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69 studies by 48 composers from 16 countries competed. Viktor Razumenko (St Petersburg) judged the formal tourney himself. The provisional award appeared in Zadachy i Etyudy 42, 5i2007 with a 2 month confirmation time.

Report: “The standard was high, though there was no one outstanding study. Never wishing to offend, after consulting colleagues and the computer, I decided not to distinguish within categories of prize, honourable mention, and commendation.”


“A superb study in the classic mode by a talented pupil of the unforgettable Tolya Kuznetsov.”


6.Kd5/iv Sfx3 7.g6 Sh4 8.g7 Sf5 9.g8Q (g8S? bxc6;) Se7+ 10.Kd6 Sxg8 11.c7 Se7 12.Kd7 (Kxe7? Kxc7;) and the zugzwang is decisive in White’s favour due to the occupation of b6 by bK.

i) Ka7 2.Qxd8 b1Q 3.Qa5+ Kb8 4.Qe5+ Ka7 5.Qxc3, when White wins.


iii) This blocks a square that will be important in the finale, but Ka7 5.bxc6 bxc6 6.g6 wins.


“The avid play by both sides keeps us on our toes right to the last move. This work by the pair from different towns certainly comes off.”

**No 17045** Nikolay Ryabinin (Russia). Despite Black being ahead White still plays: 1.Bd5/i, with:
No 17045 N. Ryabinin

prize

f7h8 0813.03 4/7 Win

- Rxd5 2.Rxf5 c6/iii 3.Rf6/iii Kh7 4.Rg1 Rh5 5.Rg7+Kh8 6.Rg5 Rh7+ 7.Kf8 Ra7 8.Rh6+ Rh7 9.Rg8 mate, or

i) 1.Be2? cRc5 2.Rf4 Re5 3.Bc4 Sg3 4.Rxh4+ Rh5 5.Rxh5+ Rxh5 draw.


“A pair of echo-mates from the very special enthusiast from the heart of Russia, whom we congratulate on his recent 50th birthday.”

No 17046 V. Kalashnikov & S. Osintsev

prize

No 17047 O. Pervakov

prize

b2d1 4044.13 5/7 Win


“Both 3.Ka4!! and 6.Bg8!! are great points to set any chess player’s pulse racing, despite the relative complexity of the delving.”


v) Gaining c2 as a flight square for bK.... and is there something else?!

“A complex symbiosis: wQ offers herself twice over, wS three times, and on top of that there are the bB moves (3...Bh4? and 3...Bf2!), the ‘logic’ of blocking d4, and the concluding epaulette checkmate. Everything executed by the Muscovite GM with engaging directness and neatness.” AJR is tickled by wK being forced away from the action to a2 on the edge, while in fact clearing a path for wQ to mate – from b1 to b3.

No 17048

N. Rezvov & S.N. Tkachenko

prize

h8e4 3082.10 6/4 Draw

No 17048


ii) Thanks to 2.Sc7+ the white pieces are now working smoothly.

“Both sides contribute dramatic play in creative tension from start to finish. A great work by the famous Ukrainian duet!”

No 17049

Aleksei Sochnev (Russia).


“Black promotion is inevitable. The basis of the play is the zugzwang miracle, White hero-
ically forcing the opponent to accept a humiliating draw.”

No 17050 M. Gromov special prize


i) Sb8 2.bRxb8+ Ka7 3.Ra8+ Kb7 4.c6 mate.


iii) Kxa6 6.Ra8+ Kb5 7.Sc3+.


“Mate with promoted knight that conducts a roundabout manoeuvre over practically the whole board! This windfall study instantly lodges in the memory in spite of the forcing play from beginning to end.”


i) 2.Rg2+? Kf1 3.Rh2 a1Q 4.Rh1+ Kf2 5.Rxa1 Rxa1 6.h7 Ra3+ draw.

No 17052 V. Maksaev honourable mention


i) Qc8 5.Bf3+ Kg6 6.Rg4+ Kf5 7.Rg5 mate.

ii) 3.Bc2+ (??) Kg4 4.Bd1+ Kf5 is an artificial prolongation.


“Not that complex, but it holds the interest!”

No 17053 D. Gurgenidze

honourable mention

No 17054 Vladimir Katsnelson (Russia). Hardly surprisingly, game-like, as the composer regularly plays otb. [AJR played memorably enjoyable quick games with him in his St Petersburg flat some years ago.] 1.d6? Rxd2 2...Kh6 and 3...g5 mate. 1.Kg4? Rxd5 is a draw. So: 1.c6, with:


ii) AJR: in the award this line and its offshoots are presented as co-main line. 2...Rc2 3.d6 (Bb6? Rg2;) Rxc5(ix) 4.d7/x, with a win, eg: Rd5 5.Kg4 Rd4 6.c7.

iii) 4.c7? g5+ 5.Kh5 Rc2 6.d6 f3 7.d7 Rc4 and 8...Rh4 mate.

iv) 5.c7? g5+ 6.Kh5 Rxf3+ 7.Kg4 Rc3 8.d7 Kg6 leads to mate.

v) 2.Bc5? g5+ 3.Kg4 Rd3 4.h4 f5+.

vi) g5 3.c7 Rc2 4.d6 Kg6 5.Bd4 wins.


ix) g5+ 4.Kh5 Rxc5 5.d7.

x) Another nice try: 4.c7? g5+ 5.Kg4/ix Rc3 6.h4 Kg6 7.h5+ Kf7 8.d7 Ke6 9.e8Q Rg3 mate, the h5 square having been actively self-blocked.

xi) 5.Kh5 f3 6.d7 Rc4 mating.

“The first line has interesting tries, while all efforts to win with 2.Bc5 in the second line fail. However, there is another method, which didn’t work before. The St Petersburg composer has given us a curious and rare treatment of this involved theme that has everything except sharp points. In other words the theme leads to long variations and beauti-
ful tries. Who knows if this is a new (or long forgotten old!) direction for studies to take?!”

No 17055
L. González (Spain).
i) 4.f8B? Rb5 5.Kh1 Rh5+ 6.Bh2 Rc8, and Black wins.
vi) Ke6 12.h7 Rxe7 13.Bh6 and bR is caught.

“Despite wK’s hazardous location, with the active aid of the infantry under officer leadership (one had promotion!) White wins freedom and the game with a victorious ‘Hurrah!’.”

No 17056
I. Akobia & R. Becker (USA).

No 17055 L. González
honourable mention

h1g4 0610.74 9/7 Win

No 17056 I. Akobia & R. Becker
honourable mention

e3g1 0136.11 3/5 Draw


xvi) 25.Re8? Bg7 26.Re2+ Kg3 wins.


“A dynamic positional draw. We are dazzled by them all. The unique transatlantic ‘computer + human’ pairing has produced another utterly OK but exceptionally tough work to solve.”


vi) 7.d6? Be5 8.Kc8 Sxd6+ wins. “Improbable, but true: such enthralling play out of such a simple minor piece position!”

