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## EDITORIAL

The production of EG was a lot easier than expected. John Roycroft's work for the section 'Diagrams and solutions' was a great contribution to this issue. It is our intention to include more articles in future issues of EG.

The issues 103 and 104 have been produced quickly after the difficulties were solved, because it was important to give the subscribers value for their money. Two more issues will be produced this year. Although they had not received anything, many subscribers paid for one or more years of EG. This was a great stimulus, and it paid for the present costs. Hopefully confidence is restored, and all subscribers will pay for 103-106.

Some reorganization is still needed for EG beyond 106, but the magazine will probably continue. More information will be included in the next issues.

## COMPUTERS AND THE ENDGAME STUDY

Jan van Reek

Computer analyses were a great stimulus for the development of endgame theory. During the last decades a new stimulus was needed, because several authors tried to write the same standard work. Computer analyses of 4 - and 5 -men endgames refuted many standard opinions. Nowadays 6-men endgames are analyzed. An important finding is the win of rook and bishop versus two knights.

These results have a great effect on some endgame studies. The new knowledge can be appreciated, but its application is embarrassing, because many fine studies are refuted. Most studies are, however, unaffected.

These developments are spectacular and were published in many chess journals and even newspapers, but the importance for the endgame study is limited. New developments are more important, and the influence of the computer will become strong.

Information about endgame studies can be stored on the hard disk of personal computers without difficulties. The main problem is software for data manipulation. Harold van der Heijden used the NICBASE program. Actually the program is designed for the storage of over-the-board games, but it can be used for endgame studies as well. At present Harold has stored the information about more than 23,000 studies. By means of the program, one can search in their bibliographic information, such as name of composer, tourney, year of publication and source. There are limited possibilities for a search in the content, such as stipulation, length of main solution, underpromotion, position and so on. It is for instance relatively easy to find all studies
with Saavedra's position (also mirrored!). I hope that Harold will publish about his work in EG.

This data base is an enormous step forwards, but several new problems are faced. A minor problem is that all information cannot be stored. Complicated stipulations cannot be included for instance. A major problem is that many sources have incorrect or incomplete bibliographic information about studies. These mistakes are difficult to correct, because even the information in biographies might be incorrect. Eventually many studies should be checked in the original sources.

Another major problem is the clumsy thematic search facility. It will be investigated, whether the Harman index can be added by the inclusion of Stephenson's data base. If this effort is successful, it will become easy for judges and composers to search for anticipation. It will also mean a great stimulus for thematic research.

Checking the correctness of studies is the greatest technical difficulty of endgame composing. Most chess programs are too weak as an assistant. I use MChess as a help. It is good in finding refutations. Once I used it for a check on a study of Pogosyants that is marked @4 in Harold's base (White is supposed to draw, but wins).

1. Ernest Pogosyants

Commended, International
Friendship Team Tourney, 1975


Win!
5/5

The intended main line was 1. c7 $\dagger$ Rxc7 2. Qa8 $\dagger$ Kxa8 3. Kxc7 $\dagger \mathrm{Bb} 8 \dagger 4$. Rxb8 $\dagger$ Ka7 5. Rb5 Ka8 6. Rb8 $\dagger$ Ka7 7. $\mathrm{Rb5}$ and a repetition of moves. White wins by 1. Qf4†!! Ka8 2. Qxf7. M-Chess found this 'super-cook' in a few seconds. Then it started to investigate another 'super-cook': 1. Qe5 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 8$ 2. Qd5.

M-Chess tries to find the strongest the strongest move. When you look at the calculated variations, a dual might be found, but it is not designed for a search of duals. Chess programs are a reliable tester yet.

John Nunn showed a completely new application during the international ARVES meeting in Rotterdam, August 1991. Most endgame analyses by the computer are fascinating for some experts and interesting like growing grass for the rest. John looked in the data base of queen and minor piece versus queen and found two endgames that could be composed by Mann or Vandiest. One example was published in Schakend Nederland, November 1991. The endgame can be regarded as a study, but who composed it?
2. John Nunn

Schakend Nederland, 1991


Win
Note: The moves are from the computer and Nunn wrote the comments. An! by a White move means that the move is a unique winning move. An!by a Black move means it is a unique drawing move.
Theme: Battle for reciprocal zugzwang. Paradoxical quiet moves by WK and WQ.
This study is partly based on the position of reciprocal zugzwang WKd7, Qf5,Sd6 versus BKb6,Qe2.

1. Sd6t!
2. Sc5 $\dagger$ ? Kb6! and 1. Kd6 $\dagger$ ? Ka8 lead to nothing, in the latter case because White cannot introduce his knight into the attack with gain of tempo.
3. .. Ka6

Of the other king moves 1. .. Ka7 is refuted relatively simple by $2 . \mathrm{Kd} 8 \dagger$ Kb6 3. Qc7†! Ka6 4. Qb7†! Ka5 5. Qb3! Ka6 6. Kc7 Qe7† 7. Kc6! winning, but 1. .. Kb6 is more complicated. White replies 2. Qf5! reaching a position of reciprocal zugzwang with Black to move and now Black must either move his king to the edge of the board or block the king with .. Qa6, in each case creating a fatal weakness:

1) 2. .. Ka6 3. Kd8 (3. Kc6 also wins) Kb6 (3. .. Qb2 4. Qd3† Ka7 5. Sc8†!

Kb8 6. Qd6 $\dagger$ ! Kb7 7. Qc7 $\dagger$ mates and 3. .. Ka7 4. Kc7 Qe7† 5. Kc6! leads to mate after 5. .. Qg7 6. Qa5 $\dagger$ or 5. .. Qe2 Qc5†) 4. Qd5! Ka6 5. Qb7† Ka5 6. Qb3! Ka6 7. Kc7 Qe7† 8. Kc6 and wins.
2) 2. .. Qa6 3. $\mathrm{Q} f 2 \dagger \mathrm{Ka5} 4 . \mathrm{Qd} 2 \dagger$ ! Kb 6 5. Qb4† Ka7 6. Kc7!

## 2. Qh3!

Not 2. Qf5? when Black's only drawing move is 2. .. Kb6!, reaching the reciprocal zugzwang position with White to move. Then White cannot win, e.g. 3. Sc8 $\dagger$ Ka6!, 3. Kd8 Kc6 or 3. Qd5 Qg4t!
2. .. Ka7

Black must still avoid 2. .. Kb6 3. Qf5!
The other lines are 2. .. Kas 3. Qa3 $\dagger$
$\mathrm{Kb6}$ transposing to the main line at move 5, 2. .. Qb2 3. Qd3 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 7$ 4. Sc8 $\dagger$ ! Kb 7 5. Qd5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 8$ 6. Qd6 $\dagger$ ! with a mate on a7, 2. .. Qe1 3. Qd3 $\dagger$ Ka7 4. $\mathrm{Sc} 8 \dagger$, 2. .. Qd2 3. Qf1 $\dagger$ Ka7 4. Qb5 Qg2 5. Sc8 $\dagger$ and 2. .. Qa2 3. Qd3† Ka7 4. Qb5.

## 3. Sc8t!

White wants to transfer his queen to the a-file with gain of time, but the immediate 3. $\mathrm{Qa} 3 \dagger$ ? Qa6 4. $\mathrm{Qc} 5 \dagger \mathrm{Ka} 8$ is only a draw.
3. .. Ka6 4. Qa3+! Kb5 5. Sd6t! Kb6 6. Qb4t! Ka6 7. Qc3!
This move is a big surprise, since it allows Black's king more freedom but it also allows Black a check on g4. However it is the only way to win. The immediate threat is 8 . Kc7 Qe7t 9. Kc6, and it is the need to prevent a Black queen check on the c-file that makes Qc3 a strong move.
7. .. Kb6 8. Kd8!

Another difficult quiet move.
8. .. Qh5 9. Sc4t!

The Black queen is vulnerable.
9. .. Kc6 10. Se5t! Kb5 11. Qb3t! Kc5 12. Qc4t! Kb6 13. Qb4t! Ka6 14. Qa4t! Kb6 15. Sd7t (or 15. Sc4t) Kb7 16. Qb4t Kc6 17. Qb6 $\dagger$ winning the queen.

## DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS

## SHAKHMATY V SSSR 1989

The 32 originals were whittled down... to 21: "a very excellent competition." Judge: An.G.Kuznetsov

No. 8320 E. Kolesnikov and O. Pervakov (i 89)
1st Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Draw
No. 8320: E.Kolesnikov and O.Pervakov (Moscow). 1.a7/i, and Kd7/ii 2.de a2 /iii 3.0-0 gh $\dagger$ 4.Kh1 Ra8 5.Ra1 Rxa7 6.e4 7.e3, 8.Rxa2 Rxa2 with stalemate in the h1 corner with W having castled, or:
$0-0 / \mathrm{iv} 2 . \mathrm{de}$ a2 $3 . \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{gh} / \mathrm{v} 4 . \mathrm{Kc} 2(\mathrm{c} 3)$ Ra8 5.Kb2 Rxa7/vi 6.Ka1 Rh7 7.e4, 8.e3, 9.Rxh2 Rxh2, stalemate in the a1 corner with Bl having castled.
i) 1.de? g2 2.Rg1 a2 3.Kd2 (Kf2,Rf8 $\dagger$;) Rh4 and Ra4.
ii) Kf7 2.de g2 3.Rg1 Ra8 4.Kf2 Rxa7 5.Ra1 Kg6 6.e4 Kg5 7.e3 and 8.Kxg2. Or Ke7 2.de g2 (gh;Rxh2,a2:Rxh8) 3.Rg1 a2 4.Kf2 Rf8 $\dagger$ 5.Kxg2 Rg8 $\dagger$ 6.Kf2 Rxg1 7.a8Q a1Q 8.Qb7†, with
perpetual check.
iii) gh 3.Rxh2. Or the sharp g2 3.Rg1 Ra8 4.Kf2 Rxa7 5.Kxg2 Kc6 6.Ra1 Kd5 7.Kf3 Kxe5 8.Kg4 Ke4 9.h4 Kxe3 10.h5 Kxe2 11.h6.
iv) 'Preventing W castling' in the controversial, and to AJR's mind very unsatisfactory, convention applied to cases where if both sides castle the position is unreachable in legal play in a game, and so invalid in the solution. In fairy chess OK , but not in studies.
v) g2 4.Rg1 Kh7 5.Kc2 Ra8 6.Kb2 Rxa7 7.Ka1, ending in stalemate as in this main line.
vi) a1Q $\dagger$ 6.Rxa1 Rxa7 7.Rh1 Rh7 8.Kc3 Kg7 9.Kd2 Kg6 10.Ke1 Kf5 11.Kf2 Kxe5 12.Kg3 Ke4 13.Rxh2 Rxh2 14.Kxh2 Kxe3 15.Kg3.
"It is true that Liburkin achieved the same two stalemates, but from an improbable starting-point - and indeed the present study is dedicated to the memory of Liburkin. But here we have chiselled form, tempo play counterbalanced on an apothecary's scales, and, finally, out of this world both-sides castling to create, with the corner stalemates, a bright pair of echoes. I'll stick my neck out by calling this a study of the 21st century!"

No. 8321: N.Micu (Romania). 1.c4 Sa3 2.Rd4 Kc3/i 3.Sc6 Rg7 $\dagger / \mathrm{ii}$ 4.Kf4/iii Sxc4 5.Bf6 Rg2/iv 6.Kf3 Rd2/v 7.Rd3 $\dagger$ Kxd3 8.Sb4 mate, believe it or not.
i) Although $w R$ and $w P$ are again attacked, as at the start, combinative play comes to the rescue.
ii) Sxc4 4.Rxc4† Kxc4 5.Se5 $\dagger$, a fork.
iii) 4.Kf3? Sxc4 5.Bf6 Rf7 6.Rxc4 $\dagger$ Kxc4 7.Se5 $\dagger$ Kd5 8.Sxf7 Ke6.

No. 8321
N. Micu (i 89)
=2nd/3rd Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
iv) Rf7 $6 . \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{~Kb} 3$ 7.Rxc4.
v) $\mathrm{Ra} 27 . \mathrm{Rd} 8 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 38 . \mathrm{Rb} 8 \dagger \mathrm{Ka} 39$. Be7 $\dagger$ and 10.Rb4 $\dagger$, 11.Rxc4 $\dagger$.

