Modern study composition has reached a stage of development where it is difficult to find one's bearings in the variety of works published. The qualitative, and in particular the quantitative dimensions of the modern study are rapidly increasing. If one assumes that at the present time some 25,000-30,000 studies exist, then the desire naturally arises to know what are all these studies, spread through many different publications throughout the world - in books, magazines and newspapers. Studies published in collections, of course, are easily attainable. As for those in magazines and in particular in newspapers, things are much more difficult in view of the scarcity of information about these sources.

The time has come to assemble this vast quantity of studies, to examine and systematize them in order to assess the achievements of the past, to clarify the present state of affairs and to determine the prospects for future development.

Until now no clear system of classification which might satisfy everybody and yet remain simple and obvious has been worked out. I do not think that one can easily develop such a system for practical use. But as a first step towards the truth, here is a possible scheme for classifying studies by content:

1. Mate.
2. Stalemate.
3. Domination (for win).
4. Domination (for draw).
5. Positional draw.
6. Systematic ideas.
7. Utilization of pawns.
   (a) Queen promotions.
   (b) Minor promotions.
8. Studies with prominent counterplay
   (aiming at stalemate, positional draw etc.).
10. Other win studies.
11. Other draw studies.

The last two groups (10 and 11) would be of a general nature and would require further division into subgroups.

For my new work “Domination”,* which will consist of two volumes and contain over 2500 studies, I searched for studies featuring the win of material. The term “domination”, as is well known, was invented by the great French composer H. Rinck. Its essence is that W pieces attack squares which B pieces then cannot occupy, leading to loss of material. I decided in the book to widen the definition of “domination” to

---

* The explicit aim of anticipation retrieval might be added. (AJR)

* Available, £1 post free, from AJR (Vol. 1 only). Review in EG35.
mean the trapping of pieces based on various elements - geometric, those of pinning, tying down to other pieces, discovered attack, refutation of mating threats, incarceration, zugzwang and so on. Why did I decide to do that? For a very important reason - these elements find their way into many studies, without any barriers between them. In fact, quite often in a study showing win of material Bl will lose in one variation through pin of a piece and in another because of a discovered attack and in a third through defending against mate, and so on. Thus the book contains many studies where W wins by the gain of material using the various devices mentioned above. Thus the concept of domination became wider, which somewhat simplified classification of the studies in the book. I also took the material into account in the classification. The studies were broken into groups, of which material was one of the principal determinants. The classification answers two questions: 1. Which Bl piece is being caught? 2. Which W pieces participate in the domination? Putting it this way allows the reader to find quickly that group of studies which interests him.

It seems to me that in elaborating different groups of studies by content, one can also adopt this combined system, where one takes into account material alongside the thematic elements. Of course, it is difficult to look ahead and make any categorical conclusions about how further work on creating a basic classification of studies should proceed. Such work is very time-consuming and demanding. I feel that one should not complicate classification, but simplify it, bringing out the main features of the content and putting aside the secondary, which in many studies only hampers a clear understanding. I hope that the grey areas in study composition will gradually disappear and that by the combined efforts of the study world a proper classification will come about to reflect what has been composed.

Corrections to, and comments on, TEST TUBE CHESS (contd.)

Oisin McGuinness, a young enthusiast from Mount Merrion, Ireland, has spotted two notation errors. p. 88 115 7. Qxd4 should be Qxc4. p. 321 (c) ... 3. Kxa2 should be Kxd2. He also points out that it is a probable error that C. Forth is described on p. 85 as an Englishmen, Carlow being firmly located in mid-Ireland. Very little indeed is known about this gentleman, except that he lived most of his life in Waterford, paid a brief visit to London (recorded in The Chess Player's Chronicle on the occasion of his death in 1847) in 1843, and contributed the analysis mentioned in TTC. I must thank Dr Adriano Chicco for drawing my attention to the CPC reference.