No 17058 S. Didukh honourable mention

3.Sf5+ exf5+ – the check is important! So:


“Adding two pieces to Rinck’s classic sketch has introduced two organic thematic tries.”

No 17060 E. Fomichev commendation

c6a4 0431.10 4/3 Win

No 17060 Evgeny Fomichev (Russia). It looks like being a fighting draw. We shall see.

i) Sidelining the dangerous pawn, but bK is now on the chessboard ropes.


“To the taste of the ‘masses’!”

No 17062 M. Croitor commendation

h1a8 0831.11 5/5 Draw


“This could be of practical application. Moves 6 and 7 can be transposed.”

No 17063 L. Topko

No 17064 V. Vlasenko

No 17065 P. Gargolin


ii) Bxh1 6.f3+, winning a black piece.


“After the initial swap-offs White finagles a reci-zug to wriggle out of being checkmated.”


i) A great find by our man in Kharkov region! Not 3.Sxg5? because of the stalemate defence, and not 3.Sf6? either, because the key square d4 will not be reached in two moves.


“The ‘almost’ St Petersburger (he lives in Sosnovoi Bor) has cleverly put together several known ideas.”
Nona 2008

The Georgian Chess Club NTN (Nona-Tigran-Nana) organized the tourney named after IGM Nona Gaprindashvili. 76 studies were received from 35 composers from 19 countries. IGM David Gurgenidze judged the tourney. The provisional award was published on Iuri Akobia’s website on 1vii2008 and sent to all participants. The award became definitive on 20ix2008.

Main nominations

No 17066 Y. Bazlov

1st prize

No 17067 I. Akobia

2nd prize

h7e7 4443.10 5/5 Win

b3e3 4400.11 4/4 Win


ii) 10.d8Q Qe4+ 11.Kg5 Qe3+ draw.

“It takes a high-grade study to give us a real fight: here Black invokes stalemate defences, against which White conjures up checkmate. Even the static wRa7 scarcely spoils the wonderful impression.”

No 17067 Iuri Akobia (Georgia). The initial position looks equal, but White has a useful initiative. 1.Qa7+, with two thematic lines:


  • Qg5 15.Qf7+ Ke3 16.Rg6/vi Qe5/vii 17.Rg3+ Ke4/viii 18.Qf3+/ix Ke5 19.Kg5+, Q-win on the rank, or
  • Rh3+ 15.Qxh3 Qxd6 16.Qh2+, Q-win on the diagonal.


iii) 4.Qxb5+? Ke4 5.Re2+ Kf3 draw.


v) Kg6 (Kh6) 14.Rd6, Q-pin 5.


vii) Qe5 17.Re6, Q-pin 6.
x) Kd5 9.Rd2, Q-pin 1.
“The domination theme, with six (echoed) Q-pin wins, embellished with all kinds of linear Q-wins lifting the artistic level.”

No 17068 O. Pervakov 3rd prize

i) First firing of the battery.
ii) This intermediate check is important.
iv) The battery fires a second time...
v) ... and a third.
“The P/B battery fires three times, showing high technique. But Black has little more than a supporting role.”

i) Thematic try: 2.Rc4? Qxc4 3.Rxa4+ Kxa4 4.b3+ Qxb3 5.cxb3+ Ka3 (Kxb3? Kh5)

No 17070 N. Kralin 5th prize

ii) 3.c8Q? Sbd2+ 4.Ke2 f1Q+ wins.
“The promoted knight moves with precision corner-to-corner to bring about the draw.”

No 17071 M. Hlinka
6th prize

No 17071 Michal Hlinka (Slovakia).


ii) c6+ 4.Rxb8 Rhxh2 5.Rb1 draw.


“Interesting and sharp play, with combina-
tive ideas by both sides.”

“Fresh nuances in some of the next six are attention-worthy.”

No 17072 Günter Amann (Austria).


vi) An intermediate attempt threatening Kb3.

v) Or else b3+, followed by Sd2+.


No 17073 Y. Afek
honourable mention

No 17073 Yochanan Afek (Israel/The Netherlands).


i) An intermediate attempt threatening Kb3.

iv) Or else b3+, followed by Sd2+.


No 17074 Wieland Bruch & Martin Minski
(Germany).
1.Kh7 (Kf7)? Sxa6. 1.g3+? Kg4.
No 17074  W. Bruch & M. Minski
honourable mention

\[
g6h4 0446.10 4/5 \text{Draw}
\]


No 17075  L. González
honourable mention

\[
b6f7 0126.03 4/6 \text{Draw}
\]


\[

– Kc6 12.Rc7+ Kxc7 stalemate, or
– Kc8 12.Rb8+ Kxb8 stalemate.


No 17076  A. Sochnev
honourable mention

\[
h8c3 0404.11 4/4 \text{Draw}
\]


"In my judgement fresh features are lacking in the remaining nine studies – ahead of the special section."

No 17078 G. Amann

d2b1 3243.33 7/7 Win


iii) a4 7.Ra5 Qxa5 8.Bxa5 draw.


No 17079 V. Bartosh

e2h1 0046.62 8/6 Win


– Be8 5.Bf5/ii Sg5 6.Kf1 Sg3 7.b5 Bxb5 8.d7 Bxd7 9.Bxd7 Sd2+ 10.Kf2 Se4+ 11.dxe4 and wins, or


iii) 11.Kg3? Kg1 12.d7 h1Q 13.e8Q draw.

No 17080 S. Hornecker

d4e6 0414.21 6/4 BTM, Win

No 17080 Siegfried Hornecker (Germany). 1...Kf7 2.Rg7+/i Kxf8 3.Rg6 f5/ii 4.Sh6 Sxf4

No 17081 G. Josten

No 17081 Gerhard Josten (Germany).
   i) Sh2 5.Rg2 Be5 6.Kf7 g3 7.Kg6 draw.
   iii) Se5 12.Re2 Sc4 13.Rg2 draw.

No 17082 J. Mikitovics

No 17082 János Mikitovics (Hungary).
   i) b4 2.Kd3 Kh5 3.h4 Rxh4 4.Rf5+ draw.

No 17083 J. Pospíšil

No 17083 Jaroslav Pospíšil (Czech Republic).
   ii) 3.e4? Bf7 4.Kxf3 Kd6 5.c7 Kd7 wins.
No 17084 P. Rossi & M. Campioli
commendation

1.f6/i Se3 2.fxe3 f2 3.Sxf2 Sf5 4.f7 Se7 5.f8R (f8Q? h1Q+;) Sf5 6.Rb8/ii Sxe3

i) 1.Sxg3? Se3 2.fxe3 f2 wins.

ii) 6.Rxf5? h1Q+ 7.Sxh1 stalemate. 6.Sh1?
Sxe3 7.Rf2 Sf1 8.Rxf1 draw.

