NEWCOMERS’ CORNER No. 4
by J. D. Beasley

One effect of the policy of using recently composed material for this column has been the preponderance to date of minor-piece studies; in particular, neither a K + P ending nor a Q ending has yet been featured. To redress this balance, we shall use mainly old material this time.

There are several reasons for accurate play in K + P endings, for example to keep open two attacking objectives, or to get on the right side of a forthcoming zugzwang. Both of these are shown in No. NC4.1 (S. Zhigis, draw).

No. NC 4.1  S. Zhigis
Mention, 64, 1930/1

Draw 3+4

W must attack with wK to get anywhere, but the position with bKd7, wKf5 is (as we shall see) reciprocal zugzwang, hence 1. Kf3 - a diversionary attack on bPh7 to force bK to d7 before wK reaches f5. B1 cannot defend bPh7 directly, so he must comply: 1. ... Ke7 (e8)
2. Kg4 Kh7 and now 3. Kh5 will lose after 3. ... Ke6 4. Kh6 Kf5. Instead, however, W plays 3... Kf5 as planned, and bK must retreat, for B1 is in trouble after both 3... e6 4. Kf6 and 3... d5 4. Ke5 Kc6

5. Ke6 (or 4. ... e6 5. Kf6 again).
Best is 3. ... Ke8, for 3. ... Kh8 4. Ke6 Ke8 5. d4 transposes back to the main line. Now, after 4. Ke6 Kf8, W must lose a tempo, for the position with bKf9, wKe6, wPd5 is also reciprocal zugzwang. Hence 5. d3!, and W wins the zugzwang: 5. ... Ke8 6. d4 Kf8 7. d5 Ke8 (nothing better) 8. g6 hg stalemate.

This second zugzwang also explains why the first position (bKd7, wKf5) was reciprocal zugzwang, for if W to play moves wK then ... Ke6 gives B1 a routine win, and after both d4 Kd8 and d3 Ke8 wins the later zugzwang.

Note for composers: the position after 7. d5 would still be reciprocal zugzwang with bBe7 instead of bP, but I can find no example of it in Kasparian’s “2500”. Anyone interested?

A third reason for a superficially curious move in a K + P ending is to guard or occupy a square crucial to a later Q ending. This is shown in No. NC 4.2 (M. Fabbri, 3rd Hon. Men., L’Italia Scacchistica, 1959 (No. 1669 in EG 31)).
draw), which has already appeared in EG (No. 1669) but is worth a close analysis; he who would guess 1. a3! straight away is far-sighted indeed. Let us instead look at the obvious: 1. a4 d4 (bringing up bK is too slow) 2. ed (neither the source nor a later analysis in 'Chess Digest' gives 2. a5, which we shall consider separately later) e3 3. a5 e2 4. a6 e1Q 5. a7 Qe8† 6. Kb7 Qb5† 7. Kc7 (alternatives no better) Qa6 8. Kb8 Qb6† 9. Ka8 Qc7 etc., or 1. b4 d4 2. ed e3 3. d5 c5 4. d6 e1Q 5. d7 Qxb4† with a standard win. The point is, however, that this standard win involves a repeated checking procedure to force wK in front of wPd7, and for this the availability of a check on c5 is crucial. Hence 1. a3! d4 2. ed e3 3. d5 e2 4. d6 e1Q 5. d7 Qe7 (a5) 6. Kc8 Qe5† 7. Kb8 Kg3 8. b4! (wPa3 and wPb4 will now stay firmly put, and B1 cannot afford time to capture them) Qe6 9. Kc7 Qc7 10. Ke8 Qe5† 11. Kd8 Kf4 12. Ke8 and B1 can never gain another tempo to bring bK closer. The guard by wPa3 is essential; with wK on c7 or c8, an unguarded wPb4 can safely be picked up by ... Qc3† or ... Qc4† since wK must either move to d8 or expose himself to a check from b4.

Diagram no. NC 4.2a is obtained in the unquoted 2. a5 line, after 1. a4 d4 2. a5 de 3. a6 e2 4. a7 e1Q 5. a8Q. The basic theory of Q + P7 vs Q, according to Averbakh and Chéron, is that there is normally a win with eP, fP or gP if the Q of the stronger side can get on to the file behind the P; there are some exceptions. It is unlikely that wPb2 will help W much (in fact it will probably get in his way), so that we might proceed by 5. ... Qb4† 6. Kc7 Qe7† 7. Kb6 (c6) Qe6† 8. Kb5 (c5, c7) Qe5† 9. Ka4 (b4, c4, a6, b6, c6, d7) e3 and 10. ... e2, and I think B1 can win in all variations. AJR, who gave me quite a bit of help with this, suggests 5. ... e3 instead of 5. ... Qb4†, and it might well be quicker.

(Civen that Q + P7 vs Q is of some practical importance, how much should the average club player know about it? I suggest that he should know the basic winning positions, and should understand the principles for winning them though he need not remember all the details. Both Averbakh and Chéron give extensive and well-ordered analysis of this ending and as the variations arising from No. NC 4.2a are a little too complex to be instructive to the newcomer we will leave it to them. He should also know the basic exceptions to the general rules; here, for example, there can be draws if the weaker K can get near enough to the P to block or threaten it, or if he can get an immediate perpetual check; and Averbakh gives wPg7, wKh7, wQg5, bKb1, bQe7 as a position where W to play wins but B1 to play can draw by 1. ... Ka2. If you know much more than this you are no longer an average club player).

For a balancing lightweight, No. NC 4.3 (C. M. Bent, win) shows a charming introduction to an old composition. We have the standard situation wherein an advantage of one minor piece will not win, the stronger side having no pawns, but an advantage of two does win. There seems no chance of immediate material gain, however, so let us drive bK into the side on the chance of a mate: 1.
No. NC 4.3 C. M. Bent (ix.x.71)

Commended, 'The Problemist', 1970-71

Win 4+4


Bf7† (better than 1. Bf3†) Ke5 2. Se6† Kb5 3. Be8! (explaining 1. Bf7†) and now 3... Ka4 is forced since 3... b6 would lose b5 to 4. Sd4†. Now there is a switchback

set up by 4. Sc5† Kb5 5. S - - Ka4, but it leads nowhere, and the only hope is 4. Bxc6†! This nominal exchange has the character of a sacrifice, and leads after 4... be to an 1862 study by Horwitz (No. 172 in "Test Tube Chess"): 5. Sc5† Kb5 6. Kd4, and after Bl has given up bB we have a winning 2S vs P ending which Horwitz analyses through to the mate. (2S vs P is a win if the P can be blocked by wS no further forward than a4, b6, c5 or d4, the theory being that wK and one mobile wS can drive bK into a suitable corner, the other wS then releasing bP to give Bl some moves while the coup de grace is delivered; I imagine that few of us would care to demonstrate it over a board). When this first appeared, I spent three evenings analysing 4. Sc5† and then gave up; it has been a firm favourite ever since. I was told the answer.

