EG reaches the 10000th study in this issue. As it happens this number 10000 is from the hand of the man who started this magazine and still is of inestimable value for the production of EG: John Roycroft. We in Holland wish to congratulate John with this 10000th study in EG and we hope to go on publishing EG until we run out of numbers.

[EvdG]
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by J. Fleck

EG 112

No. 9341, N. Manella. The author corrects his study as follows: e2e7 0713.86 d3b14a7e8 a2b34b6c7f5g47b57c2e4f6f7 11/10+, the solution runs 1.e8Q+ Kd7 2.Rxd4+ Kxe8 3.g8Q (but not 3.g8Q Re1+ 4.Kf2 Re1+ 5.Kxf1 c1Q+ 6.Ke2 Qe3+ draw) Re1+ 4.Kxe1 c1Q+ 5.Ke2 Qe6+ (5... Sd6 6.Rxd6 Qe3+ 7.Kd1 wins) 6.Rd2 Qe5 7.Bb8 and wins.
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No. 9620, H. Aloni. As David Blundell points out, the final move of my analysis in EG 116 should read 11... Se7+ (instead of 11... Sd7) and white wins (11.... c6 12.Bxc6+ Kd8 13.Kb6). No. 9631, L. Mitrofanov/V. Samilo. This looks like a diagram error. The black rooks should be on h5 and h6. (David Blundell)

No. 9652, V. Kovalenko. No win. Harold van der Heijden points out 1... Kh7 2.f7 g8Q, when 3.f8Q Qxg3+ or 3.d7 Qd4 4.Bb8+ lead to stalemate. 3.f8R is no real winning try, but can be answered in style by 3... Qd4 4.b6 Qg7 5.Re8 Qh6+ 6.gxh6 g5+.
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p. 543, M. Liburkin. Black is supposed to win after 3.... Rf8 4.Kxe4 Kg7. This line is frequently quoted (e.g. by Kofman in his collection of Liburkin’s and Kaminer’s studies), but without supporting analysis! I must admit, that I cannot see the point of this. 5.Kd5 seems to draw, e.g. 5... Kg6 6.Kd6 Kg7, 6.Kd6 Kg8 7.Kb6 (but not 7.Kb7 Rg1, or 7.Rh1 Rg1 8.AQh3 a1Q) Ke7 8.AQh3 Rxa8 9.AQh3 Kg7 10.Rh1 Ke7 11.d1+ (not 11.Kb7 Rgl 12.AQh1) Ke7 12.Rh1 with a draw.

No. 9670, V. Vukcevic. The solution should surely read 4.g6 Bf6 (instead of the given 4... Sd4) 5.Bxf6 Sf4 6.Bd8+ (6.e7 Sd8 draws) Ka6 7.e7 Sd5 8.e8R and wins, but all this is known from Troitzky, 200 Endspielstudien 1924, a8Q 2004 10.Kh4e2 c5 3/3. No. 9683, L. Prokes. The correction suggested in the notes allows 2.Se5 Bf6 3.Sd6 and wins. Moreover 2.Sf6 wins irrespective of the position of the white king.

No. 9689, V. Chekhover. The final position is clearly lost for black. Black should repeat moves with 4... Kc6. Unfortunately this does not leave much thematic content.

No. 9690, G. Nadareshvili. AJR suggested 1.Kxe6, but black wins after 1... Qe1+ 2.Kf6 (else ... Qxb1) Qe3+ and 3... Qxb8. More accurate is 1.Sg6+ Kf8 first and only now 2.Kxe6 Qxb1 3.Sf5 with a standard draw (database-checked!).

No. 9692, J. Halberschmidt. The study is sound (database-checked!), but some minor corrections must be made. The solution should run 1.Bd2+ Ke5 2.Bc3+ Kf4 3.Qe3+ Kg5 4.Qc1+ Kg6 draw and so on. After the given 1... Ke4 there is the dual 2.Qe6+ Kd4 3.Be3+ Kc3 4.Qc6+ Kb3 5.Qb5+ Ka3 6.Bf4 Kc2 7.Qa4+ and mate in a few moves. For a more detailed analysis cf. Nunn’s ‘Secrets of Pawnless Endings’.

No. 9702, A. Tetev. 1... Ke2 is a dual, but please note the try 1.Sf1 Kg2 2.Kxe6 Bb6 3.Kf1 Ba5+ 4.Ke2 Bd2 and black wins.


No. 9746, A. and S. Manyakhin. The line 5.Rh7 Se6 6.Kd5 Sc7+ 7.Kc6 is given as a draw, but white wins easily, as the black pieces are hopelessly tied down:


No. 9747, M.Gogberashvili. Black wins by 3.... Qxf7 4.Bxe4 Sxe4. The forthcoming attack on the white king will quickly win the pawn e2, when black has a decisive material advantage and a continuous attack. I cannot find a defence against the threats 5.... Kg2 and 5.... Bc4 followed by ... Qf2+ (or vice versa), for instance 5.Qd4 Kg2 or 5.Rb7 Qf2+ 6.Kd1 Be4 and the pawn e2 cannot be saved (7.Qe1 Bxe2+ 8.Qxe2 Sc3+).


No. 9766, F.Vrabec. No solution: the final position of note iii) is only a draw. Some preliminary considerations are necessary.

According to endgame theory the position e4g6 1300.12 a8f3.g3g4h5 = is drawn. Black will leave his rook at f3 and keep his king in the zone g7-h7-h6-g6. In order to break this fortress white must try to create zugzwang by immobilizing the black king (Qe8/Kh6, Qg8/Kh6 or Qh8/Kg6). This temporarily dislodges the rook from his safe spot f3. However, a little analysis shows, that he will always find another convenient square on the f-file (preferably f6). Therefore white cannot win.

Starting with a pawn on h6 doesn't make much difference. With the black king on g6 there is always the threat ... h5 with transposition to the position above, while doing nothing at all (i.e. playing Kg6-g5-h5-g6 forever, of course without permitting Qh4 with check) is also a reliable defensive idea. White must adopt a similar plan as above, but in the position Qg7/Kh5 black is saved by stalemate tricks, while after Qe6/Kg5 he can simply play ... h5, followed by ... Kg6 or ... Kh6 as soon as possible.


No. 9790, A.Milokumov. No win after 1.... Rd7. The position after 2.Rxd7 Bxd7 3.Be4 or 3.Bd5 is somewhat uncomfortable for black, but not more than that.

No. 9791, D.Gurgenidze. I cannot find a draw after 1.... Sd4 2.Kxd4+ Kd5 and now both 3.Rb7+ Kc6 and 3.Rc8 Rd1 seem to win for black.
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p. 597, D.Gurgenidze/Boris. In the line 7.... Kf6 8.Qg6+ Ke7 there is a quicker win: 9.Qg7+ Kf6 10.Qf7+ Kf6 11.Qf7+ Kg5 12.Qg6+ and mate next move.

No. 9800, V.Kolpakov. There is a simple dual win: 1.Qc8+ Kf7 2.Rf5+ Kd7 3.Qd5+ mates in a few moves, e.g. 3.... Kd6 4.Qe6+ Ke7 5.Rc5+ Kb7 6.Qe7+ Ka7 7.Ra5+ Kb8 8.Ra6+ Kb5 9.Qe5+ Kb4 10.Rb6+ and so on.

No. 9804, V.Pankov. The database hits upon 7.Kg8, which wins on the spot.


No. 9828, R.Tavarani. After 2.... Kf3 (for ... Bf2) black wins easily, as white can never advance his a-pawn.

No. 9829, I.Akobia. 2.... Sb3 wins for black:

3.Bxb3 Rg3+ or 3.b7 Bxf2+.

No. 9830, V.Haiberstadt. No duals (database-checked!).


No. 9845, A.Kakovin. 1.... Sc4 wins for black. This explains the omission of the first move.


This is the main line of Kundzhi's demolition of the famous prize winner by Mitrofanov (cf. EG 25, p. 256, or "64" 1970, No. 36).

No. 9885, B.Buyannemekh. There is a dual: 4.a4 (for Ra3 mate) Ka2 5.Rb2+...


An Enquiry into Excellence in Study Composition by Robert Pye

1. We have today a tourney judging system, tacitly approved by the PCCC, which is all too frequently capricious and eccentric. Accountability and transparency are seldom evident, and genuine objectivity almost unknown. Universal standards and criteria are practically non-existent. As a result, tourney awards are frequently nothing more than an expression of the judge’s personal preferences. Not even the FIDE Album series is immune from serious criticisms of this kind. This can only serve to damage the art of study composition and perpetuate the negative factors which have had an undue influence to date on the pursuit and evaluation of quality in this field.

2. Some attempts have been made in the past to introduce a more rigorous framework for evaluating studies -- see for example the article by V Neidze and M Iotvinnik (the former world champion) in EG41 (1975) and G Kasapryan’s response in EG43 (1976). These attempts were unsuccessful, largely, I believe, because they were clumsy and ill-formed. The response by G Kasapryan was, however, unduly dismissive, failing to give adequate consideration to the need for far greater accountability and transparency in study evaluation (see footnote). The day has long passed when we can trust to the inscrutable wisdom of enigmatic authorities when compiling tourney awards, many of whom are self-appointed and lacking an in-depth familiarity with the literature. Judges, acting alone, without any framework of objectivity to guide them and to make explicit their assumptions, are all too fallible, biased and unreliable. The literature of the past few decades, including the FIDE Album series, bears disturbing testimony to this.

3. What should count as a good study, and who should decide? Presumably the composers themselves should have the greatest say in how we ought to define a good study. If so, one would expect a clear consensus to have emerged, perhaps after a lengthy debate in which all points of view had been thoroughly explored. But this hasn’t been the case. No such consensus exists. Composers have always composed as they saw fit, with little or no explicit universal regard to aesthetic criteria or standards of excellence.

4. To my mind this is a most serious deficiency and one which the community of composers the world over should earnestly endeavour to address. Some may argue that tourneys, formal and informal, are a well established means of determining excellence in the art of study composition and that no explicit debate is required. I completely disagree. For the most part, tourney judges work, perhaps unwittingly, on the assumption that the debate has already taken place and that a consensus has already emerged -- which is simply untrue.

5. Against what criteria do tourney judges evaluate excellence and aesthetic merit if not by reference to their personal values and expectations? A consensus is not a purely individual evaluation, however generous or informed, but a proven product of universal experience.

Footnote: The term transparency denotes the extent to which the steps or activities involved in a process are clear to an outside observer.
In short, we need an agreed set of criteria by which composed studies may be evaluated and the principles and precepts of quality composition determined. To my mind, the essential and sole criteria are as follows:

1. Originality of ideas (freshness, novelty);
2. Thematic content (motif);
3. Naturalness of expression (credibility);
4. Economy of means (simplicity);
5. Mobility of forces (activity);
6. Size of play domain (spaciousness);
7. Self-evidence of play (clarity);
8. Counterplay (conflict).

This paper assumes that a study falling to be evaluated possesses a key defining characteristic of a valid composition, namely, soundness. Soundness is therefore not listed as a criterion.

All eight criteria, in my view, should feature prominently in the evaluation of any quality composition. Is this not already the case, you may ask? I think not. For some time we have seen two schools of composition vying for pre-eminence, the romantic and the analytic. The latter frequently disregards, even flaunts, one of the eight essential criteria, namely, self-evidence, with the result that their work is often muddled or obscure. They also strive after thematic content which is often only meaningful to problemists. The romantic school, however, which seems to have fewer adherents with each passing year, often neglects economy of means and naturalness of expression.

The criteria are not intended to function as quantitative factors which may be aggregated to produce an "objective" tourney result. Rather, by drawing one's attention to each essential facet of a composition, whereby it constitutes an artistic whole, they compel one to appraise it in the broadest manner possible. Only by recognising a study's contribution to the totality of chessboard phenomena, with due reference to historical, theoretical and subjective factors, can one evolve a universal perspective.

The artistic merit of a composition cannot be divorced from subjective or historical considerations but, as composers, we should be capable of defining an ideal of excellence, a set of principles which inform all quality composition and optimise the conditions necessary for full creative expression. Despite worthy attempts to tackle this issue in the past, we still lack such an ideal.

We could, of course, elect to ignore the criteria altogether and allow composers to publish what they will, without any attempt to award prizes or assign similar indicators of excellence. Why not let time decide? Why not rely on future generations to filter out the dross and conclude, perhaps by accident, which studies were, in fact, the quality compositions of today?

That approach is wasteful in that it assumes, worldwide, a surfeit of good composers, that is, persons possessing the necessary technical skills and artistic sensibility, an assumption which we know to be untrue. It also assumes the existence of a large audience for published work to provide composers with feedback on their creative output, but this too is untrue. By default, tourney judges are setting the standards by which composers are expected to produce quality compositions. The result? Confusion, a proliferation of work with vaguely defined aesthetic objectives and a mass of tourney awards of doubtful value, if not conspicuous bias.

Good compositions are still being composed, granted, but in my view there are far fewer than ought to be the case. What is worse, truly original ideas are being mauled to death by composers who are impatient to publish poorly finished, ungainly, or ill-defined work.

Only by the universal acceptance of a proven set of criteria of excellence can composers produce the best possible compositions. In my view, such criteria would result in fewer published compositions, greater refinement, and a marked increase in the extent to which study composition is achieving its ul-
timate objective, namely, the expression in their purest form of the totality of chessboard phenomena. Only then can we claim to have defined a truly objective measure of excellence in study composition.