Another commendation was G. Popov g6g4
0014.24 a2h1d4.g2g3b6f6g5g7 5/6, win: with
5.Bf7. HH wonders how this can be over-
looked!

Also a commendation by V. Shkril was
cooked by MG: h2e8 0860.22 f5g6a1a8b7e1.
a5c5a7h5 5/7, draw:

1.Re6+ Kd7 2.Rd6+ Ke8 3.Rf8+ Kc7
4.Rf7+ Kb8 5.Rd8+i Bc8 6.c6 Rb1 7.a6 Ba5
8.Rb7+ Rxb7 9.Rxc8+ Kxc8 10.cxb7+ Kb8
draw. 5.c6 is given as a try: Ra2+ 6.Kh1
Bxc6+ 7.Rxc6 Bxa5 8.Ra6 Ra4 9.Rh6 Re4
wins, but MG plays 6.Kg1 with Bf2+ 7.Kh1
11.Rh7 Rc4 12.Rb2+ Rb4 13.Re2 Rb7
14.Rh8+, or here Kb7 11.Rh7+ Kc6 12.Rf6+
Kb5 13.Rb7+ Ka5 14.Rb1. If Black tries
6...Be8 then 7.Rd8 Rb2 8.a6 as in the main
line.

No 17084 0007.46 6/9 Win

Special nominations

No 17085 V. Kalandadze
1st special prize

1.Qd4+? Ke6 (Ke7? d8Q+) 2.Kg8 Qg2+ draw.

1.Qf4+ Ke7 2.Qf7+ Kxf7 3.d8S+ Kf6+
4.Sxb7 Ke5 5.Kg6 (Sc5? Kd5;) Kd4 6.Kf5
10.Sc5 Ka2 11.Sd3 Ka1 12.Sc1 a2, and (the
known) 13.Sb3 mate.

“Synthesis of different ideas in an airy mini-
ature.”

MG spots a minor dual: 10.Sa5 Ka2 11.Sc6
Ka1 12.Sd4 etc.

No 17086 R. Becker
2nd special prize

1.Rh3+? Kg5 2.Kg7 Sg4 (Qc5) wins. 1.Rd1? Kc6
2.Rh1+ Kg5 3.Kg7 Sg4 4.Qxf7 Be5 5.Rh5+
Kf6 6.Qe6 Qd3 wins. 1.Rd2? Kh6 2.Qh3+
Kg6 3.Qh7+ Kxf6 4.Qh6+ Kf5 5.Rf2+ Ke4
6.Qh1+ Kd4 7.Rd2+ Sd3 wins. Therefore:
1.Rd4 Kh6 2.Qxb4/i with two thematic lines:

i) 2.Rh4+? Kg6 3.Qc2+ Qd3 4.Qxc7 Qg3 5.Rc4 Kxf6+ 6.Kf8 Qg7 7.Ke8 Qg8 mate.

ii) Bc3 6.Rc5 Bd4 7.Rd5.

iii) 5.Rd5? Sf3 6.Rd1 Bf4(Bb6) wins.

iv) Bd6 12.Rxf7 Sx7, third stalemate.

“An interesting way to link three known stalemates. Such syntheses are not easy to realize.”

No 17087 A. Rusz & S. Didukh
3rd special prize

\[ \text{d1c5 0000.33 4/4 Draw} \]

No 17087 Arpad Rusz (Romania) & Sergiy Didukh (Ukraine). Romanian master Mihail Marin, commenting on the encounter Adams-Polgar (Corus 2008), noted an interesting reciprocal zugzwang. The composers acknowledge their use of it by adding introductory moves and changing the stipulation, calling the theme ‘anti-Marin’.


“Study art at work on a practical endgame.”

No 17088 I. Aliev
special honourable mention

\[ \text{h1d8 1060.21 4/4 BTM, Draw} \]

No 17088 Ilham Aliev (Azerbaijan). 1...Bd5+ 2.Kh2/i with:


ii) a2 7.Kxd5 a1Q 8.g8Q+.


v) 7.Ke3? a3 see previous note.

“A favourite theme of the author. This is one more piece of evidence that Réti’s idea will be with us forever.”

No 17089 Grigory Slepian (Belarus). 1...Rb8+ 2.d8B/i Re5 3.Qxe5 Ba4+ 4.Rd7
Qxe5 5.f8B+ Kh8 6.g7+ Kh7 stalemate, avoiding Qxg7? 7.Bxg7+ Kxg7 8.Bf6 mate.

i) 2.d8Q? Re5 3.Qxe5 Ba4+ 4.Rd7 Qxe5 5.f8Q+ Kh8 6.g7+ Kh7 wins. And what is amiss with 2.d8S? ? The answer: Re5 3.Qxe5 Ba4+ 4.Rd7 Qxe5 5.f8Q+ Kh8 6.g7+ Qxg7 7.Bxg7+ Kxg7, when 8.Bf6 may be double-check, but it isn’t checkmate: 8...Kxf6.

“One can well imagine the enormous labour required to arrive at this fantastic position. What an achievement – at the cost of the presentation!”

With the introductory pyrotechnics Pogosyants Rides Again! If only it were a win and 8.Bf6 mate were the main line! [AJR]
This formal tourney was judged by Sergiy Didukh (Ukraine). The provisional award was published in *Olimpiya Dunyasi*, No.13, 22-25ii2008 and became final in No.26, 2-5v2008.

Report: “...I thank Ilham Aliev for this possibility to make my début as a judge ... I received 25 anonymous entries .... though composing technique betrayed [the identity of] some authors ... the expected decrease in creative standard at the beginning of the FIDE Album cycle didn’t happen here, and the prize studies proved to be of a very high quality. Of course there were ‘red cards’, speaking football language: ... a study by P. Rossi [HH: EG#15354] was published in *Magyar Sakkélet* in 2001 where it received a first commendation.”

---


ii) The semi-desperado bQ would like to sacrifice herself on the long diagonal. One wrong step by wK...


iv) Qc3 4.Qd8 Qa3+ 5.Kb6, is a transposition.


vi) It’s the danger of a lurking reci-zug that motivates wK’s curious dance: 7.Kb7? Qxe3zz.


x) Qe7 16.Qh6+ Kg8 17.Bd5+.

“wK’s duel with the marauding bQ, sacrificing herself on the c3-d4-e5 squares surprises at every turn. By move 10 the reader is overcome with emotion, and even thinks it will be a shame when all this comes to an end. And that’s when an unbelievable reciprocal zugzwang comes out of the woodwork, supported by new and beautiful variations. Impressive!”