RETROANALYSIS AND CODEX AGAIN

by Walter Veitch

More senior readers may remember my vituperation or Veitch-tu-peration in EG28-29 against the misapplication of the non-game frills of the Piran Problem Codex to retroanalytical studies in the 1965-67 Friendship Match. The Problem Codex for instance allowed moves based on the right to castle provided some time later castling actually took place, with surrealist consequences which no player ever would or could recognise as chess.

Amongst several who expressed views similar to mine at the time was J. van Reek (Holland). Some months ago moreover he perfected a study which he not only kindly sent to me for presentation in EG but which he dedicated to me. This study, as will be seen, presents a proposition which is also somewhat contentious, but one which could be conventionally accepted into a revised Codex without violating the principles of the game.

Mr. van Reek argues relative to this position that because .......b7-b5 was possible as the last move leading to the diagram, Black is assumed to retain the right to

J. van Reek

Original

(Dedicated to W. Veitch)

Win 6+6

83
castle either side. Having this right, it follows that ...b7-b5 must have been the last move, which allows 1. a5xb6 e.p. as key.

This to me is interesting but debatable. The normal conventions are that castling is admissible unless disproved, while en passant captures as key are admissible only if proved. Mr. van Reek in effect proposes that the first convention shall prevail over and condition the latter. To repeat, one could certainly accept this proposition (or the reverse) as a new convention, but many would oppose the idea.


i) If 1. ... Ke7 2. c7 transposes (or 2. a7). If 1. ... dc 2. b7 Kd7 3. Kb6 wins easily. ii) 3. b7? Rc6=; or 3. Rb8= Kf6 4. Rd5 Ke6 5. Rd6= 6. b7 Rxb5= draws.


A position of considerable interest, both as regards the play and because of the Codex point which it raises.

My own position which follows was found wanting in Codex terms for it was disqualified from the Friendship Match (see later). Yet the stipulation is clear: White to win, and proof involves only normal chess analysis which any player can understand.

Analysis:
The white pawns have captured five of the six missing black pieces. One of these pawn captures must have involved either the black a-Pawn or h-Pawn. But as no capture could have been made by either of these Pawns (the three captures of white pieces being accounted for) the particular Rook's Pawn before being captured must have promoted, and that either on a1 or on h1. 0-0-0 or 0-0 by White is ruled out accordingly, but in each case castling to the other side is possible and wins.

Finally, Black's last move may have been either ... d7-d5 or g7-g5, in which case the respective black bishop must have fallen at home, at c8 or f8. Now both black Rook's Pawns must have promoted, casting by White on either side is illegal, but the en passant capture, either e:d6= or f:g6=, is proved and wins.
A. If Black promoted on a1: 1. e6+ Kf7 2. Se6! Kb8+ 3. 0-0 Rf4 4. Ra1 d3 5. dxc3 c5 6. Sc7 c2 7. Re1 e3+ 8. Sa6 wins. (Much inferior would be 8. e4 Rh8 9. Kg2 Rh6 when ... Sd3 is threatened.)  
   i) 1. ... 0-0 2. Ra8 3. dxe4 dxe4 and Black at least draws, e.g.: 3. fxe4 g4 4. Ra1 Rh1 5. Kf2 Rh2? 6. Ke1 Rf1 etc.  
   iii) 3. ... R:e8 (3. ... Re8 4. Bb3 K:e8 5. Ra4 winning) 4 Bb3 again wins easily, e.g.: 4. ... e3 5. dxc3 fxe2 6. Kxe2 Rc8 7. Kd2 Rc6 8. f5 9. e7 Rc8 10. Ra6 etc.  
   v) 7. ... Kg7 8. f:e4 Rh8 9. Sd5 wins.  

B. If Black promoted on h1: 1. 0-0-0 R:h1 2. Sa8 wins; or 1. ... Ra1f 2. Kb2 Ra1 3. Ra1 wins (if 3. ... R:a1 the strongest is 4. S:d5 e:d2 5. Sc3! Kg7 6. K:a- etc. 1. e6f and 2. 0-0-0 wins similarly but is slightly less efficient.  


D. If Black last played ... g7-g5: 1. f:g6 e.p. + Kg7 2. Se6! Kg7 3. Sd4+ Kg7 4. f:e6 5. Sf5! wins.  

Correctness was criticised on two points. Firstly, the fact, noted in the solution, that in (B) 1. e6? also wins. This admittedly is a blunder, but per the Codex itself the presence of a longer minor line is only a dual and does not disqualify a study. Secondly, it was held that Black could draw in (A iii) after 5. Ra4 by 5. ... Sd3 6. Bxd5 Sb2 7. Rd4 e3 8. Rbl Rc8. However, 8. Rbl is quite unnecessary and 8. Bxb7 instead wins easily. More difficult perhaps here would be 6. ... Rc8, but 7. Re4 Rxc4 8. Bxc4 Se5 (8. ... Sb2 9. Bb3) 9. Bd5 is convincing enough. It is rather a pity, though that line (A) should be so much more difficult than the other three. A better balance would be of advantage.

One may, finally, well question whether the term 'partial solutions' can justifiably be applied to a study such as this. The stipulation is White to win, and the four lines A/B/C/D together prove this and constitute the solution. The proof furnished by the solution is complete although the retroanalysis is partial.

Happy Ending? We read that the FIDE Problem Congress at Imola (6-13.x.73) decided, inter alia, that "partial retrograde analysis" problems are again accepted as solvable. So far so good. It is further stated that such compositions are to be marked with the letters "RV" (retro-variations), while those in which the en passant capture on the first move is made legal during the further solution are to be marked "AP" (a posteriori proof).

This is prima facie evidence that again codex questions have been
viewed with an eye to problems and ignoring studies, for it seems not to have been recognised that RV positions are chess, whereas AP positions are fairy chess. RV positions are positions solvable by ordinary analysis of the initial setting and so there is no need for special letters but AP problems like help-mates and self-mates certainly do require an indication of their special nature.

I am pleased to say that Mr A. S. M. Dickins, an acknowledged authority in these matters, fully approves the opinions expressed in this article.

Obituary
Edgar Holden, of Blackburn, died at Christmas 1972. He was an EG-subscriber who also tried his hand at composing. His widow writes that Mr Holden had suffered for years from an inoperable brain tumor but that passing time with chess was a great blessing. He was playing chess up to 10 o'clock the night he died. He was never bored was happy with his life such as it was.... A couple of years ago he sent me a homemade magnetic chess set and board (which I still have), just right for the pocket, and as the idea is so brilliantly simple I passed it on to the British Chess Federation for them to give it wider circulation among school chess clubs.

