A good P-study is a rarity nowadays, because so much in this field has already been discovered. This makes a piece like No. 2292 (E. Pogosjants, win) doubly welcome. If a position offers no immediate clues, the best procedure is to try the obvious and see what happens. Thus 1. b4 g5 (trying for stalemate by 1. ... a2 is no good, since W can promote on b8 and mate with time to spare) 2. b5 g4 3. b6 (if 3. hg then 3. ... a2 and now W must concede stalemate or worse) 3. ... gh 4. b7 h2 5. b8Q h1Q. If WQ were not now guarding d5, WQ could zigzag in and mate by Qe5f/d5t/d4f/../b3t/xa3, but with bQ stopping both the zigzag and any first-rank check there is no way in which W can get through.

Let W play 1. h4, however, and Bl has a problem. 1. ... a2 still loses to 2. b4, and after 1. ... Ka2 the preceding line becomes playable since bK is exposed to check from b3: 2. b4 g5 3. b5 gh (if g4) 4. b6 ... h2 5. b8Q h1Q. If WQ were not now guarding d5, WQ could zigzag in and mate by Qe5f/d5t/d4f/../b3t/xa3, but with bQ stopping both the zigzag and any first-rank check there is no way in which W can get through.

The combination that works is 1. e6 a4 2. Sf4! Now Bl cannot play 2. ... Bxf4, for after 3. e7 a3 4. e8Q a2f 5. Ka1 the intended mating square is e8 instead of c3 and WQ guards it. The main line proceeds 2. ... a3 3. Se2 (W must cover c3 and 3. Sf5 fails against 3. ... a2t 4. Ka1 Bc1) 3. ... a2f 4. Ka1 Ka3 (W threatens perpetual check by Sd4 and Sb5, and if 4. ... Be3 then simply 5. e7) 5. c7 5. ... Bg5 (h6) (Bl must threaten mate to stop e8Q) 6. e8S and draws quickly; W threatens Sc3 and Sxa2, and if 6. ... Bd2 (c3) to stop it then 7. Sd6 with perpetual check on b5 and d4.

It has been said among composers of problems that the simplest way of ensuring a composition's un-
soundness is to dedicate it to somebody, I sometimes feel that selecting a piece for NC comes a good second. My original choice for the next study broke when I was analysing it, and the alternative was badly anticipated, so I thought I would save further thought by using one of the anticipations instead. It was all typed up ready for printing when WV bust it to shreds.

So I have fallen back on an old maxim: when in doubt, quote a lightweight. If you do not know NC7.1 (F. Sackmann) then you should. It is a twin study, W to play and win in both parts. (Solution at end of article.)

**NC7.1** F. Sackmann, 1913

![Diagram](image)

Win 4+2

*I: Diagram
II: Interchange wK and wS

Rather longer in the unravelling than any of the above is No. 2283 (J. Fritz, draw). This is a piece where any gain of material will be crucial, for R + P vs B is a win unless the weaker side can prove otherwise (so Bl to play could claim a win after as mild a move as 1... a5), while R vs B or S is merely a draw unless the stronger side can prove a win. Thus W threatens to draw by Bxa6, though he cannot play this immediately on account of 1... Rf5† 2. Sf4 Rf6 3. B... Sh5 and Bl wins. So 1. Se3 (attacking Br and so giving no time for 1... a5) 1... Ra5 (stopping Bxa6, so Bl hopes - the advantage of - Ra5 over .. Rd6 will appear after a couple of moves) 2. Sg4† Kg1 (to meet Kxg3 with .. Kxg1) 3. Bxa6! and W has drawn first blood.

Now the onus is on Bl to pick up material, and he must somehow get bS to safety; with Br on d6 he would have no useful move at this stage. So 3... Ra3† 4. Kf4 (if W loses touch with bS then .. Rxa6 will win 4... Sh5† 5. Kg5 Ra5† and again where is wK to go? If 6. Kg6 then 6... Sf4† and 7... Rxa6. If 6. Kh6 then again 6... Sf4 (threatening .. Rh5† and .. Rg5†), and if 7. Be8 defending wS then 7... Rf5† 8. Kg7 Rce 9. Bd7 (wB must keep guard on wS to avert .. Rg5†) 9... Rc7 10. Sf6(e5) Sd5(d3) 11. SxS RxBf and 12... RxS. So it must be 6. Kh4 Sf4, and now if wB flees to safety the near-mate by 7... Sg6† 8. Kg3 Ra3† forces wS to sacrifice itself (except after 7. Bb7, when 7... Sg6† 8. Kg3 Ra3† 9. Bf3 Rb3 10. Sf2 Se5 11. Sh3† Kf1 12. Sg5 Sxf3 13. Sxf3 Ke2 is good enough). So we must try 7. Kg3 and 7... Sg6 renews the threat (7... Sh5† being of no use to Bl because of the repetition by 8. Kh4). W's only answer to these threats of .. Rxa6 and .. Ra3† is 8. Bd3 and after 8... Ra3 9. Sf2 Se5 it looks as if W is helpless; but the tightrope has led to a perpetual check by 10. Sh3† Kh1 11. Sf2†. A long and (to me) enjoyable struggle, with every man moving except Be6.

