On 1.xii.70, the news of the death of Engineer Paul Farago saddened all those who had known and admired him for his profound and original studies - studies which for three decades brought his country famous successes in important international competitions.

This was a great loss for Romanian chess; it was Paul Farago who lifted Romanian problemists to unexpected heights, who discovered new ways of enriching traditional methods especially by strengthening Black's play so that points of great subtlety were introduced.

Born in Hungary in the village of Pereg on 4.iv.1886, he graduated from the high school in Kecskemet and the Polytechnic in Budapest as a geodetic engineer and settled down in Cluj, Romania in 1910.

It was at Cluj that I made his acquaintance, four decades later, when as a young study-composer I had the opportunity of visiting him and all those who had known and admired him for his profound and learning something from the craftsmanship of this master whom I greatly admired. Since then I visited him as often as I could, and the first thing I learned was that “a good ending is the realization of an original idea, aesthetic and profound, in an economic position, with a solution rich in points and surprises. . . .”

His first study was published in 1898, at the age of 13! After several smaller successes (2nd prize in the International Competition of the Romanian Chess Review in 1935 and 1st prize in the same year in the competition organized in memory of W. Pauly), in 1936 the Gold Medal of the Munich Olympic Games was awarded to him, giving him the highest place in the international hierarchy of chess compositions. His career continued with a series of successes among which it is enough to quote: 1st prize Dutch Chess Federation’s Competition 1937; 3rd prize Shakhmaty Soviet Union 1939; 1st prizes Suomen Shakki, Finland 1944, 1946 and 1948; 1st prizes Dutch Chess Federation’s Competition 1946, 1947 and 1951; 1st and 2nd prizes at the Enroque Competition, Argentine 1947/1948; 1st prize of the tourney in memory of L. Centurini, Italy 1952; and 3rd prize at the Olympic Games Helsinki 1952.

In retirement, Paul Farago devoted himself passionately and entirely to study composition, a domain in which he played an important part, rousing real emulation among Romanian study composers; a great number of now well known young chess players served their apprenticeship round him.

In 1938 he took over the study section of the “Romanian Chess Review” which was under his guidance till the end of his life. For more than a decade he directed the study section of the Hungarian “Magyar Sakkvilag” collaborating at the same time with a great number of other chess reviews.

In appreciation of his activity in the domain of artistic chess he was awarded the title “Master of Sport” in 1955 and in 1961 he became “Honoured Master of Sport”.
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His well known competence caused him to be invited to judge many international and national competitions and in 1960 he became “International F.I.D.E. Judge” for studies.

It is very difficult to portray such a complex personality as that of Paul Farago. For those who did not know him the advice to read his book “New Ideas in Artistic Chess” which appeared in Romanian and Hungarian, but not in English, is more than advice, it is a duty. In this book, there are more than 150 studies composed by this great master who gained 16 first prizes, and 50 other prizes and mentions in major competitions. His studies are characterised by a profound artistic content and extraordinary difficulty, witness the mottoes Labyrinth, Sphinx, etc. The Labyrinth (F14 below) remained unsolved after 20 years. In the author’s own words, “Engineer A. Nichita investigated this study quite deeply, demonstrating a draw in 150 variations, but Black’s best play was not among these. The real solution is often approached and passed by, but never revealed”.

To illustrate his search for the unexpected and unconventional, I should like to mention his short stories which have not only a chess theme, but a chess content too, and his conception of studies within a study, or ‘framed’ studies.

Chess concerned him all his life. In his last minutes, he was playing on his pocket chess board from which he was never separated, not even in his grave.

From the works of our late Master, Paul Farago, we quote some of his most outstanding compositions.

Eng. George Teodoru
Member of the Romanian Chess Federation Bureau
President of the Central Committee of Chess Studies and Problems
The closing date for the Farago Memorial Tourney (see EG24, p. 239) has been extended for one month. It is now 31.1.72.

F1: 1. b6/i cb 2. g6/ii hg/iii 3. e6 Kc1 4. e7 d2 5. e8Q Sc2/iv 6. Qxg6
d1Q/v 7. Qh6t Kb1 8. Qxb6t wins. i) 1. Kd2? Sc3t 2. gf h3 3. e6 h2
4. e7 h1Q 5. e8Q Qxf3 draw, or 1. e6? Kc1 2. e7 d2 3. e8Q d1Q 4. Qe3t
Kb1 draw, or 1. g6? Kc1 2. gh d2 3. h8Q d1Q 4. Qh6t Kb1 5. Qg6t Sc2
Kd1 Qxg5t draw. ii) 2. e6? Kc1 3. e7 d2 4. e8Q Sc2 5. Qb6/vii d1St
iv) 5... d1Q 8. Qe3t Kb1 7. Qxb6t wins. v) 6... Sb7 7. Qh6 Sa2t
10. Kd2 Qh3 11. g6 Qc1t draw. vii) 5. any other d1Q draw.

Kxb4 6. Kg2 wins. i) 1. a6? g3 2. a7 g2 3. Kxe6 g1Q 4. Ra2 Qxe6
draw. ii) 1... Kg3 2. Kxe6. Or 1... Sf8 2. Sc7 g3 3. Rb4t Kh5 4. Sg5
11. Kg2(g3) wins. Or 1... Sc5 2. Sc7 e5 3. Sd5 Sd3 4. Rb8 Sf2 5. Se3
Kg3 6. a6 wins. iii) 3. Rxf4t Kh3 4. Rd4 g2 5. Rd8 e6t 6. K- g1Q
wins. iv) 4. Rb8 e6t 5. Kxe6 Kg8 6. Rh8 g2 wins. v) 5. Rb17 e5

F3: 1. h7/i Rg3t/ii 2. Kd4/iii Rg4t/iv 3. Ke5 Rg5t/v 4. Kf4 Rh5 5. f8Q
Kg2(Kh1) 6. h8Q h1Q 7. Qa8t wins. i) 1. f8Q? Kg1 2. h7 h1Q 3. h8Q
Rg3 4. Kd4 Qc8 draw. ii) 1... Kc1 2. h8Q wins, or 1... Rf2 3. h8Q
Rxf7 3. Qa8t Kg1 4. Qg8t K- 5. Qxf7 wins, or 1... Rg8 2. fgB wins.
iii) 2. Kg4t Kg2 3. h8Q Rh3t 4. Ke4 Rxh7 5. Qg8t Kh3 draw, or 2. Ke4?
Rg8 3. fgB Kg1 draw, or 2. Kf2? Kg2t 3. Kg3 Rh8 draw. iv) 2... Kg2
3. h8Q/vii Rf3/viii 4. Qg7t/vii Kf2 5. Qh6 Kg2 6. Qg6t Kf2 7. Kgh5 Kg2
8. Qxg7t Kxf3 9. f8Qt wins, or 2... Rh3 3. f8Q Kg2 4. h8Q h1Q 5. Qa8t

