the circumstance of this leaf having been placed as one of the very last, those which should properly stand at the end, being found nearly at the beginning.

The general contents may be divided into the historical, the philosophical, and the practical treatise on the game; the first and last

---

[1] ١٠٢٢٤ كتاب الشطرنج لابي العباس احمد بن محمد السرخسى الطبيب توفى سنة ٢٨٦ و لبحيى بن محمد الصولى و لرجل من المتاخرين صنّف فارسيّاً و ادعى فيها انّه اعلم من فى الارض فى زماننا فى اللعب المذكور صوّر صورة و شكّل اشكالها و ذكر المصنّفين فيه قبله *

10224. Kitáb el-shitrenj, liber ludi latrunculorum, auctoribus Abu'l Abbás Ahmed Ben Mohammed Serakhsi Medico, anno 286 (inc. 17 Jan. 899) mortuus—Yahya Ben Mohammed Sauli, et recentiore quodam viro, qui Persice scripsit, et non sine arrogantia gloriatur, se ludi illius hac nostra ætate in toto terrarum orbe peritissimum esse. Delineavit formam tabulæ latruncullariæ et figuras depinxit, auctoresque qui ante de hoc ludo scripserint, recenset.—Haji Khalfæ Lexicon, tom. V. p. 104. Edition of Fluegel.

[2] The terms Mansúbah and Tâbíah are explained in a later part of this essay.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relate, in separate sections, to the two different kinds of Chess, while that part which may be called the philosophy of the game, would apply equally well to both species.

The better to follow the arrangement and connection of argument, it is necessary to observe that Timur's game, as described by Ibn Arabshah, was played on a board of a hundred and ten squares, with fifty-six men, while Chess, in its usual form, has but thirty-two pieces on sixty-four squares. The one is clearly derived from the other; either the smaller abridged from the large, or the larger augmented on the small. This latter opinion has hitherto prevailed, and the supposed additions have even been attributed to Timur himself, although a critical examination of the passage in Ibn Arabshah produces no such conviction. He says[1], "His (Timur's) mind was too exalted to play at the Little Chess (Shatranj ul Saghír), and therefore he played only at the Great Chess (Shatranj ul Kebír), on a board of ten squares by eleven, with the addition of two Camels, two Zarafahs, two Talíahs, two Dabbábahs, a Wazír, and other things, of which a description will follow," &c.; and, in a later chapter[2], "(Ali Shaikh) used to play with Timur at the Great Chess, and the Great Chess has additional pieces, as already mentioned." There is nothing in the Arabic words translated "great" and "little," to infer any relative priority. Hyde, however, assumes the alteration to have been that of Timur himself, and this assertion has been copied, apparently without further inquiry as to its correctness, into almost all European works on Chess containing anecdotes of the game.

It is also well to remind those persons who may not have paid particular attention to the history of Chess, that it is supposed to have been invented in India, and brought to Persia in the sixth century of our era, by Barzuyah, the physician of Nushirwan, who had deputed him to seek the work known to us as the Fables of Pilpay,

---

[1] وكانت علت همته عن الشطرنج الصغير فلا يلاعب الا بالشطرنج الكبير و رقعته عشرة في احد عشرة و فيه من الزوايد جملان و زرافتان وطليعتان و دبابتان و وزير و اشيا غير هذه وسياتي وصفه والشطرنج الصغير بالنسبة الي الكبير كلا شيء

Cap. xcvi. p. 798, Vol. I. Manger.

[2] وكان يلعب هو والامير بالشطرنج الكبير — والشطرنج الكبير فيه من الزوايد مما مر ذكره *

P. 876.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the results of his mission are usually understood to have been the original of the Kalílah wa Dimnah, and the art of playing chess.

To this opinion the author of our Persian MS. places himself in direct opposition, maintaining Chess, in its perfect and original form, to have been invented in Persia and taken to India, from whence it returned in its abridged and modern state. The fact, whether the game existed first in a larger or smaller form, of course, mainly affects the question. If the Great Chess were the original, there would be a strong argument in favour of the author's peculiar view; but the contrary, if the alteration had been from its simple to its more complicated system. Our author is strictly consistent throughout the whole of his treatise, and both in writing of its history, and of the principles of its play, constantly presents the Great Chess as the more ancient, scientific, and complete, and the Short game as an abridged and modern form, inferior in interest, and less symbolical of its original objects; and he invariably applies to it the term *Mukhtasar* (Abridged), in distinction from *Kámil* (Complete).

To anticipate then, in some degree, the detailed account of the work, the probable arrangement of the whole may be thus inferred from the headings of the different chapters still remaining, and from the recapitulations occasionally made of what had been already mentioned and what was to follow:—

History of Complete Chess.
Philosophy of Chess.
Manner of playing the Complete Chess.
History of Abridged Chess; and
Manner of playing it.

Among the missing portions, we have to regret the author's account of the original invention of Chess, and this deficiency in the manuscript is probably of considerable extent, as we enter at once, after the single leaf of preface remaining, into what I have called the philosophical part of the essay. This is divided into separate heads, as the "Ten Advantages of Chess," and is intended by the author to exhibit the reasons for which the game was first arranged. A brief sketch will exhibit the ingenious, though sometimes fanciful system of Oriental writers in philosophizing on all subjects.

The First Advantage (of which the commencement is wanting) turns chiefly on the benefits of food and exercise for the mind, in which Chess is marked out as an active agent, intended by its inventor to conduce to intellectual energy in pursuit of knowledge: "For, as the human body is nourished by eating, which is its food, and from which it obtains life and strength, and without which the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

body dies; so, the mind of man is nourished by learning, which is the food of the soul, and without which he would incur spiritual death, that is, ignorance: and it is current, that 'a wise man's sleep is better than a fool's devotion.' The glory of man, then, is knowledge; and Chess is the nourishment of the mind, the solace of the spirit, the polisher of intelligence, the bright sun of understanding, and has been preferred by the philosopher, its inventor, to all other means by which we arrive at wisdom."

The Second Advantage is in Religion, illustrating the Muhammedan doctrines of predestination (Jabr and Cadar) by the free will of man in playing Chess; moving when he will, and where he will, and which piece he thinks best, but restricted, in some degree, by compulsion, as he may not play against certain laws, nor give to one piece the move of another; "whereas, on the contrary, Nerd[1] (Eastern Backgammon) is mere Free Will, while in Dice again, all is Compulsion." This argument is pursued at some length in the text.

Passing from this singular application of theology to chess-play, we find the Third Advantage relate to Government, the principles of which the author declares to be best learned from Chess. The board is compared to the world, and the adverse sets of men to two monarchs with their subjects, each possessing one half of the world, and, with true Eastern ambition, desiring the other, but unable to accomplish his design without the utmost caution and policy. Perwíz and Ardeshír are quoted as having attributed all their wisdom of government to the study and knowledge of Chess.

The Fourth Advantage relates to War, the resemblance to which, in the mimic armies of Chess, is too obvious to detain the philosopher long.

The Fifth Advantage of Chess is in its resemblance to the heavens. He says, "The Board represents the Heavens, in which the Squares are the Celestial Houses, and the Pieces Stars. The superior pieces are assimilated to the Moving Stars, and the Pawns, which have only one movement, to the Fixed Stars[2]. The King is as the Sun, and the Wazír in place of the Moon, and the Elephants and Taliâh in the place of Saturn, and the Rukhs and Dabbábah in that of Mars, and the Horses and Camel in that of Jupiter, and the Ferzín and Zarafah in that of Venus; and all these pieces have their accidents, corresponding with the Trines and Quadrates, and Conjunction and

[1] For an account of the game of Nerd, see "Historia Nerdiludii," following the "Historia Shahiludii," in Hyde's Dissertations.

[2] A similar intention in the first arrangement of Chess is alluded to in Masudi's Murúj ul Zeheb, v. Dr. Sprenger's Translation, vol. i., p. 172.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Opposition, and Ascendancy and Decline, such as the heavenly bodies have; and the Eclipse of the Sun is figured by Sháh Cáïm, or Stale Mate." This parallel is completed by indicating the functions of the different pieces in connection with the influence of their respective planets, and chess-players are even invited to consult Astrology in adapting their moves to the various aspects.

The Sixth Advantage is derived from the preceding, and assigns to each piece, according to the planet it represents, certain physical temperaments, as the Warm, the Cold, the Wet, the Dry, answering to the four principal movements of Chess (viz., the Straight, Oblique, Mixed or Knight's, and the Pawn's move). This system is extended to the beneficial influence of chess on the body, prescribing it as a cure for various ailings of a lighter kind, as pains in the head, and toothache, which are dissipated by the amusement of play; "and no illness is more grievous than hunger and thirst, yet both these, when the mind is engaged in Chess, are no longer thought of."

Advantage Seventh. "In obtaining repose for the soul." The Philosopher says, "The soul hath illnesses, like as the body hath; and the cure of these last is known; but of the soul's illness there be also many kinds, and of these I will mention a few. The first is Ignorance, and another is Disobedience; the third Haste; the fourth, Cunning; the fifth, Avarice; sixth, Tyranny; seventh, Lying; the eighth, Pride; the ninth, Deceit; and Deceit is of two kinds, that which deceiveth others, and that by which we deceive ourselves; and the tenth is Envy, and of this also there be many kinds; and there is no one disorder of the soul greater than Ignorance, for it is the soul's death, as learning is its life; and for this disease is Chess an especial cure, since there is no way by which men arrive more speedily at knowledge and wisdom, and in like manner, by its practice, all the faults which form the diseases of the soul, are converted into their corresponding virtues. Thus, ignorance is exchanged for learning, obstinacy for docility, and precipitation for patience; rashness for prudence, lying for truth, cowardice for bravery, and avarice for generosity; tyranny for justice, irreligion for piety, deceitfulness for sincerity, hatred for affection, enmity for friendship."

The Eighth may be called a social advantage of Chess, bringing men nearer to kings and nobles, and as a cause of intimacy and friendship, and also as a preventive to disputes and idleness and vain pursuits.

"Advantage the Ninth is in wisdom and knowledge, and that wise men do play Chess; and to those who object that foolish men also play Chess, and though constantly engaged in it, become no wiser,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it may be answered, that the distinction between wise and foolish men in playing chess, is as that of man and beast in eating of the tree; that the man chooses its ripe and sweet fruit, while the beast eats but the leaves and branches, and the unripe and bitter fruit; and so it is with players at chess; the wise man plays for those virtues and advantages which have been already mentioned, and the foolish man plays it but for mere sport and gambling, and regards not its advantages and virtues. Thus may be seen one man who breaks the stone of the fruit and eats the kernel, while another will even skin it to obtain the innermost part; and in pursuit of knowledge men do likewise. One man is content with the exterior and apparent meaning of the words, nor seeks its hidden sense; and this is the man who eats the fruit and throws away the kernel. Another desires to be acquainted with the secret and inmost meaning, that he may enjoy the whole benefit of it, and he is like unto the man who takes out the very oil of the nut and mixes it with sugar, and makes therewith a precious sweetmeat which he eats, and throws away the rest. This is the condition of the wise man and the foolish man in playing Chess."

The Tenth and last Advantage is in combining war with sport, the *utile* with the *dulce*, in like manner as other philosophers have put moral in the mouths of beasts and birds and reptiles, and encouraged the love of virtue and inculcated its doctrines by allegorical writings, such as the Marzabán Námah and Kalílah wa Dimnah, under the attractive illusion of fable.

All these so-called Advantages of Chess are expounded at very great length in the original, and the maxims and reasoning are all attributed to the philosopher or wise man (Hakím) who invented the Complete Chess. One of the divisions is preceded by the words "The Philosopher again presented himself and said," by which he might appear to be explaining the beauties of his invention to some king or patron; a favourite medium for instruction in Eastern apologue.

We now arrive at the most valuable section, treating of the rules and practice of the larger game. This portion is fortunately complete to a very great extent, but as the description of the rules partakes much of the irregularity of other parts of the work, it seems preferable to reduce its details to a consistent whole, collecting and arranging in a more connected form all the particulars which are supplied in the less logical distribution of the original.

The Complete Chess is played with fifty-six pieces on a board of a hundred and ten squares in ten rows of eleven each, with two additional squares, making in all a hundred and twelve. "The Abridged Chess," observes the author, "was reduced to sixty-four squares and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thirty-two pieces, and in this one respect more than in any other resembles the Complete Chess, the alterations generally being much for the worse. One of the advantages of the larger board is, that the king is in the midst of his army and surrounded by his own men, and thus is more protected than in the small chess-board, in which he must be nearer one side than the other, as there is no middle to eight."

Of the fifty-six pieces there are eleven different denominations. Each side has twenty-eight men, viz., a King, Wazír, Ferzín, two Zarafahs, two Dabbábahs, two Talîâhs, two Horses, two Elephants, two Camels, two Rukhs, and eleven Pawns[1].

The manner of placing the pieces admits of a double arrangement, distinguished, according to a favourite practice in Eastern writers of applying grammatical terms to all systems, into the Masculine and Feminine arrangement. The former is exhibited by a diagram in the manuscript, from which, corrected by the description in the text, it is copied on the annexed plate. The Feminine arrangement, as described also in the work, is here added on the same board, though, naturally, both sides would be placed alike for playing. Hyde arranges them quite differently in his plate, which, though it professes to be copied from a MS. of Arabshah's work, may be presumed to be incorrect in many particulars, as it does not even give the two projecting squares, but only a plain square figure. The board is also, without authority, augmented to one hundred and thirty squares.

The Moves are of three kinds, the Straight (Mustakím), Oblique (Muâwwaj), and Mixed (Murakkab). A further division, according to their powers, is into the beginning, middle, and end of each kind of move (Ibtidá, Wast, and Nihâyat). Thus, the Wazír, Dabbábah, and Rukh are the beginning, middle, and end, that is, the first, second, and third degree of strength, of the Straight move. The Ferzín, Fíl, and Talîâh, occupy similar places in the Oblique movement, and the Asp, Jamal, and Zarafah, form the like gradation of the Mixed.

---

[1] The names and properties of these pieces are fully explained by Hyde; also in a small work called the History of Chess, &c., pp. 90 to 121, by the Rev. R. Lambe, published in 1764, and again, anonymously, in the following year.

The corruption of the original names of the Chess-men retained in the European game, occasions a little difficulty in referring to them in connection with those additional pieces for which there is no such familiar translation. To call by its proper name of *Elephant*, the Fil (our Bishop), might cause it to be confounded with our Castle (the Rook, or Rukh), frequently imaged in our sets as a castellated Elephant. *Queen* is also a term singularly inappropriate to Eastern chess, yet it is almost impossible to avoid it in the expression "to queen," in the play of the Pawns, which necessarily introduces the name of Queen for the piece itself. I have in some instances united the terms of both systems, in such a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A more particular description of each of these pieces and of its rules of action presents some difficulties, but what is gathered from the treatise in the original may be reduced to system thus :—

The Wazír is in form like the Ferzín. It moves one square at a time, in four directions, but straight, not obliquely. Thus, if it desires to move on a diagonal square, it can only do so at twice. The Ferzín cannot go on more than half the squares of the board, but the Wazír, having a straight move, can be placed on all the squares; "which shows the great honour and advantage attached to rectitude of conduct."

The Dabbábah in form is like an inkstand[1] (Dawáti), six-sided, and on the top it has a knob, as an inkstand has. There are two of these pieces on each side, whereas of Wazír and Ferzín there is only one on each. Its move is like that of the Píl, in four directions, but straight instead of diagonal, and it has the same advantage over the Píl, its corresponding power in the oblique moving pieces, that the Wazír has over the Ferzín, viz., that of being able to go on every square of the board.

Of the Rukh it is said:—"Its form and movement are perfectly well known, and it has the same advantages as those already mentioned, that is, of the Straight over the Oblique."

The Ferzín and Píl are the two lower powers of the Oblique; "their move is well known[2]."

---

manner, however, as to leave them still intelligible to any chess-player. In describing the Complete Chess, I have retained all through its proper terms, either in Persian or English, as Horse or Asp for our Knight, Elephant or Píl for Bishop, Ferzín for Queen, &c.; but where merely general principles are discussed, and in the explanation of Positions in the Short Game, I have used the terms familiar to European players. This applies also to the names for the greater and lesser form of board, varying with the works quoted, or the bearing of the argument.

[1] Some figures of Eastern chessmen are exhibited by Hyde, pp. 123–4, which may assist the comparison. An Oriental inkstand is engraved in Herbin's Traité de Calligraphie, 4to.

[2] The moves described in the MS. as "well known," differ in many respects from those of the corresponding pieces in our game. The piece we call Queen moves only one square at a time, and always diagonally, like our Bishop, to which consequently it is inferior in power, and is, in fact, the weakest on the board. The Píl, or Bishop, moves two squares diagonally, but commands only the square to which he plays, and not the intervening square, which may even be filled by another piece without affecting the move. The other chess-men have the same power as those of our game, except that the Pawns never advance more than one square at a time. The diagram, fig. 1 in pl. ii., will further exemplify the moves.

