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First of all, I wish all readers of EG a Happy New Year. On 2012’s calendar there are many exciting endgame study related events to look forward to. In January, for instance, the Tata Steel Chess and Studies day will take place on Saturday 28th (see announcement in this issue) in Wijk aan Zee as part of the famous o.t.b. GM tourney. Very recently it has been decided that the organization of the Tata Steel GMN tourney will also host the 2012 ISC on Sunday 29th (see announcement in this issue). In March we will have the annual ARVES meeting together with the Dutch problem society (Probleemvrienden) in Nunspeet (Sunday 25th). And perhaps even more exciting is the venue of the annual WFCC meeting in Kobe, Japan (22nd – 29th September).

In my report about the 2011 Jesi WFCC conference I forgot to mention that my chess friend Alessandro Cuppini attended, bringing along his impressive “bible” (Antologia di Studi Schaccistici) with no less than 541 A4 pages with endgame study stories. In Italian, unfortunately, but (endgame study) chess is an international language ….

Another interesting book, in Dutch, was written by IM Hans Böhm and IM Yochanan Afek. It is the second part of a series dealing with all chess pieces. This book is about the rook (in Dutch: De Toren) and gives many games, endgames studies and problems in which that piece plays an important role. The reason to mention this book in this editorial is the fact that the Dutch “Mister Chess” Hans Böhm together with the publisher Tirion Sport organized a remarkable publicity stunt: “De Toren bij het Torentje” – IMs Hans Böhm and Yochanan Afek present the first copies of their new book to three Dutch politicians who are also chess enthusiasts and were all chairmen of the Max Euwe Centre in Amsterdam (see p. 9).

Finally, I draw attention to the fact that Gady Costeff with his first prize winner of The Problemist 2008-2009 (EG#17820) also was awarded with the Norman Macleod award for 2008-2009 for the most striking and original problem of any genre to appear in The Problemist together with a selfmate by Mikhail Marandyuk and Ivan Soroka, scoring 13 points out of a possible 16.
This time we have three composers who each show two studies. The first is Yochanan Afek with two studies that have figured as prize puzzles at o.t.b. tournaments.

**No 17986** Y. Afek

```
```

i) 3.Kxc7? Rxc8+ 4. Kxc8 stalemate, or
3.Ba6 Rg7+ 4.Kc6 Rg6+ 5.Kc5 (Kxc7 Rx4a6;) Rg5+ draws.


Next is Siegfried Hornecker. The end of the first study will no doubt lead to some discussion as to whether 13.Qd6+ is just a waste of time or a real dual.

**No 17988** S. Hornecker

```
1…d1Q 2.a8Q Qxd7 3.Qe4 Qf7 4.e6 f1Q 5.exf7 Qb1 6.f8Q Qxe4+ 7.Kh8 a1Q 8.Qf7+ Qg6 9.Qd5+ Qg5 10.hxg5 e1Q 11.Kh7 Qxg7+ 12.Kxg7 Qc3+ 13.Kf8 hxg5 14.Qf7+ Kh6
```


Next is Siegfried Hornecker. The end of the first study will no doubt lead to some discussion as to whether 13.Qd6+ is just a waste of time or a real dual.

**No 17988** S. Hornecker

```
1…d1Q 2.a8Q Qxd7 3.Qe4 Qf7 4.e6 f1Q 5.exf7 Qb1 6.f8Q Qxe4+ 7.Kh8 a1Q 8.Qf7+ Qg6 9.Qd5+ Qg5 10.hxg5 e1Q 11.Kh7 Qxg7+ 12.Kxg7 Qc3+ 13.Kf8 hxg5 14.Qf7+ Kh6
```


Next is Siegfried Hornecker. The end of the first study will no doubt lead to some discussion as to whether 13.Qd6+ is just a waste of time or a real dual.

**No 17988** S. Hornecker

```
1…d1Q 2.a8Q Qxd7 3.Qe4 Qf7 4.e6 f1Q 5.exf7 Qb1 6.f8Q Qxe4+ 7.Kh8 a1Q 8.Qf7+ Qg6 9.Qd5+ Qg5 10.hxg5 e1Q 11.Kh7 Qxg7+ 12.Kxg7 Qc3+ 13.Kf8 hxg5 14.Qf7+ Kh6
```

No 17989 S. Hornecker

The third composer is Mario Guido Garcia.

No 17990 M. Garcia


i) 2.g8Q? Qf4+ 3.Sf6 Qc7+4. Kxe6 Qg7 5.Sg4+ Kxg6 6.Se5+ Kh6 draws.

ii) Qf4 5.g8Q Kh3 6.Qg1 Bg3 7.Qh1+ Bh2 8.Kg6 Kh4/vi 9.Qg2 a3 10.Sg5 Qg3 11.Qe4+ Qf4 12.Sf3+ Kh3 13.Qxe6+ Kg2 (Kg3; Sh5+) 14.Qe2+ Kh1 15.Qf1+ Bg1 16.Qxg1 mate.


vi) Qf5+ 9.Kh6 c3 10.Sg5+ Kg3 11.Sfe4+ wins.


No 17991 M. Garcia


iv) b1Q 10.Qxe4+ Kc1 11.Qxb1+ Kxb1 12.Kg5 a5 13.h6 a4 14.h7 a3 15.h8Q wins.

Contributors: John Beasley (England), Pal Benko (USA), Marc Bourzutschky (USA), Daniel Keith (France), Roger Missiaen (Belgium) and John Roycroft (England).

Ignace Vandecasteele and Roger Missiaen were rewarded with 2nd prize in the Marwitz MT 1992. Many years later Ignace spotted two cooks, but succeeded in finding a sound setting by turning the board and rearranging the men. The correction was published in EG184 p. 110. In September I received a letter from Roger Missiaen showing an alternative and in my opinion better correction, as it retains the original position.

U.1. I. Vandecasteele & R. Missiaen
2nd prize Marwitz MT 1992, correction by Roger Missiaen


Roger has added a black pawn on f7. In the original setting without this extra pawn there were two cooks, viz. 1.Sb1 and 3.Sa3+. 1.Sb1? is now met by f5 2.Bd5+ Ka1, and 3.Sa3+? is refuted by Kb3 4.Sb1 f5 5.Bd5+ Kb2 6.Sc3 Sc2 7.Sd1+ Kb1.

Daniel Keith is an active composer but he also likes to correct cooked endgame studies. Some time ago he made me aware of the following work.

\textbf{U.2. A. Selezniev}
\textit{Shakhmaty Listok 1930}

\begin{center}
\text{e2c5 0310.33 Win}
\end{center}

1.b4+ Kxb4 2.Be1+ Ka4 3.b4 Ka3 4.bxa5 b4 5.Kxe3 Ka4 6.Kd4 Kb5 7.Kd5 Kxa5 8.Kc5 Ka4 9.Bxb4 a5 10.a3 wins. The problem is that the continuation 7...b3 axb3 leads to stalemate. After some attempts we jointly found a sound setting. It is actually an improvement as it saves one piece and makes the play more interesting.

U.3. A. Selezniev
\textit{Shakhmaty Listok 1930},
correction D. Keith & J.H. Ulrichsen

\begin{center}
\text{f4c5 0310.32 5/4 Win}
\end{center}


In the next example Daniel corrects an endgame study by his fellow countryman Frederic Lazard. There are comparatively few mistakes in Lazard’s output. He was a strong player who shared 1st place with the famous André Chéron at the French Championship in 1926.

**U.4. F. Lazard**

*L’Échiquier de Paris* 1946

1.Rf2+ Ke8
2.Bc6+ bxc6 3.b7 d3+ 4.Rb2 Qxb2+ 5.Sc3 Qxc3+ 6.Kg8 Qa5 7.b8Q+ Qd8 8.Qf4 Qd5 9.Qf8 mate. The rather obvious cook 5...Sbc7 remained unnoticed for many years, but was found by John Nunn in 2002.

Daniel corrects the work by substituting the black knight on b5 with a black pawn. The solution remains the same.

**U.5. F. Lazard**

*L’Échiquier de Paris* 1946, correction D. Keith

1.h6 Ba2 2.Kg5 Bb3 3.Bd7! Be6 4.Kf6! Bxd7 5.Kf7. André Chéron found that 2.Kf5 and 2.Ke5 also win. If we move the white king from f4 to h4 White wins as in Lazard’s solution. This was found by Jenö Ban in 1954; cf. the following diagram.

In 1956 Chéron published a version with the white king on h4 and the black bishop on e4.

John Beasley has sent me an email concerning K.4 in *EG*186 p. 334. This position attributed to John did not first appear in *EG*, and John points out that it is hopelessly anticipated as an orthodox endgame study. It actually ap-
peared at the international problemists’ meeting in Bournemouth in 1989 and took part in a lighthearted tourney for twin studies (orthodox chess implied) organized and judged by John Roycroft. White to play wins both in ordinary chess and in “losing chess” or “giveaway chess”. The solution in ordinary chess is 1.f8R. In “losing chess” the solution is again a rook promotion: 1.Kh6 Kxh6 2.f8R. John adds that more attention was paid to the nature of the twinning mechanism than to the subsequent play. He tells us that the contribution was meant as a joke, and Roycroft gave it the prize for “sheer cheek”.