AJR

Tourneys


ASSYAC JUBILEE Tourney of EG - Final Award

1st Prize: V. A. Bron, No. 1850. (No. 1849a, note (x).)
4th Prize: A. van Tets, No. 1853.
5th Prize: A. H. Branton, No. 1854, without first move by White and Black.
1st-5th H.M. Nos. 1855-1859. 1st-6th Commended and 4 Special Prizes: as published.
Thanks to V. A. Eron (USSR) and V. Kos (Czechoslovakia) for analytical comments.
All prizes have been either distributed or ordered.

October 1973

H. Fraenkel

(AJR mini-report on Subscriptions)

How would you like to subscribe to an East European chess magazine AND help EG at the same time? If this appeals to you, send your name and address to AJR, together with the name of the magazine you select and a year's subscription to EG (i.e. £2.00). You may choose from: Shakhmatnaya Misl (Bulgaria), Magyar Sakkelet (Hungary), Szachy (Poland), Revista Romana de Sah (Romania), Shakhmaty v SSSR (USSR), Shakhmatny Bulletin (USSR), Ceskolovensky Sach (Czechoslovakia). All these magazines appear monthly. I shall then arrange for a national of the country concerned to send you the magazine you desire, and he will be sent EG.

An arrangement of this kind will help us through currently troubled financial waters, if it is supported. A small number of subscribers decided not to renew when the subscription increased. There are (at 25.xi.73) still the following outstanding renewals: AATA, EA, ECh, CF-H, LAcS, RGr, EdHo, JRHo, AIH, MBJ, DHL, CMA, JRa, CPK-F, LMa, RMI, GNe, MBE, RKG, LMu, ADu, PLe, SSA, HHS, JdeJ, WJGM, WAR, ARuSt, JvD, DFR, BSH, AvT, WFR, WI (3), MSCH; RBR, WLa, PCL, FJSK, MGvP, HW; OWc; (KAB, LAK, NeMcK, EM, RWh), etc.

Obituary. Robert Smith (see EG32, p. 483), of Buckfastleigh, South Devon, died in September, 1973. One of our older and most loyal members he was also well known in draughts circles.

Rev. F. Guillaume, known in Canadian chess circles as “Charlie Hess”, died 17.x.72. He ran the compositions column in Canadian Chess Chat (see EG32, p. 492).
**DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS**

---

**No. 1901**  
S. A. da Silva  
*Shakhmaty/Sahas iii.72*

1. c7  
Kf6/i  
2. Rf8t  
Kg5  
3. Rg8t  
Kf4  
4. Rf8t  
Ke3  
5. Re8t  
Kf2  
6. Re8t  
Kf1  
7. Rblt  
Kg1  
8. Re2t  
Kfl  
9. Rf2t  
Kgl  
10. Rg2t  
Kh1  
11. Rh2t and draws.  
i) 1... Ra1t 2. Kb8 Rblt 3. Kc8 Kd6 4. Rd8t Ke6 5. Rd7 Rxd7 stalemate,  
iii) 6. Rf8t? Kg1 7. Rg8t Kh1 8. Kb8 Rblt 9. Ka8 Rh2 wins,  
civ) 7. ... Rh3 8. cS draws.  
JRH: "Basic idea is Rinck (1938), etc. Nos. 880, 883, 884 and Kasparyan's '2,500'."

---

**No. 1902**  
A. P. Kuznetsov  
*Shakhmaty/Sahas vii.72*

1. Sd2t/i  
e4t/ii  
2. Kxd2  
e3t  
3. Kxe3  
c4t  
4. Sd4  
Bx4t  
5. Kxd4  
a1Qt  
6. Re3  
Ka2  
7. Bcl/i  
Kb1  
8. Ba3 and so on.  
i) 1. Bb2 ef 2. Bc3 Ba5 and wins.  
iii) 7. Bxd6 Kb2 8. Rg3 Qh1 9. Re3 Qg1 10. Bc3 Qg5 11. Re2t  
JRH: "Cf. Herbstman (1936), No. 53 in his collection."

