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EG readers may have experienced *deja vu* at Kuryatnikov’s No 11259 (EG 132; HM V.Neidze-60 JT), which hinges on the same complex positional draw as Markov’s No 11048 (EG 130; originals column). Here we have not plagiarism but a genuine coincidence: the composers could not have known of each other’s work, and the two studies have fully realized introductions whose only common element is the pawn sacrifice at e5. (Markov’s introduction has the advantage of a thematic try that fails by letting the Black King too close to the action.) Evidently Kuryatnikov and Markov independently found the same extension of a known positional draw. I leave it to readers better versed in statistics than I to speculate on the significance of such coincidences for the state of our art.

The saga of the aristocratic full-point mutual Zugzwang has apparently reached an end, and there is a lull in submissions of originals to this column (composers take note!). I thus take this occasion to present with Lewis Stiller’s permission some of the results of his computer analysis of six-piece endgames that have not yet appeared in print: diagrams and analysis for the three (half-point) mutual Zugzwangs in GBR class 4301. As far as I know none of these positions was discovered prior to Lewis Stiller’s work. According to his 1992 computation, there are 1780 positions of mutual Zugzwang with Q+R vs. Q+S in which the R side stands to win. Many of them appear to lie beyond human analysis — at any rate the computer analysis indicates that this endgame is quite deep and contains positions that take the R side 71 moves to win with best play. On the other hand there are only three position of mutual Zugzwang that favor the S side, including the following position with a striking hidden point:

**No 11316 *C* Lewis Stiller, 1992**

```
clal 4301.00 3/3
WTM draws, BTM loses
```

Here and in the sequel, the *diagram* is *C*, but the *analysis* is not: it is the result of this human’s efforts, and is subject to human error. This is due to the fact that it takes much less space (“RAM”) on the computer to record whether each possible position is won or not than it does to store the number of moves it takes to win each won position;
Lewis had access to a computer that could accommodate the former but not the latter. Thus he could not retrieve an optimal-play line for a given won position. (That Lewis was able to do this for other six-man classes such as 0116 was thanks to a repeated piece, a Black Knight in that case, which halves the number of possible positions and made it feasible to store win lengths.) Fortunately there seem to be few enough ways for Q+S to defeat Q+R that human analysis is feasible. That BTM loses is easy enough: the mate threat Qa4 immobilizes the Black Queen, and the only Rook moves which don’t allow Qb1 or Qa8 and mate are 1... Rb4, when 2.Qa8+ Ra4 3.Sxa4 intending 4.Sc3(c5)+ wins (but not 2.Qxb4? Qd2+!), and 1... Rb8, when 2.Qe5! wins since Black can no longer defend the double threat 3.Sb5+, 3.Qa5+ with 2... Qc7. WTM can attack, but in vain: 1.Qe5 Qc7, 1.Qe4 Ra7 2.Qb3(b4) Qb7, and 1.Qe2 (for Qa2(a6) mating) Rb1+! 2.Sxb1 Qc6(7,8)+ all draw. But isn’t 1.Qe2 decisive? No: Black defends with Qd2+!! 2.Qxd2 (Kxd2 Rb2) Rb1+ 3.Sxb1 (Kc2 Rb2+) stalemate!

For the sake of completeness we include the remaining two positions:

No 11317 *C* Lewis Stiller, 1992

![Chessboard](image1)

clal 4301.00 3/3

WTM draws, BTM loses

BTM gets mated in the corner.

WTM 1.Qd4 (S- ? Qb1#) Qa3 draws, e.g. 2.Sc4 Qb4 3.Qa7+ Ra2 4.Qg7+ Rb2 5.Sxb2 Qf4+ and Qf1(2)+ etc.

No 11318 *C* Lewis Stiller, 1992

![Chessboard](image2)

ecl1 4301.00 3/3

WTM draws, BTM loses

Clearly BTM loses: Rook moves allow Qb1#, Queen moves unpin the Knight and thus lose to Sc2, and the King has no moves at all. WTM must move his King, when Black has perpetual check. Unfortunately that’s all he has (else we would have a six-man aristocratic full-point Zugzwang): if White keeps his King near d2, Black
cannot free his other pieces. For
instance 1.Ke2 Qe5+ 2.Kd3 Qd6+
3.Ke2 Qd2+ 4.Kf3 Qd3+ 5.Kf2 and
if Black stops checking White has

The same computer under Stiller’s
tutelage also found six mutual
Zugzwangs with Q+B vs. Q+R in
which the B side stands to win (as
opposed to 1410 mutual
Zugzwangs favoring the Rook).
All are comprehensible, with only
one requiring some easy 4010
analysis; to my knowledge none
has appeared previously in either
analysis or endgame study. How
many of these six can the reader
find? Can any of these six, or the
three 4301 mutual Zugzwangs
above, be used in an artistic
damgame study?

SPOTLIGHT
editor: Jürgen Fleck

Many thanks to Spotlight’s
contributors Mario Campioli (Italy),
Peter Gyarmati (Hungary), Harold
van der Heijden (Netherlands),
Jan Lerch (Czech Republic),
Michael Roxiau (Germany) and
Jarl Ulrichsen (Norway).

EG 131
No 11145, J.Tazberik, M.Hlinka.
In EG 132 I gave the line 10....
Ra1 11.Ra7 (11.e5 Kg7) Sc1
12.Kc3 Sd3 13.e5 Kf8 14.e6 Ke8
(reciprocal zugzwang) as winning
for Black. However, MR gave the
surprising 11.Ra4 (threatening to
take on e2 and losing a tempo in
advance) Sf4(c1) 12.Kc3 Sd3
13.Ra7, when the reciprocal
zugzwang works in White’s favour:
13.... Kf8 14.e5 Ke8 15.e6 draw.
So the study is sound after all.
Frankly, I prefer the line 10.... Ra1
to the composers’s main line.

EG 132
No 11243, J.Pospisil. Unsound.
Several readers claim a draw for
Black after 2.... Qd7+ 3.Kf6 Qd8+.
The knight is only taken after the
white king has been driven to the
south-east corner of the board.
However, White wins by 1.Sc8
Qe8+ 2.Kg7 Kc5 3.d6 Qd7+ 4.Kf6
Qd8+ 5.Ke5 Qh8+ 6.Ke4 (pointed
out by JL). Black cannot prevent
the white king from finally
penetrating into the black camp,
e.g. 6.... Qh7+ 7.Kf4 Qh6+ 8.Kf5

No 11249, D.Gurgenidze,
V.Kalandadze. Why did the
authors chose the odd 1.... Kg1 as
the main line? Well, Black intends
to meet 2.Kc7 by 2.... b3 3.Rh3 b2
4.Rb3 Rg2. The more natural 1....
Kg2 would block that square for
the rook and allow a different draw
by 2.Kc7 Kf3 (2.... b3 3.Rh5 Kf2
4.Rb5 Rg3 5.Kxb6 draw) 3.Rh4
(but not 3.Rh5 Ke4 4.Rb5 Kd4
5.Rxb4+ Kc5 6.Rb1 Rg7+) Rg4
4.Rh3+ Rg3 5.Rh2 Rg2 6.Rh1.

No 11250, M.Gogberashvili. Some
supporting lines: 4.a5? Ra7 5.Rb5
Ra6 6.Ke5 Kc4 7.a4 Rh6 draw;
11.a5 Rh7 with an analogous draw;
and finally 4.... Re1 5.a5 Ra1
6.Rh4 winning.
No 11251, A.Kuryatnikov. The
play in the finale phase of the
solution is not unique. A pretty
alternative win is 8.Sc6 a5 9.Ke3
Kb1 13.Sc3+ Kb2 14.Sc4, e.g.
14.... Kbl 15.Sc6 Kb2 16.Sc5 Kb1
Ka1 20.Sc2 Ka2 21.Sc4 Ka1
22.Sc5 Ka2 23.Sc3 Ka1 24.Sc1 a2
25.Sb3 mate.
No 11253, D.Gurgenidze,
V.Kalandadze. The same finale as
No 11280.
No 11254, Y.Afek, N.Kralin.
Unsound. The main defect is 6....
Rh6 7.f7 Kg4 8.Qf8 Kh3 and it’s
White who gets mated.
No 11255, L.M.Gonzales. Is there
a misprint in the given solution?
After 1.... Qb1+ White has several
alternative wins, e.g. 3.Qf3 Sd2
4.Qxa3+ Kb8 5.Qg3 Ka8 6.Qg8+
Qb8 7.Qd5 Sb3 8.Kd7+ Ka7 9.Qc6
wins; or 2.Ka6 Qg6 2.... Qc2
3.Sc4+ Kc8 4.Sc6+ wins; 2.... Qh7
3.Qf8+ Kc7 4.Qg7+ wins; 2.... Kc7
Qg1+ 4.Kc6 and wins. Better is
1.... Qb2+, which leads back to the
solution after 2.Kc6 (2.Ka6 Qh2
draw) Ka8 3.Qf8+ Qb8. MC
wonders what the bPb3 is for.
No 11256, H.Grondijs. Unsound.
JL came up with the following
remarkable line: 2.dxc7 b1Q+
3.Kc6 Qxh7 4.Bd6 Qh3+ (4.... Kg7
5.Ke7 draw) 5.Ke7 Qc8 6.Kf7 Kh7
7.Bf4 (incidentally, this is a
position of reciprocal zugzwang)
Qf5+ (7.... Qg8+ 8.Kg6 Qg6 9.Kd7
Qf7+ 10.Kc8 Qf5+ 11.Kb8 Qb5+
Kg6 9.Kd8 Qf8+ 10.Kd7 Ke7
11.e8S draw.
No 11259, A.Kuryatnikov. A dual:
after simply 1.Bh6 Black has no
threats.
No 11261, G.Amiryan. No
solution: 2.... Kb7 3.e8Q Sc6+ wins
for Black.
No 11262 , E.Markov. No
solution: 3.... Qxb8 4.Qf3+ Ke4+
5.Qxd7 Qb1+ 6.Kd2 Qb2+ 7.Ke1
Qc3+ exchanges queens and wins
quickly.
No 11263, J.Vandiest. Two dual
21.Bf3 Qg2 22.Qf2+ Kh1 23.Be4
and mate; or 15.Qa8+ Kg1 16.Qg8
Kf2 17.Qf8+ Ke3 (17.... Kg1
18.Kh3) 18.Qf3+ Kh2 19.Qe2+
Kc3 20.Qe5+ and wins.
No 11264, E.Markov. No solution:
2.... Qc7+ draws by perpetual
check.
No 11265, V.Kalandadze.
Unsound. There are many alter-
native wins for White, e.g. 8.Rd1
wins; or 7.Rd1 Sc6 8.Sc5 wins; or
4.Rd1 Kc8 5.Sc5 Re5 6.Sc1+ Rc5
7.Sc6+ Kc7 8.Sc5+ Kc6 9.Sc7+
Kc7 10.Rd1 wins. Black has a
better defence in 1.... Sb5, which
draws.
No 11266, E.Chumburidze. The
given move 16.... Qb8 cuts the
solution short. The main line
should run 16.... Ka7 17.Qa6+ Kb8
18.Sd7+ Kc7 19.Qd6+ Kc8
20.Sb6+ Kb7 21.Qc6+ Ka6