I also permit myself to publish a joke:

**U.8. Jarl H. Ulrichsen**

Original

1.g3? loses, 1.gxh3? only draws after 1...Kc3 and 1.g4? only draws after 1...Kc3 2.g5 Kd2. White wins after 1.gxf3 Ke3 2.Kh2 Kd4 3.Kxh3 Ke5 4.Kg4 Kf6 5.Kf4. So what is the point? Well, it is simply an albino with only five men on the board, obviously an unbeatable record.

In his most active years grandmaster Pal Benko (Pál Benkö) belonged to the world’s top players. He played in the Candidates tournament in 1959 and 1962. He finished first in eight U.S. Open Chess Championships, played several times for the USA with brilliant results, e.g. in the Chess Olympiads, and won numerous strong tournaments.

Fortunately Benko has not devoted himself solely to playing chess. For more than forty years he has taken part in endgame study tourneys with remarkable success.

![Diagram](U.8.png)

Some months ago he sent me an email. Inspired by my remarks on the Valladão task (EG184 p.111), he informed me about the following charming composition.

**U.9. P. Benko**

*Chess Life* December 2011

![Diagram](U.9.png)

1.0-0 Kd2 2.g4 hxg3. After a5 3.g5 a4 4.g6 a3 5.g7 a2 6.g8Q b1Q 7.Qxa2+! Qxa2 8.Qf2+ is the quickest win. 3.h4 a5 4.Rb1! Here comes the surprise. 4.h5? a4 5.h6 a3 6.h7 a2 7.h8Q b1Q is only a draw although it looks dangerous for Black. 8.Qa1 is a promising attempt, but after 8...Kc2 Black holds. Black threatens to exchange queens and play Kb2, and if e.g. 9.Qd4 then simply 9...Qxf1+ 10.Kxf1 Kb1 (not 10...g2+?) with a database draw. 4...Kc2 5.Rxb2+ Kxb2 6.h5 a4 7.h6 a3 8.h7 a2 9.h8Q+ Kb1. Now White wins as he can drive the black king into the corner and mate him; e.g. 10.Qb8+ Kc2 11.Qe5 Kb1 12.Qe1+ Kb2 13.Qb4+ Kc2 14.Qa3 Kb1 15.Qb3+ Ka1 16.Qc2 g2 17.Qc1 mate.

This nice and aesthetic version of the Valladão task confirms my view that most of the endgame studies showing this theme are just awful.

In *EG*186 p. 336 we reproduced an endgame study by the great G.M. Kasparyan. It is not included in any of Kasparyan’s collections, and consequently it is not found in HHdbIV. Doubt on the correctness was cast by HH, and this doubt is now confirmed. In an email from Marc Bourzutschky to John Roycroft and John Beasley (forwarded to me by Roycroft for inclusion in *EG*) we are informed that Bourzutschky had only checked

Finally I add a critical remark on the “Study of the Year 2010”; cf. EG186 p. 341. The “Study of the Year” is not meant to be the best endgame study of this or that year, but the best one for promoting endgame studies to a general chess public. I really doubt that the members of the endgame study subcommittee have made a good choice. I wonder if anyone considered the length of the solution. You need eighteen moves to show that 1.g6 is the correct move and that 1.bxa3? is a mistake. The solution may be of interest to lovers of endgame studies, but it will hardly arouse any great enthusiasm among ordinary chess players. If you want to win them over on your side you must show them something that they recognize as really beautiful and surprising with a relatively short solution and comparatively few pieces on the board. If you have seen the Saavedra-position or the Réti-manoeuvre you will never forget them. Endgame studies with these qualities are still being composed, but you do not notice them if you look at compositions with the eyes of an expert.

A Happy New Study Year to all of you!

From left to right: Fred Teeven (Secretary of State for Security and Justice), Jan Nagel (member of the first chamber 50 plus party) and Eric Smaling (member of the first chamber Socialist party). In the background Hans Böhm and Yochanan Afek. The photo was taken by Serge Ligtenberg (De Telegraaf) in front of the prime-minister’s office (het Torentje – “small rook”) in The Hague.
ARVES board members René Olthof and HH have been member of the local Dutch chess club HMC Den Bosch for more than 35 years. It may well be that the endgame study activities of their fellow club member Jan Voormans encouraged them towards this chess genre. Together with his father, Jan Voormans sr., Jan’s name frequently occurred as solver/cooker in the endgame study section of *Tijdschrift van de KNSB* and *Schakend Nederland* from the late 1950s on. In the 1970s Jan published a couple of studies in *Schakend Nederland*. He was particularly proud about this one:

**O.1. J. Voormans**

*Schakend Nederland* 1975


- Bxc1 6. Sxe6 mate, or:
- Bxc7 6. Bg5 mate, or:

i) 3. Kf8 Bd6+ 4. Kxf7 is only a waste of time.


He was a very good club player at both chess and draughts and played in the highest Dutch leagues in both disciplines.

Although his major passion was (playing!) chess, he was an IM in correspondence chess but his most memorable achievement was clearly his world famous draughts problem showing the Canalejas-theme (three queens are captured with the last move 35x2). It was ranked among the best ten draughts problems of all times. For an excellent story and the draughts problem, see: Tim Krabbé’s website: http://timkr.home.xs4all.nl/chess2/diary_13.htm, item 252.

*(Photo from the website of HMC Den Bosch)*
In the footsteps of Troitzky and of the Kubbel brothers (part 1)

ALAIN PALLIER

Edward Winter’s website(1) is an invaluable source of information for every chess passionate or searcher. Some time ago, Winter had the idea to compile information about the places where chess personalities, mainly players from the past had lived(2).

The idea of this article comes from Winter’s idea. Fortunately, in August, I had the opportunity to visit Saint-Petersburg(3) for my work. Before my trip I consulted this list. Among the collected addresses, I found two as especially interesting for the endgame study amateur, concerning Alexey Alexeyevich Troitzky and Leonid Ivanovich (or, in German style, Karl Artur Leonid) Kubbel. At the time, I had not consulted another great website which would have delighted me: www.e3e5.com. I recommend it to any chess fan who wishes to visit Petersburg. The second part of this article will exploit it.

When you visit Petersburg, you may have the impression that, very often, you are accompanied by Troitzky himself (in Russian Cyrillic: Троицкий): you cross the Troitzky most (Troitzky bridge), you see the Troitzky sobor (Troitzky cathedral), you follow the Troitzky prospekt (Troitzky avenue), or you do some shopping at the Troitzky rynok (Troitzky market). Even a Troitzky dom does exist: it is an estate agency! The explanation is quite simple: Troitzky is a common name in Russian, meaning Trinity. Of course, this is not specific to Petersburg, but this creates a strange impression for the non Russian-speaking chess amateur visitor.

Many Russian people, also, are called Troitzky (and not only in Petersburg, of course). Even outside Russia: the Serbian tennis player, Victor Troicki, has paternal grandparents who emigrated from Russia: it is the same name, spelled differently with Latin letters (in Serbian Cyrillic: Троицик).

Alexey Alexeyevich Troitzky was born in Petersburg (1866) and he died there, after the city had been renamed Leningrad (1942), but he spent most of his professional life outside the former capital of the Russian Empire, even if he came back home more or less regularly. The second part of this article will deal with Troitzky’s last years, when he settled in Sankt-Petersburg after retiring and with the Kubbel brothers who on the contrary never left the city, with the exception of a short stay in Riga during their childhood. I don’t know if someone has already reconstructed Troitzky’s full route from 1897 till 1933: it has not been an easy task but from endgame studies columns and from awards one can trace a large part of his travels to the remote Russian provinces.

A.A. Troitzky, during his years of formation, spent some time in Riga since he says himself that he attended the Riga Realschule, i.e. secondary school. I don’t know exactly when Troitzky was in Riga, as he doesn’t give any precise fact in the preface to his 1934 coll-

---

(1) www.chesshistory.com.
(2) The list, with a lot of precise addresses, can be found here: http://www.chesshistory.com/winter/extra.addresses.html.
(3) Sankt-Peterburg in Russian or Peterburg, or even, in common parlance, Peter, pronounced as Piter.
lection of studies\(^{(1)}\). The \textit{Realschule} (today the Riga 1st State Grammar School) was the school where the Latvian writer Rainis, who was born under the name of Jānis Pliekšāns in 1865 one year before Troitzky, graduated in 1884.