(My thanks to Richard Harman and to John Beasley for assistance in the preparation of the material. The figures in brackets after the composer's name at the head of each diagram refer to the book 'Idei Noi in Sahul Artistic', where further analyses or details may be found. AJR)
wins, or 2...Rf3 3. h8Q Rxf7 4. Qa8+ Kg1 5. Qg8+ wins. v) 3...Rh4
4.f8Q Kg2 5. Qg8+ Kh3 6. Qe6+ Kg2 7. Qg6+ Kh3 8. Qf5+ Kg3 9. Qg5+ wins.
vi) 3...f8Q h1Q 4. Qa8+ Rf3 draw. vii) 3... Rh4 4.f8Q Rxa8 5. Qg7+ Kh3 draw.
F.4: See EG9, p. 238, or (101).

2. Ba4 e3 3. Kf4 g5+ 4. Ke4 f5+ 5. Kd4 f4 6. c5 f3 draw. ii) 1... e3

wins. iii) 2... Kg8 3. Kg6 -- 4. Sh5+(Se7t) wins, or 2... b3/vii 3.
Sf6+ Kh8 4. Kg6 wins, or 2... g3(b3) 3. Sf6+ Kh8 4. Kh6 drawn.
iv) 3... g3(b3) 4. Kh6 g2(b2) 5. Sd6 wins. v) 2. Sf5 g3 3. Sxh4 b3
vii) 4... Kh3 5. Sxd5 g3 6. Sxh4 b5 7. Sxb4 Kd7 8. Kg4 Kh6 9. Khx3
wins.

F.7: 1. e7 de/i 2. e8Q/ii elQ/v/iii 3. Qxe1 Rg2+ 4. Kh1 Re2 5. Qg1/v
Re3 7. Sxf7 draw, or 1... Rxc3 2. e8Q d2 3. Qe7 f6 4. Qg7+ Kxb8
5. Qxf7 Kh7 6. Qg5 Kh6 7. Qh5 Kg7 8. Qg5+ wins. ii) 2. Kf2? elQ+/3.
Kxe1 f2+ 4. Kd1 Rxc3 5. e8Q f1Q 6. Kd2 Qc1+ 7. Ke2 Qb2+ draws, or
2. Sxe2 Rxe2 3. Bxd5 Rxh7 wins. iii) 2... Rc1+ 3. Kf2 Rf1+ 4. Kg3
wins. v) 8...Rh1 9. Kxf2 Rxe8 10. Ke3 draw.
**F.6**

P. Farago (111)
6th Pr.,
Vittorio de Barbieri
Memorial Tournay
L'Italia Scacchistica, 1947

**F.7**

P. Farago (145)
Special Prize.
Tidschrift KNSB, 1948

**F.8**

P. Farago
(104 and 63)
2nd Pr., Enroque!! 1950

**F.9**

P. Farago (132)
'Peoples' Democracies
Competition, 1951

---

**F.8:**
Bb8 7. Bf7 Sxf7 8. d8Q+ Sxd8/iv stalemate. i) 2. d8Q? Sxd8 3. g7
iii) 4... Bg8 5. Be4 d5 6. Bb7 Bf7 7. Bb6 draw, or 4... Be6 5. Bg2 d5
Ke7 12. a7 d4 13. g8Q Bxg8 stalemate. iv) 8... Kxd8 9. Kb7 wins.

**F.9:**
11. h6+ Kf8 12. h7 Rxc6 13. h8Q+ Bxh8 14. Kb7 wins. i) 1. c7? Rblt
a 'Bl dual': 2... Be5 3. Kc8 Rcl 4. e7 Rxc6 5. Kd8 Rxa6 draw, or
2... Kg7 3. a7 Ra1 4. Kb7 Rblt 5. Ka6 Ra1+ 6. Kb6 Bd4+. iii) 4. Ka8?
Rcl 5. a7 Kg7 6. Bf7 Bd4 7. h6+ Kf8 8. h7 Ke7 9. Bg6 Re3 10. Bf5 Ra3
draw. iv) 4... Kg7 5. c7/vii Ra1 6. e7/viii Bxe7 7. Kd7 Rcl 8. a7 wins.
vi) 10... Be5 11. Bb5 Rb3 12. Kb7 Rxb5+ 13. Ka6 Rb1 14. a8Q Ra1+
F.10

Luigi Centurini Memorial
Tny, 1952
Motto: Quo vadis Domine?

Draw


F.11

Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1955

Win


AJR: It seems part of
Farago’s style that the supporting variations are sometimes more attractive than the given main line – certainly this “inside-out” method of composing lends itself to great difficulty of solutions.

F.13: 1. h4† Kh5/i 2. Kg5 c3/ii 3. e3 c2 4. Rc4 b2/iii 5. Rc8 Kh6 6. Kf6 Kh7 7. Rc7† draw. i) 1... Kg6 2. h5† Kg7 3. h6† Kg8 4. h7 Kxh7 draw. ii) Now if 3. e4? c2 4. Rc4 b2 5. Rc8 c1Q wins. The alternative, leading to the illustration of the theme, is 2... a3 3. e4/iv c3/v 4. Rc4 c2 5. Rc8 c1Q/vi 6. Rxc1 a2 7. Rd1 b5 8. Rc1 b4 9. Rd1 b2 10. Rd8 draw, as bPb2 prevents a bQa1 controlling h8, so wK on f-file can keep opposite bK to maintain a drawing mating threat. iii) 4... c1Q 5. Rxc1 b2 6. Rd1 a3 7. e4 a2 8. Rd8 Kh6 9. Kf6... iv) 3. e3? a2 4. Ra4 b2 wins. The theme is now clear: W replies to 2... c3 with 3. e3, and to 2... a3 with 3. e4, the alternatives in either case losing.

v) 3... a2 4. Ra4 b2 5. Ra8 draws, or 3... b2 4. Rxh6 a2 5. Rb8 draws.