No. 8322 R. Tavariani (x 89) =2nd/3rd Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Draw
No. 8322: R.Tavariani (Tbilisi). 1.Rg3 $\dagger$ Ke4/i $2 . \mathrm{Rg} 4 \dagger$ /ii Kf3/iii 3.Rg3 $\dagger$ /iv Kf4 4.Rc3/v Rd1 $\dagger$ 5.Kc8 c1Q 6.Bg3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 4$ 7.Rxc1 $\dagger$ Rxc1 8.Bc7, slipping out from under.
i) $\mathrm{Kc} 42 . \mathrm{Rc} 3 \dagger$. $\mathrm{Ke} 22 . \mathrm{Rg} 2 \dagger$.
ii) 2.Rc3? Rd1†, with 3.Ke8 Rxe1 4.Rxc2 Kd3†, or 3.Kc8 c1Q 4.Rxc1

Rxc $1 \dagger$ and Rxe1
iii) Kf5 3.Rc4 Rd1 $\dagger$ 4.Bd2 Rxd2 $\dagger$ $5 . \mathrm{Kc} 7 \mathrm{Ke} 56 . \mathrm{Kc} 6$, and bKd 5 is stopped. iv) 3.Rc4? Rd1 $\dagger$ 4.Bd2 Rxd2 $\dagger$ 5.Kc7 Ke3.
v) In the course of avoiding 4.Bd2, bK takes up a post on f 4 - but in this case too W finds salvation.
"Both the foregoing studies are real finds. The first is sharp and effective, the second aesthetic and harmonious".

No. 8323 V. Kozyrev (x 89) 4st Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Draw 4/4

No. 8323: V.Kozyrev (Morozovsk). 1.c7 Rf8/i 2.Rd1 $\dagger$ Kh2 3.Rd2 $\dagger$ Kg3 4.h4 Se4/ii 5.Rd4/iii Sc3 $\dagger$ /iv 6.Kb2/v Sb5 7.Rd8 Rf2 $\dagger$ 8.Rd2 Rf8 9.Rd8 Rf2 $\dagger$ 10.Rd2 Rxd2 $\dagger$ 11.Kc1 (either)Sxc7 12.Kxd2, 13.h5, 14.h6, and the Troitzky line is crossed.
i) $\mathrm{Rb} 5 \dagger$ 2.Ka1 Rc5 3.Rd5, though not 2.Ka2? Rc5 3.Rd5?? Sb4†.
ii) Se6 5.Rd8 Rf1 $\dagger$ 6.Rd1 Rxd1 $\dagger 7$. $\mathrm{Kc} 2 \dagger$ (either)Sxc7 8.Kxd1, and bS will not reach h6 for a 'Troitzky' win.
iii) 5.Rd8? Rf1 $\dagger$ 6.Rd1 Rxd1 $\dagger$ 7.Kc2 Rd2†.
iv) g 3 is not available to bS following wR's checks, and bSf6 would block the f-file.
v) 6.Kc2? Sd5 7.Rxd5 Sb4†.
"A beautiful study".

No. 8324 A. Manvelyan (v 89) 5st Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
6/7
No. 8324: A.Manvelyan (Erevan). 1. $\mathrm{Bc} 7 \dagger$ Ke3 2.Re5 $\dagger$ Kd2 3.Re4 a5/i 4.Re5 a6 5.Kd5/ii a2 6.Kc4 b2/iii 7. Bxa5 $\dagger$ Kd1 8.Re1 $\dagger$ Kc2 9.Re2 $\dagger$ Kc1 10.Rxb2 a1Q 11.Bd2 $\dagger$ Kd1 12.Kb3/iv a5 13.Bc3 a4 $\dagger$ 14.Kb4 a3 15.Rd2 $\dagger$ Kc1 16.Bxa1, and the struggle is over.
i) b2 4.Rb4 Kc1 5.Be5.
ii) This is the right moment, when bPP are on a5 and a6, and no longer on a6 and a 7 .
iii) a1Q 7.Bxa5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 28 . \mathrm{Re} 2 \dagger$, $9 . \operatorname{Re} 1 \dagger$ and 10. Rxa1.
iv) It turns out that bQ does not have use of the a6 square. Now we understand what 3.Re4 and 4.Re5 were aimed at.

No. 8325: A.Davranyan and M.Zinar. 1.f8R/if1Q 2.Rxf1 $\dagger$ Kxf1 3.Kxd2 Kxg2 4.a7 Kxh3 5.a8R/ii Kg2 6.a5 h3 7.a6 h2 8.Rh8/iii h1Q 9.Rxh1 Kxh1 10.a7 g2 11.a8R/iv g1Q 12.Rh8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 213 . \mathrm{Rg} 8 \dagger$ Kf2 14.Rxg1 Kxg1 15.c4, win.
i) $1 . \mathrm{f8Q}$ ? Kh2 $2 . \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{~d} 1 \mathrm{Q} \dagger 3 . \mathrm{Kxd1} \mathrm{f} 1 \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ 4.Qxf1, the first of 3 stalemates.
ii) $5 . \mathrm{a} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ ? g2 $6 . \mathrm{Qg} 8 \mathrm{~g} 1 \mathrm{Q} 7 . \mathrm{Qxg} 1$, the second.

No. 8325 A.Davranyan and M.Zinar (iv 89)
1st Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
9/8
iii) 8.a7? h1Q 9.Rb8 Qh2 10.a8Q Kh1 $\dagger$, and g2;, drawing.
iv) $11 . \mathrm{a} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ ? g1Q 12. $\mathrm{Qh} 8 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 2$ 13. $\mathrm{Qg} 7 \dagger$ Kf3 14.Qxg1, the third.

No. 8326 A. Ivanov (iii and ix 89) 2nd Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
No. 8326: A.Ivanov (Chuvash Autonomous Region). 1.Ka3 Se5 2.b4 $\dagger$ Ka6 3.Be2 $\dagger \mathrm{Sd} 3$ 4.Ka4/i Bb7 5.Bxd3 $\dagger$ ed 6.b5 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 7$ 7.c6 Rb8/ii 8.Ka5 d2 9.b6 $\dagger$ Ka8 10.cb $\dagger$ Rxb7 11.Ka6 d1Q/iii 12. $\mathrm{Rc} 8 \dagger \mathrm{Rb} 813 . \mathrm{b} 7$ mate.
i) 4.Bxd3†? ed 5.Ka4 Re4.
ii) Kb6 8.Rxb7 Kc5 8.Kb3.
iii) Rb8 $12 . \mathrm{Ra} 7$ mate, or Rxb6 $\dagger 12$. Kxb6 d1Q 13.Rc8 mate.

No. 8327
D.Gurgenidze and V.Kalandadze (vii 89)
$=3$ rd/4th Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty $\mathbf{v}$ SSSR, 1989


Draw
No. 8327: D.Gurgenidze and V.Kalandadze (Georgia). 1.Re7 $\dagger$ Kf2 2.Rf7 $\dagger$ Kg 2 3.Rg7 $\dagger$ Kf3 4.Rf7 $\dagger$ (Rg1? Ke3;) Ke4 5.Re7 $\dagger$ Kd5 6.Rxd7 $\dagger$ Kc6 7.Rd8 Kc7 8.Rd5 Kb6/i 9.Rd6 $\dagger$ Kb5 10.Kb7 c1Q 11.Rb6 $\dagger$ Ka5 12.Rxa6 $\dagger$ Kb5 13. Rb6 $\dagger$, with perpetual check.
i) c1Q 9.Rc5 $\dagger$ Qxc5 stalemate. The Saavedra-style c1R;, is met by 9.Ka7.

No. 8328: S.Zakharov (Leningrad). 1.Rd1 $\dagger$ Kxd1 2.Se5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 2 / \mathrm{i} 3 . \mathrm{Bg} 6 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 3$ 4.Bf7 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 4$ 5.Be8 $\dagger \mathrm{Sc} 6$ 6.Bxc6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 3$ 7.Bd5 $\dagger$ Kc2 8.Be4 $\dagger$ Kd1 9.Bf3 $\dagger$ Ke1/ii $10 . \mathrm{Sd} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kd} 2$ 11.Sxb2 c2 12.Sc4 $\dagger$ /iii Kc3 13.Sb6/iv c1Q 14.Bb7/v Qa3 $\dagger$ 15.Kb8 Qd6 $\dagger$ 16.Ka7 Qc5 17.g6 Qa5 $\dagger$ 18.Ba6 Kb4 19.g7 Qa2 20.g8Q/vi Qxg8 21.Bb7 $\mathrm{Qa} 2 \dagger$ 22.Kb8 $\mathrm{Qg} 8 \dagger$ 23.Ka7 Qxg 3 , and now 24.Sd5 $\dagger$ draws after all.
i) $\mathrm{Kc} 13 . \mathrm{Sd} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kd} 24 . \mathrm{Sxb} 2 \mathrm{cb}(\mathrm{c} 2 ; \mathrm{Sd} 3)$ 5.Bg6 Sc6 6.Be4 Sb4 7.g6 and 8.g7.

No. 8328 S. Zakharov (x 89)
$=$ 3rd/4th Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty $\mathbf{v}$ SSSR, 1989

ii) Kd2 10.Sc4 $\dagger$ Kd3 11.Sxb2 $\dagger$ cb 12. Bh5.
iii) The point of Bl's manoeuvring lies in 12.Sd3? Kxd3. Now the second phase starts.
iv) 13.g6? c1Q 14.g7 Qg5 15.Sb6 Qxg7 16.Bb7 Qf8 $\dagger$ 17.Ka7 Qc5.
v) Now the fight for the fortress starts.
vi) At last the time for this has arrived.

No. 8329 Yu. Solovyov (vi 89)
$=5$ th/6th Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty $\mathbf{v}$ SSSR, 1989


Win
No. 8329: Yu.Solovyov (Gavrilov Po-
sad). $1 . \mathrm{Sb} 3 \dagger / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Ka} 4 / \mathrm{ii} 2 . \mathrm{Bd} 7 \dagger$ Qxd7/iii $3 . \mathrm{Sc} 5 \dagger \mathrm{Ka} 34 . \mathrm{Se} 3$ (for Sc2 mate) Qd1 $\dagger$ $5 . \mathrm{Sxd} 1 \mathrm{c} 26 . \mathrm{Sc} 3 \mathrm{c} 1 \mathrm{Q} \dagger 7 . \mathrm{Sb} 1 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 48$. $\mathrm{Sd} 3 \dagger$ and $9 . \mathrm{Sxc} 1$ wins.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Sb} 7 \dagger$ ? $\mathrm{Ka} 42 . \mathrm{Bd} 7 \dagger$ Ka3 3.Bxe8 c2 4.Sc3 c1Q $\dagger$ 5.Sb1 $\dagger$ Kb4 6.Sd8 Qc8 7.g7 $\mathrm{Qa} 8 \dagger 8 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Qg} 2 \dagger$.
ii) Ka6(b5) $2 . \mathrm{Sc} 7 \dagger$.
iii) Kxb3 3.Bxe8 c2 4.Ba4†.

No. 8330 M. Gromov (xii 89)
$=5$ th/6th Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
6/3
No. 8330: M.Gromov (Vladimir). 1. Rd6 $\dagger$ Kc2 2.Rd1 Kxd1 3.Sa4 b1Q 4. Sc3 $\dagger$ Ke1 5.Sxb1 Re4/i 6.g8R/ii Rxh4 $\dagger$ 7.Kg2 Rxc4 8.Kf3 Kd1 9.Rg1 $\dagger$ Kc2 $10 . \mathrm{Sa} 3 \dagger$ and $11 . \mathrm{Sxc} 4$, winning.
i) Re8 6.h5 Kf2 7.Sc3 Re5 8.Sd1†.
ii) $6 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ ? Rxh4 $\dagger$ 7.Kg1(g2) $\mathrm{Rg} 4 \dagger$ 8.Qxg4 stalemate.

No. 8331: V.Vlasenko (Kharkov region). $1 . \mathrm{Kf} 6 \dagger / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Kh} 8 / \mathrm{ii} 2.94 \mathrm{~h} 23 . \mathrm{Be} 4 \mathrm{c} 3$ 4.g5 h1Q 5.Bxh1 c2 $6 . g 6 \mathrm{c} 1 \mathrm{Q} 7 . \mathrm{g} 7 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 7$ 8.Be4 $\dagger$ Kh6 9.g8S $\dagger$ Kh5 10.Bf3 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{g} 4 ? \mathrm{Kg} 7 . \quad 1 . \mathrm{Kf} 4 \dagger ? \mathrm{Kg} 72 . \mathrm{g} 4 \mathrm{~h} 2$ 3.Be4 c3 4.Ke3 Kf6 and Kg5.