A.A. Troitzky settled in Petersburg in autumn 1890, and he was near 30 when he completed his formation: the Wikipedia Russian article gives 1894 as the year he got his leaving certificate from the technico-forest state academy in Saint-Petersburg, with the status of ‘лесовод 2-го разряда’\(^{(2)}\). But in “Not an autobiography”, Troitzky curiously writes (I underline): ‘during 1895 and 1896, \textit{the two years that I was in Petersburg}, I composed up to 50 studies’. He also adds: ‘My enthusiasm for chess began when I went to Petersburg as a student at the Forest Institute and started going to the café Dominique\(^{(3)}\)’. From this, we understand that Troitzky had not been in Petersburg before 1895 …

At least, one thing is certain: 1895 is indeed the year Troitzky published his first studies. It was in \textit{Novoye Vremya}, a daily Peterburgian newspaper with a weekly illustrated supplement. It seems that his first study \([+3005.10 \text{ d7c5}]\) was published on 23rd January 1895, with the solution given on 13rd March, as shown by Ken Whyld, who was able to refer to the \textit{Novoye Vremya} microfilms. Troitzky indicates in “Not an autobiography” that another study \([+0005.10 \text{ h8h4}]\) was the very first but he says that both were composed ‘more of less at the same time’. This supposes that Troitzky was in Petersburg \textit{before} 1895, because, as he explains, he was encouraged to compose by some friends of note\(^{(4)}\). Troitzky had indeed made the acquaintance of the two best players in the city: Mikhail Chigorin (1850-1908), the ‘father of Russian chess’ and Emanuel Schiffers (1850-1904), the second best player in Russia after Chigorin. They ‘became my good friends’ (preface to the English edition of ‘360’, Troitzky’s last collection of studies). They met in the Café Dominique, one of the first cafés in Russia. Chigorin was in charge of a column in \textit{Novoye Vremya} (New Time) from 1890 till 1907 and he asked Troitzky to contribute some original compositions. Schiffers was the editor of \textit{Shakhmatny Zhurnal} from 1894 to 1898, the other main publication that hosted Troitzky’s first compositions.

Then a twenty-year long period began during which Troitzky lived in the large region called in Russian \textit{Severo Zapadny Kraï}, the Northwestern Territory, that was composed of six \textit{guberniyas} or governorates, themselves subdivided in \textit{yuezds} or districts (today rayons). He writes:

‘In 1897 I moved from Petersburg into the backwoods of Smolensk province in the capacity of assistant of the Chief Forester’ (“Not an Autobiography”, \textit{EG119}, p. 745). Smolensk, a large town 360 km west-southwest of Moscow, is located near the boundary with present Belarus. From Petersburg, as the crow flies, the distance is approximately 600 km. Troitzky is not very accurate, probably because none of the remote places where he was in office was known by his readers. For the 1898-99 years, two places can be identified from the endings columns of the \textit{Deutsche Schachzeitung} and the \textit{Wiener Schachzeitung}: Gorodok and Dorsky. A quick search on Google shows that there are no less than 13 villages named Gorodok in the current Smolensk Oblast, that is more or less similar, in surface, with the former Smolensk Governorate (i.e. around 50,000 km\(^2\)). One of these is located near Gagarin City, then called Gzhatsk, in the Gagarinski rayon, a place clos-

\(^{(1)}\) This text “Not an autobiography”, has been translated in \textit{EG119}.

\(^{(2)}\) \textit{Lesovod} is translated in English by nurseryman, arboriculturist or forester.

\(^{(3)}\) A famous place for chess players in Petersburg, located on the principal street in the city, the prestigious Nevsky Prospekt, at number 24.

\(^{(4)}\) It has to be mentioned that Troitzky had already published a three-mover in 1893 in the Peterburgian \textit{Shakhmatny Zhurnal}.
er to Moscow than to Smolensk. The same search for Dorsky doesn’t give any result but a village called Dor does exist, in the same rayon. Today Gorodok has … 3 inhabitants, and Dor has … 7!

Troitzky has reported that, in his forest, he lost his interest in chess, until one day in 1905 when the son of a ranger paid him a visit and brought him fresh works published by new composers (Rinck and the Platov brothers) and Johann Sehwers. ‘My earlier interest in composing was reawakened and I felt the urge to return to it’, writes Troitzky.

It is not known exactly when the composer was posted to the Kovno Governorate (Kovenskaya guberniya). Kovno (today Kaunas, Lithuania), west of Vilnius, was the capital of independent Lithuania from 1920 to 1940, as Vilnius was then a part of Poland, but we know that in 1907 Troitzky was living in Kedainiai (Kiejdany in Polish, Kedahnen in German), a village located in central Lithuania (51 km north of Kaunas). Several studies published in Bohemia, Deutsches Wochenschach, Deutsche Schachzeitung mention this place. Is it in this place that the unfortunate composer lost, for the first time, his chess material after a fire? In his preface to ‘500’, his collection published in Germany and in German, Troitzky only mentions for this disaster the year it occurred: 1908. In 1909, after a short stay in Wilna (today Vilnius, Lithuania), Troitzky went north, to a new place: Jewe (today Jöhvi in Estonia), in the Governorate of Estonia, 40 km kilometres west of Narva, in the far east of present Republic of Estonia (Ida-Viru county), close to the Russian frontier. Next year, he was in Oleshnitsa as indicated in Niva, September 1910. Oleshnitsa (until 1923 the Russian name of a village now called Alajoe, in Estonia) is on the shores of Lake Peipus. Alajoe today has around 150 inhabitants. As Jöhvi is the capital of the Ida-Viru county in which Alajoe is located, maybe it was only one place and not two. For Troitzky, the advantage of this location was its relative closeness to Petersburg (less than 200 km).

One can also assume that Troitzky had kept a pied-à-terre in the capital of the Russian Empire. From time to time, the original studies published in chess magazines mention Petersburg: for instance, in November 1909 (Deutsche Schachzeitung), in January 1910 (Niva), or in 1912, (Bohemia and Deutsche Schachzeitung). Petersburg, at the beginning of 1st World War, had to be renamed in Petrograd, because of the German origin of its name that was now inappropriate in a country fighting against German Empire. But it is in a German source, the Ranneforth’s Chess-Kalender, that we find the first precise address of Alexei Troitzky in his native town.
Heinrich Ranneforth (1864-1945) was a German chesswriter, one of the editors, with M. Karstedt, of the *Deutsches Wochenschach*. Later, Ranneforth became one of the editors of the *Deutsche Schachzeitung* during the dark times of Nazism. Ranneforth published, from 1907 till 1938, his well informed yearly *Schach-Kalender*. In the 1915 issue, p.78, he gives the following full address:

‘Troitzky, A.: Roschdestvenskaja 44, Qu 22, St Petersburg/Petrograd 8, Russia’. This address, with its German spelling is also in Lamare’s papers with a small alteration (Roschdestwensaya). It corresponds to the current 8th Sovietskaya ulitsa, apartment 22 (German Qu is for Russian Kv, apartment), in the Smolny area. The name of the Rojestvenskaja street was changed, as many other streets, during the Soviet era.

In the following years, things are far from clear: it seems that in 1916 he was still posted in Jewe (source: *Tidskrift för Schack*), even if the *Chess Amateur* award, the same year, places him in Petrograd. In 1917, he was probably in Hmara, a small village in the Smolensk oblast, south-east of the regional capital (source, again: *Tidskrift för Schack*). Later the same year, the same source gives Minsk (Byelorussia). 1917 is also the year Troitzky lost for the second time his chess material.

Troitzky’s second period of professional activity took place in another part of Russia, this time east of Moscow, in the Penza region, near the Volga. He was no longer an assistant forester, he was an instructor in the Provincial Executive Committee (*Gubispolkom* in Russian), working for the new regime. Penza is located 625 km south-east of Moscow (i.e. 1,200 km south-east of Petersburg). Life in Penza and around was particularly troubled during the Bolshevik revolution: there was insurrection in the ‘kulak districts’ and it is from Penza that the Czechoslovak Legions launched an anti-Bolshevik uprising in April and May 1918, severely quelled by the Red Army.

These difficult years(1) coincides with Troitzky’s ‘second break in [his] composing activity’ (1917-1923), that was the cause of strong anxiety about his fate. In his column devoted to endgames, on page 168 of the July 1945 *BCM*, T.R. Dawson reported that more than 25 years before, he had announced Troitzky’s death: ‘In 1919, he was reported dead, but in 1920 in a letter from his own hand I had the joy of turning “dead” into “missing and found again”’. Marcel Lamare, in his review for *La Stratégie* of the Troitzky 1934 collection also mentions the rumour (‘There was a rumour going that he had been slaughtered; in point of fact, he had been the victim of several plunderings or fires that had destroyed his documentation’ – *La Stratégie*, August 1935). Even in Russia, nobody could certify that he was still alive. Later, in 1922, the chess journal *Shakhmaty* published a kind of missing person notice, asking Troitzky to give his address(2).

