NEWCOMERS' CORNER

'N C 9'

by J. D. Beasley

This will have to be my last NC; one's leisure will not accommodate all the things that one would like to fit into it. My thanks to all my various correspondents for their kind comments.

Though most NC material is taken from the easier end of the range, I have tried to include one more difficult piece in each issue, and this month it comes first. The basic strategy of Q+B/Q is simple enough. Bl, if allowed a free move, can normally start checking in such a way that W can prevent a perpetual check only by offering an exchange of Qs, which merely concedes the draw another way. If W has the initiative then he may be able to start checking in his turn, but unless he can force a quick mate or material win he will soon be unable to continue checking without repetition. There are, however, a few positions where Bl cannot usefully check for long even with the apparent initiative, and it is the intention of the studyist to explore these.

In NC9.1 (T. Kok, win), for example, initial W checks lead nowhere, but the quiet 1. Bg6! threatens mate and leaves Bl without a good check in his turn (1... Qe2f 2. Kg5 Qe5(g2)t 3. Kh6 and wK is safe). So Bl can only defend with 1... Qg7, which makes him more cramped.

Let us now forget bPs for a while and consider the possible W checks. With bKh8, bQg7 we have check on rank; Qg8; on diagonal, Qg7; on file, Kg7/8 (whichever is free). With bKg8, bQg7 we cannot play check on rank since ...Qf8 in reply will give Bl room to breathe, but check on diagonal forces ...Kh8, since ...Kf8 would allow check on rank, Ke7; on rank, Kf6/8 (else Qxg7); on rank, Ke7 again (since ...Ke5 would allow a diagonal spear check), and W can zigzag in to mate. With bKg7, bQg8 we have no sensible check since wBg6 is attacked. Have we overlooked anything? Yes, the lovely Qg5 (as in NC9.1 A), since now Bl's only checks can be met by Bf5t winning bQ.

First, however, we must get rid of bPa2 and bPh3. This leads to 2. Qc8f (if 2. Qd8f? Qg8 3. Qd4 (f6)t Qg7 and no progress is possible, nor does any line after 2. Qe8f Qg8 3. Qe5f Qg7 lead anywhere, as may be verified) Qg8 3. Qc3f Qg7 4. Qxh3t Kg8 5. Qb3t Kh8 (forced as above) 6. Qb8t Qg8
7. Qb2+ Qg7 8. Qh2+ Kg8 9. Qxa2+ Kh8 10. Qa1† Qg7 12. Qh1† Kg8 13. Qd5† Kh8 14. Qb3† Qg8 15. Qh5† Kg7 and at last 16. Qg5† (NC.9.1A).

**NC.9.1A** Position in NC.9.1 after 16. Qg5

Now what can Bl do? Either bK move allows mate in two, and all bQ moves lose; the only cases that are not trivial are 16. .. Qb8 which loses bQ after lines like 17. Be8† Kf8 18. Qf6† Kg8 19. Qf7† Kh8 20. Qe7† and 21. Bg6†, 16. .. Qf8 which allows mate in four starting with 17. Bf5†, and 16. .. Qh8 which allows 17. Bh5† Kf8 18. Qe5† and mate or win of bQ in at most four moves more. This leaves only 16. .. f3. It is now obvious that the only safe move for wK is 17. Kh3! since 17. .. Qh8† loses as before to 18. Bh5†; certainly not 17. Kxf3? Qb3† 18. Bd3† and Bl is free. There remains 17. .. f2 18. Kg2 f1Q† 19. Kxf1 and W mops up after any Bl move as before.

This has been a longer exposition than is customary in this column, but I hope it will have shown that this particular wilderness is by no means devoid of tracks.

For the remainder of my set I have chosen three of Grigoriev’s simpler pawn studies. In NC.9.2 (win), let us first get the feel of the position by playing 1. f4 b5 (threatening to reach f8, which W must prevent!) 2. Kd4 Ke6 3. Ke5 Kd7 4. Kf6 b5! and Bl will promote first. So we must head off bK before advancing Wp, and since 1. Ke4 exposes Wq to a surely undesirable check from bP (and indeed falls quite easily) the obvious move is 1. Kd4.

