

THE DALLUHN MANUSCRIPT:

A PRE-PUBLICATION EDITION OF *DUNGEONS & DRAGONS*

Jon Peterson (jon@unreason.com) [Draft—Updated 12/28/2015]

1. SUMMARY

The Dalluhn Manuscript is a document with no clear title or attribution which contains gaming rules with a clear relationship to the original edition of *Dungeons & Dragons* (OD&D). It was found in a long-forgotten box in the collection of an early Twin Cities gamer nearly fifteen years ago, but prior attempts to ascertain the identity of its author(s) or the nature of its relationship to OD&D have proven inconclusive. This analysis reexamines the Dalluhn Manuscript through comparison to other recently rediscovered early documents, through detailed textual criticism and through forensic examinations. One crucial piece of evidence is the Mornard Fragments, a set of 24 pages of draft *Dungeons & Dragons* text known to have been generated and distributed by Gary Gygax in 1973. This analysis establishes that the text of the Dalluhn Manuscript preserves a transitional system produced during the ongoing development of OD&D. This system was probably circulated in the spring of 1973 for playtesting, and may reflect a format that authors intended for publication at the time. It contains a combination of elements contributed by Dave Arneson and Gary Gygax, including many discarded concepts that can be proven to have been in use at the time *Dungeons & Dragons* was written. The Dalluhn Manuscript preserves the earliest known near-complete version of the game of *Dungeons & Dragons*.

2. STRUCTURE OF THE MANUSCRIPT

The Dalluhn Manuscript, so called for its discoverer Keith Dalluhn, comprises two booklets designated here by Roman numerals I and II. There is no table of contents, nor any internal indication of the order in which the booklets should be read—this analysis therefore follows the order in which they were found.

The first booklet is largely complete at 32 pages with 1 known missing, the second is incomplete at 25 pages with at least 5 known missing. Page I.22 is absent from the manuscript, and some text describing spells on that page seems to be lost. Pages II.15 and II.22 are missing, but the surrounding pages mark section breaks: these slots presumably were slated to contain section divider pages. Although they do not fall on section breaks, pages II.17 and II.20 are similarly skipped without loss of text (e.g. pagination moves from 16 to 18, but the text is clearly continuous); it is clear from the text that II.17 was intended to contain a sample map, and it seems plausible that II.20 was to contain the missing “diagram of castle design” referenced in Table 23. The second booklet ends abruptly in mid-sentence on II.29 describing the end game of the Fighting-man class, and from the context that subsection would surely be followed by a similar one for Clerics. It is difficult to estimate what the full length of the second booklet might have been, but if it extended to the length of the first, a handful of pages at the end would have been lost.

As found, the manuscript consists of 8 ½” by 11” photocopied pages bound only by paper clips. The pages were copied from loose sheets rather than from a stapled original, judging from the page corners. From the placement of paper clip rust stains, it appears that the first page, which bears the legend “... Beyond This Point Be Dragons ...”, and the second page, the beginning of the tables section, were kept under independent paper clips. This may mean that the first page was not actually intended to be the cover of the

entire manuscript; it may be that "... Beyond This Point Be Dragons ..." was intended to be the title of only the first book, or perhaps just an incidental piece of art. There are no internal indications of the intended title of the work, and the phrase "... Beyond This Point Be Dragons ..." appears nowhere else in the manuscript apart from that first page; the ellipses in the phrase may hint that this phrase was not intended to be a title. The extant document has no front matter or attribution to any author. The authorship, and even title, of the Dalluhn Manuscript has therefore been the subject of some controversy.

The manuscript contains a number of illustrations: the apparent title page, four section divider pages with headings, two dungeon maps, a jousting shield illustration, and then six "filler" pictures at the end of sections, four of which are labeled depictions of monsters (the hydra, gargoyle, ogre, and ghoul). The quality of these illustrations, especially the section divider pages, reflects the work of a fairly practiced illustrator, using cross-hatching and stippling liberally. No illustrations are signed or dated. Significantly, the illustrations show at least two distinct hands: one that apparently drew the title and section divider pages as well as the filler illustrations and presumably their captions, and a second that apparently drew and lettered the two dungeon maps. While the jousting shield provides perhaps too small a sample size to evaluate, the hand that drew and lettered it looks similar to that of the dungeon maps. Given that the filler pictures all appear in places where there would otherwise be whitespace, those pictures were certainly added after the document was typed. The dimensions of the filler pictures also sometimes fit poorly into their spaces, suggesting that they might have been drawn independently and then inserted into the manuscript as an afterthought; in no cases are the filler pictures thematically relevant to the pages where they appear (i.e., the "ghoul" image does not appear on the page where ghouls are described). The jousting shield, by contrast, is embedded inside the right margin of the page in the jousting section, and clearly was integrated during the typing phase: either it was prepared beforehand, or perhaps penned by the typist.

A single typewriter produced all of the body text of the manuscript, with only infrequent errors or corrections (note a rare hand-drawn "r" in "Theurgist" in Table 2) and an orderly layout, all of which suggest that a practiced typist produced this text from a polished earlier draft. Note however that a different typewriter was used for the page numbering than for the body text. The "... Beyond This Point Be Dragons ..." title is rendered in a variant of the Victor Moscoso typeface; the section dividers headings use Old English instead, the same typeface used for the title of *Chainmail*. The Old English typeface was readily available at print shops or via Letraset transfers.

The use of two typewriters suggests a process where the body text was first typed up, and then later page numbers were added. The typist who created the page numbers intentionally put gaps in the pagination for the section divider pages and perhaps for other pages of illustrations as well. Across both booklets, all extent section divider pages are unnumbered: this comprises I.18, II.1, II.9 and II.29. It would seem that at least two section divider pages were planned that are not present in the manuscript today, per the gaps in II.15 and II.22; I.1 is another possible location for a section divider. The fact that extent section divider pages are unnumbered suggests that they were added later, but more importantly this hints that the typist assigning the page numbers was not the same person as the creator of the section divider pages. Other intentional gaps in booklet II appear in mid-section: note how page II.18 was originally labeled II.17 before the numberer corrected it. By contrast, the two full-page dungeon map illustrations do have page numbers, so clearly the typist of the page numbers had those pages when the numbering took place.

Given that the compiler of the manuscript included illustrations from at least two distinct artists, there is no immediate reason to think that the editor was either one of those artists, or even that the editor was the typist of the body text or page numbers. Thus, the evidence internal to the structure of the Dalluhn Manuscript suggests it was a distributed, collaborative project rather than a document created by any single author.

3. RELATIONSHIP TO OD&D, *CHAINMAIL* AND BLACKMOOR

The sections and subsections of Dalluhn correspond roughly to the high-level structure of the three OD&D booklets, although the Dalluhn sections appear in a different order, and Dalluhn lacks several major components of the third OD&D booklet, *Underworld & Wilderness Adventures (U&WA)*; see the “Mapping” at the end of this document for a detailed side-by-side comparison of Dalluhn to OD&D.

The first Dalluhn booklet is split into two sections:

- A section composed entirely of tables, which is analogous to the reference sheets that shipped with OD&D. Unlike in OD&D, tables are not reproduced in the rest of the Dalluhn text, but instead are referenced by number.
- A “Glossary of Terms” divided into three subsections: “Spells,” “Men and Monsters” and “Magical Items.” The first of these subsections maps to the second half of *Men & Magic (M&M)*, the latter two map to almost the entirety of *Monsters & Treasure (M&T)*.

Dalluhn book II is composed of five sections:

- “Before Setting Out for Fame and Fortune,” which corresponds to the material in the beginning of *M&M* (roughly pg. 5–22).
- “The Underworld,” which corresponds to the Underworld section of *U&WA* (roughly pg. 3–12).
- “The Upper World,” which continues with the Wilderness section of *U&WA* (roughly pg. 13–23).
- “Melee & Combat,” which has no comparable section in OD&D.
- “The Rewards of Success,” which maps to scattered elements in OD&D.

Although there are significant differences in the content of OD&D and Dalluhn, textual commonalities are so pervasive that all other considerations aside, viewing the two texts in isolation, it would seem that one must be a revision of the other. A few obvious indicators hint at whether Dalluhn is earlier or later than OD&D. At the most superficial level, OD&D represents an expansion of the content shown in Dalluhn: there are in OD&D more spells, more monsters, more mundane and magic items, and more levels of experience. OD&D after all expands the set of spells, magic items, and monsters in *Chainmail*, which had only eight spells and sixteen monsters: we would expect that a transitional system during development would have more of these categories than *Chainmail*, but less than OD&D. It seems unlikely that anyone responding to the complete OD&D text would choose to pare away those categories—all extent variants of OD&D add such material rather than taking it away—and this broadly argues for Dalluhn being earlier than OD&D. Moreover, there is significant structural evidence that will be presented below demonstrating that the implausibility that the OD&D categories (for example, Magic-user spells) could have been reduced to the set in Dalluhn after the fact.

Another key way that OD&D and Dalluhn differ is that OD&D contains external references to the *Chainmail* booklet, while Dalluhn instead reprints quite a bit of material from *Chainmail*, including even the jousting rules. It appears that Dalluhn was intended to be playable on its own without requiring the reader to have access to *Chainmail*. This has some important consequences for the design of the document. Because of its connection to the large-scale miniature wargaming of *Chainmail*, the Dalluhn Manuscript exhibits significant confusion when it comes to managing distances (in terms of “inches” or “feet” in spell ranges, for example) and durations of time. Around one quarter of the spells in Dalluhn lack a range or duration that would be specified in OD&D, but there are no spells that specify a range or duration in Dalluhn but lack one

in OD&D. Wherever *Chainmail* text is reproduced in the entries for monsters and spells, it invariably appears at the beginning of an entry, with additional text appended at the end, as if it were added later (see for example the balrog).

Blackmoor also echoes throughout the Dalluhn text, especially elements of the Scenario 3 Blackmoor campaign and the Loch Gloomen scenario, both of which were played in 1972. Surely these Blackmoor notes were among the material that Arneson first shared with Gygax at the end of 1972 when Gygax requested the rules for the Blackmoor game (for more information on this period, see *Playing at the World*). Fortunately, Arneson reprinted many of these notes in their original form in the *First Fantasy Campaign* (FFC), and we can see crucial pieces of text in Dalluhn that clearly derive from these notes. By triangulating between these and other Blackmoor notes, *Chainmail* and OD&D, we have many opportunities to test whether or not Dalluhn could have been a stepping stone between them.

Although the Dalluhn Manuscript is proficiently typed and organized, it contains numerous internal inconsistencies and editorial blunders, which broadly argue for the immaturity of the document and in some cases shed light on the relationship of the manuscript to OD&D. The various Dalluhn tables that list spells, magic items, and monsters evince numerous disparities with the descriptions in its own “Glossary of Terms,” the most striking of which is certainly the difference in order between the monster list in Table 13 and the order in which monsters are described in the Glossary: curiously, the Glossary order is very close to the order monsters are listed in OD&D, while the Table 13 order is not. This and related evidence will be analyzed in detail below.

3.1 RELATIONSHIP TO THE MORNARD FRAGMENTS

Late in 2013, Mike Mornard recovered from a storage locker some fragments of draft *Dungeons & Dragons* text given to him by Gary Gygax at the end of the summer of 1973. These “Mornard Fragments,” twenty-four pages of double-spaced text typed on Gygax’s personal typewriter and liberally corrected in Gygax’s own hand, provide another key anchor point for authenticating and contextualizing the Dalluhn Manuscript. Contrasting the construction of the Fragments with the single-spaced and comparatively polished text of Dalluhn reinforces our suspicion that Dalluhn must have been intended for some degree of distribution, whereas the Fragments show working drafts from within the development process.

The Fragments consist of six sections here designated as A (pg. 6–7), B (pg. 19–21), C (pg. 24–31), D (pg. 39–47), E (pg. 61), and F (unnumbered) which largely contain pages showing tables: they provide alternate draft versions of Dalluhn Tables 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 29 (see the “Mapping” at the end of this document for more details). Only one table shown in the Mornard Fragments has no corresponding table in Dalluhn, the dragon elemental vulnerabilities listing that would later feature in *Monsters & Treasure* (pg. 12)—however, the omission of that table is clearly an editorial error in Dalluhn, as the table is explicitly mentioned on I.29 but its reference to the Tables section is broken. The last page of Fragment D announces the beginning of “Part II” of the draft, which is titled, “Explanations of Men, Magical Items, and Monsters”; this is one of several indications that despite their common elements, Dalluhn and Mornard are very differently organized (and neither is organized like OD&D). Most obviously, where Dalluhn consolidates its tables into one section and refers to the tables by number in body text, the Fragments simply inserts the tables into their body text where appropriate. If we assume that the Mornard Fragments consisted of two parts of roughly equal length, as Dalluhn apparently did, then the total draft would have spanned around one hundred pages, of which a quarter survives.

Because Gygax heavily corrected the typed text of the Mornard Fragments with handwritten edits, we consider each Fragment to consist of two distinct texts that date to different times: the earlier typed “base text,” and then the later revised “edit text.” Occasionally there are typed corrections as well, or hand-written

edits crossed out and replaced with further notes (some pages have writing that appears to come from three different pens), which provide the opportunity for more nuanced sequencing of ideas. But on the whole, the Mornard Fragments date close to Dalluhn, as either the base text or edit text of each Fragment corresponds exactly, or nearly exactly, to the corresponding Dalluhn tables and text. In many cases, the hand corrections in the edit text appear as typed body text in Dalluhn, as if the typist of Dalluhn literally used a marked photocopy identical to the Fragments as the basis for the document. For a striking example, compare Dalluhn Table 25, the “Prize Matrix” to the base and edit text of Fragment D (see Exhibit M). Contrasting these to the eventual published version in *M&T* (pg. 22) shows how much further the ideas had evolved by the time OD&D went to print, and thus how close in time Dalluhn and Mornard must have been.

