SPOTLIGHT
directed by Walter Veitch

(We hope that W. D. Ellison will soon find the time to return.)

EG 17, No. 872: P. Perkonaja. We regret having missed that this study was eliminated from the final award, J. Koppelmäki having shown a dual draw by 5. Bc7 (threatening Ba5) d5 6. d4! Bxd4 (6. .. Se4 7. Ba5) 7. Ba5 Sxa2† 8. Kb1 Sc3† 9. Kb2 Sb5† 10. Ka2=. Therefore No. 873 took 2nd Prize (but see next item) and No. 874 3rd Prize. (Pointed out by Mr. Rombach.)

No. 873: B. V. Badaj. Black wins after 3. .. Kf6. No doubt this was intended to fail to 4. Rd1 Bf1 5. Bh3 which seems to have blinded all but Mr. Harry Rombach of Toronto to the winning mating threats of 4. .. Kg6 5. Kg8 Be7 6. Be6 Bf1.

EG 19, No. 957: A. Hildebrand. In the diagram a bP is missing on c3.

No. 964: W. Veitch. Having unfortunately become associated with this Special Theme, I wish to record that I consider the theme abhorrent and that neither my position nor the theme example in EG 15 fulfil the precise conditions because of alternative wins for Black. I leave it at that.

No. 967: F. ben Galuth. Faulty, as the line given becomes a win for White after 5. .. Ka4? when 6. Kc4 mates in 5. The threat is Re6 and Sa1, and if 6. .. a1Q 7. Sxa1 Ka3 8. Sh3 h2 9. Sc1 etc.

No. 969: W. D. Ellison. The query in Note (i) is a mistake, 3. B any wins of course. A more interesting possibility is 2. .. Bf3 3. Bg6 Be2† 4. Kg2 Bb5 5. Kg3 winning as .. Kf4 is prevented.

No. 977: C. M. Bent. The win is doubtful. 1. Bb3† Kd4 (instead of 9. .. Qh7 9. Kh7 Qh2 (instead of 9. .. Qa1† as given in Note ii) seems a simple draw.

No. 984: N. Kralin. An excellent puzzle to baffle friends with.

No. 987: A. Bondarev. No win. After 8. .. Qh1† 9. Kh7 Qh2 (instead of 9. .. Qa1† as given in Note ii) seems a simple draw.

No. 988: N. Husainov. Black wins easily by 4. .. Kf6 (instead of 5. Kg6) 5. e7† Kxe7 6. Kg7 (else mate in 4) f5† etc. Perhaps the position is still not as intended, see AJR's initial comment.

No. 993: V. Palienko. Frankly, just what is there to be commended here? The solution is stock technique which would not extend a good club player in a lightning game. 2. Kd3 is one of many dual possibilities.
No. 995: Y. Rupchev. An old theme. Moreover 6. Kf2 wins as well, for after 6... e5 7. a6 e4 8. a7 e3† 9. Kf1 e2† 10. Kxe2 Kg1 11. Qa8 Qh1 12. Qa7† etc. leading to the standard Lolli win.

No. 999: L. Maslanka. In place of 4. h4 wK can tempo, e.g. 4. Kf3 h4 5. Kf2 winning. A remedy is to eliminate wPh3 when the solution becomes 4. Kg3 h4† 5. Kh3 f6 6. e6. One move longer, one piece less, one square more for bQ.

No. 1002: M. Bordenyuk. No win seems possible after 1. Bd2 (instead of the extravagant 1...Rxh5†) 2. Ra8† Kxh4 3. Sxc2 3. Rxh5† etc.

No. 1004: I. V. Chuiko. Black wins. 14... Bf6 is bad. Instead 14... Bd6 15. Kc1 Kc3 16. Kb1 is a position known as a win since Kling and Horwitz (see diagram). The win is not simple however, in the main line the b5 is lost not at h8 but at h1: 1. Sd7 Sf7 2. Ba3 Sh8 3. Sf8 Sf7 4. Se6 Sh6 5. Bc1 Sg4† 6. Kf5 Sf2 7. Se5 Sd1 8. Sa4 Sf2 9. Sa2 Kf7 10. Be3 Sh1 11. Kf4 Kf6 12. Kf3 wins. A full analysis is given in Cheron, No. 1283, where the source is given as Berger and Amelung.