**NC.9.2** N. D. Grigoriev Izvestia, 1928

Now should Bl run bP or fight to stop Wp? If he starts running, 1. .. b5, then he must carry on doing so since this move blocks bK and after 2. f4 Wp is out of reach; so we have 2.. b4 3. f5 b3 4. Ke3! (to persuade bK within range of a check from f8) Ka5 5. f6 b2 6. f7 b1Q 7. f8Q† and either 7. .. Ka4 8. Qa8 mate or 7. .. Ka2 8. Qa8 mate or 7. .. Ka2 8. Qa8† and 9. Qb8†. Alternatively, let us try 1. .. Kb5 trying to stop Wp. The immediate further shut-out 2. Kd5 is now necessary, since 2. f4 Kc6 transposes back into the line we tried first, and the logical continuation is 2. .. Ka6 still trying to get round to f8. (If instead 2. .. Ka4, hoping to have diverted Wq far enough to allow bP to run, then 3. f4 b5 4. f5 b4 5. Ke4! b3 6. Kc4 Ka3 leads back into the line after 1...b5) Now we play 3. f4, threatening if Bl runs to pick up the new bQ with Qa8† and Qb8†. So Bl must continue trying to defend with 3. .. Kb7, but he loses after 4. f5 Kc7 (there is no point in Bl’s running now since W is a tempo ahead) 5. Ke6 Kd8 6. Kf7 b5 (Bl has regained the lost tempo by forcing Wq to go in front of Wp but at the cost of exposing himself
to check from f8) 7 Kg7 b4 8 f6 and promotes with check. If this was an example of a P-race, Nc9.3 (draw) looks more like a case where we may be trying to lose a tempo. Both 1. be? Kxa3 and 1. Kb1? Kxb3 lose quickly, so we are left with 1. Ka2 which treats immediate mate. The reply 1 ... cb 2. Kxb2 would lead to a quick draw, so Bl must try 1 ... b4. Now if W tries to be clever with 2. b3+ he will lose: 2 ... Kb5 3. a4† Kc5 4. Kb1 Kd4 5. Kc2 (else 5 ... c2) Ke4 (say) 6. K— c2! 7. Kxe2 (nothing else is better) Ke3 and turns the W position. So we play the straightforward 2 ab, and the reply 2 ... ab is obvious and best. Now 3. b3† loses roughly as before, 3. be cb 4. Kb1 (or 4. Ka1 Ka3 5. Kb1) Kb3 is a standard Bl win and 3.Kb1 Kb3 is almost as easy, so we must try 3. Ka1†, which turns out to give the anticipated crucial tempo loss (3 ... Kb3 4. Kb1 drawing). But have we not overlooked the obvious, in the shape of 3 ... c2? No, for after 4. b3†! Bl must either give stalemate or allow W a safe capture of c2; after 4 ... Kb5 5. Kb2 Kc5 5. Kxc2 Kd4 6. Kd2 wK is in time to stop the turning movement.

NC.9.3 N. D. Grigoriev

Shakhmaty, 1925

Draw

3+4

NC.9.4 N. D. Grigoriev

Shachmaty, 1928

3+4

Win

with check, and leads to 1 ... Kg5 (... Kg4 2. d5 Kf5 3. Kf7 amounts to the same) 2. Kf7† (now 2 d5 allows 2 ... Kf6 which probably wins for Bl, a typical line being 3. Kf8 h5 4. e4 h4 5. d6 (if 5. Ke8 then Ke6 and W is a tempo behind the main line since he has still to play Ke7) Ke6 6. e5 h3 7. Ke8 h2 and Bl promotes first) Kf5 (W was still threatening to promote with check) 3. d5 (now W is so far ahead that Bl cannot afford to run) Ke5 4. e4. Strange how the featureless position has suddenly become tight. Now any attempt at further defence by 4 ... Kd6 will lose easily to 5. Kf6 - if this is not in fact obvious, try a few lines - but Bl can now afford to run since W must lose a tempo for Ke7. So which bp shall we run? Let us take them from left to right. If 4 ... a5 then 5. Ke7 a4 6-8 d8Q 8. Qh8†, if 4 ... b5 then 8. d8Q b1Q 9. Qd6† Kxe4 10. Qg6† and if 4 ... h5 then 8. d8Q h1Q 9. Qd6† Kxe4 10. Qe6†. Poor old Bl, helpless as usual. Indeed one could even give him an i-pawn and he would still lose.

Grigoriev left no book as such, but a Russian collection of his studies and miscellaneous writings was published in 1954, and an Italian version, edited by G. Porreca, appeared from Mursia in 1965. It makes fascinating reading and should be on the shelf of every study enthusiast and practical chess-player.
Reflected or rotated diagrams.
Not infrequently the identical position is encountered but reflected left for right, or, if there are no pawns, rotated (and maybe reflected as well). There are least four reasons why this might have been done.

1. To place the majority of men on W squares, in order to ensure optimum clarity of the printed diagram. (Paper and print quality can leave much to be desired, for instance when Bl men occupy Bl squares.)

2. To make the position more "natural", by placing one or both K’s nearer their starting squares (e1, e8) in a game.

3. To facilitate comparison with similar positions. This was the stated intention of H. Keidanz in the problems and endings sections of Lasker’s Chess Magazine, as Richard Harman has found (viii.08). He announced that in future all such positions would be published with bK on a W square.

4. To place obstacles in the way of solvers with good memories and good libraries. This device was used by Ceskolovensky Sach for many months in featuring a pawnless study on the front cover.

These are editorial devices, but composers also tend to adopt one convention or another. C.M. Bent adopts No. 2, for instance.

AJR

Recent literature.
"Idle Passion", a psycho-analytic treatment, and definitely "anti" chess, is worth reading (author: Alexander Cockburn). In my opinion his most illuminating suggestion is that move alternation in chess makes the game an ideal means of sublimating violence. That is, there is a semblance of conflict, but in a purely rationalised form. In genuine violence (outside a game like chess) force is used simultaneously by both parties.