In other cases, the base text of a Fragment will match the text of Dalluhn, and hand edits added by Gygax to the Fragment show a later stage in OD&D’s development than we see in Dalluhn. This is the case with Dalluhn Table 27: if we take the “Miscellaneous Magic Items” subtable on I.15, the items listed appear with the same names, and in the exact same order, as in the base text of Fragment D (pg. 45). Clearly the Dalluhn typist worked from notes very similar to the Fragment D base text; the only differences between the two tables are slight editorial variations in the percentile values and in some item names (for example, the Fragment D table lists “Elven Cloak & Boots” where Dalluhn has “Elven Cloak of Concealment”—but note that in Dalluhn’s Glossary, I.32, the name of the item is instead given as “Elven Cloak & Boots.”) Beyond the base text, the edit text of Fragment D then makes numerous further corrections and additions which bring the text of Fragment D much closer to the published version of this table (*M&T* pg. 26) than Dalluhn is. Fragment D edits add, for example, the “Bag of Holding,” the “Displacer Cloak,” and the “Mirror of Life Trapping,” none of which appear in Dalluhn, as well as correcting the “Djinn Bottle” to become “Efreet Bottle” as OD&D would eventually read. Presumably Gygax made these corrections to the table after the time that draft text was assembled for the Dalluhn typist. Either some Fragments date from slightly different times, or the Dalluhn Manuscript was itself partially assembled from another set of draft notes dating from slightly different times—but the variations, again, are minor when compared to the eventual published version of *Dungeons & Dragons*.

The Mornard Fragments do show passages of draft text beyond tables. Fragment C contains the longest continuous section, a description of encounters in the “Upper Land” which corresponds to the text on Dalluhn II.19, both of which in turn prefigure the “Wilderness” section of *U&WA* (pg. 15). The text on the Fighting-man in this section will serve as a representative example of the interaction between these texts. Originally, the base text of Fragment C here read, “Warrior Men from a castle will demand a jousting match with passersby of like class.” Gygax’s typed correction has struck through “Warrior” and inserted above it “Fighting-” so that the first word reads “Fighting-Men” instead of “Warrior Men.” Finally, a hand edit by Gygax has inserted as edit text to the end of the sentence the phrase, “if the occupants are not hostile.” Reading Dalluhn II.19, we find the typed sentence with exactly those corrections: “Fighting Men from a castle will demand a jousting match with passers-by of like class if the occupants are not hostile.” The only differences are that “Fighting-Men” is not hyphenated in Dalluhn, and “passers-by” is hyphenated. By the time of *U&WA*, much of this section’s text has been reorganized, though the first sentence now reads, “Fighting-Men within castles will demand a jousting match with all passers-by of like class.” Similarly, the Fragment E text on dragons is very close to that of Dalluhn, but quite different from OD&D, and we can find comparable, though tantalizingly brief, correspondences in the Fragments dealing with the combat system (all of which will be further discussed in the analysis below).

The tight link between the text of the Fragments and Dalluhn removes any doubt that Dalluhn preserves a system dating from 1973, and one that Gygax himself directly edited. That much said, there are some key editorial differences in the two texts aside from the alternate approach to organization. The most

substantive difference is that like OD&D, the Mornard Fragments refer to *Chainmail* and *Outdoor Survival* explicitly as external texts, rather than copying some of their contents into the body text as Dalluhn does. For example, where Dalluhn reproduces the entire jousting rules of *Chainmail*, the Mornard Fragments simply defer to *Chainmail* with constructions like “if a joust takes place (use CHAINMAIL rules),” text very similar to *U&WA* (pg. 15). It seems unlikely that the intended published system would have incorporated copyrighted text taken from games made by other manufacturers (Avalon Hill and Guidon Games)—but for playtesting purposes, the authors of this system could not have assumed playtesters would have access to those products. The Mornard Fragment tables also contain more polyhedral dice usage than we see in Dalluhn: for example, where the Mornard Fragments clearly note that a d20 is rolled for a saving throw, Dalluhn specifies rolling 3d6: this too may be an indication that Dalluhn was specifically assembled for an audience that could not be assumed to own polyhedral dice, again suggesting playtesters.

Overall, the Mornard Fragments and the Dalluhn Manuscript jointly give us unprecedented insight into the state of *Dungeons & Dragons* development in 1973. The Fragments come to us with internal and external evidence that guarantees their authenticity, yet they are too brief and fragmentary to allow us to reconstruct the system—however, the correspondence of the Fragments to Dalluhn proves that Dalluhn dates from that time, and thus Dalluhn can safely fill in gaps in our understanding. As Dalluhn itself is also incomplete, our reconstruction of the system at this time cannot be comprehensive, but the analysis does shed considerable light on OD&D’s development process.

4. ANALYSIS

An analysis of the Dalluhn manuscript reveals the state of the system during an earlier point in the development of *Dungeons & Dragons*, including many variant ideas discarded during the process. Studying the language and ideas represented in these documents should help us to recognize and authenticate pre-publication material discovered in the future. Twelve salient areas of the Dalluhn Manuscript to examine are the following:

4.1 COMBAT, CHOPS & HITS

The Dalluhn Manuscript contains a “Melee & Combat” section (II.23–II.25), which relies on Tables 14, 15, 30 and 31. The presence of a combat system in the Dalluhn Manuscript is of special historical interest because OD&D does not provide an account of combat (turn sequence, initiative, surprise, damage rolls, etc.). Despite an unfulfilled promise in *Me&T* (pg. 5) that “Combat is detailed in Vol. III,” only a three sentence “land combat” section appears in that volume, and it defers entirely to the system of *Chainmail* rather than explaining the promised “alternative” combat system of OD&D based on the “Attack Matrix” tables. The lack of a combat system in OD&D has been a source of puzzlement to players ever since, so the possibility that the Dalluhn Manuscript could preserve early thinking about this is a very exciting one, especially as the Dalluhn section gives a paragraph-length example of combat.

Tables 14 and 15 are clearly connected to the “Attack Matrix” tables in *Me&M* (see Exhibit C), but in the Dalluhn Manuscript, “to-hit” rolls utilize percentile probabilities instead of a d20—though crucially, at 5% increments and thus with only twenty outcomes per roll (see the dice section for more on polyhedral dice in Dalluhn). However, the actual text in the Dalluhn “Melee & Combat” section clearly developed from the man-to-man combat text in *Chainmail*. For example, where in the beginning of the “Melee” subsection in *Chainmail* (pg. 22), we read, “When two figures are within melee range (3’), one or several blows will be struck,” the comparable section of the Dalluhn Manuscript begins, “When two creatures are within combat range and decide to use hand weapons, such as swords, maces, etc., one or several blows will be struck.” Tables 30 and 31 further cement the connection between *Chainmail* and this combat system, as they are slight

modifications of the ranged and melee combat tables from second edition *Chainmail* Appendix B to incorporate renumbered armor class (as Exhibit C shows). Table 30 is invoked after Table 14, something in the manner of a critical hit mechanism that can result in an instant kill.

We should not be surprised to learn that the 1973 combat system derives largely from *Chainmail*. Although the combat section is largely missing from the Mornard Fragments, Fragment B ends with some text under a “Combat System” heading. Significantly, the last sentence of that fragment reads, “Scoring Hits: Generally CHAINMAIL rules will apply as modified by the following:” where presumably the next page explained the variations on *Chainmail* that we see preserved in Dalluhn. The Mornard Fragments also confirm that once a hit is scored, “a die is rolled to determine how many hit points the man/monster receives (usually 1-6, but as high as 2-12 if fighting opponents with the ability to fight at **double hits**, i.e. Giants, Efreet, etc.)” Note that this “double hits” language is preserved in Dalluhn: the Glossary description of “Giant Power Gauntlets” reads “gives double hits if the wearer strikes successfully.” We can find an instance of “triple hits” in the Dalluhn roc text.

Dalluhn moreover preserves the *Chainmail* man-to-man combat notion of “**weapon class**,” explicitly permitting two or three additional attacks if the weapon class of an attacker is four or eight levels lower than that of the defender, respectively. In a slight adaptation of the *Chainmail* man-to-man rules, mounted men also add one to their hits rolled against footmen, where footmen subtract one from their hits rolled against mounted men (in *Chainmail*, the die rolls, not the hits, are added to or subtracted from). We also see that horses in Dalluhn combat, as in *Chainmail*, fight independently of their riders starting on the second round of combat, with the same equivalence to weapon classes and rolls on Table 31: a light horse counts as one mace, a medium horse as two maces, and a heavy horse as two flails. Where in *Chainmail* (pg. 22), “men attacked from the rear do not return a blow on the 1st round of melee and automatically receive 2nd blow position on the 2nd round of melee,” in Dalluhn “characters attacked from behind do not return the chop on the first round of the melee and chop second on the second round.” (II.24) From these numerous correspondences, there can be no doubt that the combat system of Dalluhn began as a *Chainmail* variant.

Ultimately, the combat system presented in the Dalluhn “Melee & Combat” section is not a very practical one—it admits of significant ambiguities, hugely favors players over monsters, and potentially involves too many rolls per attack—and it seems unlikely it would be a satisfying addition to the play of OD&D. The fact that it contains elements differing only slightly from both *Chainmail* and OD&D again suggests that this is a transitional document bridging the two. But more significantly, the dangling reference to how “combat is detailed in Vol. III” of OD&D must have referred to a section that did not end up being included in the final draft of OD&D, and we would thus expect that an earlier draft might have included a combat section that was subsequently deleted. The fact that the Dalluhn Manuscript does have such a section again positions it as a likely ancestor to OD&D.

The process of attempting to score a hit is often described as a “**chop**” in Dalluhn, most notably in the title of the combat tables (see Exhibit C) as well as throughout the “Melee and Combat” section. II.4 describes “Hits” as “the number of ‘chops’ a player can endure in combat.” Intriguingly, the term “chops” can also be found in Arneson’s 1972 Loch Gloomen notes, for example in the description of ambushing dragons in their lair: “80% chance its asleep (free chop).” (FFC pg. 89) This text parallels Mornard Fragment E, which contains a provision for sleeping dragons noting that “If the Dragon(s) is (are) asleep they can be surprised, and a free-chop gained;” virtually the same text appears in Dalluhn I.29. Effectively, the term does not survive in OD&D, except for an incidental use in the descriptions of Black Pudding and Grey Ooze. The corresponding dragon text in OD&D (*M&T* pg. 12) instead says that, “Sleeping Dragons may be attacked with a free melee round by the attacker.” “Chops” can also be found in Arneson’s pre-D&D magic swords

notes, where magic swords may “get 2 chops per melee round.” (FFC pg. 64) This “chop” terminology provides an anchor we can use to trace systems and concepts from Blackmoor through Dalluhn.

In Dalluhn, A successful “chop” scores a “hit.” The full OD&D term “**hit point**” appears only once in the Dalluhn Manuscript, however, in the text about rocs. In the Mornard Fragment B quote above, clearly the term connoted the damage dealt to a target rather than the reservoir of damage resistance the target had remaining. The construction “hits” is most common in Dalluhn, though “points” by itself is sometimes used alone as a synonym for hit points. The notion that a creature will “take hits” to kill is familiar terminology from *Chainmail* (pg. 30): a Lycanthrope, for example, “takes four simultaneous hits... to kill,” and “ogres are killed when they have taken an accumulation of six missile or melee hits.” Arneson then adopted this language for Blackmoor: in the Loch Gloomen notes, wights “take from 1–6 hits,” (FFC pg. 91) and a dragon “can take from 4–24 Hits.” (FFC pg. 89) In the Dalluhn dragon text, we see that a very old dragon might “take from 66 to 72 hits.” (I.30) Rarely, we see this terminology survive in OD&D: Kobolds “will take from 1–3 hits,” (*M&T* pg. 7) for example. The monsters described in the naval combat section of *U&WA* (pg. 35), surely contributed late to the OD&D development process by Arneson, show this construction with unusual consistency: giant leeches “take from 2–12 hits,” giant snakes “can take from 6–36 hits,” and octopi “take from 4–24 hits.” Thus characters in Dalluhn have a category for “Hits,” not for “hit points,” and “hits are usually recovered at a rate of 1 to 2 per day.” (II.25) The spell “Cure Light Wounds” in turn will “remove hits from a wounded man.” (I.23)

4.2 MONSTERS

Overall, there is not a single monster in the main Dalluhn Manuscript list (Table 13) that does not appear in the corresponding list at the beginning of *M&T*, and thus Dalluhn presents a subset of OD&D’s monsters. This Dalluhn list contains the same monsters, in the same order, as the monster table in the edit text of Mornard Fragment C, retaining a few of its characteristic misspellings (like “Meduse” for “Medusae”) but correcting some others. However, this list does not reflect the entire spectrum of monsters mentioned in passing in Dalluhn or Mornard, which further includes:

- Djinn, Efreet and Elementals (e.g., Dalluhn Table 21, Mornard Fragment C)
- Ochre Jelly and Black Pudding (e.g., Dalluhn Table 12, Mornard Fragment F)
- Dwarves, Elves, and Gnomes (e.g., Dalluhn Table 1, Mornard Fragment B)
- Various horses (light, heavy) (e.g., Dalluhn Table 6)

All of the above do appear in the corresponding *M&T* table. The only monsters from that table that completely fail to appear in Dalluhn are Green Slime, Grey Ooze and Yellow Mold (arguably, mules might be added to this list); all three appear in Mornard Fragment F, which is dedicated to the “clean-up crew.” While orcs, goblins, and kobolds are referenced frequently in tables in Dalluhn including Table 13, they are missing from the “Glossary of Terms,” due to an apparent editorial error (further described below). All of these internal inconsistencies and disparities in Dalluhn suggest either failings of collaboration or an imperfect editorial synchronization that resulted in the current document.