Solution to NC7.1: 1. g7† Kh7 2. gfB. II: 1. Sf7† Rxf7 2. gf Kh7 3. f8R.

On 3.1.75 Richard Harman gave a fully illustrated talk to The Chess Endgame Study Circle, based on the Novotny and Plachutta studies (numbering nearly 120) in his collection. We hope to print the whole talk as a Rueb Supplement in EG40 with the cooperation of the Rueb Foundation. AJR
SPOTLIGHT
by Walter Veitch

EG36, p. 81: NC 4.2. This study reminds me of this game position which I came across a few years ago. Play was brief: 1. ... Kc3 2. Kf4 Kb2 and the Tunisian master resigned. The comments stated that 1. ... Kxc4 would not win as 2. Kf4 Kc3 3. Ke4 draws. Possibilities here are 3. ... a4 4. Kd5 c4 5. a3 =, or 4. ... a3 5. Kxc5 Kb2 6. c4 Kxa2 7. Kd6 =. Nevertheless Bl in fact wins comfortably by 1. ... Kxc4 but after 2. Kf4(3) not 2. ... Kc3 but either 2. ... a4 or 2. ... Kd4 and the rest is easy.

Belkadi v. Pachman
Chess Olympiad, 1958

Black to Play

All this is hardly remarkable, Pachman merely chose a different win. But did he? W in fact resigned in a drawn position! For after 1. ... Kc3 2. Kf4 Kb2 3. Ke4 Kxa2 4. Kd5 a4 5. Kxc5 a3 6. Kd6 Kb2 7. c5 a2 8. c6 a1Q 9. c7 Qa6+ 10. Kd7 Qb5+ 11. Kd8 Qd5+ 12. Ke8 Qc6+ 13. Kd8 Qd6+ 14. Ke8 Ka3 “Avoiding, of course, Bl’s stalemate possibilities”, say the notes, but 15. c4 Kb4 16. Kb7! (not 16. c5 as suggested) and Wh draws as he can never again be forced to c8, a version of the NC 4.2 position. An example of two Homers nodding!

No. 2028: V. N. Dolgov. No win.

The comment to this study prompts one to ask why Rinck had no bPf7. The answer appears to be that after 5. ... f5 6. Be3 Qg1 (instead of ... f4) draws, the previously set win of 7. Qb5+ Ka7 8. Be5 no longer being available.

No. 2036 is marked 4+5, Should be 4+6.


F. Lazard, 1911

Win

1. Sf4+ Kh6 2. Se6 Re8 3. g8Q Rxg8 4. Sf6 Rg5 5. Sg6# wins, but not 5. e8Q? Re5# 6. Qxe5 stalemate.

Nos. 2059 & 2062: M. Sh. Gorbman. In the former position Bl draws easily by 3. ... Ra2. In the latter a third win is 5. Sb7 Re8 6. Sd6. Not good enough. Moreover the idea of No. 2062 has already been shown to perfection in this classic study by F. Lazard.

No. 2084: N. Kralin. Instead of committing ceremonial suicide, Black can win simply by 1. ...
Rb8 (if 2. g7 Bh6, or if 2. Bd5 Bd4). The win .. Rb8 is available till move 6. Black can also win by 1... Bc5 or draw by 4... Rx e4 5. hQ Bxg5. Most of this is eliminated if wB is moved to d5, but 1... Rb8 2. Bg8 Bc5 is still too strong.


No. 2091:

Endgame, composed by Lasker and Capablanca
"Endspiel, komponiert von Lasker und Capablanca"

White moves and wins 44-4

"The above endgame owes its existence to an accident. A week ago the Cuban master came through Berlin. I was about to travel to Mannheim for the Congress of the German Chess Federation, where the question of the founding of an international chess federation was to be discussed, and this matter was also of interest to Capablanca. We therefore arranged to meet each other. We did meet, and we were able to confirm that our points of view agreed in important respects. In the meantime our encounter in the Cafe Kerkau had attracted attention and a chess enthusiast took the opportunity to offer a prize for ten quick games ("Schnellpartien") between us. A condition was to be that no move was to take longer than five seconds. Despite this speedy pace we played quite passable games, Capablanca in particular committing hardly any errors even under this constraint ("Insbesondere zeichnente sich Capablancas Spiel auch bei dieser Fixigkeit noch durch Mangel an Fehlern aus").

The result was Z. 61/2, L. 31/2. In one of the games C. had won very pretty. The idea that C. had hatched on this occasion was afterwards a little stylised ("ein wenig stilisiert") by us both, and in this way the above endgame was created.