"Checkmate in Prague", by Ludek Pachman. Apparently the GM composed studies early in his chequered career. There is a passing mention of Prokop, and several mentions of Ludek’s composer, and elder, brother Vladimir, now a GM of composition.

TOURNEY ANNOUNCEMENTS


2. J. E. PECKOVER JUBILEE (formal), in honour of the Anglo-American composer’s 80th birthday. The tourney is sponsored jointly by The Chess Endgame Study Circle of New York and by E G. It will be the 4th Jubilee Tourney of EG. Closing date: 15.xi.76. Send to: Prof, Neil McKelvie, c/o Manhattan Chess Club, 155 East 55th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022, U.S.A. (Do NOT send to AJR). Judge: A. J. Roycroft. (Twins, and study whose primary points is retroanalysis, will NOT be accepted.) First Prize: $50.00. The award will be published in E G, probably in EG48.

EDITOR’S ITEMS

1. Renewal to EG45-48: on receipt of this issue, the £2.00 renewal is due. After EG48, the amount of the annual subscription is sure to increase, even drastically.

2. COZIO! In the ii.76 issue of the Italian SCACCO! is a 2-page article giving the results
of Sig. Adriano Chicco's researches. His full name was Carlo Francesco Cozio, and although his exact dates are not known, it seems reasonable to surmise ca. 1715-ca. 1780.

3. FIDE Album 1965-7 has appeared, and we are assured that the 1968-70 volume will not be long in following.

4. Among the notable supporters of EG's financial appeal was the British Friends of Chess organisation.

AJR

DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS

No. 2526 G. Nadareishvili

Win 4+2


For other studies in this award, see Nos. 2372-2376 in EG41.

No. 2527 V. Evreinov
(No. 3, reserve)
4 Comm., New Statesman, 1973 (ix.74, 26.V.75, 2.V.75)

Win 4+5


For the bulk of this award see Nos. 2239-2256.

The 4 studies given here were 'reserves' brought in to fill gaps caused by positions found faulty during confirmation time. Having 'reserves' in a formal tourney is perhaps not recommended, if only because these reserves will not themselves be subject to confirmation time scrutiny. AJR

No. 2528 L. Mitrofanov
(No. 49, reserve)
5 Comm., New Statesman, 1973 (ix.74, 23.V.75, 2.V.75)

Win 3+3

No. 2528: L. A. Mitrofanov. The "Final Award" was published on 2.V.75, with the first 2 reserves appearing one week before. Identifying the positions by their serial numbers used during the judging, the final New Statesman 1973 award should read: Prizes 35, 75, 30, 41, 79, 55. Honourable Men-
tions: 31, 68, 82, 62, 63. Com-
manded: 80, 71, 3, 49, 77, 51. (This
is in accordance with David Hoo-
per's letter to me of 28.iv.75. How-
ever, what is published is diffe-
rrent! Discrepancy due to (a) No.
2242 (70), and (b) NS of 2.v.75
placing two of the reserves in the
ranking positions of eliminated
studies, rather than moving those
originally below up! AJR)
1. Kh6† Kh2 2. Kg7 f1Q 3. Rh6†
Kg3 4. Rg6† Kh4 5. Rh6† Kg5 6.
Rg6† Kf5 7. e7 drawn. David Hoo-
per, tourney judge and authority
on R + PvQ, assures me there is no
Bl win after 7. .. Rg8f 8. Kxg8
Qc4†. (AJR).

No. 2529
V. Nestorescu
(No. 77, reserve)
6th Comm.
New Statesman, 1973
(ix.74, 2.v.75)

Win

No. 2529: V. Nestorescu. 1. Be4/i
Rf4/ii 2. b6/iii Rxe4/iv 3. b7/v
Rxe5 4. Bb4/vi Ka4/vii 5. b8Q
8. Qa6 mate. i) 1. b8? Rxf5/ 2.
Kg6 Rxe5 3. b7 Rb5. ii) 1 ... Ka4
2. b6 Rg1 3. b7 Rg8 4. Be7 wins.
Bxd5 Rxf5 5. Kg6 Rxe5 6. Bd3?
Rf3 6. Be4 Rf4 4. Bb1 Rf1 5. b6 Bd5
Rxf5†. iv) 2 ... Bd5 3. Bxd5
Rxf5† 4. Kg6 Rxe5 5. b7. v) 3 ... e6?
Re5 or 3 ... Bxe6. vi) 4 ... b6Q?
Rxf5† and 5 ... Rxa5. vii) 4 ...
Kxb5 5. b8Q† Rh5 6. Qf4† Ka5 7.
Kh6 "wins", but after 7 ... Rb7 it
remains to be proved that wP can
pass f7. See TTC p. 209 (AJR).