No 11270, G.Mzhavanadze. A simpler win is 6.Bc3 Kd1 7.Sf1 (note 7.... a1Q 8.Se3+). Moreover the study is completely anticipated (in superior form) by V.Bulanov, 3rd prize, Bulletin of Central Chess Club of USSR 1968 (EG 22.1196). In case you don't have that issue of EG to hand, here is the position: f4g2 0310.12 gla4.f6c7h3 3/4 +, 1.Bc6+ Kh2 2.f7 Rg8 3.fxg8S Kg1 4.Ke3 h2 5.Bh1 e5 6.Sf6 e4 7.Se4 c3 8.Sg3 (there were different routes from g8 to g3) c2 9.Se2+ Kf1 10.Bf3 Ke1 11.Sc1 Kf1 (11.... h1Q 12.Sd3+) 12.Kd2 Kg1 13.Se2+ and wins.

No 11274, V.Kalandadze. This is after 24.1285 by E.Pogosjants, but the knight promotion has been substituted by a rook promotion.

line.

No 11279, G. Slepyan. Probably this study was eliminated, because it does not compare too favourably with 129.10985 by S. Tkatchenko.

No 11280, A. Shulpetsov. "I expect more from chess composition than the realisation of a material advantage in a combinational way!" (JL).

No 11284, I. Bondar. Sent to more than one tourney: see EG 113.9543.

No 11285, G. Polin. A beautiful domination, but completely anticipated by V. Yakimtchik, 3rd prize, FIDE tourney 1957-58, where Polin’s position (plus an irrelevant black pawn e6) is reached after 4 more or less superfluous introductory moves.


No 11294, I. Yarmonov. The position after 2.Rg3 goes back to O. Duras, Šach 1939.

No 11297, A. Stavrietsky. According to HvdH the knight belongs on f5 and the solution should start 1.Kf1 Sg3+. However, the study is completely anticipated by A. Bor, 2nd HM, Chervony Gmk 1965 (EG 36.2057), f2h1 0110.12 h2g7.g3f5h5 3/4 =, 1.Bg1 f4 2.gxf4 Sf5 3.Kf1 Sg3+ 4.Kf2 h4 5.f5 Sxf5 6.Kf1 Sg3+ 7.Kf2 Se2 8.Kf3 Sxg1+ 9.Kg4 h3 10.Kg3 h2 11.Kf2 draw.


No 11305, V. Kalyagin. An attractive dual: 1.Rf6 (prevents the black queen from checking) Bxe6 (1... Qxe8 2.e7; 1... Bxc6 2.Nd6) 2.Bxe6 Qh2+ 3.Kd3 Qxc7 (3... Qg3+ 4.Kd4 Qxc7 5.Rf7 wins; 3... Qh7+ 4.Rf5 Qxe7 5.Sb6+ is similar to the main line) 4.Sb6+ axb6 5.Rf8+ Ka7 6.Rf7 and wins.

No 11306, V. Dolgov, V. Kolpakov. Unsound, there are many duals: 9.Qa7+; or 9.Qf5+; or 8.Qa7+; or 8.Qe3+; or 7.Qb7+; or 5.Rf2+; or 2.Qb8+ Kf7 3.Rf2+ Kg6 4.Qb6+ Kh7 5.Rh2+ Kg8 6.Qh3+.


No 11312, V. Prigunov. Sent to more than one tourney: see EG 131.11182. Moreover I cannot find

No 11315, V. Kalyagin. A dual: 5.Kxc2+ Kf2 6.Kd1 g3 7.Re2+ transposes into the solution. This spoils the effect of twice not taking the c-pawn.

ARTICLES
editor: John Roycroft

Thompson's CD-ROMs by Harold van der Heijden

Kenneth Thompson made a wonderful contribution to the endgame study world by making his perfect analysis of all 'important' 5-piece endings available on CD-ROM. However, at least once per month I receive or see a false claim, based on the wrong use of the CD-ROMs. This means that all claims of (in)correctness 'based on the CD-ROMs' should be verified by tourney judges, editors of magazines, etc.

An interface is needed to access the databases that are on the CD-ROMs. Several programs are commercially available, and possibly some interfaces are less likely to give erroneous results. I used ChessBase 6.01 to check the positions listed below, which is probably the most popular interface.

First, there a rather insignificant problem. Castling is not allowed/considered, even if the computer-interfaces to the CD-ROMs do so. Although it is not very likely that this 'bug' is causing errors, it is worthwhile to mention:

A. Selesniev
Tidskrift für Schack, 1921

553
The second problem, however, is more significant: a wrong database is used to check a position. Kenneth Thompson has put a README-file on each CD-ROM explaining the format of the databases, as well as listing the available databases on that CD-ROM. Here is the complete list.

CD-ROM 1: BB_N BN_N NN_PN_N PQ_Q PR_R Q_BB Q_BN Q_NN Q_RB Q_RN Q_RR QB_Q QN_N QN_Q QQ_Q QR_Q QR_R RB_R RN_N RN_R RR_R
CD-ROM 2: PN_B QN_B RN_B BN_B NN_B PB_B QB_B RB_B BB_B PB_N QB_N RB_N BB_N BN_N PR_Q QR_Q RR_Q RB_Q RN_Q NNN_
CD-ROM 3: NN_B NN_N NN_P NN_Q NN_R PR_B Q_PR Q_QR Q_RB Q_RN Q_RR QR_B R_BB R_BN R_NN R_PRB PN_R QB_R Q_RN R_RB R_RN RB_B RN_B RR_B
CD-ROM 4: BN_P BN_Q BN_R BN_B BN_N Q_PB Q_QB Q_RB Q_BB Q_BN PR_N QR_N RR_N RB_N RN_N

The name of a database consists of the White (strong side) pieces, '_', and the Black pieces. For each position in a database one bit has the value '0' (not won), or '1' (won). But 'not won' could mean a draw or a loss!

---

M. Karstedt
Deutsches Wochenschach 1911

b6a1 0301.10 3/2 Win
After the position is entered in ChessBase, and the CD-ROMs are consulted, ChessBase advises to insert CD-ROM 3. After doing so, the program doesn't give a win, even when one plays through the whole solution. Close examination of the list above reveals that on the third CD-ROM there is only the endgame R_PN, i.e. the program tries to find a win for the side that has the rook! In this case the position is actually lost for the rook, but as explained above the CD-ROM reports in such a case 'not won'! The endgame-database that is needed in this case (PN_R) is not on any of the 4 CD's, which is a pity! Also note, for example, that the endgame QR_Q (CD 1 and 2) is very different from the endgame Q.OR (CD 3). In the case of the Karstedt-study, in the final position it is obvious that there is something wrong. However,
sometimes confusion arises:

P. Hage
Schach-Echo 1967

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{f3} & \textbf{a3} \\
\hline
\textbf{3001.01} & \textbf{2/3 Win} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{f3a3 3001.01 2/3 Win}

P. Hage 1.Qf4/II Kb2/ii 2.Qb4+ Ka2
3.Qc3 Kb1 4.Qb3+ Ke1 5.Ke2 Sc5
6.Qa2 Sb3 7.Qa3+ wins.

\textbf{i)} 1.Qc7? Sc5! 2.Qxc5+ Kb2;
1.Qa7+? Sa5!; 1.Qf8+? Sc5!