The piece is almost nothing but thought ("fast ganz und gar Gedanke"). If you hit upon the basic idea, the solution is easy, otherwise it appears to be quite insoluble. It goes 1. Sxc7 Sxc7 2. Ra8 (and not Kxc7, which gives stalemate) 2... Sxa8 3. Kc8 and wins along well-known lines".

A photocopy of the column is in front of me as I type.

It is worth noting that this was
the last column to appear before the outbreak of World War I (hence the “accident” was extremely fortunate indeed), that no games have survived, .. and that the Newspaper Library is less than ten minutes walk from where I live - and still I did not get the story right in TEST TUBE CHESS, position 204! AJR.


One of the last remaining Mohicans of the once dominant, internationally esteemed Czech school of chess composition has passed away.

Prokop was born in the thoroughly Czech countryside of Horovice, into an obediently loyal Czecho-Austrian family who christened him František Josef, in honor of their Austrian emperor Francis Joseph. But they also endowed their son with additional “disciplines” in educational fields and multilingual. Prokop studied at Prague’s Technical College, added Natural Science and Law at Prague University, and ended up in journalism as his profession. His complex background was to cast a long shadow.

In 1923, at the age of 22 and already a strong player, Prokop started in “28.řijen” a chess column dedicated to endgame studies, one of several to follow in other newspapers under his editorship. With astonishing speed Prokop rose to become an outstanding composer of studies combining strict economical simplicity with great depth of content. With unfailing perseverance he successfully tackled difficult tasks but in 1931 surprisingly switched over to problemdom, specializing in selfmates which he mastered with virtuosity.

Although somewhat finicky in his likes and dislikes, Prokop displayed impeccable knowledge and objectivity and an attractive prose when it came to literary production. In his historical and bibliographical treatise “Ceskoslovensko v svetovém šachu” (Czechoslovakia’s role in International Chess), Prague 1935, 321 pages, he renders a brief and accurate self-portrait (p. 96):

“...In output, within a short period, Prokop even surpassed the stature of contemporary Czech composers; moreover, he created a novel and personal style, especially in his stalemate studies. Inspired by /Zdenek/ Mach, he composed studies with stalemate themes in such a fashion that the final combinations included several, always economical, stalemate variations.”

In a qualifying footnote, Prokop continues: “It so happened that during a discussion at the Czech Chess Society, between M. Havel, L. Knotek and F. J. Prokop about endgame studies, the problemist Dr. Mach suddenly produced on the empty board something of a stalemate net. As was Mach’s habit, he nonchalantly and in a quizzical manner posed the doubting question if a theme as sketched out by him, could ever be worked out in a study showing two variations, on white and black squares alternatively. The participants agreed that it would indeed be extremely difficult or even impossible. But Prokop was intrigued and a week later presented the Society with his first echo stalemate study. It was awarded 3rd-4th prize ex aequo (together with one by his compatriot O. Duras) in “Shakhmatny Listok” 1925” (see A).
1. Bh4/i Bxh4 2. Rxg4, with two Unes:
   i) 1. Rg8f? Ke7 2. Bf3 Bf3 3. Ka5 Kf7

Subsequently Prokop concentrated mostly on selfmates and in
1940 published a collection of his 100 best problems in this field,
excelling the hitherto leading Czech composer Knotek in ideas
and precision of construction.
For a “minority” citizen to have a book published in Czech lands
under German rule was somewhat an exception, but in 1943 Prokop
even followed up with an enlarged edition of his studies: “212
Endspielstudien”, published in German.
By environment and by chess tradition, Prokop was native to the
core but politically a right-winger and educationally versatile. He
seemed to adjust well and unobtrusively to the powers that be,
and as the editor of one of the indigenous Czech-language papers
permitted to appear during the War, Prokop made no waves (sic).
His book of studies contains one diagram prominently dedicated
to the German Chess Czar E. Post of Berlin.
No wonder that after the liberation Prokop was under a cloud, in
a country freed from domination, and with a new social alignment.
J. Fritz’ book on the endgame
study (published in 1951) lists all prominent Czech study com-
posers and pointedly omits the “non-
person” Prokop. Perhaps as a fu-
ture blessing, Prokop thus was
politically neutralized. But with
class still a sideline in human af-
fairs, he was subsequently per-
mitted to function as the chess
instructor in Prague’s Central In-
stitute for Youth and to continue
putting his phenomenal chess ver-
satility and erudition to productive
use. In 1968, in the aftermath of
the political thaw, the Institute
published Prokop’s “Kouzlo Sa-
chového Diagramu - Zauber des
Schachdiagramms”, a bilingual
collection with explanations and