No. 2530: V. S. Kovalenko. 1. Re8/i
Rxf7/ii 2. Re2 Rf5/iii 3. Rf2/iv Rf7
(c5) 4. Rd2† Ke1 5. Re2† Kf1 6.
Rf2† Kg1 7. Rg2† Kh1 8. Rh2†
draw. i) 1. Re1†? Kd2 2. Re2†
Kd3 3. Rd2† Ke3 4. Re2† Kd4 5.
Rd2† (Re4†, Kxe4) 5 ... Bd3 6. Rf2
Pc4 1. Re6(g5)? Rc8. ii) 1 ... 
Rxe8 2. f8Q Re1 3. Qf1 Be8 4. Qd3†.
iii) 2 ... Rf1 3. Re1†. 2 ... Bd3
or 2. Bd3 3. Rf2† Ke1 4. Re2† Kf1 5. Rf2† for
6. Rx7f. iv) 3 ... Re5? Rf8 and 4.
Re8 Bxe8, or 4. Rf5 Bxf5.

No. 2531
M. Gorbman
Original

Draw

No. 2531: M. Gorbman. 1. a3 d3 2.
Se1 Sc3† 6. Kb2 Sd1† 7. Ka2 draw.
48 of Rueb II.

No. 2533: F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1. Bb4 h2g 2. Kh1 gf 3. Bxc3 Ke2 4. Sxf2 Kxf2 5. Ba5 Kg3 6. b4 wins, as wK can cross to take bSa8 while bK, driven back, will have to take time to capture gP.

No. 2534: F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1. Kg7 fe/i 2. Bh7f Kf5 3. Se7t Kg4 4. Bh5† Kxh5 5. Sf5 Qf6 6. g4† wins. i) 1... d6 2. e7f Kxf5 3. Bg8t Kxf4 4. Bd3.

JRH: Not unlike P. Farago (1946), No. 46 in his collection. This is not exact, but the coup-de-grace is nearly identical.

No. 2535: Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1. Rf2† Rxf2 2. a7 Re2† 3. Kg3 Re8 4. Bc7† Kh3 5. Ba8 Rxb8 6. abR wins.

No. 2537: P. Monsky
New Statesman, 4.vii.75

The composer is from the USA.

No. 2538: C. Raina
Buletin Problemistic, 1973

1st Prize, Award: iv-vi.75

No. 2538: C. Raina. This was the 3rd informal tourney of the Romanian quarterly ‘BP’ judged this time by A. Hildebrand.

No. 2539: E. Dobrescu
Buletin Problemistic, 1973

2nd Prize, Award: iv-vi.75


No. 2539: E. Dobrescu. I: Diagram II: wBd2 to c1

Win 5+5

I: Diagram II: wBd2 to c1
No. 2540
A. Tutlayants and C. Petrescu
(x-xii.73)
3rd Prize, Buletin Problemistic, 1973

Qxf1 Rxfl 14. b8Q wins. i) After 2...

Rb5 Kf5/v 5. Rxb3 Bxe5t 6. Rg3/vi Bxg3t/vii 7. Kxh3 g1Q(R) stalemate.

i) 1. Rxb4? g2t 2. Kgl/vii Be7 3.
Rb5+ Kg6 4. Rb6+ Kg5 5. Rb7+ Kg6 6. Rb8+ Kg7 7. Rb9 Ke4 8.

JRH: For the stalemate see (earliest) Kubbel (1908), No. 605 in 'T1000'.
No. 2542: A. S. Kakovin and A. T. Motor

Commended,
Buletin Problemistic, 1973

Draw
5+4

No. 2543: V. A. Bron

Commended,
Buletin Problemistic, 1973

Win
5+5

No. 2544: A. Lobusov

Commended,
Buletin Problemistic, 1973

Draw
3+4

No. 2545: J. Fritz

1st Prize,
Ceskoslovensky Sach, 1973

Award: v.75

Win
4+5

The remaining 5 in this award are either badly anticipated, unclear or weak. (AJR)
Sxh4? and 1. Bc2? are noted but no refutations given, though the Bl threats of .. Sd2† or .. h3 or .. Kxg6 are clear enough.


No. 2546  D. Gurgenidze
2nd Prize,
Ceskoslovensky Sach, 1973

Win 4+3

No. 2547  V. Dolgov
3rd Prize,
Ceskoslovensky Sach, 1973

Win 3+4

No. 2548  V. Kalandadze
1 H.M.,
Ceskoslovensky Sach, 1973

Win 5+5

No. 2549  J. Kopelovich
2 H.M.,
Ceskoslovensky Sach, 1973

Win 4+3
chess composition, or perhaps rather his 1824 book. Incidentally, Mr Umnov (Moscow) informs me that 97 in TTC, given in good faith as the earliest, known Russian study (also from Petrov’s 1824 book) is in fact earlier, appearing in the Stratagèmes of Montigny in 1802.

The judge of this tourney was Korolkov, who reports in the vii.75 issue of the Bulletin of the Central Chess Club of the USSR that there were 193 entries from 112 composers in the studies section.