The **ordering** of monsters establishes an interesting relationship between Dalluhn, Mornard, and OD&D. Dalluhn Table 13 and Mornard Fragment C list monsters in an order which radically differs from the corresponding table at the beginning of *M&T*; however, order of the monster descriptions in the Dalluhn “Glossary of Terms” is very close to the *M&T* list order (see Exhibit E). Only two of the monsters in the Dalluhn Glossary appear in a different order in the *M&T* list: ents and gargoyles. Helpfully, Mornard Fragment C contains edit text that adds an “order” column to the table which lists the order that the

monsters will appear in Dalluhn's Glossary (the corresponding monster descriptions are missing from the Mornard Fragments apart from Fragment E, but presumably they followed this Glossary order as well).

Jointly, *Chainmail*, Mornard, and Dalluhn can establish a rough **sequence** in which monsters were added to draft versions of *Dungeons & Dragons*. The thirty-seven monster types in the base text of Fragment C reflects only eighteen or so additions above the original *Chainmail* second edition bestiary—though note that the passing mention of hippogriffs in *Chainmail* apparently did not immediately bring them into *Dungeons & Dragons*. Gygax has fitted the hippogriff, manticore, invisible stalker, gargoyle, and pegasus into the margins of the Fragment C list as edit text additions, which presumably reflects that they entered the game later than the base text monsters. Moving beyond lists and into the Dalluhn monster descriptions, there are creatures described above which receive descriptions in OD&D that do not appear in the “Glossary of Terms” of Dalluhn, including elementals, djinn, efreeti, the “clean-up crew,” and horses. Presumably this reflects a stage in development where a number of monsters had been conceived but their specifications had not yet been incorporated into the Glossary.

Surely some discrepancies and omissions reflect **editorial immaturity** rather than a design sequence. The subcategories of hostile men in Dalluhn exhibit some internal confusion: the Glossary text notes that the Bandit specification “applies to Berserkers, Brigands, Buccaneers, Nomads, and Pirates,” but then the Glossary goes on to provide independent descriptions of berserkers and brigands as well as a lengthy passage on dervishes. Dalluhn also gives descriptions of two categories of hostile men who do not appear in OD&D: assassins and alchemists, though note that these are listed in the specialist personnel table (Dalluhn Table 23, and in the corresponding table on *U&WA* pg. 22). Unlike Dalluhn, OD&D provides an independent specification for nomads and pirates, and includes descriptions of two new subtypes not present in Dalluhn's Glossary, cavemen and mermen—though as a further point of inconsistency, both of those subtypes are mentioned in Dalluhn Table 19 but specified nowhere else.

The **subcategories** of monsters handily illustrate the transitional nature of the Dalluhn creature text. For example, in *Chainmail* there are only two types of lycanthropes: werewolves and werebears. In Dalluhn, we see a third, the weretiger. OD&D adds to those three a fourth, the wereboar. Dalluhn is thus a clear stepping-stone between *Chainmail* and OD&D. Similarly, while *Chainmail* has no subtyping of giants at all, Dalluhn divides giants into two classes: stupid giants who dwell in caves, and intelligent giants who dwell in castles. In OD&D, there are five varieties of giant, but they are sorted into two broad categories: cave dwellers (the hill and stone giants) and castle dwellers (the frost, fire and cloud giants). To the list of dragon types in *Chainmail*, we see the golden dragon added to Dalluhn, but we do not yet see in Dalluhn the OD&D text that identifies golden dragons as “a class unto themselves” of Lawful, intelligent spellcasters.

The monster description Dalluhn Glossary text shows clear reliance on *Chainmail*, sometimes with only a bit of additional text grafted on to it. For example, the Dalluhn entry for pixies is practically a verbatim copy of the *Chainmail* sprite text, which as of second edition is flagged as text for “sprites (and pixies).” The eventual OD&D pixie text is significantly different. The ent text in Dalluhn is almost entirely identical to the *Chainmail* entry, with a single new sentence added to the end; because the text is so specific to *Chainmail*, it is completely redone in OD&D. The balrog text in Dalluhn begins by copying the entire *Chainmail* entry but appends to it three additional sentences, the first of which is “Balrogs are also of a highly intelligent and magical nature.” (I.27) Those sentences are paraphrased at the beginning of the OD&D entry for balrogs; e.g.: “Balrogs are highly intelligent monsters with a magical nature.” (*M&T* pg. 14) In other cases, text in Dalluhn seems to take for granted the existence of the *Chainmail* descriptions, as the monsters text gives no descriptions of the monster whatsoever: the entirety of the Dalluhn text for ogre, for example, reads: “Ogres will always carry their gold with them, but other treasure will be found in lair.” (I.25)

Strikingly, in those places where Arneson's **Blackmoor** notes survive, we can find strong corollaries for it in Dalluhn's monster text. The Dalluhn roc text (see Exhibit A) shows a perfect intersection of elements from *Chainmail*, OD&D and Blackmoor that provides some of the most compelling evidence for identifying the Dalluhn Manuscript as a transitional manuscript drawing equally on Gygax and Arneson's work. The roc text (I.28) begins with a near-verbatim copy of the *Chainmail* entry, and then concludes with a more heavily edited version of the roc text from Arneson's 1972 Loch Gloomen notes. We also can see in the Loch Gloomen notes clear antecedents for specific elements in the Dalluhn text for brigands, true trolls, giants and dragons.

The Dalluhn text on dervishes (I.25) offers another indisputable point of connection with Blackmoor, though also an example of the immaturity of the document, as it unmistakably contains a serious **editorial error**. The Dalluhn Glossary dervish entry for "wagon trains" is clearly copied from the Isengarder orc text in Arneson's Loch Gloomen notes: beyond the obvious reuse of the system (65% chance for 2–12 wagons with 1000–6000 gp per wagon), the Dalluhn dervishes description also contains a copying error, the statement that "Wagon trains will be guarded by an additional 10 orcs per wagon," where in the Dalluhn section it should read "10 dervishes." What seems to have happened is that the Dalluhn typist here misplaced a draft page (or two) containing the end of the rules for men as well as text for goblins, kobolds, and much of the orc text: without that material, the typist was left with the rules for men at the end of one page transitioning into the last of the rules for orcs on the next, and thus we see editorially blended the text for men into the orcs section. The error was fixed later in development: an edited version of the wagon train text correctly appears in the orc section of OD&D rather than in the dervish section, though with a slightly different system (50% chance of 1–8 wagons each carrying 20–1200gp).

For those monsters not described in second edition *Chainmail*, the Dalluhn Manuscript frequently provides text very similar to **OD&D**, with minor editorial differences. For example, the Dalluhn Glossary entry for manticora reads, "A huge, lion-bodied monster with a man's face, horns, Dragon wings, and a tail full of iron spikes which it can throw with the range and accuracy of a short bow." OD&D has them as "huge, lion-bodied monstrosities with men's faces, horns, dragon wings, and a tail full of iron spikes," and then further details their spike-hurling operation. OD&D describes medusae as "a human-type monster with the lower body of a snake, a human torso and head, with tresses which are asps," where Dalluhn has "a human-type monster with a snake's lower body and hair of asps." These textual similarities are pervasive in the descriptions of monsters, and display a decisive interaction between the text of Dalluhn and OD&D.

Several of the monster descriptions in Dalluhn can be linked to the glossary of **Lehrer's *Fantastic Bestiary*** (1969), a book that can be positively identified as the source of several monsters later added to *Dungeons & Dragons*. It is remarkable to see how the text in Lehrer for gorgons, "An iron-clad bull monster" that "fed on deadly shrubs and poisonous herbs" whose "horrible breath was reputed to kill every attacker instantly," becomes in Dalluhn "an iron-clad bullish monster with poison breath," which differs considerably from the petrifying breath described in *Monsters & Treasure* (see Exhibit L). Without the stepping stone of Dalluhn, the influence of Lehrer on draft editions of OD&D would have been obscured by later edits.

Finally, in some places, the monster text in OD&D seems to offer explicit reaction to what appears in Dalluhn. Take the Dalluhn text for gnolls, which reads, "Gnolls are a crossbreed of Gnomes and Trolls." The corresponding text in *M&T* reads "GNOLLS: A cross between Gnomes and Trolls (... perhaps, Lord Dunsany did not really make it all that clear)." This seems to suggest a dialog between **collaborators**, where one replies to the other, and perhaps hints at the editorial process of *Dungeons & Dragons*.

4.3 MAGICAL ITEMS

Dalluhn Table 27 and the accompanying descriptions of magical items in the Glossary are extremely similar to the corresponding text in *M&T* (pg. 23–27). The single largest difference is the absence in the Dalluhn Manuscript of any text about intelligent swords. There are a handful of items specified in Dalluhn that have no corollary in OD&D: a “Wand of Light” and three types of rings (Truth, Giant Strength and Sleep). Otherwise, the magic items presented in Table 27 are a subset of those in *M&T*. Items in OD&D that do not appear in Dalluhn include:

- Sword +1 with Locate Objects Ability, Sword +2 with Charm Person Ability, Sword One Life Energy Draining Ability, Sword -2 Cursed
- Axe +1, the three magic Spears (+1, +2, +3)
- Potion of Delusion
- Ring of Regeneration, Ring of Djinn Summoning, Ring of Spell Storing
- Wand of Negation, Staff of Withering
- Amulet vs. Crystal Balls and ESP, Bag of Holding, Displacer Cloak, Mirror of Life Trapping

Mornard Fragment C adds most those items via its edit text. There is no mention of the “Sword +2 with Charm Person Ability,” the “Potion of Delusion,” nor the “Ring of Regeneration” or “Spell Storing,” but the other items appear as hand-written Gyax corrections to the treasure tables in the Mornard Fragments. Early elements like the “Wand of Light” that appear in Dalluhn are not present in the base text of Fragment C.

As Table 27 lists magical items along with **percentile number ranges** for random item generation, in comparing Mornard with Dalluhn with OD&D we have an additional tool for spotting evidence to establish dates and sequences: the number ranges themselves. In cases where categories of Dalluhn Table 27 are very similar to *M&T*, the dice ranges alone can provide significant evidence about which came first. The heavy corrections to the percentile values in the random magic item generation tables in Mornard Fragment C show how liberally Gyax tweaked these numbers, especially when sandwiching new items into the middle of the tables.

The potion table of Dalluhn is completely identical to OD&D except that OD&D includes one hastily-added additional potion: by looking at the probabilities, especially in the first printing of OD&D, it is clear that the editorial process that transformed Dalluhn into OD&D left behind errors (see Exhibit D). The one potion OD&D includes that Dalluhn does not is “Delusion,” and the **delusion effect** is interesting as a case study in and of itself. The term “delusion” does not appear in the Dalluhn Manuscript, but there is a ring described as “Illusion, Wearer,” though the specific effect of that ring is not detailed in Dalluhn. In OD&D, the slot in this table occupied by that ring is replaced by the “Ring of Delusion,” which is described as “A ring which makes the wearer see whatever he desired, i.e. a bumper thrown in to fool players.” (*M&T* pg. 33) Once the idea of delusion was in play, it was only natural that there would also be in OD&D a “Potion of Delusion,” with the description, “makes the user believe the Potion is whatever he desires.” It seems very plausible that the ring of “Illusion, Wearer” evolved into the delusion ring and potion in OD&D, and thus that Dalluhn came first. Consider the alternative: that a later editor of the OD&D text would, in creating a variant, cut both the ring and potion of delusion only to reintroduce a ring of “Illusion, Wearer” in the same slot as the “Ring of Delusion” without describing its effect.

Within Dalluhn’s “Glossary of Terms,” magical items are hugely **underspecified** when compared to OD&D. In the Glossary entries for potions, for example, Dalluhn notes that “most potions are self-

explanatory” (I.30) and out of twenty-five potions it gives detailed descriptions of just eight. Although OD&D lists only one more potion than Dalluhn, it gives eighteen full descriptions, stating more conservatively, “Some potions will not be detailed here as they duplicate magic already explained.” (*M&T* pg. 31) While only four rings get a detailed description in Dalluhn out of seventeen total, OD&D gives eleven descriptions and has the same number of rings. Only five wands or staves receive descriptions in Dalluhn (out of eighteen), compared to nineteen in OD&D (with only one more staff listed than Dalluhn); even the “Staff of Wizardry,” which is listed in Dalluhn Table 27, it is not specified in its Glossary.

