

chemin de Bellevue,  
CH-1261 Trélex,  
Switzerland.

Telefax: (022) 369 39 58

14.IX.1994

Dear Mr Franklin,

As promised in my telefax of 5 September, I send a (quickly prepared, non-exhaustive) list of typographical errors, etc. that I have noted in William Steinitz, Chess Champion:

- P. ix.: **Frére**; but **Frère** in the index and elsewhere.
- P. xvii, final paragraph: since the Steinitz quote is that he could spare the fame but needed the money, can **paraphrase** be the right word?
- P. 3 (middle of page): **Deutches**, not **Deutsche**, **Wochenschach**.
- P. 3, 6 lines from bottom: **Benedict** here, but **Benedikt** on the previous page.
- P. 4, line 3: to speak of a birth being **conceivable** is presumably unintentional humour.
- P. 17: indented quote. An example of a quotation that comes without any identification of source.
- P. 17, 5-6 lines from bottom: something is wrong with the punctuation. A missing full stop after **same**?
- P. 26, 5-6 lines from bottom: **St. Leonards by the Sea**. Possibly, but I know only **St. Leonards-on-Sea**.
- P. 28, line 8: for **Blackburn** read **Blackburne**.
- P. 30, line before final quote: add comma after **Evans**.
- P. 31, four lines after quote: for **Greene** read **Green**.
- P. 31, penultimate line: the bibliographical reference 125 applies to my book on Capablanca. I do not know why it is mentioned as a source here.
- P. 35, paragraph beginning "Steinitz had won...". In lines 2 and 3 **shilling** should read **shillings** each time.
- P. 36, line 15: **always willing and never hesitant in defending** is incorrect grammar.
- P. 40, 2 lines after quote: for **Picadilly** read **Piccadilly**.
- P. 50, paragraph beginning "Reuben Fine...". It is not correct that many chess magazines started at that time are still in existence today.
- P. 59, line 14: for **1872 and 1896** read **1872 and 1886**.
- P. 87, middle of page: for **MacDonnel** read **MacDonnell**.
- P. 87, four lines from bottom: **also not a friend of Steinitz in the Chess Player's Chronicle** does not make sense.
- P. 88, middle of page. Can a sentence be started with **Further that**, with no main verb?
- P. 88, 3 lines from bottom: is the reference 38 supposed to be **38a** or **38b**?
- P. 94, start of page. A paragraph begins **Coles describes**, after which comes a quotation attributed to another writer.
- P. 95, middle of page: a clear-cut example of inadequate information about sources. The British Chess Magazine is quoted regarding the Glasgow Chess Club, but how is the reader to know when the item appeared? The BCM has been published since 1881.
- P. 97, 9 lines from the bottom: for **gentlemen** read **gentleman**.
- P. 100, line 5: add comma after **Strode**. Incidentally, he is not in the index, and I have been unable to work out why proper names are so incomplete in the index. There seems to have been a deliberate policy (wrong, in my view) of omitting most modern names, but Strode was a 19th century figure.
- P. 103, end of first quote. I imagine the reference is supposed to be

20 instead of 19.

P. 112, middle of page: **darkly hinted of?**

P. 116, the quote is introduced by the reference 58, for an unclear reason. In the quote, line 9, for **particularly** read **particularly**. Six lines from the end of the quote, the word-split **read-mission** is misleading.

P. 119, 11 lines from bottom and p. 120, line 9: it is interesting to note that the grammatically dubious **due to** is used twice, whereas the quote on p. 120 is correct with **owing to**. (However, I realize that the distinction between the two terms is now, alas, being lost.)

P. 122: the final sentence is unintelligible to me.

P. 132, 17 lines from bottom: I do not believe that the reference 128 is correct.

P. 137, 3 lines from bottom: for **pound** read **pounds**.

P. 140, 8 lines from bottom: question mark instead of full stop after **game**.

P. 142, 6 lines from bottom: for **feature** read **features**.

P. 145, line 1: for **tought** read **taught**.

P. 147, 12 lines from bottom: omit comma after **Steinitz**.

P. 147, 2 lines from bottom: for **verbage** read **verbiage**.

P. 150, line 5: for **were** read **was**.

P. 163, last line of paragraph 2: for **tournament** read **match**.

P. 166, line 1 of paragraph 2: for **The next match** read **The next game**.

P. 166, final line: why closing inverted commas?

P. 167, paragraph 5, line 3: for **matches** read **games**.

P. 169, 15 lines from bottom: I believe that Steinitz wrote that Zukertort had proven himself **superior**, not **inferior**, and that Steinitz's handwriting in plate 18 has been misread. This needs further examination, but in support of my thesis I can quote what Steinitz wrote on p. 212 of the July 1887 International Chess Magazine.

The captions to plates 33 and 34 have been inverted.

Caption to plate 35: for **Charovsek** read **Charousek**. Also, the spelling **Janowski** is used here, whereas **Janowsky** appears in caption 41.