JRH: The termination is a development of Kopnin (1971), no. 2118 in EG37.


i) 2... f2 3. d7 f1Q 4. d8Q Qg2† 5. Qd5 Qxc2 6. Qf5† Kh2 7. Be5† Kg1 8. Ed4† Kh2 9. Qh5† Kg2 10. Qg4† Kh2 11. Be5† Kh1 12. Qh3† Kg1 13. Bd4†. ii) 6. Qd5† Qxc2.
No. 2575: G. M. Kasparyan and V. Yakimchik.  


No. 2577: E. Pogosjants.  


No. 2576: J. Fritz.  
1. Sa3 Rg8 2. Sc4 Rg8 3. Se5 Rxe8 4. Sg6 Rg8 5. Kg6 Rg8 6. Kg6 Rg8 7. Kg6 draw.

i) The other main line is 1. . . . Bf8 2. Sc4 Rg8 3. Se5 Rxe8 4. Sg6 Rg8 5. Kg7 Rg8 6. Kg7 Rg8 7. Kg7.

JRH: The first embodiment appears to be F. Richter (1955), No. 500 in “555”. Other examples: Nos. 313 and 495 in EG.

No. 2578: V. Dolgov and Al. P. Kuznetsov.  


No. 2554: V. Miltner. The idea is related to a study by A. Wotawa (DSZ, 1955). 1. Rh5 g2 2. Rxh6 Kh8 3. Rg6 h3 4. Kg3 Kg5 5. Kg4 Kg3 6. Rg2 h1Q 7. Rh2+ stalemate.

JRH: see Herbstman (1960) No. 1974 in Cheron IV.


i) But not 2. Sxc3? Kh3 and wins,


iii) Astonishing! 8. e8Q? Sh5! 9. Qxh5 g3 10. Qf3 is stalemate.

iv) Best, winning wPg5, as otherwise W wins using his extra material.

v) 9. g6? Kg7 10. Bc6 Sh5 11. Kg2t Kg3 12. e3 h3 13. Se2t (or Bd6) Kf2, while not being quite clear, seems to give drawing play.

No. 2559: E. Vladimirov. 1. b6 Se3† 2. Kc3 d4†/i 3. Kxd4 Sd5 4. Kxd5 fg 5. g6. b8Q? g1Q 7. Qb3† Kg4 8. Qg3† Kf4 9. Qxg1 stalemate. i) 2. .. fg 3. b7 g2 4. b8Q Kg4 5. Qh2.

JRH, cf. V. and M. Platov (1906), No. 2331 in '2500'.


No. 2559: E. Vladimirov. 1. b6 Se3† 2. Kc3 d4†/i 3. Kxd4 Sd5 4. Kxd5 fg 5. g6. b8Q? g1Q 7. Qb3† Kg4 8. Qg3† Kf4 9. Qxg1 stalemate. i) 2. .. fg 3. b7 g2 4. b8Q Kg4 5. Qh2.

JRH, cf. V. and M. Platov (1906), No. 2331 in '2500'.

No. 2561

Original

Win

3+5

I: As set.

II: All one square right.

No. 2561: N. Sikdar.

I. 1. Sb4 (threatening 2. Qe7 mate) Qe4 2. Qc7† Ke6 3. Qe7† Kf5 4. Qh7† and either 4. ... Kf4 5. Sd3† Kf3 6. Qh1† or 4. ... Ke3 5. Sd3† Kd5 6. Qb7†.

II. 1. Sg4 Qd4 2. Qf7† and we have the position after W's 2nd in I reflected left for right.

This and the next two are by the only currently active study composer in India.

No. 2562

Original

Win

3+6

No. 2562: N. Sikdar.


i) 2. ... Ke6 3. Bc4† Kf6/ii 4. Qd6† Kg7 5. Qe7† Kh6/iii 6. Qf8† Kg6/iv 7. Bf3† Kf6 8. Bd5†.

ii) 3. ... Qd5t 4. Bxd5† Kxd5 5. Ke7 and wins by bringing wK over as quickly as possible.

iii) 5. ... Kg6 6. Bf7† Kg7 7. Bd5†. iv) 6. ... Kh7 7. Qe8t. v) 3. Qb5† Kd4 4. Qc4† Ke5 5. Qc3† Ke6 6. Bc8t/vi Kf7 7. Qc7† Kg6 8. Qd6† Kh5 draw.

vi) Or 6. Bc4† Kd7 7. Qd4† Kc6 8. Qd7† Kc5. vii) 3. ... Kd6 4. Qe7† Kd5 5. Qe8†. viii) Alternatives also lead to Bb3† with wQa3 and bKc2.

No. 2563

Original

Draw

3+4

No. 2563: N. Sikdar.


i) Re5† Ra6† 2. Ke7/i Sc6 3. Ke8 Ra8† wins, or 1. Rc7 Sxh4 2. Rg5† Kh7/iii 3. Rh3/iv Ra4 4. Kg5 Sf7†.

ii) Or 2. Kg5 Sf7† 3. Kh5 Rh6†.

iii) If 2. ... Kf8 W can draw with precise play (composer gives variations).

iv) 3. Kg5 Sc6

v) 1. ... Ra6† 2. Ke7 Sc6† 3. Kd7 Sb8† 4. Kc7 draw. vi) 3. Rh5? Ra6†.