---

**No 17091** N. Micu

1st prize


---

**No 17090**

1st prize

**No 17091**

2nd prize

---

b6h8 4010.22 5/4 Win

b1b4 0357.11 5/6 Draw
No 17091 Nicolae Micu (Romania).
“White’s hopes rest with his passed pawn, but first Black’s threats must be dismantled.”
v) “The start of the sacrificial cusp.”
“Flamboyant play by both sides, saturated with sacrifices, but not only sacrifices. We are also impressed by subtle logical moments when preparing bS’ move to the corner as well as by the prudent sideslip of wK to the stalemate square. The intense struggle ends in a pure stalemate which is not ‘pulled by the ears’ but whose unexpectedness captivates, as it does in the best artistic studies.”

No 17092 I. Akobia & R. Becker 3rd prize

v) “It looks as if all Black’s threats are maintained without any weakness being created, but...”
“The stalemate position had been constructed before by A. Belyavsky & L. Mitrofanov (honourable mention, Chervony girkov 1978) [HH: EG#4087]. What we see here is more subtle, a beautiful mzug being stitched in, along with a thematic try. An outstanding find!”

No 17093 I. Akobia 1st honourable mention

No 17093 I. Akobia (Georgia). “First, I’d like to pass a couple of general remarks to
make the coming battle more comprehensible. To draw, White has to win one of the black pawns and not let bK support the other. That is, he should be deflected immediately – and the farther the better. However, 1.f5? Sxf5 2.Re8+, is wrong because of the precise move 2...Kf3/i 3.Rf8 Kg4/iı 4.Ra8 a5, winning. The right way is:” 1.Rg8 Sf5/iıı 2.Re8+ Kxf4/iıı 3.Kd5/v Se3+/ⅱv 4.Ke6/ⅱıı Ba5 5.Kb7 Sf5 6.Kxa6 Bb6 7.Re6 Sd6/ⅱııı 8.Re7/iıx Kf3 9.Re2 Bd4 10.Re7 Bb6 (c5; Re6) 11.Re2. and since 11...Kxe2 is stalemate, the outcome is a positional draw.

i) Kf4? 3.Kd5 transposes to the main line.
ii) Kf4 4.Rf6 a5 5.Re6 draw.
iv) Kf3 3.Ra8 a5 4.Kd5, and bK is too remote. “But by playing to f4 he hampers the important defensive placing of his forces – Bf4(Bb4)-Bd6-Se7 – to prevent wK’s incursion.”


viii) “Black has managed to seal off all the approaches to his pawn, but...”
ix) “...yes, it’s zugzwang.”

x) But also Kg5 5.Ra4 Bb6 6.Rxa6 Sd6.

“The study has many instructive moments: tense struggle, an unexpected zugzwang, a positional draw, and stalemate. But its most memorable aspect is the exceedingly difficult variation play, along with their evaluation. This is a huge drawback because all the expressiveness vanishes. Well, maybe such pictures have their fans, truth-seekers with their clever ‘silicon friends’, without whose aid it’s No 17094 V.S. Kovalenko
2nd honourable mention

h1h5 3234.22 6/6 Draw

No 17094 Vitaly S. Kovalenko (Russia).
1.g4+ fxg4 2.Rh2+ Sh4 3.Rxh4+ Kxh4 4.Sf5+ Kh3 5.Sxd4 f2 6.Rf5 g3 7.Rf3, with:
– f1Q+ 8.Rxf1 g2+ 9.Kg1 Be3+ 10.Rf2 Bxd4 11.e3 Bxe3 stalemate, or
i) 8.Sf5? f1Q+ 9.Rxf1 g2 mate.

“Whoever is fond of forced sacrificial combinations will surely like the intro. But they are rather brutal in terms of chess study theory. To my mind it is not the best way to prepare a sympathetic finale with two stalemates.”

No 17095 F. Shukurov
commendation

No 17095 Fazil Shukurov (Azerbaijan). “If you thought locks could never be keys, then look at this and think again!” 1.h4, with:
– Kxe4 2.h5 Kf5 3.f4/i Ke6 4.h6 Ke7 5.h7 wins, or
– Ke5 2.h5 f5 3.h6/ii Kf6 4.exf5/iıı wins.
i) “The first pawn lock.”


iii) “The second lock.”

“Chameleon echo locks are the keys to this miniature!”

No 17096 Ilham Aliev (Azerbaijan). 1.f5, with:
– c4 2.f6 c3 3.f7 c2 4.f8Q c1Q 5.Qc8+ Kb6 6.Qxc1 wins, or
– h4 2.f6 h3 3.f7 h2 4.f8Q h1Q 5.Qa8+ Kb6 6.Qxh1, or
– b4 2.f6 b3 3.f7 b2 4.f8Q b1Q 5.Qc8+ Kb6 6.Qb8+ Ka6 7.Qxb1 wins.

“The triple Q-win by skewers on different lines is well known (eg Grigoriev, 3rd prize, Shakhmaty 1928) but here the geometrical relationships are unique.”
Two sections: (a) miniatures, (b) malyutkas. The formal tourney was judged by the IGM himself. The award was published on Akobia’s website and sent to the participants by e-mail. The final award appeared 15ii2009.

Report: 128 studies by 45 composers from 16 countries. “The organizers have already informed participants of unsoundness. Partial anticipations reduced valuations, in some cases resulting in rejection.”

**Miniatures section**

**No 17097** J.-M. Loustau 1st prize

- Kc5 10.Ra2 h3 11.Ra5+ Kd6 12.Rh5 Bg2 13.Rf5 Be5 14.Rh5 Bd4+ 15.Kh2 Be5+ 16.Kg1 and with:

i) Be4+ 2.Kg1 Be3+ (h4; Rh5) 3.Kh2 draw.

“The tourney’s great surprise: two model stalemates with positional draw. Presentation is on a high technical level.”


iv) 18.e7? Ra6+ (Rh6+; Kg7) 19.Re6 Rh6+ wins.
“Primary theme rook-pair against rook and pawns. The sharp play emphasizes positions of mutual zugzwang.”

No 17099 J. Mikitovics
3rd prize

No 17100 Y. Bazlov
4th prize

No 17101 I. Akobia
5th prize

No 17099 János Mikitovics (Hungary).

No 17100 Yuri Bazlov (Russia).

No 17101 Iuri Akobia (Georgia).

“Any interesting systematic movement flatters my weakness!”

No 17102 Yochanan Afek (Israel/The Netherlands).

“The rook and a Knight cannot detain one of black pawn, but their skilful interaction saves the white side.”

iii) “However, an echo of Grigoriev’s move is possible.”

No 17103 L. González

No 17104 J. Pospíšil

No 17105 N. Rezvov & S.N. Tkachenko

No 17102 Y. Afek

No 17103 Luis Miguel González (Spain).


i) Bc7 4.e6 wins.