There is some variance in the descriptions of magical items that goes beyond editorial differences. As the Dalluhn Manuscript does not contain the “Mirror of Life Trapping,” for example, it therefore does not mention that item in its description of the “Ring of Three Wishes,” unlike OD&D. Similarly, since there is no “Telekinesis” spell in Dalluhn, the “Ring of Telekinesis” must explain its magic effect, rather than just referencing the Magic-user spell as OD&D does. The “Mirror” does appear in Mornard, though the Mornard spell list still does not contain “Telekinesis.”

There are a number of respects in which the Dalluhn Table 27 titles of magical items are **not properly synchronized** with the descriptive text in the Dalluhn “Glossary of Terms.” For example, the miscellaneous table lists an “Elven Cloak of Concealment,” but the corresponding item in the Glossary is called “Elven Cloak and Boots,” the name of that item in Mornard and in OD&D. For the “Helm of Teleportation” listed in Table 27, the Glossary describes a “Helm of Transportation.” The “Gauntlet of Giant Power” and “Girdle of Giant Strength” in Table 27 are rendered in the Glossary as “Giant Power Gauntlet” and “Giant Strength Gauntlet.” OD&D gives these items as the “Gauntlets of Ogre Power” and “Girdle of Giant Strength.” All of these differences are indicative of synchronization problems, where parts of the manuscript did not properly keep up with the transitioning state of the tables and the Glossary. We can see further evidence of ongoing changes by comparing the Dalluhn Manuscript tables and descriptions to OD&D: there is in Dalluhn (and Mornard) a “Horn of Panic” in place of OD&D’s “Drums of Panic,” and “Boots of Flying” in Dalluhn are given as the “Broom of Flying” in OD&D—though in the Mornard edit text, Gygax has crossed out “Boots” here and written “Broom.” In Dalluhn Table 21, we see “Flying Carpet” listed as a means of conveyance, but there is no corresponding entry for this OD&D item in the Dalluhn Glossary or elsewhere in the document.

Sometimes, these slight differences in names are enough to give decisive evidence that the Dalluhn Manuscript came first and formed the basis for OD&D. This is the case with the four miscellaneous magic items that summon and control elementals (see Exhibit K). OD&D gives their names as a Censor, Stone, Brazier and Bowl; Dalluhn and Mornard instead list a Medallion, Bracelet, Stone and Gem. In the OD&D text for elementals, however, these devices are referred to by the Mornard and Dalluhn names, as “medallions, stones, gems or bracelets.” This shows conclusively that the Dalluhn list already existed at the time OD&D was written, and was referenced by the authors of OD&D when the elementals text was written. Establishing the historical precedence of the Dalluhn elemental items moreover has cascading implications for dating the other items listed in this section, and their descriptions in the Glossary.

4.4 SPELLS

Both *Dungeons & Dragons* drafts show **spell variants** entertained during the development of the game, but sequencing Mornard and Dalluhn here is challenging. The base text of Mornard Fragment C shows 40 Magic-user spells, with the edit text adding just one: “Contact Higher Plane,” at the end of the fifth tier. Magic-users in the Dalluhn Manuscript per Table 5 have access to 42 spells, as “Contact Higher Plane” has been added to the body text, as has the later-discarded spell “Glittering Eye.” This would broadly suggest that Fragment C came before Dalluhn. However, Dalluhn has “Redirect Edged Weapon” in the third slot of the

fourth tier, where the Mornard base text instead has “Curses Remove” (with edit text arrows reversing that to “Remove Curses”), as would OD&D (*Me&M* pg. 21). Also, Mornard has the sixth and seventh slots of the fourth tier as “Confusion” and “Charm Monster,” as would OD&D, where Dalluhn has these two spells in the opposite order. So was Dalluhn before or after Mornard Fragment C?

The Cleric spell list shows even more diversity between Dalluhn, Mornard, and OD&D, and suggests that there was some churn and rethinking around spells during the development of *Dungeons & Dragons*. The Fragment C base text for Clerics shows only 19 spells, with the edit text adding four. All of those edit text additions would ultimately inspire Magic-user spells in *Dungeons & Dragons*: they are “Sleep,” “Infravision,” “Normiss” (later “Protection from Normal Missiles”) and “Quest”—“Quest” here has “Geas” in parentheses following it, and in OD&D Magic-Users would gain the “Geas” spell and Clerics the “Quest” spell. Dalluhn somewhat follows the Cleric spell base text of Fragment C, except that “Remove Curse” has been added to the first tier of Dalluhn: “Remove Curse” only appears in the third tier of Fragment C, but the Dalluhn third tier has instead a “Curse” spell that apparently allowed Clerics to bestow curses. The second tier of Dalluhn Cleric spells also includes the variant spell “Tranquilize,” and as Mornard has “Sleep” on the second tier of Cleric spells instead, this likely reflects an evolutionary path of the Magic-user “Sleep” spell during the game’s development.

While it may not be possible to sequence the spell lists of Mornard and Dalluhn, they are sufficiently aligned that they must be relatively close together in time: there are 26 more Magic-user spells specified in OD&D than in Dalluhn (including the entire sixth tier, with three interesting exceptions):

- Magic-user spells only in Dalluhn: Redirect Edged Weapon, Glittering Eye
- OD&D Magic-user spells not in Dalluhn: Sleep, Knock, Infravision, Slow Spell, Haste Spell, Protection from Normal Missiles, Water Breathing, Remove Curse, Growth of Plant, Dimension Door, Wizard Eye, Massmorph, Hallucinatory Terrain, Telekinesis, Pass-wall, Cloudkill, Feeblemind, Growth of Animals, Reincarnation, Lower Water, Part Water, Projected Image, Anti-Magic Shell, Death Spell, Geas, Disintegrate, Control Weather

The spells later added to the Magic-user list were clearly just appended to the per-tier list in Dalluhn Table 5 to form the final OD&D table (*Me&M* pg. 21, see Exhibit B); just as when the *Greyhawk* supplement added more Magic-user spells, it appended them to the prior OD&D table. Within the descriptions of these spells, we gain significant insight into the development of magic in *Dungeons & Dragons*.

Like the monster description text, the spell description text of Dalluhn shows interactions with *Chainmail*. As there are so few spells in second edition *Chainmail* (just eight), and those spells only rarely align with those in Dalluhn and OD&D, there are few direct comparisons possible. The clearest example of the transitional character is the “Light” spell (see Exhibit J), which shows how Dalluhn retained some *Chainmail* text and concepts (“Light” as an antidote to a magical darkness on a battlefield, dispelling it over a vast area) but also features OD&D concepts (like the level of the caster and spell duration text that appears in OD&D). Due to the fact that page I.22 of Dalluhn has been lost, we have only one line of the text of “Conjure Elemental”: “The ability to conjure up an Elemental, but no more....” Compare that one line however to the first sentence of the *Chainmail* (pg. 29) entry: “Wizards can conjure Elementals, but no more than one of each type can be brought into existence.”

For spells without a clear *Chainmail* antecedent, the wording in Dalluhn is often quite similar to OD&D. See for example “Detect Magic,” which is in Dalluhn, “A spell to determine the presence of magic on a person or thing, or on/in a place,” (I.19) versus OD&D, “A spell to determine if there has been some

enchantment laid on a person, place or thing.” (*McM* pg. 23) Other spells worth comparing include “Protection from Evil” and “Charm Person,” as well as the Cleric spells “Find Traps” and “Dispell Evil.” Despite the fact that the Dalluhn Manuscript omits a sixth tier for Magic-users, the “Glossary of Terms” does include a brief subsection describing “Spells Above the Usual,” which are available to any Magic-User above the 11th or 13th level. (I.24) The three spells described in this section, “Flesh to Stone,” “Stone to Flesh” and “Invisible Stalkers” appear as spells in the sixth tier of OD&D (the first two collapse into a single spell, as there is no concept of reversible Magic-user spells in Dalluhn, though Chaotic Clerics “have spells which function the opposite of the Clerical spells” per I.24). These “Spells Above the Usual” are another sign that Dalluhn represents a work in progress, evolving towards having a sixth tier of spells, and thus that Dalluhn came first. Consider the alternative: it seems very implausible that anyone editing OD&D would eliminate the entire sixth tier of Magic-user spells, but then add back in this “Spells Above the Usual” section.

The absence of a sixth tier also connects the Dalluhn Manuscript to the 1973 Blackmoor “magic swords” rules (*FFC* pg. 69). In those Blackmoor rules, swords with a spell casting capability have a chance of being able to cast spells from level 1 through level 5 – there is in those rules no sixth level of Magic-user spellcasting, as we see in Dalluhn. Similarly, for swords able to cast Clerical spells, the rules suggest randomly selecting spells by rolling a six-sided die for each spell level, but that a roll of a 4 on Cleric level 5 would result in “no spell.” That is true of the Cleric spell list in Dalluhn Table 5—there are only three level 5 spells—but false of the corresponding list in OD&D, which has six spells. Clerics have 6 more spells in OD&D than they do in Dalluhn (and one spell, “Tranquilize”, not in OD&D), though their spells are also reorganized significantly. Thus, the surviving Blackmoor magic sword rules corroborate that there existed a pre-publication spell list that had properties we see in the Dalluhn list, but not in OD&D.

Spellcasting in the Dalluhn Manuscript is neither Vancian like OD&D (where spells are memorized in advance and forgotten when cast) nor reagent-based like Blackmoor (where spells are prepared from material components which are expended when cast). Instead, Magic-users get an allowance of spells per tier that they may cast every 24 hours, and they apparently may choose freely from the spell list without any preparation required. Arguably, this is the system implied by the *Chainmail* rules for its Wizards, though *Chainmail* is hardly clear about the matter.

Finally, note that offensive spells like “Fire Ball” and “Lightning Bolt” do not deal damage but are simply “**fatal** if they connect,” (I.20) so dice are not rolled for their damage; instead an accuracy check is made to determine if they hit. The only other spell that causes direct harm in Dalluhn is the Cleric “Finger of Death,” which also kills outright (targets get a saving throw only if the caster is Chaotic). Thus “hits” in Dalluhn are truly restricted to physical forms of damage. This too follows the precedent *Chainmail*, where magical attack follows a “save or die” mechanic, and cumulative hits of damage are tallied independently of magic.

4.5 ABILITIES

The six abilities in the Dalluhn Manuscript differ from the six famous abilities in *Dungeons & Dragons*, but reflect an evolutionary step forward from the abilities visible on surviving Blackmoor sheets, as exemplified by the 1972 Wizard Gaylord sheet (as reproduced in *Playing at the World*).

- Wizard Gaylord: “Brains,” “Looks,” “Credability” [credibility], “Sex,” “Health,” “Strength,” “Courage,” “Horsemanship,” “Woodsmanship,” “Leadership,” “Flying,” “Seamanship,” “Cunning”
- Dalluhn: “Intelligence,” “Cunning,” “Strength,” “Health,” “Appearance,” “Ego (or Loyalty)”
- OD&D: “Strength,” “Intelligence,” “Wisdom,” “Constitution,” “Dexterity,” “Charisma.”

OD&D, the Wizard Gaylord sheet, and Dalluhn all have “Strength” in common. The Wizard Gaylord sheet has a “Brains” stat, which in the Dalluhn Manuscript and OD&D is called “Intelligence.” “Cunning” has been added very late to the list of abilities on the Wizard Gaylord sheet (it is in pen, compared to the earlier pencil marks); we learn from the Dalluhn Manuscript that “**Cunning**” was the prime requisite for Clerics, per “Wisdom” in OD&D. “Health” carries over from the Gaylord sheet to Dalluhn, and the description of “Health” in Dalluhn suggests that we should tie this to “Constitution.” “Looks” in the Gaylord sheet becomes “**Appearance**” in Dalluhn, and we know that appearance is a factor in “Charisma” of OD&D, as are probably the “Leadership” and “Credibility” traits folded into the “Ego” ability of Dalluhn. Both Dalluhn and Gaylord are missing any ability comparable to “Dexterity,” though at only six abilities, Dalluhn is much closer to OD&D than Gaylord, which includes a hodge-podge of further abilities like “Sex” and “Courage” and then more practical skills like “Horsemanship,” “Seamanship” and so on.

Even though “**Ego**” does not appear on the Wizard Gaylord sheet, we can find evidence that it served as a Blackmoor ability in the *FFC*. Among the 1973 magic swords rules, Arneson provides a system in which the referee must “throw a die and compare with ego and brains” (*FFC* pg. 69) in order to determine whether a sword will control a character. This mechanism perhaps persists from a transitional period between the Wizard Gaylord sheet and Dalluhn when both “Brains” and “Ego” were in use, before “Brains” became “Intelligence.”

“Ego (or **Loyalty**)” in Dalluhn requires some further explication, especially as Dalluhn seems to conflate two distinct abilities in this listing. With some scrutiny, it becomes clear that “Ego” applies to player characters, while “Loyalty” applies to non-player characters (or as they are called in Dalluhn, “Non-Real Players”). In discussing the acquisition of retainers, Dalluhn explicitly advises the referee to “eliminate the roll of ego and substitute loyalty” (II.7), with the implication that the referee throws 3d6 to generate that statistic (the text mentions that “the average loyalty is 9–11,” and so on). This has an obvious parallel in OD&D, as in the comparable section on retainers, the referee is instructed that “when one or more such characters are taken into service a loyalty check is made by rolling three six-sided dice.” The results of poor or exceptional loyalty, as described in Dalluhn, mirror the language in *M&M* (pg. 13): retainers with low loyalty will “desert at the first opportunity,” for example. Over time and with good treatment, in both systems, retainers will receive bonuses to their morale. Thus, although “Loyalty” doesn’t appear as a character ability in OD&D, the system described in Dalluhn is basically in effect for non-player characters. As for “Ego,” given that it collapses into “Charisma” in OD&D, the only place where references to ego appear in OD&D is in the description of intelligent swords.