319
No. 2564: N. Kralin. Judge: S. Limbach (Poland), who runs the small, but regular, column in the newspaper. The tourney was, naturally, informal.

1. g7/i Qc3/ii 2. Sd4/iii Qxd4 3. Qe3† Qxe3 4. g8Sf Kg6 5. Sxe7f Kf6 6. Sd5† Kxe6 7. Sxe3 wins.

i) 1. Kg8? Qa8f 2. Kf7 Qxf3f 3. Qxf3 stalemate.

ii) 1. ... Qa8f 2. g8Qf wins.

iii) 2. Se5? Qc8f 3. g8Q Qxg8f 4. Kxg8f. 2. Qg3f Qc8f 3. g8Q Qxg8f 4. Kxg8f.

There were 6 other studies in the award.


i) 1. d8Qf Be3f 2. Qd2 Bxb4 3. Qxb4 Sd3†.  


and 7. ... Ke3 wins.

iii) Or 3... Sd3† 4. Kd1 Ba4† 5. Re2 Ba5 (Be1; Sc1) 6. Sc3 Bxc3 stalemate.

iv) 4... Ke3 5. Re2† Bxe2 stalemate.

Judge: Dr G. Grzeban.

No. 2566: N. Kralin. 1. Qe6f Kh8 2. Qe5f Sf6f 3. QQxf6f Kh7 4. Qg6f Kh8 (Rxg6; fgf, and Bxh3) 5. Qg7f Rxf7f 6. hg† Kh7 (Kxg7; f6†, or Kg6; Be6†) 7. Be6 Qh5† 8. Kf8/i Qh6 9. Bg8 mate.

i) 8. Bf7? Qe2f 9. Kf8 Kh6 draws, for 10. g8Q Qe7(e8)t leads to stalemate, and 10. g8R is also a draw after 10... Qd2 (guarding h6), not 10... Qxf2 11. Rg6† Kh7 12. Bg6†.

No. 2567: V. Kalandadze. 1. e8Qf Kh8 (Rxg6; fgf, and Bxh3) 5. Qg7f Rxf7f 6. hg† Kh7 (Kxg7; f6†, or Kg6; Be6†) 7. Be6 Qh5† 8. Kf8/i Qh6 9. Bg8 mate.

i) 8. Bf7? Qe2f 9. Kf8 Kh6 draws, for 10. g8Q Qe7(e8)t leads to stalemate, and 10. g8R is also a draw after 10... Qd2 (guarding h6), not 10... Qxf2 11. Rg6† Kh7 12. Bg6†.
No. 2583: A. Melnikov. 1. Rg1 Sb1 2. Rg8† Kh7 3. Be4† Kh6 4. Rg6† Kh5 5. Bd5 a1Q 6. Bf7 Kh4 7. Rg4† Kxh3 8. Be6 Qa3 9. Rb4† Kg3 10. Rb3†.


AJR: Cf. the over-the-board analysis position No. 2293.

No. 2587: P. Olin. 1. b8Q Qxb6 2. Qxb6 ab 3. c8Q Bxc5# 4. Qxc5 bc 5. d8Q Sd4 6. e8Q Ra1 7. Qxd4# cd 8. Qe3 de stalemate.


No. 2589: B. Breider. 1. Sb8/i Ra5/ii 2. g4 g5 3. Kxc2 Bxd4 4. c7 Rc5 5. Sa6 Rc6 6. Sb4 Rxc7 7. h7 Bxf6 8. Sd5 Rc8 9. Sxf8# Ke7 10. Sg8#. i) 1. h7? 0-0-0. So W plays the only move that stops castling. ii) 1. .. Rxb8 2. h7, and, bR now having moved, castling is not permitted.


Should this tourney be a “Jubilee” or a “Memorial”? It seems reasonable to keep “Jubilee” for living composers and “Memorial” for a deceased composer, however long ago he died. Had the event been a “Centenary” instead of 150 years, there would have been no problem of nomenclature! AJR
No. 2591: C. M. Bent. After eliminating 4 cooks and 8 (Harman) anticipations, the judge I. Vandecasteele (Belgium) found the quality of the remaining 23 "generally on the poor side", but "fortunately, there were some exceptions". Although the studies were all published, the judge did not, apparently, see them and was unaware of the composers' identities.


"... fresh, pawnless miniature."

No. 2592: A. C. Miller.


"... White has to make precise moves in this miniature ..."

No. 2593: C. M. Bent.


"4 bP's are about to promote - W forces three S-promotion ... Quite an achievement!"

No. 2594: C. M. Bent.

1. g6† Kh8 2. g7† Kh7 3. g8Q† Kxg8 4. Sc1 Qxa2 5. Sxa2 Be6 6. Sc3 Bf7† 7. Kh6 Bxe8 8. Se4 Sd7 9. Sd6.