The recipe is given below. Although Edgar Holden's letters were frequently hard to follow his kindness came through time and again. He persuaded the Blackburn Public Library to subscribe to EG (the only one to do so in Britain). And once, I remember, he sent me a charming, peaceful pen-and-ink sketch of himself "at the landscape." AJR.

How to make a pocket magnetic chess set, for about £ 0.05.
1. Obtain a discarded tin, with a hinged lid, measuring when closed about 2 inches by 4 inches. It must open quite flat, as the outside will be the playing surface. The tins in which miniature cigars are often sold in fives are almost ideal.
2. Paint the outside of the tine white. When dry, mark out ranks and files lightly in pencil. The "Squares" need not be absolutely square. Paste small rectangles of brown paper on the 32 "black" squares.
3. Purchase a small sheet of pliable magnetic material, not more than one-sixteenth of an inch thick, such as is used for sealing refrigerator doors. A rectangular sheet 2 inches by four should cost less than 10p. This is the only cost. The material can easily be cut with a knife or with scissors.
4. Paste paper onto the magnetic material, ensuring that this is done on the side that is less magnetically attracted to the tin. Cut the material into 32 rectangles, each slightly smaller than the "squares" on the board.
5. Borrow somebody's chess stamping set and create the 32 men by stamping the 32 rectangles. You can make more pieces, of course, such as queens and knights and endgame enthusiasts are strongly recommended to do this. There will be enough magnetic material to spare for this.
6. You can play. The men are kept in the closed tin. Captured men will adhere to the underside of the opened tin. Lost men are easy to replace. It is much handier than shop-purchased so-called "pocket" sets, which cost up to £ 3.00.

AJR, after the late Edgar Holden.

Cozio. David Hooper rightly castigates me for not giving the title of Cozio's book in my EG33 article. Well, I can do better than that. Here's what is on the frontispiece page.
Review Pawn Ending Studies, by F.S. Bondarenko, 1973 (in Russian). This 160-page paperback will be referred to in EG in future as “636”, since it contains that many studies. These days it is not enough just to put a collection together, one must think deeply about classification. The 1970's and 1980's will be the decades of discussion about how to classify studies according to their content, since it is not to be expected that any startlingly new themes remain to be discovered. Mr Bondarenko has certainly done his hard thinking here, based on the material he has painstakingly amassed, and it looks pretty definitive to me, at least as regards pawn studies. Almost certainly, generalising from this volume, one may assert that the most generally useful classification of all studies will be a gross division by material (one such division being pawn-only studies), with each division subdivided by the themes appropriate to that material. If there are too many divisions by material, then the usefulness will be less, since one will not readily find one’s way around, so the debate is likely to be about exactly how many divisions there should be. It will then need a devoted enthusiast and expert to provide a volume for each division. Superimposed on this will be work such as Kasparyan’s on the super-theme of ‘domination’, with its special system. Perhaps after some of this work has been done we can expect some agreement on the vocabulary, to correspond with the natural history terminology of sub-species, species, genus, family, order, class and phylum. Studies should not need all these levels! Discovered check is clearly a different level from domination, to take a simple example. However, all this is yet to come. Bondarenko’s book will be used, though not as easily as Kasparyan’s Domination, for anticipation identification, so his system is worth reproducing here, for wider acceptance than his book is likely to receive (for reasons of language difficulty). The main composers represented are Grigoriev, Halberstadt, Mandler and Prokes. There is considerable text accompanying the material, and as my Russian is very weak, I cannot guarantee to have done this very welcome book justice. You had better get it yourself!

AJR

BONDARENKO’S classification system for pawn studies.

MATE (6-96/”636”) without black promotion
with black promotion

W and B1 promote
W promotes, B1 having a stalemate defence
W promotes and prevents B1 Ps advancing (eg by staircase wQ manoeuvre).

STALEMATE (97-159/”636”) by threat of W promotion
by defence against threat of B1 promotion
B1 promotes and prevents W promotion
B1 promotes and avoids being mated
W and B1 promote.

ENSURING PROMOTION (160-282/”636”)
Ps on their own (ie, Ks do not intervene)
W promotes, preventing B1 promotion
with stalemate avoidance
stalemate avoidance, B1 also about to promote
with avoidance of both mate and stalemate
W and B1 promote
with avoidance of loss of material
with avoidance of perpetual check
with avoidance of continuous threat of B1 promotion
multiple promotion
Reti idea.

WIN OF PIECE (eg after both sides promote) (283-320/"636")
ADVANTAGEOUS EXCHANGE
(eg after both sides promote) (321-332/"636")
PASSIVE KING (ie immobilisation) (333-360/"636")
PERPETUAL THREAT TO PROMOTE (362-374/"636")
ACTIVE PAWNS (ie mobilisation, or freeing) (375-609/"636")
no other idea (generally, opposition cases, and long K manoeuvres)
with avoidance of stalematng of B1 with passive (ie, immobilisation, etc.) B1 Ps
with avoidance of passive (ie, immobilisation) wK
W and B1 activation of Ps Bl prevents a promotion, but another wP becomes active
prevention of bP activation (eg, by opposition; related squares; driving bK back).

UNCOMMON IDEAS (610-636/"636")
dependent check
perpetual attack involuntary (forced) stalemate involuntary (forced) perpetual check
fortress
win of P (eg manoeuvre to force bP to advance and become vulnerable)
active (ie, mobilisation) wK (eg the "Jap trick" by Kling and Horwitz)
prevention of promotion (eg by mating threat to gain time)
other ideas.

DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS

No. 2022: A. S. Kakovin
Patriot Batkivchiny, 1972
1. b6 Sxc5 2. Rxc5 Qd5 3. Ra5f Qxa5, W mates in 3. As taken from Shakhmaty vSSSR, wR was on f5, but 1. ...
Qg2, avoided by wRg5. (AJR)

No. 2023: V. Moz-zhukin
Dnieper Vecherny, 1972
h1Q 9. Bxf3† Qxf3† 10. Sf4† Kxh6 and it’s stalemate!
No. 2024: M. Dukic. 1. h6 Rc1 2. h7 Rc8# 3. Kg7 Rc7# 4. Kh6 Rc6# 5. Kh5 Rc8 6. Bc4 Kf6 7. Kh6 Rh8 8. Bg8 Kf5 9. h5 Kg4 10. Kf6 and 11. h6, winning. One suspects that there are many duals here, and that really only a little care is needed (AJR).

i) 9. Kg7? Rxh7#

No. 2025: D. Friedgood.

\[\text{Sinfonie Scacchistiche, vii-ix.72}\]

Dedicated to the Organisers of the 1972 Zonal Tourney in Caorle, Italy


This issue, EG36, is over three months late. Our long-suffering printer apologises, and so do I. If we can possibly catch up, we shall - there is no shortage of already prepared material. In the meantime, please do not forget to renew for EG37-40! There is no increase in the subscription rate, which remains at £2.00 or $6.00. AJR
No. 2027: E. Dobrescu and V. Nestorescu

1st Prize, Szachy, 1972


i) 4. ... Kxg2 5. Rxe5 Kf1 6 g8Q


Judge: Dr. G. Grzeban.