It may be helpful to consider some questions at this point:

14. **At whom precisely is this thesis addressed?** This paper is directed mainly at experienced study composers and tourney judges who, it is hoped, are committed to the promotion of objective standards in study composition. At present, this branch of chess art compares unfavourably with the level of critique and rigour applying in the domain of problem composition. In my view, this lack of rigour and critique reduces the creativity of experienced composers and impedes the development of new talent. Inconsistent, even eccentric, tourney awards and judging standards do not inspire a young composer with much confidence in the genre.

15. **Is this approach designed to restrict the number or type of studies being composed or published at present?** No. The purpose of this approach is to allow the existing level of productivity to be directed into more creative channels. In practice this is likely to result in a reduced but more refined published output from experienced composers.

16. **Are the eight categories mutually exclusive?** The criteria are not categories as such but a set of perspectives from which a study may be appraised. Taken collectively, they provide a complete basis for assessing the excellence of any composition. Like eight peaks in a range of mountains, they provide partially overlapping perspectives. Each of the eight viewing points or peaks have much in common, while possessing distinctive characteristics of their own. To that extent none of the criteria could be applied in complete isolation from the other seven.

17. **Are the eight criteria hierarchically ordered and, if so, are some necessarily subordinate to others?** I would consider each of the eight criteria to have exclusive elements not adequately addressed in any of the other seven. To that extent they are not hierarchical. However, sub-divisions of each may conceivably exhibit hierarchical characteristics in relation to one another. Questions regarding whether certain criteria were more important, and how precisely their relative importance should be determined, are ones which would require careful examination. For example, I would regard the criteria of originality and economy as being pre-eminent within the framework as a whole but their ultimate outcome in any instance would be an intimate function of the other six. Only empirical verification over a period years would serve to establish the optimum balance of the eight within the framework.

18. **How definitive is the thesis as outlined?** The thesis is designed to stimulate a serious debate which, hopefully, would culminate in a consensus amongst the main body of experienced composers. To that extent the thesis is more exploratory than prescriptive. If no consensus emerges, or if it is shown that a project of this kind can never be conclusive, we will nonetheless have made progress in our endeavour to establish study composition on a more consistent, scientific and aesthetic footing.

19. **Is there a possibility that a mistaken framework could emerge which would be harmful to the genre of study composition?** If we are too precipitate, yes. However, a reasoned debate over a period of years should permit a mature and workable philosophy of excellence to emerge. It would seem far preferable to initiate the debate than to persist in the highly ingenuous belief that the basis for excellence in study composition is already self-evident.

20. **Is it possible to be more precise as to the benefits which may be derived from the universal acceptance of criteria of excellence?** I believe so. By establishing a universally acceptable framework of excellence, study composition should benefit in the following ways:
(a) far greater consistency, objectivity and transparency in tourney awards;
(b) a more aesthetically successful elaboration and synthesis of ideas;
(c) better study construction;
(d) a more rigorous and universal terminology for debating excellence and aesthetic objectives;
(e) clearer and more universally acceptable relationships between theory, invention, precedent, and technique;
(f) greater progress in study classification;
(g) a more sophisticated and precise notation and set of conventions for expressing solutions;
(h) a more consistent approach to, and understanding of, thematic motifs (including versions, variations, echoes, tries, tasks, and theoretical critique);
(i) a more satisfactory determination of the role and potential of computer-generated analysis and construction, as well as the optimum structure of electronic databases.

It may also result in study composition proving more attractive to both novice composers and composers in other genres. Furthermore, I believe a framework of the kind envisaged would form a useful contribution to the evolution of cognitive art in general.

21. How would the thesis affect individual or collective composing styles? Style, as a product of technique and sensibility, should not be hampered by a framework of excellence. On the contrary, by providing a more ordered and directed environment for study composition, it should encourage new styles to emerge and more distinctive approaches to develop.

22. Despite the assertion that a mechanical evaluation algorithm is not intended, surely such an algorithm would nonetheless be a possible end product? Yes, in time it would. A more ordered framework for the development of the art of study composition should promote the emergence of scientific principles which may prove amenable to the creation of a number of worthwhile algorithms. Such algorithms would be considerably more complex than any seen to date and would possess a range of parameters reflecting the relative weights ascribed to each criterion. Presumably, different schools would advocate different algorithms. Indeed, schools of the future, and even individual composers, may elect to define themselves by reference to a specific, preferred algorithm. Again, this could be a valuable contribution to cognitive art in general.

23. Assuming one found the thesis broadly acceptable, what steps should now be taken by the global community of composers? In my opinion, the issue should be debated as widely as possible among the global community of composers, judges and enthusiasts in this field. Only in this way can all views be heard and a broad consensus secured. It should then be possible to define an operating framework for universal use by judges on a voluntary trial basis. This process could entail bench-mark tests against several, already well regarded, tourney awards. As experience is gained and refinements developed, it should prove possible, after a period of 5-10 years to formalise the framework.

24. Finally, what are the immediate issues in the proposed debate? I believe the key issues may be crystallised as follows:
A: Does the art of study composition require agreement of a set of objective evaluation criteria?
B: If so, are the eight proposed criteria exhaustive?
C: Are the eight proposed criteria essential?
D: Are all classes of study amenable in principle to objective and artistic evaluation using a framework based on the eight proposed criteria?
E: How precisely should each of the eight proposed criteria be subdivided into a complete and realistic set of characteristics or factors from which general
guidance principles may be derived for composers and judges?

F: What organisational arrangements are now necessary to expedite this matter (e.g. the formation of an international committee under the auspices of FIDE)?

Note: This paper may be copied (or translated) and distributed provided no portion is excised or amended, no additional text is inserted, and the author's name and copyright details are included. COPYRIGHT: Robert Pye, 130 Hillside, Greystones, Co. Wicklow, Ireland. Telephone (Dublin): 2877865 March 1995 total word count: 2367

In xii92 the following article was submitted to the French magazine DIAGRAMMES, where it appeared in French translation two years later (DIAGRAMMES 111, x-xii94). Cases 19, 20 and 21 have been added, and a few minor alterations made.

Towards a TYPOLOGY of DUALS in STUDIES

In this article an attempt is made to list situations (in the solution to a study) that might be called duals. Terms proposed, where they do not already exist, are for the most part tentative. No doubt readers, like ourselves, would welcome a comprehensive set of terms recommended (never imposed) by the FIDE PCCC Sub-Committee for Studies. While awaiting this a neutral terminology may serve - for example 'a type 5 dual', as in the list below.

To remind ourselves of the topic's importance we permit ourselves three observations. First, although a dual invariably harms the variation in which it occurs, such harm must be set against the value of the content of that study as a whole, by applying a judge's sense of proportion. (See Réti example.) Second, no dual is automatically fatal: it is harmful only in comparison with a similar study that is dual-free. Third, if the dual is present in a line that exists purely to demonstrate soundness, this should be distinguished from a dual in a line of artistic or thematic importance. Recommendations from FIDE are, we suggest, a pre-requisite for the accepted evaluation of duals, a subject that will not be easy to settle. Which duals to condone, and when, will long, maybe forever, remain matters of opinion or taste.

For the present purpose a dual is defined as any alternative move by White that meets the requirements of soundness. In principle some of the following type descriptions may apply also to moves by Black refuting tries by White (see Heuscker below), but such 'black refutation duals' will not be pursued here.

Types of dual
1. Alternative square(s) by a line piece (bishop, rook, queen). This may be a waiting move or a move to transfer the piece to another line. Term: 'line piece dual'
2. Alternative by a knight. A knight may have more than one valid route between two squares. Term: 'normal knight dual'
3. Triangulation (or similar) alternatives with the aim to transfer the move to the opponent. Term: 'single man triangulation dual'
4. Manoeuvres similar to 1, 2 and 3, but involving more than one white man. Term: 'complex triangulation dual'
5. A move or moves that change nothing. Term: 'irrelevant dual'

O. Durie, 1902 (end of a study)

b8e7 0400.20 WTM Win.
1.Rd6! After 1...Kxd6 2.Kc8, the white king has d8 available. But instead of 1.Rd6, White can temporise with his rook on the d-file because Black is unable to mount any counterplay - both sides temporise.

6. Alternative move order. Term: 'inversion dual'. (Caution! 'Transposition' arises from a move by Black and is not a dual.)
7. Manoeuvres such as staircase checks (with or without pinning) by a queen, which may allow of alternatives at one or more than one moment. Reversibility of the sequence is included. Term: 'manoeuvre dual'
8. Alternative (white) promotion piece where the reply is in each case a capture on the promotion square. Term: 'promotion dual'
9. Alternative checks leading (sooner or later) to the same position. This is especially common with checks by a white queen (on file or diagonal, occasionally on the rank) with the aim to capture a black man. Term: 'checking dual'

10. Special case of an alternative on the first move. Term: 'first move dual'.

R. Réti (1922, 1928)

\[ \text{e7e5 0100.01 Win.} \]


11. Alternative ‘desperado’ sacrifice-for-stalemate square(s). Term: 'desperado dual'

12. Alternative refutations of black defences. Refuting a black move can be difficult, but nevertheless more than one such refutation may be present. Term: 'justificatory dual'

13. 'Simple' waste of time alternatives. These occur when an alternative white move (or moves) is possible (ie retaining the stipulated true result against best play) but merely prolongs the solution with no other effect. The effect of such a move is minor, reversible, and has to be reversed by the following move(s) since otherwise the stipulation could not be fulfilled. A convenient indicator is the question mark placed between parentheses: "(?)". Term: 'pseudo-dual'

H. Weenink, Tijdschrift, 1917, end of study

\[ \text{b2e5 0300.10 WTM Win.} \]

14. 'Complex' waste of time. It is quite possible that what is technically a waste of time can conceal a deep try. Term: 'complex waste of time'

15. End of the main line. See Heuücke example. Term: 'post-solution justificatory dual'

16. Alternatives where the plan, the target position, is unique. Term: 'reorganisation dual'

P. A. Lamford, Chess in America, 1981

\[ \text{1.Kb3 Re3+ 2.Kb4 Re4+ 3.Kb5 wins. The move 1.Ka3 is a 'pseudo-dual'. After the reply 1...Re1 2.Ka2(b2) Re2+, White must play 3.Kb3, in order to win - sooner or later the move and position are unavoidable. W has wasted time without prejudicing the win.} \]

14. 'Complex' waste of time. It is quite possible that what is technically a waste of time can conceal a deep try. Term: 'complex waste of time'

15. End of the main line. See Heuücke example. Term: 'post-solution justificatory dual'

16. Alternatives where the plan, the target position, is unique. Term: 'reorganisation dual'

P. A. Lamford, Chess in America, 1981

\[ \text{b2e5 0300.10 WTM Win.} \]

1.Kb3 Re3+ 2.Kb4 Re4+ 3.Kb5 wins. The move 1.Ka3 is a 'pseudo-dual'. After the reply 1...Re1 2.Ka2(b2) Re2+, White must play 3.Kb3, in order to win - sooner or later the move and position are unavoidable. W has wasted time without prejudicing the win.

14. 'Complex' waste of time. It is quite possible that what is technically a waste of time can conceal a deep try. Term: 'complex waste of time'

15. End of the main line. See Heuücke example. Term: 'post-solution justificatory dual'

16. Alternatives where the plan, the target position, is unique. Term: 'reorganisation dual'

P. A. Lamford, Chess in America, 1981

\[ \text{b2e5 0300.10 WTM Win.} \]
c1d4 0040.23 Win.
1.f6 Bd8 2.f7 Bg5+ 3.Kb2 Bh6 4.Be7! Ke5
iii 8.Be7!! (e3? Kf2; Kf2 9.e3 Ke1 10.Kc3 Ke2
iv Kxb2 15.Kc4 wins.

i) The obvious 2.Be7? Bc7 3.f7 Bf4+, and Bh6,
draws as the white pawn on e2 is too vulnerable,
i) A waiting move, and unexpected. In fact the
position is one of true, or reciprocal, zugzwang.
Black is compelled to weaken his threat to the e2
pawn: the king is deflected.
iii) Ke3 5.Bg5+!, or Bg7 5.Bf6+! A great echo,

ii) A waiting move, and unexpected. In fact the
position is one of true, or reciprocal, zugzwang.
Black is compelled to weaken his threat to the e2
pawn: the king is deflected.

iv) It was later discovered that 7.Bc5, also wins,

Since this alternative renders the main line move
8.Be7!! unnecessary, the flaw is serious, though
much remains to be admired.

18. Thematic dual - black moves. Where this is a
white move we may be dealing with a second
solution or 'cook'. However, it can also apply to
black alternatives. General term: 'black dual
refutation of thematic white move'. The actual
type of dual should be stated.

P.Heuacker, 1960

a2h3 0340.22 Win.
Only 1.ba5! wins, Kg2 2.Sb6 Bf3 3.Kxb2 h3
This series of moves contains alternatives (7.Ke5,
is an example) but these do not count as artistic
duals, because (a) the main point of the solution
is already over, and (b) the win is well known.
The moves above are supplied to remove doubt as
to the win.
Not 1.ba5? Bf3 (also b1Q+; first).
Not 1.Ba5? Bf3 (also b1Q+; first) 2.Bxf3 b1Q+
Not 1.ba5? b1Q+ 2.Kxb1 Bg6+ 3.K- Be4 4.Qxe4
stalemate.
Since the failing underpromotions are thematic
(critical to the idea) it is a flaw that two of their
refutations contain 'black move inversion duals'.

