EG is fortunate to be able to print two appreciations of the work of the late Vitold Vitoldovich Yakimchik. We thank Paul Valois for his translations.

I: A MAGICIAN OF THE STUDY
by Ya. Vladimirov, Moscow

Vitol’d Vitol’dovich Yakimchik (1911-1977) belonged to the great galaxy of Soviet composers of the older generation. He gained general recognition comparatively late, only in the 1950s when his job (Yakimchik was an outstanding metallurgical engineer) allowed him to devote more time to composition. In the years after the war he published over 100 studies, out of a total of about 130. His highly original ideas and refined technique brought him many victories in big tourneys, including gold, silver and bronze medals in USSR Championships, alongside such stars as Kasparyan, Korolkov, Bron, Kazantsev, Gorgiev and others.

Yakimchik was a strong over-the-board player and finished high up in Kazakhstan Championships. His high analytical talent and exceptional tenacity allowed him to uncover all the possibilities in a position, approximating the study as much as possible to practical play. Yakimchik was keen to express his views in print, and in his famous article "Reaching for the ideal" (Shakhmaty v SSSR, No. 9, 1971) expounded his attitude to study composition at length.

The study, in his opinion, "is like a slice form a practical game, like an adjourned position, or a position in a correspondence game... by its very appearance it must create a pleasant impression on the solver." He loved to have an unstrained diagram position, where the two sides are engaged, where pieces are not en prise, but only become subject to attack and defence during the course of the solution. "It is good, when chances appear equal to begin with, and the position looks grey and commonplace. Surely simplicity most effectively highlights content which is out of the ordinary! A heavy and unnatural position requires some exceptional content, otherwise the essential element of the unexpected is lost."

"An essential feature of a good study is, in my opinion, the discovery either of a satisfactorily clear-cut final position or of a supple mechanism leading to a violent conclusion". In the first case, play ends when a theoretical win or draw is reached, in the second as a rule with a spectacular finale such as mate, stalemate, positional draw and so on. To make the introductory play interesting, the composer "adds material (normally un avoidable) thereby gradually and skilfully extending the time-lapses
between piece captures, forcing these pieces to live, to move... Many studies can be lengthened by the addition of material. The result is like sweets in many different sorts of wrappers, which only serve to annoy. Knowing when to stop extending a study is a not inconsiderable art".

Yakimchik had no favourite themes. His ideas are quite varied (compare Y1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9). He worked with great skill on minor promotions (Y2, 6, 10), loved miniatures and frequently went for extra analytical variations, as long as no extra material was involved. He always introduced purely analytical subtleties (Y3, 7, 9, 10) and the beauty of his compositions is particularly evident after lengthy analysis of the position.

His studies are frequently embellished by thematic tries (Y3, 5, 7, 9), and positions of mutual zugzwang (Y3, 5, 10). They are tough to solve and in a number of cases were underestimated by judges for this reason.

The Kazakhstan master considered Y6 and Y7 to be among his best compositions, considering that in them he succeeded in combining all the necessary ingredients of a study. He greatly admired the work of Mattison, Gurvich and Liburkin.

Vitol'd Vitol'dovich Yakimchik was one of the galaxy of Soviet study composers which emerged in the late 1920s. He produced about 150 studies, the overwhelming majority of them after the war. His style is clearly defined; he leant towards simple positions in which sharp ideas lay hidden. Possessing a high composing technique, he created many works of outstanding quality which will forever hold a place in the world's treasury of study composition. He published his studies only after the most careful testing, thus showing the high standard he set himself in composition. He very rarely participated in non-Soviet tourneys, a fact which surprised many, including the present writer. As a result his work is not sufficiently well-known abroad.

He took part with success in a number of USSR Championships for studies. His best results were: 3rd Place in the 6th Championship, 1963; equal 1st & 2nd with Kasparyan in the 8th Championship, 1968; 2nd in the 10th Championship, 1972 and 2nd in the 11th Championship, 1975.

An engineer, he was a leading expert in the extraction of non-ferrous metals.

I only met Yakimchik once, in 1973, a meeting which led to a joint composition. Who knows, if we had met more often, there might have been more studies...

The examples: Y1, Y4, Y8 were selected by both article writers. Y2, Y3, Y5, Y6, Y7, Y9, Y10 were chosen by Y.G. Vladimirov. Y11, Y12, Y13, Y14 were chosen by G.M. Kasparyan.