No. 1006: V. Zaitsev. Worth a mention is the echo variation 2... Re5 3. Se2 Sc2 4. Sc1 Se1 5. Sc2 =.


No. 1016: V. Zaitsev. Worth a mention is the echo variation 2... Re5 3. Se2 Sc2 4. Sc1 Se1 5. Sc2 =.

No. 1020: V. Kamensky. bPd3 should be a wP.

No. 1025: M. Gordman. Bb1 can draw by 5... Kb6. The heavily complex play seems a deliberate style (cf. No. 1023) which can hardly have a wide appeal.

No. 1031: L. F. Topko. In Note (i) after 1. Rg4 Rf5† 2. Kg6 Rf3 3. Bxh5 Rxh5 the clear dual win (mate in 6) is 4. Ra8 Re6† 5. Kf7 Rh6 6. Ra8† Kh7 7. Be5.

No. 1032: L. F. Topko. A bad dual win is 3. Ra8† Kg7 4. Sh5†.

No. 1033: A. A. Tutlayants. Note (i) is a dual win. Simply 3. e5.

No. 1038: S. Lissy. No win. Better than 2... Rb1 is 2... Rxh5† 3. Kh2 Ke2! 4. bQ (4. Be4 is no better) Rf2† 5. Kh3 Rf3† 6. Qg3 Rxh5! =.

No. 1040: I. Prashcheruk. A dual win despite Note (i) is 1. Ra7 Bg2 2. Sc6 Sc6 3. Ra6 Ef3 4. Sf5† (instead of 4. Rb6) Kg6 5. Sd4 Bg2 6. Kg3 etc.


Final point: If much above is critical, it is because there is much to be criticised, and I feel that my first duty must be to indicate mistakes. The opinions expressed (with great restraint!) are purely personal, though I would expect them to be widely shared.
UNPINNING in STUDIES

by G. Afanasiev and E. Dvizov (Zhodino, Minsk Region, U.S.S.R.)

In problem composition the theme of unpinning has long received extensive treatment. Likewise in games one comes across examples of unpinning play (1). White has two rooks en prise, but bBc3 is pinned. Unexpectedly there occurred 29. Qxf4! — White unpins the bishop! Alekhine writes: ‘In embarking on this sacrificial combination I had to consider the following variations:

(i) 29. . . Sc4 30. Bxc4 bc 31. Qe5 Rg8 32. b5 Qb7 33. Qc5† Kg7 34. Qg5† Kf8 35. Qh6† Rg7 36. Qa6 (Unpinning the bRg7. Authors’ note) 36. . . Qxa6 37. ba Rg8 38. a7 Kg7 39. Reb1 with 40. Rb8 to follow and White wins.


(iii) 29. . . Bxe1 30. Rxel Qc3 31. Qe5 Rg8 32. Bd6 with a winning attack.

After Black’s actual 29. . . d3, White maintains his advantage with a continuing attack, Black’s ingenious attempt at releasing the pin established by 30. Reel failing as follows. 30. . . d2 31. Re2 Qa6 32. Rd1 Bg7 33. Re7 and Black resigned. (The game won a Brilliance Prize: AJR)

1. A. Alekhine v. H. Rohacek
Munich 1941
Position after Black’s
20th move

2. L. van Vliet
Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1888

The ‘Chess Dictionary’ (Moscow, 1964) gives the definition: ‘Unpinning — a tactical device in composition. In 2-ers, and more rarely in 3-ers, it can serve as the basis of a problem theme.’ The possibility of unpinning as an independent theme in studies is not considered, although studies whose main content is unpin were being composed even in the 19th century (2). See also (3), though studies with
unpinning combinations usually belong to other thematic groups (4). Here White unpins wPd7 by moving his king into a stalemate position. In 'The Soviet Study', 1955, this is classed as a stalemate study. In the present article the authors attempt to present unpinning as a separate study theme. Many composers (Kübbel, Troitzky, Korolkov and so on) have used the king's retreat into a stalemate hole combined with unpinning as a device. Here are some examples from the authors' practice. (5): White unpins wBd5 by slipping his king into stalemate. (6): bQ, on various squares, is faced with defending against mating threats, and resorts to pinning, but wK is able, thanks to stalemate, to unpin.
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7. **Win**


i) 2. b7? Qc8!