No. $8331 \quad$ V. Vlasenko (iii 89)
Commended, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
3/4
ii) Kg8 2.g4 h2 3.Be4 c3 4.g5 c2 5.g6 c1Q 6.Bd5 $\dagger$ Kf8 7.g7 $\dagger$ Ke8 8.g8Q $\dagger$ Kd7 9.Be6 $\dagger$ Kd6 10.Qd8 $\dagger$, 11.Qc8 $\dagger$, and 12.Qxc1.

No. $8332 \quad$ N. Ryabinin (iv 89)
Commended, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
$4 / 3$
No. 8332: N.Ryabinin (Tambov region). 1.Rd7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$ 2.Ra7 Kb8/i 3.Ra8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 7$ 4.Kg3/ii Rc1 5.Ra5 Kb6 6.Rb5 $\dagger$ Ka6 7.Sb3 Rc4 8.Ra5 $\dagger$ Kb6 9.Ra8 Kb7 $10 . \mathrm{Sa} 5 \dagger$, and $11 . \mathrm{Sxc} 4$, winning.
i) Rf1 $\dagger 3 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{~Kb} 84 . \mathrm{Bb} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 1 \dagger 5 . \mathrm{Kf} 2$

Rg5 6.Ra5 Kc7 7.Sb3 Kb6 8.Ra6 $\dagger$ Kxb5

## 9.Ra5 $\dagger$ and $10 . \mathrm{Rxg} 5$.

ii) 4.Ra5? Kb6 5.Sb3 Rh4† $6 . \mathrm{Kg} 3(\mathrm{~g} 5)$

Rb4 7.Ra8 Kb7 8.Ra5 Kb6, positional draw.

No. 8333
B. Rivkin (v 89)

Commended, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Draw
No. 8333: B.Rivkin (Moscow). 1.Sc5 $\dagger$ Kd6/i 2.Se4 $\dagger$ Kxd5 3.Sxc3 $\dagger$ Kc4 4.Sb1 Sc3 $\dagger$ 5.Kc2 Sxb1 6.Bb7/ii a5 7.Bd5 $\dagger$ Bxd5 8.g8Q/iii, and Bxg8 9.Kxb1 Kc3 stalemate, or Sa3 $\dagger$ 9.Kxb2 Bxg8 10. Kxa3 Kc3 (Kb5;Kb2) 11.Ka4 and 12. Kxa5..
i) Kc6 2.Sxc3 $\dagger$ Kxc5 3.Sa4 $\dagger$ and 4. Sxb2.
ii) $6 . \mathrm{Bd} 5 \dagger$ ? $\mathrm{Bxd5} 7 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Sa} 3 \dagger 8 . \mathrm{Kxb} 2$ Bxg8 9.Kxa3 Kc3 and wK has been inveigled away from the a1 corner before he has himself induced the Bl aP into vulnerability, and Bl wins easily.
iii) 8.Kxb1? Kc3 9.g8Q Be4†.

No. 8334: V.Vinichenko (Novosibirsk). 1.Sb6 $\dagger$ Kb3 2.Sxc4/i Kxc4 3.Sxf3 (for Sd2 $\dagger$ ) Sxf3 4.Kd6 $\dagger / \mathrm{ii} \mathrm{Kb} 4$ 5.Rb8 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 4$ /iii 6.Ra8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 5$ 7.Rb8 $\dagger$ Kc4/iv 8.Rc8 $\dagger$ Kd4/v 9.Rf8 f1Q 10.Rf4 $\dagger$ Ke3 11. Rxf3 $\dagger$, drawn.

No. 8334 V. Vinichenko (vi 89) Commended, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989

i) 2.Sxf3? Sxf3 3.Rf8 f1Q 4.Rxf3 $\dagger$ Qxf3 $\dagger$ 5.gf c3.
ii) 4.Rf8? f1Q 5.Rf4 $\dagger \mathrm{Sd} 4 \dagger$.
iii) Ka5 6.Kc5, with Ka6 7.Rb1 Se1 8.Rb6 $\dagger$ K- 9.Rf6, or Ka 4 7.Ra8 $\dagger$ Kb3 8.Rf8.
iv) Ka6 8.Rb1 Se1 9.Kc6 Ka5 10.Rb5 $\dagger$ and 11.Rf5.
v) The square d 4 is now taken, so...

No. 8335 D.Godes and V.Muratov viii89
Commended, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Draw 5/6

No. 8335: D.Godes and V.Muratov: 1.Rh3 $\dagger$ Bg3/i 2.Rxg3 $\dagger$ Kb2 3.Rxa3 Kxa3 4.f4 Kb4 5.Kf2 Kc5 6.e3/ii Kd6
7.e4 fe $8 . \mathrm{g} 7$ e5 9.Ke3, and, it being Bl's move, it's the zugzwang and a draw.
i) Kb 2 2.Rxh4 a2 3.Ra4 a1Q $\dagger 4 . \mathrm{Rxa} 1$ Kxa1 5.f4 Kb2 6.Kf2 Kc3 7.e4 fe 8.Ke3 Kc4 $9 . \mathrm{g} 7$ e5 $10 . \mathrm{fe}$ and drawn, since bK and the d6 square will never be united. ii) $6 . \mathrm{e} 4$ ? fe $7 . \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kd6} 8 . \mathrm{g} 7 \mathrm{e} 5$, and W, having the move, finds himself in zugzwang.

No. 8336 A. Sochniev (xii 89)
Commended, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Draw
6/7
No. 8336: A.Sochniev (Leningrad). $1 . g 8 \mathrm{Q}$ d1S $\dagger$ 2.Kc2 Rxg8 3.Sxe2 Rd8/i 4.Rxh3 Sxf2 5.Rf3 Se4 6.Rxf5 Rd2 $\dagger$ 7.Kc1 Rxe2 8.Ra5 (Re5? Sc7;z) Sc7 9. $\mathrm{Re} 5 \mathrm{Re} 1 \dagger$ 10.Kc2 (Kb2? Re3;z) Re3 11.Kb2z Re2 $\dagger$ 12.Kc1 Re1 $\dagger$ 13.Kc2, positional draw.
i) If Rg 2 , then not $4 . \mathrm{Rxg} 2$ ? $\mathrm{hg} 5 . \mathrm{Kxd} 1$ Sc7 6.f3 Sd5 7.Kd2 Sf4 8.Sg1 Kxh5 9.Ke1 Kg5 10.Kf2 Kh4, but 4.Rxh3 Sxf2 5.Rg3 Rh2 6.Rg6 $\dagger$ Kh7 7.Ra6 Se4 8.Kd1 Rh1 $\dagger$ 9.Kc2 Rh2 10.Kd1, draw.

No. 8337: M.Gromov (Vladimir). 1. $\mathrm{Ba} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Ke} 7$ 2.g5 e5 3.Bc2/i Ke8 4.Bg6 $\dagger$ Ke7/ii 5.Be4 Ke8 6.Bc6† Ke7 7.Bd5/iii Ke8 8.Bf7 $\dagger$ Ke7 9.Bg6 wins.

No. 8337 M. Gromov (i 89)
Commended, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
i) 3.Bd1 is an unnecessary prolongation of the solution: Ke6 $4 . \mathrm{Bg} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Ke} 7$ 5.Bf5.
ii) W must now give Bl the move.
iii) This controls e6.

No. 8338 I. Yarmonov (ii 89)
Commended, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
$3 / 3$
No. 8338: I.Yarmonov (Zhdanov). 1.f6 Rh7/i 2.Ke8 Ra7 3.f7 Ra8 $\dagger$ 4.Ke7 $\mathrm{Ra} 7 \dagger$ 5.Kf6 Ra6 $\dagger$ 6.Kf5 Ra8 7.Kg6 (for Rh1 mate) $\mathrm{Ra} 6 \dagger$ 8.Kh5 Ra8 9.Kh6 e2 $10 . \mathrm{Rg} 7$ (for Rh7 mate) Ra6 $\dagger$ 11.Rg6 Ra8 12.Rf6/ii Rf8 13.Re6, and 14.Re8, winning.
i) e2 2.f7 Rf3 3.Ke7 Re3 $\dagger$ 4. $\mathrm{Kf6} 6 \mathrm{Rf} 3 \dagger$ 5.Kg6 Rf1 6.Rh1 $\dagger$ Rxh1 7.f8Q mate. ii) 12.Re6? e1Q 13.Rxe1 Ra6 $\dagger$, and bKg 7 .

No. 8339
E. Kolesnikov (ii 89)
= Special Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
3/2
No. 8339: E.Kolesnikov (Moscow). 1.Rf8/i. Kxd4 2.Kf7 Ke4 3.Re8 $\dagger$ Kf3 4.Rd8 Ke4 5.Ke6 d4 6.Kd6 d3 7.Kc5 Ke3 8.Kc4 d2 9.Kc3, winning.
i) 1.Kf7? Kxd4, and 2.Ke6 Ke3 3.Rf5 d4 4.Re5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf} 25 . \mathrm{Rd} 5 \mathrm{Ke}$, when d 5 is blocked, or 2.Rf6 Ke3 3.Re6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf} 3$ 4.Rd6 Ke4 5.Ke6 d4, and it is the turn of d6 to feel guilty.
"In the style of Réti."

No. 8340: V.Neishtadt (Barnaul) (iii89 and v91)1.Re2 $\dagger$ Rxe2 2.Se3 $\dagger$ Rxe3 3. $\operatorname{Rg} 2 \dagger \operatorname{Re} 24 . \operatorname{Rxe} 2 \dagger$ de 5.ed $\dagger / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Kc} 1$ 6.ba/ii, and now, e1Q 7.c8R Qd2 8.Bc2 Qxc2/iii 9.Qh6 $\dagger$ wins, or e1S 7.h8B Bxh8 8.Qf6 Bxf6 and 9.c8R/iv, winning.
i) W has avoided being checkmated. But.
ii) Now he has to avoid inflicting stalemate.

No. $8340 \quad$ V. Neistadt (iii and v 91) $=$ Special Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1989


Win
13/6
iii) With wQc8, then Bxc3 $\dagger$ 9.Qxc3 Qxc3 $\dagger$ 10.Qxc3 stalemate.
iv) With wQQ on h 8 and c8 there would be stalemate again after $\mathrm{bSc} 2 \dagger$;, wBxc $2 ;$, bBxc $3 \dagger$;, and Qxc3.
" W and Bl get together to give birth to all possible pieces." Miscegenation?!

## SCHACH-ECHO 1982-1984

No. 8341 Jan Rusinek
Hon. Mention, Schach-Echo, 1982-84


Win

No. 8341: Jan Rusinek (Warsaw). Judge: Yohanan Afek (Israel). 15 correct studies (out of 20 published in this informal tourney) offered a disappointing quality.
1.Bb2 a1Q 2.Bxa1 Kd1 3.Rc1 $\dagger$ Kxc1 4.Kxe2 h3 5.Bxe5 h2 6.Bxh2 b2 7.Bd6 b1Q 8.Ba3† Kc2 9.Sc4 mate.
"Frankly this is the only entry with features worthy of a decent study." We believe that there was no SCHACH-ECHO tourney, and therefore no award, for the year 1981.

No. 8342 M. Seidel
1st Comm. Schach-Echo, 1982-84


Win
No. 8342: M.Seidel. 1.Sd2/i Bd5/ii 2.g8Q $\dagger$ Bxg8 $\dagger$ 3.Kg7 Kh5 4.Se4 f1S (f1Q;Sg3 $\dagger$ ) $5 . \mathrm{Sf} 6 \dagger$ and $6 . \mathrm{Sxg} 8$ wins. i) $1 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ ? Bxg8 $\dagger$ 2.Kg7 Bc4 3.h7 Bxf1 4.h8Q Bg2 5.Qh6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 4$, draw.
ii) $\mathrm{Kh} 52 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Bxg} 8 \dagger 3 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Kg} 54 . \mathrm{Se} 4 \dagger$ wins.
"The try $1 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ ? and the pair of forks at the end lend this light miniature some artistic value."

No. 8343: Pekka Massinen (Finland). 1.Sb5 Bb7 2.e6/i Bxc7 3.Sxc7 Kd8/ii 4.Kxd3 Ke7 5.Kc4 Kd6 6.Kb5 Bc8 7.Sd5/iii Kxe6 8.Kc6 wins.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Sd} 6 \dagger$ ? Kd7 3.Sxb7 Bxe5 $4 . \mathrm{Sc} 5 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$
5.Se6 Bd6/iv 6.Kxd3 Bc5 7.Sxc5 stale-

No. 8343 Pekka Massinen
2nd Comm., Schach-Echo, 1982-84


Win $\quad 5 / 4$
mate.
ii) Bc6 4.e7 Kb7 5.Sd5 Bb5 6.Kd2 Kb8 7.Sc7 Bc6 8.Kxd3 wins.
iii) 7.Se8 $\dagger$ ? $\mathrm{Ke} 78 . \mathrm{Sg} 7 \mathrm{Bb} 7$ 9.Kc5 Bh1 10.Kd4 Kf6 draws.
iv) Bh2? 6.Kxd3 Bg1 7.Sd4 Bh2 8.Sb5 wins.
"The main thing here is the well-hidden stalemate after $2 . S d 6 \dagger$ ?"