---

**No. 1903**  
V. A. Bron  
*Shakhmaty/Sahas vi.72*

1. Qxe4t  
Bxe4  
2. a8Q  
Bxa8  
3. fg g2  
4. g8Q  
Rxe3  
5. Qxg2t  
Bxg2  
6 Rflt  
Bxfl  
7. Bb7t  
Kxh2  
8. Rh8t  
Bh3  
9. e8R.

---

**No. 1904**  
S. Chimedtzegen  
*Shakhmaty/Sahas ii.72*

The composer is from Ulan Bator.  
1. Sb3/i  
Kf5  
2. Kg7  
Sg6  
3. Sxd4t  
Kg5  
4. Sf3t  
Kh5/i  
5. Se5  
d6  
Sxg6  
d1Q  
7. h8Qt  
Kg4  
8. Qf4t  
Kf5  
9. Qf4t  
Ke6  
10. Qf6t  
Kd7  
11.
Se5+ Kc8 12. Qc6t Kd8 13. Sf7t
Ke7 14. Qf6t Kd7 15. Qd8t and
wins  i) 1. Se4t Kf5 2. Kg7 Sg6
Sd2 Kg5 4. Sf3t Kh5 draw. ii) 4.
... Kf5 5. Se5 d2 6. Sc4 d1S 7. Se5
Sxe5 8. h8Q wins.

No. 1905
A. K. Kalinin

Shakhmaty/Sahs v.72

No. 1905: A. K. Kalinin. 1. e4/i Qb5
2. Rgl Qc5 3. Rhl Qf2 4. e5 Kf5
5. e6 Qg2 6. Rc1 Qd2 7. Rh1 draw,
for example by 7. ... Kg4 8. e7
Qe2 9. e8Q Qxe8 10. Rg1t Kh3
11. Rh1 Kg2 12. Rg1t and so on.
i) 1. Rf3t Qd5 2. Re3t Kg5 3. Rf3t
Kg6 4. Rg3t Kh5 5. Rg1t Kh3 6. e4
Qd2 7. e5 Kh2 8. Rh1 Kg2 and
wins. A refutation of 3. Rh6t is
also given, but it makes no sense.

No. 1906
P. Perkonija

1st Pr., Thèmes-64, 1970-71
Dedicated to Harold
Lommer
Award: x-xii.72 and i-iii.73

No. 1906: P. Perkonija. 1. e7 Rd6t
2. Kc4 Re6 3. e8Q Rxex 4. Rxex
Kd5 Sf1 8. Re4t Kg7/iv 9. Rc4
Sh2 10. Rc1 Sf1 11. Rc4 g1R/v 12.

Rxb4 Rg3t 13. Ke2 Sh2 14. Kf2
Kg2) 16. ... Rd3 17. Kf2 drawn.
i) 5. Re4t? Kg5 (same reply to 1.
Rh8?) 6. Re1 Sf3 7. Rcl Kf4 (for
... Sd2i and ... Sf1) 8. Kxb4/vii
Ke3 (for 9. ... Kd2 and 10. ... Se1)
Kd2. ii) 6. Rd1? Sd2t 7. Kxb4 Sf1
8. Rd6t Kg7 9. Rd7t Kf6 10. Rd6t
Kf5 11. Rd5t Kf4 12. Rd4t Kf3
13. Rd3t Ke2. iii) 6. ... Kg5 7.
Kxb4 Kf4 8. Re1 Kg3 9. Rc8. iv)
8. ... Kg5 (h5) 9. Re8 Sg2 10. Rc1
Sf1 11. Rc6, a positional draw. v)
11. ... g1Q 12. Rh4t. vi) 14. ... Rh3
Kd2 10. Ra1 Se1. Or 8. Kd3 Ke5
Rgl Sxg1 12. Kd4 Se2t 13. Ke4
Scl. viii) 9. Kc4 Sd2t 10. Kxb4
Rc3t Kf2 (e2). "Two positional
draws – very interesting and dif-
ficult." Judge: A. Hilbedrand.