8. **Draw**

8. 1. c3 h1Q 2. Be8† Qc6 3. Bg6† Qg2 4. Be8† Qc6 5. Bg6 drawn.

9. See no. 785 in EG 16. 10. See No. 754 in EG 16.

The following studies show different reasons for unpinning. (7) is a direct unpin of bSe6. (8) combines unpin of bQc6 with mate threats. In (9) wQb7 is directly unpin. In (10) one wS unpins with tempo (2. Sd4†) so that the other wS may win. (11) shows alternative unpins of bPd6, once by White (4. Re5† in the note), and once forced on Black (4. . Kxf4 in main line). In (12) 4. Re2! unpins bQb5 by interposing on the diagonal of wBf1. And in (13) there is another unpin of Black by White, the latter’s king interposing on the line of fire of wQe2. Finally, (14) is an unpin of bQb2 combined with domination.

**FIDE Album 1962–64 Errors Competition (see EG15, p. 473)**

This competition does not seem to have excited much interest. It was won by Holland, with a one-man entry (!) covering all sections, submitted by F. Visbeen. It is not known how many entries there were. J. R. Harman and AJR submitted a joint entry for the studies section. A list of errors claimed (compiled but not verified by the FIDE Problem Commission) may be borrowed from AJR.

**Books for sale**

Two copies of ‘Sovyetsky Shakhmatny Etyud’ are available from AJR, price £ 1.5–0 each (post free). This is the modern classic anthology containing 650 examples of Soviet studies. The book appeared in 1955 and is now scarce, as indeed are all Soviet book a year after their appearance.
From the foregoing examples it is evident that unpinning combinations are as a rule of interest and do open wide perspectives for originality. The authors propose as a theme unpinning of White or Black, to win or to draw, in the latter case using the motif of positional draw — these are the possibilities. The authors hope to see composers exploring this theme.
AN ARTIST HAS LEFT US
by Friedrich Chlubna (Vienna)

‘Auf Spurensuche mit Schachfiguren’ (‘On the Trail with the Chessmen’) — this is the title of the book in which Dr. Alois Wotawa some years ago published a collection of his best studies. It contains 150 endgames of high quality, and the commentary on the solutions is not only very exact and detailed but also shows the author as a man with a great sense of humour. Now he has closed his eyes for ever: on Sunday, 12.iv.1970, he died, 74 years old, in a Viennese hospital.

Dr. Wotawa was without any doubt among the greatest artists of endgame composition, representing the same level as Troitzky, Réti and Rinck. From the FIDE he was awarded the title of ‘International Master of Chess Composition’ in 1966. Therefore you might think he had won many prizes in study tourneys. Did he? Not at all! He was not interested in tourney honours, he did not participate in them, with few exceptions. To understand that you would have to have known him personally!

I was very fortunate to become acquainted with him in 1960; at that time I was fourteen and had just started my career as a problem composer. Here I must state that all problemists in Vienna have regular meetings to show their new works and to have them checked. Dr. Wotawa had always been present, and to these meetings with him I owe my love for studies. Although he was a very well-known and successful public prosecutor, he remained a friendly and ineffably modest man, and it was due to this modesty that he preferred to publish the greatest part of his studies in the ‘Deutsche Schachzeitung’, where his friend Josef Halumbirek conducted the endgame section for several decades.

In the summer of 1968 he lost in the first place his friend Halumbirek, and only a few weeks later, quite unexpectedly, his wife died. He never recovered from these cruel blows of destiny. When I visited him at home six months ago, I saw that he was a sick man. His death was a heavy loss for his friends, but no surprise.

From his rich work (about 300 studies and a few problems which he called modestly ‘botched endgames’) I have selected six studies showing his admirable art of construction. Dr. Alois Wotawa is dead, but his work will be unforgettable as long as endgame studies survive.

1. A. Wotawa
Deutsche Schachzeitung 1944
9

Win

2. A. Wotawa
Schach-Magazin 1949
5

Win
Solutions:

   i) Not 1. cxb8Q? Qxb8 2. Bh2f Ke7 3. Bxb8 exb8 and Black wins,
   ii) Or 1. .. Qxb6 2. cxb8Qf Qc7 3. Bh2f wins.