1. e6/i Sc6 2. a6 Sd3 3. e7/i Sxe7 4. a7 Sd5 5. a8Q Sba6 6. Qf3 Kh2 7. Qg4 Kh1 8. Qg3 wins.

i) 1. d8Q + Ke2 2. Qe8 + Bc3 + 3. Ka2 Qd5 + wins.

V.V. Yakimchik
3rd Pr., 1st FIDE Tourney, 1957

V.V. Yakimchik
5th Comm., 64, 1969

Y5

Y7


Y6

V.V. Yakimchik
H.M., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1966

Win 4 + 5

Win 4 + 3


Y8

V.V. Yakimchik
2nd Pr., Molodezh' Gruzii, 1970

Draw 4 + 3


iii) 6. ... Bf3 7. Kg6 Ke2 8. Kf7 Be6 9. Kg6 is a positional draw found by A. Sarychev.
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Y13 V.V. Yakimchik
3rd Pr., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1971


Y14 V.V. Yakimchik
1st Pr., 64, 1972


John Selman (1910-2.1.78).
An appreciation by Jan.H. Marwitz,
Dalfsen (Netherlands)

John Selman was a chessplayer and study composer with brilliant ideas. Through his employment in the documentation department of Shell he edited the house chess bulletin. After the untimely passing of J.C.A. Fischer in 1939 he took over the chess column of "De Schaakwereld", and ran it well. In 1943 the paper lapsed. At about New Year time in 1940 he sent SI to Pal Farago for publication in Revista Romana de Sah. Due to
the circumstances of war he never received news of its publication. After the conclusion of hostilities there was no way to find out. S2 was entered for the TKNSB tourney of 1949 and won 1st Prize. How then did S3, by Vladimir Korolkov, win 1st Prize in "Lelo" - in 1951? Were both the composer of S3 and the judge unaware of Selman’s 1949 1st Prize? Was, possibly, Korolkov acquainted with the (presumably published) Revista Romana de Sah fore-runner? Or was it an extraordinary coincidence? In any case, the anticipation is cut. John Selman was particularly hurt that in the many re-publications of Korolkov’s "Lelo" 1st Prize there is no word of his anticipatory study. (An honourable exception occurs on pp. 72-73 of ‘650’, dated 1955, but even here the Selman position is not given).

John Selman possessed an extensive, almost complete, library of books and magazines on the endgame. His sense of order (documentation!) led him to gather together every piece of information relating to one particular topic, not resting until all missing items had been brought under his wing.

Here are two examples of John Selman’s meticulousness.

The unravelling of the riddles surrounding the famous Saavedra study cost him much time, money and hard work. Travels in Scotland, England and Spain yielded so much data that he could have made a whole book out of it. (Thanks to John Selman’s diligence and kindness, photocopies of much of this material are in my possession. AJR) Alas, that never happened. True, an article entitled "Who was Saavedra?" appeared in TKNSB for xi.40. In this regard also Selman failed to receive the credit he, and he alone, deserved: others have used his material without acknowledgment.

The ‘Reti-maneuvre’ pawn-study maneuvre also received his attention. SCHACH-ECHO in ix-xii.67 published his researched material on this, the result of many contacts, among them the late Dr. Staudte.

John Selman had many friends. In his Scheveningen house at The Hague John and his ‘fair wife Anje’ welcomed plenty of guests (Harold Lommer and AJR included). He had a stimulating effect on young composers. In the course of our long friendship I learned to appreciate him especially for his never-failing interest in, and compassion for, all "struggles with the inanimate pieces of wood"!

S1:

S2:
S2: J. Selman
1st Prize, Tijdschrift van den K.N.S.B., 1949

S3: V. A. Korolkov
1st Prize, Lako, 1951

Review

*C* 0100 and 0130 (GBR Classes)

T. Strohlein and L. Zagler of the Institut für Informatik (Computer Science Institute) of TUM (Technische Universität München) have published the results of their 1967-9 work with respect to king and rook against king, and king and rook against king and bishop. The bulk of the 202 pages comprises computer printout. The full title is "Ergebnisse einer vollständigen Analyse von Schachendspielen König und Turm gegen König König und Turm gegen König und Läufer," 1978.

0100 Every position with W to play is given, in the 'normalised' form where wK stands on one of the 16 squares a1-a4-d4-d1. The best move is indicated for each position, together with the number of moves to capture bK (that is, one move beyond checkmate). Alternatives are not given. Where there is only one move to achieve mate in the shortest time, an exclamation point (!) is printed. All this takes 86 pages. There follow 12 pages where all positions are listed where there is at least one unique line to checkmate -- that is, all possible sound problems (mate in n) with this material are to be found here. (Naturally, there are no sound studies with this material!) However, solutions shorter than 4 moves (to checkmate) are not given. Finally, all maximum solution (16 moves to mate) positions are given.