No 17106  A. Sochnev
honourable mention

No 17106  Aleksei Sochnev (Russia).
1.Rg2+ Kd3 2.Kd5 Kc3 3.R2g3+, with:
– Kb4 4.R5g4+ Ka5 5.Ra3+ Kb5 6.Rb3+ Ka5
7.Rg7 a6 8.Rgb7 c1Q 9.Ra3 mate., or
– Kd2 4.Rb3 c1Q 5.Rg2+ Ke1 6.Rxb2 Qd1+

No 17107  M. Zinar
honourable mention

No 17107  Mikhail Zinar (Ukraine).
1...Kf7 2.a7 Rh1+ 3.Kb2 (Ka2) Rh2+ 4.Bf2 Rxf2+
Rf6+ 9.Kb7 win, or
1...Kg6 2.a7 Rh1+ 3.Kb2 (Ka2) Rh2+ 4.Kb3
Rhx3+ 5.Bg3 Rgx3+ 6.Kb4 Rg4+ 7.Kb5
Rg5+ 8.Kxb6 win, or
1...Ke6 2.a7 Rh1+ 3.Be1 Rxe1+ 4.Kb2 Re2+
win.
“Roman decoy theme in 3 variations.”

No 17108  S. Hornecker
commendation

No 17108  Siegfried Hornecker (Germany).
1.d8S+ Kf6/i 2.g8S+ Kg6 (Ke5; Sf7+) 3.Se7+
draw.

No 17109  Gerhard Josten (Germany).
1.Rc7 e2 2.Re3+ Kd2/i 3.Rd8+ Ke1 4.Kb3 e1S/i

No 17110  Daniel Keith (France).
1.Rg1 c3/i 2.Kc3 c2 3.Kd2 Rb1 4.Rc1 Kg7 5.f5 Rb5/ii
6.Rf1 Rb1 7.f6+ Kg6 8.e7 Kf7 9.Rc1 Rb8

i) Ke7 2.g8Q draw, not 2.Sc6+? Kf6 3.g8S+
Kf7 wins.


iii) Kd2 4.Rb3 c1Q 5.Rg2+ Ke1 6.Rxb2 Qd1+

c1Q+ 11.Kxc1 wins.

“Roman decoy theme in 3 variations.”
No 17110 D. Keith

f2h7 0400.21 4/3 Win

No 17111 P. Rossi & M. Campioli

b2c5 0001.13 3/4 Draw

No 17112 J. Mikitovics

c1e5 0005.02 3/4 Draw


Malyutkas section

No 17113 M. Minski

1st prize

e7e2 0310.01 2/3 Draw


“Symmetry at the start. As often happens such a position has a thematic try.”

**No 17114** M. Doré
2nd/3rd prize

```
```

“As is normal, the first effective move determines the destiny of a ‘Baby’ [While the West has adopted the Russian ‘malyutka’ FSU-land often uses the English translation! AJR]”

**No 17115** V. Kalandadze
2nd/3rd prize

```
```

“The queen against two pawns – a widely developed theme, but the author has found interesting nuances.”