"Perpetual stalemate. Thus the study
was defined in the USSR, but it is ap-
propriate to call it a treadmill. Trying
to destroy the stalemate net, Bi keeps
checking in a rhythmical circle whereas
wK keeps abreast in the same direction.
The study is cited in almost all Soviet
breviaries as a shining example of be-
auty in chess" (Prokop).
1. Sf8t Kh8 2. Sg6t Qxg6 (Kh7? f8S
mate) 3. f8Qt Kh7 4. Bb1 Bc3/i 5. Ke3
   i) 4. . . Qxbl 5. Qf5t Qxf5 stalemate. If
   4. . . Qxbl 5. Qf5t Qxf5 stalemate. If
   iii) 6. . . Qxb1 7. Qxb1 Kg6 8. Qh7t (in
   a rare error Prokop gives 7. Qg7t, but
   7. . . Bxg7 wins).
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prefaces in Czech and German, of 59 studies and, in juxtaposition, 59 selfmates with corresponding themes. Diagrams No. 26 and 26(a) on page 99 (our B and C) are given here as examples. (Prokop's only remaining Czech rival, continuing and looking back at composition of first class echo studies and also of selfmates is Dr. J. Fritz - somewhat younger than Prokop but also in his early 60s). On page 13 of his book, Prokop credits the British with inventing the selfmate about 500 years ago and describes it as typical of dry English humor; that the weaker party is to prevail over the stronger one, but is a reluctant David who has to be compelled to do so. For Prokop, the selfmate is straight orthodox humor incarnate and he refuses to rank it among Fairy Chess, claiming that the basic ingredients are no different from those in orthodox treatment of problems and Prokop's constructions maintain a strong affinity to practical play, as seen from Diagram C.

Prokop's over-the-board strength was already noteworthy when he started to compose, but thereafter he acquired formidable stature as a practical player. In the third Kautsky Memorial Tournament, Prague 1926, he placed first, together with master Schulz and International Master Dr. Skačka. It is worth noting that almost any of the leading endgame study composers who formed the "Czech School" were strong practical players imbued with love for the artistic endgame study (or vice versa!), as for instance Dedrle, Louma, Soukup, Traxler, Vančura, Votrubá, Grandmasters Duras, Foltys and Réti, and masters Hašek, Mandler, Moravec, Prokeš, Prokop, F. Richter, Schubert, Skačka, Vécsey - evidence of the affinity between these branches of chess.

Prokop was a tall, goodlooking and composed personality, elegant and aloof but otherwise most helpful when asked directly for advice by a novice (like myself) during any of his sporadic visits to the Dobrusky Chess Club, the meeting place of Prague's chess elite. The last time I met him was in the summer of 1968 - he was exuberant over the publication of his last book and felt encouraged to proceed working on a history of chess, but retired in 1969 and faded into oblivion, briefly interrupted by I. Mikan's appreciation in "Československy Sach" on his 70th birthday. He must have been lonely in his later years as his death in September 1973 became known only belatedly and was not confirmed in the same periodical until May 1974 when L. Kopáč gave Prokop's memory a grand last send-off.

WALTER KORN
East Orange, N.J. USA.
TOURNEY ANNOUNCEMENTS

The 5th Thematic Tourney is announced by Shakhmaty v SSSR. The theme is the "copycat" manoeuvre, that is, the same reason for a move by a W man, and a move by a similar Bl man. The moves may be either W first or Bl first, but they must be in the same main line. By 30.iv.75, to Shakhmaty v SSSR, P.O. Box 10, Moscow G-19, 121019 U.S.S.R., with "OBYEZYANYA THEME" on envelope. Judge: Al. P. Kuznetsov. (See attached example.)

Y. Dorogov and Al. P. Kuznetsov
Shakhmaty v SSSR, x.74

The example illustrates "copy-cat" manoeuvres - see Bl's 4th and W's 7th moves, and Bl's 5th and W's 11th.

The Italian Problemists Association announces an international tourney in memory of Dr Alberto Nardone, a famous analyst and "cook-hunter". By 31.iii.75. To: Sig. Gino Mentasti, Via Grottin 53, 16012 Busalla, ITALY. Judge: R. Ravarini.

The Czechoslovak Chess Federation announces a section for studies in a formal tourney with the closing date (receipt) of 9.v.75. Send (2 copies) to Josef VOLF, Na vysinach 6, 460 05 Liberec 5, CZECHOSLOVAKIA. Judge: Miroslav Sindelar. "Valuable book prizes will be awarded."

Incidental items
- from Harold C. Schonberg’s Grandmasters of Chess we learn that Fischer broods over endgame studies. Can anyone confirm this? I am not aware that the World Champion has ever shown a positive interest in studies but would be delighted to have evidence. Fischer does not subscribe to EG.

- from Soviet Weekly, 11.i.75: “The experts believe that more than 20,000 chess studies and about 100,000 problems have been made public in all countries. Collecting and systematising them is a titanic job and has not been accomplished by anyone so far. Therefore of great interest for chess problem devotees is the collection of 30,000 chess compositions made by a Moscow factory engineer, Igor Slyusarenko. One quickly orientates himself in this mass of problems with the help of Slyusarenko’s efficiently prepared filing system.” Can one of our Moscow readers enlighten us about the classification method used by Slyusarenko for studies?