0130 Again the positions are given normalised with respect to wK. The maximum length of solution is 18 W moves to mate or win of bB. Solutions shorter than 4 moves are not given, being trivial. A recommended move for W is given. As well as the '!' to indicate the only move to win in the minimum number of moves, a '*' is given where only the given move will win at all. Clearly there are studies with this material! However, the listings do not highlight all the possible studies (ie consecutive '*' moves, uninterrupted), though all the data is provided for their indentification (preferably by computer). The diagram shows a solution abstracted from the book, using the ! and * notation.

The publication had a double historic significance. First, we now have for
the first time the published results of computer 'analyses' that are of value for endgame theory; second, we have the first example of a technique of presentation not requiring computer equipment, and within the purse of almost any enthusiast to purchase, that permits reference in a tolerable, if not exactly painless, manner.

An 'unnormalised', ie normal, solution runs:
1. Ka5* Kb7
2. Rb3 + * Ka7
3. Re5! Be2
4. Rf7 + * Kb8
5. Kb6* Kc8
6. Kc6* Kd8
7. Kd6* Ke8
8. Re7 + * Kb8/i
9. Kc6* Bc4
10. Kb6! Bb3
11. Re1! Ba2
12. Ra1! Bb3
13. Ra3! Be6
14. Re3! Bd7
15. Rf3! wins.

i) If 8. ..., Kd8 9. Rb! Bd3 10. Rb! wins bB or mates in at most 4 more moves.

*G* GBR Class 0130

Example of maximum length solution

White to Move, Wins 2 + 2

*G* GBR Class 1300

With acknowledgement to the British Chess Magazine (v. 79 issue) we give the moves from one of the positions of maximum length.

Again, computers have added to our knowledge of an endgame. However, this addition to our knowledge has not yet been 'published' in the sense that the 0130 work has been. What we can say is that o-t-b- grandmas-
ters (in particular the Americans Berliner and Browne) have found this ending initially more difficult than they imagined, but, being human, they have no difficulty in 'catching up' with the computer. The artificial intelligence specialists who hope to nail limits of 'difficulty' for a human being must take account of human adaptability -- what is difficult on Tuesday will be familiar, and no longer difficult, on Wednesday. Interesting times are ahead!

AJR

293
On p. 18 of the Batsford volume of the Averbakh work we read "against the best defence, the win in this ending takes a maximum of from 25 to 30 moves". Now the computer has refined this estimate. However, there remains at least one minor mystery. Ströhlein (1970) states that there are 4 distinct positions where 31 moves are required. The BCM article states that there are only 2, giving the other one as the same as the diagram but with wKa8 and bRa4 (essentially). The only position Ströhlein gives is: wKa2 wQa3 bKe4 bRh2. The data bases being 'unpublished', we cannot interrogate them -- yet.

*C* Chessplaying Mini-computers and Micros

Previous *C* articles have covered aspects of the endgame where relatively large computers have made an impact. Due to the non-stop reduction in the cost of computing (what else in the world is getting cheaper?) there are now on the market 2 different kinds of chessplaying devices that are sufficiently like computers to come under the heading.

**Minis** These are genuine computers that can be programmed. The PET and APPLE 'personal' computers are good examples. Chessplaying programs to run on these minis can be purchased. The disadvantage is the relatively large outlay, say £2000 for a complete system, but the advantage is that whenever an improved chessplaying program is produced, the program itself will be cheap.

**Micros** These are more strictly chessplaying machines. True, they have been programmed, but once purchased the machine's play cannot be changed. They are instantly obsoleted by 'better' models, which means that your £100 may provide limited satisfaction.

**Are they any good?** From the viewpoint of standard of endgame play all the currently available mini and micro devices are abysmal. But there is no reason why this lamentable state of affairs should continue. If a mini or micro can satisfy all the following criteria, it will be worth purchasing.