"After a somewhat forced introduction, W catches bB by checks and the threat of checks. A pity wSa7 is inactive."

No. 2595: C. M. Bent.


"Here, too, the opening play is forced. However, subsequent
events produce a surprising mate."

3 H.M. was by John Beasley, see E on p. 9 of EG33.

No. 2595  
C. M. Bent  
(v.72)

The Problemist, 1972-3

No. 2596  
D. Gurgenidze  
1st Prize.  
Shakhmaty/Saha (Riga) 1974

Award:

No. 2597  
F. Aitov  
2nd Prize  
Shakhmaty/Saha (Riga) 1974

No. 2598  
G. Nadareishvili  
3rd Prize  
Shakhmaty/Saha (Riga) 1974

No. 2599  
I. Krikheli  
1 H.M.  
Shakhmaty/Saha (Riga) 1974

No. 2596: D. Gurgenidze.  
1. hg Rg2‡ 2. Kf1 Rf2‡ 3. Ke1 Re2‡ 4. 
Kd1 Rd2‡ 5. Ke1 Re2‡ 6. Kb1 Rb2† 
7. Ka1 Rx2† 8. Kb1 Rb2† 9. Kc1 
Rc2‡ 10. Kd1 Rd2† 11. Ke1 Re2‡ 
12. Kf1 Rf2‡ 13. Kg1 Rg2‡ 14. Kxg2 
Rxh2‡ 15. Kxh2 Bxf7 16. gf Kxf7 
17. Sxd7 b3 18. Se5† (Kxg7) 19. Sc4 
b2 20. Sg3 wins.  
Judge: V. Yakimchik.
No. 2599: I. Krikheli. 1. Rb8 Ra1† 2. Rxal c1S† 3. Rxc1 dcs†/i 4. Ka1 Sb3† 5. Ka2 f1Q 6. Rh8† Kxh8 7. c6Q† Kh7 8. Qh8† Kxh8 9. d8Q† Kh8 10. Qd3 Qxd3.
   i) 4. . . . f1Q 5. Rh8† Kxh8 6. d8Q† Kh7 7. Qh8† Kxh8 8. c6Q† Kh7 9. Qf5† Qxf5, second stalemate.

No. 2600: I. Kovalenko 1 Comm., Shakhmaty/Saha (Riga) 1974

No. 2601: V. Moz-zhukin 3 H.M., Shakhmaty/Saha (Riga) 1974
   1. Sf6† Kh4 2. Bd1 Bc2 3. g5 Kh5 4. g6 Kxh6 5. g7† Kxg7/i 6. a7 Bd1 7. Rxd1 c2 8. Rg1†. i) 5. a7? Bd1 6. a8Q b1S mate, ii) 5. . . Bd1 6. g8S† Kh5 7. Rxd1 c2 8. Rd5†.

No. 2602: I. Kovalenko 1 Comm., Shakhmaty/Saha (Riga) 1974

No. 2603: V. Dolgov, S. Belokon, V. Samilo 1 Comm., Shakhmaty/Saha (Riga) 1974
   1. g6 Rhlt 2. Kg4 Bd4 3. Rd8t Kc5 4. Rxd4 Bh6 5. Bd5† Kxd5 6. Sf4† Ke5 7. g7 Rg6† 8. Sxg6 Kf5 9. g8R wins.
   JRH: cf. Herbstman (1928), wKc4, wSb4, wPb6; bKa5, bRb6. 1. c7 Re8† 2. Sax7† Kb8 3. c8R.

No. 2604: V. Kalandadze and D. Gurgenidze. 1. h7 Qd4 2. Bxh5† Kh8 3. h8Q† Qxh8 4. Bb4† Kg8 5. Bf7† Kh7 6. g8† Kh6 7. Bd2† e3 8. Bxe3† Kg7 9. Bd4† Kf8 10. g7† Qxg7 11. Be5 mate.
   JRH: Nearest to this mate is Kalandadze (1971), No. 1598 in EC29.
No. 2604  V. Kalandadze and D. Gurgenidze
3 Comm.
Shakhmaty/Sahs (Riga) 1974
Win

No. 2605  V. Kozlov and Y. Nevmerzhitzky
4 Comm.
Shakhmaty/Sahs (Riga) 1974
Draw

No. 2606  J. Fritz
Special Prize,
Sachove Umeni, 1974
Win

No. 2607  J. Fritz
Special Prize,
Sachove Umeni, 1974
Draw

No. 2608: J. Fritz. The judge, L. Kopac, seems to have treated this and the next study as twins, joining them together for a single prize. And the special prize has precedence in the award over the First Prize. To complete the reader’s confusion, EG is changing its method of referring to these awards from ‘Ceskoslovensky Sach’ to ‘Sachove Umeni’. So this award follows on from the 1972 and 1973 awards of ‘Ceskoslovensky Sach’ already reported in EG. 1. Ra5† Kb4/i 2. Ra4† Kb5 3. Rd5† Kc6 4. Eb3 Rh2† 5. Kg8/i Be2 6. Ra6† Kb7 7. Be4 Bb3 8. Rc7† Ke8 9. Rf7 Bxc4 10. Ra8 mate.