19. More than one mating move.
Term: 'checkmate dual'
20. Alternative white moves (in a win or draw
study) identified by a database of the 'total inform-
ation' type, especially the 5-man or 6-man
(pawnless) databases generated by algorithms due
to the Americans Ken Thomson and Lewis Stiller.
Each such alternative will have an associated
'depth to conversion' number which may be less
than, equal to, or more than, the solution length
envisioned by the composer. Term: 'database
dual'

21. Given two (often, but not always, very
similar) alternative black moves, one may allow
a subsequent white dual, the other not. Term:
'black-dependent dual'.

A.J.Roycroft
London

THE PAWNLESS TRÉBUCHET CHALLENGE
(see EG/16) - Report No. 1
Two contributions. Our good Belgian
player-solver friend Marcel van Herck proposes:
No 9923 M. van Herck

Very neat! Congratulations, Marcel!
The other dates from 1992, when Noam Elkies
and Lewis Stiller were examining info from their
computer generation of pawnless 6-man databases.
Noam sys there were thousands of reciprocal
zugzwangs with this material, and this one (one
of the 100 printed out) happens to be of the
whoever-moves-loses type: 
In contrast to Van Herck's position the demonstration of the BTM loss is a headache - cured easily by dissolving a tablet of wBbl, when crystal clarity is restored. (No need to add more wood by wRal.)

The next target should be a position with a total of no more than two knights!

No 9924 Julien Vandiest (Belgium) and Guy Bacqué (France) (i-ii93)

1HM Diagrammes 1992 - 1993

\[ \text{No 9924} \]

Julien Vandiest and Guy Bacqué

1HM Diagrammes 1992 - 1993

\[ \text{diagram} \]

\[ \text{diagram} \]

\[ \text{diagram} \]

**C**

diff 0107.00 -/-.

In contrast to Van Herck's position the demonstration of the BTM loss is a headache - cured easily by dissolving a tablet of wBbl, when crystal clarity is restored. (No need to add more wood by wRal.)

The next target should be a position with a total of no more than two knights!

No 9925 Julien Vandiest and Guy Bacqué (iv-vi93)

1HM Diagrammes 1992 - 1993

\[ \text{No 9925} \]

Julien Vandiest and Guy Bacqué

1HM Diagrammes 1992 - 1993

\[ \text{diagram} \]

\[ \text{diagram} \]

\[ \text{diagram} \]
square a2 for checking purposes.

viii) Checks can now be given from b4 or b8.
5.Qf7? Qc2+ 6.Ke1 Qg2 for 7...Bc3.
ix) 5.Kd2 Qe4 6.Qf6(Qg7)+ Bd4 wins, otherwise
6...Bd4.

No 9926 Leonid Topko (Ukraine) (i-iii’93)

i) 1.Rxf5? Se3 2.Bg5 Kd2, and if 3.Bxe3+ Kxe3
4.Rf8 Rh1+ 5.Kg2 Rg1+ wins, or if 3.Rf3 Rh1+ 4.Kg3 f1S+ wins.

No 9927 Jacques Tate (Marcenat, France) (vii-ix’92)

No 9928 Guy Bacqué (after A.P.Manyakhin) (x-xii’92)
SpPr Diagrammes 1992-1993

No 9929 Guy Bacqué (after Marc Lavaud) (vii-ix’92)
Sp HM Diagrammes 1992-1993

Kb4 7.f6 Qb8+ 8.Kh7 (Kg7;Qb3) Qb3 9.Se4
(Sf5+,Kh5) a4 10.Sg5 a3 11.f7 Qb4 12.Sf3+ Kb3
13.Kg8 (Kg7,a2) a2 14.Rg1 (Ra6,Qd4+) Qb3
(also Qc4), but not Qg4+? 15.Sg5+ Kb4 16.Rh1+ wins.
i) g7 is reserved for wS.

No 9927 Jacques Tate (Marcenat, France) (vii-ix’92)

3.Kg7?? Qe3 4.Sg3+ Kg5 5.Rg6+ Kf4 6.Sh5+ Kf5 7.Sg3+ Kf4 8.Sh5+.

No 9928 Guy Bacqué (after A.P.Manyakhin) (x-xii’92)
SpPr Diagrammes 1992-1993


No 9929 Guy Bacqué (after Marc Lavaud) (vii-ix’92)
Sp HM Diagrammes 1992-1993

c8e8 0444.32 BTM Draw
No 9929  G.Bacque`l...Ba6+/i 2.Kb8 Rb7+
Rd7+ (Sd3;Se6) 7.Kb8 Rd8+ 8.Kc7 Rb7+ Ke8
[cf. EG100.7868 with the added bPd7/wPd2]
10.Bd6/v exd6 (Bf7;Rh4) 11.Kx6/vi Bf7 12.Rh4
i) Bg2 2.Rxe1 Bxd5 (h2;d6) 3.Sh7 h2 4.f5 h1Q
5.Rxh1 Bxh1 6.f6 draw. In the original Lavaud
3.Sg6 (cf. EG102.1 p927) was proposed in the
equivalent line, but here David Blundell analyses:
3.Sg6 h2 4.f5 h1Q 5.Rxh1 Bxh1 6.f6 draw.

ii) 3.Kc8? Sc2 (for Rbl+;)
4.Re1 Sc7 5.Rxc2 Bd5 (h2;d6) 6.f5 h2

iii) 4.Kc8 Kc2 (for Rbl+;)
5.Rxc2 Bd5 (h2;d6) 6.f5 h2

cf. EG102.1 p927)
iv) l...Kc2 2.b7 Sc7 3.b8Q Rxh5, when
Black wins for

vi) 2.Kh5 Rxh5, 4.Qg8 Rc5+ 5.Kb4
Rb3 6.Ka8 h1Q, when
Black draws.

vii) 7.Qh5+ Kg6 8.Sf4+ Kf5 9.Kg6
Rxf4 wins.

viii) l.Sg6+ Kh5 2.Kg7
Rf8+ Kh6 draws.

The Lavaud original was EG100.7868 (Bent JT
award, 4th Prize: see EG102.1 p927). In
DIAGRAMMES (i-iii92) Bacque`s demolition
thereof and also of the author’s rescue attempt
("add bPu7"), emerges here with wPd2, the iden-
tical position with reversed colours (and
stipulation now ‘draw’ instead of ‘win’). How far
Marc Lavaud was consulted is unclear.
This raises questions, not only of the proper treat-
ment by judges and composers (including
demolition-solver-composers) of the repair of an
honoured (whether rightly honoured or not is
irrelevant) composition, but also of the whole
etiquette of corrections by persons other than the
original composer. A matter, we think, for
inclusion in a future guidelines document from
the PCCC Studies Sub-Committee - if that
volatile volunteer body survives!

No 9930  A.Lewandowski (Poland) (i-iii92)

a5c1 0614.20 Draw

No 9930  A.Lewandowski
1.Bg5+ (b7? Rxh5+;)
Kxb2/i 2.b7 Rc5+ 3.b8Q Rb5
 stalemate,
i) Kbl 2.b7, and Rc5+ 3.Kxc5 Rxh5
5.Kb6, or Sc7 3.b8Q Rxh5 4.Qd8 Re5+
But judge Rusinek observes: "1...Kc2 2.b7
Sc7 3.b8Q Rxh5, when GBR class
1603 wins for

Rb5+ 6.Kb5 Rh4
draw.

(Sf6,Rc2+;) Ra5 7.Setf6 Rh7 wins.

Goodwill Games tourney, St Petersburg, 1994
This formal international (but poorly publicised)
tourney was judged by L.Katsnelson (St
Petersburg). About 50 studies were entered, 17 in
the provisional award.

No 9931  A.Sochniev (St Petersburg)
= lst-2nd Prizes Goodwill Games tourney 1994

a3a8 3010.52 Win

No 9931  A.Sochniev
1.b7+ Ka7 2.Bd4+ Kxa6
3.Qb6+ Kb7 4.Qa6+ aQ+ 5.Kb3

467
Qd2+ 10.Ka1 Qa5+ 11.Kb1 Qb4+ 12.Bb2 Qxb8
Qc5+ 17.Kb3 Qxe3+ 18.Qc3 Qxc5 19.Qc8+,
winning bQ.
"On a backdrop of mutual Q-sacrifices wK, like a
virtuoso soccer forward, bests bQ on the
a1-a2-b1-b2 patch."
No 9932 S.Zakharov (St Petersburg)
1st-2nd Prizes Goodwill Games tourney 1994

4a6 0023.43 Draw
No 9932 S.Zakharov 1.b5+ Kxb5 2.a4+,
with:
- Ka6 3.Bc4+ Kb6 4.Bd5+ Kc7(Kc8?) 5.Kxg2 e2
drawn, or
- Qc4+ 10.Kh5 Qb5+ 11.Kh6 Qa6+ 12.Kg7(Kg8?)
drawn.
Se5 wins.
ii) Possible now that bK blocks the rank.
"A deep study with two variations linked by
paradoxical wB manoeuvres on the a1 and b2
squares in response to bK's opposition-type play."
No 9933 D.Ioffe (Kazan)
3rd Prize Goodwill Games tourney 1994

5a7 0050.14 Win
No 9933 L.Veretennikov 1.d7 Bh4+ii 2.Kch4 h2
i) h2 2.Bb6+ Kxb6 3.d8Q+ wins. Or Kb8 2.Be7
ii) cb 7.Qa8+ and 8.Qxc5 wins.
iii) cb 9.Qa5+ Kh1 10.Qe1+ Ka2 11.Qe2+ wins.
"An interesting systematic movement with wB
offers and refusals follows an unconstrained
introduction."
No 9935 L.Mitrofanov and Yu.Roslov
5th Prize Goodwill Games tourney 1994

8a8 0450.23 Win
"An impressive chase after three hares, the three bP's, is crowned with success thanks to a well-planned march by bk."

No 9936 V.Razumenko (St Petersburg) 6th Prize Goodwill Games tourney 1994

1.h3 2030.13 Win

No 9936 V.Razumenko 1.Qh8+ Kgl 2.Qa1+ Bfl 3.Qd4+ Qf2+ (else mate) 4.Qxf2+ Kh1 5.a6 e3/e 6.a7/ei ef 7.a8Q wins.
i) Qg1+ 6.Qxgl+ Kxgl 7.a7 wins.
ii) 6.Qxe3? Qg1 7.Qxgl+ Kxgl 8.a7 Bg2 draw.
"Both sides sacrifice a queen making use of bk's cornered location, a virtuoso elaboration by the composer."

No 9937 A.I.Kotov (Priozersk) and G.Kasparyan (Erevan) Special Prize Goodwill Games tourney 1994

1.e3 3140.21 Win

"The honour is for a mate with two S-promotions, in an economical setting and with quiet moves by W."

No 9938 A.Chernenko (Stavropol province) 1st Hon.Mention Goodwill Games tourney 1994

1.e3 2010.14 Draw

"Curious play is used in this amalgam of underpromotion and positional draw."
i) f2 3.B4. However, David Blundell, observing that he recalls having vetoed this study in a different award, summarily dismisses it here with 2...e2+ 3.Kf1 Qe2+ 4.Kxe2 Kg2, when Bl wins. Chernenko brazenly repeats his entry that was eliminated from the II Galitzky MT (Saratov), where it was provisionally honoured.

No 9939 V.Katsnelson (St Petersburg) 2nd Hon.Mention Goodwill Games tourney 1994

1.e3 3440.21 BTM Draw

No 9939 V.Katsnelson 1.Be3 2.g7+ Kh6 (Kd4;Ra4) 3.e7+ Kxg7 4.Rg6+ Kh6 5.Rc6 Rd4 6.Rb6 Rd4 (Ra6;Bb5) 7.Rg6 Rc4 8.Rc6
Rb4 9.Rb6 Rg4 10.Rg6, with:
Rc4 11.Rc6 Rh4 12.Rh6+ and Bc6 to follow, or
Rb4 11.Rb6 Rf4 12.Rh6+ Kg7 13.Rg6+ Kh7
14.Rg1 Rc4 15.Bg6+ draw.
"A firework sacrifice of wR is combined with positional draw in 2 variations."

No 9940 G.Amiryan (Armenia)
=3rd-4th HM Goodwill Games tourney 1994

\[ \text{chess board diagram} \]

No 9941 A.Chernenko
=3rd-4th HM Goodwill Games tourney 1994

\[ \text{chess board diagram} \]

No 9942 V.Prigunov (Kazan)
5th Hon.Mention Goodwill Games tourney 1994

\[ \text{chess board diagram} \]

No 9943 Ya.Khatyanov (Sverdlovsk region)
1st Comm. Goodwill Games tourney 1994

\[ \text{chess board diagram} \]
No 9944 V. Kozhakin (Magadan) and V. Kovalenko (Maritime province) 2nd Comm. Goodwill Games tourney 1994

No 9944 V. Kozhakin and V. Kovalenko

No 9945 A. P. Grin (Moscow) =3rd-5th Comm. Goodwill Games tourney 1994


In a most curious misprint Grin’s study was supplied in the award reversed 180 degrees, without altering the colours: a4h7 0113.03 f4f6 a8b6 c7 3/5+.