\textbf{ii)} Sa5 2.Qc1+ Kb3 3.Ke2 Sc4
4.Qa1 Sa3 5.Kd2 Sb1+ 6.Kc1, or

Checking this study using the 4th
CD-ROM reveals an unpleasant
surprise. I don’t understand exactly
what is wrong, but the
README-file on the CD-ROM
does not contain the database
\textbf{Q\_PN}, but the CD does! However,
the results reported by ChessBase
are clearly incorrect. For instance
the move 1.Qxb7 (?) is reported as
a winning move! Apart from this
particular \textbf{Q\_PN/PN\_Q?}-endgame,
there is an easy way to avoid er-
rors. Have a look first at an easy
position for that particular
endgame. For instance, the final
position of the Karstedt study cited
above makes it clear that the wrong
database was selected. This is
necessary also for 4-man endings.
The databases on the CD-ROM
also include these endings, to per-
mit the evaluation of positions after
captures. Again one should be
cautious. Trying a position like Kf1
Rd1; Kc3 d2; WTM, or the
Saavedra-position (Kb6 c6; Ka1
Rd5; wtm) will make it clear which
CD-ROM should be used to check
your particular study.

January 1999

In January 1999 we were delighted
to receive a set of closely linked
contributions (which we combine
below) from a young (two years
younger than \textbf{EG}) Azerbaidzhani
composer telling the story of his
early composing experiences. These
essays fill a void in composing
literature, offering the inex-
perienced would-be composer of
studies practical guidance in learn-
ing some of the techniques and
thereby acquiring confidence. We
glimpse the pleasure and the pain
of composing. We sense the emer-
gence of artistic judgement. In
deerence to the young talent we
are relaxing our severe attitude
towards exclamation marks, for
once retaining all that came with
the author’s text.

---

\textbf{How I became a composer}

In Sumgait, a town on the western
shore of the Caspian Sea, there is a
beautiful two-storied building. It is
a chess school that has recently
celebrated 20 years since its foun-
dation. As many as 500 school-
children attend. It was where I
myself acquired the elements of chess. Now not only do I work today in that very place as trainer, but have done so for the last eight years.

Even before 1982, when I composed my first study at the age of 15, I used to amuse myself by devising combinations of one sort or another and adding bits and pieces of my own. A1 and A2 will illustrate the kind of thing.

A1

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{e1c6 4540.12 6/6 Win} \\
\text{1.Rxg6+! Qxg6 2.Bd5+! Kxd5} \\
\text{3.0-0-0+!! Ke4 4.Qe7+ Kb5} \\
\text{5.Rd5+ Ka6 6.Qc7+ Kb7 7.Rd7+} \\
\text{Kb8 8.Qc7+ wins.}
\end{array}
\]

A2

\[
\begin{array}{c}
b1h8 4876.22 7/10 Win \\
\text{1.Rh2+ Kg8 2.Rh8+! Kxh8 3.Qh2+} \\
\text{Kg8 4.Qh8+!! Kxh8 5.Rh2+ Kg8} \\
\text{6.Bb3+ Kf8 7.Rh8+ and mate next move.}
\end{array}
\]

The studies that I came across at that time left such a deep impression, especially when checkmate was inflicted by a bishop or knight, that I simply had to take the plunge and try to compose something myself. A3 was the result, no more than a 'sprint' solution, but it gave me pleasure, and I made a few more - such as A4. Of course they were simple and naive. I showed them only to close friends, but the reader will understand how proud I was.

My first study in print appeared in 1987, rather by accident. The thing was that in 1984 I entered the Azerbaidzhan State Institute of Physical Culture in its chess section where the teacher was Aleksandr Sarychev, now deceased.

A3

\[
\begin{array}{c}
a4a7 0110.02 3/3 Draw \\
\text{1.Bb6+! Kxb6 2.Rxg2! b1Q} \\
\text{3.Rb2+! Qxb2 stalemate.}
\end{array}
\]
A4

B.Rustamov was at the same time my tutor for the course project "The role of studies in the training of young chessplayers", which I completed in 1990.
And so I gradually became enamoured of studies, but I still composed them only occasionally. The interest became serious only in 1994 when the Azerbaidzhani Commission for Chess Composition approached me for training for the 5.WCCT, giving me the impulse to renewed activity. Until that time I had not worked with themes, so I had to become better informed. I plunged into chess study literature.

Creative conflict in the chess composition classics

Familiarity with the classics is of great help to the neophyte composer. That was how my apprenticeship began. There were studies that drew one to them like a magnet, studies that simply delighted, studies where I tried to switch the order of the introductory moves, or managed to add a move or two. And I began to show results.
First, pawn studies, a category that does not figure significantly in the overall domain. There are relatively few composers who have specialised in pawn studies, only
Grigoriev and Zinar standing out. After looking closely at their output I put together over 20 of my own. It is a rare achievement to add anything to a study by Grigoriev. But in one instance I succeeded in modifying the introduction and adding several moves.

\[ A1 \]

N.D. Grigoriev
"Collection of studies", 1954

\[ Ala \]

I. Aliev
(after Grigoriev, 1954)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a6d5 0000.23} \\
\text{3/4 Win} \\
1. h5 Ke6 2. h6 Kf7 3. h7 Kg7 4. g6 \\
11. Kb6 a2 12. g7+! Kh7 13. Kf7 \\
a1Q 14. g8Q+ Kh6 15. Qg6 mate.
\end{array}
\]

A changed introduction transforms an analytical study into a combinative one.

\[ A2 \]

A. V. Kovalenko
4th prize, Shakhmatny listok, 1927

\[
\begin{array}{c}
b7a5 0000.23 \\
3/4 Draw \\
4. Kxf4!! exf2 5. Ke3!! f1Q(f1R) \\
\text{stalemate.}
\end{array}
\]
A2a  I.Aliiev  
(after A.V.Kovalenko)  
_Azerbaidzhan_, 1995

b8c5 0000.34  4/5 Draw  
1.a5! Kb5 2.Kb7!  
Kxa5 3.Kxc6, and as in A2.  

i) 1.Kb7? e3! 2.fxe3/ii fxe3 3.a5 f4  
4.a6 f3 5.a7/iii fxe2 6.a8Q e1Q  
7.Qf8+ Kb5 and Black wins.  


iii) 5.exf3 e2 6.a7 e1Q 7.a8Q Qb1+  
Qc2+ wins.

In A3a a couple of moves are  
added to Rinck's well-known 'a-  
nti-Réti' study A3.

A3  Henri Rinck  
_Revue suisse d'Échecs_, 1922

h2a2 0000.11  2/2 Win

1.a4 Kb3 2.a5, with:  
- Kc4 3.a6 Kd3 4.a7 f2 5.a8Q  
fQ 6.Qa6+ wins, or  
- Kc3 3.Kg1!! Kd4 4.a6 Ke3  
5.Kf1! wins.  

A3a  I.Aliiev  
(after H.Rinck)  
h2b4 0000.22  3/3 Win  
Not 1.Kxh3? Kxb3 2.a5 Kc4 3.a6  
Kd3 4.a7 f2 draw, but: 1.Kg3!! h2!  
2.Kxh2 Kxb3, and now as Rinck.

A4  M.A.Aizenshtat  
_Fizichna kultura_, 1931

a6f5 0000.32  4/3 Win  
1.h4, with:  
- f6 2.h6 Kg6 3.h5+! Kxh6 4.exf6  
wins, or  
- Kxe5 2.h6 Kf6 3.h5 wins.  

As Bondarenko wrote in his book  
"The study in the pawn endgame" -
'a short, but instructive combination'.

\[A4a\] I. Aliev

(after Aizenshtat)

\[g1c2\] 0000.33 4/4 Win
1. h4! Kd3 2. g4 Ke4 3. gxf5 Kf5/i
4. Kf2 f6 5. h6 Kg6 6. h5+

i) Kxe5 4. h6 Kf6 5. h5.

The short but instructive study has been lengthened by a few moves.

\[A5\] I. L. Maizelis, 1925

\[f7b2\] 0000.11 2/2 Win


\[A5a\] I. L. Maizelis

version by I. Aliev

\[g8a1\] 0000.11 a6a7 2/2+
1. Kf7! Kb2, and as in A5.