1. Choose an underpromotion if that is the best move.
2. Win/draw a 0000.10 GBR class endgame perfectly.
3. Checkmate with Q or R or BB or BS against lone king in the minimum (or near minimum) number of moves.
4. Play against itself from any position it is given. (Currently one has to purchase 2 devices and get them to play each other in order to achieve this effect).
5. Take the W or Bl side as you wish, leaving you the normal algebraic view of the board.
6. Not only castle and capture en passent correctly, but consider these moves correctly in its analyses.
7. On request, take account of the 50-move rule and advise you when the limit has been reached.
8. Indicate a repetition of position.
9. Play any 4-man or 5-man ending up to master standard.
10. Do all the above within a humanly acceptable response time.
DIAGRAMS
AND
SOLUTIONS

i) For 4. ..., Rxb2 + 5. Rxb2 Qe1 +.
iv) Not given, but important, is the try 7. Rh8 +? To win, bK heads for d4. Then, Rd(8)+, Ke3;Re(8)+, Kd2;Rd(8)+ (Re2+, Kd1) Kc2; Rf2+, Kb3 wins, while if wR is checking on the rank, Kc5; wins symmetrically. (AJR).


i) 7. bc? b3 and Bl gives mate!

i) 1. ..., Ra8 2. Bd7 + Kb8 3. Sa5 (xd8) mates.


No. 3952 G.M. Kasparyan (iv.77)

No. 3953: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Bd2/i f2 + 2. Kg2 Kg3 + 3. Kxg3 (Kxf2?? Rg7) 3. ..., f1S + (else Bg6 mate) 4. Kf4 Sxd2 5. Sf5 Sf1 (Sb3(c4);Bg8, S-Bf7 mate) 6. Bg8 Kg6 7. Bc4 Sd2 (Sh2;Se3) 8. Ba2 (for Sg3 and Ke3) 8. ..., Sf1 9. Sh4+ and 10. Sf3, for 11. Bc4.


No. 3953 E.L. Pogosyants (xii.77)


No. 3954 D. Gurgenidze and E.L. Pogosyants (ix.77)

Commended, Szachy, 1977

Win 3 + 5

No. 3954 D. Gurgenidze and E.L. Pogosyants (ix.77)

Commended, Szachy, 1977

Draw 3 + 5
No. 3955: Y. Hoch. 1. b5 h5/i 2. a3 h4 3. b6 h3 4. gh ab (a5;h4) 5. a4 Kxb3 6. a5 b5 7. a6 Bb8 8. a7 Bxa7 stalemate.
i) 1. ..., h6 2. b6 ab 3. a4 h5 4. a5.

i) 2. ..., Kb6 3. bc + Kc7 4. e8S+ Kd7 5. Sd6 draws.

i) 1. ..., Bc6 2. Ka6 Kd6(d7) 3. d5 Bxd5 4. b7 Kc7 5. Ka7 Bxb7, another stalemate.
ii) 2. ..., Bf6 3. b7 Kc7 4. Ka7 Bxd4 + 5. Ka8 Bc6, a third stalemate.
iii) 4. ..., Bb7 5. d6 Bc6 6. d7 + drawn.

No. 3958: J. Murarasu. 1. Re3 + Kf4 (Kd4;Sc6 + ) 2. Bh5 Qxh5 3. Sxd5 + Kg4 4. Rg3 + Kh4 5. Rh3 + Bxh3 6. g3 + Kg4 7. Se3 mate.

Rh5+ 3. Kg4 eRhl/ii 4. Bh4/iii Re5 
"A study with a fantastic idea: a 
permanent carousel of both bR's, 
done in masterly fashion...."

i) 2. d6? Bb6 3. Rh8 hRf1 + 4. Kg4 
f5 + 5. Kh3 Rf2 6. g4 Rh1 +, or 3. 
Rh8 + Kg7 4. Bxf6 + Kf7.

ii) 3. ..., Kg6 4. Rd6 Be5 5. Rc6 
Re4 + 6. Kf3 Re3 + 7. Kg4 Re4 + 

iii) 4. d6? Kg6 5. d7 Bb6 6. Rf8 
Rxd8 Rd1 wins, as also after 5. Bh4 
Rd5 6. d7 Kg7.

iv) 5. d6? Rd5 6. Rh8 + Kg6, or 6. 
d7 Kg7 7. Kf3 Ba7 and 8. ..., hRd1.


---

No. 3959: Em. Dobrescu (ix.77) 
1st Prize, Revista Romana de Sah, 1977 
Award: v.79

No. 3959: V. Nestorescu, 1. Rdl/i 
Bb2 + Kb4 5. Be3 + Kc5 6. Bd4 + 
Bg7 + Ke7 10. Rel + and 11. Kxh2.

i) 1. Ra2 +? Kb4 2. Be3 + Kxh2 3. 
Ra1 Kh2 4. Rd1 Ke2 5. Rh1 g2 6. 