No. 1907
Al. P. Kuznetsov

2nd Pr., Thèmes-64, 1970-71
Version x-xii.70

No. 1907: Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1.
Kd2t/i Kg2 2. c6 h2 3. Rh1 Bg1
4. Ke2 Kxh1 5. Kf3 g2 6. Kg3 e5
7. f6 e4 8. f7 e3 9. f8B e2 10. Bb4
RgxI+i h6Q/14. Bxg1 Kxg1 15. Kf5
wins. i) 1. c6? Be3 2. Rc2 g2 3.
Ra2 g1Q 4. Kc2t Ke2 5. Kc3t Kf3
6. Rg1t Bxg1 7. Ke4 h2 8. Rxh2
Ke7 14. Kb7 Kd8 15. Kxa8 Kc8
stalemate. ii) 11. ... Kd7 Ke5 12.
Kb7 e2 16. a8Q e1Q draw.


No. 1915: L. Katsnelson. 1st Prize. Award v.t. *Chakhmaty v SSSR, 1968*


JRH: A development of No. 174 (1965) in EG5, by the same pair.

No. 1918: V. Yakimchik. 1. f6 gh 2. g7† Kh7 3. Be6 Bxe6 4. g8Q† Bxg8 5. f7 Bg7 6. f6† Kh8 7. f7† Kh7 8. Sf8† draw. JRH: Cf T. R. Dawson (1923) in Magyar Sakkvilag --/8/2p5/p7/b7/kp4p1/lpPs1bP1 /1P5K/8/ // =. 1. e4 Bb6 2. Sc5† Ka5 3. Sxb3† Ka4 4. Sc5† Ka3 5. Sb3†.


No. 1921: Y. Dorogov. 1. f6 Bh4/i 2. Re1 Sxe1 3. f7 Be7 4. Sxe7 h2 5. Qb4† Sxh2 6. Qxh2 Qxc6 7. Qxh6+ Kf7 8. Qd6 mate. i) 1. ... h2 2. Rh7 wins by queening fP.

No. 1924: D. Djaja. 1. g6 hg 2. c7† Ke8 3. Bh6 g5 4. g4 Bb7 5. c8Q† Bxc8 6. Bg7 Kd8 7. Bh6 Ke8 8. Bh6 Kd8 9. Bxg5 Ke8 10. Bh6 Kd8 11. g5 (Bg7) Ke8 12. Bg7 (g5) Kd8 13. Bf8 Ke8 14. Bh6 Kd8 15. g6 wins.

No. 1925: M. Prascheruk. 1. h8Q† Qxh8 2. Se7 Qal 3. Rf1 Qxf1 4. Sf5† Kh5 5. Sg3† wins.


Mr. J. P. Toft, Copenhagen veteran, supplies two interesting items of information. The source of the Troitzky (p. 490 of EG32) mangled by Capablanca is probably Novoye Vremya, 1896. Mr Toft has an almost complete set of Troitzky studies. In response to my query, he elucidates the mystery of a “game Jorgensen-Sorensen, 1945” which is widely believed to have ended in the 9th century arab sacrificial mate in 3 reproduced as 59 in Test Tube Chess. Mr Toft assures me that the “game” was a joke in a Danish chess column. AJR


No. 1934: V. Chupin. 1. h3t Kh5 2. Bb2 gf 3. Sf5 f1Q 4. g4t Kg5 5. Lc1t Qxc1 6. Sd4 Kf4 7. Se2t wins.


No. 1935: G. M. Kasparyan. 1. g6t Kg8 2. Ke7 Sg5 3. Bd4 Rxc6 4. h7t Sxh7 5. Rh4 Rxg7t 6. Ke8 draw, as 6. ... Sf6t 7. Bxf6, protecting wRh4 (thus explaining W's 5th).
No. 1936: E. L. Pogosjants.