No. 2028: V. N. Dolgov

=2nd/3rd Prize, Szachy, 1972

1. Qe8† Kb7 2. Qd7† Kb6 3. Qe7† Ka6 4. Qxe6† Qb6 5. Qd5 f5 6. Be5 f4 7. Bd4 wins.

No. 2029: A. Grin

=2nd/3rd Prize, Szachy, 1972

1. Rf6/i alQ 2. b6t Kc8/ii 3. Rf8 Qg7 4. d6 Qh7 5. h4 Qg7 6. h5 Qh7 7. h6 Kh8 8. Qd8 wins.

i) 1. Rg6? alQ 2. b6t Kc8 3. Rg8 Qf6.

ii) 2. ... Kb8 3. Rf8 Qg7 4. d6 Qh7 5. h3 Qg7 6. h4 Qh7 7. h5 Qg7 8. h6 Qh7 9. Kd8 wins.

"A little bit of Joseph!" (AJR).

See 145 in TTC.

JRH: cf Rinck, 1923 (Rueb S III, p. 60); Kasparyan, 1936 (No. 26 in his early collection); Kalandadze, 1967 (No. 389 in EG10); Bron, 1971 (No. 1835 in EG32).

No. 2030: E. Onate

Special Mention, Szachy, 1972

I diagram II bKd2 to g4
No. 2030: E. Onate. I: 1. Rf1 Ke2/i
2. Rf4 Qc6t 3. Kg1 Qg6t 4. Kh1 h5
5. Bg3 Qxg3 6. Re4t(Rf2t) draws.
i) 1. ... Qe4t 2. Kg1 Qe2 3. Rf2.
II: 1. Rg1t/ii Kh4 2. Rg3 Qe4t/iii
3. Kg1 Qe2 4. Kh1 Qf2 (Qf1t:Bgl)
5. Bg1 Qxg3 6. Bf2 Qxf2 stalemate.
ii) 1. Rf1t Qe4t 2. Kg1 Kh3 3. Rf2
Qb1t 4. Rf1 Qg6t 5. Kf2 Kxh2. iii)
2. ... Qe6t 3. Kg1 Qe4 4. Kf2 Qh1
5. Bgl.

JRH: I - - Henneberger, 1925 (No.
1161 in '1234'); Halberstadt, 1929
(EG12, p. 337); Prokes, 1949 (Rueb
B. V., p. 23). II - - Prokes, 1949
(Rueb B. V., p. 23); Dobrescu, 1968
(Problem, 211).

No. 2031: A. S. Kakovin
and Al. P. Kuznetsov
(vi.72)
Commended, Szachy, 1972

No. 2032: M. Krosny
Commended, Szachy, 1972

No. 2031: A. S. Kakovin and Al. P.
Kuznetsov. 1. Qg3t/i Ke4 2. Re2t
Rcb2t Ka4 6. Qb3t Ka5 7. Qc3t
Kab 8. Qd3t Ka7 9. Qe3t with per-
petual check from pinned wQ! i)
1. Bxe7t? h1Qt 2. Rh2 R3xa2 3.
Qg3t Ke4 4. Qh4t Kd5 and B1
wins.

No. 2032: M. Krosny. 1. Rxd6 Rxd6
2. Be4 Rc7 3. Rb7 a3/i 4. Rxc7 a2
5. Rb1t Ka7 6. Ra8t Kxa8 7. c7t
Ka7 8. c6Q a1Q 8. Qb7 mate. i) 3.
... Rxb7 4. c7 wins. Or 3. ... Rxc6
4. Rb6. JRH: The promotion ma-
noeuvre is well-known from Fritz,
1951 (No. 104 of his SS), which is
the nearest.

No. 2033: Al. P. Kuznetsov
and F. S. Bondarenko
(xii.72)
1st Prize,
Tidskrift for Schack, 1972
Award in TIS, x.73

No. 2033: Al. P. Kuznetsov and F.
S. Bondarenko. Judge: P. Perko-
noja. 1. Sb7/i glQt/ii 2. Kxgl Kg3
3. d8S h1t 4. Kh1 Kh4 5. g6 Kh3
6. g7 h4 7. g6B wins. i) 1. Sc6t h2
2. Kxg3 Bxe8t wins for B1. ii) 1.
... Bxb7 2. d8Q h2 2. Qd4t Kf5 4.
Qd3t followed by 5. Qh3t or 5.
Qg3t.


No. 2038: M. Bronshstein. The composer is from Israel. 1. Bg2t Kxe1/i 2. a8Q Sf5/ii 3. Qa5t Kxe2 4. Bf3t Kxf3/iii 5. Qxf5t Qxf5 6. Sd6t Bg7 7. f8Q Bxf8 8. Sd4t. i) 1. ... Kxe2 2. Bf1t Kxf1 3. a8Q draws (Qhlt for instance). ii) 2. ... Qdlt not given, even though the following discovered check uncorks the B1 pieces. iii) 4. ... Qxf3 5. Qd2t Kf1 6. Qd1t. iv) Quite remarkable that bQ has no safe check (cf. 6. Sg6?).

No. 2039: G. M. Kasparyan. 1. Sf5t Kxe6/i 2. g7 Sxg7 3. Bh6 Qxg8 4. Sh6 Qh7 5. Sf7/t Qg8 6. Sh6, and it’s drawn. i) 1. ... Kd8 2. g7 Sxg7 3. Sd6. Or 1. ... Kf6 2. g7 Sxg7 3. Rh6t and either 3. ... Ke5 or 4. bg Qxg8 5. Se7 or 3. ... Kg5 4. Sd6. ii) Puts both wS and wR en prise, but still covers everything!

No. 2040: J. Carvajal Aliaga. The composer is from Bolivia. 1. f7 Re5t 2. Kg4 Re4t 3. Kg3 Rd4 4. Kxf4 Sd8 5. f8Qt Se6t 6. Kg3t Sxf8 7. Sf3, after which bS must move to a W square, whereasupon wB attacks it and threatens mate, hence winning. i) No analysis of alternatives is given, which is a pity. ii) See (i).

JRH: For the final mate, cf. Daniel (1931) in BCM.