Next year, Troitzky came back to composition and to competition. ‘My reappearance came as a surprise there where an unconfirmed rumour had spread that I had perished in the Revolution.’ (“Not an Autobiography”, *EG* 119, p.746’). Sources(3) indicate that Troitzky worked in the forest areas of Dolgorukovo, Golovinscino and Černoserje. The latter is confirmed by several chess sources: Černoserje is in the Mokshansky raion, south-west of Penza. Troitzky’s foreward for his 1924 collection of studied was signed off: ‘Tschernoserje, 1 January 1924’. The award of the Česke Slovo 1924 tourney gives the same place (see *Casopis ceskoslovenskych sachistu* vii-viii1924, p. 99 and *Shakhmaty*, August 1924).

---

(1) Civil war, with intense fighting in 1918-1920, disorganized the whole country.
(2) This is quoted on p. 26 of the introduction written by V.A. Korolkov [A.A. Troitzky, Life and Work] for the 1959 collection of Troitzky studies.
(3) E.g. the Russian academic dictionary: http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ruwiki/418098.
Next year, a new name appeared: Siromias (Сыромяч), a village in the Sosnovorobovsky raion, east of Penza (e.g. in L’Echiquier, August 1925 or in Shakhmatny Listok, September 1925). Marcel Lamare received from Troizky himself a precious paper, handwritten both in Latin and Cyrillic letters, with his name (see document). It seems that Troitzky was stable during the next few years: L’Echiquier, in 1928, again mentions Siromias in this magazine both Penza or Siromias often alternate.

The Penzenskaya Elektronnaya Encyclopaedia underlines that Troitzky played a very active part in chess life in Penza: he organized chess tournaments, he kept himself busy with the local chess section and with the Penza newspaper, the Trudovaya Pravda, that hosted some studies of his own.

In December 1933, the Shakhmaty v SSSR study column still quotes Penza. Next year, the year he was awarded the title of Master of Sports of USSR for Chess composition (with three other composers: Mikhaïl Barulin, Alexandr Gulyaev and Leonid Kubbel), the great composer retired and came back to live as a pensioner in his native city, called Leningrad since 1924.

Special thanks to Wolf Rubinchik (Minsk), who helped me in locating some of the remote places where Troitzky was posted (he found Dor and Hmara), to Harold van der Heijden for browsing old chess columns, to Oleg Pervakov who read this article and sent me the 1995 article in 64 and to Timothy Whitworth, who, in 1996, helped me in locating Kedainiai.

P.3. A.A.Troitzky
Trudovaya Pravda 1927

![Chess diagram]


Sources

Troitzky’s collections:
– Endspielstudien, Schachverlag Bernhard Kagan, Berlin, 1924
– V.A. Korolkov and V. Chekhover, Izbrannye etudy A.A. Troitskogo (Selected studies of A.A. Troitzky), Fizkultura i sport, Moscow, 1959.


The (on-line) Penzenskaya Elektronnaya Encyclopaedia.

Edward Winter’s Chessnotes (www.chesshistory.com).

(to be continued)

Errata

In my article about Gurvich (EG184), Wolf Rubinchik found the following mistakes:

p.127, read Lubyanka instead and not Lyubanka.
p.127, the article in Pravda was published on January 28 and not 29.
What is “Let’s Check”?  

EMIL VLASÁK

In June 2011 ChessBase celebrated 25 years of existence. The congratulations from Garry Kasparov – one of the godfathers of the company and the first enthusiastic user – could not be missed on the ChessBase website. But the former champion did not only praise; at the end of his salutation he re-proached ChessBase for a certain stagnation, and indicated that one cannot live forever on one success. As an answer ChessBase promised that within three months they would introduce a new product that would be another revolution in chess.

Although the entire episode was clearly prearranged, it attracted considerable attention. Experts and amateurs have tried to predict the nature of the novelty. The vast majority guessed something like a remote engine (as specific chess reaction to the modern cloud computing concept), perhaps based on the Houdini engine, at a cost significantly lower than the expensive remote Rybka. But all those “shots” were off the mark.

By the way, nothing has been heard about remote Rybka last year, but according to backstage sources several grandmasters actually pay for using it.

Let’s Check in a Nutshell

That new “thing” is called Let’s check and was introduced early October 2011 as part of the new Fritz 13 software. In short, it is (or rather it will be) a gigantic online database of chess analyses.

Each position included in Let’s Check contains (1) up to three short computer lines with the name of generating engine, depth of its analysis and evaluation, (2) the discoverer’s name, (3) a mini discussion forum and (4) several other statistical values.

How does it work?

Suppose you need to analyze some position. In the engine window of Fritz 13 you switch on the special Let’s Check enhancement panel and it indicates immediately if the position has already been included in the Let’s Check database.

If so, you can study all the associated information. Maybe your problem is solved and you have saved an hour of work. If you disagree with the lines and/or the evaluation, you can leave your engine running until it “beats” the weakest of the Let’s Check lines. This will be replaced by your analysis under your name.

If you find a new position, you can “book” it in the Let’s Check system under your name. A “discoverer” of the position remains in the Let’s Check system forever, although his analysis can be eventually replaced by deeper calculations and better engines.

The name of the discoverer or innovator is actually a nick from “Playchess”, the well-known online chess club of ChessBase.

To be included in the Let’s Check lines, the analysis must be sufficiently deep. Fritz 13 measures the performance of your hardware and accordingly the minimum time calculation is estimated. A small progress bar runs down the lines, and after reaching a turning point, it becomes green.

Finding new positions can be a sport for some peculiar types of chess player, so something like the discoverers’ rating list is ready
for them. The ranking derives not only from the number of discoveries and depth of lines, but also from the number of later “visits”.

**LiveBook**

At a first look I had a feeling that the whole system is too machine-oriented. There are still positions not comprehensible to computers. A user can recognize them but he is unable to make any manual correction in shipped analysis.

The answer seems to be LiveBook – the second essential component of the Let’s Check system. LiveBook looks like a usual opening book, but its features are much richer.

Firstly, LiveBook tries to organize all positions – not only in the opening – in trees and derive from it the right evaluations. So if the engine lines are clearly wrong, it is possible to enter several other related positions into the system and this way to guide LiveBook in the right direction.

Second, LiveBook controls (through its comments panel) a small discussion forum associated with the current position. Here you can enter your doubts textually. You are entitled to one short note up to 140 characters. Each commentary can give a “Like”/“Dislike” tag from other users (like in Facebook), and these statistics are then displayed, too.

The system maintains another incentive and attraction – a publicly accessible commentator’s list with the number of likes/dislikes. This can also affect the display order of comments.

And thirdly, LiveBook is of course what you would expect – an excellent living opening book.

What does this “Live” mean? Suppose some important game is played in a super-tournament and it is available online. Some users analyze it continuously using a quick computer and having Let’s Check enabled. The game is still being played, but its opening phase is already a part of LiveBook.

---

**Renting engines**

ChessBase is evidently interested in the rapid growth of the whole system and it should be supported by another novelty – borrowing engines.

It often happens that on a powerful computer a user runs only some undemanding activity, such as typing or surfing the Internet. During such periods, you can rent your engine and computer performance for analysis required at another end of the world. Lending is never automatic; you must always explicitly offer it.

And when you need a deep analysis yourself in return you can use remote engines. The result could be surprisingly fast. Analysis of the whole game could ideally take only the time needed for one position.

There is a credit system to keep a fair balance between borrowing and using. For loan for one position to get 1 credit and the analysis of one position costs 1.3 credits. The “profit” is used by Let’s Check for automatic analysis of classic games. For example, at the time of writing this text a full analysis of the 1953 Candidate Tournament had been completed.

**How much does it cost?**

Let’s Check requires activated Fritz 13 software (about 50 EUR), whose functionality is guaranteed until at least December 31, 2014.

Let’s Check can be partially used even without an account on Playchess. To take full advantage you need any usual Playchess account (30 EUR yearly). With Fritz 13 you get a free Premium account for a half-year.

**Problems**

The first debates saw the main problem in the reluctance of professionals to share their work. However Let’s check accepts mainly machine lines and those could be generated even by well equipped beginners. Building the system will be obviously based on enthusiastic amateurs and it seems the built-in motiva-
tions (booking positions, rating lists) are enough for them.

And what about saboteurs trying to abuse and devalue the system? It is not a problem to write wrong comments and not big problem to put engine out of tune to generate weak lines. In addition to “like”/“dislike” buttons the system provides another more extreme one allowing denouncing a user. Such cases must be undoubtedly solved by a human administrator with good chess skills.

Let’s Check could change correspondence chess. Orthodox players apparently will not use Let’s Check being afraid of “showing their cards”. However a most creative player can use Let’s Check as the second unofficial communication channel to start playing some sort of poker with his opponents.

And finally, as a composer I dislike the possibility, that anyone can “book” already composed problems. As a try I have booked a well-known Troitzky study without any problems. I have quoted the actual author in the discus forum and have got several “likes”. Putting the real author in the note is still the only reasonable option, but I would like to see some better final solution.

What does all this mean?

If Let’s Check will start as intended, ChessBase will build a gigantic database with chess knowledge. It could cover not only openings, but also the middle game and endings and will become an essential reference. If such an ambitious plan to succeed remains an open question.