No. 2607: J. Fritz. The stipulation was printed as “White to Move, Black Draws”, and one sees the point, though no “Codex” is going to approve!

No. 2609: J. Fritz. The position is a correction of a xii.73 study.


No. 2610: M. Matous. 1. Bf5 glQ 2. Rb7f Ka8 3. Be4 and two lines:

3. . . . f6 4. Bd5 and the threat of 5. Bb7f Qxd5 6. Rb8f Kxb8 leaves Bl, very surprisingly, nothing better than 4. . . . Qf1f 5. Rb5f Qxd5 and it's still stalemate!

Or 3. . . h1B 4. Bc6 with the same remarkable effect.
No. 2612: M. Matous
2 H.M.,
Sachove Umeni, 1974

No. 2613: S. Pivovar
3 H.M.,
Sachove Umeni, 1974

No. 2614: J. Mugnos
Special H.M.,
Sachove Umeni, 1974

No. 2615: J. Mugnos
Special H.M.,
Sachove Umeni, 1974

Blathy (1890), see Problem 7-9 p. 137. All these studies are characterised by masses of P's. Of particular interest is Kok (1934), No. 195 in his collection, which shows several times repeated K-march. None of these is an explicit anticipation.

JRH reports that he has 19 studies showing a wK march to and fro in order, eventually, to put bK in Zugzwang. Earliest appears to be Blathy (1890), see Problem 7-9 p. 137. All these studies are characterised by masses of P's. Of particular interest is Kok (1934), No. 195 in his collection, which shows several times repeated K-march. None of these is an explicit anticipation.

JRH reports that he has 19 studies showing a wK march to and fro in order, eventually, to put bK in Zugzwang. Earliest appears to be
No. 2616: S. Pivovar. 1. f7 (g8Q? Rd7) 1... Rxg7 2. f8Q Rg5 3. Qf4+ Rg4 4. Qf6+ Rg5 5. Qe7 a5 6. Qf6 Kg4 7. Qf3+ Kh4 8. Qf4+ Rg4 9. Qf8+ Rg5 10. Qe7 c4, and by repetition of this manoeuvre we finally reach 65... Kg4 66. Qe4 mate.

JRH: Strikingly similar to Hallstrom (1951) in Suomen Shakki, No. 22 in '123'.


i) 5... Rd7 6. d8Q Sxd8 7. Rxd8 Rxe3 wins. 

ii) 5... Rc4 6. Rd8 Sxc7 7. Rxe8 Sxe8 8. Kb9 Kc5 9. e4 draw.


i) 1... Kc4 2. b5 cb 3. Kxb5 Kc3 4. a4 and wins, for instance 4... a5 5. Kxa5 Kd4 6. c6 Kc5 7. Ka6 Kxc6 8. a5, or 4... Kd4 5. a5 Kd5 6. Ka6 Kxe5 7. Kxa7.


The best entry. It shows a complex of ideas: sacrifice, not capturing, ambush, going over the same ground, a ladder-manoeuvre, zugzwang, mate and so on. All in an economical form with interesting play by both sides.” JRH: Cf. Bron (1982), No. 758 in FIDE Album.

No. 2620  S. Belokon and V. Korolkov  2nd Prize, Komsomolskaya Znamya, 1975

Draw 4+4

No. 2621  L. Katsnelson and L. Tolmachov  3rd Prize, Komsomolskaya Znamya, 1975

Win 6+6

No. 2622  V. Dolgov  1st H.M., Komsomolskaya Znamya, 1975

Win 5+4

No. 2623  D. Gurgenidze  2nd H.M., Komsomolskaya Znamya, 1975

Win 6+6
No. 2623: D. Gurgenidze. 1. a8R\textdagger 2. Ra3 Kb5 3. c7 b5 4. c8S Kc5 5. Rxa2 ba 6. b4+ Kxb4 7. Kb3 Kc5 8. Se7 wins. i) 1. a8Q? Kb5 2. Qa3 Qb1\textdagger 3. Kxb1 stalemate.

No. 2624: E. Pogosjants
3 H.M.
Komsomolskaya
Znamya, 1975

No. 2625: A. P. Kuznetsov and B. Sidorov
1 Comm.
Komsomolskaya
Znamya, 1975

No. 2626: V. Dolgov
2nd Comm.
Komsomolskaya
Znamya, 1975

No. 2627: E. Kudevich
3 Comm.
Komsomolskaya
Znamya, 1975


JRH: “As old as Salvioli I p. 167”.

No. 2625: A. P. Kuznetsov and B. Sidorov. 1. Bb3 Qxb3 2. Bh6 Kh8 3. Rf8\textdagger Qg8 4. Sxd6 Sg5 5. Bxg5 g1Q 6. Bf6\textdagger Qg7\textdagger 7. Sf7 mate, is given, but, as JRH asks: what if 5... h5; .. there’s no answer to that.
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