For these rules, which are not found in any Oriental treatise, and can only be obtained from an attentive examination of their examples of games and positions, I am indebted to the kindness of Professor Duncan Forbes, who, in addition to his varied and profound literary acquirements, is well known to his friends as an ingenious and accomplished chess-player.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"The Talîâh in form is like the Pîl, with two faces, and its move is like that of the Rukh; for it can go from one end of the board to the other, in the manner of the Pîl (that is, angularly); but it cannot jump over any piece, as is also the case with the Rukh, for no Nihâyat (or highest power), whether Talîâh, Rukh, or Zarâfah, can jump over another piece." The Talîâh's move seems, therefore, that of our Bishop.

Of the Mixed moves, that of the Horse is known. The Jamal is in form like a camel, with a head and neck and hump, but it has no forepaws nor hind feet, like the other pieces; and, like the Pîl, it can move on but few of the squares.

The Zarâfah, which is the highest power of the Mixed move, is in form like the Knight, with two faces. It moves in eight directions, like the Knight, on one square, but has not the move of the Knight or Jamal. The Knight's move is known, and the Jamal has one square more than it[1].

To the description of the pieces and their laws of movement are appended, in the original, three *Conditions*, applying only to the Nihâyat, or last power of each move, without affecting the other two in each class, viz.,—

1st. That the Rukh (or Straight End) can move like its Beginning and Middle, the Wazîr and Dabbâbah, and has therefore the privilege of using every possible Straight move.

2nd. The Talîâh cannot move like its Beginning, the Ferzîn, but may move like its Middle, the Elephant. The third condition is, that the Zarâfah cannot move like its Beginning, the Horse, nor like its Middle, the Camel.

The Pawns differ materially from those in the modern game. They seem to bear the form of the pieces they severally precede, or rather, probably, a resemblance to it. One Pawn, however, has the shape of a common Chess-Pawn, and is called the Original Pawn (Piyâdahĭ Asl). It is placed on the left hand of each player before his Queen's Rook. All these Pawns move straight and take obliquely, as ours do, but, on arriving at the other extremity of the board, obtain the rank of the piece to which they belong, and not according to the absurd rule (says the author) of Abridged Chess,

[1] The moves of the Camel and Zarâfah present difficulties which our present resources do not enable us to explain. The Mixed Move evidently resembles that of the Knight, as combining the Straight and Oblique movement, and the proportionate strength of the two more powerful pieces in that class may be inferred to be the privilege of clearing a greater number of squares, but to what extent, is a subject for further inquiry.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where they all become Ferzíns; "for," he says, "what is more natural or just than that men should occupy the station of their predecessors, and that the son of a king should become a king, and a general's son attain the rank of general?"

Peculiar privileges attend the success of the piece called Original Pawn on reaching the extremity of the board. It does not, indeed, become immediately a Queen, nor does it assume the name and functions of any other piece, but continues to be a Pawn, being permitted, once in the game, to remove to any square on the board where it may be placed to the greatest advantage and do the most injury to the adversary, as by attacking two pieces at once, making what is termed Pílbend, or Ferzínbend[1]; and it would appear that if there be a piece on the square it desires to occupy, that piece may be removed, and the privileged Pawn be placed there. It then continues to move and take like a Pawn, and when it again arrives at the further extremity, it is again allowable to do with it as before, and it is then called King's Pawn. Should it once more reach the further end, it is called Sháhí Masnúâ, and moves as a King. In Ibn Arabshah's description of the pieces, the Original Pawn is called Baidac ul Baidac, Pawn's Pawn, and by Hyde translated "Pedes Peditis, seu Servus servorum." The powers of this Original Pawn have, in the system described in this manuscript, much connection with the use of the projecting squares in the board, which seem intended as places of refuge for the King when in distress, so that, if he is able to retire into one of them, he escapes further danger, and draws the game. There is a short chapter, which is the last portion in this work on the practice of the Complete Chess, relating to the Drawn game and its varieties, but, as the rules applying to it are rather to be gathered from general observation, it will be preferable to discuss the subject separately, when we consider some other terms of the art in a later section of this essay.

After the description of the Great or Complete Chess, the historical argument is resumed, and the reasons given for its abridgement and alteration in India. The first reason, which the author considers preferable to the other two, is the desire of an Indian king, named Kaid[2], fond of war, and constantly victorious, till there remained no kingdom for him to conquer. As a substitute for this royal amusement, his vizir, Sahsahah ben Dáhir, who was acquainted

[1] See later, where these terms are treated of.

[2] كيد A king of Canúj, of this name, is said to have been contemporary with the Alexander the Great of Persian history.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the Great Chess as introduced from Persia, abridged it, to diminish its difficulties, and presented it to the king. Then the well-known story is given of the reward asked in grain, and the king's admiration of the wonders of geometrical progression.

The second story is also of an Indian king, Fúr (Porus), leaving as heir to his throne a young son, who, being surrounded by enemies and unskilled in war, was instructed in military tactics by means of Chess, simplified so as to suit his juvenile capacity.

The third, as the narrator observes, is the account given in the Shah Námah, of a queen who had two sons, Talhand and Gaw, the elder of whom is killed fighting against his brother, and the sad news intimated to the mother by the words "Sháh Mát" ("the king is dead"), while playing Chess with her minister. This, the author says, is the best known story, but prefers the other two; and he adds, that some have assigned one or other of these reasons as being those of the original invention of the game; but he argues that in that case it would have been subsequent to its abridgement, for that all agree that Sahsahah ben Dáhir was the person who *abridged* chess.

The next chapter is entitled "How the Abridged Chess came into Persia," but here, unfortunately, the manuscript is again defective, and in the next fragment, which seems the conclusion of the mutilated chapter, we find Nushirwan playing at the Abridged Chess, which he has just received in its modified state.

At this interesting period of the narrative the author, rather abruptly, proceeds to the "Description of the Abridged Game," commencing it with a chapter on the respective value of the pieces; "because," he says, "until this is properly understood, a man cannot play chess." The calculation is ingeniously made in money, as in some of our treatises, but the proportions are laid down with much greater nicety. Thus, after stating that the Rook is worth one dirhem[1], the Knight four dánks, the Queen half a dirhem, or, according to some, two dánks and a half, he tells us the Pawns, one with another, are valued at a single dánk, but that the side Pawns, as of inferior importance, are worth only half a dánk, and the King's and Queen's Pawns a dánk and a half each. A distinction also is made in the value of the Bishops, that on the Queen's side being worth more than the other, for reasons connected with Pílbend and Ferzínbend, requiring further illustration. The King has no price, or

[1] A Dirhem, or silver piece, in Muhammedan money, is usually calculated to be worth about sixpence, and to be divided into four Dánks.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rather is beyond price, from his rank and station. Here the subject is again interrupted by the loss of a leaf in the manuscript, and the next chapter is on the "Degrees of Odds" (Tarh), or the advantage given by one player to another. A great knowledge of the game is displayed in the nicety of the gradation, ascending from the lowest possible odds given, to the highest reasonably asked. The smallest advantage consists, as with us, in having the first move, which, otherwise, is said usually to be decided by throwing dice. Next to this, and a less advantage than giving a Pawn, is removing the Knight's Pawn and placing it before the Rook's Pawn, which thus becomes doubled, while the Knight is left exposed. This is considered as giving half a Pawn. Next the Rook's Pawn is given, then the Knight's Pawn, then the Bishop's Pawn, the Queen's Pawn, the King's Bishop, the Queen's Bishop, the Queen; after which the odds are those of the Queen and Pawn, the Knight, the Rook; "and the person to whom both Rook and Knight are given as odds, they do not count as a chess-player, for the Rooks in chess are as the two hands, and the Knights as the two feet, and what would be said of the bravery of him who would fight another man who is deprived of a foot or an arm, or who should propose single combat on the terms of his adversary having one leg or one hand bound, with which advantage it would be shameful to attack him, and victory itself be inglorious?"

In this part of the work I am inclined to place the paintings, for reasons which will be easily understood by those who inspect the manuscript itself, although the more natural arrangement would seem to be either at the beginning or end of the volume. On the reverse of the last painting is the commencement of a chapter on drawn games (Bábï Cáïmhá) which, besides that it recapitulates many of the subjects already discussed, could not possibly, from its contents, be supposed to be the commencement of the work.

Cáïm is described as a drawn game, or situation in which neither party can win, from the equality of the pieces opposed to each other at the end, and the requisite proportion of forces necessary to constitute a Draw is accurately stated. A term called Irá, which includes our varieties of Check by Discovery, Double Check, &c., is explained on another fragment, and this, according to the arrangement which I infer, is to be considered the last leaf of the present contents.

With respect to the age of the manuscript, it may be assumed to be at least five hundred years old, both from the character and from some peculiarities of orthography, but the style claims a much higher

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

degree of antiquity for the work itself[1]. The paintings are well worthy of attention for their execution and subject. They are sixty-two in number, and illustrate so many celebrated positions either for mates or for drawn games, though the first four are rather openings. These are called Halíli, Janáh, Mujannahĭ Temám, and Muâllac, terms, the application of which I shall endeavour to illustrate later from other sources. With the exception of these, and another opening called Muwassat, and one position which is not distinguished by its title, the various mates and drawn games are all referred to the players to whom they severally occurred. The names of twenty different chess-players, from all countries known to the East, appear among the authors of these games; Khalíl of Misr (Egypt); Adali of Rúm (or Rumelia), Farazdac Yúnáni, a Greek; Rabrab Khatáï, the Khalif Mûtasim, Osmán of Damascus, and Abúl Fath of Hindustan. All the others, whose country is designated, are Persians of different provinces. Two of these names explain the meaning of terms occurring in the Arabic work quoted by Hyde, in which are mentioned the positions called Adali and Rabrab. The first he translates[2] "The Equal Position," and the other is interpreted by him as "The Herd of Wild Oxen." They are evidently named after their authors, Adali of Rúm, one of the most celebrated chess-players and writers on the game, who is much quoted in a work noticed later, and Rabrab, apparently a native of Chinese Tartary, of whom two positions are given in these paintings, and several also occur in other places. After these two names, and that of the Khalif Mûtasim, to whom two positions are ascribed, the only personage of whom we have any historical account is Khájah Ali Shatranji, so called from his celebrity in connection with the game. He was also a distinguished poet, a native of Mawarannehr, and his life is given in many of the native biographies, or Tazkirahs, with selections from his poetry, in which, however, we do not find any illustrations of the game to which he owes his surname, nor do the memoirs of him intimate his skill further than by the metaphorical allusions to Chess, by which, in some authors, his life is prefaced. Another player, called Shatranji, or *the Chess-*

[1] Al Rázi, quoted in the preface, died A.H. 310 or 320 = A.D. 922 or 932, which date is the only limit we can assign to the age of the MS.

[2] De situ lusuum, p. 135. "(Thema) Primum vocatur منصوب العدلي لوقوعه له مع العدلي Thema Adali, i.e. æquale, eo quod Lusori incidat cum æquali." Page 136, "Octavum vocatur منصوب الربرب Thema Al Rabrab, i.e. Agmen boum sylvestrium."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

player, to denote his excellence in the game, is found in this list as the author of several positions, but the name itself is difficult to determine from the manuscript. None of the other personages are distinguished by titles or particulars sufficiently precise to fix their identity.

The following list exhibits their names, with the exception of one which is not deciphered with certainty, and the figures denote the proportion in which each has contributed to the Positions and Openings:—

جلال الدين نخجواني	Jeláluddín of Nakhjawán. 1.
خليل مصري	Khalíl of Misr (Egypt). 1.
عدلي رومي	Adali Rúmi (probably Greek). 5.
فرزدق يوناني	Farazdac Yúnáni (Greek of Asia Minor). 7.
ربرب خطائي	Rabrab of Khatay (Chinese Tartary). 2.
خواجه علي شطرنجي	Khájah Ali Shatranji, already noticed, 18; also another player, called Shatranji, whose name appears to be Surkh(?) (سرخ), 5.
خواجه مسعود تبريزي	Khájah Masûd of Tabríz. 2.
محمود كرماني	Mahmúd of Kirmán. 2.
عثمان دمشقي	Osmán of Damascus. 1.
خليفه معتصم	The Khalif Mûtasim (who reigned from A.H. 833 to 842). 2.
خطاب عراقي	Khattáb of Irac. 1.
عبد الله خوارزمي	Abdullah of Khárizm. 2.
محمد كازروني	Muhammed of Kázrún. 2.
شمس كرماني	Shams of Kirman. 1.
حاجي نظام شيرازي	Háji Nizám of Shiraz. 2.
ابو الفتح هندوستاني	Abúl Fath of Hindustan. 2.
بها الدين شيرازي جمال الدين شيرازي	Beháuddín and Jemáluddín, both of Shiraz, and a player of Misr (Egypt), whose name appears to be Farûn (فرعون), each 1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Persian MS. of the Museum[1] is an interesting little treatise, compiled by one Muhammed Ben Husámuddaulah for the Emperor Humayun, chiefly from an Arabic work, Al Manhaj fi ilmi'l Shatranj[2], or the "Guide to the Knowledge of Chess," by Abú Muhammed ben Omar Kajíná. Though devoted exclusively to the Short Game, it gives more practical views on each division of the subject than any other native work we possess.

This MS. contains sixty-two leaves, numbering ten lines to a page. The first ten pages are Preface, commencing with the praise of the Deity under his different attributes, with ingenious applications to the terms of the game of Chess.

The author then states his work to be a "Description of Chess and its advantages, with the reason of its invention, and a relation of sayings in regard to its lawfulness and unlawfulness;" in regard to its being unlawful, because all games are equally forbidden[3], and because those who play Chess are constantly absorbed in it, and indulge in swearing, and neglect prayer and other duties; while in favour of its being lawful are cited the examples of many of the Companions and Followers of the Prophet, who have either played chess, or have seen others play, and not forbidden it. "In truth," says the author, "Chess was not invented for sport, but for a higher object and with sounder views, and its lawfulness or unlawfulness depends on the intention." This opinion he supports by arguments similar to those already exhibited in the analysis of the last work, and apparently copied and abridged from it: "And at all times, powerful and illustrious kings and sultans have been inclined to chess-play, and have enjoined the composition of works for teaching it. This, however, has not been easy to effect, as it is a science without limit of perfection, or fixed bounds, but each one of its professors has laboured according to his knowledge and skill, and has composed a short treatise on it, such as Ustád Adali, and Abú Bekr Al Súli, and Abúl Muzaffar Lejláj, and other celebrated masters." This leads the author to the subject of his own book and its abridgement from the Manhaj, as already mentioned, of which he has retained, he says, all the original matter, with many additions of his own, and omitted only a few of the Arabic chapters, containing some Casídahs on Chess, or otherwise not immediately relating to the game. The table of contents is thus given:—

[1] Presented by Major Yule, and numbered 151.

[2] كتاب المنهج في علم الشطرنج

[3] كل لعب حرام

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ch. I. An account of some of the Companions and Followers of the Prophet, who played Chess.

Ch. II. Arguments in favour of the lawfulness of Chess, and on its benefits.

Ch. III. Some other advantages of Chess.

Ch. IV. Of the inventor and invention of the squares at Chess.

Ch. V. Derivation of the terms used in the game.

Ch. VI. On the practice of politeness in Chess-play.

Ch. VII. Advice to Chess players.

Ch. VIII. On the knowledge of the end of the game, whether it is won or drawn.

Ch. IX. On opening the game.

Ch. X. On some amusing games which have been played.

Ch. XI. Positions and their explanation.

Ch. XII. On playing Chess without seeing the board.

The first chapter exhibits the names of Companions and Followers of the Prophet, and other holy personages of Islam, as the Imam Jâfar Sádic, Shâbi, Hasan Basri, Sâíd ben Jubair, &c., all more or less affording support to chess-play by their presence or favourable opinion, and some even by their practice of it, as Abdullah Masûd; of Sharr ben Sâd, who had a son possessing great skill in the game, and who one night seeing the Prophet in a dream, asked him concerning its lawfulness, and received for answer, that "there was no harm in it." One of the Shaikhs of Medinah reported Sâíd ben al Musaiab to have looked on while chess was playing, and even to have given advice; "Take with the Rukh." Omar al Khattáb said, "There is no harm in it, it is a reminiscence of war." Lastly, Ali's inquiry concerning chess play is recorded, the story of which is well known[1].

The Advantages related in the 2nd chapter are chiefly in reference to wisdom, and are denied to Nerd, as being a more frivolous pastime and subject to contention.