Maizelis may consciously have preferred his more natural K-positions to an increase in solution length of one move. AJR

\[A6\] was published in 1951. It turned out to have a second solution, spotted by D. Gurgenidze, who has proposed a version based on the cook. However, a correction preserving the original idea is possible, as A6b shows.

\[A6\] Yu. Tsikovani

Norchi Lenineni, 1951

\[g7c1\] 0300.31 4/3 Win
1. h7 Rg2+ 2. Kf7 Rf2+ 3. Ke7 Re2+
Rd2+ 7. Ke7 Re2+ 8. Kf7 Rf2+

p560


**A6a** D. Gurgenidze
after Tsikovani (1951)

```
g7fl 0300.21 c2.h3h6c7 3/3+.
```

**A6b** I. Aliev
after Tsikovani

```
h8h4 0300.31 4/3 Win
1. Kg7/i and as before (A6) until 10... Rg5 11. h8Q Rxh5+ 12. Kg7 Rxh8 13. Kxh8 Kg5 14. a4 wins.

i) Not 1.a4? Rg2! 2. a5 Kxh5 3. a6 Kg6! and if 4. Kg8 Kh6+ 5. Kh8 Rd2, or if 4. a7 Ra2 5. Kg8 Rxa7.
```

**A7a** I. Aliev

correction of N. Shakhtakhtinsky

```
h5h7 0013.20 4/2 Draw

Then I had this thought: why bother to correct A7? And sure enough, A7b emerged.


A7 N. Shakhtakhtinsky

Baku, 1970


A7 N. Shakhtakhtinsky

Baku, 1970

A7b I. Aliev
Die Schwalbe, 1998

A8 M. Liburkin and F. Bondarenko
2nd prize, All-Union tourney, 1950

A8a I. Aliev
(after Liburkin and Bondarenko)

i) There is a very strong try in:
Kxh2 4.e5 Bb4 5.e6 Bb8! 6.Ke5
Kd6 draw.
The beautiful try variation makes up for the unnatural position of
wSg2 at the start. With a different
jumping-off point I came up with
A8a, improving the naturalness but
losing the strong try.

A9 F. Bondarenko
Put' k kommunizmu, 1977

Simply by adding a black pawn A9
becomes the 'twin' A9a.
i) 2.h4? Kc7 3.Bxc6 Kd6!

A0a I.Aliev
(after F.Bondarenko, 1977)

Another opportunity to prefix a move is in A10, again by Bondarenko.
A10 F.Bondarenko
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1952

Jindrich Fritz’ beautiful A11 went round the world in its day. But it leaps to the eye to ask why the white bishop on a8 may not somehow be replaced by a queen.
A11 J.Fritz
1st prize, Svobodne Slovo, 1961

h5a5 0310.21 4/3 Win
1.Bh1! Rxh1 2.a8Q Rdl! 3.Qh1!!
Rxh1 4.a7 Rg1 5.a8Q+ Kb4
A12a I.Aliiev  
(after V. and M.Platov, 1908)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a7g2} 0310.10 3/2 \text{Win} \\
1. \text{h7} \text{Ra1+} 2. \text{Kb7} \text{Rb1+} 3. \text{Kc7} \\
\text{Rc1+} 4. \text{Bc2!} \text{Rxe2+} (\text{Rh1}; \text{Be4+}) \\
5. \text{Kd7} \text{Rd2+} 6. \text{Ke7} \text{Re2+} 7. \text{Kf7} \\
\text{Rf2+} 8. \text{Kg7} \text{wins.}
\end{array}
\]

**Twin studies**

A small modification converts A13 into the 'twin'.

A13 S.Rumyantsev  
Karseladze MT, 1970

\[
\begin{array}{c}
b4c8 0001.31 5/2 \text{Draw} \\
1. \text{Sd6+} \text{Kd7} 2. \text{f7} \text{Ke7} 3. \text{f6+} \text{Kf8} \\
4. \text{Sc4} \text{g1Q} 5. \text{Se5} \text{Qd4+} 6. \text{Kb5} \text{Qc3} \\
7. \text{Kb6}, \text{and the lone bQ can achieve nothing.}
\end{array}
\]
A13a  L.Aliiev
(after Rumyantsev, 1970)

1.b7 Se3+ 2.Ke2 c2 3.Kd2 c3+ 4.Kc1 Sf5! 5.b8Q Sd4 - so far as of old. But the new placement of bK allows wQ more possibilities.
6.Qg8 Kh5 7.Qg7 Kh4 8.Qg6 Kh3 9.Qg5 Kh2 10.Qg4 Kh1 11.Qh3+! (Qg3? Se2+;) Kg1 12.Qg3+ Kf1 13.Qh2 Ke1 14.Qg2, and the queen wins the duel.

The idea shown in A14 with a black knight can also be shown (A14a) with a bishop.

A14  G.Afanasiev
Krasnaya zvezda, 1950


A14a  L.Aliiev
(after Afanasiev, 1950)


In G.Kasparyan’s book The pawn’s strength we find A15, by L.Prokeš.

A15  L.Prokeš
Sach, 1943

1.b6, with:
- Kc6 2.Bb5+! Kxb5 3.b7 wins,
or
- Bc6 2.Bd5! wins.
But this can readily be extended by a couple of moves (A15a).
ILHAM ALIEV
(After Prokes, 1943)

1.b4 Ke5 2.b5 Kd6, reaching the
Czech composer’s initial position.

Over a period of four years my
labours have produced over 80
studies. Discussion and presentation
could have been at greater length,
but there is no point in standing
still. The material we have seen has
in the natural course of events sug-
gested ideas for totally new studies
- but that is another story.

Ilham Aliyev
Sumgait, Azerbaijan
21/1999

DIAGRAMS AND
SOLUTIONS

editors: John Roycroft
Harold v.d. Heijden

Mikhail Yakovlevich Podgaets-50
jubilee tourney.

The celebrant has been FIDE
Champion Anatoly Karpov’s
constant trainer.

This formal international tourney
was organized by the United Chess
and Draughts Club of Odessa and
the Black Sea Association of Chess
Composers and was judged by
M.Podgaets and S.Tkachenko.
The provisional award was
published on pages 10-18 from a
special number of the bulletin of
"OLJILIK", the Odessa Chess and
Draughts Club 28xii97 and was
signed by both judges.

54 entries by 43 composers from
14 countries, namely Austria, Ar-
gentina, Armenia, Belarus, Ger-
many, Italy, Israel, Spain, Moldova,
New Zealand, Poland, Russia, Uk-
raine and Finland. 16 studies
published.

No 11319 V.Kalashnikov,
S.Osintsev and A.Selivanov
(Russia)
1st prize Podgaets-50JT

b6e5 0033.30 4/3 Draw

No 11319 V.Kalashnikov,
S.Osintsev and A.Selivanov
(Russia) 1.Kc7/ii Sa3/ii 2.Kb8 Kd6
3.c4/iii, with:
- Sxc4 4.a8Q Bxa8 5.a7 (Kxa8?
Kc7;) Sb6 stalemate, indeed, ideal
stalemate, or
- Kd7 4.c5/iv Sh5 5.c6+ Bxc6
6.a8Q Bxa8 7.a7 Sc7 and, would
you believe it, a second ideal stalemate.


ii) The line: Sxc3 2.Kb8 Kd6 3.a8Q Bxa8 4.Kxa8 Kc7 5.a7, explains the main line self-denial.

iii) Again we must look at alternatives, to see what difference, if any, there is to what we have already seen. 3.a8Q? Bxa8 4.Kxa8 Kc7 - no change - and, in this, 4.c4 Kc6 5.a7, with an unexpected reci-zug: Kd7 6.c5 Sb5 7.c6 Kd8 8.c7+ Sxe7 and the Black cannot improve on a stalemate outcome. However, Black can improve, with 4...Kd7 5.a7 Kc6, and reci-zug operates for Black: 6.c5 Sb5 7.Kxa8 Kc7 8.c6 Kc8 9.c7 Sxe7 mate, thanks to non-capture of that cp.

iv) 4.a8Q? Bxa8 5.a7 Kc6 wins. "A great miniature with such an un-chesslike theme. White with dignity withstands the temptation to snap up the black bishop, conducting the struggle down to a pair of ideal stalemates." One could well add that both sides play at non-capture - a chess 'stand-off'.
ily harasses bB to play to d6. He pins his hopes on his leader.

v) Is it a positional draw? bS would like to play to e4, [What about c2? AJR] and why not?

vi) Aiee! bS sees that e4 is occupied by his own chief!

"A subtle logical study with energetic wR, preparative 'feints' and like manoeuvres force the black pieces to get in each others' way by obstruction and line interference. If only a drop of blood were spilt! This is a great creative success for the most senior Ukrainian composer."

No 11321 Gamlet Amiryan (Armenia)
3rd prize Podgaets-50JT

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
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d8d6 0740.34 6/8 Draw


ii) "The key position is reached after an unassuming introduction. The untouchable bR underlines the threat of discovered mate (Kc7), and on top of that 6...e4 is threatened for a second battery mate by 7.Kc5!"

iii) Bd5 7.Qxg8 Kc7+ 8.Qxd5.

iv) "Putting an end to the attentions of his opposite number and renewing the c5-c4 threat."

v) White's intended counter was 9.Qxg8 Kc7+ 10.Bg2.

vi) And now if c4; White has 9.Qxf8 Kc7+ 10.Bf3 lined up.

vii) With control of e4.


x) 15.Qd8? Re8 16.Qxe8 Kc7 mate.


"A subtle and instructive duel with romantic nuances. A pity that the clumsy intro clashes with the subsequent frenzied mêlée."
No 11322 V. Kirillov and V. Kondratev
4th prize Podgaets-50JT

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{d2d4 0160.01} \\
2/4 Draw
\end{array}
\]

No 11323 Pavel Arestov (Russia)
=lst-3rd honourable men
Podgaets-50JT

\[
\begin{array}{c}
g8e2 0740.32 \\
6/6 Draw
\end{array}
\]

No 11322 V. Kirillov and V. Kondratev (Russia)
1. Kc2 Ke3
2. Rh2/i Bd4 3. Rh3+, with:
   - Kf2 4. Kb1 Bxd5 5. Rb3/iii Bxe4+
   6. Ka2 Bxd5 7. Kb1 Bxb3 stalemate, or
   - Ke2 4. Ra3 (Kb1? Bxd3+) Bxd5
   Bxa2, and again stalemate thanks to bK's participation.
   2. Rf3 Ba2 3. Rf4+ Ke3 4. Rf1 Bd5
   ii) 2. Rd2? b1Q+. 2. Rg2? Bd4
   3. Rg3+ Kf2 4. Rh3 Kg2 5. Ra3 Bd5
   and Black wins easily.