On the picture is a full Fritz 13 screen with Let’s Check.
1 – Let’s Check engine add-in pane; 2 – LiveBook. 3 š Discus forum.
In the discussion forum you can see my note about the actual author; it got 3x “likes”.
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Back in the late sixties and early seventies, when I made my first steps in the minefield of chess composition, one of my favourite books was *FIDE Album 1945-55* where I first got acquainted, among many classics, with the following *malyutka*:

A.1. Hugh Blandford
1st prize *Springaren* 1949

![Chess diagram](attachment:image.png)


This series of obvious (in fact forced) moves shows in the purest form the old theme known also from other genres as the Excelsior: A pawn moves all the way from its initial square to promotion.

The first excelsior belongs to the one and only Sam Loyd (1841-1911), the American wizard who was just 20 when he published this moremover:

According to the Wikipedia, Loyd had a friend who was willing to wager that he could always find the piece which delivered the principal mate of a chess problem. Loyd composed this problem as a joke and bet his friend that he could not pick a piece that *doesn’t* give mate in the main line (his friend immediately identified the pawn on b2 as being the least likely to deliver mate), and when the problem was published it was with the stipulation that White mates with “the least likely piece or pawn”.

The solution: 1.b4! (Threatening 2.Rf5 and 3.Rf1 mate, or 2.Rd5 and 3.Rd1 mate) 1...Rc5+ 2.bxc5! (Threatening 3.Rb1 mate) 2...a2 3.c6! (Resuming the threats as on move one) 3...Bc7 4.cxb7 and 5.bxa8Q (bxa8B) mate. The mate is delivered with the pawn which starts on b2.

The theme was named after the poem “Excelsior” by the famous American poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. The word means in Latin and in archaic English “ever higher.”

The Excelsior alone is not too exciting any more. After all as over the board players we happened to demonstrate it more than once running a single pawn or more all the way to the eighth rank.

However, combined with other motifs it might intensify the impression and contribute...
to the study’s thematic unity. This is best displayed in two recent prize winners.

The prolific Hungarian composer won the studies section in the big and successful tourney that celebrated (a couple of years too late but who cares?) the first jubilee of the Permanent Commission for Chess Composition.

A.3. János Mikitovics
1st prize PCCC 50 AT 2010


The formal theme in all sections of the event required pins and here indeed we witness a festival of pinning, unpinning, halfpinning and selfpinning. Quite a lot of them indeed are indicated in the course of the solution either in the main line or in thematic tries. Nevertheless, my personal view is that most of it is in fact just a matter of formality since, in particular, the unpinning and half-pinning are barely exploited to create real effect on the events. On the other hand, I was more impressed by the surprisingly natural and precise Excelsior as well as by the beautiful switchback, despite the absence of any tactics:

A special tourney commemorated the centenary of the late Russian grandmaster Alexander Tolush. The St. Petersburg duo realized the Excelsior in a bishop ending. The advanced black pawns look pretty dangerous while their white counterpart is under control. Which of the other white pawns is going to give it a try?

A.4. Leonard Katsnelson & Alexei Sochnev
1st prize Tolush 100 MT 2011

b1e1 0040.62 7/4 Draw
Jan Timman 60 Jubilee Tourney

New In Chess announces a composition tourney to commemorate the 60th birthday of Jan Timman, grandmaster and author of *The Art of the Endgame* and several other fine books on endgame studies.

No set theme. Twins and/or joint studies allowed.

The judge of this event will be Jan Timman himself.

**First prize: 300 €; Second prize: 200 €; Third prize: 100 €**

Also book prizes

Honourable mentions and commendations will be awarded

Entries should include the name of the composer(s), postal address, diagram with full solution (preferably with a PGN-file attached).

Please send **before June 30th, 2012** to the tourney director:

**René Olthof**

c/o New In Chess

P.O. Box 1093

NL 1810 KB Alkmaar

The Netherlands

E-mail: raja@newinchess.com

The winners will be announced in *New In Chess Magazine*
Tata Steel Chess and Studies Day

The third international Tata Steel Chess and Studies Day will be held on Saturday, January 28th, 2012 in De Moriaan in Wijk aan Zee (Netherlands) as part of Tata Steel chess tournament and in collaboration with ARVES. Chief Arbiter: Luc Palmans

Here is the time-table:
10:00 – 10.30: Registration
10.45: Official opening
11.00 – 14.00: International Open Solving Competition of studies with a prize fund of 750 euros and book prizes. Special prizes will be awarded to the best newcomers and youth solvers.
14.00 – 17.00: Watching live the penultimate round of the world’s most famous chess tournaments with GM commentary.

17.30: Prize giving and presentation of the solutions.

Entry fee: 15 euros; juniors (u-20) 10 euros; GMs and IMs – free.


For further details and registration (in advance as the number of participants is limited!) Please write to the organizer Yochanan Afek (afek26@gmail.com) before January 25th, 2012. Join an enjoyable chess and chess composition weekend with the special atmosphere of the great Wijk aan Zee festival and help us to create a successful event again!

International Solving Contest

The International Solving Contest (ISC) will take place on January 29th, 2012 – the last day of Tata Steel Chess tournament. The solving championship will be held simultaneously in various countries at the very same time. In 2011 more than 200 solvers from 28 countries took part and the winner was the English GM John Nunn (triple former winner of the Hoogovens, now Tata Steel grandmaster tournament). He will try to defend his title in De Moriaan against tough opponents such as GM Piotr Murdzia (Poland), currently the world’s highest rated solver, GM Dolf Wissmann, Netherland’s highest rated solver and GM Oleg Pervakov, currently the world’s study composing champion. They will all also take part in the study solving day on Saturday, January 28th.

The ISC is organized in two categories. The first category is aimed at experienced solvers and comprises two rounds of six problems each: twomover, threemover, moremover, selfmate, helpmate, study. The second category is designed for novice solvers, who have to solve four problems per round, two of which are twomovers.

Participation is free.

Location: The VIP room in De Moriaan at Wijk aan Zee

Time table:
10:30 – 10:45: Registration
11:00 – 13:00: Round 1
13:30 – 15:30: Round 2
Around 17:00: Results

After solving you may still enjoy the last round of the Tata-tournament and the live-commentary.

Registration and information:
No later than 25th January 2012 to: jc.uitenbroek@kpnplanet.nl through citing ISC2012.

More information about chess problems can be found at www.probleemblad.nl.

(Hans Uitenbroek)
The judge, Iuri Akobia (Georgia), received 14 entries. Three studies proved unsound, and four anticipated. The remaining studies all made it into the award.

**No 17992** R. Becker  
Prize  

![Chessboard](image1)


“The uncontested winner of the tourney. The stalemate with lock-out of the bishop is familiar, but here this idea is realised in a crystal clear manner in a new position!”


“A pleasant positional draw is realised here”.

**No 17994** Z. Mihajloski  
2nd honourable mention  

![Chessboard](image2)


“The play is sharp enough. It is necessary to note the accurate moves of the wK”.

No 17995  Z. Mihajloski
special honourable mention

```
  e8a8 0100.05 2/6 Draw
```


“Well-known manoeuvres, but the author has refreshed the play by adding the moves 11…e1S! in the try and 13.Ra1+! in the main line”.

No 17996  M. Pagani & M. Campioli
1st commendation

```
a8a5 0037.31 5/5 Draw
```

- Bf4+ 9.Kb7 Be3 10.Sd6+ Kc5 11.Sc4 draws, or:

No 17997  M. Pagani & M. Campioli
2nd commendation

```
g5c5 0004.57 6/9 Draw
```


No 17998  M. Campioli
3rd commendation

```
f4d1 3802.06 5/10 Win
```

- Kc1 6.Sa2+ Kb1 7.Sc3+, and:
  - Kc1 8.Rb7 d1Q 9.Sa2 mate, or here:
  - Ka1/i 8.Ra7 d1Q 9.Rxa5 mate.
The requested theme of the 2nd ARVES endgame study tourney during the PCCC meeting in Rio de Janeiro was: “studies with double check and mate in the final position”. The study used as an example was AJR’s EG1.00001! Judge Marcel Van Herck selected three studies for the award.


During the 2010 meeting in Crete of the World Federation for Chess Composition (WFCC, formerly PCCC) ARVES held its third Jenever tourney for endgame studies. The set theme was: mate by a pinned piece or pawn, no double check allowed.

Judge Marcel van Herck received 16 entries and considered the level satisfactory.

No 18001 O. Pervakov (Russia). 1.g7 Bxg7 2.Rxg7 Kb7 3.a5 Qc7 4.a8Q+ Sxa8 5.a6+ Ka7 6.Rxd7 Qxd7+ 7.Sc6 mate.

"Nice mating position and rich black counterplay".

No 18002 M. Erenburg (Israel). 1.Bb3 Qxd2+ 2.Sf4+ Kf8 3.g7+ Sxg7 4.b8Q+ Se8/i 5.a6+ Ka7 6.Rxd7 Qxd7+ 7.Sc6 mate.