Kutna Hora - 60.
This formal international tourney was celebrating 60 years of the chess club of the town near Prague. The tourney was judged by Vladislav Bunka. The award was published in Sachova Skladba 45 xii94 pp910-912.

35 entries from 15 composers, 8 in the provisional award. Confirmation period: "...její definitivní výsledek přináší.“ The text of the award also in Czech.
No 9948 Mario Matouš
1st Prize Kutna Hora 60

f4h5 0341.33 Win
No 9948 M.Matouš 1.e7 g5+ 2.Kxg5 Bg6 3.Kxe7+ Rxe7 f5+ 4.exf5 Kg6+ 5.Kf5 Bxf5+ 6.Rxf5 Rxf5+ 7.Kxf5, with:

No 9949 K.Husák and E.Vlasák
2nd Prize Kutna Hora 60

h5h8 0440.21 Win

No 9950 M.Matouš
3rd Prize Kutna Hora 60

a1h2 0405.00 Win

No 9951 G.Slepyan (Belarus)
1st HM Kutna Hora 60

a5a7 4006.11 Draw
No 9951 G.Slepyan 1.Qg1+ Ka8 2.Qg8+ Kb7 3.Qd5+, with:
Die Schwalbe, 1990-92

This formal tourney was judged by IGM Jonathan Mestel. "The average quality of the 35 studies was high, although none was clearly outstanding. The two prize-winners combine appropriate levels of originality, elegance and difficulty, but the rest of the award was much harder to distinguish, my opinions changing from day to day. Although I have not ranked them explicitly, the commendations are presented in roughly diminishing order of merit. I attempted to solve every composition myself, in order to assess the degree of surprise and wealth of side-play which I consider important factors in a study's overall worth. As a result, I may have been over-impressed by those ideas I took longest to find. I also confess to a slight preference for game-like positions."

"I found very few, and no serious, errors in the editor's solutions and analysis, which was a great help in appreciating those points which eluded me when solving."

"The effectiveness of the underpromotion in 7913 is surprising, though similar things have been seen before. It is a pity that wBgl is also promoted! The perpetual check in 7477 requires continual accuracy, but nothing of particular interest. The zugzwang in 7675 is amusing, but it is easy to solve and heavy-handed. Likewise the reciprocal stalemate in 7735 requires a slightly..."
cumbersome setting, as usual with that theme. The simple elegance of 7403 is appealing, but the idea is not new. The play in 7734 and 7674 is of some interest, but each has construction flaws. A number of the studies display influence from problems, for example the twinning in 7274 (The 2HM by Randviir). To my mind, 7609 is clearly a mate in 6 rather than a study. In conclusion, I would like to express my thanks for being asked to judge this impressive tourney, and apologise for the time it took me to decide on the award.

Jonathan Mestel, 18vii1994

No 9956 Gerd Rinder (Germany)
1st Prize Die Schwalbe 1990-1992


"The need to drive BK to a7 is subtle, leading to a domination duel. At first I thought there was another kind of dual (!) with 5.Rf5, but then I saw Be6 6.Re5 Re8. There are other variations not given which seem to work, for example 2...Rg1+ 3.Kf8 Rd1 4.Re6 h3 5.hQ h2 6.Qb2 Rd8+ 7.Kg7 hQ 8.Qb6+ Kb8 9.Qxd8+ Bc8 10.Rb6+ Ka7 11.Qd4. It is a long diagonal on which to run out of squares."

No 9957 Juri Randviir (Estonia)
2nd Prize Die Schwalbe 1990-1992

No 9957 J.Randviir 1.h7 Sg4+ 2.Kh3 Se5 3.h8Q Sf4+ 4.Kh2 SF3+ 5.Kh1 Se2 6.Qb2 b4 7.Sa3 bx3 8.Qa2 drawn!

"An original end position. I found this hard to solve as the black play is easy to miss. It is tempting (but vain) for Bl to seek a win on the queenside after 1.h7 SF1+ 2.Kh3 Sf4+ 3.Kg4 Sg6 4.Kf5 Sh8 5.Ke4! The W zugzwang and unique subsequent drawing line are surprising and original. It is a pity that wSbl plays a passive role - otherwise this might have achieved first prize."

No 9958 A.Konstantinow
1st Hon.Mention Die Schwalbe 1990-1992


"The main interest of this study is how in response to a double attack on the pinned wR W must switch between the two defences (Rh4, and Rh8+) according to which squares on the h-file happen to be guarded at each stage of the systematic manoeuvre (3...Re2 4.Rh4? or 5...Rd2 6.Rh8+?, or 8.Rh4?). A technical achievement, difficult to compose, but not interesting enough for a prize. Bl moving first is a mild flaw."

No 9959 Juri Randviir
2nd Hon.Mention Die Schwalbe 1990-1992

No 9959 J.Randviir 1.h8 0430.45 Win
No 9959  Juri Randviir I: diagram
I: remove bPd3,d5; add wPd3 bPc3
I: 1.Kf7 Rf6+ 2.Ke7 Bg5 3.Rd8+ Rf8+ 4.Kxf8 Bxd8 5.e5 Bg5 6.e6 d2 7.h6 Bf6 8.g5 wins.
"A tricky position, although slightly ugly. The use of twinning, albeit in a somewhat impure form, to illustrate the tries is interesting and uncommon. Indeed, the main interest is in the failure of the tries: the forced draw in II after 1.e5? d2 2.Kf7 Bg5 3.Rb7 Bb8! 4.Rd7, is a surprise. The R-swap-ping mechanism is original but the P's vs. B play is not special. Almost deserving of a prize."

No 9960  Gregor Werner (Germany)
3rd Hon.Mention Die Schwalbe 1990-1992

"A game-like position. Indeed, I suspect this study was inspired by a game. The position after 5.Qd6! is very reminiscent of the game Tal-Keres, beautifully analysed in the book The Art of the Middle Game by Keres and Kotov."

No 9962  S. Shaigorowski (Bulgaria)
Commendation Die Schwalbe 1990-1992
No 9963 John Nunn (Britain)  
Commendation Die Schwalbe 1990-1992

Qg4  
d7a4 4001.00 Win


"The stalemate defence after 1.Kc7? Qg4! 2.Qb3+, and the failure of 1.Kd6? Qg1! 2.Qb3+ Ka5 3.Sc4+ Ka6 4.Qa4+ Kb7, are subtle. The availability of 5.Sd6+, in this latter line after 1.Kd8 (zugzwang?) is hard to foresee. Nevertheless, not quite enough play for a higher placing. I do not wish to discuss 'database composition' here!"

AJR: I hold the view that studies extracted from 'Thompson' databases should not compete in tournaments against human composers. To maintain, on the ground that it is difficult to draw the line, that no line should be drawn, is to invoke a false and cowardly principle: as in real life, lines are always having to be drawn, and where this has to be done it should be done by the exercise of good judgement.

No 9964 Harrie Grondijs (Holland)  
Commendation Die Schwalbe 1990-1992

d2h4 0411.13 Win


"The clean main line to the pleasing trapping of bR has the down-side of little side-play. The failure of 2.Rh7, vital for soundness, is not so very interesting, as obviously wR is better placed further away from bk."


No 9965 Gunter Jahn  
Commendation Die Schwalbe 1990-1992

e3b6 0000.44 Win


"It is hard to be original with P- endings, but this subtle composition blends several known ideas and theoretical positions, and I was tempted to place it higher in the award. I wonder whether starting with the kings on e4 and a5 would be an improvement. Does W then have to begin with 1.Ke3?"

David Blundell: Now this is my kind of study! W wants to execute the plan Kd3-c3-Pb4, and Kc3-xa3 is winning. Now Bl cannot prevent b3-b4 with a7-a5 since W's plan of picking up bPH5 has to be met by bKa5-b4-c3. Bl must therefore prevent b2-b4 by meeting wKc3 with bKa5. If W tries to execute his plan immediately with 1.Kd3, Bl plays, not Ka5? 2.Kc3, but Ka6! 2.Ke2 Kb6 3.Kd2 Ka6, and W is wasting time. So before executing the plan W induces a7-a6, as thereafter bk can no longer hover around a5. JM is correct in his assumption that W must play 1.Ka3, in the setting with wKc4, bKa5. But here if W tries to execute the above plan immediately with 1.Kd3, Bl has the two possible replies: bk6 or bKa6. Hence the composer's choice of setting.
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No 9966 Andrzej Lewandowski (Poland)
Commended Die Schwalbe 1990-1992

```
e6h5 0500.03 Win
No 9966 Andrzej Lewandowski 1.Rd7 c3 2.Kf5
e2 3.Rc8 Rh6 4.Rxd2 e1Q 5.Rh2+ Qh4 6.cRc2
wins.
```

"Simple and elegant. Not quite enough play for a
higher placing."

No 9967 Michal Hlinka and Karel Husak
(Slovakia)
Commendation Die Schwalbe 1990-1992

```
h8f8 0441.22 Win
No 9967 Michal Hlinka and Karel Husak I.c7
Rc3 2.Rxf6 Rxc7 3.Se6+ Ke7 4.Sxc7 Bxf6+
```

"An amusing finale, but disappointingly little play
for the slightly cluttered position."

No 9968 J.Randvir
Commendation Die Schwalbe 1990-1992

```
c6h2 0143.13 Win
No 9968 J.Randvir 1.Rbl a1Q 2.Bxb1 SE3
3.h7 Se5+ 4.Kc7 Sg6 5.Kd8 Kg3 6.Ke8 Kg4
7.Kf7 Kg5 8.Kg7 wins.
```

"This study and 7341 investigate the relative
worth of paralysed blockaders. It is no surprise
that wB is more use than wR in supporting
promotion of wPh7, but 4.Kc7 is a nice move."

1st Donetsk Region tourney
This informal tourney, reserved for composers in
the regio, was organised by the newspaper
"Makeevsky rabochy" (71983) and judged by
V.Fyodorov. The provisional award appeared in
Makeevka Rabochy, 9vi84. 23 studies from 12
composers in the Donetsk region were entered, 7
in award.

No 9969 Yu.Kuruoglu (Makeevka)
1st Pr 1st Donetsk Region tourney

```
d7a7 0040.36 Win
No 9969 Yu.Kuruoglu 1.Kc8 Bd6 2.Bg5 f1S
7.Kxc7 and 8.b8Q mate.
```
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No 9970  G.Gotsdiner (Makeevka)
2nd Pr 1st Donetsk Region tourney

G.Gotsdiner 1.Sf6 g3 2.Sxf4, with:
g1Q 4.b4+ Kc4 5.d3+ Kc3 6.Se2+ Kxd3 7.Sxg1,
or g1S 4.h5 Sf5 5.h6 Sg5 6.Sef6+ Sxe6 7.h7 wins.

No 9971  V.Gorbunov (Yasinovataya)
3rd Pr 1st Donetsk Region tourney

V.Gorbunov 1...e2+ 2.Kd2 Rf7 3.a8S+
Kd7 4.Sxb6+ Ke7 5.Sc8+ Kf7 6.Sd6+ Kg6
7.h8S+ Kxe5 8.h5f7+ gxf7 9.Sxf7+ Kg4 10.Sb6+
Kg3 11.Sf5+ Kg2 12.Rxf7 exf7 13.Se3+ Kf2

No 9972  Yu.Kuruoglu
1stHM 1st Donetsk Region tourney

Sa6 4.Sd7+ Kf7 5.b7 wins.

No 9973  V.Zabolotny (Donetsk)
2nd HM 1st Donetsk Region tourney

V.Zabolotny 1.Bf5+ Kxf5 2.Qc8+ Kf4
3.Qxg4 Qf7 4.Qe4+ Kg3 5.Qxe5+ Kxg4 6.Se5+
wins.
i) David Blundell: "Unsound - 4...Kxe4 5.Sg5+

No 9974  A.Ugnivenko (Dobropolye)
1st Comm 1st Donetsk Region tourney

A.Ugnivenko 1.f4+ Kxd4 2.Bh3 Ke4+

No 9975  Yu.Kuruoglu
1.b6 Sa6 2.Sd5 Sb8 3.Se5
Sa6 4.Sd7+ Kf7 5.b7 wins.
Like the first, this informal tourney was reserved for composers in the region and organized by newspaper “Makeevsky rabochy” (1985). Judge was V. Fyodorov. The provisional award appeared in “Makeevsky rabochy” 6/86. 17 studies from 12 composers entered, 10 published.

Yu. Kuruoglu (Makeevka)
1st Pr 2nd Donetsk Region tourney

No 9977 Kh. Animitsa (Kremnevka) and A. Kakovin (Bryanka)
2nd Pr 2nd Donetsk Region tourney

V. Gorbunov and A. Shvichenko (Yasinovataya)
3rd Pr 2nd Donetsk Region tourney

G. Gotsdiner
1st Pr 1st Donetsk Region tourney

V. Gorbunov and A. Shvichenko

Kh. Animitsa and A. Kakovin
1. Ra6+ Kf7
2. Rh7+ Kg8
3. Ra8 Qxa8
4. Rb7 Qa6
5. Rb6 Qa7
6. Rb8+ Kf7
7. Rb7+ Qxb7 stalemate.