The Wizard Gaylord sheet lists all of its traits under the heading of “**Personality**.” This too is the term used for them in the Dalluhn Manuscript; e.g., “the player rolls a series of three dice for his personality traits” (II.4). OD&D would later call these traits “abilities.” Overall, in terms of abilities, Dalluhn thus does appear to be a missing link between early Blackmoor and OD&D.

4.6 ALIGNMENT

In the Dalluhn Manuscript, alignment is called “**division**.” For example, a late section in the character creation text reads, “The next major decision is the choosing of the division: Law, Chaos, or Neutral.” (II.3) The Dalluhn text on languages uses “division” this same way: “One can attempt to communicate through the common tongue, language particular to a creature class (orc), or one of the divisional languages (law, etc.). While not understanding the language, creatures who speak a divisional tongue will recognize a hostile one and attack.” (II.5) Intriguingly, this text is almost exactly identical to the corresponding languages section in OD&D, *M&M* pg.12: OD&D contains the constructions “divisional

language" and "divisional tongue" (see Exhibit I), even though it elsewhere calls division "alignment." Even without the existence of the Dalluhn Manuscript, these "divisional language" usages in OD&D imply that at some point in its history, OD&D was edited to replace the term "division" with "alignment," but that the editor neglected to update the language section. These uses of "division" in the OD&D language section are very strong evidence that OD&D accidentally preserves the terminology we see in Dalluhn, and thus that the OD&D text descends from the Dalluhn text.

Note as well that the set of monsters sorted into Law, Neutral and Chaos in Dalluhn Table 1 are almost exactly the same as in the comparable OD&D table in *M&M* (pg. 9): OD&D adds only the Spectre. While there are minor differences in the order of the lists and assignment of monsters to categories, OD&D does not assign an alignment to any creature not specified in the Dalluhn monster list (Table 13). Also, note that neither first-print OD&D nor Dalluhn has Griffons in the alignment table; however, the OD&D errata sheet indicated that Griffons should be assigned to the Neutrality category, and we find them there in subsequent printings. This illustrates Dalluhn's close relationship to the earliest printing of OD&D, rather than later editions.

Finally, in Dalluhn the unaligned category is called "**Neutral**," which preserves the terminology of *Chainmail*, rather than using OD&D's "Neutrality." There is no mention of either "division" or "alignment" in the Mornard Fragments as the surviving sections do not contain direct specifications of characters. Our sole source on the use of "division" is Dalluhn.

4.7 DICE

The Dalluhn Manuscript relies on six-sided dice for most system rolls. The construction "roll a die" or "roll one die" is a common one, and refers to rolling a **d6**, as if there were no need to disambiguate what sort of die to roll. Even in cases where, for example, a table requires one outcome out of eight, typically the Dalluhn Manuscript will require rolling 2d6s rather a d8—as does Table 18 versus its counterpart in *U&WA* (pg. 18).

This is in striking contrast to the Mornard Fragments, which exhibit far greater use of polyhedral dice in otherwise identical contexts. For example, the saving throw table at the end of Fragment D explicitly states that "**saving throws** are with a 20-sided die"—yet Dalluhn Table 16 indicates that saving throws "use 3 dice," clearly implying 3d6 (confusingly, *M&T* pg. 20 does not state explicitly than one rolls a d20 to save, and in fact the numbers required to make saves in OD&D range from 3–16). The values listed in the two tables differ slightly, but nothing obvious about the tables would lead us to identify which version dates first.

Note that there are in Dalluhn several tables that require the resolution of **percentile probability**, most notably the combat tables 14 and 15, but also Table 20 (evading monsters), Table 24 (castle inhabitants) and the various treasure tables (Table 25–27). Numerous references to percentages also pepper the "Glossary of Terms" entries for spells, monsters, and magical items. The Manuscript suggests that these percentile odds can be resolved with either "100% dice" or "a deck of playing cards minus the face cards," (II.23) and the example of combat shows the referee drawing two cards to generate a "to-hit" number. While percentile dice thus warrant a mention in Dalluhn, percentile resolution can be accomplished by other means. The absence of the d20 from combat rolls is especially noteworthy: percentile dice are assessed against 5% increments for twenty outcomes. Although no attack matrix tables survive in the Mornard Fragments, we wouldn't be surprised to find that they used a d20, and that Dalluhn's attack matrix percentile resolutions in Table 14 and 15 are an adaptation for the benefit of those who lack polyhedral dice but can rely on playing cards for resolution.

Does Dalluhn preserve a system from an earlier stage than the Mornard Fragments, when polyhedral dice usage was less frequent than it is in OD&D? Or is there some other explanation for the lack of

polyhedral dice in Dalluhn? A small number of Dalluhn tables (just the “number appearing” listings in Table 13 and the coin ranges in the treasure of Table 25) imply the availability of other polyhedral dice by specifying certain ranges (e.g., 2–24, 1–8), though such dice are never mentioned in the manuscript. Why are those usages intact, but others do not appear in Dalluhn?

This remains a matter of speculation. Polyhedral dice were not widely used by gamers in the spring of 1973: Gary Gygax published an introductory article about polyhedral dice in June 1973 entitled “Four & Twenty and What Lies Between” in which he explicitly mentions that he was “busy working up chance tables for a fantasy campaign game,” certainly referring to the tables that would eventually appear in OD&D. The d20, especially for generating percentile numbers, had been well-known in Lake Geneva since 1971 thanks to *Tractics*, but there is little evidence that any polyhedral dice were in use in the Twin Cities: in the *FFC*, Arneson explicitly says of early Blackmoor that they had “no funny dice back then.” These disparities in the Dalluhn tables may thus reflect regional differences: perhaps drawing cards for percentile numbers was common in the Twin Cities at the time, but percentile dice would be the preferred method in Lake Geneva. Or it may reflect that the intended audience of Dalluhn could not be assumed to possess the dice: it is possible that Dalluhn preserves a **playtesting** system that was tweaked to rely on polyhedral dice as little as possible.

4.8 *ECONOMICS AND EQUIPMENT*

The economic world depicted in the Dalluhn Manuscript has many recognizable vestiges of the initial Blackmoor system. As one striking example, the areas of **investment** for baronies (II.18, see Exhibit F) in Dalluhn are a clear stepping stone between the corresponding list in Blackmoor Scenario 3 (*FFC* pg. 4) and the list in *U&WA* (pg. 24). A very similar comparison, again showing Dalluhn as a stepping stone, can be drawn from the list of specialist personnel; moreover, specialist personnel and castle construction are provided in the same Dalluhn table (Table 23), reflecting their proximity in the Blackmoor notes. Castle construction prices are nearly identical in *U&WA* (pg. 21) and Dalluhn Table 23. The elements listed under “Heavy Construction” in the Scenario 3 notes (*FFC* pg. 5, moats, earth works, palisades, etc.) clearly formed the basis for a set of similar listings in Table 23, which in turn parallels the “Other Construction and Equipment” in OD&D (*U&WA* pg. 21); note that this “Other Construction” listing appears only up to the fourth printing of OD&D.

Another respect in which Dalluhn and Blackmoor show a strong interaction is the prevalence of slavery and other elements of John Norman’s **Gor** setting, references to which pervade the early Blackmoor literature. For example, the Scenario 3 price list in the *FFC* (pg. 5) specifically separates female slaves into categories of “red” or “white,” a reference to the red silk and white silk female slaves of Gor. The Scenario 3 specialist personnel list also stipulates a “Tarn Rider,” and numerous other references to the tarns of Gor exist in early Blackmoor literature (see the reference in the Blackmoor roc text in Exhibit A, for example). Dalluhn exhibits these concepts without tying them specifically to Gor: the female slave no longer has a color coding, and tarns are not mentioned in Dalluhn in favor of more generic flying mounts (the “Tarn Rider” specialist is replaced by a “Flying Animal Rider,” for example). OD&D, however, contains no references to slavery whatsoever, and even the “Flying Animal Rider” is gone. Once again, this positions Dalluhn as a stepping stone between Blackmoor and OD&D.

The structure and contents of the price list (Dalluhn Table 6) also show a decisive interaction with the Scenario 3 Blackmoor notes. The Blackmoor **price list** (*FFC* pg. 4) is broken down into three subcategories: Weapons, Armor and Transportation. Dalluhn has a slightly different break-down of four, comprising Weapons, Armor & Other Equipment, Transportation, and Mounts & Trappings. The Transportation section in particular shows strong ties between Dalluhn and Blackmoor Scenario 3: the prices

of draft horses (30), small carts/wagons (80), wagons (160), rafts (40), merchant ships (5000) and galleys (20000) correspond too closely to be coincidental. The OD&D prices for these same items vary considerably, and moreover the OD&D price list is not broken into subcategories.

Overall, the **equipment** list in OD&D follows Dalluhn fairly closely. The list of weapons is almost identical: the only differences are that the term “bolt” is used in Dalluhn instead of “quarrel” in OD&D, and the pike in Dalluhn is qualified as “pike (or thout lance).” Most strikingly, the order of the weapons is exactly the same; the order of the first twelve weapons, from dagger to pike, adheres to *Chainmail* weapon class order, which is in turn followed by the Wizard Gaylord sheet’s weapon listing. The order of “Armor & Other Equipment” is also the same between Dalluhn and OD&D, though the list of “Other Equipment” in OD&D has a large number of new additions, including all forms of rations and various mundane equipment intended to combat supernatural adversaries (garlic, mirrors, crosses, etc. – and thus the application of these items is similarly missing from Dalluhn Glossary entries for vampires, basilisks, medusae and so on). The price list of “Mounts & Trappings” in OD&D also omits any fantastic mounts as well as their accoutrements (e.g., thout saddles) that we see in Dalluhn.

Finally, taxation plays a far larger role in the Dalluhn Manuscript than it does in OD&D. In Blackmoor, payment of **taxes** was one of the main requirements for being Lawful, and considerable emphasis is placed on proper reporting of earnings and on tax collection in Blackmoor. Dalluhn then describes taxes as “an inevitable result of a profitable trip,” and notes that “besides the usual taxes... an imaginative Referee should be able to come up with a number of ways to part a player from his money.” Cities have city taxes. Guilds exact dues on Magic-users. Even in places where OD&D keeps the system, it doesn’t use the vocabulary of taxes: where Dalluhn requires that “All players must also pay 1% of their minimum [experience points] for taxes,” (II.7) OD&D instead says, “Player/characters must pay gold pieces equal to 1% of their experience points for support and upkeep.” (*U&WA* pg. 24) Taxation further cements the connection between Dalluhn and the early Blackmoor system.

4.9 EXPERIENCE AND LEVELS

The experience text in OD&D is famously opaque. The text in the Dalluhn Manuscript (II.5) presents a complicated system for **experience** that resembles the original Blackmoor system. As Arneson recalled in the *FFC* (pg. 74), “A MU did not progress unless he used Spells, either in the Dungeon or in practice (there was no difference) sessions... there was no automated progression, rather it was a slow step by step, spell by spell progression.” In Dalluhn, Magic-users and Clerics gain experience by casting spells, per Blackmoor. When killing monsters, Fighting-men gain experience equal to the level of the monster divided by the Fighting-man’s level (as do Clerics, when killing monsters not of an opposed alignment or “division.”) Money acquired by Fighting-men converts to experience only on a 10-to-1 basis. There are various experience bonuses for “tense situations” or using “extraordinary cunning.” (II.5) Given the complexity of this system, however, it seems reasonable that OD&D presents a simpler, if ultimately less well articulated, system.

The **level titles** in the Dalluhn Manuscript admit of some internal variance: for example, in Tables 2 and 17, the second-level Cleric is called an “Adept” (as in OD&D), but in Table 4, the second-level Cleric is a “Friar.” In Mornard Fragment A, we see considerable hand corrections around the level titles of the Cleric class, but not for Fighting-men or Magic-users: “Friar” is crossed out as a second-level title for Cleric and replaced with Adept. Similarly, the fourth through seventh level titles, originally given as “Priest,” “Vicar,” “Curé” and “Abbé,” are all struck out by a Gyax correction to “Vicar,” “Curate,” “Bishop” and “Lama.” Later, Fragment D shows exactly the same correction of level titles in the table for turning undead (the corollary of Dalluhn Table 17), though the originals in Mornard for the last two are here given as “Curé” and “Abbé.”

In all Dalluhn tables, as well as Mornard Fragments A, the second and third level titles of the Magic-user in Dalluhn, “Conjurer” and “Seer” respectively, reverse the assignment in OD&D. Note that the text of the “Locate Object” spell in Dalluhn thus scales its spell radius by “20 feet for each level of user above level 3 (Seer).” (I.19) OD&D bases the example on a Necromancer instead. There is further corroboration in the text that a “Conjurer would wind up paying 10 GP a month” to his in taxes, which is one percent of his base minimum experience of 1000 points.