   Kg3 8. Rh5 Bf1 9. Rh1 Kg2 10. Rh4
   Bd3 wins.

"There's Mattison's precursor of 1927 (=1/2pr Shakhmatny listok -
two stalemates with rook against bishop knight and pawn), but the
two active R-sacrifices form a companion piece to the classic,
worthy of 4th prize."

No 11323 Pavel Arestov (Russia)
1. b8Q Rh8+ 2. Kxh8 Rh6+i 3. Kg8
   Rh8+ 4. Kf7 Rxb8 5. Rxb8 h2
   h1Q 9. Rf3+ Kg1 (Kc1; Bd3) 10. Rh3
   Qxg2 11. Rh1+ draws.
   i) Rf8+ 3. Kh7 Rxb8 4. Rxb8 h2
   5. Bd3+ Kf2 6. Rf8+ and 7. Rf1,
   level pegging.
   ii) h1Q 8. Rxc3 Qxh4 9. Rc2+ Kg3
   10. Bg6 draw. "White must change
   plans after 7...Be1, for 8. Be4? h1Q
   9. Rf3+ Ke2 wins, but 8. Bf1 h1Q
   9. Rf3+ (also Rh3) Kg1 10. Rh3
   ends bQ's life."
   iii) 8. Rb2? h1Q 9. Rxd2+ Ke3
   with White to lose a piece. "A
   hair-splitting solver might ask
   about 8. Bf1 as a good alternative,
as h1Q 9. Rf3+ follows, but Black
   has 8...Be3, and the h1 promotion
   will follow willy-nilly."

"No bad! White's lively play
neutralises the future bQ. The final
moment, one has to say, is hardly a
climax."
No 11324 Yochanan Afek (Israel) and Nikolai Kralin (Moscow) =1st-3rd honourable men
Podgaets-50JT

No 11325 L.Gonzalez (Spain) =1st-3rd honourable men
Podgaets-50JT

No 11326 G.Nekhaev (Russia) 4th honourable mention
Podgaets-50JT
Due to the urgency imposed by Black's threat to run his aP, the solutions to I and II run the same:

I.

1.d5+ Kxd5 2.Sc6+ Ke5 3.Sc7+ Kd6 4.h4 a4 5.Sb6 Ke5 6.Sxa4+ Kb5, but now there is a split:

1a) 7.Kc7 Kxa4 8.Kb6 a5 9.Ka6 10.h5 g4 11.h6 g3 12.h7 g2 13.h8Q g1Q 14.Qe8 mate.

1b) 7.Kf7 Kxa5 8.Kxg6 Kb5 9.h5, and wP will be the first to reach a promotion rank.

1ii) 7.Kd7? Kxa4 8.Kc6 a5 - zugzwang - 9.Kb6(Kc5) g5 10.h5 g4 11.h6 g3 12.h7 g2 13.h8Q g1Q+, the other side checks this time.

1iii) 9.Kc5? we have seen. The other move is 9.Kc6? g5 10.h5 g4 11.h6 g3 12.h7 g2 13.h8Q g1Q 14.Qe8 Qg6+ Qxg6 stalemate.

"Two phases; a sacrificial intro, then wK moves precisely to decide the fate of a P-ending by ensuring the future bQ takes no part in the fight."

No 11327 V.Kondratev and Yu.Solovyov (Russia) 1.Sb4+ Kd2 2.Sc6+ Kd1 3.Sxd4 c1Q 4.gSe2 Qa1/i 5.Sc3+ Kd2 (Ke1;Sc2+)


i) Qb1 5.Sc3+. Qg5 5.Sc3+ Ke1 6.Qxe2+ with perpetual check, Kd1


"Studies with minor pieces against the queen were in at the dawn of the genre... The authors here once again illustrate the saying that the queen 'is not as black as she's painted'... Today we need to see greater colour, more incident... For example, at the start White leaves bPh6 standing so as to block bK's path to h8 right at the end! This is the realm of the study - action! Other nuances exist - it's important to go out looking for them."

No 11327 V.Kondratev and Yu.Solovyov
1st commendation Podgaets-50JT
No 11328 Gamlet Amiryan (Armenia)
=2nd/3rd comm Podgaets-50JT

a3c1 3110.11 4/3 Win


"A forcing miniature with a finale with off-beat material. bQQ are no match for the white batteries. Once again, as in the preceding study the chance is seized to lend the study more tasteful: the position after 4.Bd4 is a reci-zug... If only there were a try where White were ensnared!"

ii) 4.Ra5? Rb5+ 5.Kxa4 Rb4+ 6.Ka3 Be7 7.Rd7, seeing that b1 is not to bB's 'taste'.

"White's valour is rewarded by a mirror stalemate. A little thing to the taste of the 1920's."

No 11329 N.Rezvov (Ukraine)
=2nd/3rd comm Podgaets-50JT

5/4 Win

No 11330 A.Foguelman (Argentina)
4th commendation Podgaets-50JT

d5c3 0403.32 5/5 Draw

"White’s valour is rewarded by a mirror stalemate. A little thing to the taste of the 1920’s."
No 11331 S.Radchenko (Russia)
special prize Podgaets-50JT
for a study with significance for theory

c4c6 0400.12 3/4 Draw

No 11331 S.Radchenko (Russia)
1.e4/i dxe3 2.Ra2 Rd1 3.Re2 (for Kb3) Rb1 4.Ra2/ii, with:
- Kb6 5.Kd3 Rb3+ 6.Kc4 Rb1
7.Kd3, positional draw, or
- Rd1 5.Re2 Kd6 6.Kb3 Rd3+

i) 1.e3? Rb2 2.Rh6+ Kb7 3.Rh7+
Kb6 4.Rh6+ Ka5 5.exd3 a2 6.Rh8
Rb4+ 7.Kc5 Rd5+ 8.Kc4 Rb6 and
Black wins.

ii) "Figaro here, Figaro there!"
"A beautiful contribution to the theory of rook endings. Three pendulum positional draws with en passant embellishment!"

No 11332 I.Bondar (Belarus)
Black's threat to administer perpetual check must not be overlooked - indeed, it makes the introduction understandable.
1.Qb5+ axb5 2.e8Q+ f6 3.Qxb5+
Qxb5 4.g7 Qe8 (Qb1;g8Q+) 5.e7
Bxc6 6.b7 Bxd4 7.b8Q Be5+
8.Qxe5 fxe5 9.g8Q+ Qxg8 10.e8Q+
(e8R+? Kxe5+; Kf5 11.Qg6+ Qxg6 12.hxg6, and the most backward of White's pawns (wPe2) was needed all the time to ensure the win.
"In the many phases of this study no fewer than five queens appear. We can't help being reminded of the legendary Mikhail Tal."

No 11332 I.Bondar (Belarus)
special honourable men
Podgaets-50JT

No 11333  Pekka Massinen (Finland)
special honourable men
Podgaets-50JT

f1h1 4046.14 4/9 Win
3.Bxa8 a1Q+.
ii) Sc3 2.h8Q+ Qh5 3.Qxa8+ Sd5
4.Qxd5+ Qxd5 5.Qh8+ Qh5
6.Qa8+ Kh2 7.Qg2 mate.
iii) 2.Kf2? Sxa1 3.h8Q+ Qh5
4.Qxa8+ Qf3+.
iv) "He thinks he’s safe, now that
his king is out of peril."

Qc5+ 7.Ke2 Qe3+ 8.Kd1 Qe1
mate.
"Exceptional manoeuvres by wQQ via three corners take advantage of bK lying low in the fourth. No question, the basis of the study contributes towards game endings. Raises a smile!"

No 11334 Konstantin Osul
(Moscow)
special commendation
Podgaets-50JT

No 11334 Konstantin Osul
(Moscow) 1.Ke6 Sf3/i 2.g7+/ii Kg8
3.Kxf5 g3 4.Kg4/iii g2 5.Kh3
g1B/iv 6.Kg2 Be3 7.Kxf3 Bxh6
8.Ke4 Bxg7 9.Kd5 and it’s good-
bye to Black’s last pawn.
i) g3 2.h7 Kg7 3.h8Q+ Kxh8 4.Kf7
and 5.g7+.
ii) 2.Kxf5? g3 3.g7+ Kf7.
iii) "Hoist the Troitzky banner!"

iv) g1Q 6.h7+ Kxh7 7.g8Q+ Kxg8
stalemate. Or g1S+ 7.Kg2 Kh7
Sxc3 11.Ke3 draw.
"A special award for this congratulatory study showing Podgaets’ jubilee date: wK’s route d5-e6-f5-g4-h3-g2-f3-e4-d5 is a closed loop representing zero, and in the award (?) there is the round date of 50 years!"

64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1997

This informal tourney was judged by Boris Godes (Moscow). The provisional award was published in 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 12/98 (Dec. 1998). Text (incl. signed):
"No easy job, judging this informal tourney. What about spreading them around, as in patience, according to taste? But then, with 30 of them, with no clear differentiation apparent, that simply won’t work. We don’t wish anyone to be offended, so we have to do some real thinking. OK then, let’s clamber over the card index where thousands upon thousands of diagrams taken from books and notebooks and copied onto cards sit on shelves and in boxes - a load of dead information springing momentarily into life. Sure enough, anticipation prisoners were taken, ...
[5 examples] .... and the computer’s iron brain took more, victims of unsoundness ... [7 examples] ...

Coming now to the selections, I feel nervous: for the third time in succession as a judge I find myself
awarding first place to Muscovite Pervakov. This lays me open to the charge of bias, against which I can joke that 'Oleg may be my friend, but honesty is dearer to me!'. Besides, his co-author is one of the top and most interesting composers around today."

No 11335 O.Pervakov and S.Tkachenko  
1st prize "64" 1997

No 11336 A.Visakosov  
2nd prize "64" 1997
Bf4+ 29.Kd3 positional draw,
i) "This is the key position. Were it not for wPa3 bK could reach his pieces and disentangle them."
"A synthesis of domination, reci-zug and positional draw due to attachment duties. A powerful construction! We are impressed and intrigued by the valiant grappling for essences shown by this composer at the start of his career as he works with complex ideas. We have to concede that the study atelier has gained much now that it has been joined by the outstanding talent of A.Visakosov."

No 11337 G.Amiryan and S.Tkachenko
3rd prize "64" 1997

i) Kg5 2.Rg4+ Kh5 3.Kf6 h1Q 4.Rg5+ Kh6 5.Sf5+ Kh7 6.Rh5+ Kg8 7.Se7+.
iii) 7.Kf4? Kg1 8.Kg3, and W has no time to sacrifice his R because of c5 9.Rh4 Bf1.
iv) "bK’s sally has been a damp squib."