In Chapter 3rd is related a cure performed by means of chess, by Búcrát (Hippocrates), on a king who had diarrhœa; and a saying of Jálínús (Galen), in favour of Chess, as the most efficient remedy in cases of erysipelas. It describes also a mode of calculating by means of the squares of Chess, which for this purpose are to be augmented by one row, making them nine by eight. The calculation is

[1] Hyde, p. 40. Cap. An Shahiludium sit licitum.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to be noted by placing a tamarind stone on the square which marks the product.

As the reason for the invention of Chess, we have in chapter 4 the usual story, that an Indian king desired his wise men to arrange a game representing the tactics of war, and that when all others were at a loss, Sísah (صيصه) ben Dáhir al Hindi invented Chess and presented the board; after which the reward was claimed in grain, &c. Another story is, that fourteen Indian sages, after great trouble, invented it for the monarch of that time; another, that it was first arranged in the time of Edrís the Prophet. The geometrical progression of the sixty-four squares, on the plan of the grain already alluded to, is computed here at full length, commencing with a Dirhem on the first square, and amounting to two thousand four hundred times the size of the whole globe in gold.

Chapter 5th quotes Shatranj as written either with S or Sh, and with i, or a, and says that Jurairi writes it with i.

Various etymologies are also proposed for the word Shatranj or Satranj; *Satrán*, two rows (of men), or *Shatrán*, the two sides or halves (of the board), white and red; *Shash rang*, the six kinds of men; *Sad ranj* (a hundred cares), from its great anxiety and difficulty; *Sad ranj* (or properly, *Saddí ranj*), "dispelling grief," and because it was invented to console the queen who lost her son (p. 14), and hence, we are told, the Ferzín is placed by the King's side for the purpose of advising him.

There follows a long digression, in which Ferzín is said to be the Hinduwi for Queen. The remainder of the chapter describes the position of the pieces, and the reason for so placing them. Among others, the origin of the Rukh is given, which will be better quoted in another place; also the value of the pieces, which it might be well to compare with the same subject in other Eastern treatises.

Ch. 5th. "On the rules of politeness in Chess," which are here laid down with very great exactness, commencing even at the placing of the board and men. "He who is lowest in rank is to spread the board and pour out the men on it, and then wait patiently till his superior has made his choice; then, he who is inferior may take his own men and place all of them except the King, and when the senior in rank has placed his own King, he may also place his, opposite to it. If of equal rank, whichever first gets the men may place them," &c.

The stronger player is recommended to give fair odds, so as to make the game equal, without which there would be no pleasure.

Rule 3 recommends the observance of politeness, both in question

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and answer, and in reproof, and to avoid all foolish talk and ribaldry.

4. Enjoins any third person present to keep silence while looking on, and to abstain from remarks on the state of the game, or from advice to the players.

5. Cautions an inferior, or servant playing with a superior in rank, or with his master, not wilfully to neglect the game, make his moves carelessly, nor underplay himself that his senior may win, and gives anecdotes of the Khalifs Mámún and Walíd Abdúl Malik Merwán severely reproving their courtiers for such ill-placed obsequiousness.

"They say, the Khalif Mámún was one day playing with one of his courtiers, who moved negligently and in a careless manner. The Khalif perceived it and got wroth, and turned over the board and men, and said, 'He wants to deceive me and to practise on my understanding;' and he vowed an oath that this person should never play with him again." In like manner, it is related of Walíd ben Abdúl Malik ben Merwán, that on an occasion when one of his courtiers, who used to play with him negligently at chess, omitted to follow the proper rules of the game, the Khalif struck him a blow with the Ferzín (or Queen) which broke his head, saying, "Woe unto thee! art thou playing chess, and art thou in thy senses?"

Chapter 7th gives advice to players in the conduct of their game, which may be reduced to the following rules, commencing by a recommendation not to play when the mind is engaged with other objects, nor when the stomach is full after a meal, neither when overcome by hunger; nor on the day of taking a bath; nor, in general, while suffering under any pain, bodily or mental. Of the rules which follow, on the practical conduct of the game, some apply peculiarly to the tactics of Eastern Chess, but others are similar to our own. A few of those in the original are omitted, being of little importance, and others condensed, to avoid repetition.

The usual advice is given to play with care; to avoid hurried moves; to look well over the pieces; to be on guard against "check by discovery" (Irá), and to beware of the Bishop's range[1]; to keep the King always on the Queen's 2nd, and to take great care of your own Bishops, especially the King's, for that is the Fílí Caïm[2].

---

[1] در عرا منشین در سیر فیل هم Verse, probably a quotation.

[2] فیل قایم Apparently one of the Bishops of greater value in drawing the game at the end; but I am unable to explain the reason.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Be careful in playing the Pawns at the commencement, that your adversary may not pass them and complete his opening.

"Open the game on the King's side and not on the Queen's. If possible, do not advance the King's Pawn more than one square, unless the Queen's Pawn be with it, in order that it may go to queen at the end.

"Endeavour to effect even exchanges.

A rule here states at some length the best and worst places for each piece to stand on. "The corner is the worst for all the pieces, as affording least range, except for the Rook."

"Avoid choking up your King, and be cautious of exposing him to a discovered check. Beware also of his being approached by any of your adversary's strong pieces, as the Knight or the Rook.

"Should you be able to exchange a Bishop for two Pawns, do not fear to do so, though a Bishop is better than one Pawn, unless the Pawn be able to queen. Next to the centre Pawns, the best is the King's Knight's Pawn.

"Commence as your adversary does, and if he plays his King's Rook's Pawn, play the same; and by all means take care of your King's and Queen's Pawns, for these two are better than a Knight, as some say, and by all are allowed to be better than a Queen.

"Avoid equally stinginess and too great generosity in your game (in exchanging), and use caution and foresight; neither be alarmed, should your adversary take a man gratis, but rather consider how the game may still be won, or drawn."

Directions are given, some unimportant and some not very plain, describing the best mode of clearing a crowded board, and of freeing the King when blocked up, and concluding with the following among others from Al Súli, respecting the best side to open and to finish the game, viz., to commence the opening on the sides, and to finish the game from the King's side, and that towards the end the best play is that of the Rook. "It is related, that in India there was a player who during forty years never had a Pawn taken from him gratis;" but the author observes, "we have never beheld success like this."

Chapter 8th is on the relative force of combined pieces, and of those which, when opposed to each other, produce a drawn game. The instructions are rather complicated, calculating the equivalent even of four Queens at once, and in our imperfect state of knowledge respecting the manner of carrying out the Eastern system, do not present much utility.

"On the opening of the game, which they call Tâbíah (تعبية),

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and on the different kinds of Tâbíahs which professors have invented," the subject of Chapter 9, was intended to be illustrated by diagrams, of which eight are sketched in the MS. Six, however, are blank, and the only two which are filled up and accompanied by description, do not seem properly to be openings. These Tâbíahs, or openings, are said to be named after the players who invented them, but none of the names are given.

The "Amusing Games" contained in the 10th Chapter, are similar to the contents of a chapter in another treatise described p. 30.

Chapter 11th, on Mansúbahs, or Positions, gives forty-two diagrams, each, with the explanation, occupying a page. There are examples of all kinds, games won and drawn, &c. Amongst them appears the celebrated position called Dilaram's Mate.

"Red plays and wins."

"Red gives check with his Rook, on the Black King's Rook's square. King takes the Rook. Red removes Bishop[1] to his 5th and discovers check from Rook. Black King to his Knight's square. Rook gives check on Black Rook's square. King takes the Rook. The Pawn advances and checks. King to his Knight's square. Red Knight to Black King's Rook's 3rd, mates." (See pl. III. fig. 1.)

These directions were more concisely given by Dilaram herself in two lines of verse:

> "O King, sacrifice your two Rooks and not Dilárám;
> Advance the Bishop and Pawn, and checkmate with the Knight[2]."

Chapter 12th and last, is on the art of playing without seeing the board, a degree of skill once considered the exclusive acquirement of the celebrated Philidor, but since exercised by the most distinguished French player of modern times, M. de la Bourdonnais, and now frequently exhibited, and even taught on system by many professors of the game. Similar instances of skill in Arabian players are

[1] Jumping over the Knight, according to the Eastern game. Dilaram's Mate has been published by Mr. G. Walker in the Palamède, and in some other Chess periodicals, but I am unable to state from what original Persian source.

By making the mask with the Knight on the Rook's 2nd, the Bishop being already placed on his own 5th, this game may be accommodated to the European system; the play will then be (2nd move) Kn. to his 4th, disc. ch.; the remaining moves as before. Another piece or pawn, of either colour, must also be placed on Black K's 3d, otherwise there would be Mate on the move.

[2] اي شه دو رخ بده و دلآرام‌را مده
پیل و پیاده پیش کن وز اسپ شاه مات

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

quoted by Hyde, but none that can at all compete with those related in this Persian work, though all of them far exceed the highest degree of perfection to which that branch of the art has yet arrived in modern European chess-play; thus verifying the proverb so often exemplified, that "there is nothing new under the sun," and showing that whatever wonders have been produced by mechanical science in the civilization or demoralization of mankind, mere intellectual powers have accomplished in other nations, and in earlier times, almost every degree of skill which the supposed improvement of the present age seems to claim as an undivided right.

Practical directions for the blindfold game are given in this chapter, which commence by instructing the player in the names of the squares of the board, so as to be able to understand what may be announced to him as his adversary's play, and to direct the movement of his own pieces. He is therefore to picture to himself the board as divided first into two opposite sides, and then each side into halves, those of the King and the Queen, so that when his Náïb, or deputy, announces that "such a Knight has been played to the 2nd of the Queen's Rook," or "the Queen to the King's Bishop's 3rd," he may immediately understand its effect on the position of the game. This mode of playing, however, is not recommended to those who do not possess a powerful memory with great reflection and perseverance, "without which no man can play blindfold." Then follow more detailed instructions for calling the moves and playing them, and there is a diagram to assist the study, numbered according to the names of the pieces and squares. There is also another diagram, blank, said to be for "the ending of the game," but in its state in this MS. it of course admits of no explanation.

The chapter is concluded by the author's observation, that some have arrived to such a degree of perfection as to have played blindfold at four or five boards at a time, nor to have made a mistake in any of the games, and to have recited poetry during the match; and he adds, "I have seen it written in a book, that a certain person played in this manner at ten boards at once, and gained all the games, and even corrected his adversaries when a mistake was made."

The MS. was copied in Rabíâ, of the year 1021 (= A.D. 1612), by one Asahh al Kirmáni.

The term Ghâïb, or Ghâïbánah, to express playing blindfold, or without looking at the board, in distinction from Házir, or Háziránah, the usual mode of play, restores the text in the passage of Arabshah, where Manger has proposed Al Ghálib for the Al Ghâïb of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

edition of Golius[1]: "And Ali sat down and played *alghâïb, absent*, that is, blindfold, or without seeing the board;" not, according to Manger's emendation, *alghâlib, victorious*, an epithet which would be prematurely applied to one sitting down to chess, the event being uncertain till he rose.

The Arabic treatise contained in the British Museum Library is named Al Shatranj ul Basri, Basrian Chess, from Hasan al Basri, its author. The full title of the work is "The Book of Chess, its positions and beauties." The copy was made in the 655th year of the Hijrah (= A.D. 1257), and the work itself may be assumed to be much older. Its object was to instruct the uninitiated in chess, in which, the author says, the greatest monarchs have delighted, and have made it, with other sciences, an essential part of the instruction of their sons. The division prescribed by the author is into "Positions specially connected with Check, Positions not so connected, a Chapter on Drawn Games, and a Supplement of select and elegant moves." These are illustrated by very numerous diagrams, with the mode of play in each explained at full length. There is also a preface, or rather what might be considered the introductory part of the work, occupying the first twenty pages, the remainder being a sort of praxis. This introduction commences with traditions on the lawfulness and unlawfulness of the game, and an imposing array is exhibited of examples of its practice or permission by men of the most undoubted orthodoxy. They are paraded with the same gravity and in the same solemnity of procession as in all other more serious questions of Hadís, and, in many instances, the anecdote embodies only a very trifling incident in connexion with the subject, citing even instances of doctors and divines saluting or returning the salute of those who played, or merely looking on at chess-play, as a testimony at least of their acquiescence in its harmlessness. There is much acuteness in the arguments by which the author labours to remove

[1] وكان يلعب علي الغالب مع خصمين ويعلم مع الطرح لمن هو فى جهته علي الجهتين The note in Manger's edition, Vol. II. p. 877, adds, "Mendosè in Gol. Ed. prostat علي الغايب Ali ludebat *absens*, quod turbat, pro علي الغالب Ali *victoriosus*, qui nunquam in ludo succumberat." Manger, therefore, translates the passage, "Ludebat Ali ille victor cum duobus simul adversariis, et monstrabat, cum moveret, quantus esset solus adversus duos." مع الطرح is also badly rendered here "cum moveret;" *Tarh* signifying not a "move," but "advantage given;" a meaning not in our Dictionaries, and overlooked by Manger in another passage, p. 874, l. 7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the objections which attach to chess in common with all other games prohibited by Coranic precept. The following is a specimen of his ingenious reasoning. "If," says the casuist, "a man be so engrossed in the study of law, theology, or even of the holy Coran itself, as to neglect prayer, the offence is great, but consisteth in the neglect of a duty, not in the cause, for who shall say the study of the Coran is unlawful? Or should he be so absorbed in private prayer as not to observe the fixed times of public worship, he offendeth also, but by neglect, not by exceeding in private devotion, which last also is to be commended; and in like manner Chess may be pronounced lawful and innocent unless it interfere with other more important duties, and even then it is the neglect itself, and not the cause of neglect, which is to be condemned." It may be suspected that these worthies of the Muhammedan faith were anxious to protect by their dogmas an amusement which they felt irresistible in its attractions, and that the logic bestowed on chess-play resembles the quibbles in defence of wine-drinking, the evasive Fetwas concerning the use of coffee and tobacco, and the overstrained application of Sufi symbolism to the sensuality of some of their favourite poets.

The first few pages are occupied with this discussion. At page 6 the invention of the game is treated of, but the account is confined to the usual story of Súsah ben Dáhir (thus written), and a sick king to whom he presented the board, receiving his reward in proportion to the progression of the squares, &c. A comparison between Nerd and Chess follows, frequent in works on this subject, and, after it, the philosophical arrangement observed in the places and powers of the different pieces. The remaining part of the introduction touches on most of the subjects already more fully discussed in the preceding Persian treatise, exhibiting little novelty, except that, in the division of players into classes, two new names appear, those of Al Canáf and of Ibn Dendán, both of Baghdad, but to whose further history I have found no clue. As chess-players they are placed here on an equality with Al Adali. From the last-mentioned authority the value of the pieces is fixed in a short concluding chapter, and another, called Báb ul Tâábi (Chapter on Openings), introduces the practical part of the work, which occupies the greater portion of the volume, and also seems its chief object.

There are two hundred and fifteen diagrams in all, of which, however, several are blank, though equally accompanied by explanation. They are mostly positions, drawn or won, but at the end occur some of those games which, though not strictly Chess, are derived from it and illustrate the power of particular pieces, or which exercise the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

player in their use; similar to those in Major Yule's MS., and in one to be described later, p. 30.

Since the outline of these sheets was first sketched, I have been favoured with the perusal of two Arabic MSS., from the valuable collection of Dr. John Lee, and though they contribute no additional information of any extent on the subject of the Great Chess, they afford many interesting particulars on the practice of the usual game and on some points in connection with it. The more important of these two works on account of its antiquity, though possessing less variety in its details, is named the Nuzhatu arbábi 'l ûcúl fí 'l shatranji 'l mancúl[1], and the author, who calls himself in his preface, Abú Zakaría Yahya Ibn Ibrahím al Hakím, describes it as a book on the invention and arrangement of Chess, compiled from various works. There is no division into chapters, but the usual subjects are discussed in the order observed by most Eastern writers, commencing with arguments in support of the lawfulness of the game, and testimonies in its favour from various writers. Its origin is explained according to the different stories already related in similar works, and among other fables respecting its invention, it is said to have been played first by Aristotle; by Yáfet ibn Núh (Japhet, son of Noah); by Sám ben Núh (Shem); by Solomon, as a consolation for the loss of his son; and even by Adam when he grieved for Abel.

Sayings of kings, sages, and physicians are quoted in praise of chess-play, including examples of some of the earliest Muslim doctors who either practised it or permitted it as harmless.

At the sixth page the classes (Tabacát) of players are enumerated, and of those considered among the Alíyah, or highest class, are the names of Rabrab, Jábir, Abúl Nâím, Al Adali, and Al Rázi, the first and last of these being superior even to the others. The qualifications of the subordinate classes are also given, but no mention made of particular players among them.

At page 26 the value of the pieces is explained, agreeing in most of its conditions with the rules already quoted on the same subject; also the proportion of forces necessary to draw or win at the end of the game.