4.10 CHARACTER VS. PLAYER

The Dalluhn Manuscript and Mornard Fragments alike frequently refer to “**players**” or “participants” where OD&D talks about “characters.” This results in subtle but pervasive differences between the drafts and OD&D. In Dalluhn, for example, the Potion of Longevity “reduces up to 10 game-years from the game-age of the player using it.” The same potion in OD&D “reduces 10 game-years from the game-age of the character drinking it.” Similarly, for the Ring of Three Wishes in Dalluhn “greedy players will request three or more wishes,” while in OD&D we learn “greedy characters will request more wishes.” In Dalluhn, experience points are awarded “as players best monsters in mortal combat,” whereas in OD&D they come “as characters meet monsters in mortal combat and defeat them.” While in Dalluhn, “All players... must provision themselves for the journey which lies ahead,” in OD&D “it will be necessary for players to equip their characters” with various items. When it comes to learning languages, in Dalluhn “participants with an intelligence above and not including 10 may learn additional languages,” whereas in OD&D “characters with an Intelligence above 10 may learn additional languages.”

In some spell descriptions, Dalluhn thus contains very alarming constructions, as in the description of the Cleric spell “Curse” that “the **player or character** will die.” The spell “Tranquilize” will similarly “calm any player or character.” Neither appears in OD&D.

Although the distinction between player and character is observed in many places in OD&D, there are passages where the two are conflated—and many of these follow the Dalluhn text very closely. Where in the description for Charisma, we read that the ability may help to decide if “a witch capturing a player will turn him into a swine or keep him enchanted as a lover,” we read in the Appearance text in Dalluhn that “when a male player is captured by a Witch, for example – will she turn him into a swine or keep him for a lover?” The “angry villagers” rules may be invoked “whenever the Referee feels that players have committed some unforgivable outrage” in Dalluhn, and the same is true in OD&D “whenever the referee finds that some player has committed an unforgivable outrage,” rather than a character committing it.

In Dalluhn, non-player characters are called “**Non-real Players**.” In the *First Fantasy Campaign* there is an instance where the text refers to “Real Player Clerics” (p.76) by way of contrast to those controlled by the referee, who would presumably be non-real player clerics. This is however the only *FFC* indication that “non-real players” could be a Blackmoor term. OD&D, when it uses the term “non-player character,” often contrasts that with “player-character” as a hybrid term. Curiously, in the final third of *U&WA*, OD&D begins using the compound term “player/character” very consistently, but that form appears nowhere else in OD&D or in Dalluhn; surely this reflects the late addition of that material in *U&WA* and thus the lack of editorial synchronization with the remainder of the text.

As Dalluhn reproduced the jousting rules from *Chainmail* verbatim, and those rules also discuss players in a way that seems irrelevant to a dungeon exploration game, e.g., “Each player can operate one or several knights to stage a tourney.”

4.11 SETTING ELEMENTS

While the Foreword of OD&D identifies Edgar Rice Burroughs, Robert E. Howard, Fritz Leiber, L. Sprague de Camp and Fletcher Pratt as the primary **inspirations for its setting**, we see in the Dalluhn

Manuscript (II.16) nods to C. S. Lewis for Narnia, John Norman for Gor, Burroughs for Barsoom and Leiber for Lankmar. Throughout the text, there are mentions of thoats and other Barsoomian creatures. The sample character's name, which in OD&D is given as Xylarthern, in Dalluhn is given as Mythrandir (II.4), but that is the only nod to Tolkien apart from elements already present in *Chainmail* such as hobbits, ents, balrogs and so on. While Arneson's 1972 Blackmoor notes frequently mention elements of the Gor setting including tarns (e.g., the Blackmoor roc text shown in Exhibit A), most of these elements have been removed from corresponding sections in Dalluhn (including the investments, and the personnel lists in Table 23) and replaced with more generic references to rocs or "flying animals." However, female slaves feature prominently in several lists, and the mention of the "Caste of Assassins" in the Glossary entry for Assassins (I.25) is surely a direct Gor reference. Note that Howard is completely absent from Dalluhn, including from the "Angry Villagers" section, which in OD&D mentions Conan.

The **sample dungeon** in Dalluhn consists of two maps and a key, and is almost identical to the sample dungeon in *U&WA*. The *U&WA* dungeon includes an additional room, and thus the room key listing has one more entry. The Dalluhn Manuscript is missing dungeon locations "J" and "C." In the dungeon key describing the numbered locations on the map, the first entry is identical, but subsequent ones show some editing, additions and retuning. Interestingly, the description of location 5 is the same, but in the OD&D version it is prepended with the warning, "The combinations here are really vicious, and unless you're out to get your players it is not suggested for actual use," and then appended with the further warning, "(This is sure-fire fits for map makers and among participants.)" This reads like commentary reacting to the existing text in Dalluhn: written later, perhaps after the benefit of playtesting, when it was determined that the entry as it read in Dalluhn was too difficult.

In the Dalluhn Manuscript, the term "**dungeon**" is rare (4 uses). The subterranean locale where parties adventure is more commonly called the "Underworld" (21 uses), as survives in the OD&D book name *Underworld & Wilderness Adventures* as well as its chapter titles within ("The Underworld," "Underworld Monsters"). In Dalluhn, the territory above is called either the "Upper World" or "Upper Land," versus the "Wilderness" (0 uses in Dalluhn) of OD&D.

We see in a few places in Dalluhn that magic is written in a language called **Magi**. While all Magic-users can speak Magi, they have only a chance (based on Intelligence) of being able to read it. Presumably Magic-users who cannot read Magi must cast "Read Magic and Languages" or wear the magical helm with that effect to read scrolls or learn new spells. In OD&D, without casting "Read Magic" all magical writing "is unintelligible to even a Magic-user." (*M&M* pg. 23)

The **characters and locations** mentioned in examples throughout Dalluhn remain a mystery. A mage name mentioned in an example text is Brysbane the Blue. The dwarf in the combat example is named Nargarth. Magic-users in Dalluhn are to be associated with a Guild or Fellowship (the "Fellowship of the White Hand" is given as an example). Clerics should belong to a monastery or Order. The Dalluhn Manuscript makes no mention of either Greyhawk or Blackmoor (albeit, they are little mentioned in OD&D as well). Instead, II.16 states the intention to include a sample map with the following major cities on it: "Cylorn," "Lalkel" (mountainous, near dwarves) and "Nadirh" (forested, near elves). No map appears in the Manuscript, however, as page II.17 is missing. The section divider illustration for "Before Setting Out for Fame and Fortune" contains a signpost referring to an apparent location called "EmWood" and as well a "Lord of Arn." It is currently unknown if any of these elements refer to any existing campaign, or if they were created specifically to serve as examples in Dalluhn.

4.12 OD&D ELEMENTS MISSING FROM DALLUHN

Several large components of *Dungeons & Dragons* are **missing** from the Dalluhn Manuscript. Almost a third of *U&WA* contains rules for naval and aerial combat, neither of which are present in the Dalluhn Manuscript. Nor do we see the example of play (dialog between referee and caller) from *U&WA*. The rules for intelligent swords in *Me&T* are also absent. The many respects that *Chainmail* material integrates into Dalluhn are described above, and similarly we see several tacit but direct appropriations from *Outdoor Survival*: the hex map (with a base move of three hexes per turn for a man on foot), the terrain types (following *Outdoor Survival*, “clear” and then “woods... desert, swamp, river and mountains”), the concept of lost parties, and the random encounter mechanism (rolling a d6 for an encounter on a 5 or 6).

From internal evidence in OD&D, it seems clear that many of the components missing in Dalluhn were added late in the development process. The naval combat subsection of *U&WA* contains systems and descriptions for many monsters (most notably the dragon turtle) not present in the main monster list of *Me&T*. This inconsistency in OD&D is surely a sign of incomplete integration, and thus a late addition. While the “swimmer” encounter charts in *U&WA* (pg. 19) do include these naval monsters, the corresponding Table 19 “swimmer” list in Dalluhn excludes them, which shows that the Dalluhn version of the encounter charts must have been created before the naval combat rules came into play. We know that Dave Arneson originally designed the aerial rules as an independent game called “Battle in the Skies,” which Gygax condensed into a section of *U&WA* towards the end of the OD&D development process. The aerial combat rules similarly contain system elements (like critical hits) that are not yet integrated into the main rules of OD&D. These *U&WA* sections are effectively completely self-contained, almost independent mini-games within OD&D, which are completely absent from Dalluhn.

There are two other small but key sections in *Me&T* which have no corollary in Dalluhn: the “Other Monsters” and “Artifacts” passages. As both show the direction of ongoing development at the time that OD&D was published, they are therefore necessarily elements integrated late into the published product. The “Other Monsters” lists a number of potential monsters that might be specified in the future, including titans, which appear in *Greyhawk*; the “Artifacts” postulate a category of “super-powerful” magical items, an idea that would later be fleshed out in *Eldritch Wizardry*. There are no comparable sections in Dalluhn. Note that there is one monster listed in the “Other Monsters” section of *Me&T* that does appear in Dalluhn: the salamander, which is listed only in Table 12. This anomaly may however be explained by the note in the “Other Monsters” section to the effect that some of its creatures had arisen “in the campaigns associated with the play-testing of these rules.” (pg.20)

The remaining elements missing in Dalluhn are minor. Dalluhn has no mention of spell books. There are in Dalluhn no rules for magical items making saving throws. Paragraph-length sections from *U&WA* on subjects like rumors and “other worlds” are absent from Dalluhn. Much of the introductory material in OD&D has no obvious corollary. Since the second booklet of Dalluhn is incomplete, it is of course possible that there was some lost material included in the full version of the document, but overall, the text that would become the second half of *U&WA* seems to have been in a very preliminary stage of development at the time that the Dalluhn Manuscript was written.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. **Dalluhn enables us to identify elements in OD&D deriving from the Blackmoor system.** By providing a stepping stone in the evolution between surviving Blackmoor records and the published game of *Dungeons & Dragons*, we can safely make some key attributions to Arneson. We see this starkly in the economic system: in the investments (Exhibit F), in specialist personnel, and in the Transportation price list.

Themes from Norman's "Gor" setting that pervaded Blackmoor remain in Dalluhn, although they are absent from OD&D. Also, the names of the character abilities ("Cunning" and "Health" instead of "Wisdom" and "Constitution") follow Blackmoor, and in Dalluhn, they are referred to as "personality" traits, the same term used on Blackmoor sheets. Evidence survives from Blackmoor that "Ego" was once a personality trait as well, per the OD&D magic sword rules. As we see in Exhibit A and elsewhere, some monster description text is also derived from Blackmoor notes.

2. Dalluhn shows how strongly *Chainmail* influenced system development. Dalluhn lets us inspect the roots of OD&D as a Chainmail variant. Most strikingly, the "Melee & Combat" section of Dalluhn builds on the existing text of *Chainmail's* "Man-to-man" melee rules, and it incorporates updated versions of the *Chainmail* Appendix B combat tables which reflect OD&D-style armor class (Exhibit C), as well as incorporating weapon class, which we see in transitional documents like the Wizard Gaylord sheet. In some cases, like the "Light" spell, we see text from *Chainmail* directly incorporated into Dalluhn, but not present in OD&D (Exhibit J). A considerable amount of *Chainmail* language survives in the Dalluhn monster listings, most notably in the "roc" text (Exhibit A).

3. Pre-publication material explains many editorial inconsistencies in OD&D. The most obvious example of this is the lingering "medallions, stones, gems or bracelets" mention in the OD&D elementals text (Exhibit K) as opposed the versions in the magic items listing. Another strong example of lingering Dalluhn concepts is the mentions in OD&D of "divisional languages" for the alignments, where "division" is the Dalluhn term for "alignment" (Exhibit I). The broken references to a missing combat system in OD&D are further evidence of this. Even blunders in the percentile values of OD&D tables (Exhibit D) have clear roots in earlier versions of the tables.

4. Numerous discarded transitional ideas are preserved in Dalluhn. OD&D often provides only murky guidance on key aspects of the system that we find quite explicitly specified in Dalluhn: aside from the combat system, the most notable is surely the experience system. The Dalluhn spell list also contains three spells and a handful of magic items that did not make it into D&D—surely some pruning is a natural part of the design process—and many variant spell effects. Alternate names for many magic items, or even core system concepts like character abilities, non-player characters, and alignment, also survive. We see economic elements that D&D lacks, including details of taxation, magic item auctions, and the sale of captured monsters. Hints of setting elements in play at the time, such as Guilds for Magic-users and Orders for Clerics, as well as the use of Magi as a magic language, and even place-names, provide a further indication of practices forgotten since 1973.

5. Dalluhn permits us to sequence the introduction of ideas to OD&D. Thanks to a consistent view from Chainmail to Blackmoor to the Mornard Fragments to the Dalluhn Manuscript to OD&D, we can sequence the introduction of particular system elements to *Dungeons & Dragons*. Monsters are perhaps easier to sequence, but we can approach spells and magic items with a similar level of specificity: we can see the evolution of spells like "Sleep" via the Cleric "Tranquilize," and track how the spell list expanded beyond Dalluhn with "Spells Above the Usual." In some cases, Dalluhn even exposes other lost sources that the authors of *Dungeons & Dragons* drew upon (Exhibit L). All of this gives us tools that can date key concepts, and thus to identify related pre-publication documents and ephemera with a far greater degree of certainty than before Dalluhn came to light.

The Dalluhn Manuscript shows an important transitional step between the earliest Blackmoor system and *Dungeons & Dragons*. Considered jointly with the Mornard Fragments, it preserves nothing less than a 1973 pre-publication edition of *Dungeons & Dragons* which includes original design decisions that were later abandoned by Gygax and Arneson, making the Dalluhn Manuscript a critical historical resource.