No 18005 Sergey Borodavkin (Ukraine). 1.Raa6 Sxe7 2.g4+ Bxg4 3.Rh6+ Kg5 4.h4+ Kf4 5.Rhf6+ Sf5 6.Ra4+ Qd4+ 7.e3 mate.

No 18006 Vitaly Kovalenko (Russia). 1.h7 Rxh4+ 2.Kxh4 g2 3.h8Q g1Q 4.Qh6+ Ke4 5.Qh7+ Kd5 6.Qd3+ Qd4+ 7.e4 mate.

The 3rd commendation by A. Ooms, E. Van Beers (Belgium) & D. Wissmann (Netherlands) has a second solution: f7d7 4354.25 h6b8c7a6e3d8g4c8.e5e5b6c6e6e7f6 7/10

No 18005 S. Borodavkin
1st commendation

No 18006 V. Kovalenko
2nd commendation

During the WFCC-conference in Jesi, one of the numerous quick composing tourneys (in various chess composition genres) was organized by ARVES. It was an informal tourney as the names of the composers were known to the judges Marcel Van Herck (Belgium) and Harold van der Heijden (the Netherlands). The theme was “White and black underpromotion to bishop”.

In total 9 studies were submitted. By far the best study of the tourney was returned to the composer because it was not thematic since the bishop promotion occurred as a try.

A new matrix for a bishop promotion was found independently by three composer groups.

**No 18007** D. Gurgenidze & I. Akobia  
1st prize


i) g1Q 9.Rh1 Qxh1 10.h8Q wins, but not 9.h8B? Qg7+ 10.Rf6 Qxf6+ 11.Bxf6 stalemate.


**No 18008** Yochanan Afek (Israel/the Netherlands).  
2nd prize


**No 18009** Andrzej Jasik (Poland).  
3rd prize


**No 18010** Jan Timman (the Netherlands).  
1.f6 Sg7 2.fxg7+ Kg8 3.b7 a1B 4.bxa8B/i Bc7 5.Bc6/ii dx6 6.dxc6 d5 7.Ba2 b1Q 8.Bxd5+ wins.
**No 18010** J. Timman  
1st honourable mention

```
9rvl-+n+-mk0  
9zp-+p+-+-0  
9PzP-zp-+PmK0  
9+-+P+PzPP0  
9-+-+p+-+0  
9+-+-zP-+-0  
9pzp-+-+-+0  
9+L+-+-+-0  
h6h8 0343.86 10/10 Win
```

i) 4.bxa8Q (R)? stalemate, 4.bxa8S? Be7 5.Sxc7 stalemate,
ii) 5.Bb7? Ba5 and Black mates, e.g. 6.Be8 Bc3 7.Bxd7 Bxg7 mate.

**No 18011** David Gurgenidze (Georgia). 1.g7 Qe6+ 2.b6 f1B+ 3.c4 Qxc4+ 4.Sxc4 Bxc4+ 5.b5 Bg8 6.gxh8B/i wins.

i) 6.gxh8Q? (Rax8?) Sb4+ 7.axb4 stalemate.