---

No. 3960: V. Nestorescu (vii.77) 
=2/3 Prize, Revista Romana de Sah, 
1977

No. 3960: V. Nestorescu, 1. c8Q +/i 
Sxc8/ii 2. Sd3/iii b1Q 3. Rel Qa2 
4. Ra1 Qc2 5. Rcl Qe2 6. Rel Qh5 
7. Rh1 Qe8 8. Rel Qh5/iv 9. Rh1 
Qe2 10. Rel Qc2 11. Rcl Qa2 12. 
Ra1.

i) 1. Sd3 b1Q 2. Rel Qa2 3. Ra1 
Qe2 4. Rel Qh5 5. Rh1 Qe8 6. Rel 
Qa8 +. 1. Sc5 +? Kxd6 2. Re6 + 
Kxc7, or 2. Se4 + Kxc7. 1. Rxd3? 
b1Q 2. Rxe5 Qe4 + 3. Kf1 Qc4 + 
and 4. ..., Bxd6.

ii) 1. ..., Kxc8 2. Rc3 + Kd7 3. Sd2. 
Qa2 + 5. Re2 Qa7 +.


---

No. 3961: V. Nestorescu (xii.77) 
=2/3 Prize, Revista Romana de Sah, 
1977

No. 3961: V. Nestorescu, 1. c8Q +/i 
Sxc8/ii 2. Sd3/iii b1Q 3. Rel Qa2 
4. Ra1 Qc2 5. Rcl Qe2 6. Rel Qh5 
7. Rh1 Qe8 8. Rel Qh5/iv 9. Rh1 
Qe2 10. Rel Qc2 11. Rcl Qa2 12. 
Ra1.

i) 1. Sd3 b1Q 2. Rel Qa2 3. Ra1 
Qe2 4. Rel Qh5 5. Rh1 Qe8 6. Rel 
Qa8 +. 1. Sc5 +? Kxd6 2. Re6 + 
Kxc7, or 2. Se4 + Kxc7. 1. Rxd3? 
b1Q 2. Rxe5 Qe4 + 3. Kf1 Qc4 + 
and 4. ..., Bxd6.

ii) 1. ..., Kxc8 2. Rc3 + Kd7 3. Sd2. 
Qa2 + 5. Re2 Qa7 +.


---

No. 3962: V.V. Novikov, 1. Bg4 + 
apparently given by the composer, but (in the ii.78 issue of Revista de
Bxf1 Kd1, in all cases with a draw.

No. 3963: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Rxe3/i
Bxc2 + 2. Kb4/ii Se5 3. Re2 Sd3 +
Sa5 + 7. Kb4 Sc6 + 8. Kc4 Se5 +
9. Kb4. The position is now as after
3. Re2. 9. ..., Sd3 + 10. Kc4 Bbl
11. Rd2 Se5 + 12. Kb3 Ba1 13. Rd1
drawn. My personal (AJR) preference
is for the solution to be presented as
two variations, one beginning 4. ..., Se5 + and the other 4. ..., Bb1. In
this way no one is misled by the
apparent length of a solution.
i) 1. Rb3 +? Kc5 2. Bd1 Bc2 or 2.
Bxb1 c2.

No. 3962: V.V. Novikov
1 H.M., Revista Romana de Sah, 1977

No. 3964: Em. Dobrescu
1 H.M., Revista Romana de Sah, 1977

No. 3963: E.L. Pogosyants
2 H.M., Revista Romana de Sah, 1977

No. 3964: Em. Dobrescu. 1. Rg8/i
Qh1 + 2. Kxb2 Qh2 + 3. Kb3 Qh3 +
Kb6 Kxe7 7. a8Q Qh6 + 8. Kb5
Qh5 + 9. Kb4 Qh4 + 10. Kb3 Qh3 +
Kal wins.
i) a8Q? Qg1 + 2. Kxb2 Qf2 + 3. Kb3
Qe3 + 4. Kb4 Qd2 + 5. Kc5 Qd6 +
Qd5 + 9. Kc7 Qe5 + 10. Kd8 Qb6 +
Rc8? Qg1 + 2. Kxb2 Qd4 + 3. Kb3
Qd3 + 4. Kb4 Qd2 + 5. Rc3 Qd4 +
i) 11. Ka2? Qe6 + draws.


No. 3968: L. Mozes. 1. Rg7+ Kh8 2. Rh7+ Kg8 3. aKg7+ Kf8 4. Rd7 Kg8/ii 5. hRg7+/ii Kh8 6. gRe7 d1Q 7. Rxg8+ Rxe8 8. Rxd1 wins.


i) Threat 2. Rc2 and 3. Rh2, while if 1. ..., Sf2 + 2. Kg5.