V. Gorbunov and A. Shvichenko

V. Gorbunov and A. Shvichenko

Yu. Kuruoglu (Makeevka)
1st Pr 2nd Donetsk Region tourney

No 9978

K. Animitsa
1. Rc1+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

G. Gotsdiner
1. Sc3+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

K. Animitsa
1. Rc1+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

G. Gotsdiner
1. Sc3+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

K. Animitsa
1. Rc1+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

G. Gotsdiner
1. Sc3+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

K. Animitsa
1. Rc1+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

G. Gotsdiner
1. Sc3+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

K. Animitsa
1. Rc1+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

G. Gotsdiner
1. Sc3+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

K. Animitsa
1. Rc1+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

G. Gotsdiner
1. Sc3+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

K. Animitsa
1. Rc1+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.

G. Gotsdiner
1. Sc3+ Kf2
2. Sc1 Kxel
3. Ka5 Kdl/i 4. Rb2 c1Q 5. Rbl Qxb1 stalemate.
No 9979 G. Gotsdiner (Makeevka)
1st HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

No 9980 V. Petrochenko (Makeevka)
2nd HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

No 9981 V. Stetsenko (Makeevka)
3rd HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

No 9982 D. Grenadir (Avdeevka)
4th HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

No 9983 V. Scherbina (Donetsk)
5th HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

Note that bBb1 is obtrusive, but at least there is a missing eighth bP to account for it!

Duals - per Shvichenko and Gorbunov:

No 9979 G. Gotsdiner (Makeevka)
1st HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

No 9980 V. Petrochenko (Makeevka)
2nd HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

No 9981 V. Stetsenko (Makeevka)
3rd HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

No 9982 D. Grenadir (Avdeevka)
4th HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

No 9983 V. Scherbina (Donetsk)
5th HM 2nd Donetsk Region tournament

Note that bBb1 is obtrusive, but at least there is a missing eighth bP to account for it!

Duals - per Shvichenko and Gorbunov:
No 9984 I. Pasichnik (Makevka)
1st Comm 2nd Donetsk Region tourney


No 9985 A. Nikitin (Donetsk)
2nd Comm 2nd Donetsk Region tourney


No 9986 N. Manella and H. Aloni
2nd prize Israel 'Ring' 1991


No 9987 Yochanan Afek (609 in Shahmat)
2nd prize Israel 'Ring' 1991

1. Be5? b2, and now 2. Bg2+ Kgl 3. Rh8 blQ, or 2. Rc8 b1Q 3. b8Q Sg3+ 4. Bxg3 Qh2+ 5. Bh2 Qxf1# draw.

Israel Ring Tourney, 1991

This informal tourney was judged by Virgil Nestorescu (Romania). The provisional award appeared in Variantim No. 19, iii95. 26 studies were published. No explanation of the long delay is offered, but the 2-er award in the same issue is for the same year and with a different judge.
No 9987 Yochanan Afek

No 9988 Yuri Randviir (Estonia) (251 in Variantim)
3rd prize Israel 'Ring' 1991

No 9988 Yehuda Hoch (Israel) (210 in Variantim)
1st hon. mention Israel 'Ring' 1991

No 9988 Yuri Randviir

No 9988 Yuri Randviir

No 9988 Yehuda Hoch (Israel) (210 in Variantim)
1st hon. mention Israel 'Ring' 1991

a27 3340.11 Draw
1) Ke7? 2.Re4 and mates. Kg6 2.Rg6, is the main line.
2) 2.Re4+? Re7 3.cxb7 Qxa1+ 4.Kxa1 Qg1+ 5.Kb2 Qh2+.
4) Qxe7 7.Rh8+ Kg7 8.Rxf7+ Kxh8 9.Qf8+ and 10.hQ.
5) 9.Kb2 Qe5 wins. 9.Kd2(Kd1)? Qd8+ wins.
6) 10.Ka2? Qa8+ 11.Kb1(Kb2) Qe4(g2)+ wins. "Exact W play persists until 10...Qc8+, when the dual (11.Kd1 or 11.Kd2) somewhat damages the general good impression."
No 9990

Gasparyan (Armenia)
(249 in Variantsim)
2nd hon. mention Israel 'Ring' 1991

A4h7 0423.22 Draw

No 9990

3.Ra7+/iii Kxb6 4.Bxd4+iv d2 5.Bg7+/v Kg6
9.Rxa2 draw.
i) 1.Ra7+? Kxb6 2.Bb2 d2 3.Bg4 Rg3/viii
ii) d2 2.Bg4 Rg3 3.Bd1 Rg1 4.Bxg4 Rxg1 5.Rd8
R 6.Bg7 draw.
iii) 3.Rxc8? d2 4.Rc7+ Kxh6 5.Rc1 a1Q+ 6.Rxa1
4.Ra4? Sc2+ 5.Ksa2 d2 6.Rb4+ Kg5 7.Rh1 Se1
wins.
viii) Rxc4+? 4.Ka3 Sb5+ 5.Kb3 Rcg4 6.Ra6+ and
ix) 4.Bh5 Kxb5 5.Rh7+ Kg4 6.Rh1 Se2, and
x) 5.Rd7? Rxd1 6.Rxd4 a1Q+ 7.Bxa1 Rxal+
8.Kb5 a1Q 9.Rxd1 Rxd1 10.c5 Kgb wins. Or
5.Ra6+ Kg5 6.Kb4 Rxdl 7.Kc3 SD 8.Rd6 a1Q
wins.
"A war-like study. Black's play seems of greater
value than the way that White draws."

No 9991

Porath (Israel) (284 in Variantsim)
1st commendation Israel 'Ring' 1991

e6f3 0001.11 Win

No 9991

Porath 1.Sf5 Ke4 2.d7/i c2 3.d8Q c1Q
4.Qd5+ Kf4 5.Qe5+/i Kf3 6.Qg3+ii Ke4/iv
wins.
i) 2.Se3? Kxe3 3.d7 c2 4.d8Q Kc1Q. Or
2.Sg3+? Kf3 3.f7 Kf2 draws.
Ke4 6.Qe5+ Kd3 draws.
iii) 6.Sd4+ Kg4 7.Qf5+ Kh4 8.Qe4+ Kh5 9.Qf3+
Kg5 10.Qg3+ Kh5 11.Qh3+ Kg6 draws.
iv) Ke2 7.Sd4+ Kf1 8.Qf3+ wins.
"A miniature in which the way to win is not
evident. There is a danger of anticipation."

No 9992

Rabinovich (Israel) (619 in Shahmar)
2nd commendation Israel 'Ring' 1991

i8c4 0002.10 Win

No 9992

Rabinovich 1.Sd5/i Kxd5 2.Sb6+ Kc5
Kd3 draw.
"A simple solution based on the opposition, but
the amusing refutation of the symmetrical try
1.Sb5 is memorable."
DOBRESCU-60 JT

This international tourney was judged by Emilian Dobrescu. The provisional award appeared in Buletin Problemistic No.61 (i-vi 94). 23 studies of composers from 13 countries entered 13 in the provisional award. In the judge's view "the quality was remarkable, reflecting tendencies manifested in the contemporary evolution of chess" [?] The final award appeared in Buletin Problemistic 62 (vii-xii 94). Changes from provisional: 4th prize eliminated.

No 9993
Yehuda Hoch (Israel)
1st Pr Dobrescu 60 JT

h1f1 1703.20 Win

No 9993
i) 2.Qe7+? Kf2 wins. 2.Qc3(Qa1)+? Kf2 3.Qa2(Qb2)+ Kxf3 draws.
ii) Kf2 3.fxg4 Rh6+ 4.Qb5 Rxf5+ 5.gxf5 Ke3 6.a5 Ke4 7.a6 Sc8(Sb5) 8.h6 wins.
iv) Rxh3+ 7.Kxh3 Kf2 8.g5 Se8 9.a5 Kf3 10.a6 Kf4 11.a7 Sc7 12.g6 wins.
vi) Rxh2+ 5.Kxh2 Kf2 6.a5 Kg3 7.a6 Sc8 8.g5 Ke4 9.g6 Kf5 10.g7/v Sxh7 11.a7 wins.
vii) 9.Kg3 Sxh6 10.a5 Sf5+ and 11... Sa6 12.a6 Sb5 draws.

"In my opinion we are in the presence of a study that ranks with the best of recent years. The thematic trap has great value in itself (especially 4...Se4!! and 14...Kg1!), and is countered by a subtle white manoeuvre (5.Qh6 and 6.Qh3), obliging bk to take up residence on f2, a square avoided on move 2. A modern work of great complexity, with profound motivation on both sides. Sincere congratulations."

No 9994
Anatoly Kuznetsov, Oleg Pervakov and Karen Sumbatyan (all Moscow)
=2nd/3rd Pr Dobrescu 60 JT

K2c3 0035.23 Win

No 9994


"This study too has shows organic unity of solution and content (traps, sub-variations, complementary analyses). The Troitzky finale is the pretext for a spectacular domination."

No 9995 Virgil Nestorescu (Romania)
=2nd/3rdPr Dobrescu 60 JT

[Diagram]

a4h7 0413.11 Win

No 9996 David Gurgenidze and Velimir Kalandadze (Georgia)

[Diagram]

a5a7 0801.32 Draw


•••Provisionally awarded 4th prize, this was eliminated for thecook identified by N. Micu: 2.Sb5+ Rxb5+ 3.Kxb5 Rxa1 4.Re7+ Kb8 5.Re8+ Kd7 6.a7 Rxa3 7.Re7! drawn.***


iii) David Blundell again: "Surely W has 14.Re1 h2 15.Ra1, transposing? There's also the time-wasting non-dual 16.Rb7+ Ka8 17.Rb1 h2 18.Ra1+ Kb8. These are eliminated by playing 13...h2, first, forcing 14.Re1, and g2 15.Ka1 Ke8 16.Kc6 Kb8, and we are back in the main line. Ah! No! After 13...h2, W draws with 14.Rb7 Ke8 15.Kc6 Kb8 16.Kf6 Kg8 17.Rh5 (Rb4,Rh3) g2 18.Rg5+ Kb8, so the main line is correct and 14.Re1 is a transposition dual. A remarkable study."

665
Eduardo Iriarte and Alberto Foguelman  
(Argentina)  
4th Pr Dobrescu 60 JT

No 9998 Paul Joitsa (Romania)  
Special Pr Dobrescu 60 JT

No 9997 Eduardo Iriarte and Alberto Foguelman  
Re4 6.Rh8+ Kg7 (Kc7;Re8+) 7.Rg8+ Kxg8 8.Sf6+, or  
f5(f6) 6.Sxe5 Rxb4 7.Sg6+, or  
Kg7(Kc7) 6.Sxe5 Rxb4 7.Sf5+, or  
8.Sd2 b2+ drawn, or 2.Sf5+ Kg6 3.e4 b3 4.Rxe4+  
Kh5 5.Rh4+ Kg5 6.Kc1 b2+ 7.Kb1 Rd4 draws.  
ii) b3+ 3.Kb1 Rd7 (Rh5,Sxg4) 4.Sf5 Rd1+ 5.Kb2  
Ke8 6.Kxb3 Re1 7.e3 g3 8.Rh4 wins.  
iii) 3.Sxg4? b3+ 4.Kb2 Re5 5.Rg3 f5 6.Rf3 Ke8  
7.Kxb3 f4 draws.  
v) David Blundell: "4.Kb2? Rb4, is the central  
zugzwang WTM. The point is that after the  
plausible 5.e3, B draws the resulting GBR class  
0001.12 ending after f5 6.Sxe3 Rxb4 7.Sg6+ Kf7  
8.Sxh4 Ke6 (Kf6;Sf7), and 9.Ke5 Kd5 10.Sd2 f4  
vii) 2.e4 Kg6. Or 2.Sf5+ Kg6 3.e4 b3 4.Rxg4+  
Kh5 5.Rh4+ Kg5 6.Kc1 b2+ 7.Kb1 Rb4 is a clear  
draw.  
"Once more an elegant case of reciprocal  
zugzwanz, finished off with a fine display of  
S-forks."

No 9997 Paul Joitsa 1.c7 (Qc3+? Kd5+) Sb6/i  
5.Qd2/iv Qb8+ Sxb8 7.b7 Qxb7/vii 8.cxd8B+ wins.  
i) Qxc5 2.Qc3+ Kd5 3.Qf5+ wins. If Kd5  
2.Qd2+, and Bd4 3.Qa2+ Kc6 4.Qe2+ wins, or  
Kc4 4.Qd7 Qc4+ 5.Kf8 Sxc6 5.cBQ wins.  
ii) If 2.Qc3+? Kd5 3.cxb6 Qg6+ 4.Kd7 Qf5+  
Qxc7 draws, or 3.Qd2+ Bd4 4.cxb6 Qb5+ 5.Kd7  
(Kf8,Bb8+) Qd4+ draws.  
iii) Qc4 5.Qf4 Qd5 6.Qe6+ wins.  
iv) 5.c8Q+? Ke7 6.Kh7 Qf7+. Or if 5.Qg6? Qa8+  
and mate. Or 5.Qe3+ Kf5+ 6.Kh8 Qa8+ 7.Kf7  
Qf5+ 8.Kd8 Qd6+ 9.Kg8 Qa6+ 10.Qe6+ Qe3  
in.Qh8+ wins.  
vi) 6.Kh7? Qh8+ draws,  
vii) Qa4 8.c8Q+ Ke7 9.bBQ wins. Or Qa5 8.c8Q+  
"I consider this to be the best interpretation of a  
theme addressed already by Nadareishvili and  
Benko."