2: 1. g3/ a5 2. Bg2 a4 3. f3/ a3 4. Bh3 Bxh3 5. g4 wins.
   i) Not 1. Ka2? or 1. Be4f Kxh6 2. g4 Kg5 3. Bg2 Kg4 4. Bd5 a5 5. Be6 Kh3, also not 1. f4? Kxh6 2. Bf3 a5 3. g4 a4 4. g5f Kg6 5. Bg4f Kd6 6. Be6 a3 7. Be8f Kg4 8. Bf7 Kf5 and no win.


Anagrams. Most people find studies heavy going. Light relief is rare. Harold Lommer has suggested anagrams of the names of composers. There has been some activity on these lines in American and British chess magazines lately, but naturally only relating to players' names. No outstandingly successful anagram has resulted. The anagram should of course be appropriate to the original. Lommer's own suggestion:
Harold Lommer = More droll ham.
He hopes, and so do I, that readers can improve on this! Entries (no prizes) to AJR.
Walter Veitch = Clever wi' that!

Lommer Jubilee Tourney

The award stands unamended. The First Prize (A. Hildebrand) has an anticipation in one of its lines by Bent (British Chess Magazine, vii.1951), but as this is a partial anticipation only, and as the earlier piece is unsound, no change has been made.

AJR
EG 20’s ‘Diagrams and Solutions’ begin with a sparkling quintet of originals by one of the newest holders of the title of FIDE Master of Chess Composition, E. L. Pogosjants of Moscow.


   i) 1. .. Kd7 2. e8Qt Kxe8 stalemate. ii) 2. e8Q? Sf7f 3. Qxf7 Rxg7f 4. Kg8 Kg7 stalemate.
   iii) Here there is a study within the study. 5. Kg7? Sf4 6. h8S Kg7 and B1 mates next move. iv) 6. Sxh5? 

   i) 1. g3†? Kxg3 2. Kh8 Rc5 3. Be6 g4 4. g8Q Rh5† draws. ii) 1. ... Rc5
2. g8Q (2. Be6? g4=) 2. ... Rxf5 3. Qh7† wins. iii) 2. ... Sg4 3. g8Q Sf6 4. Qc4† K– 5. Kg7 wins. iv) 4. Kg6? Se5† 5. Kh6 Sg4† 6. Kg6 Se5† 7. Kf6 Sg4† 8. Kg6 Se5† 9. Kf5 Sg4 10. Kg6 Se5† with a positional draw. v) 4. ... Kh3 5. Kg6 wins.

A most attractive study.

No. 1052: G. M. Kasparyan


Judge was Grandmaster Yuri Averbakh.

No. 1053: G. M. Kasparyan.

1. h7 Rg+ 2. Kf8 Kg8 3. h8Q Bxh8 4. e7† Kh7 5. e8Q Rg8† 6. Kf7 Rxe8 7. Ra4/i Kc6/i 8. Rf4 Bb5 9. Rh4† Kg5 10. Rh5† and draws by stalemate or Rxb5.

i) 1. ... Ke7 2. Ra7f Kxe8 3. h8Q Rg5† 4. Rg7.  ii) 7. Ra5? Re5 wins. 7. Ra3? no threat.  iii) Because 8. Kxe8? Bb5† wins, and 8. Rh4†? Kg3 wins.
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No. 1053: G. M. Kasparyan
1/2-Pr., Chess Life Tourney
Award iii.1970

No. 1054: A. Hildebrand
3rd Prize, Chess Life Award iii.1970

No. 1055: E. L. Pogosjants
1st Hon. Men., Chess Life Award iii.1970

No. 1056: V. Bron
2 Hon. Men., Chess Life, Award iii.1970


No. 1057: M. N. Klinkov. 1. d7 Kf3 2. Kh2 Rc1 3. Bg1 Rd1 4. c6 Rd6
5. Be3 Kg6 6. Kg1 Kg8 7. Bd4 Rh8 8. Kh2 Rh1 9. Bg1 Rd1 10. c7 Rd6
11. Be3. A real cliff-hanger, this. Who has the advantage? 11. . . Rg6
12. Kg1 Ra6 13. Kh2 Ra1 14. Bg1 Ra5 15. c5 Ra6 16. Be3 Rg6 17. Kg1
behind his g-pawn he threatens mate in two by . . gQ; Bxg1, Rh-
mate.