No. 3968: L. Mozes (x.77)
Commended, Revista Romana de Sah, 1977

Win 4 + 5

No. 3969: G.A. Umnov
(xii.77 and vi.78)
Commended, Revista Romana de Sah, 1977

No. 3970: E. Janosi
(xiv.78)
1st Prize, L'Italia Scacchistica, 1978

Award: vii-viii.79

No. 3971: G.A. Umnov
(xiv.78)
2nd Prize, L'Italia Scacchistica, 1978


Draw 5+5


i) 1. b7? ab 2. Rh4 Qa1 + 3. Sa3 Qxa3 + 5. Kb8 c4 wins.

No. 3973: E. Janosi (ix.78) = 3/4th Prize, L'Italia Scacchistica, 1978

Draw 7+5

No. 3973: E. Janosi. 1. Sc6 + Kc8 2. Bd5, with the following echo-variations: 2. ..., R7f4 3. Sxb4/i


No. 3973: E. Janosi (ix.78) = 3/4th Prize, L'Italia Scacchistica, 1978

Draw 5+6

No. 3974: G.M. Kasparyan. 1. g7 + Bxg7 2. Ra8 + Ke7 3. Re6 + Kf7 4. Rf8 + Bxf8 + 5. Re7 + and stalemate whether Bl takes the wR or not! While 3. ..., Kd7 4. Rd8 + Kxd8 5. Re8 + Kd7 6. Re7 + Kc8 7. Re8 + Kd7 8. Rb8 + is a more normal draw.

No. 3974: G.M. Kasparyan (ii.78) 1 H.M., L'Italia Scacchistica, 1978

Draw 5+6

No. 3974: G.M. Kasparyan. 1. g7 + Bxg7 2. Ra8 + Ke7 3. Re6 + Kf7 4. Rf8 + Bxf8 + 5. Re7 + and stalemate whether Bl takes the wR or not! While 3. ..., Kd7 4. Rd8 + Kxd8 5. Re8 + Kd7 6. Re7 + Kc8 7. Re8 + Kd7 8. Rb8 + is a more normal draw.

No. 3975: J. Rusinek (v.78) 2 H.M., L'Italia Scacchistica, 1978

Win 4+3


No. 3976: C.M. Bent. 1. a8Q Sg2+ 2. Kxf3 Bd5 + 3. Se4 Bxe4 + 4. Kg3 Rg6+ 5. Kh2 Bxa8 6. Sf4+ Sxf4 stalemate. (Thought: 5. ..., Rh6 could be awkward to analyse to a draw. AJR)

No. 3978: C. Costantini. 1. g6 Sg5 2. Kd6 Se6 3. Sc7+ Sxc7 4. Kxc7 d2 5. g7 d1Q 6. g8Q+ Ka7 7. Qc4 Ka8 (b6; Qc6) 8. Qc3 Qa4 9. Qh8+ and mates now that the square a4 is blocked.

No. 3977: V. Gerasimov (ix.78) 1 Comm., L'Italia Scacchistica, 1978

No. 3978: C. Costantini (i.78) 2 Comm., L'Italia Scacchistica, 1978

No. 3979: Y. Hoch (i.78) 3 Comm., L'Italia Scacchistica, 1978
1) 1. ... Ka5 2. Rxa7 a1Q 3. Rxa6 + Kxa6 4. Ra8 +.
2) 5. Rf8 + Kg2 6. Rf1 Kxf1 7. Rh8 Kg2, and Bl wins. 5. Rxa7 a1Q 6. Rf7 + Kg3 7. Rg8 Kg4.

No. 3980: P. Rossi (iii.78)
i) 1. ... gRc4 + 2. Kd8 Rb8 mate.
ii) 1. ... Rc4 + 2. Kb7 Ke7 3. Bg5 + wins.
iii) 5. ... Kxe5 6. g7 Kd6 7. Ke8 Kc6 8. Sd7 wins.

No. 3982: E. Janosi (vii.78)


No. 3986: V. Shanshin and G.A. Umnov
The text move caters for the e2 capture.
iii) bKa6 allows wBb5 + to meet ..., bSxd2, but naturally 13. ..., Ka4 14. Rb1 + and 15. Rgl.