**No 17116** J. Mikitovics
4th prize

```

“There are interesting manoeuvres, but the solution is over-long. Yes, the author has assembled 55 moves” – apparently made up of 40 in one line and 15 in another (but it is not clear which). HH: 14 + 15 + 26 = 55.

Kc1 21.Qf4+ Kd1. Compare with the intended solution. Now with wK on e5 instead of a5 (for some reason), White should not play 22.Qf3+, but 22.Qf1+ Se1 23.Qf5 Sc2 24.Qd3+. If 22...Kd2 23.Ke4. HH observed that if this is true, it also means that in the main line 22.Qf1+ (instead of 22.Qf3+) is another cook: 22...Se1 23.Qf5 Sc2 24.Qd3+. And 22...Kd2 23.Ka4.

No 17117 I. Akobia
honourable mention

c2a3 3100.10 3/2 Draw

No 17117 Iuri Akobia (Georgia). 1.Rc3+ Ka4 (Kb4; Rb3+) 2.Re3/i Qc7+ 3.Kb2, with:
– Qb6+ 4.Ka2/ii Qxe3 5.a8Q+ draw; or

i) 2.Rc4+? Kb5 3.Rc3 Qa5 4.Rb3+ Ke4 wins.

ii) Qf2; having been ruled out by wRe3.


No 17118 D. Blundell
honourable mention

h5a3 0033.10 2/3 Draw

No 17118 David Blundell (Great Britain).


No 17119 L. González
honourable mention

g8h1 0013.10 3/2 Win

No 17119 Luis Miguel González (Spain).


No 17120 S. Hornecker
honourable mention

h1g3 0403.00 2/3 Draw

No 17120 Siegfried Hornecker (Germany).


No 17121 G. Hörning honourable mention

c7h1 0103.01 2/3 Win


No 17122 O. Pervakov honourable mention

c6c8 4001.00 3/2 Win


iii) manoeuvre of Réti by Sarichev.

No 17124 S. Hornecker commendation

b8c4 0000.21 3/2 Draw

No 17124 Siegfried Hornecker (Germany). 1.c6 f1Q 2.c7 Qb1+ 3.Ka7/i Qf5 4.f7 Kb5/ii 5.f8Q Qxf8 6.c8Q Qxc8 stalemate.


ii) Kc5 5.f8Q+ Qxf8 6.c8Q+ Qxc8 draw. Qc8 5.f8Q Qxf8 6.Kb7 Qe7 7.Ka8 Qxc7 stalemate, but also 5.Kb6 Kd5 6.f8Q Qxf8 7.Kb7 Qe7 8.Ka8 Qxc7 stalemate.
**No 17125** V.S. Kovalenko  
Vitaly S. Kovalenko (Russia).  
i) 5.Ra7+? Kd6 6.Ra6 + Kd7 (Kc7) 7.Ra7+ Kd6 8.Rxh7 stalemate.

**No 17126** W. Neef  
W. Neef (Germany).  

**No 17127** A. Pallier  
Alain Pallier (France).  
1.Kc2, with:  

**No 17128** Michael Roxlau  
Michael Roxlau (Germany).  
ii) Database users may like to note: 10...Rb2+ has a win-depth of 30, while the composer’s choice of 10...Bb2 has a win-depth of ten. This is explained by the mate-metric, as the R-check loses bB in a couple of moves.
The Gomel (Belarus) daily newspaper Zvyazda has continuity (presumably apart from German occupation in WW II) from 1917. Issue with serial number 26051 (ix2007) carries the first part (of four) of this award.

Remarkably, no fewer than seven honoured studies start BTM. The number seven also relates to each of the numbers of prizes, honourable mentions and commendations.

Evgeny Dvizov (Zhlobin, Belarus) himself judged the tourney with 33 studies by 26 composers from 11 countries.

HH remarks that the judge apparently forgot to have the studies checked for soundness. EG’s Mario Garcia cooked no less than 8 of the 22 studies in the award! A real disaster.

The first is the special prize study by V. Sichov: c8f1 0438.37 a2h4 0438.37 a2h7d8e4f5a5a8.b4d5f6a4c4e5e5 g6h4h6 7/12 Win. 1.Sxh4 Bc7 2.Sg3+ Ke1 3.Sg2+ Kd1 4.Se3+ Kc1 5.Se2+ Kb1 6.Sc3+ Kc1 7.Rc2. However: 2.bxc5 Sb6+ 3.cxb6 Bxb6 4.Sf3 Rc7+ 5.Kd8 Sb7+ 6.Ke8 wins.

Even one of the 1st/2nd prizes proved unsound: V. Bartosh e8b6 0401.68 h6e2d2.4a6e3e4f7h5 a6b7c6d7f2g3g7h3 9/10 Win: 1.f8Q Rxd2 2.Qf5 gxh6 3.a5+ Ka7 4.Kxd7 g2 5.Qc5+ Ka8 6.Qe5 Rxd6+ 7.Kxd6 f1Q 8.Qe8+ Ka7 9.Kc7 Qf7+ 10.Qxf7 g1Q 11.e5 Qe1 12.Kc8 Qb4 13.e6 h2 14.e4 Qb2 15.e5 Qb4 16.e7 h1Q 17.e8Q Qd5 18.e6 dQd6 19.Qc7 Qxc7+ 20.Kc7 Qxa5+ 21.Kc8 wins.

MG: 15.e7 h1Q 16.e8Q Qh3 17.Qf5 Qha3 18.Qd8 Qg7 19.e5 also wins. But there’s worse: 1...gxh6 2.Qf5 g2 3.Kxd7 f1Q 4.a5+ Ka7 5.Sxf1 g1Q 6.Qc5+ Ka8 7.Qe5 Qg4+ 8.Qe6 Qg7+ 9.Qe7 Qg4+ 10.Kc7 Qg8, or here 3.Sc4+ Ka7 4.Qc5+ Kb8 6.Sb6 g1Q 7.Sxd7+ Ka8. Or 3.a5+ Ka7.

The 5th prize by B. Sidorov & E. Kudelich is also unsound: h3f1 0247.13 b7e6h1a6c1d1
No 17131 I. Bondar
4th prize

f6.h2f3g3g5 6/7 BTM, Draw. 1...Se4 2.Rxe4
g2 3.Bxg2 fxg2 4.Rf7+ Sf2+ 5.Rxf2+ Kxf2
6.Sd3+ Bxd3 7.Rg4 g1Q 8.Rxg1 Bf5+ 9.Rg4
Be6 stalemate with pinned rook.

MG: 3.Sd3 g4+ 4.Kh4 gxh1Q 5.Re1+ Kg2
6.Rxh1 Kxh1 7.Rb1. If 3...Bxd3 4.Bxg2+ fxg2
5.Rf7+ Sf2+ 6.Rxf2+ Kxf2 7.Rg4 is the main
line.

No 17132 L. Topko
6th prize

e1h2 0730.21 4/5 Draw

No 17132 Leonid Topko (Ukraine). 1.fxe7
Re3+ 2.Kf2 Rf3+ 3.Ke1 Re3+ 4.Kf2 Re2+
5.Kf1 Rxd6 6.Rxd1 dRe6 7.e8Q Rxe8 8.Rd2
Rxd2 stalemate.

No 17133 V. Kondratev (Russia). 1.Sd3+
Kg1 10.Sf3+ Kf1 11.Sxh2+ Kg1 12.Sf3+ Kf1
mate.

i) 2.Sd2+? Ke2 3.Sf3 g1Q 4.Sf4+ Kf1
5.Bxg1 Bxf3+ draw.

No 17133 V. Kondratev
7th prize

e4e1 0042.03 4/5 Win

Another incorrect study by F. Bertoli won
1st honourable mention: e6g6 0014.14
f4g4e4.f7c2d3g2h4 4/6 BTM, draw. Intended:
1...g1Q 2.Se5+ Kg7 3.Bh6+ Kxh6 4.f8Q+
Kh7 5.Qf5+ Kg7 6.Qf7+ Kh6 7.Qe8+ Qg7
8.Qf4+ Sg5+ 9.Kd6 Kh7 10.Qxh4+ Kg8

HH: 12...Qxd3 13.Qxg5+ Kf7 is a database
win.

MG: 3...Kh7 4.f8Q Qb6+ (also Qg8+ wins)

No 17134 R. Becker
2nd honourable mention

d1d4 0431.24 5/7 Draw

No 17134 Richard Becker (USA). 1.Rf2
5.Re2+ Kf4 6.Rf2+ Kg4 7.Rxd2 Rc4 8.Ke1
Kxh2 12.Rd4 Kh3 13.Rd3+ Kg4 14.Kg2 Ra1
15.Rg3+ hxg3 stalemate.

No 17135 Boris Sidorov & Eduard Kudelich
(Russia). 1...Bc4+ 2.b5 Qc8+ 3.Rb7+ Qxb7+
No 17135 B. Sidorov & E. Kudelich
3rd honourable mention

a6b8 3230.72 10/5 BTM, Win
4...Qc3+. Also 1...Bb5 2.b4+ Kxb4 3.Rd5+ Kc3 4.Bg7+ Kb4 5.Rxb5 Ka4 6.Kb2 Qe8 7.Rb7 Qa8.

No 17137 L. González