No. 1938: N. A. Kondratyuk.
1. a6 g2 2. ab Bxd6t 3. Kxd6 glQ 4. Ra3t Kd2 5. Ra2t Ke3 6. Ra3t Ke2 7. Ra2t Kf3 8. Ra3t Kg4 9. Ra4t Kg5 10. Ra5t Kf6 11. b8Q Qg3t 12. Re5 Qxe5t 13. Kd7 Qxb8 stalemate.

No. 1937: D. F. Petrov.

No. 1939: I. L. Kovalenko.
1. f7 e6 2. Ke5 g5 3. Kxe6 g4 4. Kf5 Kf3 5. Kg5 Bc5 6. Kf5 Be7 7. Ke6 Bf8 8. Kf5 Bh6 9. Kg6 Bf8 10. Kg5 Bc5 draw, W always being able to maintain an alternative attack on bPg4 or bB.


No. 1945: L. Kopac. 1. Se8 Bxe8 2. f8St Kg7 3. h6† Kf6 4. Bc3† Ke7 5. Bb4† Kf6 6. h7 Bb5† 7. Ke3 wins (though there is some mystery, as my source continues 7. ... g2 8. h8Q 'mate', which it is not).


John Easley conscientiously indicates a blemish in the footnote study of his on p. 9 of EG33. 1. Rxb4† Qxh4 2. g8R Qh3† 3. Kbxb4 Qh4† 4. Kb5 Qh3† 5. Kb6 Qh6† and now 6. Ka5 will also win, transposing to the main line after 6. ... Qh5† 7. Kc6 Qh6†, or 6. ... Qd2† 7. Sb4.
1. h3\texttt{\textdagger} Kh4/i 2. Be5 e2\texttt{\textdagger} 3. Kh2 Qg1\texttt{\textdagger} 4. Kg1 Rxh2/ii 5. Kh2 Rh\texttt{\textdagger} 6. Kxh1 e1Q\texttt{\textdagger} 7. Qf1 Qxf1\texttt{\textdagger} 8. Kh2 Qf2 9. d8Q Qg1\texttt{\textdagger} 10. Kxg1 b1Q\texttt{\textdagger} 11. Qd1 Qxd1\texttt{\textdagger} 12. Kh2 and wins.

\texttt{\textdagger}{i)} 1. ... Kf4 2. Bxb2\texttt{\textdagger} Ke4 3. Qf3 mate.
\texttt{\textdagger}{ii)}

\texttt{\textdagger}{.} Judge: "Good realisation of a known idea. Well masked, effective, 'trap' mechanism arises during play. Use of R's as thematic material probably original."

No. 1948: A. Sarychev.

\texttt{\textdagger}{i)} 2. ... Kh6 3. Sxf7\texttt{\textdagger}. Judge: "Witty miniature with vivacious mutual play."
It is an inevitable feature of tournament judging, which must endeavour to assess composing skill, that the good big pieces find their way to the top while the smaller works, however good, rarely creep far above the Commends. A consequence is that this column will take most of its material from the lower reaches of awards, or even from outside them.

No. 1951, for instance, is a short-short that would never stand a change in a respectable tourney but is not totally out of place here. W has on the face of it a winning material advantage, but he cannot afford to lose a piece (two Bs only drawing against one if the stronger side has no pawns), so that wK and wBc3 are tied to the defence of the pinned wS. Nor can wBe5 try to pick up bPb3, for B1 threatens 1. ... Ka2 and 2. ... BxB2†, after which 3. BxB2 will be stalemate. Hence W must play 1. Be4 Ka2 2. Bb1† Ka1. Since bK is now immobile, any waiting move by wBc3 will force bB to give up the pin; but the first try 3. Bd4? fails against 3. ... Be5!, since 4. BxS is again stalemate while lines like 4. Sc† BxS 5. Sd2/Sa5 (hoping for mate on b3) Bc3/Bb2† give B1 a safe gain of enough material to draw. There is another variation of this stalemate after 3. Be5? Bd6 4. Sc† Bxe5 5. Sxe5 b2† 6. Kc2. So wB must journey into outermost darkness: 3. Bb8† and soon mates.