No. 3987: Y. Hoch and H. Aloni
i) 1. Sxg2? Rxg8 1. Rxa2? g1Q.
ii) 2. Sf3? g1Q 3. Sxg1 h(or a)Rb2 mate.
iii) 2. ..., a Rxe2 3. Rxb5 is a draw.

No. 3988: Cs. Meleghegyi

No. 3989: C. M. Bent
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No. 3989: C.M. Bent. Not 1. Kxg6? Bxb6 2. Sf3 Bd8, but 1. Sd5 (for Sf3) Se5 + 2. Kxf6 Sg4 + 3. Kg5 (Kf5? S4e3 + ) 3. ..., S4e3 4. Sh3 Bh4 + 5. Kh6 Sxh5 6. Sf4 and Bl is faced with a choice: lose a B (after ..., Kg8 or ..., Be1, for example); allow bB to be taken (after ..., d(g)Se3) by wSg6 + ; or to give stalemate (either bB captures).


i) 3. ..., Qh7 4. dRxg8 Rxg8 5. Ra6 + Kb8 6. Ra8 + .
ii) And not 4. gRxg8 Qf6 + and 5. ..., Rxd8.
iii) 6. Ra7 + ? Kb6, and if wR checks on a-file, then bK escapes the checks on b1, or if wR checks on 7th rank, bK heads for g1, captures on g2, and comes to rest on the a2-f7 diagonal, when bQ can recapture on a check.
iv) The culmination of this study would be 11. ..., Kf6 12. Rh7.

i) 1. Se2 + ? Kf3 2. Sc3 a3 wins.
iv) 7. Bb2? Ke1 8. Bc3 a1Q.

i) 1. Se2 + ? Kf3 2. Sc3 a3 wins.
iv) 7. Bb2? Ke1 8. Bc3 a1Q.

i) 2. ..., clQ 3. Rd6+ Qc6 4. dc.

No. 3998: J. Rusinek. 1st Prize, Gazeta Czestochowska, 1978 Award: 1. viii.79

No. 3999: V. Kichigin. 1. e7 Bb5 2. Sc6/i Bxc6 3. a6 ba 4. b7 Bxb7 5. e8Q.
i) 2. a6? ba 3. b7 a3 4. b8Q a2 5. Sc6 a1Q+.

No. 4000: V. Nestorescu. Judge: M. Kovacevic. A Yugoslav (Macedonian)
No. 4001: D. Gurgenidze. 1. Rd6 + c6 2. Bxc6 + (Rxc6, Qa5;) 2. ..., Kb4
3. Rd4 + Kc5 4. Rd5 + Kb6 5. Rd6
Kc7 6. Rd7 + Kb8 7. Rd8 + Kc7 8.
Rd7 + Kb6 9. Rd6 Qa5 10. Rd5 Qa7

No. 4002: V. Neishtadt and Al.P.
Kuznetsov. 1. g4 + Ke4 2. e3 (ef?
Rxf3:) 2. ..., Rxe4 3. hxh3 4. Qxb2
h2 5. Kbl h1R + 6. Qc1 Rd1 7. a6
Rd- 8. a7 Rd5 9. a8R and not even 9.
a8S? Rd1 10. Sc7(b6) Rxc1 + and
stalemate.

No. 4003: B. Milosheski and
Bh2 Kf3 6. e5 wins.

i) 1. Bxc7? Kf3 2. Kf5 g5. 1. Kf5?
Kxd3 2. Bh2 g6+ 3. Kf4 c5. 1. Kd5?
Kf3 2. Bh2 Kg2 3. Bc7 g5. 1. d47 g5
Bc7 Kf2.

ii) 1. ..., Kxd3 2. e5 c5 3. Kd5 c4 4.
c6 d3 5. c7 d2 6. e8Q d1Q 7. Qe4+
Qb3 + .

No. 4004: N. Pagava. 1. Sd6 Bg8
2. Bd1 Se5 (Sg1; Bc2) 3. Be2 + Sc4 4.
Bxc4 + dc 5. Se4 Be3 6. Sc5 + Bxc5
stalemate.
No. 4004: N. Pagava. The solution was not supplied but is (presumably, says AJR): 1. Sg3 + Rxg3
2. a8Q + eRg2 3. Qf3 Rg4 4. Qe4 Rg5 5. Qd5 Rg6 6. Qe6 Rg7 7. Qb7 Rg8 8. Qa8 Kg1 9. Qa7 + Rf2 10. Qf7 + Rg2 11. Qa7 + drawn.