Some relationships between the Dalluhn Manuscript, OD&D and Blackmoor as described in the *FFC*—notably “chops,” the relationship between the “magic sword” spell-casting rules and Dalluhn spell list, the specialist tables, and the orcs misplaced in the dervish text—were first noted by Daniel Boggs. Exhibit B owes to the observations of Geoffrey McKinney. The author would also like to thank Matt Shoemaker and Daniel Boggs for their comments on this analysis.

6. PROVENANCE AND AUTHENTICATION

In 1999, **Keith Dalluhn** acquired this manuscript from M.A.R. Barker along with other documents that clearly date from before 1975, including the earliest known draft of *Empire of the Petal Throne*. While Barker does not appear to have played *Dungeons & Dragons* until early 1974, he had contact with numerous Twin Cities gamers who were among the playtesters of the game, any of whom might have retained a copy of a pre-publication edition of *Dungeons & Dragons*.

More than a decade ago now, Keith Dalluhn reached out to both **Gary Gygax** and **Dave Arneson** regarding this manuscript. For this purpose, Dalluhn created scans focused on the illustrations and tables of the manuscript. Gygax responded that he "took a look, seems to be a rip-off of the D&D game that I've never seen before." Arneson however responded: "It might be 'MY DRAFT!' The one that I sent Gary way back when. OR his first draft back. Either way it is VERY COOL!" Dalluhn was unfortunately not able to provide Arneson with a complete copy of the manuscript before Arneson died. Around that time, Skip Williams, an early TSR employee, was shown “a page” and responded that “it did not sound like Gygax.” The lack of a consensus among the authors of the game about the authenticity of the manuscript has made many despair of ever authenticating it; however, given that none of these responses followed analyses of the complete document, they cannot be considered decisive. Moreover, memories are not always reliable grounds for establishing authenticity of a work, and during the development of OD&D, given many draft documents were doubtless used briefly, no one could have anticipated the need to remember any single one.

In the spring of 1975, Gary Gygax remembered the production of *Dungeons & Dragons* thusly: “When I played in [Arneson’s] ‘Blackmoor’ campaign I fell in love with the new concept and expanded and changed his 20 or so pages of hand-written ‘rules’ into about 100 ms. pages.” Over the decades, Gygax and Arneson gave varying accounts of this process, sometimes describing multiple iterations of drafts: some accounts mention 50 page documents, some 150 page documents. It is not clear what name any of these documents circulated under, though late interviews refer to it as the “**Fantasy Game**.” After authorship of *Dungeons & Dragons* became a subject of legal dispute in the late 1970s, these accounts became more polemical and less reliable. Adhering to Gygax’s earliest account—written before Arneson came to work for TSR, let alone before their subsequent falling out may have tainted the narrative—we should grant the existence of a pre-publication 100 page document, and the Mornard Fragments are a very strong candidate to represent about one quarter of that. The Dalluhn Manuscript clearly does not preserve a working draft, but instead a version intended for distribution; it thus requires a separate explanation.

In order to get a more thorough assessment of the Dalluhn Manuscript, the author of this study contacted a number of players who participated in the playtesting of *Dungeons & Dragons*. This included **Michael Mornard**, the only player to have extensive experience playing in both Greyhawk and Blackmoor before OD&D was published. Mornard studied the entire Dalluhn Manuscript in detail and he concurred with the conclusion of this analysis that the Dalluhn Manuscript preserves an evolutionary step in the

development process between Chainmail, Blackmoor and OD&D. He did not however have any conclusive opinion as to who had editorial control over the Manuscript. Seeing Dalluhn did inspire Mornard to scour his storage areas until he recovered the Mornard Fragments, which played a decisive role in authenticating the document.

David Megarry played in pre-D&D Blackmoor and created the *DUNGEON!* board game. He accompanied Dave Arneson to Lake Geneva when Arneson first demonstrated Blackmoor to Gary Gygax, and remained involved in the ongoing development of the game in the Twin Cities afterwards. Megarry has had the opportunity to study the entire Dalluhn Manuscript in detail, and he believes it is a pre-publication version of D&D, probably one created in the Twin Cities. He judges that the text clearly reflects concepts and stylistic elements consistent with Arneson's output in 1973.

Ernest G. Gygax, Jr. was invited to participate in this analysis, but declined due to time constraints. Robert Kuntz also undertook a study of the Dalluhn Manuscript, but his written results were not available in time to incorporate into this analysis; Kuntz communicated as a preliminary result his belief that M.A.R. Barker was the likely producer of the document, largely because Kuntz believed Barker created the artwork in Dalluhn.

In terms of related documentary evidence, early 1973 is something of a blind spot in the history of *Dungeons & Dragons*. As of June 1, 1973, Gygax and Arneson **reached out** through the gaming fan press (*Gamesletter* Vol. 9 No. 58) to contact gamers about “an extensive set of rules for fantasy campaigns,” with Gygax’s address given as the point of contact. No title was given at the time, and indeed even very late in 1973, after TSR was incorporated, Gygax referred to the game in a letter to the *Great Plains Game Players Newsletter* only as “a fantasy campaign set” rather than giving any title. According to later accounts, Gygax provided copies of rules to interested playtesters, by post, prior to publication (see the *Dragon* #7). We know that Gygax gave Mike Mornard the Fragments at the end of the summer of 1973, when he went away to college, and thus that the system elements it shows must have been produced before that date.

Given the general level of polish of the Dalluhn Manuscript, it does not look like it would have served as just a private draft copy of the game in development, but instead it appears to be something created for broader **distribution**. While the circumstances of the generation of the document remain unknown, it is well within the realm of possibility that the Dalluhn Manuscript was distributed for playtesting. It is a curiosity that Mornard would have a copy of Gygax’s draft notes, but not of the Dalluhn Manuscript, if Dalluhn were created for playtesting—but then again, Mornard likely played with the system captured by the Fragments, and

In mid-1973, it was moreover unclear how the authors would bring *Dungeons & Dragons* to market. Presumably Guidon Games had already passed on the work, and TSR was many months away from being founded. The legal dispute between Gygax and Arneson has unfortunately biased most of the first-hand accounts of this period, especially regarding the respective contributions of the protagonists. Regardless of whether it was used for playtesting, the Dalluhn Manuscript may also represent an early, aborted plan to **publish** the game roughly as is through some channel. What does seem clear is that the purpose for which this manuscript was created has been forgotten. We do not however need to ascertain that purpose, or the circumstances of the document’s production, to learn a great deal about the pre-publication process behind *Dungeons & Dragons*.

The Dalluhn Manuscript is now held by the **Strong Museum** in Rochester, NY, on loan from the collection of the author of this study.

7. DOCUMENT PRODUCTION

While the study above concludes that the Dalluhn Manuscript reflects a mix of material generated by Arneson and Gygax, and that this material predates and anticipates the published *Dungeons & Dragons*, establishing precisely who typed the body text and generated the illustrations remains a separate and significant question. The primary forms of salient evidence in the document are threefold: the two typewriters that produced the body text and page numbers; the two apparent hands that illustrated the dungeon maps and the figural illustrations; and finally the display typefaces (Victor Moscoso and Old English) on the section divider pages and apparent title page. Numerous open questions remain on these matters.

The author of this analysis assembled extensive samples of the **handwriting** and artwork of Gygax and Arneson, and then contracted with a forensic expert in questioned document examination to attempt to ascertain the hands that drew various elements of the Dalluhn Manuscript. The hand that drew that Dalluhn dungeon maps in particular has obvious similarities to the hand that drew the same maps in OD&D (see Exhibit G). Linda L. Mitchell of Forensic QDE Lab reported the following: “In my expert opinion, it is more likely than not that the Dungeon Map, page II.12, was annotated by Gary Gygax. The handwriting of page II.25 and the Dungeon Levels, page II.11 are minimal, providing little help with identification of the writer. While I cannot exclude the possibility of another writer, there is no evidence within these writings that would suggest a writer other than Gary Gygax.” While this opinion may help to guide further research, it is not presented as a certainty; Gygax’s hand is notoriously difficult to identify, as he whimsically experimented with styles and frequently alternated between cases and scripts mid-sentence, or sometimes even mid-word. Note that we see such a switch between upper case and lower case in the word “secret” in the Dalluhn dungeon map key; the staff of the “g” and the two different styles of “a” in “passage” are similarly characteristic of Gygax’s hand.

The **artwork** remains perhaps the largest single mystery of the Dalluhn Manuscript. The lack of any illustrations in common between Dalluhn and OD&D casts considerable doubt on the dating and production of the document, especially as there are overlaps in the monsters depicted (the hydra and gargoyle). We know that Keenan Powell produced his monster illustrations for the published text of *Dungeons & Dragons* largely in June and July 1973, and thus that OD&D’s production was already underway at that point; we might take that as evidence that the Dalluhn Manuscript must date to before that time. But even if this would help us to explain why OD&D’s illustrations don’t appear in Dalluhn, it doesn’t explain why none of Dalluhn’s illustrations survive in OD&D? This question unfortunately lends itself to very subjective comparisons of the respective quality of these works of art, which serve only to distract us from the key. Given that all of the figural illustrations in Dalluhn occupy “filler” white space at the end of pages, or reside on unnumbered pages, it is entirely possible that these images were added after the document was distributed by its original editor: it could have been the case, for example, that Gygax oversaw the production of the body text and the dungeon maps, but Arneson (or some other Twin Cities third party) added the illustrations without furnishing them to Gygax—perhaps because the set of illustrations were unfinished, as the missing section divider pages might suggest. However, if Arneson himself drew these illustrations, the hydra is a peculiar case, as we attribute a different hydra illustration in OD&D (*U&WA* pg. 1) to Arneson. Another hypothesis is that the printing process used for *Dungeons & Dragons* may have required art to be done through a particular process, perhaps on special paper or with specific implements. It is also possible that the Dalluhn Manuscript was temporarily lost during the development of OD&D, as apparently was the *Blackmoor* manuscript two years later, or that some similar logistical reason made it impossible to use the images. Or there might have been some rights issue. We have no shortage of hypotheses, but further research is required to unearth evidence that might steer us towards one or another.

The body text **typewriter** of Dalluhn does not correspond to the personal typewriters commonly employed by either Gygax or Arneson—unlike the Mornard Fragments, which are an obvious match for Gygax’s typewriter. However, similar “polished” pre-publication documents by these authors, including *Arbela*, *War of the Empires*, *Don’t Give Up the Ship*, and *Ships of the Line*, also were not typed with personal typewriters associated with the authors. There are other plausible candidates for the typewriter that produced the body text of the Dalluhn Manuscript. It was typed on the same model typewriter that produced the *Domesday Book* under the editorship of the Schleicher family (Nos. 6–11). The *War of the Empires* (1969) play-by-mail record was also typed on the same model typewriter. This same model typewriter also produced the *IFW Monthly* issues under the editorship of Phil Pritchard (1969–1970). As such, there are multiple candidates whom Gygax and Arneson knew personally that either might have enlisted as typists for the body text. The primitive reproduction technologies of the fanzines and the Dalluhn Manuscript itself, however, render forensic comparison of the type too tenuous to draw any certain conclusions. Furthermore, the typewriter model that generated the page numbers (which features a very distinctive “4”) has not to date been observed in any other contemporary documents, though work is ongoing to identify potential candidates.

The consistent appearance of the Old English **typeface** in International Federation of Wargaming fanzines, especially the *International Wargamer*, may suggest that the section divider title pages originated from IFW circles. This typeface appears in several advertisements for the Castle & Crusade Society in 1971, as well as on the cover of *Chainmail*. Old English is however a common typeface. The Victor Moscoso variant used for the “... Beyond This Point Be Dragons ...” typeface is far more rare and distinctive, and more likely to narrow potential candidates for producing the illustrations in the Dalluhn Manuscript.

Ultimately, more evidence and study is needed before any definitive statement can be made about the circumstances in which this document was produced. But again, establishing that OD&D derived from the rules preserved in the Dalluhn Manuscript does not hinge on the resolution of these questions.

7.1 OTHER ARGUMENTS FOR AUTHORSHIP

Before the Mornard Fragments were discovered, Daniel Boggs argued that the Dalluhn Manuscript represents **Arneson’s revision** of a lost, pre-D&D manuscript generated by Gygax. Boggs pointed to a 1979 (post-lawsuit) claim by Arneson that he had authored a “final draft version” which contained ideas that Gygax never integrated into D&D, and identified the Dalluhn Manuscript as that document. Boggs based his argument on Arneson’s own assessment that Dalluhn might be his draft (albeit, Arneson seemed equally amenable to the idea it was Gygax’s draft), from the clear derivation of certain passages of Dalluhn from Blackmoor rules, and from his assessment that the illustrations, writing style, and some handwriting resembled Arneson’s work. The case for this being a belated Arneson draft of OD&D faces a number of difficulties, however.

First, the Mornard Fragments show that Gygax personally worked on this system, including on many of the respects that the system differs from published OD&D, and thus that it did not reflect some **independent** effort of Arneson’s. Furthermore note the many internal forms of evidence (Exhibits B, D, I and K especially) showing that the final editor(s) of *Dungeons & Dragons* did have access to these variant system concepts as preserved in the Dalluhn Manuscript, which argues that this system did not arise outside of OD&D’s development process.