F.14: No printed solution appears in “Idei Noi in Sahul Artistic”. (A similar article to the present one appeared in Thèmes-64, vii-ix.71, with an editorial note to F.14 that an unpublished solution has been traced -- Thèmes-64 hopes to print it in their x-xii.71 issue. AJR)

Reprint of EG1 and EG2

Many correspondents have asked for back issues of EG. Very few issues are available. However, a small reprint of EG1 (vi.1965) and EG2 (x.1965) has just been completed, and they are available at £ 0.50 or $1.50 each. From AJR.

A new magazine, “Scacco!” This is yet another Italian magazine, with a studies section run by Ettore Volta. It is in its second year. AJR
SPOTLIGHT

directed by WALTER VEITCH

It is time for me to end with "Spotlight", as a regular feature anyhow, though I shall still be prepared to deal with analysis from readers. By the time this appears in print I shall have moved to a new address (see back page) and have a house and garden to occupy me which will be much more important and rewarding than chess. Meanwhile there is obviously enough material to fill EG also without this column, so readers can look forward to more studies, and enough has perhaps been said here over the past 6 years to show that appreciation should be allied to a fair degree of critical watchfulness. Samuel Butler once wrote: "The artist drew a great many lines and saved the best of them". Endgame composers often enough tend to save a number of less good lines as well, and (as EG shows) there is no hope really that accuracy will improve.

A Black draw was quoted on p. 217 of EG24. Diagram A is a correction which the composer sent on 28.ix.70 to Harold Lommer, who advised us of it. It is not clear whether it has been published. Essentially, the solution has been shortened by one move.

EG14, No. 720: G. Teodoru & C. Niewiadomski. Note (i) gave a line arriving at W: Ka5 Qb8; B: Kg2 Sh8 Ph2 and AJR commented that W would win by checking until Qe4t Kg1 etc. Mr. Teodoru, who only recently became aware of this comment, points out that the correct reply to Qe4t is Kg3! and after Kb4 Sh7 B1 draws by the threat of Sg5-h3-f2. An interesting point, which was omitted from the solution published in Szachy.

EG24, No. 1302: V. Kalandadze. Dr. Gorgiev advises that the idea used for a win in No. 1302 was previously exploited in the drawing study of Diagram B.

EG25, p. 242-3: T. B. Gorgiev's article.
No. 4: Black draws by 3... d4 4. Sxd4 b3t 5. Sxb3 b6!
No. 5: A bPb4 is missing from the diagram.
No. 7: A quicker win is 6. Sd8-e6-d4. A corrected and improved version, kindly avised to us by the composer, is shown in Diagram C.
**B. T. B. Gorgiev & D. Godes**  
*Cheskoslovensky Shakh* 1959

**Draw** 7

**C. T. B. Gorgiev**  
*Commended, Tidskrift for Schack, 1970 Award ix.71*

**Win** 4
(i) 1. Kf2? would prevent the later threat of 6. Sf2 mate.  
(ii) 4. Sg7? d4 5. Sf4 Bd3!  
(iii) 5. Sd8? Bb3!

---

P. 250-5: C. M. Bent’s article.
**C1:** With bK at h1 the position is in fact won by 5. Se4 Bf1 6. Sg3+ Kg2 7. Sxf1 Kxf1 8. Be7.

**C2:** This also would be a win bK at h1, much as in C5, by 1. Sc7 Bc4 2. Se5 Bh3 3. Bd2 Kg2 4. Sb5 Kf2 5. Sf5 and 6. Kh4 winning.


No. 1346: V. Vlasenko. Black mates by 4...Sa4-b6-d7. How can one possibly miss such a simple thematic stalemate avoidance? (Compare No. 1295 in EG24)

No. 1354: V. N. Dolgov & Al. P. Kuznetsov. The idea is not new, see No. 394 by Troitski in “1234”. Both studies are alike too in suffering from dual draws, the Troitski by 6. g8Q, and No. 1354 by 5. Ke6 g2 6. Sg1 Ba8 7. d4 etc. or even by 5. Sxg3 Kxg3 6. Ke6 etc. Moreover, in the supposed solution, how does W draw after 6. Bh6 or after 5. Bc7?

No. 1356: V. S. Kovalenko. ... Kb7 is the alternative defence and is met by 2. Ba3 Se3† 3. Kf3 Sxd5 4. Be4 Kc6 5. Kg4 Be3 6. Kf5 Bc5 7. Bb2 Kd6 8. Be5†, a good line worth noting.


Nos. 1372-81: F. S. Bondarenko.
No. 1373: A dual win is 2. Ra4 Kf8 3. Rxa5. The ingredients of the position are the threat of a back rank mate and a simple Zugzwang, yet per the comment preceding it no anticipation exists. I am sore puzzled!

No. 1377: The EG solution omits to give the winning method after 9. Bxb3, i.e. B returns to c8, P advances to c5, releasing wK to go and capture on h4.

No. 1378: This position is in fact very similar to a 1950 study by Liburkin & Bondarenko, the added element here being the line 1...Be1.

No. 1379: The solution fails because of 12. Bc3†. Instead 5. b4 Bg8 6. Rxb2 wins!


To end with, an excursion outside EG:-

Forty Years On

In 1929 and the early 1930's a number of related studies appeared of which Diagram D is one. The solution: 1. Bf4† Kc8 2. Kg1† Bb4 (other B moves lose immediately) 3. Rg8† Kb7 4. Be5 Ka7 5. Bd4† Kb7 6. Ke2 (waiting) Bb7 7. Rg7 wins. i) The assumption here was that 2. Rg8† Kb7 3. Kf1 Re3 would draw, even though after 4. Be3 Be5 5. Kg2 the wK can wander to d7, see Diagram E.
I came across position E in 1968 and decided that from such a situation a win had to be possible, and in due course I proved it in two long and intricate variations which I made the basis of a study to "Chess Life". But before its publication, and rather to my dismay, R. Missiaen in "Schakend Nederland", April 1969, produced a similar analysis, which proved moreover that my two variations could be condensed into one line of some 18 moves from Diagram B. The coincidence of these refutations 40 years on is rather remarkable. Then, in December 1970, I took another look at the matter and found an alternative winning method rather quicker than Missiaen's; i.e. 1. Rc8 Bg3 2. Bc5 Bf4(?) 3. Rc6 (threat Rb6t) Kb8 4. Bd6t Bx6 5. Rxd6 wins as wK gets to c7, e.g. 5... Kb7 6. Kd8 Kb8 7. Rb6t Bb7 8. Kd7 Ka7 9. Kc7 with a stock book win.