6th honourable mention

e6h4 0304.31 5/4 Draw
– Kxg4 3.Sxh6+ Kh5 4.Sf7 Rg6 5.Se5 Rh6
6.Sf7 Rg6 7.Se5 positional draw, or
6.Kg6 Ke5 7.Kh5 Kf5 8.g3zz draw.

No 17136 V. Kondratev
5th honourable mention

g8h6 1653.11 5/6 Draw

No 17138 A. Pallier
7th honourable mention

e2h4 0000.33 4/4 Win

No 17138 Alain Pallier (France). 1.Kf3 g4+
2.Kf4 g3 3.hxg3+ Kh5 4.Kf3 Kg5 5.Kf2 Kg4
6.Kg1 Kxg3 7.e5 h2+ 8.Kh1 Kf2(Kf3) 9.e6
Ke2 10.e7 Kxd2 11.e8Q c3 12.Qd8+ Kc1
13.Qg5+ Kb1 14.Qb5+ wins.

No 17139 Vasily Tupik & Viktor Zhuk (Belarus).
1.d6 d1Q 2.d7 Qxd4 3.Re4 Qxc4
4.d8Q+ g5 (Kh3; Qd7+) 5.Qxg5+ Kxg5 stalemate.

No 17140 Vasily Tupik & Viktor Zhuk (Belarus).
1.Sc3 e3 2.Sd5 b3 3.Sxe3 b2 4.Sf1/i,
with:
– b1Q stalemate, or
– b1B 5.Sxh2 draw.
No 17139 V. Tupik & V. Zhuk
1st commendation

h7h4 0130.22 4/4 Draw

No 17140 V. Tupik & V. Zhuk
2nd commendation

h1h3 0001.03 2/4 Draw


No 17141 A. Strebkovs
3rd commendation

h6e5 0313.30 5/3 Draw


HewD asks: What is the point of the three hPs?


MG: 2...a4 3.Bxd5+ Kf8 and the black pawns cannot be stopped.


And the 7th commendation by V. Kichigin cannot stay behind: f8h5 0011.26 a6f5 a5g2a3c2d7e3e4h6 5/7, Win.


MG: many cooks. The easiest is 2.g3 and bK is mated soon.
Provisional/definitive published: *Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia* 77. Judge: Oleg Pervakov (Moscow). 44 studies by 28 composers from six countries. The standard was high. There was significant wastage: 18 eliminations are listed in the judge’s award.


ii) 13.Kd1? d3, and we’re in the try.

“Plenty of logical planning lies behind sharp tactical content and the ‘long distance’ effect. A real duel, to which both sides contribute!”


ii) 13.Kd1? d3, and we’re in the try.

“A reci-zug of great interest. A certain lack of precision in wK’s peregrinations is, in the judge’s view, perfectly acceptable. We like the underpromotion and the final mate is a beauty.”


“An excellent example of proper use of a database. To create such a twin study calls not just for easy-mining [чёс] but for real mastery”

No 17145 N. Kralin
1st honourable mention

No 17146 E. Eilazyan
2nd honourable mention

No 17147 Y. Bazlov & V. Kovalenko
3rd honourable mention
“Refined play supports this curious position-al draw.”

No 17148 A. Stavrietsky (Russia).


“A sharp study on the theme as the last WCCT, where wQ gets in the way of her own pieces” – and has to be disposed of.


“A sharp study on the theme as the last WCCT, where wQ gets in the way of her own pieces” – and has to be disposed of.


“A long-winded 25 moves-worth, but the look-ahead is straightforward enough.”


No 17150 G. Zgersky (Russia). 1.Kc6 Bc8 2.Sd7 Ka6 3.Kc7, with:
– Bb7 4.Sc5+ Ka7 5.Sxb7, or

“A pleasing domination sprint.”
A further commendation by Valeri Kalashnikov & Aleksandr Pankratev was cooked by MG: a6a8 0070.45 g2a7h7.c4f36h4e5c6f5 f7h5 6/8+. 1.f4 Kb8 2.Bh1 Bg6 3.Bf3 Bh7 4.Bxe5 Ka8 5.Bf3 Kb8 6.h5 Bg8 7.h6 Bh7 8.Bh5 Ka8 9.Bxh7 Bb8 10.Bg8 Bxg8 11.f7 Bxf7 12.h7 Bg8 13.h8Q Bxc4+ 14.Kb6 wins.


There was a special section for studies with a six-man database finale.

No 17151 V. Kovalenko
special commendation

– Ka7 9.Kc7 f2 10.b8Q+, or
“Systematic movement on the small scale!”

No 17152 V. Kovalenko
special commendation

No 17152 Vitaly Kovalenko (Russia). 1.Ba7, with:
“It may look simple, but it’s a positional draw in a ‘baby’.”

No 17153 I. Akobia & R. Becker
special commendation

No 17153 Iuri Akobia (Georgia) & Richard Becker (USA). 1.Sd4 fx e5 2.Rxe5 Bf6 3.Re4/i, with:
– Bg2 4.Rg4 Bxd4 5.Rxg2 c5 6.b4 axb4 7.Kc4 zz b3 (what else?) 8.Rg3 draw, or


“Tries, zugzwang, two stalemates.. But the play lacks the feel of wholeness.”


ii) 6. c4? Ka6 7. Kc5 Bxb5 8. cxb5+ Kb7 draw.

“Even if the Dutch study man did resort to a database, it is still done tastefully: 4. Kc6! and 6. c3! impress.”
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 2007

Oleg Pervakov’s (Moscow) report in Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 83, vi2008 (condensed): Only five remained after eliminations. The standard of the original studies published in Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia has declined in recent years, no doubt due to competition from other tourneys, not to mention money prizes. Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia survives as a non-commercial venture due to the voluntary labours of Yasha Vladimirov, the support of Andrei Selivanov, and financial assistance of Valery Gurov. But winners need encouragement, perhaps just a free subscription... For my part I am ready to offer as book prize both this year and next the forthcoming The Study for the Practical Player being worked on with Mark Dvoretsky, especially seeing that the title will appear in English and German as well as Russian, so that our colleagues abroad are not forgotten.

![No 17155 V. Vlasenko prize](image)

No 17155 Valery Vlasenko (Ukraine).

i) g1Q? 3.Rxg1 Bxg1 4.Kb5 Kc7 5.a5 Bf2 6.Ka6 Kxc6 stalemate.

ii) For 1...Ka8 see (iv).

iii) As the thematic try showed stalemate follows promotion.

iv) With bKa8 the draw is achieved by 4.c7 Kb7 5.Rxb6.

v) The tempo must be lost because g1Q 5.Rxg1 Bxg1 6.Ka5 wins bPa6. But how now is promotion to be met?

vi) Ah! 5...g1Q is countered by 6.c7+. Black must find another plan.

vii) It seems White is in zugzwang and must abandon wPc6.