No. 2041: H. Källström. 1. h7 Rh3 2. g6 Rh6 3. h8Qt (Be8 Ke8) 3. ... Rxh6 4. g7t Kg8 5. Bd5t (Be8? Rh8t) 5. ... Kh8 6. Be6 c1Q 7. Bxf5t Kg8 8. Be6t Kh7 9. Bf5t perpetual check.

JRH: Similar perp. ch by wB v. bK g6-h7 shown in Lewis (1827), Rueh (Br, p. 33) and Dobrescu/Nestorescu (1966) in EG9 p. 236.


No. 2045: A. S. Kakovin. 1. Sc3†
Ka5 2. d7 Rxex† 3. Se4 Rxex4† 4.
Kxe4/i Sc6† 5. Kd5 Kb5 6. d8S/i.
i) 4. Kd3? Sf2† 5. Kc3 Rc3†. ii)
But not to Q because of 6. ... e6†
and bS fork, when cP wins. Re-
markable economy!

No. 2046: J. J. van den Ende. 1. ed
Rc2 (Sxd4; Rd1†) 2. Bf1† Ke4 3.
Bxb5 Bxb3 4. Sd6† Kd5/i 5. Sxb5
8. Sh1† Kb3 9. Rd3† Ka2 10. Ra3
mate. i) 4. ... Kxd4 5. Sxb5† Kc5
W threatens to keep wPd4 by
mate.

No. 2047: B. Soukup-Bardon. 1.
Sc6 4. Kb6/v or 3. ... Sc6 4. c3†
(Kxb3; c4 or Kb5). i) 1. Ka8? Sc5
2. b3 Se4 3. Ka7 Sc6† 4. Kb7 Se5
(for Sc3) 5. c3† Kxb3 6. c4 Sc5†.
1. Kc8? Sc5 2. b3 Sa6 3. Kd7 Kc3
4. Kd6 Sb4 5. Kc5 aSc6 and ...
Kxc2. 1. Kc7? Se5 2. c3† Kb3 3.
Kb6 aSb7 and ... Kxb2, while if
here 2. b3 (to hinder Sc4xb2) 2. ...
Sc4 (Zugzwang) 3. c4 Sc5, or 3.
Kb6 Sc3 4. Ka6 Sc6 5. Kc6 Sd4,
when B1 wins by playing as if
wPd3 did not exist. 1. c4? Sc5 1.
c3† Kb3 and ... Sc4. i) For 3. Kb6
and 4. c3†. 2. Kb5? Sc4† 3. Kc6
Sxb2. 2. c3t? Kb3 3. Kb6 aSb7.
iii) For ... Sc3. 2. ... Sc6† 3. Kb6
Se5 4. c3†. 2. ... Kc3 3. Kb6 aSb7
4. Kc6 Kb4 5. Kb6 Sd6(d6) 6. c3†.
For c3† 3. Kb6 Sc3 4. Ka8
Sc6 5. Kc6 Sd4 and 6. ... dSb5,
winning as (i). v) For instance 4.
... Scd5† 5. Ka6 Sc6 6. c3† Kxb7.
i) For ... Sc3. 2. ... Se5 3. Kb6
Sc6 4. c3†. 2. ... Kc3 3. Kb6 aSb7
4. Kc6 Kb4 5. Kb6 Sc6(d6) 6. c3†.
For c3† 3. Kb6 Sc3 4. Ka8
Sc6 5. Kc6 Sd4 and 6. ... dSb5,
winning as (i). v) For instance 4.
... Scd5† 5. Ka6 Sc6 6. c3† Kxb7.

Pawn Endings, an English transla-
tion (in descriptive notation) of
the Maiselis classic volume of the
4 "Averbakh" theoretical tomes
dating from 1956 (in Russian, but
since updated) has just been pu-
lished by Batsford. An extraordi-
narily bold gamble, in business
terms, but how welcome it is!
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No. 2048 V. S. Kovalenko

2 H.M.,

Schakend-Nederland, 1972

| Win | 1: diagram | II: wPh2 to h3 |


No. 2049 J. J. van den Ende

3 H.M.,

Schakend-Nederland, 1972

| Win | 3+i-8 |


No. 2050 C. M. Bent

4 H.M.,

Schakend-Nederland, 1972

| Win | 6+i-8 |

No. 2050: C. M. Bent. 1. b8Q/i Sc5/i 2. Ke8/ii Rf8† 3. Kxf8 Sd7† 4. Kg7 Sxb8 5. f3† Kf4 6. Sg6† Kxe5 7. Bf1 (for Bd3 mate) 7. ... c1S 8. Bc4 g4 9. Be6† Kg5 10. f4 mate. i) For mate by f3 or Qg3. 1. f3† Kf4 2. b6Q† Se7†, or here 2. Sd5† Kxf5 3. b8Q Se7†, ii) 1. ... Rh3 2. Bxb3† Kf3 3. Bg4† and 4. Qg3 mates. iii) Clearly not 2. Ke7? Sa6†.
No. 2051: Al. P. Kuznetsov and A. T. Motor

No. 2053: I. Vandecasteele
1. d5† Ke5/i 2. Bc7† d6 3. Ba5 (for Bc3 mate) 3. ... Se2 4. Bc3† Sxc3 5. be a1Q 6. c4 (for Sd7(g4) mate) 6. ... Qg1† 7. Sg4† Qxg4† 8. Kxg4 draw.

No. 2052: C. M. Bent
1. Rh5† Kxh5 2. Bf3† Kh6 3. Bc1† Rxc1 4. Sg8† Kg6 5. Bh5† Kxh5 6. Sf4† Kg5 7. Kg3 and 8. h4 mate. “The quiet 7. Kg3 makes up for the previous violence.”

No. 2054: V. S. Kovalenko
1. Kb3 Qxa3† 2. Kxa3 b1Q 3. Rc8† Ka7 4. Rc7† Kxa6 5. Re6† Kxa5 6. Rc5† Ka8 7. Ra5† and either 7. ... Kxa5 stalemate, or 7. ... Kb6 8. Rb5† draw. The award (xii. 73) gave full credit to J. R. Harman for sterling anticipation identification.
No. 2055: E. Pogosjants. Judge: T. B. Gorgiev. 1. Kh2 Kf3 2. g5 Kg4 3. g6 Sf3t 4. Kg2 Sh4t 5. Kf1 Sxg6 6. Ke1 Se5 7. Kxd1 Sc4 8. Ke1 Kg3 9. Kf1 Kf3 10. Ke1 Kg2 11. Bb2 Sxb2 stalemate. By courtesy of the Chervony Girnik columnist, D. Kanonik, who sent us this award recently, we learn that this was the 8th in a traditional composing event series.