Obituary
H. Edson, EG supporter, died in March 1974. He frequently attended the meetings in Wigmore Street when his work in the Post Office permitted.
DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS

No. 2248  V. S. Kovalenko (No. 82)
4 H.M., New Statesman, 1973 Award: 1.xi.74

1. h4 Bc5/i 2. Kg7/ii Ba3/iii 3. Ra1 Bd6


“A curious self-block by Bl is forced to allow W to free his pieces and evaluate the material plus.”

No. 2249 V. A. Bron (No. 36)
5 H.M., New Statesman, 1973 Award: 1.xi.74


“Very charming miniature - one of the best of its kind - with a thrice - repeated wB manoeuvre.”
No. 2250: V. Korchnoi v. A. Karpov. 54. ... f4/ii 55. Kb4 Kg2/i 56. a5 f3 57. a6 f2 58. a7 f1Q 59. a8Q/i ii Qf3 60. Qa2f Qf2 61. Qd5f Qf3 62. Qd2f. See No. 2250a, i) Genuinely study-like is 54. ... g2 53. Kb4 Kg2 56. Ke3/vi g1Q/v 57. Rxg1 Kg1 58. Kh2 59. a5 f4 60. a6 f3 61. Ke2 Kg3 62. a7 f2 63. Ke2 Kg2 64. a8Qf, which is, of course, a well known theoretical conclusion. ii) 55. ... g2 56. Ke3 Kg2 57. Ka4 f3 58. Ke4. iii) The note in 64 reads: Despite the remoteness of the forces from each other Bl does not succeed in repelling the attack by his opponent's major pieces. iv) 56. a5? g1Q 57. Rxg1 Kg1 58. a6 f4 59. a7 f3 60. a8Q f2 with a theoretical draw. v) 56. ... f4 57. Ke4 f3 58. Ke5 Ke3 60. Kx5f Kd4, or in this 59. a5 f4 60. a6 f3 61. a7 Kg1 62. a8Q f2.

No. 2250a: Korchnoi v. Karpov. This position appears to break fresh theoretical ground. The game concluded: 62. ... Qf2/i 63. Ke3 Kg1/i 64. Qd1f Kg2/i 65. Qd3/i Qe5f/iv 66. Kb3 Qb6 67. Kc2 Qh6 69. Qe3 Qh4 70. Rb8 Qf6 71. Rb6 Qf5 72. Rb2 Kb2 73. Qh6f Kg1 74. Qh6f Kh2 75. Qb8 Kh3 76. Qh8f Kg4 77. Rb4f Kf3 78. Qh1f Kf2 79. Rb2. Bl resigned. i) There is no comment in 64 but this surely is wrong. It allows
No. 2251: C. M. Bent. 1. gSe7†/i Ke6/ii 2. Rf6† Kd7 (Kxf6;Sd5†) 3. Sb6† Ke8 4. Sg6. For Rf8†, 4. ... Qa5† 5. Kb1/iii Qe1† 6. Ka2 Qa5† 7. Kb1 Kd8 8. Rc6 Ke6 9. Rf6 Kd8 10. Re6 draw.
i) 1. Rxh1? Qa4† 2. Kb1 Qe4† wins. 1. R(K)xal? Sd3 wins. ii) 1. ... Ke5 2. Rf5† and 3. Rf4† draw.
1. ... Ke4 2. Rf4† Kxf4 3. Sd5†.
“A brilliantly original final position, but a weak introduction, and static features, rob this of a prize.”

i) 1. Rxh6? Bd5f 2. Kg1 Rg2† 3. Kf1 Be4† 4. Ke1 Sf3† 5. Kd1 Bb3† 6. Ke1 Rc2† 7. Kb1 (Kd1, Rh2?) 7. ... Sd2† 8. Ka1 Ra2 mate. 1. Rf6† as before, until 4. ... Bd2† 5. Kd1 Bb3 mate. ii) “The capture of wS must wait.” iii) “bS cannot be captured with wR on bl square.” iv) 5. ... Bxb8 is stalemate.
“Drama on the 4th rank. The play throughout is excellent, but only a Commend due to anticipation.”

No. 2253: R. Tavariani. 1. Rd4† Kg6/i 2. Rxc4/ii Bf8† 3. Kh7 e1Q 4. Kg8 with 2 positional draws:
a) 4. ... Qe7 5. Re4/iii Qe5 (Qxe4; Kxf8) 6. Re5 Qb4 7. Re4 Qd6 8. Re6.
b) 4. ... Ba3 5. Ra4 Bc5 6. Re4 Be7 7. Rc7. Also, 4. ... Bh6 5. Rc6 draw.
i) 1. ... Bxd4 2. f8Q Be3† (elQ; Qd8†, Qe8(c7)† draws) 3. Kg6 e1Q 4. Qe7† draw.
ii) 2. Re4? Kf2 3. Rxc4 (Rf4†, Ke3;) 3. ... Bf6† 4. Kh7 e1Q 5. Kg8 Be7(-) 6. Rc7 Qg1† wins.
iii) 5. Re7? Qd6/iv 6. Rd7 (Re6, Qg8) 6. ... Qh6 7. Rd3† Kf4 8. R† Ke5 wins.
iv) 5. ... Qb4? 6. Rb7 Qe5 7. Rc7 draws.
“A positional draw with wR and wP holding bQ and bB. The repeated R-offer is piquant.”