But this is not yet the end. Black improves by 2...Be1(h4) and there is no win by 3. Rc7† Ka6 4. Ra7† because 4...Kb6 attacks wB. Similarly if 1. Rc8 Bg3 2. Bg1 Bf4 3. Bc5 Bd2! holds the balance. Therefore 1. Rc8 Bg3 2. Bg1 Bf4 3. Bf2 Be5 4. Bc5 (Now!) Bg7, the only chance left but not good enough: 5. Rc6 Kb8 6. Rb6t Bb7 7. Bd6† Ka7 8. Kd7 Be4 9. Bc5 Be5† 10. Kd8 Ka8 11. Bc5 wins. (Or 8... Ba6 9. Rb4; or 8... Bg2 9. Rb3/4; or 8... Bh1 9. Bc3 Be3† 10. Kc2.) This, I hope, is the last word on Diagram E, of which by now I have had quite enough!

However, before we leave the subject, here are two related studies. R. Missiaen in F exploits the fact that E is a win. The Sarychev study G elaborates on the 1929 A. & K. Sarychev study in "64" which started the whole business but which now is bust (W: Kg1, Bb2, Bb7, Pg2 - B: Kf4, Rb8, Bh4. The intended draw was 1. g3† Bxg3 2. Bc1 Kg4 3. Bh1 Rb1 4. Kg2 Rxc1 stalemate, but 4...Be5 etc. wins).

---

**F. R. Missiaen**
Schakend Nederland
April 1969

**G. A. Sarychev**
1st Pr. - New Statesman
1961

---

**Win**

1. Rc2† Kd1 2. Rxc7 Be5†
3. Re7 Bb3/ii 4. Rh7 Bb2/iii
5. Rd8 Ke1/iv 6. Re7 Kb3/v-
7. Ra7 wins as given above.
1) 2... Ke2 3. Rc2† Kd1 4.
Kc3 Bb1 5. Kb3 Bf7; or 2... Bb3 3.
Rb7 Bc2 4. Rd7†; or 2... Bg8
3. Re8 Be4, Re8 Bb3 5. Kg3
Bb2 6. Kf2, ii) 3... Bc3 4.
Re8, i) 4... Bb1 5. Ke3
Bb2 6. Rd7†, iv) 5... Ke1
6. Be5 Bf6 7. Kg3, v) 6...
Kd1 7. Ke5 Bb2 8. Ba5 Ke1

---

**Draw**

1. Bd8/i Ke4 2. Kxb2/i Bb3†
3. Kb1/iii Re1† 4. Kc2 Re2†
Rf5 10. Bh4 Rh3 11. Be1 Rh2†
12. Kd1=, or 11... Rh1 12.
Bd2=.
1) 1. Kxb2 Re7 2. Bf6
Bd3 3. Bxb4 Re1† 4. Kc2 Re2†
iii) 3. Ke2† Rc3 4. Kd1= v) 3...
Kc1? Rb2+ 8... Rxd8 stalemate.
RESULT OF "DR PAOLI'S COMPETITION FOR COMPOSERS"
(see EG21, p. 153)

Only three entries were received from: F. Schuermans (Belgium), I. Vandecasteele (Belgium), and W. Veitch. The prize, a subscription to the Italian quarterly Sinfonie Scacchistiche donated by Dr Paoli, goes to Mr Schuermans, whose analysis is given below. The task was to correct a study published in 1938 by the Italian composer Vittorio de Barbieri, and to correct it by finding a correct placing of the black king.

Mr Schuermans’ analysis
In my opinion the composition cannot be corrected by moving bK. The theme requires promotion by W on d8, but any position of bK will in fact lead to either a Bl win or a W win. From Diagram B1:

B1

Vittorio de Barbieri
Revista Romana de Sah
1938

Draw(?)

Composer’s solution: 1. d7
Bb5 2. c6 Bb8 3. g6 Rc6 4.
e7/f Rx f 5. g5 Rg 6. d8Q
Bxd8 7. g8Q Rg8.
1) 4. g7? Rh5t 5. Kf4 Rg5
6. Kh4 Rg7t 7. e7 Rx e7 wins.

B2

F. Schuermans
(Correction of B1 by Barbieri)

Draw

Solution: see article. AJR:
"It is a pity that the solution is now two moves shorter."

I. d7 Ba5 2. c6 Rx e6 3. g6. This is the play in I to V. Now,

I: bKa8, a7, a6, b5,
3... Kb7(c6) 4. g7 Rh6t 5. Kg3 Kg6 6. Kh3
Kc7 and wins, as shown in Dr Pirrone’s original demolition.

II: bKa8

There is also, in this case: 3... Ka7 4. g7 Rh6 5. Kg3
Rg6 6. Kh3 Kg7 7. g8Q Rh7!! 8. Qh4 Rxh4 9. Kxh4
Kb6 10. Kg3 Kc5 11. h4 Kd4 12. h5 Kc3 13. h6 Kd2 14. h7
14. h5 Bh8. The first of these two lines is also the key
to the wins in III below.

III: bKa7, a6, b5, c5, d5,
In all these cases bK moves on 3rd and
a1, a2, a3, a4,
b1, b2, b3, c1, c2,
d4, d5, d1, d2, f4
9th moves to reach any of the following
squares in the line of II above: b4, c4, c3,

V: bKe1, f1, f2, g1, h1 3. ... Rxg6 with variations already seen.

VI: bKa5 W wins.

1. d7 Bxe5/i 2. d8Q+ Bc7/ii 3. Qd5† Kb6 4. Qb3† Ka6 5. g6 Be6 6. Qd3† Kb6/iii 7. Qb3† Kc5 8. Qf7 wins.

i) 1. ... Bd4 2. d8Q† Bb6 3. Qd5† Rc5 4. Qxc5† Bxc5 5. g6 Bf8 6. e6.

ii) 2. ... Kb5 3. Qe8 Bd4 4. g6 Kb6/iv 5. Qd8† Kc5 6. Qg5† Kb4 7. g7 Bxg7 8. Qxg7. Or 2. ... Kb4 3. Qd5 Rc5 4. Qe4† Kb3 5. g6 Bg8 6. Qb7† Kc2 7. Qh7 Bg7 8. Qxg7 Rh5† 9. Kg4.


iv) 4. ... Ke5 5. g7 Bxg7 6. Qe7†. Or 4. ... Kg7 5. Qf7 Bb6 6. Bxg7 7. Qxg7.

VII: bKb4 Again, W wins.