An extract from Al Adali's work briefly describes the different kinds of Chess, of which the first is called the Square Chess

---

[1] نزهة ارباب العقول في الشطرنج المنقول "The Delight of the Intelligent, in description of Chess-play," MS., No. 146 of Dr. Lee's Catalogue of his Oriental collection, and No. 76 of the New Catalogue.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(الشطرنج المربعة), being the "well-known game attributed to India."

2ndly. "The Complete Chess (التامّة), of which the board is 10×10, with four additional pieces in the same form, called Dabbábah, placed between the King and his Bishop and the Queen and Bishop on each side; their move that of the King, and their value half a dirhem and a third of a dirhem." Probably their value was proportioned to the side on which they stood.

Al Shatranj ul Rúmíyah, which is said to be taken from the Hindíyah or Indian game aforesaid. There is some difference between the powers of its Rook and Knight from those of the common Chess, and the Pawns do not queen, as (from its circular form) the board has no extremity. About seventy diagrams follow, exhibiting positions in the usual game, taken from the works of Al Adali and Al Súli, with explanations; also three others exhibiting the mode of covering all the squares in succession by the Knight's move; the second mode is attributed to Ali ben Maníâ (منيع), and the third to Al Adali. Memorial lines are given for the rule. About twenty pages of the MS. are then devoted to extracts in verse on Chess, selected from various authors. There is no note of the scribe's name, nor period or place of writing. The copy, however, is evidently of considerable antiquity.

A second Arabic MS. in the same collection is entitled "Anmúzaj ul Catál,[1]" which might be interpreted "Exemplum rei militariæ." It was transcribed in the month Rajab, A.H. 850 = 1446. A short preface, commencing with allusions to Chess and its praise as an amusement of kings and great men, proceeds to the title of the work and its arrangement, which is into an introduction and eight chapters, coinciding with the number of the rows of squares, so that "each Bayt (or house) may have its Báb (door, or chapter);" also a Khátimah, or Conclusion. The Contents are then enumerated.

The Introduction relates examples, similarly with the treatment of the same subject in other works, of the early Muhammedan doctors, and even of Companions and Followers of the Prophet, who either themselves played chess or were spectators of the game. Some of these are also said to have played (وراء الظهر) "behind their back,"

[1] كتاب انموذج القتال في نقل العوال No. 147 of the Old Catalogue, and 77 of the New. The author of the Anmúzaj, Ibn Abi Hajlah, composed also the history of Egypt, entitled Sukkerdán, Sugar-Bason. "Ahmed ben Yahya Tilimsáni, vulgo Ibn Abi Hejla, ob. 776 = 1374." (Fluegel's Haj. Khalf. 7191.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

i. e., without looking at the board. Conditions are laid down respecting the lawfulness of chess-play, which according to some were three; viz., that the player should not gamble (play for money), nor delay prayer at the appointed times; and that he should keep his tongue from ribaldry and improper conversation. Some of the Sháfiâh sect made the conditions four: not to play on the road; nor for a stake; nor to talk frivolously; nor to be estranged by it from the times of prayer. The sect of Al Sháfiî seems to have been the only one at all indulgent to chess-play, the other three Imams condemning it absolutely and unconditionally, while Abú Hanífah would not even salute a person playing it, nor return his salutation. The argument is continued on the respective merits of Chess and Nerd as to lawfulness; this chiefly depended on the games being played for money or not, for where both were played for a stake, Chess was by many considered still more blameable than Nerd. The Introduction is concluded by a short chapter on the spelling of the word شطرنج quoting as authorities the Durrat ul Ghawwás[1], Al Safadi, and others. Shitranj is stated to be the more correct spelling, but Shatranj said to be the more usual. It is also discussed whether S or Sh should commence the word, and Shatrán, Satrán, Shash rang and Sad ranj, are offered as etymologies in support of the various *orthographies*.

The 1st Chapter, "On the Invention of Chess," gives five stories, which are mostly those already known from other works; there is, however, one rather different from the usual accounts, relating it to have been invented for certain kings of Hind, who were wise men and unwilling to go to war, and for whom Chess was proposed as a sort of peace-arbitration by which to settle their disputes. Another version is that Nerd having been invented to prove to a king that mankind were slaves of chance, and their actions compulsory, some philosopher arranged the game of Chess to show that destiny was tempered by free will. The usual reward in corn is claimed by the inventor, and a separate section treats of its application in arithmetic, according to different methods. The first is the same given by Ibn Khallican[2]; a second, with a diagram, is taken from a work called Muházarát ul Udaba; another is calculated in dirhems; a fourth,

[1] درّة الغوّاص في اوهام الخوّاص A grammatical treatise by the celebrated Hariri.

[2] In the life of Abú Bekr al Súli. See Vol. III. of De Slane's Translation, p. 71.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from the Durrat ul Muzíyah, in lunar years, and the last, by another author, makes the calculation in distances of miles.

Chapter 2nd divides chess players into the usual five classes, of which the Alíyah is said never to contain three in any one age. The Mutacáribah, or second class, is inferior to the Alíyah by a Knight's Pawn on the Queen's side, or by a Rook's Pawn; between the 3rd class and the highest there are the odds of a Queen; the 4th receives from the 1st something more than a Queen and less than a Knight; the 5th receives a Knight, and the 6th a Rook, and he who requires greater odds is not considered a player. Two other sections of this chapter describe the respective value of the pieces, and their powers.

Chapter 3rd gives an extract of eight pages from Al Súli's work, which it is difficult to abridge without injustice to the importance of its contents. Some of the maxims are those found in our treatises on the game, but there are also many practical rules applying only to Chess as modified by Eastern laws, and very interesting as a specimen of these peculiar tactics. Al Súli's instructions are commented by the author who has extracted them, showing in nine pages their illustration from war or history.

Chapter 4th sets forth the qualifications necessary for a chess-player, and especially treats of the proper times and seasons for playing, the best being considered to be when rain falls. The four temperaments[1] are associated with four of the pieces, the King, Queen, Elephant, and Rukh; and Hippocrates and Galen are quoted for cures effected by Chess.

Chapter 5th is anthological, and contains extracts in prose and verse, from various authors, in praise or blame of Chess.

In the 6th chapter the Complete Chess is mentioned, the account of it being taken from the Arabic work last described, or, probably, both from an earlier treatise. Another variety is called Shatranjí Sâídíyah, of which the arrangement is said to be similar to the Complete Chess, except that its squares are eight, as in the Indian or common game. In the Shatranjí Sâídíyah, the Pawns are not allowed to queen. Other games are the Shatranjí Memdúdah, and Rúmíyah, of the former of which a diagram is given in the MS.

The second part of this chapter describes several ingenious games and amusements on the chess-board. The first is Mikhrác ul Rukh, a trial of skill between two players, with one Rook each; another,

[1] The Warm, the Cold, the Wet, and the Dry, which correspond with the four component parts of the human frame, and are introduced by Arabian doctors into the whole system of Physics.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the two Knights. In a third, the Rook alone is played against all the Pawns. Two other games are, to take all the Pawns in as many moves with the Knight, the Pawns in one example being placed diagonally across the board. In the Mikhrác ul Afiál, the Bishops are to take all the men in a certain number of moves; and the last is the Mikhrác ul Bayádac, by Al Súli, in which the eight Red Pawns placed on the line of the pieces, are to move, one by one, in four moves of the Knight each, into the corresponding squares on the Black side. A sequel to these games is the well-known problem of the Ship, first as described by Safadi, and then in other varieties. (Hyde, p. 23.)

The chapter following contains anecdotes of Chess, of which those of two blind players, and some others, have been already related by Hyde. The earlier part of the 8th chapter seems wanting, or at least does not correspond with the title; the few poetical extract given are on the love of travel and its advantages, exemplified by the success of the Pawn, which becomes a chief when he leaves his own country. At the close of each of these eight chapters is found a selection of Mansúbahs, in diagram and in explanation, though their distribution in different parts of the treatise does not seem regulated by any intention beyond that of dividing them in portions. The conclusion of the whole work is a Macámah Shatranjíyah, in rhetorical prose, similar to that of the celebrated Macámahs or Discourses of Haríri, and forming a curious addition to the numerous imitations of that style which have been composed on other subjects. This Chess Macámah is dedicated by the author to the Sultan Malik ul Adil, prince of Márdín, and was composed by him as a sequel to another Macámah of his in honour of Al Malik ul Násir Hasan.

The Nefáïs ul Funún[1], or Treasures of Science, a valuable Persian encyclopedia, by Muhammed ben Mahmúd al Amuli, has three chapters on Chess, commencing the article "Der Ilmĭ Maláïb" (the Science of Games)" In the second chapter five different kinds are described, two of which are unknown to us from any other sources.

---

[1] The whole title is نفايس الفنون في عرايس العيون, interpreted in Baron Hammer-Purgstall's Catalogue of his MSS., in which the work is fully described, "Der Kenntnisse Kostbarkeiten aus der Quellen Braüten," and in English may perhaps be rendered, with a slight paraphrase of the original, "Treasures of Science from Virgin Sources." There are copies in the East India House Library, and in the Gore Ouseley collection, and another, slightly imperfect, in the possession of the writer of this note. The part relating to chess is, in some of the copies, so incorrect as to require careful collation with all the others. The chess diagrams found in them are to be followed with still greater caution, many of them not even agreeing with the text.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The first kind is Shatranjĭ Zawát (Zát?) ul Husún, Castellated Chess. The squares are 10×10, and at the corners are four additional squares called Hisn, or Fort, into which the King retires when hard pressed, and then nothing can happen to him, unless his way is intercepted so that he cannot move into them. There are four Dabbábahs, which seem the only additional pieces; their move is like the Rook's[1], and in this game the Pawn never becomes a Queen. Another Chess is on an oblong board 16×4. It is played with dice thrown alternately by each player, and the moves are regulated by the throw. If Ace is thrown, a Pawn is to be played; if Deuce, a Rook; Trois, a Knight; Quatre, a Bishop; Cinq, the Queen; Seize, the King. (This appears to be the Shatranjĭ Memdúdah of other writers.)

A third Chess is arranged on a round board[2], and in the middle is a small circle to which the King retires for safety, and in which, as in the first game, nothing can happen to him as long as he remains there. In this game also the Pawn cannot queen; and if two Pawns meet, one takes the other; and so also with the Bishops. These two last games are said to be well known, like the Square Chess (Shatranjĭ Murabbâ).

A fourth kind of Chess, which is also on a circular board, is arranged to resemble the heavens, having seven stars and twelve signs. The signs, which are the spaces between the concentric circles, are divided among the stars according to their mansions, and the moves of each star are proportioned in number to the height of its heaven; so that Saturn has seven squares, and Jupiter six, Mars five, the Sun four, Venus three, Mercury two, and the Moon one.

The Great Chess (Shatranjĭ Kebír) is the fifth kind named in the Nefáïs, and is said to contain, besides other things, a Zaráfah and a Camel[3]. The encyclopediast excuses himself from entering into a description of its rules, the form of its board, figure of the pieces, and mode of commencing the game, as leading to too great prolixity,

---

[1] But باخ راف—*i.e.*, probably with the different power already assigned to them in the Great Chess.

[2] Ibn Arabshah, p. 877, mentions the Round and Oblong games among the varieties of Chess played at Timur's Court: ورايت عنده شطرنجيا مداورا وشطرنجيا طويلا and this Round Board has also been reputed the invention of Timur, as well as the Great Chess Board; both on equally slight authority.

A round board, similar to fig. 3, pl. IV., but with pieces differently arranged, is engraved in Strutt's Sports and Pastimes.

[3] One MS. has شبير a Lion, no doubt a mistake in the points, for شتر.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and says he therefore contents himself with giving some Mansúbahs of the "Square Chess, which is well known;" thus depriving us of the assistance we should have had in investigating the still obscure game of Timur.

Of these Mansúbahs about fifteen or sixteen are given, but they present no novelty after those contained in other practical works already mentioned.

There is a chapter on the ethics, or rather, social observances of Chess, from which the following is a selection.

"In India they try a person's fitness for the duties of a Wazír by playing chess in his presence. If he looks on silently, they put confidence in him, but if he gives advice, they consider him wanting in discretion."

"*Rule.* Even if asked to decide a dispute at chess, do not, but say, 'I did not see,' unless attending the match expressly as an arbitrator." Another rule recommends not talking too much at the game, as it disturbs your adversary; also, not to be tediously silent; not to swear at chess; and when play is over, not to touch the men, but to leave them till your adversary sets them for a fresh game; "and if any one asks, 'Who won?' even though you have won all the games, not to say, 'I won;' but, 'I won some, and my opponent some.' In short, so to play chess that it may become a source of love, not a cause of hatred." A wholesome code of social laws, which it would be well to enforce and practise as strictly in our chess-play as the fixed rules of the game itself.

Besides separate treatises on the history and tactics of the game, a favourite subject in Eastern rhetorical composition is the parallel between Chess and Nerd, each having its partisans. At the end of Wassáf's celebrated Persian history[1] is a declamation of this kind, of considerable length, and in a highly ornamented style. The Praise and Blame of Chess are a theme for poets as well as prose writers, and under these heads are usually divided the extracts on this subject in their Anthologies, especially those from Arabic authors. The two following pieces present the two varieties of style, and exhibit both sides of the question. They are from the "Yawákít ul

[1] Commonly known as the Táríkhí Wassáf, but the proper title is تجزية الامصار وترجية الاعصار by Abdullah Fazlullah, surnamed Wassáf ul Hezrat.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mawákít," a valuable Arabic work in the collection of Baron Hammer-Purgstall at Vienna[1].

The first of these, in Praise of Chess, is from the Diwan of the poet Ibn ul Mutâzz, and is quoted in the anthology referred to, as the best of all similar compositions. The following free translation of it exhibits perhaps its spirit rather than its beauties. The passage in Blame of Chess is in prose, and the text of both is given in the note[2].

In Praise of Chess, by Ibn ul Mutâzz.

O thou whose cynic sneers express the censure of our favourite Chess!
Know that its skill is science' self, its play distraction from distress.
It soothes the anxious lover's care, it weans the drunkard from excess;
It counsels warriors in their art, when dangers threat and perils press;
And yields us, when we need them most, companions in our loneliness.

Censure of Chess.

"The Chess-player is ever absorbed in his Chess and full of care, swearing false oaths and making many vain excuses; one who careth only for himself and angereth his Maker! 'Tis the game of him who keepeth the fast only when he is hungry; of the official who is in disgrace; of the drunkard till he recovereth from his drunkenness: and in the Yatímat ul Dehr it is said, Abúl Cásim al Kesrawi hated Chess and constantly abused it, saying, You never see a Chess-player rich, who is not a sordid miser, nor hear a squabbling that is not on a question of the Chess-board."

---

[1] مواقف المواقف في مدح كل شيء "Rubinen des Zarten im Lobe und Tadel jedes Dinges," by Al Saalabi. Hammer-Purgstall's Handschriften, No. 11.

[2] باب مدح الشطرنج

احسن ما قيل فيه قول ابن المتعز رحمه الله

يا عايب الشطرنج من جهله * وليس للشطرنج من باس *
في فهمها علم و في لعب * شغل عن الغيبة للناس *
وتذهل العاشق عن عشقه * وصاحب الكاس عن الكاس *
وصاحب الحرب بتدبيرها * يزداد في الشدّة والباس *
واهلها من حسن آدابها * من خير اصحاب و جلّاس *

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The variety of historical anecdotes of Chess in the East may be conceived from the number of their great men who made it their study. Charlemagne, in the European annals of chess-play, is said to have staked his empire on a single game; but a still more extraordinary wager is recorded between the celebrated Harun and his wife Zubaidah, which influenced even the succession to the Khalifate[1]. There is also a curious anecdote respecting the same prince, which, if authentic, adds a new feature to the romantic history of the Bermekides, and connects Chess with the reason of their disgrace and downfall.

It has often been stated that one of the causes of Jâfar's fall, the last of his house who enjoyed honour and power under its fickle patron, was in connection with his marriage with Abbásiah, the sister of the Khalif. The reason usually given for Al Rashíd's consent to a marriage so much inferior to the rank of the beautiful princess, and which was fraught with such dangerous happiness to the young bridegroom, has been assigned to be the Khalif's desire to remove the inconvenience of his sister's occasional visits to the royal apartments, where Jâfar, as Minister, was frequently in attendance; but the motive assigned for it in the following anecdote has not, I believe, been published.