No. 2254: S. Belokon

No. 2255: R. Tavariani (No. 63)

"A witty shuffle along the first rank."

No. 2255: G. Grzeban

5 Comm.,
New Statesman, 1973
Award: 15.xi.74

Draw 5+7

No. 2255: G. Grzeban. 1. Qe1 Bd7/i 2. Qh1† Re4 3. c4 ii c6/iii 4. Qh8† Re8 5. Qxe8† Bxe8 6. f3, any, stalemate, i) 1. .. Bh5? 2. Qh5† f3 3. Qxh5. ii) 3. Qxe4† c6 and the threat of .. Bc6 mate wins. 3. Qh8†? Re8 4. Qh1† c6 wins.

iii) 3. .. f3 4. Qh8† (Qxf3? c6; and no stalemate) 4. .. Re8 5. Qxe8† Bxe8 is stalemate, and also a draw is in this 4. .. Be6 5. Qe5 (Qf6 draws, too) 5. .. Rxe5. 3. .. Bc6 4. Qh6 draw. 3. .. Kb8 4. Qh1†.

"A short, but piquant, self-stalemate."


"Bl's move 2 variations provide the counterpoint, and W's explosive 9th the effect, in this 'Pandora's Box' study."

No. 2257: J. Fritz

1st Prize,
Szachy, 1973
Award: vii.74
No. 2258: F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov (ix.73)
2nd Prize, Szachy, 1973
Win 8+9

No. 2259: V. N. Dolgov (v.73)
3rd Prize, Szachy, 1973
Win 3+4

i) 1. .. Kf7 2. hRf6f Kg7 3. Rg6f Kf7 4. eRf6f Ke7 5. Rf2. ii) 8. .. Kg7 9. Rg6f Kf7 10. Rgxg2.

No. 2260: Em. Dobrescu (vii.73)
1 Hon. Men., Szachy, 1973
Win 3+4

No. 2261: S. Pivovar. 1. Qg6t/i
Qe7 Rd5 5. Qf7t Rf5 6. Qc4t wins.
i) 1. Qg4t? Kh2 2. Qg8 Rf1t 3.
Kd2 Bh3 draw. ii) 3 .. Re8 4.
Qb5t. 3 .. Rh8 4. Qb5t Kg1 5.
Qg5t Kh1 6. Qd5t and 7. Qd4(e5)t.

No. 2262: G. Grzeban
3-4 Hon. Men.,
Szachy, 1973

No. 2262: G. Grzeban. 1. Rf1t
Qxf1 2. Ke3t Qg2 3. Bf3 f6 (f5;
Kxf3 and mates with WS on move
Sxf2).

No. 2263: N. Kralin. 1. Rg7t Kh8
2. Rg8t Kxg8 3. h7t Kh8 4. Kh6 a6
5. h3 a3 6. h4 a4 7. h5 wins.
No. 2265  V. A. Bron
1 Commend, Szachy, 1973

1. Rd5 Be6
2. Re5 Sb3+ 3. Sxb3 Bxb3
4. Sd6 Rb6 5. Rxb5f Rxb5
6. Sc4f Ka4 7. Sb2f Ka3
8. Sc4f Ka4 9. Sb2f with perpetual check or stalemate.

No. 2266  A. Sarychev
2 Commend, Szachy, 1973

1. Rd5 Be6
2. Re5 Sb3+ 3. Sxb3 Bxb3
4. Sd6 Rb6 5. Rxb5f Rxb5
6. Sc4f Ka4 7. Sb2f Ka3
8. Sc4f Ka4 9. Sb2f with perpetual check or stalemate.

No. 2267  B. G. Olympiev
3 Commend, Szachy, 1973

i) 3... d3 4. h7 d2f 5. Kxd2 Kb1
6. h8Q a1Q 7. Qh1f wins.

JRH: Klinkov (Problem, 1970):
wKe1, wBe5, wSh5, wPa5; bKg2,
bPe7, h3, h5. 1. Bg1 Kxg1 2. Sf5 h2
3. Sg3 h4 4. Sh1 Kxh1 5. Kf1 e5
6. a6 e4 7. a7 h3 8. a8R e3 9. Bal

No. 2268  L. Tamkov
4 Commend, Szachy, 1973

1. c7 Rc5
2. Rd8f Kg7 3. c8Q Rxc8 4. Rxc8
h5f 5. Kxh5 Bf3f 6. g4 Bd5 7. Rg8f
Kxg8 8. Kg6 draw.