No. 2061: M. Kralin. 1. h4 a5 2. a4 Kf5 3. g3 h6 4. g4† Kf4 5. g5 Kf5 6. g6 a6 7. a3 Kg6 8. Kg4 Ke5 9. Kh5 draw. If 8. ... Kxg6 9. h5† draws.


No. 2062: M. Sh. Gorbman. 1. c6 Re4 2. c7 Re8 3. Se8† Kf6 4. Sd8 Re5. Se6 wins, but not 5. c8Q? Rc8† 6. Qxc8 stalemate, though one would like to see analysis of 5. c8R. (AJR)
No. 2063: G. Nadareishvili and V. Neidze. Only 9 studies participated in the tourney, but the judge, V. A. Bron, found some good quality. "...very interesting and original. Undefended wQ pins bQ in two variations."

1. \( b4^{1/2} \) Kxb4/ii 2. Qa3\( ^{\dagger} \) Kc4 3. Qa6/iii Kc5 4. Qa5 Kc4 5. Qa6 draw. i) 1. Qc8\( ^{\dagger} \) Kxb5 wins ii) 1. ... Qxb4 2. Qa3 Kb5/iv 3. Qb3 Ka5 4. Qa3\( ^{\dagger} \) Qa5 5. Qc3 Qb4/v 6. Qa3\( ^{\dagger} \) Kb5 7. Qb3 Kc5 8. Qa3 Kc4 9. Qa4 draw, or 1. ... Kc4 2. Qc6\( ^{\dagger} \) Kxb4 3. Qc3\( ^{\dagger} \) Ka4 4. Qa3\( ^{\dagger} \) Kxa3 stalemate. iii) 3. Qa2\( ^{\dagger} \) Kd4 4. Qa4\( ^{\dagger} \) Qc4 wins, or 3. Qa4\( ^{\dagger} \) Qb4 4. Qb3\( ^{\dagger} \) Kb5. iv) 2. ... Kc4 3. Qa4 merely transposes, v) 5. ... Kc5 6. Qa5\( ^{\dagger} \) and stalemate.

EG-Readers will find the 2nd Prize as No. 1214 in EG23 (also EG24 p. 219).

No. 2064: F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov. "Attack by wS and wB leads to a Novotny accomplished by the other wB. Also interesting is the b\( ^{3/4} \) promotion, blocking bRa1, whose passivity is a blunder."


No. 2065: A. Goset. "Slight, but elegant, likewise with a Novotny."

1. Sd2/i Ba6/ii 2. Rb5\( ^{\dagger} \) B(R)x\( ^{\dagger} \)b5 3. Sb3\( ^{c4} \) mate. i) 1. Sd6? is met only by 1. ... Ba6; 1. ... Be2? 2. Sb7\( ^{\dagger} \) Rxb7 3. Rxb7, or 1. ... Rb8? 2. Rxb5\( ^{\dagger} \) Kxb5 3. Sc4 mate. ii) 1. ... Be2 2. Re3 Ba6/iii 3. Re5\( ^{\dagger} \) Bb5/iv 4. Sc4(b3) mate. iii) 2. ... Rb7(c6) 3. Sb3\( ^{\dagger} \) wins. iv) 3. ... Rb5 4. Sxb5 Bxb5 5. Sc4\( ^{\dagger} \) Ka6 6. Kb4 wins.
No. 2066: J. Hoch. Judge: Hillel Aloni. There were 27 participating endgames. No prizes were awarded.

No. 2069: Zvi Rot. "... a thematic try, an element of retrograde analysis, an unusual stalemate - what more can one demand from a endgame of only 4 moves?" (B1 cannot castle; wK must have played to d7 or d8 en route to c7, so bK must have moved). 1. Rc4/v Qxa1 2. Qxa1 Qxg7 3. Ra4 Qal 4. Ra8t Qxa8 stalemate, i) 1. Rc2 Qd4 2. Qg7/v Qxg7 3. Ra2 Ba3 4. Rxa3 Qc3/i 5. Rxc3 e2 6. Re3 h5, or 1. Qh1? h5 2. Ra1 Ke4 3. Rf1 Qf2 4. Rxf2† e5 5. Qf3† Kg7, ii) 2. Qxg5 Rf8, iii) But not 4. ... Qa1? 5. Rxa1 Kf8 6. Kg7, iv) 1. ... Bh4 2. Kxb7 Qc3 3. Qg7, or 1. ... Qd4 2. Qg7 as in main line, v) 2. Kxb7 e2 3. Qg7 Qxg7 4. Ra4 Qa1 5. Rxa1 Kf8, or 2. Qxg5Rgb 4. Ra4 e1Q, or 2. Qh2? h5 3. Qc2 Qf6 4. Ra4 Kf8.


No. 2069: Mention, Israel Ring Tourney, 1971-72

Draw 6+12


No. 2071: Y. Bazlov. Judge was the veteran A. Sarychev (Baku), who commented in the award on the poor support given this tourney by the leading USSR composers. 1. Sfd7/i Ra5/ii 2 Sc4 Ra6 3. Sxa4 Ra8t 4. Kc7 Bxa4 5. Kb6. Now bR returning to a8 will allow a draw by repetition. What else can B1 try? The solution continues 7. ... Rb5† 8. Ka6 Kxd4 9. Sb6 Rd4 10. Ka5 Rb5† (Kc3; Sd5†) 11. Ka6 Kc5 (avoiding repetition) 12. Sxa4† Kc6 13. Sc3 is a draw, 13. ... Rb3 14. Sa4 Ra3 15. Ka5 Rb3 16. Ka6. i)1. Se6? Kf5 2. Sg7† Kf6 3. Se8† Ke7 wins, ii) 1. ... Bc6 2. Sf6†, iii) 3. ... Sxb6 4. Sc5† and 5. Sxa6. The study incorporates three positional draws; after 7. ... Ra8; after 11. ... Rb5†; and the main line conclusion.

JRH: Cf. Koranyi (1965) No. 360 (II) in EG9, and Lommer (1946), No. 1742 in FIDE Album 1945/55. For the final position, cf. Lolli (1763), 202 in TEST TUBE CHESS.
No. 2073: K. da Silva. 1. Sg8† Kf7 2. Sg8† Kf6 3. Kd6† i) Kf8 4. Sc1 Bf1/i iv.) 5. Se7 d2 6. Sg6† Ke8 7. Sd3/ iii) Bxd3 8. Ba4† Kd8 (Kf7; Se5†) 9. Se5 d1Q/iv 10. Bd7 ... taking bQd1 would only draw, but now W mates. i) 3. Kxh4†? Kf8 followed by bBe2–h5–f7 and B1 wins a piece, drawing. ii) Here W would win by Troitzky if B1 tried the (i) line: 4. ... Bf6 5. Sxd3 Bf7 6. Bxf7 Kxf7 7. Se7, as there is a blocked bPd4† iii) But not 7. Ba4†? Kd8 8. Sa2 Be2 9. Bd7 Bb5 10. Bg4 Ba4 with a draw. iv) 9. ... Bf5 is met by 10. Sc6†, 11. Se7† and wins bB.