SCHACH-ECHO, 1985-1987
No. $8344 \quad$ V. Nestorescu
1st Prize, Schach-Echo, 1985-87


Win 5/3

No. 8344: V.Nestorescu (Romania). The judge, Ofer Comay from Israel, reports 34 correct studies participating in this informal tourney. $1 . d 7 \mathrm{Bg} 5 / \mathrm{i}$ 2.b5 $\dagger / \mathrm{ii} \mathrm{Kxb} 5 / \mathrm{iii} 3 . \mathrm{Be} 2 \dagger$ Kc6 4.Bb5 $\dagger$ Kxb5 5.Rxg5 $\dagger$ Kc6 6.d8R/iv Kc7 7. R8d5 wins.
i) Rd4 2.Rc3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 5$ 3.Rc8 Bg 5 4.Rc5 $\dagger$. Rf7 2.Rc3 $\dagger$ Kd6 3.Kb6 Bg5 4.Rc6 $\dagger$. ii) 2.Bh3? Bh4 3.Rb3 Kb5.
2.Rc3 $\dagger$ ? Kd6, and if 3.b5 Rxg4 4.Rd3 $\dagger$ Kc7 5.b6 $\dagger$ Kd8 6.b7 Bf4 7.Rd4 Bb8t, or if 3.Rd3 $\dagger$ Kc7 4.d8Q Bxd8 5.Rd7 $\dagger$ Kc6 6.Rxd8 Rxb4.
iii) Kc5 3.b6 Ra4 $\dagger$ 4.Kb7, and Bd8 5.Rc3 $\dagger$ Kd6 6.Rc6 $\dagger$ Ke7 7.Re6 $\dagger$, or Rb4 5.Rc3 $\dagger$ Kd6 6.Rc6 $\dagger$.
iv) $6 . \mathrm{d} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ ? Rf7 $\dagger$ 7.Kb8 Rb7 $\dagger$ 8.Ka8 Ra7 $\dagger$ 9.Kb8 Ra8 $\dagger$ 10.Kxa8 stalemate.
"An elegant introduction and a pretty concluding combination incorporating promotion to R. It is a pity that the black pieces are already set for the finale."

No. 8345 H. Bernleitner
2nd Prize, Schach-Echo, 1985-87


Draw
2/4
No. 8345: H.Bernleitner. 1.Rg2/i Be2 /ii 2. Rg 1 Bg 4 3.Rg2/iii Bd1 4.Rg1 Be2 5.Kg5/iv f3 6.Kh4 f2 7.Rf1 g2 8.Rxf2 g1Q 9.Rg2 $\dagger$ Qxg2 stalemate.
i) 1.Rxd3? g2, and 2.Rd1 f3 3.Rg1 Kf7,
followed by f2. Or 2.Rd5 g1Q 3.Rg5 $\dagger$ Qxg5 4.Kxg5 f3.
ii) Be4 2. Kg 5 f 3 3.Rxg $3 \mathrm{f} 24 . \mathrm{Kf} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 7$ 5.Rh3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 6$ 6.Rg3 $\dagger$.
iii) 3.Kg5? f3 4.Kh4 (Kxg4,f2;) f2 5.Rf1 g2 6.Rxf2 g1Q.
iv) 5.Rg2? Kf7 6.Kg5 f3 7.Rg1 f2.
"An interesting position where both kings are uncomfortable. There is a quantity of delights and a stalemate in this pleasant miniature."

3rd Prize: see EG 92.6874

No. 8346 Gregor Werner
1st Hon. Mention, Schach-Echo, 198587


No. 8346: Gregor Werner. a8Q g1S $\dagger / \mathrm{i}$ 2.Kd3 c1S $\dagger$ 3.Ke4/ii Bxc6 $\dagger$ 4.Sd5 Re7 $\dagger$ 5.Be5 $\dagger$ Bxa8 stalemate.
i) Rxg 7 2. $\mathrm{Be} 5 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 7$ 3.Se4, and Sd 5 $4 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{clS} \dagger$ 5.Kc4 Bb3 $\dagger$ 6.Kb4 g5 7. Bxg7, or c1S $\dagger 4 . \mathrm{Kf3} 3 \mathrm{~g} 1 \mathrm{~S} \dagger$ 5.Kxg3 Se2 $\dagger$ 6.Kg4. [3...g1S $\dagger$, suggested by David Blundell, is not given.]
ii) $3 . \mathrm{Kc} 4$ ? $\mathrm{Bb} 3 \dagger 4 . \mathrm{Kc} 5 \mathrm{Sd} 3 \dagger 5 . \mathrm{Kd} 6 \mathrm{Bf} 4$ mate.
"Two Bl S-promotions and a stalemate with 2(!) pieces pinned, but W's play is passive and the position heavy."

No. 8347
Rolf Richter
2nd Hon. Mention, Schach-Echo, 198587


Draw
No. 8347: the late Rolf Richter. 1.Sf4 Kf6 2.Sd5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 6$ 3.Se7 $\dagger$ Kf6 $4 . \mathrm{Sd} 5 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 5$ 5.Kg8 Qe6 6.Sf4 Kxf4 7.Kh8(g7) Qc8( $\dagger$ ) $8 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ Qd7 9.Kh8 Qd8 $\dagger$ 10.Kg7 Qd7 11.Kh8 draw.
"Interesting fight by bQ against a 'good' (for drawing purposes) wP and wS, the latter being sacrificed twice on f 4 to decoy bK. Play from move 7 is known."

No. 8348
1st Comm., Schach-Echo, 1985-87


Win
5/4
No. 8348: T.Brand. 1.Kd6 $\dagger$ Kb7 2.Ra1 cd 3.Be4 $\dagger$ Kb6 4.Ra6 $\dagger$ Kxa6 5.Bd3 $\dagger$ Kb7 6.Bxe2 Kc8 7.Ke7 wins.
"The key prepares the R -sacrifice on move 4. A pretty study."

No. 8349
Rolf Richter
2nd Comm., Schach-Echo, 1985-87


Win
No. 8349: the late Rolf Richter. 1.Ke3 $\dagger$ g2 2.Bd5 d6 3.Sf6 gh 4.Se4 Kg1 5.Sd2 h1Q 6.Sf3 $\dagger$ Kf1 7.Bc4 mate.
"To begin with bith sides try to control f 3 , but it turns into a mating problem. It can be seen as such, but there are study qualities."

No. $8350 \quad$ Pekka Massinen
3rd Comm., Schach-Echo, 1985-87


Win
5/4
No. 8350: Pekka Massinen (Finland). 1.e7 Rb8 2.e8S/i Rxf6 $\dagger$ 3.Sxf6 c5 4.Sd7, and Rc8 5.Sb6 $\dagger$, or Rd8 5.Sf8, winning.
i) 2.Ke6? Ka7, and 3.Kf5 Rh1 4.f7 Rf1 $\dagger$ 5.Ke6 Rb6 $\dagger$, or 3.Ke5 Rh5 $\dagger$ 4.Kf4 $\mathrm{Rb} 4 \dagger 5 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 5 \dagger$ and so on. "S-promotion, and then bR captured ("Abfang") on the back rank. wPa4 is a minus, but needed for 2...Rxe8 3.Kxe8 Rxf6 4.g8Q Rd6 5.a5 Kb7 6.Qb3 $\dagger$ Ka7 7.Qb5."

## BRON MEMORIAL, 1990

Sponsor: Sverdlovsk Committee for chess composition Judge: B.G.Olympiev (Sverdlovsk) Received by AJR from: Yu.Konstantinovich LYALYUSHKIN

No. 8351 M. Matous
1st Prize, Bron Memorial


Draw
No. 8351: M.Matous (Prague). 1.Sd4/i f2/ii 2.Rb1/iii Se1/iv 3.Sf3 $\dagger$ and two lines:
Kh3 4.Rxe1 Bc6 5.Re4 f1Q $\dagger / v$ 6.Sg1 $\dagger$ Kg 3 stalemate, or
Kg3 4.Rxe1 Bc6 5.Rg1 $\dagger$ Kh3 (Kxf3; Kh 2 ) $6 . \mathrm{Rg} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kxg} 3$ stalemate.
i) 1.Sc3? f2 2.Rb1 $\mathrm{Se} 13 . \mathrm{Rb} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 3$ wins. $1 . \mathrm{Sg} 1$ ? $\mathrm{Sf} 2 \dagger 2 . \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Sg} 4 \dagger 3 . \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{f} 2$ 4. $\mathrm{Sf} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 3$ wins.
ii) Bxb5 2.Sxb5 Kg3 3.Kg1 Sf4 4.Sd6 draw.
iii) 2.Rf5? Bxf5 3.Sxf5 $\dagger$ Kh3 4.Sg3 Sf4 5.Sf1 Sh5 wins. $2 . \mathrm{Sf} 3 \dagger$ ? Kg 3 wins.
iv) $\mathrm{Bc} 6 \dagger$ 3.Kh2 Se1 4.Sf5 $\dagger$ draws.
v) Kg 3 6.Rg4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxf} 3$ 7.Rg1.
"Very beautiful! As the saying goes: gold is more precious the less of it you have!"

No. 8352
A. Kasparyan

2nd Prize, Bron Memorial


Draw
No. 8352: A.Kasparyan (Erevan). 1. Kg8/i Se7†/ii 2.Kh8 Bxc3 $\dagger$ 3.Bxc3 Rxc3 4.a8Q h1Q 5.Qxh1/iii Rc8 6.Qa8 Sg6 $\dagger$ 7.hg Rxa8 8.g7 Rxe8 $\dagger$ 9.g8Q/iv Rxg8 $\dagger$ 10.Kxg8 Kg6 11.Kh8 Kf6 12.Kh7 Ke5 13.Kg6 Kd4 14.Kf5 Kc3 15.Ke4 Kb2 16.Kd3 Kxa2 17.Kc2 drawn.
i) 1.Bd2†? Kh7 2.a8Q h1Q 3.Bc6/v Qf1 $\dagger$ 4.Ke6/vi Qc4 $\dagger$ 5.Bd5 Qg4 $\dagger$ wins. 1.a8Q? h1Q 2.Kg8 Se7† 3.Kh8 Sg6† wins.
ii) Kg 5 2.a8Q h1Q 3.Qxa5 $\dagger$ is good enough.
iii) 5.Qa6 $\dagger$ ? Rc6 6.Bxc6 Qa1 mate.
iv) 9.g8R? Re2 10.Ra8 Rxa2 11.Ra5 Ra1 $12 . \mathrm{Kg} 8 \mathrm{a} 2$ wins.
v) $3 . \mathrm{Qxa} 5 \mathrm{Rf} 3 \dagger 4 . \mathrm{Ke} 6 \mathrm{Qh} 3 \dagger$ (for Rf5 $\dagger$ ). 3.Qxc8 Rf3 $\dagger 4 . \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Qh} 4 \dagger$ 5.Kd7 Qg4 $\dagger$.
vi) The source also offers "4.Ke8 Qe2 $\dagger$ 5.Be4 $\dagger$ Qxe4 $\dagger$ 6.Qxe4 Sd6 $\dagger$ wins". Is this another case of mass hypnosis? One wonders whether $1 . . . K x a 5$ might save the study slim.