To this general rule concerning high-ranking studies the Szachy award for 1971 provided a partial exception. No 1952 (V. N. Dolgov) will be won for W if he can promote and keep the new Q, for Q vs 2S is a win unless the weaker side can prove otherwise (and here the B1 force is so scattered that W will soon win additional material). So 1. Rb8†, and if 1. ... Ka2 or Kc2 then 2. a8Q and wins quickly. If bK stays on the first rank, however, B1 can meet 2. a8Q? with 2. ... Ra2†, winning the new wQ, and we shall see later that 1. ... Ka1 is the better choice. The only way for W is now 2. Rb5, to meet 2. ... Ra2† with 3. Ra5, while if 2. ... Rg6† then 3. Ka5 and B1 has nothing significantly better than 3. ... Rg2.

W can repeat this procedure: 4. Rb4 Rg5† 5. Ka4 Rg2 6. Rb3 Rg4† 7. Ka3 Rg2, and if bK were now on c1 W could win by 8. a8Q. As it is, however, 8. Re3 threatens mate, and since 8. ... Kb1 9. Re1† Kc2 10. a8Q is hopeless for him B1 must try 8. ... Ra2† 9. Kb3 Rb2† 10. Kc3; but it is to no avail, for though the mate threat has temporarily departed any attempt to pick up by 10. ... Ra2 will bring it back. This column is not deliberately didactic, but there is a lesson for over-the-board play in this repeated shielding manoeuvre.
In No. 1953 (V. A. Bron) W’s winning hopes centre upon the attacked wPf6, whence 1. f7 is automatic, and since 1. ... Rd8 is met by 2. Re8 B1 must try 1. ... Re6. The necessary defence 2. Re7 creates a subsidiary threat (3. Rxc7? Kb6 4. Rb6, and either 4. ... Kxc6 5. Re6 Rx6 6. f8Q or 4. ... c7 Kb7 6. c8Q Kxc8 7. Re8? and so on), so 2. ... Kb6 is necessary. Now 3. Kxh4 threatens to push bR off the f-file by 4. Kg5, whence 3. ... b6, and the very unexpected 4. f3! is now needed to stop B1 from giving himself essential space by 4. ... f3. Since 4. ... Ke5 5. Rxc7 Kd6 6. Re7 any 7. c7 gets him nowhere, B1 has nothing better here than 4. ... a5.

There remains only 5. Kh5 a4 6. Re8! Rx7 7. Kg6 and B1 has nowhere to go. (JRH says that the nearest are Troitzky, No. 640 in Tattersall, and Rinck (1922), No. 708 in his "1414").

The two top prizes in the award were shared, one of the participants being a full-scale piece of blood-and-thunder which would take too long to elucidate in detail. The other, No. 1954 (G. M. Kasparian), is much more in line with the visions normally conjured up by the term 'endgame study'. Getting our bearings, we notice that W is two pawns up and can immediately loot a piece by 1. Bxd5 Bxd5 2. Kxd5; but this allows 2. ... Kxh5 followed by the capture of wPg6, and two minor pieces alone will not win against K+B. Meanwhile if W does nothing B1 can not only play ... Kxh5 but can dissolve the pin of wPg6 by ... Se7. Since wPf5 cannot be defended, we might as well confirm the pin at least by 1. Bf8t, which also defends g7 for the advance of wPg6. Not immediately after 1. ... Kxh5, however, for after 2. g7? Bxg7 3. Bxg7 B1 can escape from the pin by 3. ... Se3; if 4. Bxh3 the piece comes straight back by 4. ... Sf5. Subtly better is 2. Bf7t, for the discovered check by g7t cannot be tolerated, while after 2. ... Kg5 (B1 must keep in touch with wPg6 to prevent Bxd5 followed by g7) wS can make itself felt by 3. Sf3t. Chasing wS by 3. ... Kh4/Kg4 leads to a book loss such as we shall demonstrate later, and 3. ... Kh5? 4. g7t is disastrous, so the choice lies between 3. ... Kf5 and 3. ... Ke5. On f5, however, B1 prevents the bS fork there after 4. g7 Bxg7 5. Bxg7 Se3, and though 5. ... Sc5 will give a similar fork on e6 after 6. Bxb3, two can play at that game: 6. Sd4t instead and wS's fork beats B1's. Best therefore is 3. ... Ke6.