"All in all a harmonious technical study with a curious final positional draw. It is a beautiful development arising out of Nekhaev’s article in Zadaky i etudy No.14 (1997)."
"There is a significant gap of quality between the foregoing and following studies."
No 11338 V.Neishtadt
1st honourable mention "64" 1997

16.Kxf6 b3 17.Kg7 b2 18.f6 b1Q
19.f7 Qb7 20.Kh6 Qxf7 stalemate.
i) Re1 5.Be6 Bf1 6.e8Q Bb5+
Rd1 10.Bd5 draws.
"The position with Black having an
extra rook is curious, facilitating as
it does White's self-stalemating
combination: sacrificing it simply
allows another stalemate."

No 11339 An.Kuznetsov
2nd honourable mention "64" 1997

No 11340 A.Popov and
K.Beznoskova
3rd honourable mention "64" 1997

"Not bad for a position starting out
from the proviso of 13 chessmen!"
The study was included in an article
13 is everywhere, invoking 13
men on the board, the 13th world
champion, and a 13 move solution.
No 11341 V. Kichigin
4th honourable mention "64" 1997

No 11341 V. Kichigin 1. c7 Rc2
2. Bc6 Rxc6 3. Ra6 Kd7 4. Rxc6 Ke8
5. Kc5 h3 6. Kd6 h2 7. Rc1 Bf3
8. Rb1 Bb7 9. Re1 Be4 10. Rxe4 h1 Q
11. Re8+ wins.

"Although all the constituent elements are familiar and have been shown many times, the synthesis works pretty well. As the solver might say: 'Not hard to solve, but it game me pleasure'."

No 11342 V. Vinichenko
1st commendation "64" 1997

No 11342 V. Vinichenko 1. h4+
Kg6 2. Se7+ Kg7 3. Sf5+ Rx f5+
7. Rf5 Be6 8. Kh5 Bf7+ 9. Kg4 Be6
10. Kh5 Bb3 11. Kg4 Be6 12. Kh5,

No 11343 D. Gurgenidze
2nd commendation "64" 1997

f1d1 4200.03 4/5 BTM, Win

No 11343 D. Gurgenidze 1... Qe1+
2. Kg2 Qf2+ 3. Kh1 Qe1+ 4. Kh2
Qf2+ 5. Qg2 Qh4+ 6. Kg1 Qe1+
7. Qf1 Qxf1+ 8. Kxf1 e2+ 9. Kg2 d2

"Another find with this material much exploited by the composer, but still non-standard."

No 11344 G. Amiryan
3rd commendation "64" 1997

b4b8 0800.11 4/4 Draw
"A positional draw preceded by an out-of-the-ordinary choice of square for wK."

No 11345 E.Eilazyan (Ukraine) 4th commendation "64" 1997

h3 f3 0513.37 7/10 Draw

No 11345 E.Eilazyan (Ukraine)
"A combinative study in which all the pieces are sacrificed - too many, perhaps?! My view is that moderation should be a principal component of such studies."

Zadachy i etudy, 1995
The provisional award of this informal tourment was published in Zadachy i Ety No.14 (1997).
Text: The artistic level of the best studies was adequate for a resuscitated journal (No. 8 appeared 50 years earlier) and using them as a platform enables the judge to rank the remainder. Nekhaev’s interesting malyutka No.90 was punctured by solvers and excluded. The best of the six in I.Bondar’s article Bishop against knights is honoured but the judge did not deem it expedient to consider the other five that did not meet the article’s theme so well. Signed: Yuri Roslov (St Petersburg). 22 studies by 18 composers were entered.

No 11346 L.Katsnelson (St Petersburg) 1st prize Zadachy i etudy, 1995

a5c6 0133.23 4/6 Win

i) The first threat of mate. If now Sg6 4.Rd4 - so Black finds an improvement.
ii) Switching the mating threat.
iii) 5.Rg5? f5 6.Rg3 b1S 7.Kb6
Bb3 8.Re3 Ba4, after which Black
activates his forces.
iv) 6.Kb6? Sg6 7.Re3 Se7 8.Rxe7
Ba4, and Black is winning.
v) Alternation of the mating threat
again. The difference from (iii) is
that now the subsequent threat
comes from the f-file and not from
the e-file.
vi) The fourth - and last - switch.
"The play is strictly logical,
covering the whole board and using
all the pieces. There is not a
moment to draw breath with a
repetition of moves - no chance.
One scarcely notices the
underpromotion, it occurs so
naturally. No question - first prize."

No 11347 S.Zakharov
(St Petersburg)
2nd prize Zadachy i etudy, 1995

f4h3 0000.34 4/5 Win

No 11347 S.Zakharov
(St Petersburg) Despite the initial
take that this is something simple,
in reality we are facing something
significantly logical. Perhaps
1.Kg5!? is the move, relying on:
d5? 2.b4 f4 3.Kxf4 Kxh4 4.b5 g5+
5.Kf3 Kh3 6.b6 g4+, and now not
7.Kf2? Kh2 8.b7 g3+ 9.Ke2 g2
10.b8Q+ Kh1 drawing, but 7.Ke2!
g3 8.b7 g2 9.Kf2 Kh2 10.b8Q+ and
White wins. However, Black has a
decisive improvement in 1...f4!
2.exf4 d5 3.f5 Kg3, when he
draws. We’re still not finished with
the tries: 1.b4? Kxb4 2.b5 g5+
3.Kf3 Kh3 4.b6 g4+ 5.Kf2 Kh2
6.b7 g3+ draw. This shows Black
winning a tempo when wK is in
check from a black pawn. Now we
can face the solution.
1.e4 fxe4 2.b4 Kxh4 3.b5 g5+
4.Ke3/f4 5.b6 g3 6.b7 g2 7.Kf2
e3+ 8.Kxg2,
winning.
i) Made possible by the initial
sacrificial vacation of this square.
"Far-seeing plans and
counter-plans, and with pawns
only, and only seven of them. A
honed pawn ending by a composer
known for his logical
more-moveers and studies."

No 11348 N.Kralin (Moscow)
3rd prize Zadachy i etudy, 1995

c4a6 0433.10 3/4 Draw

No 11348 N.Kralin (Moscow) 1.b7
Rb8 2.Rc3 Sa3+ (Se3+;Kd3) 3.Kb3
Rxb7+ 4.Ka2 Bb2 5.Rc6+ Kb5
(Ka7;Ra6+) 6.Rc5+ Kb4 7.Rc3 Ka5
8.Re5+ Ka4 9.Re6 (Rc8? Sb5;)
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Rb8 10.Rc5 Kb4 11.Rc3 Ka5
12.Rc5+ Ka6 13.Rc6+ Ka7
14.Rc7+ Kb6 15.Rc6+ Kb5
"Technically irreproachable
miniature with active piece play
leading to a positional draw based
on perpetual threat of stalemate.
It's unfortunate that only the three
leftmost files are exploited, leaving
a somewhat limited impression."

No 11349 A.Kotov (Priozersk)
special pr Zadachy i etudy, 1995

In the judge's view the level of the
honourable mentions that follow is
scarcely lower than that of the
prize-winners, so the former might
well be tagged 'very honourable
mentions'.

No 11350 V.Kalyagin and
† L.Mitrofanov
hon men Zadachy i etudy, 1995

In the judge's view the level of the
honourable mentions that follow is
scarcely lower than that of the
prize-winners, so the former might
well be tagged 'very honourable
mentions'.

No 11350 V.Kalyagin and
† L.Mitrofanov
hon men Zadachy i etudy, 1995

In the judge's view the level of the
honourable mentions that follow is
scarcely lower than that of the
prize-winners, so the former might
well be tagged 'very honourable
mentions'.

No 11350 V.Kalyagin and
† L.Mitrofanov
hon men Zadachy i etudy, 1995

In the judge's view the level of the
honourable mentions that follow is
scarcely lower than that of the
prize-winners, so the former might
well be tagged 'very honourable
mentions'.
No 11351 V. Katsnelson  
(St Petersburg)  
hon men Zadachy i etyudy, 1995

![Chess diagram](image1.png)

No 11351 V. Katsnelson 1. Se4  
Ra2/i 2. Rc7+ Ka6 (Ka8;Kd6)  
3. Kd5/i Ra3 (Rxa5;Sc5+) 4. Sc5+  
Kxa5 5. Rb7 and Rc3 6. Kc6, or Rh3  

i) Kb7 2. Sxf2 Kxc8 3. Se4 Kb7  
4. Sc5+ Kc6 5. a6 wins.

ii) 3. Sc5+? Kb5 4. a6 0 draw.

"Another healthy miniature. The  
mating pictures are familiar, but the  
setting is free so they arise quite  
unexpectedly out of the starting  
position."

No 11352 V. Razumenko  
(St Petersburg)  
hon men Zadachy i etyudy, 1995  
dedicated to Yu. Fokin

![Chess diagram](image2.png)

No 11352 V. Razumenko 1. Qd5+  
Kb8 2. Qd6 Ka8 3. Qc6+ Rb7+  
4. Kc8 Ra7 5. c5z c4 6. e6 c3 7. e7  
c2 8. e8Q/c1Q 9. Sc7 mate.

i) 8. e8Q? c1Q 9. eQc4 Qb2,  
positional draw.

"Another miniature with a picture  
finale mate with promoted piece.  
But while the play by one of the  
parties is dynamic, that of the other  
is straightforward and forced."

No 11353 Ivan Bondar (Belarus)  
special HM Zadachy i etyudy, 1995  
No. 6 in article: Bishop versus  
cavalry

![Chess diagram](image3.png)

No 11353 Ivan Bondar 1. c7 Kb6  
2. e8Q+, with:  
- Kc7 3. Sxa7/i Bxc4 4. Sf6 Bf1  
5. Sd5+ and 6. Se3, wins, or  
- Kc5 3. Sb3+ Kxc4 4. Sd2+ Kd3  
5. Sxf1 wins.

"An interesting and original  
working with the material B vs,  
SS+P, or B vs. SSS. The honour is  
a 'special' for the exploration of  
irregular distributions of force. Had
all six studies presented in the article been taken as one group they would have been rewarded at the 'prize' level. But one would have liked to see more sparkle in any one of the compositions.

No 11354 S.Borodavkin (Ukraine)
1st comm Zadachy i etyudy, 1995