No. 8353 V.S. Kovalenko
3rd Prize, Bron Memorial


Win
4/4
No. 8353: V.S.Kovalenko (Primorsky krai). 1.Ke6/i Kf3/ii 2.Kd5 Kf4 3.Kc6 Kf3 4.h4/iii Kg4 5.f3 $\dagger$ /iv Kh5/v $6 . f 4$ Kg4/vi 7.f5 Kxf5 8.h5 (zugzwang) Kg5 9.Kxc7 d5 10.cd c4 11.d6 c3 12.d7 c2 $13 . \mathrm{d} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ wins.
i) 1.h4? Kg 4 draw. 1.Ke7? d 5 and Bl wins.
ii) Ke4 $2 . \mathrm{h} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5(\mathrm{Kf4} 4 \mathrm{f} 3) 3 . \mathrm{f} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kd} 44 . \mathrm{h} 5$ dc $5 . \mathrm{h6} \mathrm{c} 36 . \mathrm{h} 7 \mathrm{c} 27 . \mathrm{h} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ wins.
iii) 4.Kxc7? d5 5.cd c4 $6 . \mathrm{d} 6 \mathrm{c} 37 . \mathrm{d} 7 \mathrm{c} 2$ 8.d8Q c1Q $\dagger$ 9.Kd7 Kxf2 10.Qh4 $\dagger$ Kf1 11.Qg4 Qc5 12.h4 Qf8 13.h5 Qf7 $\dagger$ $14 . \mathrm{Kd6} \mathrm{Qf} 8 \dagger$ 15.Ke5 $\mathrm{Qb} 8 \dagger$ draw.
iv) 5.f4? Kxf4 6.h5 Kf5 and W is in zugzwang.
v) Kxh4 6.Kxc7 d5 7.cd c4 8.d6 c3 9.d7 c2 $10 . \mathrm{d} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ wins.
vi) Kg6 7.f5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 58 . \mathrm{f6} 6 \mathrm{Kg} 69 . \mathrm{h} 5 \dagger \mathrm{Kf7}$ 10.h6 Kg6 11.f7 Kxf7 12.h7 Kg7 13. $\mathrm{h} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ Kxh8 14.Kxc7 d5 15.cd c4 16.d6 c3 17.d7 c2 18.d8Q $\dagger$ wins.

No. 8354: V.Kondratev and A.G.Kopnin (Chelyabinsk). 1.Kb3 a2 2.Be5, with

No. 8354 V.Kondratev and A.G. Kopnin
4th Prize, Bron Memorial


Draw
$2 / 3$
two alternatives:
Rg5 3.Ba1/i Ra5 4.Kb4 Kb6 5.Bd4 $\dagger$ Ka6 6.Ba1 Rb5 $\dagger$ 7.Ka3 Ra5 $\dagger$ 8.Kb4, positional draw.
Kb5 3.Bb2 Re2 4.Ba1/ii Kc5 5.Bb2 $\mathrm{Kb} 5 / \mathrm{iii}$ 6.Ba1 Kc5 7.Bb2, positional draw.
i) 3.Bb2? Ra 5 4. $\mathrm{Ba} 1 \mathrm{~Kb} 55 . \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Ra} 3 \dagger$ 6.Kc2 Kc4 7.Kb2 Kb4 8.Kc2 Rb3 wins. ii) 4.Kxa2? Kb4(a4) 5.Kb1 Kb3 wins.
iii) Kd5 6.Kxa2 Kc4 7.Ka3 Re3 $\dagger$ 8.Ka2 Kb4 9.Bg7 Re2 $\dagger$ 10.Kb1 Kb3 11.Kc1 draw.
No. 8355
G. Slepyan

5st Prize, Bron Memorial


Black to move; White wins

No. 8355: G.Slepyan. 1...Bc6/i 2.dc Rxa7 $\dagger$ 3.Kxa7 Bc5 $\dagger$ 4.Ka6 b1Q/ii 5. e8S $\dagger$ Kxc6/iii 6.Bxe4 $\dagger$ Qxe4 7.d5 $\dagger$ Qxd5/iv 8.b8S mate.
i) $\mathrm{Rxa} 7 \dagger$ 2.Kxa7 Bc5 $\dagger$ 3.dc b1Q 4.d6 $\dagger$.
ii) Bxe7 5.Bxe4 Kb8 6.c7† Kxc7 7.Ka7.
iii) Kd8 6.c7 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke7} 7 . \mathrm{dc}$ wins.
iv) Kxd5 8.Sf6 $\dagger$ and 9.Sxe4.

No. 8356
V.S. Kovalenko

1st Hon. Mention, Bron Memorial


Win
$4 / 3$
No. 8356: V.S.Kovalenko. 1.Sd5/i Sc7. /ii $2 . \mathrm{Se} 3 / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Sd} 5 \dagger$ 3.Sxd5 g2 4.Be1 $\dagger$ Kh3 5.Bf2 Kh2 6.Bg3 $\dagger$ Kh1(h3) 7.Se4 g1Q 8.Sf2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 2$ 9.Se3 mate.
i) 1.Sc4? g2 2.Be1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 33 . \mathrm{Bf} 2 \mathrm{Kh} 2$ 4. $\mathrm{Bg} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 1$ 5.Se4 g1Q 6.Sf2 $\dagger \mathrm{Qxf} 2 \dagger$ 7.Bxf2 Sc7 draw.
1.Sxa8? g2 2.Be1 $\dagger$ Kh3 3.Bf2 Kh2.
ii) g2 2.Be1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 3$ 3.Bf2 $\mathrm{Kh} 24 . \mathrm{Bg} 3 \dagger$ Kh3 5.Se4 g1Q 6.Sf2 $\dagger$ Qxf2 $\dagger$ 7.Bxf2 wins. Sb6 2.Se3 Sd5 $\dagger$ 3.Sxd5.
iii) 2.Sxc7? g2 3.Be1 $\dagger$ Kh3 4.Bf2 Kh2

No. 8357: V.Ryabtsev. 1.Rg5 $\dagger$ Kd6/i 2.Rh6 $\dagger$ Kc7 3.Rg7 Kb6 4.Rh3 Rf5 $5 . \mathrm{Rb} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 5 / \mathrm{ii} 6 . \mathrm{Rg} 5 \mathrm{Rd} 6 \dagger$ 7.Rd3 Rf6 8.Rf3 Rxg5 9.Rxf6 wins.
i) $\mathrm{Kc} 42 . \mathrm{Rh} 4 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 3$ 3.Rg3 cRf6 4.Rxf3 $\dagger$ Rxf3 5.Rh3 wins.
ii) Ka5 6.f8Q Rxf8 7.Ra7 $\dagger$ Ra6 8.Ra3 $\dagger$ Kb6 9.R7xa6 $\dagger$ wins. Ka6 6.Rg8 Rxf7 7.Ra8 $\dagger \mathrm{Ra} 78 . \mathrm{Ra} 3 \dagger$ wins.

No. $8357 \quad$ V. Ryabtsev
2nd Hon. Mention, Bron Memorial


Win $4 / 3$

No. 8358 I. Bondar
3rd Hon. Mention, Bron Memorial


Black to move; draw
4/3
No. 8358: I.Bondar (Brest region). $1 . . . \mathrm{Bd} 4 \dagger 2 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{~b} 23 . \mathrm{Bg} 6 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 6 / \mathrm{i} 4 . \mathrm{Bf} 8 \dagger$ Bg 7 5.Bd6 Bc3 6.Bf8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 5$ 7.Be7 $\dagger$ Bf6 8.Bd6 Bd8 9.Bf4 $\dagger$ Kf6 10.Be5 $\dagger$ Kxe5 11.f6 draw.
i) $\mathrm{Kg} 74 . \mathrm{Bf} 8 \dagger \mathrm{Kf} 65 . \mathrm{Be} 7 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 76 . \mathrm{Bf} 8 \dagger$ Kxf8 7.f6 draw.

No. 8359: V.Kalyagin (Sverdlovsk). 1.b7/i Rf8 2.d6 $\dagger$ Kh8 3.Qf7 Qxd6 4. Bxe5 (Rb1? Rb8;) fe 5.Qxf8 $\dagger$ Qxf8 6.Ra1 and 7.Ra8 wins.
i) 1.d6? Bxe1. 1.Qa8†? Rf8 2.b7 Qxd5†.


Win

No. 8360
V. Ryabtsev

2nd Comm., Bron Memorial


Win
3/6
No. 8360: V.Ryabtsev (Donetsk region). 1.Kf3 Kf1 2.e6 h3 3.e7 h2 4.e8Q h1Q 5.Qe2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 6.Qe1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 2$ 7.Qxg3 $\dagger$ $\mathrm{Kg} 18 . \mathrm{Qe} 1 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 2$ 9.Qe5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 10.Qc5 $\dagger$ Kh2 11.Qxh5 $\dagger$ Kg1 12.Qc5 $\dagger$ Kh2 13. Qc7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 14.Qa7 $\dagger$ Kh2 $15 . \mathrm{Qxh} 7 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 16.Qxh1 $\dagger$ Kxh1 17.g4 wins.

No. 8361: P.Shulzhenko (Khmelnitsky region). 1.Sd2 Bd4 2.a6 e5/i 3.a7 Be6 $\dagger$ 4.Ka3/ii Bd5 5.Sf3 $\dagger / \mathrm{iii}$ Bxf3 $6 . \mathrm{h} 7$ e4/iv 7.a8Q wins.
i) Kh1 3.h7 Bh3 4.Sf3 wins. Kg3 3.h7 Bh3 4.Se4 $\dagger$ wins.

No. 8361
P. Shulzhenko

3rd Comm., Bron Memorial


Win 4/5
ii) $4 . \mathrm{Kb} 1$ ? $\mathrm{Bf} 5 \dagger 5 . \mathrm{Kc} 1 \mathrm{Bxa} 7$.
iii) 5.Se4? Bxe4 6.h7 Bxh7 7.a8Q Kg3 draw.
iv) Bxa 7 7.h8Q $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 18 . \mathrm{Qg} 7 \dagger$.

No. 8362 V. Dolgov and A.Maksimovskikh
1st Special Prize, Bron Memorial


Draw
3/4
No. 8362: V.Dolgov (Krasnodarsky krai) and A.Maksimovskikh (Kurgan region). 1.Ra2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 7$ 2.g8Q Bc7 $\dagger$ 3. Qg 3 $\mathrm{Rh} 8 \dagger$ 4.Kg2 $\mathrm{Bc} 6 \dagger$ 5. $\mathrm{Qf} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 8 \dagger / \mathrm{i} 6 . \mathrm{Kf} 2$ $\mathrm{Bb} 6 \dagger$ 7.Qe3 Rf8 $\dagger$ 8.Ke2 $\mathrm{Bb} 5 \dagger$ 9.Qd3 Re8 $\dagger$ 10.Kd2 draw.
i) Not $\mathrm{Rh} 2 \dagger$ (now or later) $6 . \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Bxf} 3$ 7.Rxh2.

No. 8363
G. Nekhaev

2nd Special Prize, Bron Memorial


Win

No. 8363: G.Nekhaev (Kursk). 1.Rc1 $\dagger$ Ke2 2.Rc7 Sd8 3.Rd7 Se6 $\dagger$ 4.Ke5/i Sc5 5.Rc7 Sd3† 6.Kd4 Ba6 7.Rc2 $\dagger / \mathrm{ii} \mathrm{Kd1}$ 8.Ra2 Sb4 9.Ra4 Sc2† 10.Kc3 Bb7/iii 11.Ra7 Bh1 12.Rh7 Bc6 13.Rd7 $\dagger$ Kc1 14.Rc7 Be4 15.Re7 and wins.
i) 4.Kf5? Sc5 5.Rc7 Se4 6.Ke5 Ba8 draw. 4.Kg4? Sc5 5.Rc7 Bf3 $\dagger$ 6.K- Sa4 draw. 4.Kg3? Sc5 5.Rc7 Se4† 6.Kf4 Ba8 draw.
ii) The availability of this check is given as the explanation of W's first move.
iii) $\mathrm{Bc} 811 . \mathrm{Ra} 8 \mathrm{Bb} 712 . \mathrm{Rb} 8$ wins.

No. 8364 A. Davranyan
3st Special Prize, Bron Memorial


Draw
3/3

No. 8364: A.Davranyan (Donetsk region). $1 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Ka} 32 . \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{~Kb} 23 . \mathrm{Ke} 3 / \mathrm{ii}$ Kc3 4.Kf4 d5 5.Ke3 f5 6.Kf4 Kxc2 7.Ke5 draw.
i) 1.Kf1? Kb4 2.Ke2 Kc3 3.Kf3/iii Kd2 4.Ke4 (Kf4,d5;) Kxc2 wins.
ii) 3.Ke4? Kxc2 4.Kd4 Kd2 5.Ke4 Ke2 6.Kf5 Kf3 7.Kxf6 Kf4 wins. 3.Kf4? d5 4.Ke3 Kc3 and W is in zugzwang.
iii) $3 . \mathrm{Kd1}$ f5 $4 . \mathrm{Kc1} \mathrm{f4} \mathrm{5.Kd1} \mathrm{d6} \mathrm{6.Kc1}$ d5 7.Kd1 d4 8.Kc1 d3 9.f3 Kd4 wins.