"Al Rashíd was devoted to the game of Chess, and he had a sister, called Abbásiah, who played well. Now Jâfar used to beat Al Rashíd (at chess), as his sister also did, and it was Al Rashíd's wish to see which of the two (Jâfar or Abbásiah) would prove superior, in his presence. Then he said to Jâfar, 'I will give thee (my sister)

باب ذمّ الشطرنج

قيل ان صاحبه ابدا مشغول مهموم يحلف بالله كاذبا ويعتذر مبطلا ويسلم نفسه ويسخط ربّه وفي لعب الصابم اذا جاع والعامل اذا عزل والمخمور حتي يفيق وفي كتاب يتيمة الدهر ان ابا القاسم الكسروي كان يبغض الشطرنج ويذمّها و يقول لا تري شطرنجيّا غنيّا الاّ بخيلا دنيّا ولا تسمع نادرة بادرة الاّ على الشطرنج

[1] It is to be found, in translation, in Von Hammer's Rosencel, 2nd vol., or Flaeschchen. The story is too long for insertion here, and would suffer by abridgement.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Abbásiah in marriage, on condition that thou approach her not, except by my command and appointment;' and Al Rashíd sent for the Cádhi, and he wrote Abbásiah's marriage contract with Jâfar: and Abbásiah used to sit with Jâfar, whether Al Rashíd was present or not, and used to play with him[1]."

We have seen in the tales of the Thousand and One Nights the young prince, when transformed into a monkey, play Chess with the king, his patron[2]. In the Jámi' ul Hikáyát, a monkey plays chess with the son of his master, a Kutwál in India, and quarrelling about the game, kills him with a blow of the board, thus furnishing a ludicrous parallel to the numerous Chess homicides, especially among royal players, in the histories of the West[3].

---

[1] وكان الرشيد مُغرِيًا بلعب الشطرنج وكان [له اُختٌ]
يقال لها العباسيّةُ و كانت تلعب ملبج و كان جعفر يغلب
الرشيد كما [اختَه] و مراده [لِيري] من يغلّب قدّامه فقال
ازوجكَ العباسية بشرط انك لا تقرب اليها الا بامري و علمي
واحضرَ القاضي واجري نكاحها عليه وصارت تقعد مع جعفر
إن كان الرشيد حاضر ام لا و تلعبُ الشطرنج معه *

This interesting anecdote, both in text and translation, was kindly communicated to me by the Rev. G. Hunt, of Plymouth. It is taken from one of the numerous MSS. containing anecdotes of Harún, and the imperfections of the copy, as shown by the inclosure of brackets, have been supplied by Mr. Hunt himself, as well as the following note:—"The MS. reads يغلبه (3rd line), which cannot be right. For if Harun only wanted to know whether Jafar or Abbasiah was a better player than himself, he could ascertain that without bringing Jafar and Abbasiah together in his presence. Both beat *him*, and what he wished to see was which of the two would beat the other, and this could not be unless they met, and they could not meet, according to Oriental etiquette, unless married."

[2] In the "Story of the Second Royal Mendicant," according to Lane's translation. It is to be regretted that Mr. Lane has not taken an opportunity of bestowing on us, from his extensive resources of learned research and practical experience, some detailed information on the present or former practice of Chess in Egypt. In a Note (67), the game is said to be "played somewhat differently in different parts of the East."

[3] Pepin's son killed the son of King Ottocar of Bavaria in this manner. The story, as related by Selenus of Lunenburg, and repeated in the poem Quirinalia, in the twelfth century, is cited, with numerous similar anecdotes from

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The caution against indulgence in foolish and even improper conversation during chess-play, recited in some of the preceding pages as Ethics of Chess, seems not to have been an unnecessary precept. A memoir of Imádler, in the Atesh Kedah, affords a proof of its gross violation, and supplies the subject of an epigram by that poet. As a specimen of a more inoffensive style of wit during chess-play, the following humorous anecdote has been contributed by the same valued correspondent from whom I received the quotation in page 36.

"It is said that two men were playing chess, when a person present observed that one of the players was in check. Then he said to him, 'Cover it;' but as soon as he had said to him 'Cover it,' up started the player and rushed suddenly upon him with a huge fist, and thrust him away. Then he said, 'God has made you witnesses against him, that he intermeddled with my dignity.' The other replied, 'And what is it I have said about your dignity?' The first answered, 'You said to me *Ustur* (Cover), and I do not allow this; for if it be mispronounced, it becomes *Ushtur*, and Ushtur in the Persian language means 'Camel;' and *Jamal* (Camel), if mispronounced, becomes *Hamal* (Aries), and Hamal is a constellation in the heavens; and there is associated with it a constellation called Zúl Carnain (the two-horned, viz., Capricorn), and so he made me out to be a Ram' (*i.e.* Olens, or Cornutus). Then they who were present laughed[1]."

---

the early Chronicles, by Sir Frederick Madden, in his learned "Historical Remarks on the Introduction of the Game of Chess into Europe," &c., in the Archæologia, Vol. XXIV. 1832.

A monkey also plays chess in a story related in the Palamede, Vol. I. 1836—"Le Singe et le Gascon."

[1] قيل إنّ رجلين كانا يلعبا بالشطرنج فنظر رجل من
المتفرّجين بإنّ واحدًا عليه كِشْ فقال له أستر فلما قال له استر
نهض وبدره بكف عظيم ولقطه من اطرافه وقال اللّهم شاهدكم
عليه بانه دخل في عرضي فقال له وما الذي قلته في عرضك
فقال له قلتَ لي أستر ولم اقبل لانّها إن صحّفت تصير
اشتر واشتر بلسان الفارسي يطلق علي الجمل والجمل إن صحفناه

Chess is also a sign in Eastern dreams, and has its appropriate interpretation in their Tâbír Námahs, or Dream-books. In a Turkish work on this subject[1], I find it to portend "a foolish and vexatious undertaking," and in a chapter of the Nefáïs ul Funún, already quoted, which treats of Dreams, it is said that to dream of playing Chess announces dispute on vain subjects; and if one dream that he beats his adversary at Chess (or at Nerd), it signifies that he will have success in vain undertakings. The Nuzhat ul Culúb, in the 4th chapter, "Maláhi" (Amusements), says that to behold Shatranj or Nerd signifies "vain undertakings, deceit, and treachery."

Of poetic specimens, some are in the form of riddles on Chess. The following, in Persian, is the composition of Ziáï, a poet of Ardúbád. It forms a Casídah or ode, in praise of Shah Gharíb Mirza, son of Husain Mirza Baicara, and though the allusions rather too plainly disclose the subject of the enigma, the author has shown ingenuity in the manner in which he has turned it to the compliment of his patron[2].

قصیدهٔ لغز شطرنج

در مدح شاه غریب میرزا

ای دل کدام عرصه درین کشور آمده

کز خیل روم و زنگ در آن لشکر آمده

خیل غریب و قوم عجیبی که در مصاف

بی تیغ و تیر در سر یکدیگر آمده

هر یك دو اسپه رانده بجمع پیادگان

کایشان سپاه‌را بوغا رهبر آمده

يصير حمل والحمل نجم في السما ويقارنه نجم يقال له ذو القرنين

فجعلني عرضاً فضحكوا الحاضرين

[1] تعبیر نامه printed at Constantinople, A.H. 1206 = 1791.

[2] Ziáï (ضیای) according to the Atesh Kedah, came from his native place, Ardúbád, to Herat, and entered the service of the celebrated Emír Ali Shír. After the fall of the Gúrgán power, he fled from Khurasan to Azarbaijan, and died at Tabriz in that province, A.H. 927 (A.D. 1520). Ziáï was chiefly a lyric writer.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

با شاه خویشتن ۞ یکرنگ و یکجهت
خصم افگن و سپهسکن و صفدرآمده
در معرکه به پشتی هم کرده جنگها
وآن جنگ اکثر از پیء سیم و زرآمده
گر پردلان و پیلتنان را فگنده شاه
لیکن ز یك پیاده گهي مضطرآمده
سلطان عصر شاه غریب آنکه در بساط
هر گوشه صف چو شاهرخش چاکرآمده

In the encyclopedia called Mifṭáh ul Sâádat[1], under the division Ilm ul Muâmma (the Science of Riddles) is found an Enigma on the name of Muhammed, in which an allusion to Chess is introduced:—

"The vow of Moses twice repeat;
"The principles of life and heat;
"The squares of Chess, in order due,
"Must take their place between these two;
"When thus arranged, a name appears,
"Which every Muslim heart reveres."

The solution of this Enigma presenting some difficulties, it was referred by Baron Hammer-Purgstall to one of the Ulema of Constantinople for my instruction. The original of the interpretation, thus obligingly communicated to me, is found in the note, appended to the Arabic text[2]. The Enigma is thus explained:—

---

[1] مفتاح السعادة و مصباح السيادة "Schlüssel der Glückseligkeit und Leuchte der Herrschaft," Handschriften Hammer-Purgstall's, No. 12.

[2] المغنّا على اسم محمّد يروي انه لعلي ابن ابي طالب كرّم الله وجهه لكن هذه الرواية غير صحيحة

الا خذ وعد موسي مرّتين * وضع اصل الطبايع تحت ذين *
وسكّن خان شطرنج فخذها * وادرج بين ذين المدرجين *
فهذا اسم لمن يهواه قلبي * وقلب جميع في الخافقين *

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Take the 'vow of Moses,' which is 40; double it, and it becomes 80, equivalent to the two Míms in the name Muhammed. Place under these the bases of the temperaments, that is, the Elements, which are four (the power of the letter D); then take the number of the houses (or squares) of Chess, which are eight in a row, and place it (8 = to the letter H) between the two M's, and you have the name of the Prophet, Muhammed (M H M D)."

It has been necessary to turn the Arabic commentary a little, in order to make the solution more intelligible to those unacquainted with the trick of Eastern riddles. Some further explanation is also required to illustrate the solution itself. The vow of Moses refers to his forty days' fast. The four temperaments, the Bile, Atrabile, Phlegm, and Blood, are represented in the Arabian system of physics by the four elements, which are considered to be connected with them.

The figures refer to the numerical powers of the *Abjad*, or Alphabet.

The Enigma itself has been attributed, though on uncertain grounds, to Ali, the son-in-law of the Prophet.

In Persian poetry the images drawn from Chess are innumerable, and abundant opportunities are afforded for the lively imagination of their poets in ingenious allusions to the terms of the game, and their fanciful adaptation to the objects of their verse, especially a play on the word *Shah*, King, frequently applied to the beloved object, and *Rukh*, as the cheek or face of beauty, and also the piece called Rukh in chess.

دل ما گرد لبت باخت چه هوش کمال
بحریفی که دو رخ دارد هیچ مباز

"Kemál upon thy lip staked all his soul and lost;
Play not against an adversary with two Rukhs (cheeks)." *Kemál.*

يعني خذ وعد موسي عليه السلام و هو اربعين مرتين فصار ثمانين و هو ميمين في ذاك الاسم القدس عليه الصلاة والسلام وضع علي اصل الطبايع و هي السوداء والبلغم والصفراء والدم و تجعل ان يراد منه العناصر الاربعة والاربعة عدد الدال المهلمة و هي اذا اضع تحت هذين الوعدين وادرج خان الشطرنج يعني خانه وهو ثمان و الثمانية في الحروف حاء مهملة اي غير معجمة بين الميمين فظهر اسم سيد الخافقين عليه الصلاة والسلام

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

دست رحمت در عنان دوستداري زن دمي
تا بساطي رخ نهد در پيش اسپ شاه من

"For one moment draw the rein of friendship with the hand of mercy,
That Bisáti may lay his cheek (*Rukh*) before the horse (*Asp*) of his Sovereign (*Shah*)."

Bisáti.

آن روز که شطرنج جفا گستري آموخت
در اوّل بازي رخ خوشش دل ما برد

"When my beloved learnt the chess-play of cruelty,
In the very beginning of the game her sweet cheek (*Rukh*) took my heart captive."

Kemál Khojendi.

From similar passages interspersed through the Diwans of the Persian poets, many of the terms of Chess may be illustrated.

گر شهرخ وصال بساطي بمات رفت
در کف عنان اسپ مراد ازچه او گرفت

"If the Shahrukh of meeting led Bisáti to death (*Mate*),
Why did he take in his hand the reins of the *horse* (Asp) of desire?"

Bisáti.

شطرنج غم عشق تو شه مات خوشست

"The chess-play of love's grief is a pleasing *check-mate*."

Feríddudín Attár.

شطرنج وصال تو توان برد * بي تعبيهء مراد نتوان *
هيهات که پيلبند عشقت * آسان آسان کشاد نتوان *
تا سهو نيوفتد ببازي * رخ بر رخ او نهاد نتوان *

"Though thou mayst win the chess-game of union,
It cannot be won without the *Attack* of desire;
Alas! that the *Pílbend* of thy love
Cannot without difficulty be dissolved!
Unless there be an error in play,
Thou canst not place thy Rukh (or cheek) against hers."

Hasan Dehlewi.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The following Fragment from Anwari's Diwan presents a series of images drawn from the game:—

صاحبا راي رفيعت كه بيعار خرد *
هست پيوسته چو ميزان فلك حادثه سنج *
پيش شطرنجيء تقدير چو بر نطع امور *
از بيء نظم جهان كرد بساطيء شطرنج *
چرخ را اسپ و رخي طرح كند در تدبير *
فتنه را بر درِ شهمات نشاند بي رنج *
باز چون دست بشطرنج تغرّج بازي *
اي ز دست تو طمع رقص كنان بر سر گنج *
شاه شطرنج كه در وقت ضرورت شده است *
بارها خانهء فرزين و پياده بسپنج *
چون ببيند كه ترا دست بود بر سر او *
هم در آن معركه بر پيل كند نوبت پنج *

Besides these incidental allusions to Chess, which seldom exceed the limits of a single couplet, whole poems have been composed, of greater or less extent, either in praise of the game, or on its principles of play. Such compositions are chiefly in Arabic, some of which are known to us only from extracts preserved in Anthologies, similar to those already described, and others are presented entire in different manuscript collections. One of these, a Casidah, containing nearly eighty lines, is found in the Diwan of Ibn al Afif[1], in the Library of the British Museum.

---

[1] الصدر الامام العالم الأوحد الفاضل شمس الدين ابو عبد الله محمد ابن الشيخ الامام العالم الاوحد عفيف الدين عبد الله بن سليمان التلمساني

The MS. is in the Collection of Rich, No. 7567, and is called "Diwan Ibn al Afif et alia."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Sprenger of Delhi, for a copy of a Persian poem on Chess, which he was so obliging as to have transcribed for me and sent over for the purposes of the present essay. It is in the Didactic form, and chiefly exhibits practical rules for playing the usual short game. The whole poem consists of about three hundred couplets, composed in the Khafíf, or metre of the Hadícah of Senáï, and commences its exordium in praise of the Deity, with an allusion to the colours of the chess-board:

ای منوّر ز تو مه و خورشید
وز تو پیدا سیاه و سپید

"From thee both Sun and Moon derive their light,
Thou markest Day from Night, and Black from White."

The Tauhíd and Nát, or praises of the Deity and the Prophet, differ little from the usual style of such invocations in similar compositions, and appear to have little reference to the subject of the poem. They are followed almost immediately by directions for placing the men, instructions on their relative value and best mode of position, with two or three varieties of play, such as the Queen against two Rooks, and others already mentioned. A short chapter, rather irregularly introduced, discusses in a few lines the question of the lawfulness of Chess, which it admits on three conditions, viz., that it be not played for a stake, nor to the neglect of prayer, nor with indulgence in frivolous or dissipated conversation; to which conditions the author adds also, that it should be played with persons of good character, and that the match should not exceed three games at a sitting. Then follow twenty-four diagrams of positions, the mode of play being explained in verse. There is also the problem of covering the 64 squares of the board with the Knight, in so many moves. One of the games is Dilaram's Mate, already described in the analysis of Major Yule's MS. There is some difference in the story as it is related in the poem, though the position and solution are the same[1].

The poem concludes with a few lines in praise of the author's patron, to whom it is dedicated, and who appears to have been named Saif Khán. There is no other clue to its history, nor to the name

[1] This game seems also to have had a place in Dr. Hyde's authorities, though, not meeting with the tale connected with it, he mentions the Position as "Mansûbo 'l Gjâriya, i. e., *Thema Lusús currentis.*" منصوبة الجارية evidently refers to it as *Thema Puellæ, vèl Ancillæ*; scil. *Dilaramæ.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or birth-place of the poet, and, until I have an opportunity of further information from the source whence I derived the MS., I am unable to give any particulars concerning this little work. It is styled, simply, Risálahĭ Shatranj on the cover of the copy sent me. In a literary point of view it affords a pleasing resemblance to Vida's celebrated Latin poem, and to the Caïssa of Sir W. Jones.

A history of celebrated Eastern Chess-players would form an interesting chapter of biography, and a desirable complement to a treatise on the literature of Chess. Abundant materials are supplied by the names which occur in anecdotes relating to the game, and many are to be gathered from the different Openings or Positions which bear titles from their authors. Among the Persian poets we find several who were renowned for their skill in chess-play, which is in every instance carefully recorded by their biographers, as a merit worthy of being mentioned with their literary and poetic talent and their proficiency in the higher branches of art or science. Táhir of Nasrábád, who wrote memoirs of the poets in the reign of Shah Abbas, mentions one Azim, or Názim, of Yezd, who pretended to superiority in all arts, especially Chess, in which he boasted that "he would give even Lejláj a Knight, and beat him." Táhir however adds, that he had himself, notwithstanding his own want of skill, beaten this pretended champion several times.