viii) If 9...Kd7, then not 10.Re1? because bK can march to h2 and recapture on g1 (after the promotion) with bK, but 10.Rg8.

“White’s subtle gain of tempo is superimposed on Black’s anti-stalemate counterplay.”

At this point in his award report the composition GM judge lets us inside his head: When I start judging any tourney I glance at all the studies from the page. After mentally selecting those that appeal to me I turn my close attention to the remainder. After finally sorting out candidates for honours the labour of testing and searching for anticipations starts. In the first stage of testing I deliberately do not rely on Fritz or Rybka for analysis. I prefer to get under the skin of the study, to get to grips with its core and hidden reefs, things which the program does not ‘see’ (yes, it happens!). Only after that do I invoke the Mighty and the Terrible...

Going through the studies for this tourney I lingered on No.4476 by G. Amirian:

g3g5 0405.01 g8f5g7h5f1.h2 4/4+.

After 1.Kg2 Se3+ 2.Kxh2 Sg4+ 3.Kh3 – leaving g3 free – Sh6 4.Se6+ Kxh5, the author tidies up with a beautiful finale – 5.Rg5+ Rxg5 6.Sf4 mate. But the ice-cool 5.Rg3 also solves, and I thought “The finale is very likely not new, but 5.Rg3 rules it out”, and put the study aside. But an inner impulse prompted
me there and then to set the position up on the PC for Fritz to analyse. ... And, lo and behol, after ten minutes a study appeared, receiving ‘special prize’ in the tourney! As you can see, the colours are reversed and the stipulation has changed. The h2 pawn, which gave rise to the cook, has disappeared, and we have an extra move.

No 17156 G. Amirian
special prize


i) Kh6 2.Rf7 threatens mate, leaving Black no time to push bPh3.

ii) We already know the consequences of 4.Sxh3? Se3+ 5.Kxh4 Rg4+ (Rg6 also) 6.Rxg4 Sf5 mate.


iv) “Double check, the big trump in the aggressor’s hand.”

v) Rg3 7.Sg5 Kxf6 8.Se4+.

vi) “A superb stalemate defence! 7.Rf4? hSf5 8.Rf3 Kf6, when White unexpectedly finds himself in zugzwang.”

“Chess is indeed inexhaustible!”

A study by E. Kudelich won an honourable mention: h7e8 4701:54 e1a5d1d7f8e3.b2e3d6 f6h3b3b7c6f7 9/8 Draw:


But MG cooks: 2.Qg5, and Rxd6 3.Kg7 Qd8 4.Qf5 Re6 5.Rxd5. Although Black is a rook up, White has many threats. A nice sample line is Qc7 6.Ra5 Qg3+ 7.Qg4 Qxg4+ 8.hxg4 Ra6 9.Re5+ Re6 10.Ra5. Or Kd8 3.Rxd5 Qb6 4.Ra5 Qxd6 5.Ra8+ Kc7 6.Qa5+ Kc6 7.Qa4+ perpetual.

No 17157 V. Kalashnikov
commendation

1.d6 Kb2/i 2.g5/ii a3 3.Bd5/iii a2 4.Bxa2 Kxa2 5.h6, with:

– Kb3 6.g6 gxh6 7.gxh7 Sf7 8.Kh5 Kc4 9.Kg6 Sh8+ 10.Kg7/iv or


i) Attempts to improve the position of bSg8 fail to save the game: Sh6 2.Bc6 Ka3 3.Bxd7 Sf7 4.g5 Sxd6 5.g6 hxg6 6.hxg6 Se4 7.g7 Sf6 8.Be6. Or Sf6 2.g5 Se8 3.h6 Kb2 4.g6 Sf6 5.Kg5 a3 6.Bd5.


iii) “The first position of domination of bS.”

iv) bS is doomed again.

No 17158 Ilham Aliev (Azerbaijan). 1.Rg5? f3 2.Se4 Kh4 3.g7 f2 is fatal. 1.Se2 Rxe2 2.g7 Re8 (g1Q; Rh5+) 3.Rf8/i with:


h4a2 0013.33 5/5 Win

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsiya 2007
No 17158  I. Aliev
special commendation

d3h3 0401.22 5/4 Win

– g1Q 4.Rh8+ Rxh8 5.gxh8R+, repeating the stalemate already seen.
  i) 3.Rh5+? Kg4 4.Rh8, leads to a Stamma position (1737), where 4...Rg8 draws, though 4...Rh8 is just as good.
  ii) 4.gxf8Q? g1Q 5.Qh6+ Kg3 6.Qg5+ Kf3 7.Qxg1 stalemate, a familiar sight.
  “Echoed promotion in conjunction with the phoenix theme.”
Marco Campioli (Italy) judged the first endgame study tourney of Scacchi & Dintorni, the magazine of the chess club “Club 64” of Modena, Italy. The award was published in issue 4, x-xi 2007.

No 17159 S. Didukh
1st prize


The judge points to a similar finish: E. Pogosyants, Vecherny Volgograd 1985, e5a8 0501.03 g4g7b7a4.a6g5h2 4/5 Win: 1.Rg8+ Rb8 2.R4xg5 h1Q 3.Sb6+ Ka7 4.R5g7+ Kb7 5.Rxb7+ Rxb7 6.Ra8 mate.

No 17160 I. Akobia & R. Becker
2nd prize

No 17160 Iuri Akobia (Georgia) & Richard Becker (USA). 1.e7, and:


No 17161 N. Mironenko
3rd prize


No 17162 Luboš Kekely (Slovakia). 1.f8Q Rc8+ 2.Kf7 Rxf8+ 3.Rxf8 Bxc5 4.g7 Sf5 5.g8Q Sh6+ 6.Kxf6 Sxg8+ 7.Rxg8, and:

The judge draws attention to: F. Bondarenko & A.P. Kuznetsov, Tidskrift für Schack 1981, f5h7 0411.16 g6b5f4g3.a5a4a6b7b2d5g7 5/8 Draw: 1.Sf6+ gxf6 2.Rh6+ Kg7 3.Rg6+ Kf7
No 17162 L. Kekely
4th prize


No 17163 R. Becker
5th prize

c4e5 0146.12 4/6 Draw

No 17164 Julien Vandiest (Belgium). 1.e7 d1Q 2.e8Q+ Kc7 3.Qe7+ Kc8 4.Qe5 g4 5.Qe8+ Kc7 6.Qe7+ Kc8 7.Qe5 g3 8.Bc4 Kd8 9.Kb6 Qg1+ 10.Kb7 Qh1+ 11.Kb8 Qc6

No 17165 J. Vandiest
1st honourable mention

h5g8 0001.12 3/3 Win


Compare: V. Kovalenko, Molodoi Leninets 1976, h8g2 0000.32 b4c2c4b6c6 4/3 Win: 1.b5 cxb5 2.cxb5 Kf3 3.c4 Ke3 4.c5 bxc5 5.b6 c6 6.b7 c3 7.b8Q c2 8.Qh2 c1Q 9.Qh6+, and N. Elkies, 3rd HM Czerniak MT 1986, g8d2 0003.31 g4.b5c4h6b6 4/3 Win: 1.h7 Sf6+ 2.Kg7 Sxh7 3.Kxh7 Ke3 4.c5 bxc5 5.b6 c4 6.b7 c3 7.b8Q c2 8.Qh2 c1Q 9.Qh6+, and:

- Kb2 4.h5 a2 5.Bxa2 Kxa2 6.h6 Kb1 7.h7 a4 8.h8Q wins, or:


No 17170 J. Mikitovics 2nd commendation


No 17172 Mihajlo Milanovic (Serbia). 1.hxg7 Se8 2.a4 Kd4 3.Be5+ Kxe5 4.a5 Kd6 5.a6 Kc6 6.a7 Kb7 7.a8Q+ Kxa8 8.g8Q wins.

No 17174 Moreno Merciari (Sassuolo, Italy). 1.Rh8+ Kf7 2.Sc6 Qxg5 3.Rf1+ Kg6 4.Se7+ Qxe7 5.Be4+ Kg5 6.Rh5+ Kxg4 e2g8 3811.34 8/8 Win 7.Rh2 Qh4 8.Bf3+ Kg3 9.Rg2+ Kh3 10.Rh1 mate.