1. d7 Be5 2. d8Q Bc7/i 3. Qd4/ii Rc4/iii 4. Qb2† Ka5/iv 5. g6 Re4 6. Qa1† Kb5 7. Qb1† Rb4 8. Qxb4† wins.

i) 2. ... Bf4 3. g6 Rg8 4. Qd4† Ka5 5. Qa1† Kb6 6. Qb1†. Or 2. ... Bd6 3. Qd7 Kc5(b5) 4. g6 wins.

ii) 3. g6? Bxd8 4. g7 Rh6† 5. Kg2 Rh5 6. g8Q Rg5† 7. Kh3 Bxe7 8. Qxg7 Rf7 stalemate!

iii) 3. ... Ka5 4. g6 Rxg6 5. Qa1† Kb4 6. Qb1† and 7. Qxg6, or here 4. ... Rc1 5. g7 Rg1 6. Qd5†...

iv) 4. ... Ka4 5. g6 Ba5 6. g7 Rc8 7. Qa2† and 8. g8Q.

However, Mr Schueremans corrects the study (as Walter Veitch does also) by leaving bK on a8 and moving wPg5 to g6 (Diagram B2).

1. d7/i Ba5 2. e6/ii Rxe6/iii 3. g7 Rg8/iv 4. d8Q† Bxd8 5. g8Q Rxg8 stalemate.


ii) 2. g7 Rh6† 3. Kg3 Rg6† 4. Kh3 Rxg7 5. e8 Kb7, or here 4. Kf4 Bd8 5. Kxe3 Rxg7.

iii) 2. ... Bd8? 3. g7 wins.

iv) 3. ... Rh6† 4. Kg3 Rg6† 5. Kh3 Kb7 6. d8Q Bxd8 7. g8Q Rxg8 stalemate.

A. J. ROYCROFT
6.vii.71

The galley proofs of “Test Tube Chess” (sub-title: A Comprehensive Introduction to the Chess Endgame Study) are being corrected. The publishers are Faber and Faber, and the provisional date of publication is i.v.72. There will be about 450 diagrams and about 350 pages. Author: AJR.
GEORGY VASILEVICH AFANASIEV
24 XII. 1910 - 26 III. 1971

Georgy Afanasiev published his first study in 1927 in the magazine “64”. During 45 years of composing activity he published about 110 studies, of which 60 were in collaboration with E. I. Dvizov from about 1965 onwards. His last years were his most successful, including his participation in the Byelorussian team which won the team championship of the U.S.S.R. in 1968. Of late, he published articles in EG, Szachy and Problem; “declining the double attack” and unpinning were two themes advanced by him. In life he was a construction engineer, though from the outset of the war until 1957 he was in the Soviet Army. (From materials supplied by E. I. Dvizov).

G. V. Afanasiev
3rd Mon. Ment., 64, 1928

Draw
1. Ke4 h2 2. Kc4 g2 3. Rh8 Kg6 4. Rxh2 g1Q 5. Rg2 Qxg2 stalemate.

G. V. Afanasiev
Sovetskaya Byelorussiya, 1959

Win

G. V. Afanasiev, E. I. Dvizov
Problem, 1968

Draw

G. V. Afanasiev
Vo slavu Rodiny, 1949

Draw
Draw

1. Sb3 Bxb3 2. Bg7 and now
   two lines A. 2... Bc2t 3. Kg8
   Bb3t 4. Kh7 Bg8t 5. Kf6
   Bh7t 6. Kf7 (if 6. Kh7? a1B
   wins) Bg8t 7. Ke6 and a
   draw.

B. 2... a1B 3. Kg5 Bc2t 4.
   Kf7 Bb3t 5. Kg6 draw.

No. 1382: F. S. Bondarenko. 1. e7 h2 2. e8Qf Kb7 3. Qxb5t Kc8 4. Qe6
   Kd8 5. Qe6 Bb8 6. Qg8t Kc7 7. Qxg3t wins.


No. 1387: F. S. Bondarenko. 1. c6/i Qxc6 2. ef Bb5 3. e8Q†/ii Qxe8 4. feQ† Bxe8 5. Rd1 g1Q† 6. Kxg1 wins, but not 6. Rxe1? Sf8 7. Rd1 Bd7. i) 1. ef Bb5 2. e8Q† Bxe8 3. feQ† Qxe8. ii) 3. Rd1? g1Q† 4. Rg1 Qc2† 5. Kxh3 Qb3† 6. Kh2 Qxf7 wins.


No. 1391a:
In general it is accepted that 3 minor pieces win against one (Troitzky, incidentally, took it for granted that 3 S's would win against a single S), but this special case with 2 B's on the same colour seems not to have been investigated before. Examination soon suggested the win to be probable, but the question of proving it remained. WV solved it for this position by making White first concentrate on improving the position by the 5 moves Bb7, Ec6, B(6)b5, Kh7 and Kh6, meanwhile in essence ignoring all moves by the bS, which therefore by 12. Kh6 can wander to any of the 32 white squares of the board. The
win was then demonstrated from each square in turn, a task which required 89 columns. This method probably did not always produce the most efficient win, but had the advantage of reducing the whole thing to a systematic exercise.

No. 1391a

Position after 7, c8B
in No. 1391

Black to Move,

White Wins

Although theory states that 3 minor pieces win against one, the special case of two B's on the same colour has not been investigated before, as far as is at present known. Troitzky, incidentally, took for granted that three S's would win against a single S. It is assumed that the present analysis breaks new ground, even if the win causes no real surprise. But as the longest variation is 28 moves, and as bK is already at the board's edge, there is at least a possibility that in some cases this ending might pass the 50-move limit. (AJR)

The main line in the analysis arises as one would expect when bS keeps close to bK: 7... Sf6 8. Bb7 Ke8 9. Be6+ Kf8//i