Now 4. Sh4 gives added protection to wPg6 (as indeed would 4. Se5, but wS will need to reach f5 later), and chasing wS by 4. ... Kg5 leads to a standard loss: 5. Bxd5 Bxd5 (if Bb moves elsewhere wS has time to retreat) 6. Kxd5 Kxh4 7. Kc6 Kh5 8. Kf7 Be3 (if Bb stays put 9. Bg7 exchanges it) 9. Bg7 Bxd2 10. Bd4 Bh6 11. Be3 Bf6! (11. ... Bxe3? 12. g7) 12. Bd2! (12. Kxh6? Kxg6) and B1 must move and give up his grip. He has two other ways of dealing with the threat of 5. Bxd5, however: 4. ... Bc2 and 4. ... Sf4, both further attracting wPg6. After 4. ... Bc2 B1 seems indeed to have escaped; but after 5. Kxd5 Pd3 6. Kd6 Bxf7 wPg6 is doomed, but it is a Pyrrhic victory: 7. g7t! Bxg7 8. Be7 mate.

There is another pretty mate after 4. ... Sf4 5. Be7t Kg7 6. Se5, but though both are 'pure' (each square in bK's field being denied to him in only one way) the first has the additional charm that all the men on the board, including wK and the full B1 force, are involved. That bBh8 blocks bK on two different squares, and while it scarcely qualifies as a 'turbulent' priest, how bK must long for someone to rid him of it!

NC1, p. 14 of EG33 (No. 1871), for "1. ... ba Se7" read "1. ... 2a ba 2a Se7".


No. 1955: V. Yakimchik. 1. Qa1/i Bh8/ii 2. Qa3t/iii Kg7 3. Qg3t Kh7 4. Qd3t Rf5 5. Qxf5t ef 6. Kh5 Kg7/iv 7. h4 Kf8 8. Kh6 Bg7t

9. Kh5 Bh8 10. Kh6 Ke7 11. h5 draw, or 10. ... Bh7 11. Kxh7 Bg7 12. h5 Bh6 13. Kxh6 Kg8 stalemate. i) Threatening to draw by perpetual check. ii) 1. ... Bh6 2. Qxf6, iii) 2. Qa8t? Kg7 3. Qg2t Kh7 4. Qc2t f5 wins. iv) To deal with the immediately drawing self-stalemate threat of h4.

No. 1956: E. L. Pogosjants
2nd Prize, Shakhmatnaya Moskva, 1966

No. 1957: N. Kralin
3rd Prize, Shakhmatnaya Moskva, 1966

No. 1958: D. Gurgenidze
(1971)


The given main line and note (iii) are in a sense echoes as in one case a lone wS, in the other a lone wB, draw against Br and BS combined. The Zugzwang in the main line is reciprocal, in that W has no spare move.


The following studies (to No. 1981) are from the awards in what Hillel Aloni describes as the Israeli “Ring Composing Tourneys”, of which there have been 5:

1963-5 Judge: A. Hildebrand (Sweden)
1966 Judge: M. Milescu
1967 " H. Aloni
1968 " S. Segenreich
1969-70 " H. Aloni

Mr Aloni writes: “We have now in Israel a new young generation of study-composers J. Hoch Jr. J. Kopelovich, M. Bronstein, Z. Rot, O. Komai and others - and the whole branch of endgame composition is in swift development, and we hope that British, and other, composers will take part in our tourneys”.