Some of the best rhetorical specimens containing allusions to Chess are to be found in these biographies of poets, or other great men, to distinguish them for their skill in the game, or, metaphorically, to describe their excellence. Thus, in Auhadi's Life of Khájah Ali Shatranji, already mentioned (p. 42).

"When he moved his Rukh, (or face,) in the Arena, (or Board) of imagination, he gave the odds of two Horses and the Elephant to the Kings of rhetoric; the Gambit-player of fancy fell mated in the Fílbend of confusion from his Pawn[1]."

Similar to this is the metaphorical allusion to Chess in a memoir of Abul Farah Rúni, another poet of early date, in Taki Auhadi's Tazkirah, theUrfát.

---

[1] خواجه دهقان علي شطرنجي كه چون رخ بعرصهء فكرت نهادي شاهان سخن را دو اسپ و فيل طرح دادي منصوبه‌باز خيال در فيلبند حيرت پياده مات افتادي

Though Mansúbah means merely a Position at Chess, the words Mansúbah-báz are here translated 'Gambit-player,' for want of a suitable expression.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"The Líláj of his genius, when it played the Nerd of knowledge, gave the Three-stroke move to the coursers of the hippodrome in the Shashder of power, and when he manœuvred the two-knight game in the exercise of imagination on the Chess-board of composition, would give two Knights and a Queen to the Shaháfíl of intelligence[1]."

In the life of Aláuddín Jehánsúz is a passage descriptive of the attack made by that Prince and his brothers on the army of Behrámsháh, which also introduces many of the names of the Pieces, but without affording any novelty of illustration[2].

Líláj, Lejláj, or Lejáj[3], is named by Hyde, who fully discusses the subject in his Chapter "De Inventore, Auctore," &c., (Shahiludii,) p. 57. To those who have not access to that work, it may be necessary to explain that this person was by some supposed to be the inventor of Chess, and by others, merely to have excelled at it, and, in general, to be the Coryphæus and prototype of gamblers and players. Allusions to him under each of his three names are found in the extracts, both prose and verse, quoted in this essay, where he is repre-

---

[1] لیلاج طبعش چون نرد دانش پاي نرخم باختي یکه‌تازان میدان‌را در ششدر قدرت سه ضربه دادي و چون در امر فکرتش در عرصهء شطرنج سخن دو اسپه تاختي شاهافیل سوار معانی‌را دو رخ و فرزي نهادي *

[1] Shashder is the Board at Nerd or Backgammon. Several of the Chess terms in this and other extracts are not yet sufficiently illustrated to enable us to understand them. Some few of them are explained later.

[2] با آنکه آن پلیتن رستم دل چون با وي در عرصهء جلادت سپاه شطرنج و از رخ بر رخ نهادهء پیاده و سوار صف در صف کشیدند دویست زنجیر فیل جنگي داشت و خود در اثناي سواري بر فرس باد رفتار هزار پیل و سندان میگذرانید از کج بازیها سپهر فرزین طبع بي اختیار از پیش وي چون تیر از خانهء کمان جسته &c.

[3] لیلاج — لجلاج — لجاج

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sented not only to have been a player at Chess, but at other games[1]. From the repetition of two of the names in the same passage, as quoted by Hyde, and some ambiguity in the explanation from the dictionary cited below, it might be assumed that there were two different persons, Lejláj, and Líláj, or Lejáj, one the inventor of Chess, and the other a celebrated player at it.

Dr. Hyde has so learnedly illustrated the instruments of chess-play, that little remains to be added to his information. The word Kálá (کالا), however, is worthy of remark, as used in the Price manuscript to signify any one of the pieces, and also collectively for the whole, as well as Káláhá, in the regular Persian plural. No such signification is given in any of the native dictionaries among its many meanings, and it seems, like Asbáb (اسباب) and Alát, (آلات) equivalent, in a general acceptation, to our word Piece, and the German *Stück*. It does not appear in any other Chess treatise, the Persian word most frequently employed, especially in poetry, being Muhrah (مهره).

The usual colours of the Chess-men appear to have been Black and White, though often also Black and Red, by which the two sides are distinguished in the positions of the Price MS. In the poem described p. 43, the colours are Green and Red. The division into White and Black gives occasion to many ingenious allusions of their poets; Ghazáli of Meshed says:—

گردون بقصد بردن نقد حیات او
شطرنج شب و روز سپید و سیاه کرد

"Fortune, to win the ready stake of thy life,
"Checquered in white and black the chess-board of day and night[2]."

---

[1] لجلاج بر وزن و معني لیلاج است که پیر و مرشد قمار بازان باشد و بعضي گویند که نام شخصي است که واضع شطرنج است و بعضي دیگر گویند لجاج نام واضع شطرنج است *Burhán*

[2] This couplet, and one similar, p. 43, seem to controvert the prevailing opinion that the squares in Eastern Chess are not of different colours. It is nowhere so stated in their treatises. MS. diagrams are, necessarily, alike, as even in engraving it requires a complicated process to represent the pieces on coloured squares.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The two following couplets present men made of wood, and also of ivory. From the Mufarrih ul Culúb:

با غیر او اضافت شاهی بود چنانك
بر یك دو چوب پارهء شطرنج نام شاه

"The addition of royalty to other monarchs than him,
"Is like the name of King bestowed on a few wooden pieces at chess."

آن رخ از خوبان برد شطرنج حسن
گرچه باشد هر یکیرا رخ ز عاج

"That cheek (Rukh) of hers would win from all the fair ones of the world, at the chess-play of beauty,
"Though each one of them should have a cheek (Rukh) of ivory."
Kemal of Khojend.

The term Mansúbah (منسوبة), a "Position at Chess," is improperly called by Hyde a Gambit, ("De Situ Lusuum, qui vulgo Gambettæ vocantur, Ch. VII., p. 135); the Gambit of our modern game consisting in a peculiar mode of opening by advancing a second pawn and offering it for an advantage. The Mansúbah is merely a position of the pieces from which some curious and scientific manner of winning or drawing is to be deduced[1]. The opening, or commencement of a game, is called Tâbíah (تعبية) an Arabic word signifying the array of an army for battle[2], and answering also extremely well to our term in chess, *Attack*. Both Mansúbahs and Tâbíahs are associated with the names of the inventor, or the player to whom they first occurred, as, in our chess-books, Cunningham's Gambit, the Muzio Gambit, &c., but there are also the two following Mansúbahs, of which one occurs in the Anmúzaj, and the other in the Nuzhat, of Dr. Lee's collection, and they are there quoted from Adali's and Al Súli's works. They are منصوبة قايمة خفية, (or perhaps خفيفة), and منصوبة مانعة, and they appear to be named

[1] In Johnson's Persian and Arabic Dictionary, "Mansúbah" is called "the game of Chess," instead of "a (particular) game or position at Chess."

[2] تعبية is the Noun of Action of the 2d conjugation of عبا, which is explained, "Instruxit aciem vel exercitum."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from the nature of the position, viz., the one, as ingeniously leading to a Drawn-game, and the other as "a defensive" position.

The following are the principal Tâbiahs, or Openings, collected from the different works already mentioned, with whatever illustration is afforded by the limited materials we possess.

تعبية المردّد — Tâbíat ul Muraddid, with which Jábir, and, after him, Rabrab used to open his game. It was called so, لترديد الفرسين, "from repulsing the two Knights."

تعبية (؟) خصي فرعون — With which Abú Farûn used to begin.

تعبية موشّح — Muwashshah, played by Al Súli and mentioned in his book.

تعبية وتد العنز — Watad ul ânz, (?) also described by Al Súli.

الملاحق — Al Muláhic, so named by Al Súli because, he says, البيوت قد لحق بعضها ببعض

تعبية مشايخي — Mashá'ikhi, with which Temím (تميم) used to commence.

تعبية المعقرب — Tâbíat ul Muâcrab was played by فم الحوت Fam ul Hút.

تعبية المجنّح — Tâbíat ul Mujannah. One of the paintings in Major Price's MS. bears the name of Mujannahĭ Temám, but is too much defaced to show the nature of the opening. It is probably a system of opening on the sides, as recommended by Al Súli, in his treatise quoted, p. 22.

تعبية سيف — Tâbíatu Saif

تعبية العجايز — Tâbíat ul Ajáïz

تعبية السيالة — Tâbíat ul Sayálah

Are so many Openings described in the same work (Anmúzaj); but the application of the names does not appear.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Three other games are figured at the commencement of Major Price's MS., but it is difficult to know whether to assign them to the class of Mansúbahs or Tâbíahs. They are called Halíli (هليلى), Janáh (جناح), and Muâllac (معلق). The first is probably named after some player called Halíl. The Janáh appears to be connected in meaning with the Mujannahĭ Temám, already mentioned, which follows it in the MS. and to be a side opening, *on the wings*. The only illustration I can offer for the Muâllac is in this line of the poet Kemal of Khojend,

در ازل دل بتو شطرنج تعلّق میباخت

عرا *'Irá* is explained in the Madár ul Afázil and the Muyid ul Fuzala to be, "that piece at chess which is interposed between the King and a Rook to protect" (the King from the Rook's check), and the name to be derived from 'Ará, "a place in which there is no tree nor covering;" the vowel being changed, as the dictionary says, to denote an altered meaning[1].

The signification of دست *Dest*, as a (single) game, is fixed by the Burhánĭ Cátî and other works[2]. It frequently occurs in the Price MS., as, in در آخر دست "at the end of the game." The word بازي (Bázi), corresponding with the Arabic لعب (Lâb), is used to express the *Play* or *Move*, and it appears at the head of all chess problems in phrases similar to the following:—سیاه برد و بازي اورا است "Black *plays* and wins" (literally, wins and the *move* is his).

---

[1] عرا بالکسر مهرهء که میان رخ و شاه شطرنج حایل بود و اصل این عرا است یعني زمیني که در وي درخت و پوشش نباشد لیکن آن مهرهرا عرا میگویند برین که مقام عرا است از تسمیّة الشيء باسم محله لیکن عین‌را کسر داده اند تا دلاله کند تغیر لفظ بر تغیر معني

The explanation in the Madár ul Afázil is similar.

[2] دست — کرة و مرتبه و نوبت‌را نیز گفته اند همچو یك دست دیگر شطرنج و یك دست دیگر نرد بازي کنید *

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A misapprehension has arisen as to the meaning of the term *Shah Rukh*, respecting which there is an anecdote current in most of the works on Chess, as having been bestowed as a name on Timur's eldest son, and from him applied to Shahrukhiah, a city on the river Saihún or Jaxartes. The story is related in Hyde, both from the Greek historian, Ducas Byzantinus, and from Ibn Arabshah's narrative, but is erroneously explained to be a check to the King from the Rook. "Si quis Rucho monebat Regem, ille dicebat شهرخ Shâh Rùch, *i.e.*, Shàh à Rucho." (Hyde. VI. 128.) The same signification is said to be preserved in the Italian term Scaccorocco. Shahrukh, however, is clearly nothing else than an attack by which the King and his Rook are checked at the same time, so that, the King being forced to move or otherwise defend himself, the Rook is taken by the piece that checks. It is merely a double check, which as it insures the capture of a Rook (by far the strongest piece in the Eastern game), and probably other advantages, is naturally a move of the highest importance, and one which might decide the event of the game. For this reason also it might have been usual to announce it to the adversary, though there is no evidence of this custom; just as some persons in playing the European Chess have the habit of calling Check to the Queen, or Double Check to the King and Queen, a move of corresponding consequence with Shah Rukh. The simple check of the King by the adversary's Rook would, under ordinary circumstances, be of little consequence, nor should it necessarily affect the issue of the game more than a check by any other piece. The question, in fact, is completely settled by the interpretation given, in the dictionary called Bahárí Ajam, to the expression, شاه‌رخ خوردن, "to suffer Shah Rukh, which is when the King is checked, so that he is obliged to move, and his adversary takes the Rukh[1]." In illustration of this meaning a couplet is quoted from the poet Zuhúri's "Description of

---

[1] شاه رخ خوردن آنست که کشت بشاه برسد که بضرورت از آنجا بر خیزد و حریف رخرا بزند * ظهوري در تعريف شطرنج بازي ممدوح گويد *

نیست غم ورنه خجلتی برد
شاهرخ گو که شاهرخ میخورد

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chess-play," which supports the inference that notice was given of it, or at least the stroke announced, as in Check or Check-mate.

Shah Rukh, separately, is interpreted in the same dictionary as "Two pieces at chess[1]," and not, a stroke at chess. The position is more particularly illustrated in one of the examples of Games in the Chess Poem described p. 43.

بعد از آن فرز بر رخ اندازد رخ مابین که شاهرخ سازد
رخ زند بر وزیر مفت برد رخ سرخش دگر زهم بدرد

Dr. Hyde would seem to extend the use of a similar expression to other combinations, as the Check by the Queen, or the Bishop, or the Knight. If his authorities indicate its use, it is probably to be explained, as in Shah Rukh, to signify a Double Check in which one of those pieces is attacked as well as the King. The same principle, no doubt, might be applied to another term he quotes, Asp-Ferzín, or Shah-Asp-Ferzín, and probably also to Sháháfíl. *Supra*, p. 45.

Pílbend (or Fílbend) and Ferzínbend would appear, from the use made of these terms in the few places in which they occur in the treatises, to signify what we call *forking* two pieces, of which the Bishop or the Queen would be one. The Baháŕí Ajam describes Pílbend as "a position at chess," but explains the compound "Pílbend dádan" (پیلبند دادن) to be an expression signifying to "mate by a check with the Bishop[2]." This, like the interpretation erroneously given to the term Shah Rukh, would not imply a stroke of such importance as to decide the game, or even to justify the metaphorical use of these words in the passage of Nizami's Sikander Námah, quoted by the Baháŕí Ajam as an authority:

"When thou castest the noose in the combat of Elephants,
Thou givest Pílbend to (takest prisoner) the King of Cannúj."

---

[1] شاهرخ نام دو مهرهء شطرنج

[2] پیلبند نام یکي از منصوبهاي شطرنج — و پیلبند دادن عبارت از مات کردن بکشت پیل * نظامي *
چو در جنگ پیلان کشائي کمند
دهي شاه قنوجرا پیلبند

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Price's MS., where the action of the privileged or queened Pawn is described, it is said, "If the player wishes, he may make a Ferzínbend with it, or if he will, Pílbend[1]," thus plainly showing that in the situations to which these terms are applied, the Ferzín or the Píl, from which they are named, is one of the pieces attacked, and not attacking, as that advantage would be equally open to a Pawn or other piece.

Dr. Hyde relates that a native Arab, when playing with him, used a word resembling the sound *Ksh*, in giving Check, and *Ksh mát* for Checkmate, but has given no explanation of the word, further than that the Arab cited a corresponding expression for it in Turkish[2]. The word *Kisht* (کشت) is clearly described by Persian lexicographers to mean Check, and the use of it occurs in other places. The following explanation is found in the Bahárí Ajam.: "*Kisht*, a term used by chess-players. Mír Khusru, in his work, the '*Tersíl ul Aâjáz*[3], in discussion of the technical terms of Chess,' writes it *Kist* (کسط), signifying *Justice*, and a king cannot dispense with justice, and when the King at chess flies from *Kist*, it means 'he has no justice;' and it is for this reason they have changed the letter Cáf to Káf in *Kist*, that it may not indicate such a signification[4]."

---

[1] و اگر خواهد بدان فرزین‌بند کند و اگر خواهد پیل‌بند

[2] Page 132, 4to edition. "Cum aliquando luderem cum Arabe Hierosolymitano," &c. The writer of this note has heard the same word used by an Arab of Western Africa, who said it was Persian, and signified "Move (out of check)," and it might almost have been supposed to be a corruption from the word Kashídan (کشیدن), "to withdraw, or remove," which would correspond with the interpretation as گشت "Ito, migra," by Dr. Hyde's "Arabs Hierosolymitanus."

[3] ترسیل الاعجاز This treatise would be invaluable, in explaining much which we can never hope to understand in the game, without such direct authority, and the present opportunity is taken to invite attention to it, should it still be extant in manuscript collections.

[4] The uncertainty of text in native dictionaries causes much difficulty in quoting from them, and renders the definitions they contain comparatively unavailable. This objection particularly applies to those which, like the Madár ul Afázil and the valuable Bahárí Ajam, are of more rare occurrence; and also, in the present instance, to most of the original sources consulted, the copies of which, especially the chess treatises, are, as far as the Editor is informed, unique.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The same Lexicon, following the Burhánĭ Cátî, explains *Kisht kerdan* to mean "To check, or give check;" and the meaning of *Kisht* to be "Get up," *i.e.*, "move from the check[1]."