No. 1392

N. Plaksin
(U.S.S.R.)

1st Place,
2nd Team (‘Friendship’)
Match, Studies Section, 1965-7

No. 1392: N. Plaksin. For a description of the terms of this international team composing match, see EG9, p. 239-240. The full award was to have been published by the end of 1968, but (surprise, surprise!) has not yet appeared. Judge: Dr S. Zlatic (Yugoslavia).
I have no hesitation in pronouncing this a masterpiece. (AJR) It can be demonstrated that at least 49 moves without capture or P-move must have preceded the diagram. The only move to prolong this series for 1 extra move in order to apply the 50-move draw rule, is 1. Sg3t. No good is 1. Se3t? because of the capture reply 1... Kxe2. The solver new to retrograde analysis will wonder, though, about those 49 moves. Well, the first rule is to count captures: 2W and 1 Bl men captured. Next, examine P-position to see how many captures are accounted for. In this case wPf7 and wPg6 have somehow passed their opposite numbers, involving 2 captures by W or Bl: but only 1 Bl man missing, so Bl must have captured W men; therefore wPf7 came from f2; therefore bPf6 came by capturing from g7; but this must have been after bBf8 emerged; and bBf8 emerged before the original bRa8 emerged; and bRa8 must have emerged before wR's b7 and b8 could infiltrate. This is the kind of argument one must handle. The last capture took place from a position like No. 1392a. From there on the shortest play to reach No. 1392 goes, with some minor alternatives: g7xf6; 1. Bf6-g7; 2. ..Rh8; 3. ..Bf8; 4. ..Rg7; 5. ..Bg8; 6. ..Rb7; 7. Bg7 Rh8; 8. ..Rhg4; 9. Rh7; 10. Bh6; 11. Rg7 Bh7; 12. Rg8 Bg7; 13. Rb8 Bf8; 14. Bg7 Bg6; 15. Rh7 Rh4; 16. Bh6 Rg2h2; 17. Rg7 Bh7; 18. Bg8 Bg7; 19. Rg6 Bf8; 20. Bg7 Bg8; 21. Rh7 Rh6; 22. Bh6 Rg7; 23. Rcb8 Bh7; 24. ..Rg6; 25. ..Bg7; 26. ..Rc8; 27. ..Bf8; 28. Bg7 Bg8; 29. ..Rg7; 30. Bh6 Rg7; 31. ..Bh7; 32. ..Bg8; 33. ..Bg7; 34. ..Rg6; 35. ..Bf8; 36. Bg7 Bg6; 37. ..Qh7; 38. Bh6 Qg7; 39. Ke4 Bh7; 40. Kg3 Qg8; 41. Kg4 Bg7; 42. Kh5 Qe8; 43. ..Bf8; 44. Bg7 Sh6; 45. Sf5 Sg8; 46. Bh6 Bg7; 47. ..Qf8; 48. ..Re8; 49. ..Rcd8. It may be noted that the idea has 2 spare moves to save it from demolition, in that wrb7, b6 can be placed on b8 and c6, with necessary moves by bK.

No. 1393: A. Koranyi. 1. 0-0/ii bc/ii 2. c4/iii g6 3. Kh1 Qa4 4. Sxg6 Qd1 5. Rxd1 Rgx6 6. Rdf1 wins. i) By a kind of argument whose validity, but not ingenuity, may be contested, 0-0 shows that wrf2 is promoted, since if wrf2 has never moved then wrf1 can never have emerged, given the position of the wP's. But if wrf2 is a promoted wP, on which square could it have arisen? Only 3 possible promotion squares: d8, f8, h8; and in every case bK must have moved, either to permit promotion or to allow wr to emerge legally. What about promotion on b3? In that case, arguing from the position of wP's, Bl P's and the number of captures, it can be shown that Bl fp must have promoted without capture, on f1, hence wK must have moved in reply to .. f3-f2. In that case W would not be permitted to castle. Therefore, runs the argument, W casting proves that Bl may not castle. (More correctly, and this is where the validity of the argument can be called in question, if W may castle, then Bl may not.) 1. Rhf1? 0-0-0 "prevents" W from casting, though of course in a game the game-score would be 291.
independent of the kind of argument involved here (namely, if BI may castle, then W may not). 1. Sg6? be and now either 2. Rhf1 0-0-0, or 2. 0-0 c4 3. Kh1 Qxf2; noting that here 1... 0-0-0-0 fails to 2. Sxe7+ and 3. Sxc6. i) 1... b5 2. d4 and 3. Sg6. Or 1... g3 2. Sg6. Or 1... Qa5 2. Sd7 Qg5+ 3. Sg2. ii) 2. Sg6? c4, pinning wRf2.

No. 1394: N. Petrovic. The BI P’s account for 6 captures, that is, all missing W men. Similarly wP’s have taken all 4 missing BI men, so wPe6 came from b2, wPf7 came from g2 via g6, wPf5 is from f2 without capture, and all captures by BI were therefore by the BI P’s now on d5, e5, e4 and f4. It is important to realise that bPf6 could not have captured from e7, since then bPf4 would have made no captures and the wP’s on f-file would be illegally placed (too many retro-captures). Solution: 1. f5xg6/i Bc5 2. e3 fe/i 3. 0-0 e2f 4. Kg2 ef1Qt 5. Kxf1 and 6. g7 wins. i) If W may castle, then this is demonstrably legal, arguing from the P-position and number of captures. BI attempts to prevent W from castling, but W succeeds, thus, according to the printed solution “legalising the initial en passant capture retrospectively.” ii) 2... Bxe3 3. de and 4. 0-0.

No. 1395: N. Littlewood. The proof that W may castle involves recognition that wRb5 is promoted, that bPd5 promoted (to bS) on f1 (capturing wR there) after 4 captures, and that therefore W’s last move was d6x7t (there is no other), so that bPd5, which can have made no captures (no men available) came on BI’s last move from d7. Therefore: 1. c6x6t Kxd6 2. e6Q+ Re7/i 3. 0-0-0/ii Kc7 4. Qxe7t Kc8 5. Qxa7 wins. i) 2... Kc7 3. Pd6t Kxd6 4. 0-0-0/ wins. ii) 3. Bxe7t? Kc7 and escapes via b7, vacated by br. This study is, like the previous one, a case of retrospective legalising of an initial en passant capture.
No. 1396: J. Knöppel. The 9 captures by Bl P’s account for missing W men, while wP’s made 4 captures, lifting total of Bl men accounted for to 13 (9 in diagram already). Therefore wPg2, h2 promoted (to be capturable by bP’s), both of them. But this is not all: how was wPf2 captured? Only, it appears, by itself having made a capture. And so there are only 2 Bl men left for gP and hP to have taken on their promotion path; and this is not enough to avoid bK or bRh8 having moved. Therefore, Bl may not castle. 1. Ke6 Kf8 2. Kf6 Kg8 3. Kg7 Kf8 4. Ra7 Ke8 5. Ke5 Kd8 6. Kd6 Ke8 7. Rf7+ Kb7 8. Rxb8 a5/9. Rh7+ Ka6 10. Kxc6 b1Q 11. Rh8 Ka7 12. Rh7+ Ka6 13. Rh8 Qh1+ 14. Rxb1 b2 15. Rh8 draws. i) 8...b1Q 9. Rh7+ with perpetual check.