No 9999 Michal Hlinka (Czech Republic)  
1HonMen Dobrescu 60 JT
b2d1 0413.12 Win

i) 1.Bf3+? Kd2 2.Re2+ Kd3 3.g7 Ra8 4.Rg2 Sc4+ 5.Kb3 Sd2+ and Sfxf3 draws.


iv) 4.Bf3+? Kg2 5.Re2+ (Bxd5,Sf5;) Kd3 6.Rg2 Se4 7.g8Q Rxg8 8.Rxg8 Sd2+ draws.


"The apparently neutral move 2.Ka2! creates a strong impression, the effect being decisive for the success of the future R+B battery."

No 10000 John Roycroft (England)
2HM Dobrescu 60 JT

b1d3 0133.22 Draw
No 10000 John Roycroft 1.f3/i Bf5 2.Rf8 Bxd7 3.Rd8 draws:


ii) 4.Rf8? Bc6+ and Bh6 wins.


"...after the fine introductory move 1.f3!, bB is harried to a draw by wR on 4 different diagonals: a8-d5, e6-g8, f5-h7 and b5-e8."

No 10001 Attila Koranyi (Hungary)
3HM Dobrescu 60 JT

e1h3 0410.02 Draw


"The analytical and artistic elements unite in harmony."

No 10002 Alexandr Stavrietsky (Russia)
1Comm Dobrescu 60 JT

f1f5 0081.45 Draw

i) Qe1 4.h4+ Kh5 5.Bg4+. Or Qc4 4.h4+ Kh5 5.Kh3, when W wins.

"A stalemate constructed in the modern manner with wB blockaded."
No 10003 Pekka Massinen (Finland)
2Comm Dobrescu 60 JT

No 10005 Ion Murarușu (Romania)
4Comm Dobrescu 60 JT

No 10004 Jean Roche (France)
3Comm Dobrescu 60 JT

No 10006 A. Sochniev
1 Pr Schakend Nederland 1986

---

The move-pair 2.Sd7 Se5 creates a good impression.

The only P-study, with two stalemates well differentiated.

Schakend Nederland 1986
This informal tourney was judged by Jan van Reek and Adam Sobey. 29 correct studies were by 12 composers from 8 countries. Provisional award published in Schakend Nederland 88-3.

No 10006 A. Sochniev
1 Pr Schakend Nederland 1986

No 10004 Jean Roche 1.Re2+ Ka3 2.Sb1+ Kb3 3.Rxc3+ Kb2 4.Rb3 Bb7 5.Rd3+ Kb1 6.Rd7 Bb6 7.Rb7+, with:
Rb2 8.Rxa7 Bb6 9.Kh1 Bb7 stalemate, or
ii) 5.Sa3? Re4 6.Rg3 Bc3 and Bl wins. The move 5.Rd3, counters Bb7's desire for the d4 square.
"Natural play leads to two stalemate positions."

h3b3 0107.22 Draw
No 10006
A.Sochniev
1.Rh8 i Sb6 ii 2.Rxh6
Ka3 iii 3.Rc6 dxec 4.d7 Sg5 5.Kh2 SF 6.a6 c1Q
7.d8Q Sxh8 8.a7 Qb6+ 9.Kg1 Qc1+ 10.Kh2 draw
i) 1.Rc8 Sc3 2.Rxc3 Kxc3 3.Sf4 Kd2
ii) 1... K-2.Rc8
iii) 2... Ka2 3.Rb2 Kh8 4.Se1 Sf6 5.a6 Sd5 6.a7
Sb6 7.Kg1 c1S 8.Kf5 draw

"Exciting play in a open position leads to a
positional draw. The beautiful side-variation is a
bonus."

No 10007
J.Rusinek
2Pr Schakend Nederland 1986

a4e2 0473.30 Draw

No 10007
J.Rusinek
1.Ka3 Bf8 2.Ka2 Rxh4
7.Kc2 Bg7 8.e5 Be5 9.d4 Bxh4 stalemate
i) 3.Sxal Ra4 4.Kb1 Ka1 5.Rd5 Bc4 6.Rd8 Ba2
7.Ka1 Bb3

"A beautiful pinned stalemate in the great stile of
the master."

No 10008
J.Marwitz
3Pr Schakend Nederland 1986

c3e8 0714.01 Draw

No 10008
J.Marwitz

Ra4 12.Sb2 draw
i) 1.Bxd4 exd4 2.Kxd4 Ke7 3.Rf1 Rh5 4.Sf5 Ra4
ii) 2.Kf2 Sb4 3.Sr6 Kb8 4.Sd7 Kf7 5.Re2 Rxh2

"A natural introduction leads to sharp play, in
which white being a rook down, forces a
positional draw."

No 10009
J.Vandiest
4Pr Schakend Nederland 1986

b4a8 4010.02 Win

No 10009
J.Vandiest
1.Bd5 Kb8 2.Qf7 Qc8
3.Kb5 c3 4.Qe7 Qc7 5.Qe8 Qc8 6.Qxe5 Qc7
7.Qe8 Qc8 8.Qe7 Qc7 9.Qf8 Qc8 10.Qb4 c2
15.Qb5 Ke7 16.Qg5 Kxe6 17.Qf4
i) 10... Qd7 11.Kb6 Kxe8 12.Qc5 Kd8 13.Qf8 Qe8
14.Qd6 Qd7 15.Qb8 Qe8 16.Qe5 Qd7 17.Bf6 c2
18.Bxd7 c1Q 19.Qe8

No 10010
M.Matous
1HM Schakend Nederland 1986

g2d4 0480.11 Win

No 10010
M.Matous
1.Bd7 Kh4 i 2.Bg3 Kh5
3.Kh3 Rxg7 4.Be8 Rg6 5.c7 Bc2 ii 6.c8B Bc1
7.Bh4 Bd1 8.Bf5 Bg4 9.Bxg4 mate
i) 1... Kh5 2.Kh3 Rxg7 3.Bf6 Rg6 4.c7 Bc2
5.c8B Bf6 6.Bf6
ii) 5... Bxe8 6.c8Q Rg8 7.Qf5 Rh8 8.Be5 Rg8

669
9.Bd4

No 10011 L.Katsnelson
2HM Schakend Nederland 1986

c6/1 0810.23 Win
i) 1.b3 Rf1 2.Rxa2 Kxa2 3.Bh6 Kb3 4.Rxa5 a2 5.Bg7 Kb4

No 10012 Y.Hoch
3HM Schakend Nederland 1986

e3/1 0101.03 Win
i) 1... Kh1 2.Kd2 Kg2 3.Sxh2
ii) 6... b1S 7.Sc4 Sc3 8.Rg1 Sd1 9.Kc2 Kb1 10.Sa3 Kb2 11.Sc2

No 10013 G.Amirjan, D.J.Brink and J.van Reek
(Correction)
4HM Schakend Nederland 1986

g4/1 0540.03 Draw
In the original by Amirjan alone (f7/1 0540.13 b3/b2d5c1/a42a2c2) 3... Re3 4.Kg8 Rf4 5.Bh7 Rb4 6.Bd3 Rh8 7.Kxh8 a1Q was possible. 2...
a1Q was the intended main variation of the original.

No 10014 N.Cortlever
ICom Schakend Nederland 1986

a6/8 0650.63 Win

670
No 10015 F.Morena Ramos  
2Com Schakend Nederland 1986

gb5 0710.30 Win
No 10015 F.Morena Ramos 1.e7 Raxg2i 2.Kf1  
Rg1 3.Kf2ii R1gL2 4.Kf3 R5g3 5.Kf4 Rg4 6.Ke3  
Rxe7 11.Bf7 Rxf7 12.g8Q  
i) 1... Re2 2.Bh7  
ii) 3.Kc2 Rd5 4.Kf2 Rse1

No 10016 S.Kasparjan  
3Com Schakend Nederland 1986

g5b8 0010.14 Win
No 10016 S.Kasparjan 1.Kf6 e1Qii 2.Bd5 Kf8  
3.g7 Ke8 4.g8Q Kd7 5.Bb6 Kc7 6.Qc8 Kb6  
15.Bb5 Kd5 16.Be2 Ke4 17.Qe5 mate  
i) 1... b1Q 2.Bd5 Kf8 3.g7 Ke8 4.g8Q Kd7 5.Be6  
Kc7 6.Qc8 Kd6 7.Qd7 Kc5 8.Qc7 Kd4 9.Qe5  
Kd3 10.Bf5

e2b8 0014.00 Win
No 10017 R.Missiaen 1.Kd3 Ke7i 2.Kc4 Sc1  
i) 1... Sb4 2.Kc4 Sa6 3.Kb5 Sc7ii 4.Kb6 Sa8  
Sb6 22.Sc5 and wins according to  
Berger/Amelung  
i) 3... Ka7 4.Sc6 Kb7 5.Sc7 Ka7 6.Bg4 Sc5  
11.Sc6 Ka8 12.Bf1  
The original was d3b8 0014.00 d1e5b4. and allowed 1.Kc4 Sa6 2.Kb5 Sc7 3.Kc6 Se8 4.Bg4 Sf6  
5.Bf5 Sh5! and apparently no win was found.  
ii) 3... Ka7 4.Sc6 Kb7 5.Sc7 Ka7 6.Bg4 Sc7  
11.Sc6 Ka8 12.Bf1

Review
A snare for the black king, by V.Neishtadt and  
K.Sukharev, Barnaul, 1994, paperback, in Russian  
("Lovushka dlya chernovo korolya"), 168 pages,  
363 diagrams, also illustrations. ISBN  
5-88198-009-3. Over 120 of these compositions  
of all sorts, mainly by Siberian composers, are  
studies. Many are taken from awards which have  
not appeared in the pages of EG. We still hope to  
trace the complete awards, when you will have  
them - here!  
-----------------------------------------------  
EG 115 and 116 errata:  
EG 115, K7, page 547: Wp b5 instead of b7  
EG 115, K11, page 549: Ws a2 instead of b2  
EG 116, 9889: Wp f3 instead of g3 and Bp a4  
extra  
EG 116, 9807: the same study was in EG 115  
as 9738 (reported by Harold van  
der Heijden)  
EG 116, 9911: almost the same study (black
rook h2 on d2) was in EG 109 as 8898 (Van der Heijden)
EG 116, 9858: according to Van der Heijden the name A.Kuindzi should be
A.Quincy
EG 116, 9851, 9852 and 9853 the diagrams were completely wrong. The correct diagrams are:

No 9851 A.Herbstman and L.Katsnelson
(Leningrad)
1stCommendation PROBLEM 1969-71

No 9852 A.Hildebrand (Uppsala)
2ndCommendation PROBLEM 1969-71

According to the Van der Heijden database, Cortlever never entered a study to a tourney outside the Netherlands. In fact most of the 77 studies registered in this database were not in any tourney at all, and often in magazines/columns where you would not expect to find an endgame-study at all. Cortlever had a personal view on what makes a study a good study. He wanted his studies to be difficult to solve. "A surprising point, you simply have to find because everything else obviously fails, does not charm me. I gladly accept a lot of difficult tries, if those tries make the real solution harder to believe." Many of his studies are complex positions with much material. We refer to Schakend Nederland 95-4 pp 17-18 and EBUR 7-2 pp 2-7 for more details. A few studies of Cortlever:
Nico Cortlever
De Schaakwereld 1940

a4a6 0650.54 Draw

Nico Cortlever
De Schaakwereld 1939

e1a8 0451.15 Draw

EG Subscription

EG is produced by the Dutch Association for Endgame Study (‘Alexander Rueb Vereniging voor SchaakEindspelstudie’) ARVES. Subscription to EG is not tied to membership of ARVES. The annual subscription of EG is NLG 35 (Dutch guilders), free of bank charges, or alternatively NLG 55.

Bank account: Postbank 54095, in the name of ARVES, Laren (NH), The Netherlands.

Payment by Eurocheque is preferable, but please fill in your number and mention EG!

The intention is to produce 4 issues per year. If organizational problems make the production of 4 issues in one year impossible, the subscription fees are considered as payment for 4 issues.
Circumstances decreed that the chess world knew of many of Troitzky's compositions only after the themes and ideas they revealed had been realised by other composers. [Herbstman has in mind the relative obscurity of the St Petersburg chess columns of 1895-99 and Troitzky's enforced abandoning of, and separation from, chess until 1905, rather than the subsequent disruption of WW-I, the 1917 Revolution, and their prolonged aftermath. To make sense of the publication of Troitzky studies in the years 1897-1899 we may reasonably assume that the composer either had already submitted, or continued to submit, his already composed studies (to Chigorin, presumably) for publication. Tr.] It is asserted that H.Rinck and the Platov brothers developed battles between the pieces [Herbstman's words are clear, his intended meaning is not. Rinck specialised in pawnless play but only two such early Platov studies are in Whitworth's 1994 book. H6 and H7 may indicate his meaning. Tr.], that domination is the imprescriptible due of Rinck, that Simkhovich discovered the positional draw, and Herbstman incarceration. In point of fact all these themes and more were discovered and realised by Troitzky: the above-mentioned composers either deepened them or systematised them. The chronological priority of Troitzky with respect to a group of themes was established by Vasily Platov in his article on Troitzky which appeared in Zadachy i Etyudy No.1 (1927); and the reader is at liberty to pursue for himself this research angle by comparing the studies of the present collection [of Troitzky's studies] with the anthologies of other composers. The point we make here is not that this or that study by Troitzky was published earlier than the analogous study by another composer - this is easily checked by comparing publication dates - but that the priority of idea in practically every region of study creativity belongs to Troitzky. Whether we take the struggle of pieces, domination, systematic ideas, checkmate, stalemate, underpromotion, problem themes, positional draw, incarceration, pinning, or synthesis of ideas - we find all of these, underlined by a pervasive breadth of scope, realised in Troitzky's multi-faceted work. The struggle of assorted force of approximately equal value (as a rule the side that achieves the stipulation is materially somewhat weaker, albeit there is the familiar positional compensation in having the first move) is convincingly and comprehensively illustrated in the next five studies.
Rinck’s study was published 15 years later!
Trotzky applied himself generously to so-called systematic ideas. Katzenellenbogen covered this aspect of Trotzky’s work in his article in Zadachy i etudy No.8, therefore I shall quote just two examples, H11 and H12.