Hyde, p. 134, quoting from the Ferhengĭ Jehángíri, translates *Kisht kerdan*, "Regem occidere," confounding it, perhaps, with the Persian verb *Kushtan* (to kill), and, singularly enough, not connecting it with the *Ksh*, already discussed by him[2].

These few remarks in illustration of the terms of Chess, may very suitably conclude with an observation on Sháh Mát and Sháh Cám, which represent the two endings of the game. The latter offers some difficulty. Sháh Mát is always understood to be our Check-mate, and to signify, of course, that the King is checked, and can neither move nor cover the check. Sháh Cám would therefore be a Drawn game, or rather Stale Mate, rendering the parties equal, as according to the European laws. It seems, however, to be effected in a different manner from our Stale Mate, the condition of which is, that the King, not being checked on the square he occupies, should be unable to move out without putting himself in check, which would be against the rules of the game, and, as the penalty of his adversary's want of skill, makes the ending drawn. The Bahárĭ Ajam, which quotes also the Burhánĭ Cátî, explains Sháh Cám at some length thus:—

"*According to Majduddín Causi, Sháhcám is a compound word,* signifying 'the King has risen,' and it is used when the chess-player

---

[1] — وکشت کردن شاه شطرنجرا نیز گفته اند و کشت بکسر کاف باصطلاح شطرنج بازان آنست که مهرهء از مهرهاي شطرنجرا در خانهء گذارند که بحسب حرکت آن مهرهٔ شاه در خانهء او نشسته باشد و کشت خوانند یعني بر خیز از خانهء من *

[2] شاه کشت کردن شاه شطرنج بود "Regem occidere dicitur de Rege Shatrangico." The quotation, properly, should run thus,—

شاه سه معني دارد — سیوم کشت کردن شاه شطرنج بود

and its translation would be: "*Shah* has three significations,—the 3rd is, to check (*kisht kerdan*) the King at chess." Even Meninski, who frequently quotes Hyde for chess terms, explains *Kisht*, "Vocabulum in ludo latrunculorum, ubi Rex eorum petitur," and calls it a corruption of *Kish*; and, similarly, the phrase *Kisht kerdan*. Johnson's Persian Dictionary also gives *Kisht* and *Kish*, Check at Chess.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is overcome and his King so reduced as to be in danger of immediate Checkmate, and in order to avoid being Mated, he moves his King, and plays it to another square, and places some pieces to protect him; and then they say, Sháh Cám, that is, 'the King has arisen,' and this rising is the extreme degree of defeat. The author of the Burhán says that when a player finds himself distressed in the game, he gives his adversary repeated Check, and does not allow him an opportunity of playing any other move, and thus the game is drawn. This explanation is preferable to the former. The word Cám, though strange to the Persian language, has come into use among chess-players, like the verb Mát, which is also foreign; both being used in the past tense[1]."

Without entering into the etymological discussion of this word Mát, which is already so learnedly set forth in Dr. Hyde's Dissertation, it must be said that the general tendency of authorities in Persian

---

[1] شاهقام بقاف مجد الدين قوسي گويد لغظيست مركب از شاه و قام بمعني شاه بر خاست و اين در وقتي گفته ميشود كه در شطرنج بازي از يك جهت غلبه واقع شود و كار شاه مغلوب بآن رسيده باشد كه به يكبارگي مات شود بجهت دفع مات شدن شاه خودرا از آنجا بر خيزد و بخانهء ديگر برد و مهرهء چند فدا كند درين وقت گويند شاه قام يعني شاه بر خاست و اين بر خاستن نهايت مغلوبي است و صاحب برهان آورده كه چون كسي خودرا در شطرنج بازي زبون بيند حريفرا پي در پي كشت گويد و اورا فرصت ندهد تا بازي ديگر كند و قايم ماند (و بازي قايم شود) و اين توجه بهتر مينمايد و لغظ قام اگرچه غريبست در استعمال شطرنج بازان آمده باشد چنانچه لغظ مات كه آن نيز غريبست هر كدام بصيغهء ماضي *

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

works is to confirm the opinion that Mánd, or Mánad (ماند), and not Mát (مات), was originally used. It is hardly probable that the Persians would have borrowed a foreign word to express one of the most familiar points in the game, for which they must have had a corresponding symbol in their own language, or might have easily arranged a more simple and intelligible expression; nor is there any reason that one single Arabic word only should have been preserved to the exclusion of all others, even if the terms generally had been derived from that language. Sháh Cám is the only parallel to it, and the Burhán indeed, already quoted, calls them both of foreign extraction; but it is possible that, even before the time it was written, the corruption had already taken place, and the compound Shahmát, being of unknown origin, was explained by the lexicographers as Arabic. It is remarkable that throughout the whole of the old Persian treatise, the term Sháh Mát, or Mát kerdan, is never once used, but that the expression for the King in that situation is, on every occasion, Sháh Mánad (شاه ماند), and the same is also used in many other works. The perfect opposition in meaning between the two phrases "the King has arisen" (Sháh Cám), and "the King remains" (*i.e.*, prisoner, or surrounded, or beaten), may fairly presume the antithesis to be intended not only in practice, but in the meaning of the words themselves, even though from different languages, Mát or Mánad, and Cám.

Whatever may be its exact derivation, Sháh Mát, as now used, seems to correspond most accurately with our Check Mate; and Sháh Cám, to comprehend all the varieties of the modern system of Stale Mate, whether by Perpetual Check, or the other conditions of that game; while a Draw by the equality of forces on both sides is clearly represented by *Cáïm* (قایم), to which subject a chapter is specially devoted in most of the treatises, giving the equation according to the value of the pieces. This is shown also in the term Mansúbah Cáïmah, already noticed, and in that of Cáïm andáz, to signify a player of such strength as to make a lost game equal[1].

---

[1] در شطرنج قایم آنرا گویند که هر دو حریف برابر باشد * *Kashf ul Lughát.*

قایم انداز یعنی برابر دارندهٔ بازیهٔ شطرنج و نرد * *F. Rashídi.*

قایم انداز شطرنج باز و نرد باز کامل باشد و از حریف بازی خود قایم دارد *Baháŕ Ajam.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The preceding paragraph, then, would, in the separate definitions of the two authors, indicate two different kinds of Sháh Cám, of which one would be our Perpetual Check to avoid being mated, and the other, strictly, the Stale Mate of the Persian game, which still requires some illustration. The King's rising or moving to another square seems evidently connected with the privilege in the earlier system for him to retire to a place of refuge, which in the Great Chess was into one of the projecting squares, and latterly into certain squares assigned for such protection in the ordinary board, while the Draw obtained by the weaker party moving his King, instead of leaving him confined to his single square, as with us, constitutes a very essential difference both in the practice and the intention of the game.

In the description of Complete Chess given in the old Persian MS., the varieties of endings of games are somewhat differently arranged, and present still greater difficulty. The passage which relates to it was omitted in the analysis of the work where it occurred, as an inconvenient place for its discussion, but is thus literally translated.

"Description of Sháh Cám and its Varieties.

"In this Chess, Sháh Cám cannot be made while a piece is near the King. He (the inventor) says, it would be impossible that a common weak foot soldier (Pawn), or any other piece besides the Pawn, should come and kill a monarch in the very middle of his army; and after that, what advantage would there be to them? When the antagonist cries Check, and there remains no square for the King, once only, whichever piece he pleases, he places before his antagonist, and moves his King there, and this in the Book of Complete Chess they call Sháh Fát[1], and they say Fidá; and also Sháh At when the King can cover a Check; and they call it Sháh Tát, when the King cannot cover it; and Sháh Cám is when the King is separated from his men; nevertheless, if the King can attain that additional square of his

[1] شاه فات — شاه آت — فدا — شاه تات—*Fidá*, "ransom" or "hostage," naturally applies to the piece which, as it were, offers its life to save the King by interposing between him and the enemy, and the expression is frequent in Eastern chess books. The words At, Fát, and Tát, which have no meaning in Arabic or Persian, seem invented merely as parallel sounds to Mát.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

adversary, they draw the game, unless the Sháhĭ Masnúâ be on that place, and we have already described its properties, &c.[1]

In addition to such technical words and phrases as have been furnished to us in Hyde's Dissertation, and as an appendix to those which are explained in the foregoing pages, the following Persian terms have occurred, chiefly in relation to the Move, and to Checking and Checkmating. A diligent examination of the Positions explained in the various treatises would supply a much larger stock, and might form the elements for a Glossary of Oriental Chess; but more extensive materials are still required, both to complete what is wanting, and to elucidate in a satisfactory manner, what is already before us.

---

[1] صفت شاه قام و انواع آن

و درین شطرنج شاه قام نشود تا کالا باشد پهلوي شاه * گوید که محال باشد که پادشاهي * در میان لشکر خویش یك پیادهء ضعیف بیاید و اورا هلاك (کند) یا کالاء دیگر دون پیاده * پس ازین پادشاهي و لشکر اورا چه فایده دهد * چون حریف شاه خواهد و شاهرا خانه نباشد * یك پاره کالا آنك خواهد پیش حریف نهد و شاه خویش آنجا برد * اینرا در کتاب شطرنج کامل شاه نات خوانند و فدا گویند * و شاه آت نیز چون شاه بتوان پوشید آن شاه خواهرا * و شاه تات آنگاه گویند که نتوان پوشید و شاه قام شود که از کالاء خویش جدا ماند * و با این همه اگر تواند که بآن خانهء زیادتي حریف شود قایم گیرند مگر آنك شاه مصنوع بر جاي باشد و در بیان آن گفتم که چه چیزست

The text is an exact copy, the points only being occasionally supplied, and one word in brackets, together with the necessary orthographic marks.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To checkmate.	To check.	To take.	To move (a piece) (Active).
شاه مات گفتن	شاه طلبیدن	زدن	انگیختن
مات کردن	شاه طلب کردن	گرفتن	راندن
مات نمودن	شاه طلب نمودن	انداختن بر	نهادن
مات ساختن	شاه گفتن	بر داشتن	بردن
مات خواستن	شاه خواستن	ریختن	—
—	پادشه خواستن	فرو ریختن	To move (Neut.)
To be checkmated.	شاه زدن	افگندن	پیش آمدن
شاه مات شدن	کشت کردن	—	رفتن
مات شدن	کشت نمودن	To cover check.	نشستن
مات گردیدن	کشت خواستن	پوشیدن	خاستن
در ماندن	کشت گفتن	پرده ساختن	بر خاستن
		فدا گفتن	
		فدا کردن	

Besides their ordinary meanings in the list just given, *Afgandan* (افگندن) and *Nihádan* (نهادن) are equivalent to طرح دادن "to give as odds," and are so explained in the Ferhengí Rashídi and Bahárí Ajam[1].

Burdan (بردن) seems specially used as the verb to express winning at chess, as already seen in many of the quotations, particularly the poetic extracts; but it also means to take (a piece), and this signification is supported by some of the same examples.

---

[1] پیل افگندن یعني پیل طرح دادن که کنایت از عاجز کردن باشد * (F. R.)

پیاده نهادن یعني پیاده طرح دادن و آن کنایت از زبون داشتن حریف بود * (F. R.)

فرس افگندن و فرس نهادن کنایت از نا توان و مغلوب گردانیدن * (B. A.)

اسپ و فرزین نهادن کنایت از مات کردن * (B. A.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As Dr. Hyde's work is now scarce, and the terms of Chess may not be familiar to all Orientalists, it has been thought advisable to exhibit in the following table the Pieces of the Great Chess, and, inclusively, those of the common game, with the English names of the latter, and their move according to Eastern tactics.

Persian and Arabic Name.	Meaning.	European Piece.	Move.
شاه Sháh	King	King	Same as ours.
فرزين Ferzín	General	Queen	One square obliquely.
پيل Píl فيل Fíl (*Arabic*)	Elephant	Bishop	Two squares obliquely, jumping over.
اسپ Asp فرس Faras (*Arabic*)	Horse	Knight	As ours.
رخ Rukh	Rukh	Rook, or Castle	As our Castle.
پياده Piyádah بيدق Baidac (*Arab.*)	Foot soldier	Pawn	As ours, but only one square.
پيادهء اصل Piyádahí Asl بيدق البيدق Baidac ul baidac (*Arab.*)	Original Pawn	. .	Similar to our Pawns. V. p. 13.
وزير Wazír	Minister	. .	One square straight.
طليعه Talíâh	Advanced Guard	. .	Our Bishop's move.
دبابه Dabbábah	War Engine	. .	Two squares straight.
جمل Jamal	Camel	. .	Similar to Knight's ?
زرافه Zaráfah	Giraffe	. .	Similar to Knight's?

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A tabular view also of the Pieces of the Great Chess, arranged according to their powers, will assist the description given in pp. 10, 11, 12.

روش مستقیم Rawishĭ Mustakím. Straight Movement.

ابتدا	Ibtidá	Beginning, or Lowest power	Wazír.
وسط	Wast	Middle, or Medium power	Dabbábah.
نهایت	Niháyat	End, Extreme or highest power	Rukh.

روش معوّج Rawishĭ Muâwwaj. Oblique.

ابتدا	Ibtidá	Beginning	Ferzín.
وسط	Wast	Middle	Fíl.
نهایت	Niháyat	End	Taliáh.

روش مرکّب Rawishĭ Murakkab. Mixed.

ابتدا	Ibtidá	Beginning	Asp.
وسط	Wast	Middle	Jamal.
نهایت	Niháyat	End	Zaráfah.

---

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

With regard to the varieties of the Game itself, the different boards named in the authorities quoted may be classed in the following Synopsis, which will facilitate a reference to the Plates.

I.[1]			
كامل	Kámil	Complete or Great Chess.	Price Ms.
تامّة	Támmah		Nuzhat. Anmúzaj.
كبير	Kebír		Arabshah. Nefáïs, No. 5.
II.[2]			
مختصر	Mukhtasar	Abridged or Little.	Price MS.
صغير	Saghír		Arabshah.
هنديّة	Hindíyah	Indjan or Square.	Nuzhat.
مربّعة	Murabbâh		Nuzhat.
III.[3]			
صعيديّة	Sáídíyah	Sáïdian?	Anmúzaj.
IV.[4]			
مداورة	Mudáwarah	Round or Grecian.	Arabshah. Nefáïs, No. 3.
روميّة	Rúmíyah		Nuzhat. Anmúzaj.
V.[5]			
طويلة	Tawílah	Oblong.	Arabshah. Nefáïs, No. 2.
ممدودة	Memdúdah		Anmúzaj.
VI.[6]			
ذوات الحصون	Zawát ul Husún	Castellated Chess.	Nefáïs, No. 1.

There is also the second circular board, which might be called the "Celestial" Chess, described and figured in the Nefáïs, but in a very unsatisfactory manner; and Firdusi's large board, Pl. III. fig. 2.

[1] Pl. I.
[2] The form is well known, and appears in Pl. III. fig. 1.
[3] Described as similar to the common Square Chess, but no drawing is given.
[4] Pl. IV. fig. 3, from the Nefáïs.
[5] Figures 1 and 2, Pl. IV., from two different MSS. of the Nefáïs.
[6] The figure given in the Nefáïs is incomplete, and, evidently, inaccurate.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The subject of Eastern Chess may be thought very imperfectly discussed without allusion to the chapters in the Sháh Námah in which is to be found perhaps the earliest Oriental notice of the game; but as the principal passage has been given by Hyde, though from a faulty text, and consequently unsatisfactory in translation, and as the present object is rather to supply what is wanting than to accumulate a mass of detail, it will be sufficient to refer inquiry to the quotation already alluded to, reminding the reader that the description of that game was given by the Ambassador of the King of Canúj in reference to its traditionary origin, after he had introduced the chess-board at the court of the Persian monarch[1].

The question of the original invention of Chess, in whatever form it made its appearance, and of the name of its inventor, could not be conveniently discussed within the limits of these sheets. Little is available from our present sources beyond the repetition of the legend attributing the first invention to Sassa, or Sissa, a name which occurs in the various Eastern authorities as Sahsahah, Susah, or Sísah, according to the multiplied errors of copyists in reproducing it, or the caprice of lexicographers in fixing an arbitrary pronunciation. They are all obviously corruptions of the word Xerxes, or of a name which has served as its origin; the invention of Chess having, in many of the European legends, been ascribed to a philosopher so called in the reign of Evil Merodach, at Babylon[2]. The whole name of Sahsahah ben Dáhir[3], or, as in some versions, ben Nasír, is too evident a falsity to establish it as an authority for a historical fact. The patronymic is so clearly Arabian, as to remove all pretence to Indian origin. If a corruption, the evidence, thus once injured, is destroyed.