i) a1Q 6.b8Q Qa4 7.Qg3 wins.
ii) 6.b8Q? stalemate.

```
The Romanian GM received 44 studies from 30 authors of 18 countries for his 80th JT. The results were published in *Gambit*. During the confirmation time the first prize winner (by Gasparyan and Manvelyan) was eliminated due to a second solution.


“After a short and pleasant introduction there is unexpected zugzwang position. White should avoid a positional draw after 4.Kd7? and a stalemate after 9.Bd8? It is surprising that the win is achieved by the last soldier on the board (wPc2) after all the pieces have disappeared”.


“A beautiful and unexpected stalemate with two white pieces pinned follows dynamic play by both sides”.


“Difficult play, including avoidance of a thematic try, results in two echo lines of a positional draw”.

---

**No 18013** M. Doré & A. Pallier 1st prize

b8b5 3045.30 7/4 Win

**No 18014** M. Hlinka & L. Kekely 2nd prize

h1e1 0761.21 5/6 Draw

**No 18015** J. Mikitovics 3rd prize

d4a5 0720.02 4/5 Draw
No 18016 L. Gonzalez
4th prize


“The stalemate position is not fully original but the accuracy of the white moves against clever black counterplay makes a good impression”.

No 18017 J. Mikitovics & I. Akobia
1st honourable mention

No 18017 János Mikitovics & Iuri Akobia (Georgia).


“Two lines based on positional draws after a small change: one with a permanent opposition of the rooks or stalemate, the other with a pleasant underpromotion”.

No 18018 J. Timman
2nd honourable mention

No 18018 Jan Timman (the Netherlands).


“An excellent miniature with a position of mutual zugzwang and a sacrifice of the wB to win the advanced pawn”.

No 18019 Leonard Katsnelson & Vladimir Katsnelson (Russia).


“The stalemate conclusion can be achieved only after the difficult finding of fine and precise play”.

No 18019
No 18019 L. Katsnelson & V. Katsnelson
3rd honourable mention

No 18020 V. Kalandadze
4th honourable mention

No 18021 R. Becker & I. Akobia
special honourable mention

After refusing to capture a rook, White sacrifices his queen. Since the bQ has to prevent the wP from promoting, the wK is just in time to get to g8. The wK march to b3 is spectacular, although predictable. The black pawn promotion ending in stalemate is well-motivated as a rook could not win the ending without the help of the bK’.


“After the introductory phase of this difficult study an ending of queen and rook against queen and rook results. The length of the solution and the analysis of white and black alternatives make this study too difficult to solve but I could not remain indifferent to the depth of the study and the very original zugzwang position after 30.Ke3 which is the only way to achieve the victorious march of the wK from the d-file to the h-file”.


ii) Qb5 31.Rh7+ Ka6 32.Qa3+ Qa5 33.Ra7+ wins.

iii) Qd3 33.Re7+ Ka6 34.Qc8+ Ka5 35.Qa8+ Kb4 36.Re4+ Kb3 37.Qa4+ wins.

iv) Qb3+ 34.Kh2 Qb2+ 35.Kh3 wins.

v) Rb6 46.Kh4 Qb5 47.Qg7+ Rb7 48.Qa1+ Qa6 49.Ra8+ wins.
No 18022  G. Amann & M. Minski
1st commendation

The draw in this difficult miniature is only achieved when the bK reaches the second rank so that the pawn/rook battery is able to fire following a sacrifice of wS”.

No 18023  A. Pallier
2nd commendation

An unexpected model stalemate arises after sacrificing all the white pieces with check but in a precise order”.

No 18024  J. Mikitovics & I. Akobia
3rd commendation

“The not so common ending of queen and pawn against rook, bishop and pawn includes some interesting moments”.

No 18025  Y. Afek
4th commendation

4/3 Draw
4/3 Win
3/5 Win

“A phoenix theme in a stylish miniature”.

MG proposes 4.Sc5 Bd6 5.Ra8+ Bb8 6.Kb5 Rd5 7.Ra6 Rh5 8.b7+ Kd8 9.Re6 Rh7 10.Kb6 Rh1 11.Rg6 and although at first sight it is difficult to make progress, all lines analysed eventually led to a win. The relevant 7 men EGTB will give the final answer in the future.

No 18026 Melnichenko
1st laudation


“A mate study with a clear solution without special virtues”.

No 18027 A. Avni
2nd laudation


i) f4 2.Qb7 Qd1+ 3.Ke5 Qa4 4.Qb1 Qa5+ 5.Kf6 draws.

“A wQ sacrifice on d7 and reappearance of the wQ are followed by another sacrifice of the wQ (a spiritual expansion of the Phoenix theme) in order to capture the bQ. A brief but sparkling solution”.

h5d7 0426.31 7/5 Win

d4a3 4310.12 4/5 Draw
Beginners tourney 2008

In Shakhmatnaya Kompozitsia no. 84 the results of a tourney for beginners, in several composition sections, was published. A beginner was defined as a composer without having a composition in the FIDE Album (!). The endgame section was judged by David Gurgenidze (Georgia).

No 18028 L. Gonzalez

1st prize


“Clear final combination and beautiful stalemate with two active self-blocks”.

No 18029 S. Didukh

2nd prize


“Nice work, synthesis of several study ideas”.

No 18030 M. Pagani & M. Campioli

1st honourable mention


No 18031 Pietro Rossi

3/8 Win


No 18032 Maddalena Pagani & Marco Campioli


“Clear final combination and beautiful stalemate with two active self-blocks”.


“Nice work, synthesis of several study ideas”.

No 18030 Maddalena Pagani & Marco Campioli (Italy). 1.Ke1, and:

– bxa5 2.a7 a4 3.a8Q a3 4.Qa5 a2 5.Kf2, and:
  • a1Q 6.Qxa1 e1Q+ 7.Qxe1 and mate, or:
  • e1Q+ 6.Qxe1 a1Q 7.Qxa1 and mate, or:

– b5 2.a7 b4 3.a8Q b3 4.Qe4 b2 5.Qe5 e1Q+ 6.Qxe1 b1Q 7.Qxb1 and mate.


No 18031 P. Rossi

No 18032 M. Pagani & M. Campioli

No 18033 V. Zenkov


No 18033 V. Zenkov

No 18034 F. Bertoli

No 18032 M. Pagani & M. Campioli

No 18031 P. Rossi


i) Kd6 5.Sf5+ and 5.e4 mate.
GM Jan Rusinek (Poland) judged the 2007-2008 Israel Ring Tourney. The award was published in *Variantim* no. 51, x2009.

No 18035 Gregory Slepyan (Belarus).

i) 1.b8Q? gxf1Q+ 2 .b7+ Qxa6 wins, or 1.b8S? gxf1B 2.b7+ Bxa6 wins.

ii) gxf1Q+ 2.b7+ Qxa6 3.Rxf6+ Kxf6, or g1Q+ 2.b7+, or Rxb8+ 2.Kxb8 Sd7+ 3.Kc7 Rc5+ 4.Kd8 g1Q 5.Bc4+ win.

“The wK is in check in the diagram position but there is compensation for this flaw in the fantastic sequel: reciprocal bishop promotions lead to an extravagant position with bishops of the same colour on either side: two black-squared ones versus rook plus two-white squared ones! The two white bishops successfully block the bR, while the two free white-squared black bishops are powerless against the wK, as he can always occupy a black square!”.

MG wonders whether 6.Bbxe5 is a dual and proposes a different move order: Re6 5.Bdxe5 Bxb7+ 6.Ka7 Kd7 7.Kb6 is main line.

No 18036 Jürgen Fleck (Germany).

i) 5.Kd5? Qg5+ 6.Ke6 Qc5 wins.


iv) Ka7 10.Bc4 zz.


“Interesting lengthy and sharp play (on both sides) with some attractive motifs: sacrifices, reciprocal zugzwang and minor promotions. All the captures (except pawn captures) are of sacrificed pieces. A not very serious dual (but a dual anyway) on move 13 slightly spoils the impression. Probably the Nalimov Tablebase is a co-author of this study, but only in a small percentage”.


i) 2.Kg6? Bh8 3.17 Sf4+ wins.


“Not an original final stalemate combination (for example Filaretov 1926 and many others), but the introductory play with two knight promotions seems to be original and is attractive”.


No 18038 Valery Kalashnikov & Aleksandr Pankratiev 2nd honourable mention

h1g4 3442.11 6/5 Draw


i) h3+? Kg5 2.Rg2+ Kh6 3.Bg7+ Kh5 4.Sf6+ Kh4 5.Rg4+ Kxh3 wins.

“A fantastic final position after 7.Sd4, with Black to move, his king not in check and the bQ and bB unable to win against two white knights. If not for the very brutal initial play this study would have been placed higher”.


i) Kxd7 2.g7 Rh1+ 3.Kg3 f1Q 4.Bxf1 Rxf1 5.Kg2 wins.

ii) d3 8.g8Q d2 9.Qg4+, or Rd6 8.g8Q d3 9.Qg4+ win.

“Sharp and interesting play”.

No 18040 R. Becker & I. Akobia 4th honourable mention

h1e3 0443.11 4/5 Draw


"After the initial play we have a position with rook against rook, knight and pawn. In some variations White draws by precise play based on reciprocal zugzwang positions and stalemate. It is a pity that the wK, bK and bS already stand on their final squares in the starting position. The concluding play seems to be a large extent ‘composed’ by the Nalimov Tablebase, hence the not very high placing”.

No 18041 Wieland Bruch & Martin Minski (Germany). 1.Ka5/i Rb8 2.Rb7/ii, and:

– Rxb7 3.Qd3+/// Qxd3 stalemate, or:

– Bxb7 3.Qxb4+/// Kxa2 4.Qd2+ Kb1 5.Qd1+ Kb2 6.Qd2+ Kb3 7.Qe3+ Qxe3 stalemate, or:

No 18041 W. Bruch & M. Minski commendation

b6a3 4430.34 6/8 Draw


"Three stalemate variations (after a very attractive 2nd white move). In the third main line the authors should end the solution by the immediate stalemate 4.Rxb4, because of the dual 6.Rd7”.

No 18042 J. Vandiest † commendation

d3f2 4031.02 3/5 Win

No 18042 Julien Vandiest (Belgium). 1.Qh2+ Kf3 2.Qh3+ Qg3 3.Qxf5+ Qf4 4.Qh3+ Qg3 5.Qf1+ Qf2 6.Qxd1+ Kg3
7. Qg4+ Kh2 8. Qh5+ Kg3 9. Qg5+ Kh3 10. Qh6+ Kg3 11. Qg7+, and:
- Kf4 12. Qg4+ Ke5 13. Qd4+ Ke6 14. Qd5+ Ke7 15. Sf5+ Kf6 16. Qd8+ Kg6 17. Qg8+ Kh5 18. Qxh7+ Kg4 19. Se3+ Kg5 20. Qg7+ Kf4 21. Qf6+ Kg3 22. Qg5+ Kh3 23. Qg4+ Kh2 24. Ke4 Qb2 25. Qh4+ Kg1 26. Qg3+ Kh1 27. Qh3+ Kg1 28. Qf1+ Kh2 29. Sg4+ Kg3 30. Qf4+ Kh3 31. Sf2+ Kg2 32. Qf3+ and wins, or:

“Long but not very interesting play with no artistic elements. Similarly to the 4th HM, it seems that the Nalimov Tablebase is a significant co-worker in this study”.

HH doubts the judge’s remark. The late Belgium composer never worked with a computer.


i) 2. Qb2+? Kg3 3. Qe5+ Kh3 4. Qxf5+ Kh2 5. Qf2 Kh1 draws.


“A pawn ending, with a Réti manoeuvre in the try”.

But MG observes that also 2. b8Q g1Q 2. Qxa7+ and 1. Kd5 g2 2. b8Q work. Perhaps minor duals, but as a key move?
An endgame study tourney was organized to commemorate the 100th birthday of Aleksandr Gulyaev/Grin (18xi1908-18ii1998) and Rafael Kofman (26iii1909-20xii1988). The judge was Andrey Selivanov (Russia), and the award was published in Shakhmatnaya Kompozitsia no. 92, 9xii2009.

Thanks to the index that Paul Valois (Great Britain) compiled – see http://www.arves.org/egin-index.txt – we can quickly retrieve what has been written in EG about Gulyayev (Grin): EG86 (p. 160) about the change of name, photographs in EG127 (221) and EG129 (366), a recent article by A. Pallier in EG182 (270) and a long obituary by AJR in EG129 (364) that finishes with the remarkable fact that Gulyayev was not only born on the same day as his wife, but also died on the same day that she died. In EG121 (866) Gulyayev write about semi-pawn studies. In 1991, ARVES published a book (7th ARVES-book) about him, written by Timothy Whitworth.

A short obituary of Kofman can be found in EG95 (528).

The tourney attracted only 14 studies by 14 composers from Russia, Ukraine and Armenia. Apparently the tourney had not been widely announced…

No 18044 E. Eilazyan
1st prize

```
No 18044 E. Eilazyan (Ukraine). 1.a7, and:


iv) e.g. Kg6 18.Kc3 Qe2 19.Qf4 Qd1 20.Qg3+ Kf5 21.Qh3+ Kg5 22.Qe3+ Kg4 23.Qe4+.

v) After 12…Kh6 the bK is caught in prison and cannot escape.

“A double main line study with mutual logical manoeuvres and fine imaginative play by both parties”.