e3/ 5. Kf1 Be8 6. Sg5 Bc2 7. h7 Bxh7 8. Sxh7 a4 9. Sg6 a3 10. Sc3 a2
Sc2 17. Sc5/vi Kf4 18. Sd3 Kg3 19. Sc5 and a draw by repetition of
moves.
Bxh5 5. Sxf5. iii) 4. Sg3 e3/ 5. Kf1 Bg2+ 6. Ke1 Bd5 7. h6 Bg8 and
Black wins. iv) The point of 5. Kf1. After 11. . . a1Q(R) is stalemate,
No. 1061 J. Berry
3rd Commend. Chess Life
Award iii.1970

No. 1062 V. I. Tjavlovsky
1st Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1958
Award x.59

while if 11... Kh2 12. Sc2 Kg3 13. Sa1 Kg4 14. Kg2 Kf5 15. Kf3 Ke5
16. Sc2 draws. v) With the same stalemate point as in (iv).
vii) With Se4† as threat. viii) 8... Bg8 9. h7 Bxh7 10. Kxd5 Kf2 11.
Kb2 draws.

No. 1059: Y. Dorogov and A. Kuznetsov. 1. Kb6 Bd7 2. c6 Qh6 3. Re1
Be8 4. a7 Bxc6 5. a8Q† Bxa8 6. Ka7 Qg7 7. Bd7† Kc8 8. e8S.
Note that after 4. a7 Bxc6 5. Bxc7† Qxc7 6. Kxc6 is stalemate, this
defence not being available while the square b8 is open to Black’s king.

5. Re4 b2 6. e7 Kf2 7. Re6 8. Kf2 draws, as 8... Rxe7 9. Rxe7 b1Q
is harmless because of 10. Ra7† and 11. Rb7†.

No. 1061: J. Berry. The composer is a young Canadian. 1. Rg3† Kh4
2. Bf5 g5† 3. Kd3 h6 4. Rg4† Kh3 5. Sg5† Kh2 6. Rh4† Sh3 7. Rxb3†
Kgl 8. Sf3† Kg2 9. Rxd1 Kxh1 10. Bh1 followed by mate on g2.
i) 2... h6 3. Rh4† Kh3 4. Sf2† Kh2 5. Sf4†, or 3... Kh5 4. Sf6†.

There now follows a series of studies, published between 1958 and
1963, by one of the leading, but lesser known, composers of the U.S.S.R.

No. 1062: V. I. Tjavlovsky. 1. Bh5† f2 2. Be2 Se3 3. g4 Se5†/i 4.
Kae6/iv Ke3 5. g5/v Sf4 6. Bf1 Kd2 7. Ka5 Ke1 8. Be4 Se2 9. g6 f1Q
10. g7 Qf5† 11. Kb4 Qd1† 12. Kc3 Qf5† 13. Kb4 drawn.
4. Kd7 (e5) Sf5 5. g4/vii Sg3 6. Ba6 Kd2 7. g3 Se2 wins. iii) 3... Sxg4
g5 f1Q 10. g7 Qf5† 11. Ke8 Qg6† 12. Kf8 Kc4 13. Bf7 Qh6 and B1 wins.
v) 5. Bf1? Se3 6. g3 Sxf1 7. g6 Sf8 8. g7 f1Q wins. 5. Ka5 Kd2 6. Bf1
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   i) 2. Ba3†? Bd6 3. Ra7† Ke6 4. Ra6 Rd4 draws.

No. 1066: V. I. Tjavalovskyy.
   Kc2 22. Kg7 Kh6 23. Kh5 Kg7. 
   Kg7 Ke6 7. Kg6 Ke5 8. Kg7. 

   i) 2. Ba3†? Bd6 3. Ra7† Ke6 4. Ra6 Rd4 draws.


   Sg6 Ke5 25. Kg8 Kf6. 
   7. Kg6 Ke5. 
   7. Kg6 Ke5. 

This study is in the FIDE Album, without a single note!


No. 1073: V. I. Tjavlovsky.