P. 185, line 3: for **represent** read **represents**.

P. 185, 8 lines from bottom: for **opponents** read **opponents'**

P. 190, paragraph 3, line 11: for **as printed** read **was printed**

P. 195, line 3 of second quote: for **occured** read **occurred**.

P. 198, line 1 of second paragraph: **Chess came always first sounds** very unnatural English.

P. 200, paragraph beginning "Flora's death...". **took care of Flora since December 11** cannot be proper grammar.

P. 200, last paragraph, line 1: for **March 1988** read **March 1888**.

P. 201, penultimate line: for **is** read **was**.

P. 205, paragraph 4, line 1: Zukertort died in 1888, not 1988.

P. 216, paragraph 1, line 8: for **Pollack** read **Pollock**, presumably.

P. 218, line 3: for **Lowenthal** read **Löwenthal**.

P. 228, final quotation: are some words missing (I am bound at any **rate ... that there is a solution**)?

P. 231, line 4 of final paragraph: there seems to be a problem with the single and double quotation marks (e.g. double ones after a book).

P. 239, paragraph beginning "The July 1890 ICM...": **hoping that Steinitz** is intended to have Mason as its subject, but the faulty sentence construction obscures this.

P. 240, paragraph 3 line 7: for **toward's** read **towards**.

P. 241, line 14: **The reporter challenged Steinitz, that these were...** does not make sense.

P. 249, 9 lines from bottom: I imagine that **consent** is supposed to be

consensus.

- P. 253, three paragraphs from end: **cheese/chess**, as discussed.
- P. 260, line 6: for **Thirteen St.** read **thirteenth**.
- P. 268, line 3: **Built around 1888, the evidence seems strongly...**
- Faulty grammar (floating present participle).
  - P. 272, line 14: for **a unmarked** read **an unmarked**.
  - P. 273, penultimate line: for **nor the bedclothes** read **or the bedclothes**.
  - P. 277, line 8: for **incidence** read **incident** or **incidents**.
  - P. 283, para 3, line 2: for **return game** read **return match**.
  - P. 284, lines 2-3. As it stands, the sentence seems to say that meeting his second wife was bad for Steinitz.
  - P. 282: the final line ("**and the worst...**") does not seem to make sense.
  - P. 285: the final line is peculiar (a list of three venues where Lasker won matches), and I don't understand the reference 127 (i.e. to my World Chess Champions).
  - P. 287, penultimate paragraph, penultimate line: omit **future** before **world champion**.
  - P. 288, line three: for **it well have been** read, presumably, **it may well have been**.
  - P. 293, last line before final quote: **introductionary??**
  - P. 295, penultimate paragraph, first and second lines: for **En gland** read **England**.
  - P. 302, penultimate paragraph, last line: **to accommodate chess master** must have something missing.
  - P. 304, third paragraph, two and three lines from end: I don't agree that Hooper's article was **taken from Steinitz's own writings**.
  - P. 304, final paragraph, second line: for **Korchnoi was** read **Korchnoi is**. In any case, "19 years and 10 months" is wrong, as shown by Gaige's Chess Personalia.
  - P. 308, first line: **Nürnberg** here but **Nuremberg** on p. 405.
  - P. 311, third paragraph, first line: **brilliance prize: brilliancy prize** is the normal term.
  - P. 319, first paragraph after quotation, last line: for **has read had** and for **is** read **was**.
  - P. 322, final line before second quotation: for Schachblatter read Schachblätter.
  - P. 341: the quotation is attributed to 102, which is a book by Reinfeld that does not contain the letter in question.
  - P. 341:, third line after quotation: **He was living with his first wife for some 27 years** is incorrect grammar.
  - P. 346: the final sentence (**from the world**) does not make sense.
  - P. 367: five lines from bottom of page: for **player's** read **players'**.
  - P. 373, third paragraph: something has gone wrong in the chronology. The year 1898 is being discussed (when the Vienna tournament was played), but MacDonnell did not die until 1899.
  - P. 380, second line from bottom of page: there would appear to be something missing (**that back of the house...**).
  - P. 389, three lines from end of second quote: **The doctors says...**
  - P. 401, lines 6-7: **As long ago as 1932, Richard Réti said...** Réti died in 1929. On p. 402, a Réti book is dated as 1943.
  - P. 401, paragraph 4, line 1: for Schachspeils read Schachspiels.
  - P. 401, paragraph 5, line 4: Richard Eales' book was published in 1985, not 1900.
  - P. 403, penultimate paragraph: Horton's book was published in 1959, not 1965.

- P. 406: under (m) and (n), add a comma before **who withdrew**.
- P. 407: the last two paragraphs strike me as a silly inclusion in a serious book.
- P. 428, line 5: for **Defensed** read **Defense**.
- P. 471 (item 10): for **Rattman** read **Rattmann**.
- P. 472 (item 41): for **Players** read **Player's**.
- P. 473 (item 54): for **Geheimniss** read **Die Geheimnisse**.
- P. 473 (item 61): for **Oxford** read **The Oxford**
- P. 473 (item 75): **Lasker's Chess Magazine** should be listed under Emanuel, not Edward, Lasker.
- P. 474 (item 84): The Marshall book was published in 1942, but not by Dover. Dover merely published a subsequent reprint.
- P. 474 (item 90): for **Moran** read **Morán**. For 1974/6 read 1986.
- P. 475 (item 126): for 1983-89 read 1982-89 - unless the author has a particular reason for ignoring one year of **C.N.**'s run. This is possible since under item 20 his starting date for the **BCM** is 1892 and not, as one would expect, 1881.

If any of my points are unclear, don't hesitate to let me know. The above list (which I hope helps to explain the sour final sentence of my telefax of 5 September) was just being completed as I received your letter of 6 September. Many thanks for your observations about the possible book. I shall reply as soon as possible.

All best regards.

Yours sincerely,



Edward Winter