No. 2269  A. Johandl
5 Commend, Szachy, 1973

1. Sf7f Kh8
2. Sg6f h5 3. Rh8f Kg8 4. Ke7 f1Q
Qxd5 8. Rh8f Kxh8 stalemate.
No. 2270: A. Sarychev
Chervony Girnik, 1973
1. Rg3+ Ka4 2. Exe4 Bd2+ 3. Kxc2
Rg3 Bf6 12. Ra3+ Bxa3 13. b3 mate.
If 9. ... Bf4 10. Ra6+ Kb5 11. Bc4+ 
Kc5 12. b4 mates.
JRH: Gorgiev (1960), No. 88 in “Studies of Ukraine”, and Kovalenko (1966), No. 708 in EG14.

No. 2271: V. N. Dolgov
Chervony Girnik, 1973
Qb4 f6 5. Qb8 Kc3 6. Qc7+ Kd2 7.
Qc7+ Kd2 11. Qf4+ Kc2 12. Qxf5+ 
Qb4 wins.
JRH: I have 11 studies terminating in this mate, but none shows the repetition manoeuvre. Bron (1968), No. 678 in EG14 shows Q-march.

No. 2272: N. Kralin
Chervony Girnik, 1973
1. Kf1 Ka4 2. b6 Kb5 3. b7 Ka6 4. b8B h1Q+ 5.
Bgl Kb5 6. Bd6 Kc4 7. Be7 Kb5
Be7 Kc4 16. Ba5 Kb5 17. Bxc3 Kc4
wins.
JRH has 6 earlier studies with this idea of enclosing bQ. Kovalenko (1936) No. 2171 in ‘2500’; Korolkov (1947), p. 224 of his 1958 collection.
No. 2273: E. Pogosjants. 1. Se1 h1Q 2. Sxf3† Kg4 3. Sf6† Kf4 4. Sd5† Kg4 5. Se3† Kf4 6. Sg2† Kg4 7. Se5† Kh3 8. Bf5† g4 9. Bxg4† Kh2 10. Sf3 mate.


JRH: van den Ende (1965), No. 84 in EG3; Belokon (1972) No. 2226 in EG38.


JRH: Cf. T. R. Dawson, Chess Amateur, 1921. wKa8, wQd4, wPa6; bKa3, bQb4, bRb6, bPa4, c4.
1. Qa1† Kb3 2. Qb1† Kc3 3. Qe1† Kd3 4. Qxb4 Rxb4 5. a7 c3.

also Enevoldsen (1966) and Kazzantsev (1962), Nos. 152 and 153 in Bondarenko’s “Gallery”. Perhaps nearest; Keres, No. 1616 in Cheron III.

No. 2279: L. Topko.


AJR: my memory said “very old”, but it took JRH actually to locate 5 similar studies. Earliest is Troitsky (1889), No. 36 in ‘1234’. See

No. 2280: M. Gorbman.
1. h8S† Kh7 2. g6† Kh6 3. g5† fg4 4. Kg4 Rcl 5. Rxc1 e3 6. Rc6 Qxc6 7. Sf7† Kxg6 8. Se5† and wins.

JRH comments on this tourney as a whole: “Either the entry was very poor or the judges quite unaware of the prior art. Out of 10 studies, only 3 are wholly unanticipated, and they include the 4th Commend.”
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No. 2282: G. A. Nadareishvili. 1. g7† Kg8 2. Ra8 Bc6† 3. Kg2 Bxg2† 4. Kg1 Qxa8 5. f7† Kxf7 6. g8Q† Kxg8 stalemate, i) 3. .. Qxa8 4. Ba4† Bxa8 5. Kg1 h2† 6. Kh1 Kf7/ii 7. g8Q† Kxg8 stalemate.

No. 2287: I. Kovalenko. 1. Be7 e3 2. Bf8 e2 3. g8Q e1Q 4. Qxf7† Qe6† 5. c4† Ke5 6. Bg7† Kd6 7. Bf8† Ke5 8. Bg7† draw. i) 4. .. Kc6 5. Qe4† Kd7 6. Qd5† Ke8 7. Qh5† Kd8 8. Qd5† draw.

The point of the composition appears to be that 4. .. Qe6 threatens a discovered check to wK, and there arises a kind of symmetry around the diagonal a2-g8.

No. 2286: B. G. Olimpiev. 1. Rh8† Kg8 2. Rxg7† Kf3 3. Rf7† Ke3 4. Re7† Kd2 5. Kb2 Bb5 6. Rh5 Be2 7. Rh2 Re1 8. Kg2 wins.

i) But where is the win after 4. .. Kd3 ask JDB and AJR?

No. 2288: V. Kalandadze. 1. g7† Kg8 2. b7 Rxe6† 3. g6 Re8 4. b8Q Rxb8 5. Rxb5 R5d8 6. Rd5 Ra8 7. Re8 Ra5 8. Re6 Rac8 9. Rc5 Rd8 10. Rd5 draw.