Second, elements of OD&D that Arneson certainly provided do not appear in the Dalluhn Manuscript. Notably, the detailed rules for magic swords in OD&D are based on a set of Arneson rules reproduced in the *FFC*. If the Dalluhn Manuscript represents Arneson’s final contribution, why would it omit those rules? Since clearly Gygax did see the **magic swords** rules in time to incorporate them into OD&D, and since they were apparently sent after the Dalluhn Manuscript was compiled, the Dalluhn Manuscript

cannot reflect Arneson's "final" draft. Other elements of the rules that originate with Arneson, such as the naval combat systems in *U&WA*, are also absent from Dalluhn. The absence of these elements impacts earlier charts as well: for example, the "swimmer" encounter charts in *U&WA* include monsters only mentioned in those naval rules, such as the dragon turtle, and in the corresponding Dalluhn chart (Table 19) those monsters are missing. How could Dalluhn then be Arneson's final draft, or even a late draft?

Third, Arneson documented his concerns with the final version of *Dungeons & Dragons* in a 1974 letter to Scott Rich. He claims for example that Gygax misinterpreted **hit points**, where the intended system for hit points was one in which characters rolled for an initial hit point total (between 1 and 36) and never gained hit points as they advanced in level. This system is obviously different from hit points in the Dalluhn Manuscript. If Arneson saw fit to note this in a 1974 letter, that why would his own "final draft version" not include his preferred system?

If it is not a "final" draft, Dalluhn could of course be a draft earlier in the collaboration—so could it be an earlier draft generated by Arneson? Broadly, the structure and layout of the document are out of keeping with other Arneson manuscripts of the era; it is of a far higher **editorial caliber** than other work Arneson generated by himself. It was clearly produced with access to print shop typefaces or Letraset, unlike any contemporary Arneson products (including *Corner of the Table*). Moreover, Dalluhn does not contain any of the familiar idiosyncrasies of Arneson's own editing: failure to put spaces after punctuation, difficulty managing the letter "e" before suffixes, confusing "it's" for "its," and continual, severe grammatical and spelling errors. Arneson was well aware of his failings as a typist and editor: he wrote in a 1974 letter that he had discontinued *Corner of the Table* until he could "get someone who could type AND spell."

Arneson could conceivably have engaged a third party to type and edit a draft—but of course, so could Gygax. Given that Arneson was in the middle of developing this commercial game with Gygax, who had edited Arneson's work in the past, would Arneson give his text to a third party to edit in order to then send that edited text to his primary editor, Gygax? We can compare the Dalluhn Manuscript against earlier collaborations of Gygax and Arneson, most notably *Don't Give Up the Ship* (1972), for which we have surviving drafts from both authors. We can see how those rules initially written by Arneson were subsequently revised by Gygax and determine if these changes are consistent with the stylistic adjustments we see in examples like Exhibit A. We can draw similar comparisons between the "magic swords" rules in the *FFC* and the resulting text in *Me&T*. While the details of this analysis are outside the scope of this document, the editorial changes from early Arneson drafts to the finished text are clearly analogous to the editorial process that transpired between the Loch Gloomen Blackmoor notes and the text of the Dalluhn Manuscript.

While the Dalluhn Manuscript contains many elements that obviously derive from Arneson's Blackmoor campaign—as it should, given that D&D was literally built from the Blackmoor system—this alone does not argue that Arneson personally produced the document. Dalluhn shows signs of **collaboration** between multiple authors, and regardless of where any given idea originated, the question at hand must be which of the two primary collaborators would have edited a manuscript with these properties. The editorial level of the document suggests that would be Gygax. *DGUTS* (and subsequently *Ships of the Line*) established a pattern of collaboration in which Gygax produced finished copy from Arneson's drafts that would surely be followed in the production of OD&D. Given the layout and illustrations of the Dalluhn Manuscript, it seems more indicative of a distributed publication than a draft circulated between co-authors. Moreover, early sources attest that Gygax was the point of contact for playtesters, as we see in the June 1973 outreach notice, which gives as his contact address rather than Arneson's.

It has also been proposed that the Dalluhn Manuscript is the work of a **third party**, as there were reportedly numerous "fan" variants of D&D produced in the late 1970s. This view also faces significant challenges. First of all, any third party would need access to the pre-D&D Blackmoor and *Chainmail* material

that this manuscript preserves, material like the Mornard Fragments, which significantly limits the pool of potential authors. The complete lack any post-1974 concepts in the manuscript (including Dexterity, as well as later spells, monsters or classes) also seems incompatible with a later third party producing the work. Effectively, only a playtester would have access to the necessary materials from this stage of development, and it seems highly unlikely that a playtester would create an effectively competing manuscript, one that liberally plagiarizes the playtest notes and the published *Chainmail* game, given the violation of trust this implies.

Moreover, since the Manuscript shows clear signs of collaboration in typing and artwork, it could not be the work of a sole fan, but must instead be the work of a **team**. This therefore could not be an individual's attempt to reorganize the work for personal use. Enlisting a group of enthusiasts for such an enterprise, based on pre-publication material, at such an early date, for the purposes of producing an alternate version of D&D, also seems unlikely.

Finally, if the authors of the manuscript were not Gygax and Arneson, we would expect to see signs of **variation**. There is not a single monster in the Dalluhn Manuscript that is not in OD&D. There is not a single table in the Dalluhn Manuscript that does not have a corollary in OD&D. All major elements of the system of Dalluhn can be shown to correspond to elements of *Chainmail*, Blackmoor or the finished OD&D game. The few ideas that appear only in Dalluhn are minor ones that fall well within the margins we should expect from developmental pruning. Dalluhn makes no mention of OD&D or its booklets, which would also be unusual, if not unique, among the variants produced in that era. For these reasons, it seems quite unlikely that Dalluhn could have been produced outside the *Dungeons & Dragons* development process, and is surely a product of the ongoing collaboration between Gygax and Arneson towards *Dungeons & Dragons*.

SOURCES

Anonymous. Untitled dungeon adventure rules [Dalluhn Manuscript]. 2 vols. n.p.: n.d. (1973?)

Arneson, David L. *First Fantasy Campaign*. Decatur, IL: Judges Guild, 1977. The "Scenario 3" notes appear on pg. 3–5, the "Loch Gloomen" notes on pg. 86–92, and the 1973 "magic swords" notes on pg. 67–70.

Boggs, Daniel. "Analysis of a D&D Archaeological Mystery," last modified May 14, 2012, <http://odd74.proboards.com/index.cgi?action=display&board=dragonsatdawn&thread=7199&page=1#95766>

Dunnigan, James. *Outdoor Survival*. Baltimore: Avalon Hill, 1972.

Gygax, E. Gary. "Four and Twenty and What Lies Between." In *Lowrys Guidon* #5. Belfast, ME: 1973.

Gygax, E. Gary. "Origins of the Game." In *Dragon* #7. Lake Geneva, WI: Tactical Studies Rules. 1977

Gygax, E. Gary. Letter. In *Great Plains Gameplayers Newsletter* #6. Ed. Jim Lurvey. Vermillion, SD: 1973.

Gygax, E. Gary. Letter. In *Alarums & Excursions* #2. Ed. Lee Gold. Los Angeles, CA: 1975.

Gygax, E. Gary and David L. Arneson. Advertisement for fantasy campaign rules. In *Gamesletter* Vol. 9 No. 58. Ed. Don Miller. Wheaton, MD: 1973.

Gygax, E. Gary and David L. Arneson. *Dungeons & Dragons*. Lake Geneva, WI: Tactical Studies Rules, 1974. In three vols., *Men & Magic*, *Monsters & Treasure*, and *Underworld & Wilderness Adventures*. Also fourth printing, 1975.

Gygax, E. Gary and David L. Arneson. Untitled dungeon adventure rules [Mornard Fragments]. n.p: n.d (1973).

Gygax, E. Gary and Jeff Perren. *Chainmail*. Evansville, IN: Guidon Games, 1971. Also 2nd edition, 1972. Page numbers given here are for second edition.

McKinney, Geoffrey. "BTPBD/Dalluhn certainly is pre-1974," last modified September 23, 2012, <http://odd74.proboards.com/index.cgi?action=display&board=dragonsatdawn&thread=7842&page=1#103408>

Peterson, Jon. *Playing at the World*. San Diego: Unreason Press, 2012. The "Wizard Gaylord" sheet is reproduced on pg. 367.

MAPPING DALLUHN TO OD&D AND MORNARD

The following charts show, for the subsections of the three booklets comprising OD&D, which corresponding sections appear in the Dalluhn Manuscript. If there is no corresponding section in Dalluhn, a dash is given; cases where there exists a corresponding section but it represents a substantial departure from the text in OD&D are marked with an asterisk. Due to the large number of subsections in the *U&WA* volume, the mapping requires more references than the other booklets. While this list is not completely exhaustive, a more detailed mapping that addressed text below the section level would find a similar amount of correspondence. Re-arranging the text of the Dalluhn Manuscript to allow a side-by-side comparison with OD&D is left as future work.

Men & Magic to Dalluhn Manuscript

Foreword/Introduction/Scope/Equipment	-
Preparation for the Campaign	II.2
Characters	II.2
Character Alignment, Including Various Monsters and Creatures	Table 1
Determination of Abilities	II.4
Bonuses and Penalties to Advancement due to Abilities	Table 3
Languages	II.4
Non-player Characters	II.6
Loyalty / Relatives	II.7
Basic Equipment & Costs	Table 6
Weight which can be carried	Table 7
Example encumbrance	II.6
Weights and Equivalent	Table 8
Levels and Number of Experience Points Necessary to Attain Them	Table 2
Statistics Regarding Classes	Table 4
Experience Points	II.5 *
Dice for Accumulative Hits	II.4
Spells & Levels	II.5 *
Fighting Capability	II.6
Levels above those Listed	II.29 *
Attack Matrix I	Table 14
Attack Matrix 2	Table 15
Saving Throw Matrix	Table 16
Spells Table	Table 5
Cleric vs. The Undead	Table 17
Explanation of Spells (pg 23-34)	I.19-24
Magical Research	II.29
Books of Spells	-

Monsters & Treasure to Dalluhn Manuscript

Monster Reference Table, Hostile & Benign Creatures	Table 13
Special Ability & Attack/Defense	-
Monster Descriptions (pg5-21):	I.24 – I.30
Treasure Types	Table 25
Magic/Maps Determination	Table 26
Swords/Armor (pg23-27):	Table 27
Swords (pg27-30):	-
Swords, Armor and Misc Weapons	I.30
Potions	I.30
Scrolls	I.31
Rings	I.31
Wands/Staves	I.31
Misc Magic	I.32
Magic Items Saving Throws	-
Artifacts	-
Treasure	Table 8, II.27

Underworld & Wilderness to Dalluhn Manuscript

Sample Cross Section of Levels	II.11
Sample Level	II.12
Sample Map of Underworld Level	II.10
Tricks and Traps	II.13
Distribution of Monsters & Treasure	-
Unguarded Treasure	-
Maintaining Freshness	II.14
Movement/Turn in the Underworld	II.6
Secret Passages	II.10
Text on listening, light, etc	II.13
Surprise	II.13 *
Wandering Monsters	II.13
Monster Determination and Level of Monster Matrix	Table 11
Monster Level Tables	Table 12
Avoiding Monsters	II.14
Random Action by Monsters	-
Example of Referee Moderating a Dungeon Expedition (pg12-14)	-
The Wilderness	II.16 *
Castles	II.19
Type of Guards/Retainers in Castle	Table 22
Castle Resident	Table 24
Movement (table):	Table 21
Large Party Movement/Terrain Penalty/Rest	II.18
Wilderness Monsters	II.19
Lost Parties	Table 18*
Wilderness Wandering Monsters (table):	Tables 18, 19
Evading in the Wildness	Table 20
Pursuit	-
Construction of Castles & Strongholds	Table 23
Specialists	Table 23 * (listed in table but not explained)
Men at Arms Classification (table):	Table 9
Rumors/Information/Legends	-
Player/Character Support and Upkeep	II.7
Baronies	II.16 (Investments II.18)
Angry villagers	II.16
Other Worlds	-
Land Combat	* (But Melee & Combat II.23)
Aerial Combat (pg25-28)	-
Naval Combat (pg28-33)	-
Underwater Monsters (pg33-35)	-
Healing:	II.25
Time	-
Afterword	-

Mornard Fragments to Dalluhn Manuscript (Tables)

A	
6 (inc.) Experience for Advancement	Table 3 (MM:11)
6–7 Statistics Regarding Types/Classes	Table 4 (MM:16–17)
B	
19 Underworld text, “Monster Determination & Level”	Table 11 (UWA:10)
20–21 [“Wandering”] Monsters (per level)	Table 12 (UWA:10–11)
C	
24–25 Monsters Hostile and Benign	Table 13 (MT:3–4)
26 Castle Inhabitants	Table 22 (UWA:15)
27 Outdoor encounter table	Table 18 (UWA:18)
28–29 Die for Type of Adventure	Table 19 (UWA:18–19)
30 Treasure for men	Table 24 (UWA:19)
30–31 Prize Matrix (Exhibit M)	Table 25 (MT:22)
D	
39 Spell List and Explanation	Table 5 (MM:21–22)
40 Clerics vs. Undead	Table 17 (MM:22)
41–46 Magic Items and Maps	Table 26 and 27 (MT:23–27)
47 Beginning of Part II	
47 Saving Throw Table	Table 16 (MM:20)
E	
61 Dragon types	Table 29 (MT:11)
61 Dragon vulnerabilities	- (MT:12)
F	
Clean up crew	-