No. $8365 \quad$ V. Kalashnikov
Special Hon. Mention, Bron Memorial


Draw
8/7
No. 8365: V. Kalashnikov (Sverdlovsk). $1 . \mathrm{Sa} 3 \dagger / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Kb} 2 / \mathrm{ii} 2 . \mathrm{Rb} 1 \dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 3.Ra1 $\dagger$ Kb 2 4.Rb1 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 5.Ra1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxa} 1$ 6.Sxb8 Rxd6 $\dagger$ 7.Sd7 Rxd7 8.Sc2 $\dagger$ Ka2 9.Sb4 $\dagger$ and:
Kb1 10.Ka3 Rd8 11.Sc6 Bxc6 12.b8Q $\dagger$ Rxb8 stalemate, or
Kb2 10.b8Q Rd8 $\dagger$ 11.Sc6 $\dagger$ Rxb8 stalemate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Ra} 2 \dagger \mathrm{Kxb} 12 . \mathrm{Sxb} 8 \mathrm{Rc} 4 \dagger$ 3.Kb3 Rc3 $\dagger$ 4.Kb4 Kxa2 5.d7 Bxd7 6.Sxd7 h3 7.Sc5 h2 8.b8Q h1Q 9.Qg8 $\dagger$ Ka1 10. $\mathrm{Sb} 3 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 2$ 11.Sxd4 Qe1 12.Qd5 Rb3 $\dagger$ $13 . \mathrm{Kc5}$ Qb4† 14.Kc6 Rc3 $\dagger$ 15.Kd7 Rd3 16.Qb7 Ka3 17.Qxa7 Rxd4 $\dagger$ 18.Kc6 Qd6 $\dagger$ 19.Kb7 Qe7 $\dagger$ 20.Kb6 Rb4 $\dagger 21$. Kc6 Qxa7 wins.
ii) $\mathrm{Kc} 32 . \mathrm{Sb} 5 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 2$ 3.Rb1 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 4.Ra1 $\dagger$ Kb2 5.Rb1 $\dagger$ Kxb1 6.Sxb8 Rxd6 7.Sd7

Bxd7 8.b8Q Rd5 9.Qh2 Rxb5 10.Qa2 $\dagger$ Kc 1 11.Qc4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 1$ 12.Qa2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxa} 2$ stalemate.

## B.A. SAKHAROV MEMORIAL TOURNEY

Judge: A.P.Grin (Moscow).
There were 'about 100 ' entries. The standard was high.
Boris Andreevich Sakharov (1914-1973) was a leading scientist as well as study composer, soviet delegate to, and Vi-ce-President of, the FIDE PCCC. The judge points out that in judging a MT to a composer the style and preferences of the composer have their place. For instance, Sakharov did not favour solutions longer than 10 moves - an opinion shared by the judge, who adds that most importantly a study's combination and culmination should form a unity.
Award: Bulletin of Central Chess Club of USSR, ix. 1990


No. 8366: Yu.Bazlov. 1.Rc4 Re7† (Sd2;

Rd4 $\dagger$ ) 2.Kf5 Sd2 3.Rd4 $\dagger$ Ke8 4.Rxd2/i, and Be4 $\dagger$ 5.Kf6 Bxd2 6.Rb8 $\dagger$ Kd7 7.Rd8 $\dagger$ Kxd8 stalemate, or Rf7 $\dagger$ 5.Kg6 Bxd2 6.Re3 $\dagger$ Kf8 7.Re8 $\dagger$ Kxe8 stalemate.
i) Ready for Bxd2 5.Rxf3, but Bl has two other replies.
"The study reproduces a stalemate of Kubbel (1st Pr, Shakhmaty, 1925) that Rafael Kofman years ago called the best in the history of composition. And here we have the Kubbel masterpiece's content multiplied by two, 65 years on."

No. 8367 N. Kralin
2nd Prize, Sakharov Memorial


Win
5/5
No. 8367: N.Kralin (Moscow). "To start with, complete material equality. We hardly expect a two-fold win of bQ."

1. Qf1 Kc7 2.Qb5 Qa1† 3.Bg1, and:

Be3 4.Qb7 $\dagger$ Kd6 5.Qd7 $\dagger$ Kc5 (Ke5; Qg7 $\dagger$ ) 6.Qa7 $\dagger$ Qxa7 7.Bxe3 $\dagger$ and 8. Bxa7 winning, or
Qh8 $\dagger 4 . \mathrm{Bh} 2 \dagger \mathrm{Bf} 4$ 5.Qb7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 6$ 6.Qb8 $\dagger$ Qxb8 7.Bxf4 $\dagger$ and 8.Bxb8 winning.
"Remarkable! A strong combination shown with brilliant mastery in a pair of variations."
"So, in the first two places we find studies of the Czech school. This is not to say that I belong to that school - it is simply that these two were the best
among the best!"
No. 8368 G.A.Nadareishvili 3rd Prize, Sakharov Memorial


Win
No. 8368: G.A.Nadareishvili (Tbilisi). 1.Bd5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 1 / \mathrm{i} 2 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ f3 3.Bxf3 gf 4. Qxg6 $\dagger \mathrm{Bg} 25 . \mathrm{Qb} 1 \dagger$ (Kg3? h1S $\dagger$;) Bf1 6.Kg3 h1Q 7.Qb6 $\dagger$ cb 8.Bxb6 $\dagger$ f $29 . \mathrm{Bxf} 2$ mate.
i) f3 2.Bxc7, with 3.Bxh2 or 3.g8Q.
"The somewhat coarse play ends with what seems to be a new ideal pure mate where all pieces participate - very important (see the 1st Prize also)."


No. 8369: O.Pervakov (Moscow). 1.

Sg5/i Bxg5 2.hg Sb6 3.Sxb6 (BXb6; Sc4†) e3 4.Sd5 Se4 $\dagger$ 5.Ke7 e2 6.Bf2 Sxf2 7.Sf4 e1Q $\dagger$ 8.Kf7, with unstoppable perpetual check by Sg6-f8. "Without the sacrifice on f 2 Bl could set up a pin of wS on the f-file."
i) $1 . \mathrm{Kxd} 7$ ? Kxh 7 and W will have to give up his B for the P.
"Lively play, with beautiful points on moves 2 and 6 . Yes, the final position has been met before in studies."

No. 8370 L.A.Mitrofanov and A.Bor

5th Prize, Sakharov Memorial


Win
5/3
No. 8370: L.A.Mitrofanov and A.Bor (Leningrad). 1.Sd8 Qxg4 $\dagger$ 2.Ka5/i Rh5 3.b7 $\dagger$ Kb8 4.Qxh5 Qxh5 $\dagger$ 5.Kb6 and it's all over. bQ and bK together, with the move, are helpless against wS and wP. The position is known from analysis by Pogosyants, but here we have it in study form.
i) 2.Kb5? Qe2†. 2.Ka3? Rh3 $\dagger$.
"This study may well have a longer life before it than the first four, but this alone did not warrant a higher placing."

No. 8371: A.Sadykov (Sverdlovsk). 1.Bb4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd1} 2 . \mathrm{Ba} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 1$ 3.Ba3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 1$ 4.Rb5 $\dagger \mathrm{Bb} 2 / \mathrm{i} 5 . \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Sf} 1 \dagger$ 6.Kd1 Se3 $\dagger$ 7.Kd2 Sc4† 8.Kd1 Sxa3 9.Bb3/ii e5
10.Bd5 Sc2 11.Be4, and "the whole herd of Bl pieces" are stalemated.

No. 8371
A. Sadykov

1st Hon. Mention, Sakharov Memorial


Draw
7/9
i) Qb2 5.hg Qxb5 6.Bxb5 a1Q 7.Bd3 $\dagger$ with perpetual check.
ii) W can also temporise: 9.Rb4 e5 10.Bb3.
"The preceding studies belong, following Herbstman's classification, to the realistic genre. I wanted to show the typically 'romantic' as well, but only the Sadykov really qualified."

No. 8372 A.Kuryatnikov and A. Khait
2nd Hon. Mention, Sakharov Memorial


Draw

No. 8372: A.Kuryatnikov (Riga) and A.Khait (Saratov). 1.Bf3 $\dagger$ Kh4 2.g3 $\dagger$ Kh3 (Kxg3;Se4 $\dagger$ ) 3.Sd3 Rxd3 4.Rxc2 Rd7 $\dagger$ 5.Kg6 Bb1 6.Bg4 $\dagger$ Kxg4 stalemate.
"Lively play leads to a mirror stalemate with a distant pin. Sad that bSg8 is paralytic, not making a single move."

No. 8373 D. Gurgenidze
3rd Hon. Mention, Sakharov Memorial


Draw
5/4
No. 8373: D.Gurgenidze (Tbilisi). "A classic rook study with material the Georgians are fond of. This example is not one of the composer's best, so we see him in this unaccustomed place."
1.Rf5 $\dagger$ Kxf5 2.h8Q a1Q $\dagger$ 3.Qxa1 Rxa1 $\dagger$ 4.Kb8, and "W and Bl having exchanged compliments" the study finishes with:
Rxc6 stalemate, or
aRb1 5.c7 Rxb7 $\dagger$ 6.Ka8 Rxc7 stalemate, or
Ke6 5.c7 Rxb7† 6.Kxb7 Rb1 $\dagger$ 7.Kc8
Ke7 stalemate, or, in this, Kd6 8.Kd8 Rh1 9.c8S $\dagger$ drawn.

No. 8374: A.Malyshev (Yaroslav region).
1.Kc7 Rd3 2.Se7 Rxc3 3.f7 Sxf7 4.Sd5

Re1 5.Sb6 $\dagger$ Sxb6 $\dagger$ 6.Bc6 $\dagger$ Ka7 stale-
mate.
"A good stalemate study."


Draw
5/4
No. 8375
Yu. Roslov
5th Hon Mention, Sakharov Memorial


Win
4/6
No. 8375: Yu.Roslov (Leningrad).
1.Bd5/i b3 2.a8Q b2 3.Ba2, and:

Rxa2 4.Qh1 $\dagger$ Kd2 5.Qd5 $\dagger$ Kc1 6.Qc4 $\dagger$
Kb 1 7.Qf1 mate, or
baQ 4.Qh1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 25 . \mathrm{Qg} 2 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 16 . \mathrm{Qf} 1 \dagger$
Kb 2 7.Qe2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 18 . \mathrm{Qe} 1 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 2$ 9.Qd2 mate.
i) 1.Sc2? Kxc2? 2.Bh1 b3 3.a8Q b2 4. $\mathrm{Qg} 2 \dagger$ wins, but $1 . . . \mathrm{Rh} 3$ ! draws.
"Content out of the ordinary - a pair of 'minimal' mating finales. The Bl ' P -
collective' is idle, apart from bP - the costs of construction."

No. 8376
A. Gasparyan

Comm., Sakharov Memorial


Draw
4/6
No. 8376: A.Gasparyan (Erevan). 1. Bd4 $\dagger$ Kh1 2.ef g1Q 3.Bxg1 Rg7 4.g6 Kxg1 5.Kc8 c3 6.f8Q Rg8 7.g7 c2 8.Kd7 c1Q 9.Qc5 $\dagger$ Qxc5 stalemate.
"All is well, apart from the finale, which is not pure, c8 being covered twice."

No. 8377 V.S. Kovalenko
Comm., Sakharov Memorial


Win 5/7

No. 8377: V.S.Kovalenko (Primorsky jrai).
1.Rb4 $\dagger$ (Kxa1? Kb6;) Ka8 2.Kxa1 Rc1 $\dagger$
3.Kb2 Rc2 $\dagger$ 4.Kb1 Rc1 $\dagger$ 5.Kxc1 b2 $\dagger$ 6.Kd2 b1Q 7.aRb5 wins.
"The whole point lies in the final move. As Anatoly Kuznetsov writes in such situations: all of a sudden $7 . a R b 5!"$

No. 8378
E. Kolesnikov

Comm., Sakharov Memorial


Draw
$3 / 5$
No. 8378: E.Kolesnikov (Moscow).
1.Re8 $\dagger$ Kf4 2.Rxe4 $\dagger$ Kxf3 3.Re2 h1Q 4.Rh2 $\mathrm{Se} 3 \dagger$ 5.Ke1 $\mathrm{Sg} 2 \dagger$ 6.Kf1 Se3 $\dagger$, drawn, or h1R 4.Rf2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 3$ 5.Rg2 $\dagger$ draw.
"W plays for stalemate, Bl counters, and in the end it's peace."