No. 4008: V.N. Dolgov. 1. Se1 + Kg3 2. Qe3 + Kg4 3. Qe2 + Kf5 4. Qh5 + Ke4 5. Qg4 + Ke3 6. Qe6 + Kd4 7. Qf6 + wins.
   i) Presumably (AJR) 7. ..., Bd6 8. c7 Kd7 9. Kg4, since 9. ..., Bxg3 10. c8Q +, or 9. ..., Kxc7 10. f8Q.

No. 4008: V.N. Dolgov

3 H.M., Mongolian Thematic Tourney, 1978

Win 4 + 3

No. 4010: H. Zajic

= 1/2 Comm., Mongolian Thematic Tourney, 1978

Win 4 + 6

No. 4011: H. Zajic. 1. Bf7 + Ka3 2. Bg8 Sb6 3. f7 Sd7 4. bc8Q stalemate.


No. 4012: T. Amiryan

= 1/3 Prizes, Anniversary (150 years) Tourney, Armenia SSR, 1979

Award: Shakhmatain Aiastan, v. 79

Win 3 + 3


ii) 5. ..., a5 6. Sc6 a4 7. Sd8 +.

JRH: A fore-runner is Halberstadt (1951) in L'Italia Scacchistica, No. 244 in 'Selected Endings' by Whitaker and Hartleb (1960).

No. 4013: L. Mitrofanov and V. Khortov.


No. 4014: B.G. Olympiev.


No. 4019: J.H. Marwitz. There was a fine total of 90 entries for this Tourney announcement

The 60th year of Soviet Armenia is commemorated with an international tourney to be judged by Grandmaster Kasparyan and by G. Akopyan. Maximum 2 entries per composer. Closing date: 1.vii.80. Address: Central Chess Club of Armenia, Ul. Khandzyana 50, 375025 Erevan, Armenian SSR. Mark envelopes: "Study Tourney".
Tourney Announcement

Eero Bőök Jubilee (70 years on 9.ii.80) Tourney of The Finnish Problem Society. This is a theme event - set theme: "Studies, based on an idea taken from a published game or its published analysis. The idea must be taken further." See example.

Theme Example:
Game Goby vs. Fuderer, Dortmund, 1951

1. ..., f6 2. Qxe6 Qh2 + 3. Qh3 Qxf4 + 4. Qg4 Qh2 + 5. Qh3 g5 + 6. Kg4 h5 + 7. Qxh5 f5 + 8. Bxf5 Qg2 mate.

Closing date: 31.x.80, Judges: E.E. Bőök and A. Dunder. Prizes to the value of FMK 700,-. Maximum 3 entries per composer. Send to: Bruno Breider, Matinraitti 11 D 47, 02230 Espoo, Finland.

*C* SARGON 2.5

This device is a chessplaying micro costing about £279. Its program is replaceable, allowing improvements to be purchased for a portion of the initial outlay. Although it is weak, as are all other similar devices, in basic endgame positions, and will not underpromote voluntarily, it is remarkably strong in solving tactical studies with mating finishes, when playing at its highest level. The program is the latest commercially available version of a successful home-brewed effort by Dan and Kathe Spracklen of California, U.S.A.

Review "Uj Magyar Sakkfeladvány Antologia", Budapest, 1979 (in Hungarian). Dr. Laszlo Linder was among the team that compiled this comprehensive anthology of recent Hungarian chess compositions. There are 10 studies in an introductory section, and 84 in the principal section. All genres of composition are included. The solutions to the studies are reasonably comprehensive. The diagrams are clear, the paper quality is good, the hard cover binding should last, and there are photographs of 44 composers, in addition to biographies and a glossary. The period covered is the 40 years since the appearance of a 'Handbook of Hungarian Chess Problem Composition'. An excellent book.
GBR

Guy-Blandford-Roycroft (GBR) code for completely representing chessboard force. Class 1032 is the code for wQ, no rooks, bB and 2wS. 4870 is the code for wQ, bQ, 2wR, 2bR, wB, 2bB, no knights. 0005 is the code for 2wS, bS. In other words, the digit position denotes, from left to right, Q, R, B, S; the digit value is the sum of '1' for each W piece and '3' for each B1 piece. '9' is reserved for additional (promoted) force, in the appropriate position. Pawns are denoted by uncoded decimal place digits: 0000.35 would denote no pieces of any kind, 3wP and 5bP. It is often useful to call the force so coded a 'class', especially when discussing endgame theory. The GBR code is convenient for indexed retrieval of chess positions and for representation in computer systems.

*C* denotes, in EG, either an article relating to electronic computers or, when above a diagram, a position generated by computer.