```
c2h3 4031.13  4/6 Win
No 11354 S.Borodavkin (Ukraine)
1.Sg5+ Kh4 2.Sf3+ Kh3 3.Qh2+ Kg4 4.Qg2+Kf4 5.Se5 Qxe5
6.Qh2+ Ke4 7.d3+ Kd4 8.Qg1+ Qe3 9.Qg7+ Qe5 10.Qa7 mate.
"The most interesting of the commendations. 5.Se5!! makes a beautiful point and the climactic checkmate has overtones of domination. But in regard to complexity and pieces dynamism the whole lags behind the studies placed ahead of it."

No 11355 S.Berlov
1.Re1 a2 
"WK must make a precise choice to set up the stalemate. The finale and the approach to it are known."
```

No 11355 S.Berlov (St Petersburg)
2nd comm Zadachy i etyudy, 1995

```
g5a4 0143.02  3/5 Draw
No 11355 S.Berlov (St Petersburg)
1.Rel a2
"WK must make a precise choice to set up the stalemate. The finale and the approach to it are known."
```

No 11356 G.Amiryan (Armenia)
3rd comm Zadachy i etyudy, 1995

```
d8g3 0043.21  4/4 Win
No 11356 G.Amiryan
1.e7/i Bc6 
i) 1.Kc7? Sd4 2.Kxb7 Sxe6 draws!
"A minor pieces ending where a complex logical scheme gives birth to a known B+P vs B win. Cf J.Sulc, 2nd prize Sachové umění (1948)."
```
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**No 11357** † A.Grin (Moscow)
spec comm Zadachy i etudy, 1995

No 11357 † A.Grin 1.e4/i, with
- fxe4 2.Kf2 Sc3 3.Ke3 Kg7
4.Kd4 draw, or
draw.
i) 1.Kf2? Sc3 2.Ke3 Kg7 wins.
"In the best sense of the phrase a 'youngster's malyutka' from the brain of our eternally young veteran of chess composition! It's brief, but the solution is paradoxical, with its e2-e4 opening move!"

*H* Israel-50 JT 1998

To mark the 50th anniversary of the State of Israel (1948-1998), the Kasparov Chess Academy in Tel-Aviv organized an international tourney for endgame studies. Azmatzia Avni was the judge, replacing J.Hoch during the tournament. 50 studies were submitted by 41 composers from 18 countries. 23 pieces were chosen as candidates for the award, but only 9 survived the correctness and anticipation checking (by Uri Blass, Harold van der Heijden and Azmatzia Avni). The award was dated 28-3-1999, with no confirmation period indicated.

**No 11358** Emilian Dobrescu (Romania) and Harold van der Heijden (Netherlands)
1st Prize, Israel-50 JT 1998

i) 1.Qh8? Bxd1 2.Sc3+/xiii Sxc3 3.Rxa7+ (Qxc3; Qb1 mate) Ba4 4.Rxa4+ Sxa4 5.Qg8+ Ka3 6.Qg7 Qc5+ 7.Kd1 (Qc3+; Sxc3) Qh5+ and Qh1(e2) mate; 1.Sdc3+? Ka1 2.Sb1 Qc4+ 3.Sec3 Qh4 (Sxc3?; Qh8) 4.Sd1 Qc4+ 5.Sbc3 Qb4 6.Sb2 Qa3 7.Sd1(xa4) Qa2.
ii) 2.Sb2? Qa3 3.Sxa4 Qa2; 2.Sb1(5)? Qc5+.
iii) 3.Sdb2? Qa2.
iv) Qa2 4.Rxa7 Qxa7 5.Qh8.
v) Thematic try: 4.Sc4? Qxc4+
5. Sc3 Qa6(c5) 6. Rx a7(+) Qxa7.
vi) 7. Sb5? Qc5+.

vii) Q(B)x a4 8. Qh8+; Qd4 8. Qb5.

ix) 9. Sd1 Qc7+ 10. Sdc3 Qh2.


xiii) 2. Rb7 Qxb7 3. Qg8+ Ka3.


"White attains victory, after an arduous and fascinating struggle."

No 11359 Nikolai Kralin (Russia)
2nd Prize, Israel-50 JT 1998

...g8a2 0403.21 4/4 Draw

No 11359 Nikolai Kralin 1. Rf1
hgx2 2. Rgl Rg3 3. f7 Se5+// 4. Kh7 Sg6//i 5. Kg7/ii KB3 6. Kf6 Kc3


"Clever stalemate-avoidance, and a brilliant intentional entry into discovered check (5. Kg7!!)."

No 11360 Andres Gillberg & Axel Ornstein (Sweden)
3rd Prize, Israel-50 JT 1998

...g8a2 0331.73 9/6 Win


"A Knight versus Bishop position is transformed into reciprocal..."
zugzwang. Both solution and try reach the same position, with a minor but significant difference - the turn to move.

No 11361 M. Roxlau (Germany)
4th Prize, Israel-50 JT 1998

```
```

"The quiet 6.Bf3!! is impressive. Although far ahead in material, Black remains defenceless."

No 11362 M. Roxlau (Germany)
1 Hon. Mention, Israel-50 JT 1998

```
1.Bf6 Sf3 2.e6+ Rxf6 3.e7 Se5+
4.Kc7 Re6+ 5.Kb7 Re6 6.e8Q
Rx8 7.Rxe8 Sc4 8.a4 Kb3 9.Re4
Sd6+ 10.Kc6 Sxe4 11.a5 f5 12.a6
f4 13.a7 f3 14.a8Q f2 15.Qa6/i Kc3
```

"White walks twice into a knight's fork. Even after queening his passed pawn, he has to find 'only' moves."

No 11363 G. Nekhaev (Russia)
2 Hon. Mention, Israel-50 JT 1998