JRH: Cf the same composer in Chess Life & Review (1973), a study which has yet to appear in EG (it won a 2nd Commendation).
Having had the basic idea, I contrived to set up the position so that it would best be illustrated; I eventually arrived at M1,

with the play 1. ... Rc6 2. Bb4! Rb6 3. Ba3 Rf6 and WB moves between c5 and a3 so that aP must move until it is captured on a3, BL is now in Zugzwang, and must now lose.


There is a secondary line 1. ... Pd4 2. Ba3 Rd8 and loses as before. But here there is a dual after 2. Rc5 Rc4 3. Ba3.

In the solution, bR could have moved onto a total of 41 different squares, all of which lose.

Now to get the lead-in play. To make 1. Bd6 the key (e.g. by moving Bd6 to h2, say) is rather second-rate, since it is so obvious. The most promising approach is 1. key move Re4 2. Bd6. Using this excludes the idea 1. key move Re4 2. Rxe7, because (a) this is obvious and (b) the only decent way to make it more subtle is to start with a position such as M2.

with the introduction 1. Re7+ Kf8 2. Bd6. But what with the alternatives 1. ... Kd8 and also 2. Ba3, I soon abandoned this type of approach.

Such experimentation showed me that I couldn't start with WB on the a3-f8 diagonal. So I returned to my original method of 1. key move Rc4 2. Bd6 (from the h2-b8 diagonal). This immediately posed the question: what's wrong with 1. ... KxR? The only way to prevent this is to make the key move attack bR. I based all further thoughts on this foundation. Now bR has to be forced onto c4. This calls for a capture. So we have the forced play 1. key move Rxc4 2. Bd6.

Since I was going to use the b8-h2 diagonal, then bR must come from one of such squares, yet also so that on the move it can get to c4. The only possibilities are for bR to be on c7 or f4. The first is obviously out because here W could play 1. RxR instead.

So, including the white piece on c4 (which for the time being I made wP), I now reached the position M3.
I soon realised that wB could not instead be at h2, because then the key-move would have to be Bh2 from g1. This, however, is not feasible since you now have the cook 1. Bc5. Similarly, wB could not in $M_3$ have come from e1 or f2. This makes $h_4$ the only square.

(At this point I must explain why I have used so few pieces. Undoubtedly I could relieve some of the difficulties which present themselves by having other men on the board. But I never compose a study which has more than seven pieces in the initial position; thus I am a miniature composer. Thus I am against more than one or two captures in the course of the solution. This, of course, restricts my field of composition. But I am a great believer in the simplest possible setting, combined with neat and instructive play.)

So now my position is $M_4$.

But because the forces are nearly equal, the key is not hard to find. So I now wanted this setting to be the position after Bl’s first move.

How about the first move then being 1. Bh4? This looked promising. However, since wR is under attack, the only two possibilities were (a) that wB comes from the e1-h4 diagonal - this is out because of cooks like 1. Bb4 or (b) that it comes from f6 or g5. This ties bR down to f1, 2, 3 or 5, otherwise 1... RxP straight away is unavailable, if it were on f4.

First I tried g5, with bR on one of white squares f1, 3, 5. If bR is on f1 or f3, there is a cook after 1. RxP e.g. 1... Rh3+ 2. Rh2! Rc3 3. c5! (a move which wins in a lot of situations). With bR f5, there is nothing more than a draw after 1. Bh4 Rc5 because now 2. Re4 is the only way to save P, allowing 2... Rh5 mate. bR therefore must be on f2. But this too loses after 1. RxP.

So g5 is out. Now with wBf6, 1. RxP is not a cook because wB is en prise. My hopes rise. But by this time I was beginning to get suspicions about bPa7. I saw the variation 1. Bh4 Rf4 2. Bg3 Rd4 3. Re7 and it occurred to me that bPa7 might just allow him to force a draw. Also, because the forces were so nearly even, the solution would be more obvious. Either I could remove bP, or I could replace wPc4 by wS or wB. The latter idea allowed more cooks, and anyway it didn’t look neat, so I removed bPe7. However, this course of action cuts out the move ... Rh8 in the main variation, since have bR is not even temporarily safe. This cuts the total of 41 squares down to 36. Also, it allows a dual in the main line, as will be seen latter. With wBf6, now, there is a dual after 1. Bg5. So I was now back to $M_4$, minus bPa7.

What other introduction could I find? I tried moving wP back to c3, and bR to f3, with the idea 1.
c4 Rf4 etc. But 1. Rc7 Rh3 2. Rc4 also won, just. Still, I didn’t give up the idea of wP, threatened by bR, moving to c4. However, even after moving the board around, there was no way on doing this. So I finally settled on the setting M5,

Thus the study, and the full solution, became M6.


(Black has a total of 36 replies by the Rook. These are met by corresponding moves of the white Rook.)

As final touch, but vital to soundness, bPh6 had to be added, to avoid Bl saving himself with stalemate. This gives No. 262 in EG8, which won 4th Prize in the New Statesman in 1966.

A.C. Miller 25.iii.66
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