No. 1399: J. H. Marwitz. 1. Ka1/i Qb4/ii 2. a3 Qd6 3. Rd3/iii Qc5 4. Rc3 Qd6 5. Rd3 Qxd3 6. Re1+ K−7. Re8+ and stalemate! i) One of wR’s is promoted, and this can have taken place only on a square where bK must have moved before or after the promotion. Note that W is in check in the diagram, and that after 1. Ka1 he threatens 2. Re3. ii) 1... Kd8 2. Rf7 Ke7 3. Re3 Qxe3 4. Rf7+ and de. iii) A delightful surprise.

No. 1400: B. Jamnicky. 1. g7/i Rg8 2. Rh3 Sb6 3. 0-0-0/ii Sd7 4. Rh8 Rf8 5. Rfx8+ Sxf8 6. g5 Qxg5/iii wins. i) W castling before Bl “proves” that wRa3 is promoted and that this promotion involved loss of castling privilege by Bl, at least on the Q-side, if wP promoted to R on b8, or on a8. W’s first move prevents Bl castling on the K-side. 1. Rh8 0-0 wins! ii) 3. Rh8? 0-0-0 is allowed, under the convention (which must be accepted if this genre is to continue to exist) that in positions where castling depends on the opponent’s ability to castle, the act of castling before the opponent is decisive to the “proof”. iii) Not compulsory, as promotion may be delayed a move. A very small flaw. (AJR)
No. 1401: V. Bartolovic. wBb1 is promoted, and reached bl after wPcxb3. Therefore, and this seems a curiously original point, if W may still castle, there must be found two legal Bl moves to retract. There seems no difficulty, as ...c7xd6 and ...f7xe6 are both "on". But they must both have been captures of wS's (because no other piece could have passed the barrier of W's own P's). However, for one of the captures bk would have been in illegal check (from wSd6, and there is no spare move for wS to have reached that square). Hence, if W can castle, Bl may not. And conversely.

Solution: 1. 0-0-0 Rc8 2. Bg6t Kd8 3. Rxf8t Kc7 4. Rxe8t Kxc8 5. Kf1 and so on.

i) 1. Rf1? 0-0-0, in accordance with the now familiar logic, if the reader has followed the preceding solutions. Notice that the retractions by Bl must not deprive him of the castling privilege.

No. 1402: F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1. e6/i de/ii 2. Bg4t/iii hg 3. de Iv iv 4. a6 Kg6 5. a7/v Kh7 6. Sg5 Ke6 7. Sh3 with an interesting repetition. i) Bl castling is illegal as wBb1 promoted via f7. 1. Bg4t? Kd8 2. e6 dc 3. a6 Ke8. ii) Bl tries to make way for his R to halt aP. iii) 2. de? g5 3. Sxg5 Kf8 4. Sf7 Rg8 5. Sh5 Rg6 6. Bd3 Sxd3 7. a6 Rh5t 8. Kg1 Sf2, or here 5. Bxe7 Rg4 6. Kh3 Kg5 7. Kh2/vi Kg7 8. Be4 Kg8 9. Sh6 Rg8. iv) Not given is 3... Rh4 and Bl seems to win by ... Rxb4. (AJR) v) 5. Kg1 Sxe2t 6. Kh2 g5 7. a7 Kh7, or here 6. Kg1 Sg3 7. Ke1 f3 8. a7 f2t. vi) 7. Kh4 Rxg2 8. a6 Rxg2.
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No. 1404: B. Schlotterbeck. 1. Rd3 h5/i 2. Re3t Kf8 3. Bd6t Kg8 4. Rg3t Kh7 5. Rg7t Kh6 6. Bf4 mate. i) bK or bR must have moved last, so no castling. 1... Qxg2 2. Re3t Kf8 3. Bd6t Kg8 4. Re8 mate.
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No. 1408: K. Fabel. Last move was ... b7-b5. This because bPc2 came from h7, and bBf8 was captured by a wP, so ... e7-e6 is also eliminated.
1. a5xb6 Sb3+ 2. Kb5 Sxd4+ 3. Ka6 ab/i 4. Kxb6 Sxc6 5. Kxc6 and mates next. i) 3... Sxc6 4. b7t Kd7 5. b8Q or 5. c8Q+ wins.

No. 1409: A. Stavrinides. 1. h5xg6 Bxf2/i 2. gh gh/i 2. h8Q Kg1 4. Qa8 h1Q 5. Qxh1+ Kxh1 6. g4 Bel/iii 7. g5 Bxd2 8. b5 Kg1 9. h7 h2 10. h8Q h1Q 11. Qxh1+ Kxh1 12. g8 Qf t 13. Kxg6 Kg2/iv 14. f7 Bb4 15. Kg7 Kf3 16. f8Q Bxf8+ 17. Kxf8 Ke4 18. Ke7 Kd5 19. Kd7 wins. i) 1... hgt 2. Ke4 Bxf2 3. Bxg4 Kg2 4. Bf3t. Or 1... fg+ 2. Kxg4 Bxf2 3. Kf3 Kg1 4. Bg2. ii) 2... Kg1 3. Bg2 Kg2 4. h8Q h1Q 5. Qa8+ Kh2 6. Qxh1+ Kxh1 7. h7 and so on. iii) 6... c5 7. b5 c4 8. g3. iv) 13... Bb4 14. f7 Bf8 15. Kf6 Kg2 16. Ke6 wins.
No. 1410: P. Perkonoja. 1. Bf2/i Kf8/ii 2. Bc5† Kg8 3. Se7† Kf8 4. Sc8† Kg8 5. Sd6 g6 6. Se8 Rg7/iii 7. Sxf6 mate. i) 1. Be1? g6 2. Bb4 gf 3. Bc5 f4 4. Sc5 f5 5. Sd5 f6† with at least a draw. 1. Bg3† Kf8 2. Be6† Kg8 3. Sc7† Kf8 4. Sc8† Kg8 5. Bc5 g6 6. Sd6 Rg7 7. Se8 Rhh7. ii) 1... 0-0 is clearly illegal, the original bRh8 having moved at least once. 1... g6 2. Bc5 gf 3. Sb4 f4 4. Sd5 and 5. Sf6 mate, or here 3... Rg8 4. Sd5 Rg6 5. Kb8 and 6. Sc7 mate. iii) 6... gh 7. Sxf6† Kg7 8. Sxh5† Kg8 9. f6 Rg7 10. fg wins. Or 6... g7. Be7 f4 8. Bxf6 Kf8 9. Kb7 wins.