No. 1074: V. I. Tjavlovsky.
III: 1. Sd4† Kb2/iv 2. f7 a2 3. f8Q a1Q 4. Qb4† Kc1/v 5. Qe1† Kb2 6. Qd2† wins.
iv) 1. . . Kc4 2. f7 a2 3. Sc2 Kc3 4. Sa1 Kb2 5. f8Q Kxa1 6. Ke4 Kb2, then wQ checks on ranks to Qd2†, Kb1; Kb3 wins. v) 4. . . Ka2 5. Qxa4† Kb2 6. Qb3†.


No. 1076: V. I. Tjavlovsky. 1. Kf5/i c4/ii 2. h5 c3 3. h6 c2 4. h7 Sh4† 5. Kf6 c1Q 6. h8Q Qa1† 7. Kg5 Qxh8 stalemate.

i) 1. h5? Sf4† 2. Kf5 Sxh5 3. Ke5 Sf6 4. h4 Kg4 5. f4 Sd7†.

ii) 1. .. Sxh4† 2. Ke5 1. .. Sf4 2. Ke5 Ke2 3. h5.

No. 1077: V. I. Tjavlovsky. 1. f6 Sc6 2. Kxc6 a3 3. f7 a2 4. Sa5† Kc3 5. f8Q a1Q 6. Qh8 Kb4 7. Qb8† Kc3 8. Qe5† Kb4 9. Qe5† Kc3 10. Qb5 (c4)† Ka3 11. Qb3 mate.


No. 1079: V. I. Tjavlovsky. 1. Sg2† Kd4/i 2. g7 Sg4 3. Kg5/ii Sf6 4. Kxf6 d2 5. g8R wins/iii. 
iii) 5. g8Q? d1Q 6. Qd8† Ke4 7. Qxd1 stalemate. Now after 5. g8R Black may try 5. . . Kd3 6. Rd8† Ke2 7. Sf4† Ke1 8. Sd3† Ke2 9. Sb2 and wins.

   i) 1. . . Kb5 2. Se6 Bf3 (2. . . g3 3. Sg5) 3. Kg5 g3? 4. Sd4†. 
   iii) 3. Se6? g3 4. Sg6 Bf4(h3). 
   v) 3. Kg5 g3 4. Sd4 Bd1. 
Or 3. Sg5 h4.

i) 2. . . Kxh5 3. b6 g3 4. b7 g2 5. b8Q g1Q 6. Qh8† and 7. Qg8†.
No. 1085: J. Lamoss
Magyar Sakkelet 1968
Award 30.v.69

i) 1... Sxe6 2. a7 Be3 3. Kb6 Se4† 4. Kb7 Sd6 wins.

No. 1086: G. M. Kasparyan
Magyar Sakkelet 1968
Award 30.v.69

i) 1... Qf8 2. Rg8 Qb+ 3. Ke2=. 
ii) 4... Ke7 5. Rg7 Qxg7 6. Se8=. 
iii) 6... Qg6 7. Rxh7† Kd8 8. Kd2 Qi5 9. Kc3 Qxe5† 10. Se4.
i) 2. .. Kd5 3. Se4 mate. ii) 3. .. Qg7 4. Se8f wins.

iii) 2. a4? Kf2 3. b5 ab 4. a5 b4 5. Kc4 b3 or 4. ab Kg2 =. iv) 5. .. a5 6. b5 Kh1 7. b6 h2 8. b7 a4 9. Kg3 wins.


No. 1090: G. M. Kasparyan 1 Men., Magyar Sakkelet 1968 Award 30.v.69
i) 5 ... Qxf6 6. Bg7† K, Qxg7 stalemate.

i) 3 ... h1Q 4. b8Q Qh2 5. Qc8 mate.

ii) 1 ... Bb7 2. f3 =.
iii) 4. Rh5? Bb5 5. Ke2 Sg1†.

No. 1093: J. Lamoss. 1. c7† Kc8 2. Sc4 Sc6† 3. Kh4 g5† 4. Kg3 Sxc7 5. Sb6† Kd8 6. Sh4 =.
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No. 1094: J. Lamoss. 1. g8\textit{St/i} Sxg8 2. c7 Rg7\textit{†} 3. Kh3\textit{ii} Rh7\textit{†} 4. Kg2 Rg7\textit{†} 5. Kh1 Kd7 6. Rxh7\textit{†} Rxh7 7. e6\textit{†} wins.
   \textit{i}) 1. g8Q? Rg7\textit{†} 2. Qxg7? Sxf5\textit{†}.
   \textit{ii}) The f file is taboo.