With this group the coverage of tourneys by EG from 1965 is almost complete: the only serious omissions are the Yugoslav PROBLEM (quality good, but tourneys take years to complete and analysis is minimal), and the following:

Schakend Nederland 1968, 1970
Stella Polaris 1968, etc.
Tidskrift for Schack 1970.

If there are any other omissions, please let me know!

AJR

No. 1959: Z. Kahan. The tourney was in memory of A Luxenburg and was the first such in Israel. A. Hildebrand was the judge.

There were 27 qualified entries. “An interesting and well-done R engrade with many fine points and classical economy”.


No. 1960: D. Ehrlich

Hon. Men.
Israel ‘Ring’ Tourney, 1963-5

Draw 5+3

No. 1960: D. Ehrlich. “Very pleasant, with good play and tries”.

Win 3+3


No. 1964: A. Hildebrand. "...the solution is somewhat too short. Black is forced to prevent a fatal check, whereas he has the advantage of 2 pieces".


Draw

4+5

No. 1965: A. H. Branton. "Good play. The main variation has 13 moves, after which W is left with a won position".

1. Bh7 Bh5/i 2. e7t Ke7 3. Ke8/ii Kg4t/Bf7t 4. Kd6 Bh5/iii 5. Kg8 c5/iv 6. Bd5/v c1Q 7. Bc6t Kf7 8. e8Q Kg7 (B1 alternatives from here on are met by continuous checks forcing mate or material gain) 9. Qe5t Kg8 10. Bd5t Bf7 11. Qe8t Kf7 12. Qxf7t Kh6 13. Qe6t and after ... Kh5 both Qh3f and Bf3t lead to wins.

1) ... Ba4 2. e7t and 3. Bg6t.
3) 4. ... Kf7 5. Bg6t.
4) 5. ... Bd1 6. Be6 Ba4 7. Bg4 Kf7 8. Pd7 wins.
5) 6. Bxc4t c1Q 7. Bb5t Kf7 8. e8Qt Kg7 9. Qe5t Kg8 draw, or 6. Bc6? c1Q 7. Bd7t Kf7 8. e8Q Kg7 9. Qe5t Kg8 10. e6t Bf7.

No. 1966: P. Vatarescu. "A struggle of wQ against 2 Bl pieces. Rich content with quiet moves. It is a pity the key is somewhat rough and the construction too heavy".


Win

8+10

No. 1966: P. Vatarescu. "A struggle of wQ against 2 Bl pieces. Rich content with quiet moves. It is a pity the key is somewhat rough and the construction too heavy".


No. 1964: A. Hildebrand. "...the solution is somewhat too short. Black is forced to prevent a fatal check, whereas he has the advantage of 2 pieces".


Draw

4+5

No. 1965: A. H. Branton. "Good play. The main variation has 13 moves, after which W is left with a won position".

1. Bh7 Bh5/i 2. e7t Ke7 3. Ke8/ii Kg4t/Bf7t 4. Kd6 Bh5/iii 5. Kg8 c5/iv 6. Bd5/v c1Q 7. Bc6t Kf7 8. e8Q Kg7 (B1 alternatives from here on are met by continuous checks forcing mate or material gain) 9. Qe5t Kg8 10. Bd5t Bf7 11. Qe8t Kf7 12. Qxf7t Kh6 13. Qe6t and after ... Kh5 both Qh3f and Bf3t lead to wins.

1) ... Ba4 2. e7t and 3. Bg6t.
3) 4. ... Kf7 5. Bg6t.
4) 5. ... Bd1 6. Be6 Ba4 7. Bg4 Kf7 8. Pd7 wins.
5) 6. Bxc4t c1Q 7. Bb5t Kf7 8. e8Qt Kg7 9. Qe5t Kg8 draw, or 6. Bc6? c1Q 7. Bd7t Kf7 8. e8Q Kg7 9. Qe5t Kg8 10. e6t Bf7.

No. 1965: A. H. Branton. "Good play. The main variation has 13 moves, after which W is left with a won position".
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