**H9**: 1896.

```
```

**H10**: H.Rinck, Sydsvenska Dagbladet Snailposten, 1911

```
1.Sd5 Rc4 2.g7 Kf7 3.g8=Q+ Kxg8 4.b3 wins.
```

H11: Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1908

```
1.Rh6+ Qxh6 2.Qa8-b7-c8-d7-e8-f7-e7-e7xe5+ 9-16. Qe7-e8-d7-c8-b7-a8-a7 x d4 +
```

H12: Trudovaya pravda, 1925

```
1.Sd5 Rc4 2.g7 Kf7 3.g8=Q+ Kxg8 4.b3 wins.
```

**H6** and **H7** are lively piece struggles, in the first case with rooks and pawns, in the second with bishops and pawns. **H8** handles two knights against the queen: White wins the opposing queen after offering her no fewer than 23 (!) squares to choose from. Trotzky shows in this study, and in earlier studies, the domination theme that Rinck showed with less conviction - cf. H9 [Only the year is given by Herbstman, not other source details, which weakens his case. Tr.] and H10 [But Rinck shows in H10 the full 14-square domination as against Trotzky’s 13, the latter requiring one more chessman and a shorter solution. Tr.]. Yet
Chess theory is a set of conventions. Its specific application to the game and to composition stems from these conventions. Of course, objective truth has a conventional character for chess composition, since it consists of the reflection of principles and idea-rich moments peculiar to practical play, which is by its very nature conventional. The most conventional of all conventions is stalemate, whose essence is a draw in the presence of overwhelming superiority of the opponent! Stalemate is a rare occurrence over-the-board. Perhaps this is why stalemates are relatively rare in Troitzky's oeuvre. But even here he has something to teach the composers of today.

Troitzky brilliantly illuminates the theme of checkmate. What could be more paradoxical or economical than checkmate with a minor piece, in violation of chess theory guidelines? H13 and H14 show us mate with a lone bishop and a lone knight, and in this book the reader will even find an anticipation of L. Kubbel's brilliant sacrifices of the queen—leading to mate with a lone bishop or knight.

[The positions are No.96 and:
Chess Amateur, 1916. No.35 in '360.']

Win


Win.

H12: Bohemia, 1912.

Win


Flb6 0401.12

Win

1. Qa7-a8-b7-c8:f5+
2. 22-28. Qc8-b7-a8-a7-d4-d3xc3+ 29-34. Qxb2+
35-38. Qxd5 wins.

H12: Bohemia, 1912.

Chess theory is a set of conventions. Its specific application to the game and to composition stems from these conventions. Of course, objective truth has a conventional character for chess composition, since it consists of the reflection of principles and idea-rich moments peculiar to practical play, which is by its very nature conventional. The most conventional of all conventions is stalemate, whose essence is a draw in the presence of overwhelming superiority of the opponent! Stalemate is a rare occurrence over-the-board. Perhaps this is why stalemates are relatively rare in Troitzky's oeuvre. But even here he has something to teach the composers of today.

Troitzky brilliantly illuminates the theme of checkmate. What could be more paradoxical or economical than checkmate with a minor piece, in violation of chess theory guidelines? H13 and H14 show us mate with a lone bishop and a lone knight, and in this book the reader will even find an anticipation of L. Kubbel's brilliant sacrifices of the queen—leading to mate with a lone bishop or knight.

[The positions are No.96 and:
Chess Amateur, 1916. No.35 in '360'.]
The themes so far examined are those that I would provisionally call classic, qualitatively set against themes that we may call romantic. In my article "The evolution of the study" ("64", No.19 of 1928) I made the observation that with classicism in the study it is the material that largely determines the idea, serving as an end in itself, with the alignment of material in balance, while in the romantic sub-genre it is the idea that determines the choice of material, the alignment in the latter lacking stability. The idea with the classic is canonical, with the romantic it is unfettered. I have since laid stress on the tendency in both classicism and romanticism to develop having regard to realism, by which is to be understood the reflection and expression in artistic form of the principles and prominent creative incidents of the game as played over-the-board. It should be pointed out that these qualitatively distinct styles of creativity in the study are solidly represented in the work of Troitzky.
Themes that stand on the border between the classic and romantic, now and then breaching the code of stability of force that characterises the classical tradition, are: promotion, the passive sacrifice, and refusal of material. The embodiment of these themes is yet again outstanding in the case of Troitzky.

H19: 500 Endspielstudien, 1924

H20: 28 Rijen, 1925

H21: Bohemia, 1908.

Promotion of the self-same white pawn to bishop is ruled out by that self-same black pawn: Black would play 4...e5, and after the white knight has moved, $\text{Se}6+$ would follow, drawing. When Black in the second variation liquidates his pawn, so as to forestall White winning an endgame with his two knights, he simultaneously gives up his prospective attack on the white knight on $f4$, and then White is able to promote to bishop after all, since he is left with two minor pieces and a pawn against a minor piece. H20 is a stroke of genius in its depth and succinctness and lightness of implementation!

We can now turn to Troitzky’s work with problem themes. Here too Troitzky’s pre-eminence is plain. In articles placed in Magyar Sakkvilág in 1929, and in the review Zadachy i etudy No.7 I did no more than systematise and supplement what Troitzky himself had done years before. The most subtle of problem manoeuvres such as the ‘roman’ decoy, Turton doubling, the percritical Herlin-Loyd movement [Paul Valois: I do not think that Loyd links with the Herlin manoeuvre], cutting-point (German: Schnittpunkt), focal point (German: Brennpunkt) and repeated square revisiting - all of these feature with the utmost clarity in Troitzky’s work. From the large number of studies with problem themes I have chosen four. H21 and H22 show the cutting point theme and sacrifice on the point of intersection of two differently moving black pieces. In H21 we see for the first time in a study two cutting-points (which both A.Gulaev and myself achieved only 20 years later), and in 1934 in Shakhmaty v SSSR there appeared a study with a triple cutting-point. H22 is a surprising example of the cutting-point employing not two white pawns, which is customary, but one, putting the specific characteristics of the pawn to good use, namely movement on the file and capture on the diagonal.

H19 and H20 will speak to us about this with the unrivalled eloquence of chess poetry. Let us pause for a moment on H20. What is the motivation of the promotion to knight? It is that after 4...$\text{Se}4+$ 5$\text{Kh}4$ $\text{Sxg}3$ 6$\text{Kxg}3$ $\text{Sxc}5$ 5$\text{d}8\text{B}$ wins.

H19 and H22 will speak to us about this with the unrivalled eloquence of chess poetry. Let us pause for a moment on H20. What is the motivation of the promotion to knight? It is that after 4...$\text{Se}4+$ 5$\text{Kh}4$ $\text{Sxg}3$ 6$\text{Kxg}3$ $\text{Sxc}5$ 5$\text{d}8\text{B}$ wins.

H20 is a stroke of genius in its depth and succinctness and lightness of implementation!
H22: Shakhmatny listok, 1926.

H25: 1895

d1h8 0334.41 Win
H23: Pravda, 1928.

g2h5 3041.21 Draw
1.Sd7 Bb6 2.BB Qxf8 3.Sf5 Qg8 4.Be4 Qh7
H26: F.Simkhovich, 1927

e6g8 3051.44 Draw
1.Bf7+ Kd7 2.Be6+ Kd6 3.Bf4+ Kc5 4.Bd2+ Ka4 5.Kd1, positional draw, for any move of bQ or bB leads to perpetual check, while White always has the waiting king moves Kb1-a1-b1 at his disposal.

H23 illustrates the focal point idea, combining it with zugzwang. L.Kubbel sums up H24: "The problem theme of focal points is transferred in a masterly manner into a stalemate study and shown in three variations."

F.Simkhovich systematised and sharpened the creative attention of composers with the idea of the positional draw, a highly romantic idea. That is his due, beyond any doubt. But for the filigree positional draw, multifaceted and comprehensive, earlier than any other, we must look again to Troitzky. The isolated king, the cornered queen, cyclic attack, varied forms of perpetual check, all of these are manifest in a series of brilliant Troitzky compositions created at the very start of his activity and continuing up to the present time.

Let us compare the locking-in of the black queen, or if the latter slips out, of the black king, the theme of Troitzky's H23, with Simkhovich's H26,
showing precisely the same theme.
Let our composer speak for himself: "After 3.Sc5 the black queen is restricted to two squares only, g8 and h7. If she tries for freedom via h6 then this restricts the black king to two squares, g6 and h5. If White mistakenly meets the move Qg8 (or Qh7) with Bc2+, instead of Bc4 (or Bf3), then Black wins, because the black king slips out via h6 or g5. Here we see the germ of the idea shown by Simkhovich in his study honoured in Pravda.
This study is very much to my liking - I think it is simply superb. Material, position, play, idea - they all impress. ... Simkhovich has succeeded in cultivating a luxuriant fruit from a seedling (my position) that maybe he was not fully aware of. The square e8, which in his study could give the black queen her escape hatch, were it not blocked, corresponds to the square h6 in my study. A specific queen move in both studies (Qe8 or Qh6) is the most interesting move, determining the perpetual check to the black king. The white king manoeuvre Kb1-a1-b1-a1 in his study corresponds to the bishop moves Bc4-d3-c4-d3 in mine, though their nature differs somewhat, and H26 is more subtle. It is interesting to note that the material is in each case practically the same: Simkhovich skilfully added a knight as a sacrificial decoy of the black queen to an unfavourable square, after which two minor pieces oppose the queen, as in my study. Of course, we should not descend to counting pawns - they reflect the depth of the conception."
This deconstruction of a study shows that Troitzky is not only a study poet of the highest order, a real creator of studies, but also a profound theoretician.

H27: Tidskrift for Schack, 1910.

H28: Zadachy i etudy, 1928

c1c3 0011.23 Draw
[David Blundell: Probably unsound - bQ is freed by dP's advance. In No.309 in '1234' bPd6 is omitted and bPd1 added: The solution is the same apart from 2.Sxf3.]

H29: L'Echiquier, 1927.

f7g5 0317.22 Draw

Our next three examples are positional draws. In H27, thanks to his use of tempo-gaining moves, White succeeds in locking the black king in and thereby reducing the black queen's power to nil. H28 is one of Troitzky's more recent pieces. It spurred the tourney judge to a burst of lyricism on the occasion of placing it highly: "This study shows the positional draw theme. The construction is light and refined. One senses the master's fist. This is after we are convinced that the black queen really is in hock - we don't want to believe it, there is so much space on the board. There has to be a way out, but, my goodness, there is not." H29 is a perpetual motion study, a movement that goes on for ever, an attack that never stops. The idea is geometrical, with the knight marking out
an elongated rhombus, periodically revisiting the same square. With a combined attack on black rook and king the knight in one variation describes the rhombus from right to left, in another from left to right, and it could even be now to the right, now to the left, in which case the periodicity is 4, 6, 8 or 10 moves, depending on how Black plays. The checks to the black king serve as jumping-off platforms for the tireless harrying of the black rook.

Sub-dividing the incarceration theme for the use of the school of young soviet composers as a creative exercise, was my doing. But the honour of elaborating this highly interesting idea that is excellently suited to accompany other study ideas (such as pinning, and lengthy king journeys) fell to Troitzky and to him alone. The incarceration of a bishop, incarceration of a bishop by underpromotion, incarceration in conjunction with black counterplay based on a pin, all of these can be found chez Troitzky long before the positions by myself, by Gurvich, by Korolkov and many another composer. Two illustrations only must suffice, though dozens are on tap. In every case we find something new, unexpected and valuable in both the aesthetic and practical senses. Two further studies show the same theme, namely the blocking in of a knight on a corner square.