No. 2074: S. Sakharov. 1. e7 Rel 2. a7 Bg2 3. Sf6. Threatening the standard Novotny play to e4. 3. ... Rxe7 4. a8Q Bxa8 5. Sd5†. Stalemate if accepted, but B1 can try to win the bB v. wS ending, with bPg5, by playing bB to the commanding square e4, carefully avoiding (if he can) tempo-gaining checks from wS. 5. ... Kd6 6. b4† Ka6 7. b5† Ka5 8. b4† Kxb5 9. Sxe7 Bxe4 10. Sg8 g4 11. Sf6 g3 12. Sxe4 g2 13. Sc6† Kxb4 14. Se2 draws.

JRH: wS offer forking bK + bR to give stalemate is well known, eg Gorgiev (1929), No. 867 in '1234'. The play following refusal to take wS does not seem to be known.
No. 2075: V. Israelov. 1. Sf7† Kc7 2. Bxb7 Bxe6 3. Sg5 Bc4† 4. d3 Bxd3† 5. Kg2 Kxb7 6. Se6, with two lines: - 6. ... Bb6 7. a5 Be3 8. Kf3 Bgl 9. Ke2 draws, 6. ... Be4† 7. Kf1 Bb6 8. a5 Be3 9. Ke2 Bg1 10. Kf1 Be3 11. Ke2 and an echo positional draw. From a composing viewpoint, this is an example of what I really call technique, how to engineer two variations out of an idea. 6. ... Be4† is the key to the twinning. (AJR)

JRH: Nearest to this positional draw is Perelman (1954), No. 123 in Kasparyan's 'Positional Draw'.

No. 2076: V. Kovalenko. 1. Rd3t Se3. This very effectively prevents wBgl-d4. 2. Rxe3† Kg4 3. Rb1 Ke4† Kf5 4. Ra4 a1Q 6. Bd4 and draws. The composer can consider himself very lucky to get in the Award, seeing that the same idea secured him a 1971 Magyar Sakkélet honour (No. 1793). (AJR).

No. 2077: V. Dolgov. 1. Kf2 (for Rf3) 1. ... Ra2f 2. Kg3 Kg7 3. Rd7t Kg8 4. Rd4 (to repeat the threat, one rank higher) 4. ... Ra3t 5. Kg5 Kg7 6. Rd7† Kg8 7. Rd5 Ra4† 8. Kg5 Kg7 9. Rd7† Kg8 10. Rd6 Ra5† 11. Kf6 Rb5 12. Rxf8† Kxf8 13. Rd8 mate. But the solution in Shakhmaty (xi. 72) gives 8. ... Rb4 as a bust, gives 11. Kg6 Rb5 12. Rdd8 as a cook, and 'corrects' by placing wRb8 on a8, c8 or d8. It is incomprehensible how this study is included in the award. (AJR).

No. 2077: V. Dolgov. 1. Kf2 (for Rf3) 1. ... Ra2f 2. Kg3 Kg7 3. Rd7† Kg8 4. Rd4 (to repeat the threat, one rank higher) 4. ... Ra3t 5. Kg5 Kg7 6. Rd7† Kg8 7. Rd5 Ra4† 8. Kg5 Kg7 9. Rd7† Kg8 10. Rd6 Ra5† 11. Kf6 Rb5 12. Rxf8† Kxf8 13. Rd8 mate. But the solution in Shakhmaty (xi. 72) gives 8. ... Rb4 as a bust, gives 11. Kg6 Rb5 12. Rdd8 as a cook, and 'corrects' by placing wRb8 on a8, c8 or d8. It is incomprehensible how this study is included in the award. (AJR).

No. 2078: A. Ivanov. 1. Sf7† Kc7 2. Bxb7 Bxe6 3. Sg5 Bc4† 4. d3 Bxd3† 5. Kg2 Kxb7 6. Se6, with two lines: - 6. ... Bb6 7. a5 Be3 8. Kf3 Bgl 9. Ke2 draws, 6. ... Be4† 7. Kf1 Bb6 8. a5 Be3 9. Ke2 Bg1 10. Kf1 Be3 11. Ke2 and an echo positional draw. From a composing viewpoint, this is an example of what I really call technique, how to engineer two variations out of an idea. 6. ... Be4† is the key to the twinning. (AJR)

JRH: Nearest to this positional draw is Perelman (1954), No. 123 in Kasparyan's 'Positional Draw'.
No. 2078: A. Ivanov 1. Be3 b1Q
2. Re8+ Kh6 3. Rg8+ Kh5 4. Bg7+ Kg6
10. Rg5+ Kh6 11. Rb5+ wins. Original diagram was without wPc2,
allowing 8. ... Qxd3.
The study that shared 4/5 Hon.
Men. was by Pogosjants, and has already appeared, see EG31, p. 418.

No. 2079 A. Kuryatnikov
(xl.72)
1 Comm.,
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1972
Win
3+3

No. 2079: A. Kuryatnikov. 1. Re5 Kg2 2 Rg5+ Kf2 3. Rh5 Kg2 4.
Kb6 h1Q (f5; Rg5+) 5. Rxf1 Kh1 6. Ke5 Kg2 7. Kd4 Kg3 8. ... a4/1
Kg4 9. a4 f5+ 10. Kd3. This manoeuvre is known. 10. ... f4 11. a5
f3 12. a6 Kg3 13. a7 f2 14 Ke2 Kg2 15. a8Q+ wins. i) 8. Ke5? Kg4 9.
Kf6 Kf4 and bk has managed a kind of Réti manoeuvre to get
within the square of aP.
JRH: After move 6 all is known.
A dozen studies show bK drawn
into check from promoted P. Earliest seems to be Duras (1905), No.
1 in ‘1234’, and Grigoriev, No. 701 in Chéron II. Up to move 6, seems
new.

No. 2080 A. Tulyev
(ii.72)
2 Comm.,
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1972
Draw
4+5

ii 2. Sxe4 Kxe4 3. a3/iii Ba2 4. b3,
leading very neatly to two very
well-known drawn positions, either 4. ... ab 5. Kb2 ba 6. Kxa3
Kd3 7. Kb2, or 4. ... ba 5 ba Kd4
6. a5 Ke5 7. a6 Kb6 8. Kc3. i) 1.
Sa5? Be6 2. Sf5t Ke5 and 3. ...
Bxa2, ii) 1. ... Ba6 2. Sf5t Ke5 3.
Se3 Kf4 4. Sd5t Kf3 5. Sxb4 draw.
ba b3.
JRH: Nearest is Koranyi, (1954),
No. 1695 in FIDE Album 1945-55.