   \textit{ii}) 4. .. Bb8? 5. Qe4\textit{†}.

Now, for readers to have an opportunity to compare composing styles, here is a group (Nos. 1096 to 1110) by the leading Finnish study composer, Pauli Perkonoja, who is also a holder of the coveted title of F.I.D.E. Master of Chess Composition. They may be compared with Nos. 1062 to 1082 by V. I. Tjavlovsky.

   \textit{iv}) 3. .. Se8 6. Sh5 Kxb3 7. Sc4\textit{†}.

No. 1097: P. Perkonoja. 1. b8S\textit{†/i} Sxb8 2. Sa7\textit{†} Kb7 3. c6\textit{†} Kxa7 4. c7 Sxa5\textit{†/ii} 5. Kb5 Sb7 6. c8S\textit{†} Ka8 7. Sb7\textit{†} Ka7 8. Sc8\textit{†} perpetual check.
   \textit{i}) 1. b8Q? Sxa5\textit{†} 2. K- Sxb8 wins.

i) 6. ...Qh5 7. Bc4.


ii) 3. Rh3+ Kg5 4. Se8+ Kf4 5. Rh6 Bc8+ 6. Ke2 Kg5 draws.

iii) This is the cunning tempo point that is the improvement on a Kasparyan 1946 study, No. 7 on p. 336 of EG12. iv) Now only.

   i) 1. Rd8†? Kh7 2. Bb3 Ra1† 3. Kf2 Se6 draws.  ii) 4. Kg2? would allow on the seventh move 7. ..Rg5† releasing the knight.
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ii) 1. K-? Rh2 2. Bfl Rh1.
ii) 5. . . e8 6. Rg7† Ke8 7. de Re4 6. Sb5 Rxe6 9. Sc7† wins.


The following eight studies have been provided, complete with notes (and exclamation marks!) by the noted Belgian composer Mr J. Vandiest. They were prompted by Nos. 940 to 956 and feature different symmetrical and asymmetric effects possible in studies. We are very grateful to Mr Vandiest for this supplement.


This, by the way, completely anticipates Réti’s study in Tidskrift for Schack 1923 (wKe5, Be6/bKe3, Pb4, h4). WV points out that No. 1111 is already twice in EG (EG4, p. 82; EG19 p. 83).

No. 1112: R. Bianchetti. 1. Bb2!, — 1. . . Rf 5 2. Rc7f! Kg8 3. Rg7† Kh8 4. Ka2!, winning the bR; — 1. . . Rh6 2. Rg3† Kh7 3. Rg7† Kh8 4. Kh1!, idem; — 1. . . Rf 5 2. Rh3†! Kg8 3. Rh8 mate; — 1. . . Rg6 2. Rc8†! Kh7 3. Rh8 mate. Remarkable!
No. 1115: F. Dedrle  
Le monde des échecs 1946

No. 1116: H. Rinck  
Les surprises de la théorie, 1947


2. — Kf3 3. b6 Kg4 4. h5! wins;

No. 1115: F. Dedrle. 1. Qe7!, and now:
— 1. ..Sfe4 2. Qd7! Kd1 (2. ..Kf1? 3. Qg4!) 3. Qe6! Sg3(5) 4. Qa4† Ke1 (4. ..Ke1 5. Qa1†) 5. Qa3† Kd1 6. Qa1† Ke2 7. Qa2† Kc- 8. Qxd2, with check;
Fascinating!

No. 1116: H. Rinck. 1. Ke6!, and:
— 1. ..Rh8 (1. ..Rf7? 2. Sd6†, or 1. ..Rxf8? 2. Sc7† Kf8 3. Kx5 Ke7 4. Ke5, or 1. ..Rg8? 2. Sf6†) 2. Sf6† Kf8 3. Sd7† Kg8 4. Sf6† Kf8 5. Sa6† =;
— 1. ..Rb8 (1. ..Rxd5? 2. Sg7† Kd8 3. Kxd5, or 1. ..Rd7? 2. Sf6†, etc.) 2. Sd6† Kd8 3. Sf7† Ke8 4. Sa6† Kd8 5. Sa6† =;
— 1. ..Ha8 2. Sc7† =.