**H30: Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1912.**

```plaintext
flc1 0031.44 Draw
1.\text{Se}5 \text{h}2 2.\text{Sd}3^+ \text{Kd}2! 3.\text{Sf}2 \text{Bx}b3 4.\text{Sh}1! \text{Bc}4+
5.\text{Sx}2 \text{Bxa}6 stalemate.
```

**H31: A.O. Herbstman, 1928**

```plaintext
h3h1 0043.65 Draw
1.\text{Bd}4+! \text{Kx}d4 2.\text{a}8Q \text{Rc}1+ 3.\text{Kb}2 \text{c}3+ 4.\text{Kxb}3 \text{Rb}1+ 5.\text{Ka}2 \text{Rb}2+ 6.\text{Ka}3 \text{Bd}6+ 7.\text{Ka}4 \text{Ra}2+ 8.\text{Kb}3! \text{Rx}a8 stalemate.
```

The knight speeds merrily to its quiet sepulchre in H30, while in H31 it doesn't move at all. Forcing play is absent from the solution to H30, while H31 is packed with necessity. White effectively doing nothing but react to the black hammer-blows. It is true that H31 has a lighter, more economical, construction than H30, and the play is longer, but in the light of the aforementioned defects it is far from satisfactory to place H31 on the same level as H30, which was composed 16 years earlier. The most stringent critique must give preference to H30.

**H32: Shakhmaty, 1924.**

```plaintext
H32 shows incarceration by underpromotion to bishop. 1.\text{Bg}8 \text{Bx}g8 2.\text{h}7 \text{Bx}h7. By decoying the black bishop from f7 to h7 White defers the black mating threat from three to four moves - e6-e5, followed by \text{Bx}g8-d5-g2. This allows the white pawn time to promote: 3.b6 \text{Sa}6 4.b7 \text{Sh}8! Otherwise White achieves stalemate simply by the further advance and sacrifice of his pawns. 5.a6 \text{Bg}8 6.a7 e5 7.a8B!!, and the black knight cannot move because of b7-b8Q. The promoted bishop is incarcerated! (In another study published in Deutsche Schachzeitung in 1*908 Black achieves just such an incarceration.)
```

*Note. Herbstman chooses not to give the position, which is this:

A.A. Troitzky (Vilna) 
Deutsche Schachzeitung (vi1908) 
dedicated to F.Amelung in Riga

h8f8 0040.54 a8d1 a6b6e6f7b6a3b2e7h7 7/6.
The irregular stipulation reads: "White to move - can either side win?"

Solution: 1.\text{Be}4 (for \text{a}7) \text{Bc}2/ii 2.\text{Bxc}2 a2/ii

---

*Note. Herbstman chooses not to give the position, which is this:

A.A. Troitzky (Vilna) 
Deutsche Schachzeitung (vi1908) 
dedicated to F.Amelung in Riga

h8f8 0040.54 a8d1 a6b6e6f7b6a3b2e7h7 7/6.
The irregular stipulation reads: "White to move - can either side win?"

Solution: 1.\text{Be}4 (for \text{a}7) \text{Bc}2/ii 2.\text{Bxc}2 a2/ii
3. Bb1 iii a1B, and now that White dare not move his bishop (because of promotion with discovered check), neither side can win!

i) a2? 2.Bb1, followed by 3.b7 and 4.b8Q+.

ii) An attempt to win. If b1Q a2 4.Bxa2 stalemate.

iii) 3.b7? b1Q. Or 3.a7? a1Q. Black’s reply is his only move.

In introducing the present article I laid emphasis on the claim that Troitzky established a link between the game and the study at the level of ideas. The studies we have seen demonstrate the expression in artistic form of the general principles that underlie the game of chess and its tactics: the struggle for space, for time, for material; domination, rejection of material on offer, breakthrough, sacrifice and suchlike. But the highest expression of this link at the level of ideas is to be seen in the remarkable investigation of the struggle of king and two knights against king and pawn, on which Troitzky laboured many years. [The reader can roughly quantify 'many' for himself by careful reading of Troitzky’s ‘autobiography’, scheduled for EG’s next issue. Tr.]

As every master knows, it is a paradox of chess that two knights are unable to checkmate the ‘bare’ king if the defence, by convention black, plays correctly, since the mating move must be preceded by a position of stalemate. A few examples of positions where the black side loses because he has a pawn are to be found in the older chess treatises: the pawn’s presence gives Black a move so that the stalemate is inoperative. In the latter half of the 18th century Taruffi and Chapais gave some specific examples of this possibility: in the Schachzeitung of 1862-63, and in the fourth edition of the Handbuch, Von der Lasa reproduced three such positions taken from manuscript sources in his sumptuous library. In the 19th century Bledow, Mendheim, Bolton, Kling and Horwitz, Guretzky-Cornitz, H.F. L.Mayer, P.K.Plotitsyn and others widened the scope of ideas applying to this most interesting of endgames, but they drew no further, more specific conclusions. It was left to Troitzky in his articles published from 1906 to 1910 in the Deutsche Schachzeitung to unveil to the chess world the principles underlying the struggle of two knights against pawn (or selected pawns). He defined precisely on which squares a single pawn must be held for the win to be unconditional; he established a group of exceptions, and he set down the pawn’s positions for a loss or a draw depending on certain precise circumstances; and he demonstrated techniques for halting pawns and gradually confining the black king, so as to drive the latter into a mating net by application of the dynamic interacting potential of the white men.

In Troitzky’s own words: “Wherever the black king may be White wins without exception only in the cases where a black pawn is blocked on a4, b6, c5, d4, e4, f6, h4 or higher up the board - 26 cases in all. (The rook’s pawn case was absorbed into this number only after Troitzky had pin-pointed the winning combination involving the sacrifice of a knight.) And for the following pairs of pawns: h3 and f4 (a3 and c4), e3 and f4 (d5 and c4), f6 and g6 (c6 and b5), h6 and g6 (a6 and b5), c4 and d2 (f4 and e2) - 38 cases in all. In addition cases could occur where a chance middle-game exchanging combination gives rise to an exceptional losing position with the pawn on any square at all, or even with several pawns. From the foregoing it follows that this endgame is not as abstruse or arcane as was thought - one should not run away from it.”

Troitzky was not content with these specific research results: he used them for artistic ends as well, creating a series of noteworthy studies based on the two knights against pawn struggle. The reader will find in the present work a great number of studies that in one way or another link with this struggle: in some it is the central idea, in others it relates to a variation, or to a try, or to black counterplay, and so on.

This survey of Troitzky’s work, modest as it has been, would be incomplete without taking account of the remarkable ability of our composer not only to discover the essential core and beauty of this or that single chess idea, but to combine several of them together into one unified product.

H33: Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1914.
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h1a6 0341.43. Win
1. Sc7+ Rxc7 2.dxc7 b1R+!! 3.Kb2 Rb7! 4.a8R!!
H34: 1917

\[\text{Draw}\]

1.\text{a7} B\text{a7+} 2.\text{Kd7} B\text{f4+} 3.\text{Kd8}! B\text{g4+} 4.\text{Kd7} Q\text{h8+} 5.\text{Kc6} Q\text{xa8} stalemate. But not 3.\text{Kc6}? B\text{f3} 4.\text{exf3} h\text{h1R}!! wins, nor 3.\text{Kd8}? B\text{f3} 4.\text{exf3} h\text{h1R}!! wins.

In H33 we see a rook promotion in black counterplay aiming at subsequent incarceration of a bishop with paralysing pin of the promoted rook - a trap which White overtrumps by himself choosing to promote to a rook. In H34 White attains stalemate by extremely subtle play that skirts round two otherwise winning underpromotions of a black pawn to bishop and rook. The theme of two underpromotions in black play is combined with the 'mirror' stalemate theme.

Even this swift survey of the treasure-house of ideas enables us to look at the excellence of the structure of chess poetry erected by Troitzky in pursuit of his chosen activity. We should underline that the full flowering of his talent is taking place in the era following the October Revolution. That is why we are entitled to recognise Troitzky as the teacher and moral inspiration of Soviet study composers.

3.

It remains for us to consider the theory of the chess study worked out by Troitzky and published by him already in 1910. [The late John Selman tracked down the Niva article, secured a translation, and it appeared in EG in 1968.]

We shall take a series of extracts from his article, practically forgotten today. "The fundamental principles of the art of composing chess studies":

"A chess study is a chess position on the chessboard that could have occurred in a game where one side, white by convention, offers to conclude the game either by winning or by forcing a draw.

"A study may arise in either of two ways: from a practical game, or by an effort of creativity. In the latter case the author should make the position not only possible in general, but such that it might have arisen through normal moves in a game.

"However varied study themes may be, their combinations can still be placed in one of two categories: 1) middle-game combinations, and 2) endgame combinations.

"As with all artistic endeavour the study can be considered from the standpoint of form and of content.

"The content of a study, considered as an artistic product, is the resolution of an advantage present in the position or in having the move. [But not an advantage in material. AH]"

Thus far Troitzky on the study's essence and origin. His opinion runs counter to the standpoint adopted by certain influential West European masters.

In his introduction to the collection of Rinck's studies Johann Berger wrote: "The straightforward relationship of the study to the practical ending is that the study brilliantly illustrates and demonstrates important exceptions to a general rule. (The italics are mine. AH) These exceptions may sometimes cross boundaries that could never happen in the practical game."

H. Rinck, for example, who is one of the world's leading composers, defines the essence of the study in the same way.

And J. Mieses writes: "Studies essentially represent significant additions to theory's endgame chapter, demonstrating exceptions to general rules."

Two things stand out from such definitions: the first is the connection of the study only with the endgame phase of chess, and the second is the 'exception' relationship of the study to the bases of chess, namely chess theory.

Troitzky's ground rules laid down 24 years ago stress the study's link not only to the endgame but to the middlegame phase, a link whose strength is corroborated by the whole story of the development of the study and which today, now that we have the very specific themes such as positional draw, incarceration and pinning, and more themes from problemdom, has received such a dazzling impulse to creativity. This is our first point. Our second is that Troitzky asserts that the study is not at all about exceptions to general rules of chess theory. Such an attitude is very superficial, being based merely on the relative strengths of the competing forces, something that applies only to primitive endgames and takes into account only, for example, cases such as king and queen against king, or king and rook against king, but not applying to involved positions where evaluation must consider not just the material strength but also the situation, chiefly the
situation with respect to time, to space and to the material elements with their mutual supports and interactions. In a study White is the weaker side (if White is the stronger side, according to Troitzky, the study ceases to be artistic), so that when White wins or draws it is not because he demonstrates an exception to the rules but because, being inferior in material, he is superior in time and in space, his pieces working together in a coordinated and harmonious way. In a study it is indeed the stronger side that makes out, but the strength is transmuted: it relates to the quantity and quality of the pieces, and is expressed in other components characteristic of chess as a game.

[AJR: For what it is worth, my considered view is that Black's moves in a study are determined by applying (a sophisticated interpretation of) current endgame theory, which White nevertheless outweighs: one can call the resultant entity either 'an exception to the rules' or 'the realisation of something deeper than material'. Troitzky, with Herbstman's assistance, has contributed a priceless analytic appreciation of that 'something deeper', but the alleged conflict is, I suggest, largely artificial.]

Troitzky dwells at length on technique in composing studies.

"A study acquires value as a work of art from the complexity and richness of its idea. What is most attractive about chess as a game is the element of context. It is this that has to be given expression by allowing the defeated side a range of defensive devices in the course of the solution. The black pieces must not be too cramped: their positioning must give rise to many variations, and play should not be too short."

In his description of the embryology of the study, Troitzky refers to broadening, deepening and artistic execution - at the level of ideas.

"If variations are not inherent in the theme they can be introduced as consequences of manipulating the theme to complicate it and thereby enhance its significance. Even the simplest of moves such as for example a knight check with attack on the queen, becomes interesting if it arises in many variations."

"The deepening of an idea occurs with the unearthing of that position out of which the position develops that was chosen for the theme in the first place. The introductory moves of the solution, leading from the first position to the second, may be called preparatory. The deepening of themes is greater the more links there are between the play that follows and the preparatory play; and also the greater the freedom of the struggle, in other words the greater the number of variations that arise. Therefore moves of a brutally forcing nature, such as a series of sacrifices whose refusal is out of the question, should be as few as possible. If a move threatens something then the threat should be weak, in the sense that it ought to be distant rather than immediate. Quiet moves of the preparative waiting (i.e., zugzwang) or pure waiting (tempo move) types are excellent. The exchange of the weakest piece for the strongest must be judged inartistic and therefore inadmissible. The least objectionable capture is of a very weak pawn or the exchange of the strongest piece for the weakest (i.e., a sacrifice)."

These two last precepts apply to the first move or to the introductory moves. Most recently Troitzky has added the following statement: "I sanction the addition of extra material (to provide scope for combinations and sacrifices) in my own studies practically only in the case of two knights against pawn(s) and specifically on the grounds of the fact that White in some way or another has to have the advantage of two whole pieces."

Troitzky places extraordinary value on artistic presentation, which "at all stages demands the observance of the principles of economy, both of means and of force. Not a single man should be present that does not play some part in the solution. Sometimes this part can be entirely passive. For instance, at most one black piece can be present to prevent a second solution. In this case the additional black force must be the minimum necessary to ensure the desired outcome. In general, in pursuit of any aim the composer should not add any new man to the board until he has convinced himself that a rearrangement of the existing pieces, or the replacement of one or more, will not do the trick. The newly introduced man must be no stronger than the duties required of it. This relates as much to black force as it does to white."

"Purity of stalemate, mate and other positions will follow as consequences of observing these requirements."

Later, while establishing the principle of 'the exclusivity of a theme', [This phrase is explained in the second paragraph of this section.] Troitzky added the following to the above precepts: "As regards the strict adherence to these rules, I will confine myself to the view that minor deviations are sometimes unavoidable. There are themes which cannot be implemented otherwise, and some of these are of considerable interest."

Thus established by Troitzky, the theory of the