No. 8379
A. Manvelyan

Comm., Sakharov Memorial


Draw
I: diagram II: add wPd2

No. 8379: A.Manvelyan (Erevan).
I: 1.Ra3 Bxc2 2.Rxa4 Sa6 $\dagger$ 3.Kb5 Bd3 $\dagger$
4.Rc4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 75 . \mathrm{a} 3$ (a4? Ka7;) Ka7 6.Ka4 Bxc4 stalemate.
II: As I until 5...Ka7 6.a4 Kb7, again with stalemate.

No. 8380 E. Pogosyants
Comm., Sakharov Memorial


Win
No. 8380: the late E.Pogosyants (Moscow).
1.Kh4 Bc5 2.Rh3 $\dagger$ Kg1 3.Rf3 Bf2 $\dagger$ 4.Kh3 Kh1 5.Re2 wins, provided W captures bB and not bS after 5...bSxwR.

## RÉTI MEMORIAL TOURNEY 1989

Judge: Vladimir Kos (Brno).
Provisional award of this formal tourney in: PAT A MAT No.13, August 1991, p. 5.
Received by AJR from Formánek.

No. 8381
Emilian Dobrescu
1st Prize, Réti Memorial


Draw
No. 8381: Emilian Dobrescu (Romania). 1.Ra6 $\dagger / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Kd7/ii} \mathrm{2.Ra7†/iii} \mathrm{Kc6} 3$. Rh7/iv f2/v 4.Ra6 $\dagger$ Rb6 5.Rh6 $\dagger$ Kc5 6.Rh5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 4$ 7.Ra4 $\dagger \mathrm{Rb} 4$ 8.Rh4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc5}$ 9.Rh5 $\dagger$ Kc6 10.Ra6 $\dagger$ Rb6 11.Rh6 $\dagger$ Kc7 12.Rh7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$ 13.Ra8 $\dagger \mathrm{Rb} 8$ 14.Rh8 $\dagger$ Kc7 15.Rh7 $\dagger$ Kc6 16.Ra6 $\dagger$ Rb6 17. Rh6 $\dagger$ drawn.
i) 1.Rxb4? h1Q $\dagger 2 . \mathrm{Kb}(\mathrm{c}) 2 \mathrm{f} 23 . \mathrm{Rb} 6 \dagger$ Kd 7 4.Ra7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$ 5.Rg6 Qb1 $\dagger$ 6.Kxb1 $\mathrm{f} 1 \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ 7.K- Qe2 $\dagger$ 8.Kc3 Qe3 $\dagger$ 9.Kb2 $\mathrm{Qd} 2 \dagger$ and Bl wins.
1.Rh5? Rxa4 2.Rxh2 Kf5, and 3.Rh8 Rd 4 or $3 . \mathrm{Rh} 5 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 4$ and Bl wins.
ii) Kf 5 2.R4a5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 4$ 3.Rg6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 3$ 4.Rh5 $\dagger$ Rh4 5.Rxh4 $\dagger$ Kxh4 6.Rh6 $\dagger$ Kg3 7.Kd2 f2 8.Ke2 and draws.
iii) 2.Rh6? Rxa4 3.Rxh2 Ke6, and 4.Rf2 Ra3 5.Kd1(d2) Kf5 6.Rf1 Kf4 7.Ke1 (Rf2,Ke3;) Ke3, or 4.Rh6† Kf5 5.Kd2 Re4 6.Rh8 Kg4, and Bl wins. iv) 3.Ra6†? Rb6 4.Rh4(h7) Rxa6 5.Rxh2 Kd5 6.Rh5 $\dagger$ Kd4 7.Kd2 Re6 8.Rh2 Re3 9.Rh4†/vi Re4 10.Rh2 Ke5 11.Rh5 $\dagger / v i i \operatorname{Kf4}$ 12.Rh4 $\dagger$ Kf5 13.Rxe4 Kxe4 14.Kd1 Kd3 and Bl wins.
v) Rxa4 4.Rxh2 Ra1 $\dagger$ 5.Kb2, and Rg1 6.Kc3 Rg2 7.Rh6 $\dagger$ (for Kd3) draws, or Rf1 6.Rh5 Kd6 7.Rf5 Ke6 8.Rf8 Ke5 9.Kc2 Ke4 10.Kd2 Ra1(h1) 11.Rf7
draws.
vi) 9.Rh- Re2 $\dagger 10 . \mathrm{Kd} 1 \mathrm{Ke} 3$ and Bl wins.
9.Rf2 Ra3 10.Ke1 Ra1 $\dagger$ 11.Kd2 Ke4 Bl wins.
9.Kd1 Ra3 10.Ke1 Ra1 $\dagger$ 11.Kf2 Ra2 $\dagger$ Bl wins.
vii) 11.Kd3 Re1 12.Kd2 Ra1 13.Ke3 $\mathrm{Ra} 3 \dagger$ 14.Kf2 Ra2 $\dagger \mathrm{Bl}$ wins.

No. 8382 Velimir Kalandadze
2nd Prize, Réti, Memorial


Win
6/5
No. 8382: Velimir Kalandadze, Georgia. 1.Rg4 $\dagger$ Kh6 $2 . \mathrm{Rxh} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 6$ 3.Rg7 $\dagger$ Kxf6 4.Rxa7 Rd6 $\dagger$ 5.Kc2/i Rxa7 6. Rh6 $\dagger$ Ke5 7.Sc4 $\dagger$ Kd5 8.Sxd6 Rc7 $\dagger$ 9.Kd3 Rc6 10.Sd4 Rxd6 11.Rh5 mate.
i) 5.Ke2? Rxa7 6.Rh6 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke5} 7 . \mathrm{Sc} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kd} 5$ 8.Sxd6 Re7† 9.Kd3 Re6 drawn.

No. 8383: Emil Melnichenko (Auckland, New Zealand). 1.Se5 $\dagger / \mathrm{i}$ Kxd6 $2 . \mathrm{Sc} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kd} 7$ 3.Rxc7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 84 . \mathrm{Kb} 7 / \mathrm{ii} \mathrm{Qb4} \dagger$ /iii 5.Sb6 Qe4† 6.Kb8 Qe5 7.a8S wins. i) 1.Rxc7†? Kxd6 2.Rf7 Qc3 3.Rf6 $\dagger$ Qxf6 4.Sxf6 Kc7 drawn.
1.dc? Qxa6 2.Se5 $\dagger$ Kd6 3.Sf7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd7}$ 4.Rb8 Qc6 $\dagger$ 5.Rb7 Kc8 6.Sd8 Qd5 7.Sc6 Qxc6 stalemate.
ii) 4.Kb8? Qb4 $\dagger$ 5.Rb7 $\mathrm{Qd} 6 \dagger$ 6.Ka8 Qc6 7.Sb6 Qe4 8.Sd7 Qd5 9.Sf6 Qc6 draw.

No. 8383 Emil Melnichenko 3rd Prize, Réti Memorial


Win
6/3
iii) $\mathrm{Qf} 3 \dagger$ 5.Rc6 $\mathrm{Qb} 3 \dagger$ 6.Rb6 $\mathrm{Qf3} \dagger$ 7.Kb8 Qf4† 8.Rd6 $\dagger$ wins.

No. 8384
Sergei Tkachenko
1st Hon. Mention, Réti Memorial


Black to move; White wins
No. 8384: Sergei Tkachenko (Ukraine). 1...Rf6 2.Qe3/i Rd6†/ii 3.Kxe7 Ba3 4.Ke8/iii c1Q 5.Bd5 $\dagger$ Rxd5 6.Qe6 Qc5 7.Qxd5 $\dagger$ Qxd5 stalemate.
i) 2.Qh5? c1Q 3.Qd5 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 3$ 4.Qa5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 3$ 5.Bd5 $\dagger$ Kc2 6.Be4 $\dagger$ Kd1 7.Qa4 $\dagger$ Ke1 8. $\mathrm{Qb} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Bc} 3$ and Bl wins.
ii) c1Q 3.Bd5 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 14 . \mathrm{Qa} 7 \dagger \mathrm{Ba} 35 . \mathrm{Qd} 4 \dagger$ Qb2 6.Qd1 $\dagger$ Qb1 7.Qd4 $\dagger$ draw. iii) 4.Bd5 $\dagger$ ? Rxd5 $\dagger$ 5.Ke8 Rc5 and Bl
wins.
No. 8385
Lars Falk
2nd Hon. Mention, Réti Memorial


Draw


No. 8385: Lars Falk (Uppsala, Sweden). 1.Rb8 $\dagger$ Kd7 $2 . \mathrm{Rb} 7 \dagger$ Kc6 (Ke6; Re7 $\dagger$ ) $3 . R b 6 \dagger /$ i Kd7/ii $4 . R b 7 \dagger$ Kxd6 5.Rb4 Ra1 $\dagger / \mathrm{iii} 6 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Be} 5 \dagger$ 7.Bd4 a3 $\dagger$ 8.Kxa1 $\mathrm{Sc} 2 \dagger$ 9.Kb1/iv Sxb4 10.Bb2 Bxb2 (or ab) stalemate.
i) 3.d7? Rd3 4.Rb4 Rd1 $\dagger$ 5.Kb2 $\mathrm{Be} 5 \dagger$ and Bl wins.
ii) Kd 5 4.d7 Bc 7 5.Rb8 $\mathrm{Ra} 1 \dagger$ 6.Kd2 $\mathrm{Sc} 4 \dagger$ 7.Kc2 Sa3 $\dagger$ 8.Kc3 $\mathrm{Be} 5 \dagger$ 9.Kb4 Bd6 $\dagger$ 10.Kxa4 Sc4 $\dagger$ 11.Kb3 draw.
iii) Rc3 $\dagger$ 6.Kd2 Rc4 7.Rb6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 7$ 8.Kxe3 $\mathrm{Bg} 1 \dagger$ 9.Kd3, and Rg4 10.Ra6 Kb7 11.Rxa4, or Bxb6 10.Kxc4 Bxa7 11.Kb4 draw.

No. 8386: Julien Vandiest (Borgerhout, Belgium). 1.Bc6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 8$ 2.Ka6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 73$. Qb6 $\dagger$ Kc8 4.Qc5 Kd8/i 5.Qe5 Kc8/ii 6.Bb5/iii, with:
h3/iv 7.Bxc4 Kd8/v 8.Kb6 Qg1†/vi 9.Kb7 Qh1 $\dagger 10 . \mathrm{Kb} 8 \mathrm{Qb} 1 \dagger$ 11.Bb5 Qg6 12.Qc7 mate, or:

Qd3 7.Qe8 $\dagger$ Kc7 8.Qe7 $\dagger$ Kc8 9.Bc6 Qd4/vii 10.Bb7 $\dagger$ Kb8 11.Qe8 $\dagger$ Kc7 12. Qc8 $\dagger$ Kd6 13.Qd8 $\dagger$ Kc5 14.Qb6 mate.

Julien Vandiest
3rd Hon. Mention, Réti Memorial


Win
3/4
i) Qd8 5.Bd5 $\dagger$ Qc7/viii 6.Be6 $\dagger$ Kd8 7.Qf8 mate.

Qd2 5.Bd5 $\dagger$ Kd7 6.Qc6 $\dagger$ Ke7 7.Qe6 $\dagger$ Kd8 8.Qd6 $\dagger$.
Qc1(a1†,e1) 5.Ba4 $\dagger$ Kd8 6.Qd6 $\dagger$ Kc8 7.Qd7 $\dagger$ Kb8 8.Qb7 mate. ii) $\mathrm{c} 3(\mathrm{~h} 3) \quad 6 . \mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Qb} 3 \dagger$ 7.Bb5 Qf7 $\dagger$ 8.Kb8 Qe7 9.Qd5 $\dagger$.
iii) $6 . \mathrm{Ka} 7$ ? Qg1 $\dagger$ 7.Ka8 Qg3 8.Qe8 $\dagger$ Kc7 9.Qd7† Kb6 draw.
iv) c3 7.Qe8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc7} 8 . \mathrm{Qe} 7 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$ 9.Bc4 Qa1 $\dagger$ 10.Kb6 $\mathrm{Qg} 1 \dagger$ 11.Kc6 $\mathrm{Qg} 2 \dagger$ 12.Bd5 Qg6 $\dagger$ 13.Be6 $\dagger$.
Qd8 7.Qe6 $\dagger$ Kb8 8.Bd7 Kc7 9.Qc6† $\dagger$
Qg4 7.Qe8†Kc7 8.Qe7† Kc8 9.Bc6. W wins every time.
v) Qd2 8.Be6 $\dagger$ Kd8 9.Qf6 $\dagger$, and Kc7 10.Qe7 $\dagger$ Kc6 11.Qb7 $\dagger$ Kc5 12.Qb6 mate, or Ke8 10.Qf7 $\dagger$ Kd8 11.Qf8 $\dagger$ Kc7 $12 . \mathrm{Qc} 8 \dagger$ wins.
vi) Qf3 9.Bb5 Qf7 10.Qd6 $\dagger$ Kc8 11.Ba6†.
vii) c3 $\dagger$ 10.Ka7 Qd4 $\dagger$ 11.Ka8 Qb6 12. Qd7 mate.
viii) Kd7 6.Qc6 $\dagger$ Ke7 7.Qe6 $\dagger$ Kf8 8.Qf7 mate.