No. 1117: J. Vandiest. 1. g6 h3 2. g7 h2 3. g8Q h1Q 4. Qg4† viii Qe4/ii 5. Qd1†/i Qd3 6. Qg7† Kd5 7. Qg8† iv Kg4 8. Qg7† Ke4 9. Qg4† Kd5 10. Qd7† Ke4 11. Qe7/v Kg5 12. Qe5† Ke4 13. Qe5†, winning the bQ by 14. Se5† or mating in 3 by 14. Sd6†.
i) 4. Qd8†? Qd5 5. Qh4† Qe4 6. Qf6† Kd3 7. Qc3† Ke2 8. Qd2† Kf1 =, the wS being pinned, or 5. Qb6† Ke4 6. Qg6† Kf4 =, or 5. Qf6† Ke4 6. Qb4† Kd3 7. Qc3† Ke2 =, if 4. Qg7?; then 4. ..Kd5!, then 5. Qd7† Ke4
6. \(Qb7f\), winning the \(bQ\); and if 4. .. \(Kd3f\), then 5. \(Qd7f\) \(Kc2\) 6. \(Qd2f\) \(Kf1\) 7. \(Se3f\) \(Kg1\) 8. \(Qe1f\) \(Kh2\) 9. \(Qh4f\) \(Kg1\) 10. \(Qg3f\), inflicting the 'standard' mate in the corner.

iii) But not 5. \(Qd7f\)? \(Qd5\) 6. \(Qg7f\) \(Kd3\) = iv) So the \(bK\) is lured to the half of the board where he has more space because the \(wQ\) is in bad need of it! Without the square \(g8\) being available, there would be no winning manoeuvre left. v) Preventing 11. .. \(Kf4\) 12. \(Qh4f\), winning the \(Q\), as well as 11. .. \(Kd4\) 12. \(Qe3f\) mate.

The \(bK\) is mated in 3 corners (3rd corner, after 4. .. \(Kd3f\) 5. \(Qd7f\) \(Kc2\) 6. \(Qd2f\) \(Kb1\) 7. \(Qb2f\) mate).

---

**No. 1118: J. Vandiest.**

1. \(f6\) \(c2i\) 2. \(f7\) \(c1Q\) 3. \(f8Qf\) \(Kc7\) 4. \(Qe5f\) \(Kb8\) 5. \(Qd6f\) \(Kb7\) 6. \(Qxd5\) \(Kb8\) 7. \(Qd6f\) \(Kb7\) 8. \(Qd6f\) \(Kb7\) 9. \(Be6f\) \(Kb6\) 10. \(Bd7f\) \(iv\) \(Kb7\) 11. \(Qe6f\) \(Ka7\) 12. \(Qe5f\) \(Kb7\) 13. \(Be6f\) \(Kc7\) 14. \(Bb7f\) \(Kf3\) 15. \(Bxh3\) \(Qb8\) 16. \(Qc8f\) \(Kc7\) 17. \(Qd7f\) \(Kf6\) 18. \(Qe6f\) \(Kg5\) 19. \(Qe3f\) \(Kg6\) 20. \(Bf5f\) \(Kb5\) 21. \(Bb4f\) \(Kg6\) 22. \(Qe7\) \(c3\) \(viii\) 23. \(Qe6f\) \(Kg5\) 24. \(Qe3f\) \(Kg6\) 25. \(Qc7\) \(c2\) 26. \(Qd6f\) \(Kg5\) 27. \(Qd2f\) \(Kg6\) 28. \(Qxc2f\) \(Kf6\) 29. \(Qf5f\) \(Ke7\) 30. \(Qd7f\) \(Kf6\) 31. \(Qe6f\) \(Kg5\) 32. \(Qe3f\) \(Kg6\) 33. \(Qe7\) \(Qg5\) \(ix\) 34. \(Qg7f\) mate.

---

**Stop Press:**

WV axes 14 moves off the solution with 19. \(Qf5f\) \(Kg4\) 20. \(Qg4f\) mate.
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