```
b1Q 4.Rg8 Qg1 5.Rxg1 e1Q
6.Rxe1 Bc3 7.Rb1/i Ba5+ 8.Kc8
Ka7 9.Sc6+ Kb6 10.Sxa5 Kxa5
```

"The advanced pawns prove powerless against the precise 7.Rb1!"
No 11364 Y. Afek (Israel)
1 Commend, Israel-50 JT 1998

f7g4 3201.10 5/2 Win

No 11364 Y. Afek (Israel)
1.Rh2/i Qc4+ 2.Kg7 Qc7+ 3.Kg6 Qd6+ ii
i) 1.Rhh8? Qc7+; 1.Rh6? Qc7+
2.Kg8 Kxg5; 1.Rhh8? Qc7+.
ii) Qc6+ 4.Rf6 Qe8+ 5.Kg7 Qe5
"Two quiet rook sacrifices in a
miniature. Unfortunately, the final
picture is anticipated by several
prior works (Lokker & Kralin, 1st
Prize, Magyar Sakkelet 1974; and
also Caputto Ka4/Kh5, 1988; Zak-
hodyakin Kf3/Kg7, 1982; and
Pogosyants Kc7/Kh5 1961)."

No 11365 S. Tkachenko (Ukrain)
2 Commend, Israel-50 JT 1998

g4h6 0072.12 5/5 Win

No 11365 S. Tkachenko (Ukrain)
1.Sf5+ Kg6 2.Bd8 Bxb3 3.Se7+
Kd7 7.Sd4 Bd1+ 8.Kxh4 Kxc7
9.Sb2/ii.
Bd1+ 8.Kxh4 Kb7 9.Sd4 Kxb6
10.Sb2 Kc5 11.Se6+ Kd5 12.Sf4+
Ke4 draw.
ii) "Troitzky".
"Partly anticipated by Troitzky
Kf3/Kd7, 1912; and by the com-
poser himself Kg4/Ke8, 1996."

No 11366 V. Kondratyev (Russia)
3 Commend, Israel-50 JT 1998

a2c3 4344.21 6/6 Draw

No 11366 V. Kondratyev (Russia)
1.Sd5+ Kxc2 2.Sxf4 b3+ 3.Ka1
b2+ 4.Ka2 Bg8+ 5.Sd5 Bxd5+
Rf4+ 9.Be4+!! Rxe4+ 10.Qxe4+
Sxe4 11.h4 Sf6 12.h5.
"This study, like the preceding one,
shows refined play, aiming to reach
a winning version of the Troitzky
theme of K+2S vs. K. However,
the subject matter is devoid of
novelty."
*H* Boris II tourney

Jan van Reek, Margraten, The Netherlands, organized and judged a theme tourney on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of his cat Boris II. Had the tourney for its predecessor (1993) mirror mate as the set theme (see EG 112), this time studies figuring a mirror stalemate were required.

Harold van der Heijden assisted by checking the studies for correctness and possible anticipation.

The award of this tourney was published in *Schaakmagazine* 2/1999.

**No 11367** Merab Gogberashvili (Georgia)
prize Boris II 1998

```
No 11367 Merab Gogberashvili
```

```
h2f2 0533.34 6/8 Draw
No 11367 Merab Gogberashvili
```

**No 11368** John Roycroft (England)
special comm Boris II 1998

```
No 11368 John Roycroft (England)
1.Rf5 Bg6 2.h8Q, with:
- Bxf5+ 3.Ke3 Bxh8 stalemate, or.
- Bxh8 3.Ke3 Bg7/4 4.Rg5 Bh6 stalemate.
```

```
i 1958 but did not participate in a tourney, due to a misunderstanding on the part of New Statesman chess columnist ASSIA. Also, the solution as published in the New Statesman was the bare main line with echoed mirror stalemate. The artistic content also includes a chameleon echo quiet move by the white rook in each case inviting a pin by a black rook.
```
bishop. The important line 3.Ke3 Kd1! 4.Rg5 Bb1! 5.Rxg4 Ke1! was pointed out to me privately by Walter Veitch though Walter today does not recall this! In addition to the continuation above, the alternative on Black's 9th, namely 9...Ka3, is just as important. My analysis runs: 9.Rb6+ Ka3 10.Kf3! Bd3 (e4+;Ke3) 11.Re6 Bc4 12.Re7 Bd5+ 13.Kg4! Bf6 14.Ra7+ Kb4 15.Kf5 draw.

No 11369 Pietro Rossi (Italy) commendation Boris II 1998

\[c8g7 3117.00\] 4/4 Draw

i) "Now we have a rabid Rook".
ii) "A partly mirrored stalemate. Only 5 squares adjacent to that of the King are vacant".

AJR's SNIPPETS

1. In case the latest INFOBLATT doesn't make it to readers in time, the FIDE Album selection tourney for the calendar years 1995-1997 is now announced with a closing date of 30x1999. The section director for studies is AJR, and two of the three judges are already known: Michal Hlinka (Slovakia) and Nikolai Kralin (Russia). Composers wishing to enter must send their best work (only!) published during the 3-year period, in five clear copies, in diagram form with a position control, on one side of the paper (continuation sheets allowed), with full name(s), postal address(es), complete solution, comments and detailed source. Send to AJR and mark entries and envelope FIDE Album 1995-1997.

2. The 42nd FIDE PCCC and associated WCSC etc will take place 23-30x1999 in Netanya, Israel.

3. Harold van der Heijden informs us that the end date for entering the ARVES-10JT has been changed from 1 June 1999 to 1 Jan. 2000. Further information: EG129 p.363 or http://home.wxs.nl/~haroldh/home.html
No 11370 Jan van Reek
Strategisch denken, 1997


1.Ke7/i, with two lines:
   - Kg4/ii 2.h4/iii Kf5/iv 3.a4/v Sf6
     7.h6 wins, and
   - Sg5 2.h4 Se4/vi 3.h5 Ke3/vii
     4.h6 Sg5 5.Kf6 Sh7+ 6.Ke5 Kd3
     i) 1.a4? Sf6 2.a5 Sd5 3.a6 Sb4 4.a7 Sc6+.
     1.h4? Sf6 2.Ke7 Sd5+
     3.Ke6 (Kd6,Se3;) Ke4 4.a4 Sf4+
     ii) Ke4 2.h4 Kd5 3.a4. Or Kf4
         2.h4 Ke5 3.a4 Sf6 4.a5 Sd5+ 5.Kf7 Kf5 6.a6.
     iii) 2.a4? Sg5 3.Kd6 Sf3 4.Kd5 Sh4
          8.a6 Sd6. van Reek quotes H.Rey for this analysis.
     iv) If Kxh4, Grigoriev and others have been this way before: 3.a4
         Sg5 4.Kd6 Sf3 5.Kd5 Se1 6.a5 Sd3
     v) 3.h5? Sf6 4.h6 Kg6 5.h7 Sxh7
         with a draw.

Would any UK subscriber to EG who enjoys chess proof-reading (or thinks that s/he might enjoy it) and would like to assist in the preparation of tourney awards and articles please get in touch directly with John Roycroft:

telephone: 0181 205 9876
e-mail: roycrof@ics.qmw.ac.uk
address: 17 New Way Road,
NW9 6PL London
GBR code

(after Guy/Hlandford/Roycroft) concisely denotes chessboard force in at most 6 digits. Examples: two white knights and one black pawn codes into 0002.01; wQ hQ wR codes as 4100; wB3 vs hN codes as 0023: the full complement of 32 chessmen codes as 4888.88. The key to encoding is to compute the sum 'I for W - all - I for Wt' for each piece type in QRBN sequence, with white pawns and black pawns uncoded following the 'decimal point'. The key for decoding is to divide each QRBN digit by 3, when the quotient and remainder are in each of the 4 cases the numbers of B and W pieces respectively.

The GBR code permits unique sequencings, which, together with the fact that a computer sort of several thousand codes and the reference attached to each is a matter of a second or two, enormously facilitates the construction of look-up directories.

A consequence of the foregoing is the code's greatest overall advantage: its user-friendliness. The GBR code has the unique characteristic of equally suiting humans and computers. No special skill or translation process is required whether the code is encountered on a computer printout or whether it is to be created (for any purpose, including input to a computer) from a chess diagram.

A natural extension of the GBR code is to use it to represent a complete position. A good convention is to precede the GBR code with the squares of the kings, and follow the code with the squares of the pieces, in W-before-B within code digit sequence, preserving the 'decimal point' to separate the pieces from the pawns, if any (where all W pawns precede all B). The 223-move optimal play solution position in the endgame wK wK bK bN bN would be represented: a7d1 0116.00

h2b3c6d6 3/31. The '3/3' is a control indicating 3 W and 3 B pieces, with '1'

meaning W wins, while '=' would mean White draws. The win/draw indicators are optional. Note that although in this example there are no pawns the GBR code decimal point and immediately following pair of zeroes are obligatory (enabling a scan of a text file searching for encoded chess positions) but the absence of a decimal point in the list of squares confirms that there are no pawns.

A position with pawns but no pieces would be coded in this manner: a2e4 0000.32 c4e3f2e4f3 4/3 WTM. To indicate Black to move (but still with the implied win or draw for White) it is suggested that '+' and '=' be employed. Where the position result is unknown or undecided or unknowable it is suggested that the computer chess convention 'WTM' (White to move) and 'B TM' be followed. The redundancy check piece-count (including the '/' separator) and terminating full stop are both obligatory.
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