No. 1411: S. Segenreich and M. Shorek. A nice variation on illegal castling, linked here with proving that W’s last move, prior to the move putting him in check, was e2-e4, to which the reply was .. bPxe3#. Incidentally, on Bl’s previous move the same P disclosed check from the same piece, something one would have thought impossible! Anyway, wBd1 is promoted, and in the process BK moved, for the usual reason. 1. Kd4/i Rd8/ 2. Kc5 Rd6/ii 3. b6/v iii Ke7/iv 4. Qh4† Sf6/v 5. Qxf6† gf 6. Qxf6† Rx6/v 7. Sxf6 wins. i) 1. Ke2? Sc1#. ii) 2... Bxh7 3. Qxg4#. iii) 3... Kd7 4. Qxg4#. iv) 4... Kc6 5. Qxf7#. v) 4... f6 5. Qxg7#.

No. 1412  
E. Paoli  
(Italy)  
21st Place,  
2nd Team ("Friendship")  
Match, Studies Section, 1965-7  
Win 8

No. 1413  
C. Jonsson  
(Sweden)  
22nd Place,  
2nd Team ("Friendship")  
Match, Studies Section, 1965-7  
Win 7

No. 1414  
B. Breider  
and O. Kaila  
(Finland)  
23rd Place,  
2nd Team ("Friendship")  
Match, Studies Section, 1965-7  
Win 10

No. 1415  
E. Thiele  
(DDR)  
24th Place,  
2nd Team ("Friendship")  
Match, Studies Section, 1965-7  
Win 7

No. 1413: C. Jonsson. 1. h5 Bxb7 2. h6/i Bd5+ 3. Kg7 Bg8 4. Kxg8 Kd8 5. d5/i Kc8 6. c6 dc 7. dc and only now can the wPh6 advance to promote and win.  
i) 2. Kg7? Rb8 3. h6 Be4 4. de Rbl. Castling by Bl is illegal, since bK or bR must have moved immediately prior to the diagram.  

No. 1414: B. Breider and O. Kaila. Bl has no shortage of retractable moves, but W has few possibilities. Bl P's have taken all missing W men, as have wP's all missing Bl men. Therefore wPa2 promoted. Therefore . . . a5xb4 was not Bl's last. Therefore to give wPb? an 'uncapture' without getting behind Bl eP, Bl's last was . . . c7-c5.  
i) 1. b8Q? Be4 2. Bc8 Rh4 3. f3 (gh, h1Q:) 3... Sxf3 4. gf Bxf3 5. Kxh7 Be4+ 6. Kg8 h1Q 7. Qc7 Rg4t 8. Bxg4 hg 9. Rxh1 Bxh1 10. Qxb6 e6 "etc."

i) 1. 1. Bd8? a8t 2. Kb6 Ra7 3. Bb7 Rxb7+ 4. Sxb7 b3  ii) 1...  
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No. 1416: Spiros Bikos. 1. c5xd6/i cdt/ii 2. Kxd6 d3/iii 3. Bg5 d2/iv 4. Bxd2 Kxf6/v 5. Kd7 wins. i) Moves of bS not retractable because that would have meant wK in check with Bl to play. ii) 1... Rxf8 2. Bg5 cdt (Sg6t; Kxd4) 3. Kxd6 Sg8 (d3; c7) 4. c7 d3 5. c8Q wins. Or 1... d3 2. Bg5 Sf7t 3. ef Kxf8 4. Be7 mate. iii) 2... Sg8 3. Sxg8 and 4. c7. iv) 3... Kxf8 4. Kd7 g8 5. Bh6t Rg7t 6. e7t. v) 4... Kxd8 5. Bg5t Kc8 6. e7 Sf7t 7. Kd5.

No. 1417: G. A. Croes. 1. h5xg4 hgt/i 2. Kf4 g5t/i 2. Kf4 g5t/i 3. Kf5 Kh7 4. Kxg5 Sh6 5. Kh5 Sg8 6. g5 Kh8 7. g8 g5t 8. Kxg8 Sh8 9. ft7 wins. i) 1... fg7 2. Ke4, but not 2. Kf4? g6t 3. Kf5 Sxf6 with stalemate. ii) 2... Kh7 3. g5 wins.

No. 1418: E. M. Hassberg. 1. d3/i a1Q/ii 2. Rd2 Qa6 3. e4 wins. i) Not castling, as wK had to move to let in wRe2. 1. d4? a1Q 2. Rd2 Qa6. ii) 1... a1B 2. Kf1 Kd1 3. f3 wins.


No. 1422: E. Iwanow. 1. h7 Ke7 2. Bg8 Ra1# 3. Kc2. Or here 2. ... Rd8# 3. Ke1.

The Tidsskrift för Schack informal tourney for studies published during 1969 was judged by Walter Korn, FIDE International Judge for studies. Quotes below are from the award, which was confirmed in Tfs 9/70 when the 5th Prize was added.

No. 1424: Dr. A. Mandler. I: 1. Sa5† R3b7 2. Ka3 Ka7 3. Bxb7 Bxb7 4. Sc6† etc. = II: 1. Sd6† R5b7 2. Ka5 Ka7 3. Bxb7 Bxb7 4. Sb5† etc. = “A wholly legitimate presentation in twin form of this chameleon theme”.


No. 1426: G. Nadareishvili. 1. e8S Rxe8/i 2. dxe8S/ii Rxe8 3. fxe8S Bd2/iii 4. c8R Be3 5. h8B wins. i) 1... Be7 2. Sxg7 Rf8 3. d8Q Rx8d 4. exd8Q Rx8d 5. Bd7 Rf8 6. Be8 Rh8 7. Se6 wins. ii) 2. fxe8S? Bg7† 3. Sxg7 Rf8 wins. iii) 3. Be3 4. h8B wins. (TFS gives 4... Bd2 5. c8R but 5. Bb2† will do. WV) “Fascinating how the sequence of the underpromotions is rendered absolutely forced.”
No. 1426: G. Nadarelshvili
4th Pr. TfS Tny 1969
Award 6/70


No. 1427: H. Källström
5th Pr. TfS Tny 1969
Award 6/70 & 9/70


No. 1429: H. Lilja
2nd Hon. Men. TfS Tny 1969
Award 6/70

“Orthodox and not entirely new, but elegantly executed.”

No. 1428: V. Kivi
1st Hon. Men. TfS Tny 1969
Award 6/70


No. 1429: H. Lilja
1st Hon. Men. TfS Tny 1969
Award 6/70
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