No 18045 L. Katsnelson & V. Razumenko
2nd prize
```

```
f7c8 0540.34 7/7 Win
```
**No 18045** Leonard Katsnelson & Viktor Razumenko (Russia). 1.e7 Bb3+ 2.Kf8 Re5 3.e8Q+ Rxe8+ 4.Kxe8, and:


“Two mate finishes, the first of which has three tries each ending in stalemate”.

**No 18046** A. Gasparyan
3rd prize

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)

a4e8 0375.21 6/6 Win


“An ideal mate with two knights”.

**No 18047** M. Zinar
special prize

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)
b1f8 0000.78 9/8 BTM, Win

Two studies that won special prizes are incorrect:


G. Amiryan (Armenia) has multiple duals (I. Akobia): e1e4 0200.28 a1h1.b4e3a3b3 b5b6b7g3h3h6 5/9 BTM, draw: h2 2.O-O-O/i Kxe3 3.Rxh2 gxh2 4.Rh1 Kf4 5.Rxh2 Kg5 6.Rh3/ii a2 7.Kb2 h5 8.Rxb3 draws, or a2 2.O-O/iii Kxe3 3.Rfb1/iv axb1Q+ 4.Rxb1 Kd4 5.Rxb3 Kc4 6.Rxg3 h2+ 7.Kxh2 Kxb4 8.Kg2 (Kg1) and White wins (!). However, in the first main line also 6.Rd2 (Re2) draw, while in the second main line 3.Rab1 (Rad1, Rfe1+) also draw.

**No 18048** Y. Rupchev
1st honourable mention

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)
a8g6 3210.23 6/5 Win


Ali Tebrizi Shatranji MT 2009

Ali-As-Shatranji Aladdin at-Tebrizi, a chaturanga master of the 14th-15th century, came from the city of Tebriz, the historical capital of Azerbaijan. He was the strongest player in the Timurid Empire (1336-1405) and he could play blindfold games as well. Ali Tebrizi is an author of a treatise on chaturanga that carries also 60 mansubas, 19 of which are his own. It is in this treatise that, for the first time, the names of the authors started appearing above the diagrams.

Tebriz is the biggest city in the north-western part of Iran, and, it is the capital of the Eastern Azerbaijan Province. The population is over 2 million. Being historically an Azerbaijani city, Tebriz boasts a rich ancient history having been a capital of several ancient empires.

21 studies from 17 Azerbaijan composers participated. The judge, Bakhtiyar Rustamov (Baku, Azerbaijan), was assisted by Iuri Akobia (Georgia) who checked the studies for soundness and anticipation, and Rauf Aliovsadzade (USA) who took care of the English translation. The award was published in Shahmat bestechiliyi no. 10 iv2009. The MT was sponsored by the ‘Maccabi-Azerbaijan’ Culture and Sports Society and had a total prize fund of 200$.

No 18050 I. Aliev
1st prize

f8h8 4800.30 7/4 Draw


ii) 2.g6+? Kh8 3.Qxe3 Qg8+ 4.Ke7 Qg7+ 5.Kd8 Qf8+ 6.Qe8 Rc8+ wins.

iii) Rxg6 5.hxg6+ Kxg6 6.Qg1+ Kf5 7.Qxe3 draws.


“A picturesque study with consecutive sacrifices of white pieces: two rooks (one sacrifice showing the WCCT-7 theme) and queen, plus interesting play with a S-promotion and stalemate. In spite of the fact that this stalemate position is not new, the whole play is just amazing”.

No 18051 M. Muradov
2nd prize

e1h5 1600.16 3/9 Draw


ii) 9.Qe1? Rf2 10.Qg1 Rf1+ 11.Qxf1+ g2 12.Qf2 Rh1+ 13.Kxa2 g1Q wins.
“A fight between the wQ and many black pieces ends in a march by the wK to a stalemate retreat. A correction of the author’s earlier published position in Shahmat (Baku) 1985”.

**No 18052** S. Badalov †
3rd prize

![](image1)

**No 18053** G. Gelman
1st honourable mention

![](image2)

**No 18054** S. Badalov †
2nd honourable mention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Comments/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.c6</td>
<td>bxc6 2.Qg8, and:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Qxh4 3.Qh8+ Kg5 4.Qd8+ Sf6 5.Qd2 mate, or:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sf8 3.Qh8+ Sh7 4.g5+ Kh5 5.Qc8 Sxg5 6.Qg4+ Kh6 7.Qxg5+ Qxg5+ 8.hxg5+ Kxg5 9.bxa5 wins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) 1.Qg8? Sf8 2.Qh8+ Sh7 3.g5+ Kh5 4.Qc8 Sxg5 5.Qg4+ (hxg5 Qxg5+;) Kh6 6.Qxg5+ Qxg5+ 7.hxg5+ Kxg5 8.bxa5 (c6 b6;) c6 draws.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“A nice key move with foresight effect. Motives from a Botvinnik & Kaminer study (HHdbIV#10514)”. 


i) 3.a7? a1Q 4.Bc7+ e5 5.Bxe5+ Qxe5 6.a8Q Qf6+ draws.
ii) 4.a7? a1Q 5.Bxe5+ Qxe5 6.a8Q Qf6+ draws.
iii) 5.f4+? Kxf4 6.a7 a1Q 7.a8Q Qf6+ 8.Kh3 Qf5+ 9.Kh4 Qg4 mate.
iv) 6.f4+? Kxf4 7.a8Q Qf6+ draws.

“A series of tactical moves allows the seizing of the new-born bQ”.


“A series of tactical moves allows the seizing of the new-born bQ”. 

The 3rd HM is cooked by MG: R. Allayov & R. Hasanov, h2e8 0400.22 f7c5.f5g6a5b4 4/4 Win. Intended: 1.Kh3 b3 2.f6 Rg5 3.Re7+ Kf8 4.g7+ Kg8 5.Re8+ Kf7 6.Rf8+ Ke6 7.g8Q+ Rxg8 8.Rxg8 wins. However also 2.Rf6 wins: Rc8 3.Rb6 Rc3+ 4.Kh4 Rc4+ 5.Kh5 b2 6.Rxb2 Ke7 7.Rb7+, or Ke7 3.Re6+ Kd7 4.g7...

No 18055 E. Abdullayev
1st commendation

b5d5 0440.50 8/3 Draw

No 18055 Elmar Abdullayev (Shirvan).
  “Getting rid of all the pieces leads to a stalemate. Nice but rather forceful”.

No 18056 Alakbar Tahmazov (Lachin).
1.b4+, and:
  – axb3ep 2.Ra1+ Kb6 3.Sd5+ Kb7 4.Sxc7 wins, or:
  – cxb4 2.Rh5+ Kb6 3.Sd5+ Kc6 4.Sxc7 wins, or:
  – Kb6 (Kb4) 2.Sd5+ and 3.Sxc7 wins.
  “’Shorty’ with forks involved”.

No 18056 A. Tahmazov
2nd commendation

d3a5 3101.13 4/5 Win

No 18057 M. Isgandarov
3rd commendation

b5e6 0300.20 3/2 Win

No 18057 Misraddin Isgandarov (Sumgayit).
1.b7 Re1 2.c6 Rb1+ 3.Kc5 Rc1+ 4.Kd4 Rb1 5.c7 Rxb7 6.c8Q+ wins.
  “Rook malyutka. The wK moves are clearcut”.

No 18057 M. Isgandarov
3rd commendation
EG Subscription

Subscription to **EG** is not tied to membership of ARVES.

The annual subscription to **EG** (Jan. 1 – Dec. 31) is **25,00** euro for 4 issues.

Payable to ARVES (Brialmontlei 66, B-2018 Antwerpen, Belgium):

- IBAN : NL19 INGB 0000 0540 95
- BIC : INGBNL2A
- ING Bank NV, POB 1800, 1102 BW Amsterdam
- In the Netherlands Postbank 54095 will do

If you pay via eurogiro from outside the European Union, please add **3,50** euro for bankcharges.

Payment is also possible
- via Paypal on http://www.paypal.com to arves@skynet.be

And from outside Europe:
- postal money orders, USD or euro bank notes (but no cheques)

  to the treasurer (please, not ARVES or **EG** !)

**New!** Subscribers in Great Britain can pay via Paul Valois. They can write him a cheque for **£22** (payable to Paul Valois, please) for one year’s subscription to **EG**. His address is 14 Newton Park Drive, Leeds LS7 4HH.

It is of course possible with any kind of payment to save bank charges by paying for more years or for more persons at the same time, as some subscribers already do, or in cash at the annual World Congress of Chess Composition (WCCC) run in conjunction with meetings of the World Federation of Chess Composition (WFCC).

For all information, especially change of address, please contact the treasurer:

Marcel Van Herck
Brialmontlei 66, B-2018 Antwerpen, Belgium
e-mail : arves@skynet.be
# Table of contents

*Editorial*, by Harold van der Heijden ................................................................. 3  
*Originals (35)*, by Ed van de Gevel ................................................................. 4  
*Spotlight (31)*, by Jarl Ulrichsen ................................................................. 6  
*Obituary, Jan Voormans (18VI1944 - 26XI2011)* .......................................... 10  
*In the footsteps of Troitzky and of the Kubbel brothers (part 1)*, by Alain Pallier 11  
*What is “Let’s Check”*, by Emil Vlasák ......................................................... 16  
*Even higher: Excelsior Plus*, by Yochanan Afek ........................................... 19  
*Timman 60 JT* .................................................................................................. 21  
*Tata Steel Chess and Studies Day & International Solving Contest* ................. 22  
*Awards*  
  16th Meeting of Solidarity 2007-2009 ............................................................... 23  
  2nd ARVES Jenever ty 2009 ............................................................................ 25  
  3rd ARVES Jenever Ty 2010 ........................................................................... 26  
  4th ARVES Jenever ty 2011 ........................................................................... 28  
  Nestorescu 80 JT 2010 .................................................................................. 30  
  Beginners tourney 2008 .................................................................................. 35  
  Israel Ring Tourney 2007-2008 ...................................................................... 37  
  Gulyaev & Kofman MT 2009 ......................................................................... 41  
  Ali Tebrizi Shatranji MT 2009 ....................................................................... 44  

ISSN-0012-7671  
Copyright ARVES  
Reprinting of (parts of) this magazine is only permitted for non-commercial purposes and with acknowledgement.