No. 8376: Emil Vlasák (Ustí nad Labem, Czechoslovakia)1.Sa1 Kxa1/i $2 . \mathrm{b} 7$ Bf3 $\dagger$ /ii 3.Rxf3 Rb6 4.Bd6/iii Rxb7 5.Kc6, and Rb1/iv 6.Be5 $\dagger$ Rb2 7.Rf1

No. 8387 Emil Vlasák
1st Comm., Réti Memorial


Win
mate, or Rb2 6.Rf1 $\dagger$ Rb1 7.Be5 mate.
i) Ba6 2.Rxg6 hg 3.Bf6 $\dagger$ wins.
ii) $\mathrm{Rg} 5 \dagger$ 3.Kc6 Rb5 4.Re6 Rb2 5.Rxe2 Rxe2 6.b8Q Rxe7 7.Qb3 Rg7 8.Qc2 Rg1 9.Qc3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 1$ 10.Qd3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 111 . \mathrm{Qe} 3 \dagger$ Kb 2 12. Qd4 $\dagger$ and W wins.
iii) 4.Kc4? Rxb7 5.Bf6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 1$ 6.Rf1 $\dagger$ Kc2 draw.
4.Bxa3? Rxb7 5.Kc6/v Rb1 6.Kd5 Rb7 7.Rc3 Rb2 8.Rh3 Rb7 9.Rc3 Rb2 10.Rc1 Rb1 11.Rc2 Rb3 draw.
iv) Ra 7 6.Rb3 Ra6 $\dagger$ 7.Kd5 Rxd6 $\dagger$ 8.Kxd6 h5 9.Kd5 h4 10.Kc4 h3 11.Rxh3 Kb 2 12.Rh2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 1$ 13.Kb3 a1S $\dagger$ 14.Kc3 Sc2 15.Rxc2 a2 16.Rb2 $\dagger$ and $W$ wins. v) $5 . \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{~Kb} 16 . \mathrm{Rf} 1 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 2$ 7.Ra1 Kd2 draw.

No. 8388: Michal Hlinka (Kosice, Czechoslovakia). 1. $\mathrm{Ra} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 2 / \mathrm{i} 2$ 2. Bb 3 Sd3 $\dagger /$ ii $3 . \mathrm{Kxe} 2 \mathrm{Sc} 1 \dagger 4 . \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{~b} 4$ 5.Ra4 b5 6.Ra6 Sxb3 7.Rxg6 h5 (Kh3;Rg3 $\dagger$ ) $8 . \mathrm{Rg} 2 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 3$ (Kh1;Rg3 and Rxb3 mates) $9 . \mathrm{Rg} 3 \dagger$ wins.
i) Kh4 2.Bb3 Sd3 $\dagger$ 3.Kxe2 $\mathrm{Sc} 1 \dagger$ 4.Kf1 b4 5.Ra4 Sxb3 6.Rxb4 $\dagger$ wins.
ii) g5 3.Kxe2 g4 4.Be6 g3 5.Rf3 h5 6.Rf4 g2 7.Rh4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 3$ 8.Rh3 $\dagger$ Kf4 9.Kf2 wins.


No. 8389 Jaroslav Pospisil 3rd Comm., Réti Memorial


Draw 4/5

No. 8389: Jaroslav Pospisil (Prague). 1.c6 dc 2.Be5 a3 3.Bc7 a2 4.Ba5 a1S 5.Bb4/i Sb3 6.Bc3 Kb8/ii 7.Bb2, with: c5 8.dc d4 9.c6 d3 10.Bc3 Sd4 11.Bd2 Sxc6 12.Kb5 Se5 13.Kb4 Sf3 14.Kc3, or: Sd2 8.Ba3 Sb3 9.Bb2 Ka8/iii 10.Bc3 Sc1 11.Bb4 Sd3 12.Bd6 draw.
i) 5.Bd8? $\mathrm{Sc} 26 . \mathrm{Bf} 6 \mathrm{Sb} 4 \dagger$ 7.Ka5 Sd 3 8.Ka6 Sf4 9.Bg7 Se6 10.Be5 Sf8 11.Bc7 Sd7 12.B- $\mathrm{Sb} 8 \dagger$ 13.Ka5 Kb7 and Bl wins.
ii) Sc1 7.Bb4 Sd3 8.Bd6 S- 9.Bc5 draws. c5 7.dc d4 8.Bb4 d3 9.c6 draws.
iii) c5 10.dc d4 11.c6 d3 12.Bc3 Sc5 $\dagger$ 13.Kb5 Se4 14.Bb4 d2 15.Bxd2 Sxd2 16.Ka6 draw.

The second section required a complete game of reasonable quality (and optional comments) ending with the classic 0000.11 Réti draw. The prize went to Rudolf Maric of Belgrade. Two of the other 4 valid entries were honoured, including one based on a game of Réti's. Judges: otb IGM Lubomir Ftacnik and Bedrich Formánek..

## PRAVDA-TRNAVIA 1987

Judge: Bohuslav Sivák (Zvolen, Czechoslovakia)
Provisional award in: PAT-A-MAT 12 "Sep 1990"

No. 8390 Michal Hlinka
1st Prize, Pravda-Trnavia, 1987


Draw 5/3

No. 8390: Michal Hlinka. 1.Bf8/i Bd4 2.Sb4 Rg2 $\dagger$ 3.Kh5/ii Rf2 4.Bd6 Bc3/iii 5.Bg3 Rg2 6.Sd5 draw.
i) The Bl threat was bBa 3 . 1.h4? Ba 3
2.Sc1 Bxc1 3.Bxc1 Rxc1 4.h5 Rh1 5.Kg5 Kc6 6.h6 Kd7 7.Kg6 Ke6 8.h7 Rg1 $\dagger$ 9.Kh6 Kf7 10.h8S $\dagger$ Kf6 wins
ii) 3.Kh4? Bf6 $\dagger$ 4.Kh5 Rg8 5.Bd6 Rd8 6.Bc7 Rd7 7.Kg6 Be7 wins.
iii) Bc5 5.Bxc5 Kxc5 6.Sa6 $\dagger$ Kb6 7. Sb4/iv Kb5 8.Sd5 Rf5 $\dagger$ 9.Kg6 Rxd5 10.h4 draws.
iv) 7.h4? Kxa6 8.Kg6 Rg2† 9.Kf6 Rh2 $10 . \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{~Kb} 6$.

No. 8391
Michal Hlinka
2Prize, Pravda-Trnavia, 1987


## Draw

## 4/5

No. 8391: Michal Hlinka. 1.Rg4 $\dagger$ Kh7 (see (i)) 2.gf Ra5† 3.Kb3 (Kb4,Ra2;) Rb5 $\dagger$ 4.Kc4 Rb2 5.Kd3 Rf2 6.Rh4 $\dagger / \mathrm{i}$ Kg6 7.Rg4 $\dagger$ and Kh5 8.h3 Bf6 9.Ke3 Bd4 $\dagger$ 10.Kxd4 Rxf4 $\dagger$ 11.Ke3 Rxg4 12.hg $\dagger$ Kxg4 13.Kf2 Kh3 14.Kg1 Kg3 stalemate, or Kf5 8.h3 Bf6 9.Ke3 Bh4 10.Rg7/ii Kf6 11.Rg8 Ke7 12.Rg7† Kf8 13.Rg6 Kf7 14.Rg4 draw.
i) wK hankers after the f3 square, but 6. Ke3? Bd4 $\dagger$ 7. Kxd4 Rxf4 $\dagger$ wins, though this would fail with bKf7 as wR's recapture would be with check.
ii) $10 . \operatorname{Rg} 5 \dagger$ also looks possible.

No. 8392: Michal Hlinka. $1 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Re} 2 / \mathrm{i}$ 2.Sd2 Rxd2 (Bxd2;Kxc2) 3.Rc3 Bd4/ii 4.Kc1 Ke1 5.Rf3/iii Ke2/iv 6.Rb3 (Rg3? Be3;) Ke1 7.Rf3 Bf2 8.Rc3 Bd4 9. Rf3 Ke2 (Rg2; Rd3) 10. Rb3 Ke1

No. 8392
Michal Hlinka
Special Hon. Mention, Pravda-Trnavia, 1987


Draw
11.Rf3, repetition.
i) Kxf3 2.Rc3 and 3.Rxc2.
ii) $\mathrm{c} 1 \mathrm{Q} \dagger 4 . \mathrm{Kxc} 1 \mathrm{Rd} 3 \dagger 5 . \mathrm{Kc} 2$.
iii) 5.Rxc2? Rd1 mate. 5.Rg3? Re2
6. Rc3 $\mathrm{Be} 3 \dagger$ wins.
iv) $\mathrm{Bb} 2 \dagger$ 6.Kxb2 Kd1 7.Rf1 $\dagger$ draw. Re2 6.Rf1 $\dagger$ Kxf1 stalemate.

No. 8393
Oto Mihalco
Comm., Pravda-Trnavia, 1987


Win
3/4
No. 8393: Oto Mihalco. 1.Ra3 Rb1 $\dagger / \mathrm{i}$ 2.Ke2 Rb2†/ii 3.Kf1 (Kf3? Rb3†;) Rc2/iii 4.Rxa4† Kc3 (Kd3;Ra1) 5.Re3 $\dagger$ $\mathrm{Kb} 26 . \mathrm{Rb} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 1(\mathrm{Ka} 1 ; \mathrm{Re} 1 \dagger)$, and now a dual: 7.Re1 $\dagger$ or the immediate 7.Ra3,
and W 'wins', but AJR fails to see how in either case.
i) Kc4 2.Re4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 5$ 3.eRxa4 wins. Kc5 2.Rxa4 Kb5 3.Ra8 Kb4 4.Re4†. Rh2 2.Kc1.
ii) Kc4 3.Rd1, and Kb4 4.Rxa2 Kb3 5.Rxb1 $\dagger$, or $\mathrm{Rb} 2 \dagger$ 4.Rd2 Rxd2 $\dagger$ 5.Kxd2 Kb4 6.Rxa2.
iii) Rd 2 4.Rc1 Rb2 5.Ke1 Rb1 6.Kd1 and W wins, or Rh 2 4.Kg1 Rb2 5.Rf1 winning.

No. 8394
Lubos Kekely
Comm., Pravda Trnavia, 1987


Win 6/3

No. 8394: Lubos Kekely. 1.g7 Re8/i 2.Bh5 (else Rg8;) Rg8/ii 3.Bf7 Rxg7 4.g6 Kb4 5.a6 Bb8 6.c6 wins.
i) $\mathrm{Kc} 22 . \mathrm{Bd} 1 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 1$ 3.Ka2.
ii) Ra8 3.Bf7 Rxa5 $\dagger 4 . \mathrm{Kb} 1 \mathrm{Rb} 5 \dagger 5 . \mathrm{Kc} 1$ Rb8 6.g6 Kd4 7.c6 Kc5 8.g8Q Rxg8 9.Bxg8 Kxc6 (Be5;Bd5) 10.g7 Be5 $11 . \mathrm{Bd} 5 \dagger$.

No. $8395 \quad$ Milan Nemcek
Comm., Pravda-Trnavia, 1987


Win 4/3

No. 8395: Milan Nemcek. 1.Kg4/i Sxh2 $\dagger$ /ii 2.Kf4 Sf1/iii 3.h4 Sd2 4.h5 Sc4 5.h6 wins, for instance Sd6 6.h7 Sf7 7.Kf5 Ka5 8.Kf6 Sh8 9.Kg7 Ka4 10. Kxh8 W wins.
i) 1.Bd6? $\mathrm{Sg} 12 . \mathrm{h} 4 \mathrm{Sf} 3$ draw.
ii) Sd4 2.h4 Se6 3.h5 Sf8 4.Bd6 Sh7 5.Kf5.
iii) Ka 5 3.h4 Ka4 4.h5 Kxa3 5.h6 b5 6.h7 b4 7.h8Q b3 8.Qxh2 b2 9.Qc2 wins.
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