No. 2081 V. Moz-zhukin
(vi.72)
3 Comm.,
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1972
Draw
5+4

No. 2081: V. Moz-zhukin. 1. Bf7
4. Rg2/iii Rc4† 5. Kd3 Rc3† 6. Kd4
with a repetition draw. i) 1. ...
Sxe3† 2. Kd3 gRg4 3. Bf5 and 4.
Bf3. ii) 2. ... Sc3 3. Bd5†. iii) 4.
Bxd5†? Rxd5† 5. Kxd5 Rd8†.


JRH: Nearest is Yakimchik (1954), No. 1686 in FIDE Album 1945-55.


No. 2086: P. Joita

3rd Prize.
Revista de Sah, 1972

3: Qb3† Ka1 2. Qc3† Ka2 3. Bb3† Bxb3 4. Qxb3† Qxb3 5. g8B wins. The reply to 5. g8Q is 5... Ka1, but is this really drawn? 6. Qg1† Ka2 7. Qb6 Qf3† 8. Ke7 Qa3† certainly looks strong, but the composer/editor should have supplied the analysis. (AJR).

No. 2087: G. M. Kasparyan

1 Hon. Men.
Revista de Sah, 1972

1. Bd7† Kg3 2. Rxf4 Qa8 3. Rf8† Kg2 4. Rg8† Kf1 5. Rf8† Ke2 6. Re8† Kf3 7. Rf8† Ke4 8. Bf5† Kd5 9. Rd8† Kc4 10. Re8† Kb5 11. Bd3† Ka4 12. Bc2† draw.

No. 2088: V. Nestorescu

2 Hon. Men.
Revista de Sah, 1972


No. 2089: A. Sarychev

3 Hon. Men.
Revista de Sah, 1972

1. Qb3† Kc2 11. Qe4† Bc3 12. Qxc3†, or in this 11... Kb2 12. Qb4† Kc1 13. Qd2† Kb1 14. Qc2† Ka1 15. Qa4† draws.


No. 2091: P. Joita 2 Commend, Revista de Sah, 1972

1. Bf4 Rh8 2. Be5 Bxh1 3. Bxh6 Ba8 4. Ba1 h1Q 5. h5Q Qb7 6. Qxf7t and draws. The doubling of the long-distance clearance (ie by B1 with 3. ... Ba8, and by W with 4. Ba1) is of course the theme, the Q of each side playing to the last cleared square, b7 for B1 and b2 for W: the 'Bristol' problem theme (Healy).


JRH finds, of course, the bishop sacrifice, for example Daniel (1913) in The Chess Amateur.


i) The only square, as note (iv) proves, ii) 1. ... Bxf7 2. Bg4. See B1's 4th. iii) For mate with wb. iv) Had W played 1. Bf5? there would now be 3. ... Qa6 4. ba Rxa6 winning, or 1. Be6?, 3. ... Qb3 4.

No. 2094: J. Roche. We are 'enchante' to have a pair of originals from this energetic young French composer. 1. Rh8† Kxh8 2. a8Q† Bg8/3. Qc6 Rd1†/ii 4. Kf2/iii Rd5/i 5. Qh6† Bh7 6. Qf6† Kg8 7. Qe6† and 8. Qxd3. i) 2. ... Kh7 3. Qa5 Bc4† 4. Kg2?? Kd5t. ii) 2. ... Kg7 3. Qe4t Kg7 4. Qh3t Bh7 5. Qc3t and 8. Qc2t. iii) 4. Ke2? Rh1 5. Qc8t/v Kh7 6. Qh3† and 7. Qg4†. iv) 4. ... Kg7 5. Qg2† Kh8 6. Qh3† Bh7 7. Qe3† and 8. Qb3†. v) 4. ... Ba2 5. Qc6† Bg8 6. Qc3† and 7. Qe2†. vi) 4. ... Bd5 5. Qf6† Kg8 6. Ke2 Rh1 7. Qg5† and 8. Qxd5. v) 5. Qf3? Rh1 6. Qf5 Rh1 7. Qxf7 Rf1†.

No. 2095: J. Roche, 1. f7 Sd3/i 2. Bf4† Sxf4 3. f8Q Rf1† 4. Kg4 Rg1† 5.Bg2 (Kf3? Rf1) 5. ... Rxf2† (Sxf2; Qe5†) 6. Kf3 Se6 7. Qb8† (Qh8†? Rf7) 7. ... Kf6 8. Kxg2.

i) Presumably, though the composer does not give the line, 1. ... Rf1† 2. Bf2 Sd1(d3) 3. Kg3 Rxf2 4. Bf3 wins. AJR.

No. 2096: V. Nestorescu. Dr Grzegorz judged this formal tourney, for which there were 17 entries in the "5-men-only" section. The unrestricted section appears to have no award. 1. Qc1†/i Kb7/ii 2. Qc5 Ka6/iii 3. Ke2/iv Ra2† 4. Kf3/v


ii) 1. Qf5? Ke7 2. Qb5 (Qe5t, Se6; or Qf7t, Kb6;) 2. ... Ra8t 3. Ke4 Sc6.

iii) 1. ... Kd8 2. Qd1t. 1. ... Ra2t 2. Qc3


Tourney announcement

Mr Gorgiev has written to clarify his article published on pp. 6-7 of EG 33, which JRH has queried. He had originally intended the above as the title of the article, but changed it at the last moment. The article was meant to illustrate King marches from one side of the board to another, not King mar- 

The stalemate in the Gurvich study quoted in the EG33 article is anticipated by L. Kubbel, No. 246 in "1234".

News about our 78-year-olds!
On 10.vi.74 I had the great pleasure of having tea in London with David Joseph, full of reminiscences of Akiba Rubinstein and other fine players he has known. Joseph is, of course, the composer of a world-famous miniature (145 in Test Tube Chess) thought up on a train journey from Warrington to Manchester in 1922. It is curious that Joseph is still often attributed to the Polish town of Lodz, but he has lived in Manchester all his life. (Latest example is in an article by E. Asaba in 64 in v.74).

The very next day I had indirect news of our six-foot-four wonderman Edmund Peckover of New York. Apparently during a power cut our one-and-only JEP climbed a dozen flights of stairs (since the lifts were not working) in order to arrive to give a chess lesson not more than 30 seconds late. He was not even out of breath.

FROM ONE EDGE TO ANOTHER

I. T. B. Gorgiev

64, 1932

Draw 4-4

P.S. JRH reports that the stalemate in the Gurvich study quoted in the EG33 article is anticipated by L. Kubbel, No. 246 in "1234".

II. N. D. Grigoriev

1930

Dedicated to T. B. Gorgiev

Win 3-2
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