In returning to the subject of the history of Chess, it may be permitted to observe that, however startling the assertion in Major Price's MS., the evidence may, supported by other arguments, still make some stand against the more prevalent opinion. The Indian

---

[1] Hyde; Cap. De Scaccario, p. 75: or in Macan's edition of the Shah Namah, Vol. IV. p. ۱۷۴۴, the whole part relating to Chess extending from p. ۱۷۱۹ to p. ۱۷۴۵

[2] By Polydore Virgil, and others. In the illustrated edition of the Nuremberg Chronicle is found a portrait of Xerxes Philosophus, with the chess-board arranged before him.

[3] An author quoted by Dr. Hyde writes صهصهه بن داهر الهندي.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

origin of Chess seems to have been first asserted by Sir William Jones, who says, "If evidence be required to prove that chess was invented by the Hindus, we may be satisfied with the testimony of the Persians; who, though as much inclined as other nations to appropriate the ingenious inventions of other people, unanimously agree that the game was imported from the West of India," &c.[1] Now we have just heard a perfectly opposite assertion from *one* Persian writer, and there may be many others of a similar opinion. By destroying the unanimity of the consent, we invalidate the proof. The "Exceptio probat regulam" does not apply here; Sir William rests his thesis, mainly, on the *universal* credence given to it by the Persians themselves, but for this even there is not a sufficient mass of evidence to establish an implicit agreement of all authorities.

The resemblance between his Chaturanga and our chess-play hardly infers identity. They differ materially both in form and principles, and the Seang Ke, or Chinese Chess, might almost equally well claim to be the parent of the European. The name itself, Chaturanga, though plausible as a derivation, is not applicable in meaning, and as a mere sound has no greater similarity than any of the numerous Arabic and Persian words or compounds already proposed. Indeed, I am almost surprised that over zealous etymologists have not pressed into their service Seang for Satrang, and Ke for Chess[2].

Objections have been made to the Rukh and Elephant; the first as being of uncertain origin, and the other as foreign to Persia. Accordingly, Sir Wm. Jones will have Rukh to be from Rat'h, a Chariot, first forcing it through the Bengali Rot'h, to obtain a broader vowel. This vague etymology is but weakly supported. Armed chariots are as ill placed in Persian warfare as the fabled bird the Rukh, even supposing there were no better interpretation for that word. As to Elephants, they may as well be used in Persian Chess as if it were of Indian origin. They appear in the Sháh Námah in the armies of Iran and Turan, and figure in the description of Chess in that poem, while to the Arabs they are familiar from the chapter of the Coran which bears their name, and which recalls their use in war in one of the earliest battles of Islamism.

We need not, however, rest the Rukh's claim to a Persian origin, solely on its assumed signification as a large bird. Abundant

---

[1] On the Indian Game of Chess. Asiatic Researches.

[2] The Board of Chaturanga is exhibited in pl. II. fig. 2, from the description furnished by Sir W. Jones' Essay. The form of the Chinese Chess is given in a plate in Hyde's work.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

materials are supplied by Eastern authors to refer it to other originals, and the difficulty lies chiefly in selecting from the numerous descriptions one which will best correspond with the functions and form of the piece in question, and with the attributes of the animal of which it is the pretended type.

On the origin of the Rukh, the Persian MS. of Major Yule quotes the following account, in the chapter relating to the names of the pieces, and already noticed (p. 20):—"The Rukh is a certain animal found in that part of Hind in which Aloes wood grows. It is an exceeding large beast, of great fierceness, and all creatures are afraid of it. When a man sees it, he runs away, and it follows him, and if there is no shelter for him, it kills him on the spot; but in the case of its being in a forest, and there is refuge in a tree, if it is a high tree, and the animal cannot reach him, it again attacks him and jumps at him, and continues to jump till it has no more strength left for the attack. This animal has two faces, and two heads, and four ears, and on each head two ears, and two eyes, and one mouth; and two bellies, and on each belly four hands and feet[1]," &c. Several of the native dictionaries also describe the Rukh as a large and powerful beast, in addition to the usual interpretation of a bird, and the cheek, &c.; among others, the Madár ul Afázil, in which it is said—"*Rukh;* the Chess Rook; originally written *Rukhkh,* but by the Persians with one *kh;* it is the name of a large animal which preys on the Elephant

---

[1] رخ جانوريست در بلاد هند آنجا كه عود قماري باشد بغايت بزرگ و صاحب شوكت و همه حيوانات از وي خايف باشند و چون آدمي اورا به بيند بگريزد و او عقب روان شود اگر پناهي نباشد در حال هلاكش كند و اگر چنانچه بيشه باشد و آنجا بدرخت اگر درخت بلند باشد بوي نرسد باز حمله كند و بر جهد همچنين بر مي جهد تا بوقتي كه اورا قوت بر جستن و حمله كردن نماند — و او جانوريست كه اورا دو روي و دو سر و چهار گوش باشد و بر هر سري دو گوش و دو چشم و يك دهان و دو شكم و بر هر شكم چهار دست و پاي &c.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Rhinoceros[1]. It is also used in the signification of cheek or face; it is also a certain bird," &c.[2]

Strange, then, as we may consider the accounts of Oriental geographers or naturalists in description of the animal by which Rukh is to be translated, there is sufficient proof in the extract just selected from numerous similar passages, in addition to those already cited by Hyde, that some quadruped of large growth and powers and of savage nature was indicated by this word, which at first seemed to own no other representation than that of the fabulous and gigantic bird, more familiarly known to us from Eastern fairy tale, and which might, perhaps, reasonably be denied a place in the array of the chess-board. What recognised subject in our Natural History may best correspond with the animal so fancifully depicted in Oriental writings, is still a question. Dr. Hyde's opinion, founded on some of the native descriptions he cites, is in favour of the Dromedary; but he is evidently biassed also in his decision by the probability of the Dromedary being selected as an appropriate image in a game invented to represent Eastern warfare. A further support to his argument is the figure the Rukh assumed in the earlier sets of chess-men, where we find it forked, in a form still preserved by the Chess-Rook borne in many coats of arms as an heraldic device. The forked appearance he supposes to represent the two humps, which are also part of the characteristics of the Rukh. This plea of identity, though otherwise plausible, is no longer admissible in the case of the Great Chess, where we have the Rukh appearing on the same board with the Jamal or Camel, whose name allows no other interpretation. The figure of the earlier Rook, at a time when the carved chess-men no longer directly imaged their original attributes, was not peculiar to it alone. In our European game, the Alfin, the representative of the Fíl, or Eastern Elephant, had a head similarly shaped, and from its resemblance to a mitre seems to have been derived its present English name of Bishop. In the account of the pieces of the Great Chess also (p. 12), several are described as having "two faces,"

---

[1] The word in the MS. might be either Gurg (Wolf) or Kerg, the same as Kergadan (Rhinoceros), which would agree with the account in Hyde.

[2] رخ بضم رخ شطرنج و آن به اصل بتشديد است فارسيان بتخفيف استعمال كنند و نام جانوري بزرگ كه پيل و كرك طعمهء اوست — و بمعنىء رخسار — و مرغي است &c.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

evidently alluding to the same appearance, so that the "Bifrons Ruchus" can no longer alone claim that distinction.

On the whole, if, as there may be some reason to doubt, the Rukh in Chess was intended to represent an animal having a real or supposed existence, I should be inclined, in preference to all others of which we have a knowledge, to identify it with the Hippopotamus. A remarkable coincidence exists between that animal and the native accounts of the Rukh, especially in an extract from the geographer Abul Hasan, quoted by Hyde, p. 111. Even the double-headed form, repeated in most passages on the same subject, and at best to be considered only an exaggeration of the marvellous, produced by fear, or added by ignorance, may far better be supposed to be represented in the forked symbol both of Eastern Rukh and European Rook, than the double hump[1] of the Dromedary would be, as advocated by some of the authorities. To anticipate an objection similar to that already made to the Rukh, namely, that such an animal as the Hippopotamus, strange to Eastern warfare, would be absurdly introduced in mimic battle, it may be replied that we have already a certainty of the Zarâfah or Giraffe's existence in the same game, a figure equally misplaced in such a scene, but of which the etymology does not permit us to question the identity.

I should not have extended the inquiry into the origin of the Rook to so great a length, had not the objection been so much insisted on by those who follow Sir W. Jones's theory, that it seemed to require a more particular notice than would have been necessary as a purely philological question.

It is commonly stated in European essays that Chess is played in the East with little or no variation from our rules. This, as far as regards the practise of Muhammedan natives of India in their intercourse with our colonists, seems to be a fact, and even among those Oriental branches having less intercourse with foreigners, the alteration, though sufficient to affect the system of its tactics, presents merely a variety in the same game. There is, however, a modern work on Chess, printed at Bombay, in which the game is taught with very remarkable differences in its practice. It is a translation of a contemporaneous Sanscrit treatise, called "Vilas Muni Munjuri," or the "Diamond Flower-bud of amusement," and the name of its author, a Brahman, was Trevangadacharya. Any chess-player inspecting its

[1] Dr. Hyde writes of it as having two humps. The *Râhilah*, or Dromedary, is, however, only a swifter breed of the single-bunched Arab Camel; v. Russell's Aleppo, vol. ii., and even Hyde's plate of Indian chess-men figures the Rukh as a Camel with *one* hump.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rules will immediately perceive them to differ so essentially from those we follow, as to require a separate study and a new system of play[1]. It also shows some coincidences with the Great Game of our unknown Persian author, almost tempting us to consider them as traces of an earlier mode of practice, and the game itself to have formed a sort of Zend, between the Sanscrit and the modern Persian Chess, in which its Bombay votaries have preserved its symbols in preference to those of the Pagan Chaturanga and the Muhammedan Shatranj.

---

[1] In the title page it is called "Essays on Chess, adapted to the European mode of play, &c., by Trevangadacharya Shastree. Bombay, 1814."

The rules may be abridged thus, observing a different order, as more convenient:—

I. The King on one side is opposite to the other player's Queen.

X. He who has won most games, moves first.

IX. The first four or eight moves may, by agreement, be placed for beginning the game.

VIII. The Kings' and Queens' Pawns may move two squares at their first move, if the pieces to which they belong are in place; other Pawns only one square.

VI. No Pawn can go to the last line, nor take any piece on that line, so long as the master piece of his own file remains.

V. In *queening*, the Pawns obtain the powers of the pieces to which they belonged, except the King's Pawn, which becomes a Queen. The Knight's Pawn also is entitled to one move as a Knight, in addition to that by which he queens.

VII. The King may not castle, but once in the game is allowed the Knight's move, if not previously checked. He may not, however, take with this move.

II. There are three modes of winning—*Boorj*, when no piece is left. This is the least creditable, and by some called Drawn; 2nd. Checkmate, the adversary having one or more pieces remaining; 3rd. Checkmate with a Pawn, called Piedmát, the adversary having some pieces left. This is the best mode.

III. There is no Stale Mate; the adversary must make room by moving. In some parts of India, one of the adversary's pieces, at choice, may be removed for that purpose.

IV. No game can be drawn by Universal Check; the party checking must make another move.

In the fly-leaf of the copy referred to is found the following note, which, after omitting the names quoted and also the signature, may be inserted here:—

"The author, familiarly known in the Bombay Presidency by the name of *the Brahmin*, was said never to have lost a game at Chess, except one, in which he allowed himself to be beaten by a lady. Even here, however, the Brahmin had not miscalculated—the lost game secured him a Bullock Contract.

"I was assured by my friend * * * that, on the famous Position, called Phillidor's Legacy, being submitted to him, after five minutes' consideration, he divined the move."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sufficient importance is hardly attached to the circumstance that the board described in the Sháh Námah contains one hundred squares and forty pieces, thus demonstrating the existence of a game of larger dimensions and greater powers four hundred years before the age of Timur, and it is a fair question for examination, whether that form may not be an indication of a still larger and more ancient kind of Chess agreeing with the Shatranjĭ Kámil. The two additional pieces in it are also identical with two of those in the Complete Chess, viz., the Camels on each side, and their power agrees exactly with that ascribed to the same pieces in the early part of this essay. Firdusi's description, whether authentic or imaginative, abundantly proves that the large board ascribed to Timur was not of his invention, although he might, possibly, from his enthusiastic love of chess. have been led to revive and adopt an obsolete variety of it. There remains then only the question of prior antiquity between the long and the short game, and of the circumstances under which they were respectively modified, and, in some degree dependent on that question, the locality of the invention of the original game, in whatever form that may have been.

The whole of the evidence drawn from the history of Chess shows a tendency to abridgement in the game, in its gradual decline from the extreme size and powers of the Great Chess to that which is now played, and the intermediate modifications in Firdusi's description and in the Bombay Chess form epochs which indicate the progress of the change. It is shown in the altered size and form of the board, the varying moves of the men, and the peculiar play of the King when in distress. The large board, with its two additional squares, seems first to have lost those two projections, and to have been reduced to a plain figure, and even to have suffered a further abridgement of one row of squares, as we find the number described indifferently as 100 and 110 in different manuscripts, even in reference to the Great Chess. The board being thus limited in the number of its squares, a corresponding decrease may be inferred in that of the men, some of the original, now called additional pieces, having been retained on boards even of lesser dimensions. To compensate for the loss of many of these pieces, their powers appear to have been transferred to those still retained in the modern game, as in the instance of the Bishop, which has received the more extended move of the Talîâh of Great Chess. In some cases, additional power has been granted, as that shown in the superiority of the Queen over the piece it represents, the Ferzín.

The altered system of protection for the King is still more strik-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ingly illustrative of the change from large to small, from complication to simplicity. The projecting squares of the Great Chess, or ancient game, having been abolished, either from their inconvenience in the practice of the game, or for greater uniformity in the shape of the board, a compensation seems to have been made to the King, first, by the allotment of the squares distinguished as his place of refuge in the more modern Eastern board described in Hyde, p. 74, and, later, by the anomalous process of Castling, an expedient evidently of such modern invention as not to be allowed even in the present game, as played among the natives of the East. This latter change is particularly remarkable, as admitting no possible question of inversion, and as, apparently, having accompanied, and kept pace with, a corresponding diminution in size, form, and power, in the Board and Pieces, and in the whole system of chess-play.

Before, then, we bow to this opinion of the Hindu origin of Chess, or allow the four-headed divinity of the Brahmans to appropriate the wisdom of all the quarters of the globe, and their many-handed monsters to clutch every invention of the East as their own, a few queries suggest themselves, which claim an answer from those who consider their position too strong to be disputed. These objections may be classed under three general heads, and, to follow the arrangement of the work which gave rise to this discussion, they may be divided into an historical, a philological, and a practical difficulty in connection with the game itself.

If Chess, in any near resemblance to that which we now play, was known in early ages to the Hindus, where are their historical or romantic records of its invention or its use? Does any ancient Sanscrit treatise exist on its principles or practice? And, as the Persians are supposed to acknowledge its introduction into their country from India, do the annals of the Hindus themselves equally relate their share in the transaction?

If Chess is of Indian birth, and even allowing Chaturanga to be its parent, how did it retain the name of the game only, and yet change all the names of the pieces? Why should the Rat'h or Rot'h alone remain untranslated? The Persian terms endure in all the languages of Europe, although their powers have been modified and their original attributes forgotten.

If Chaturanga was the origin of all Eastern Chess, where and at what period did it undergo that sudden and almost total transformation necessary to obtain a resemblance to the Persian form under which it makes its next appearance? Was, then, the Chaturanga its purer state of being, and Shatranj only its Avatar among its more distant worshippers?

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Though of trifling importance to real science or profound literature, there is an interest in Chess and in its history, which repays a more critical investigation than it has yet received. Learned antiquaries have illustrated its existence of the last ten centuries, but there are still links wanting to connect it with its earliest origin, and to complete our knowledge of this ancient and universal game, which presents so remarkable on instance of etymologies surviving the Babel of ages, and historically, as well as in philology, constitutes one of the most intimate points of union between Europe and the East.

Considered merely as a chapter in the social history of mankind, Chess is equally worthy of admiration; a game which, having established its mimic images in defiance of the persecutors of idolatry, has triumphed alike over the denunciations of Coranic moral and the zealous rage of the Byzantine Iconoclast, and for whose support law and theology have been strained alike by Muslim Mulla and by Western Priest; from which kings have given names to their sons and to the cities they have founded, nor hesitated to ascribe their glories to its practice, when they made it a principle in the education of their children; and which, as an image of war, or an exercise of wisdom, has been the royal sport of lawgiver and conqueror, from the Haruns and Cosroes of the East to the Charlemagnes and Canutes of our own climes; from the shepherd warrior of Tartary to the fugitive hero of Poltava, or his more modern rival in boundless empire and lawless ambition, the Tamerlane of France, Napoleon.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00165001 Published online by Cambridge University Press