Dear EG-Subscriber,


The tremendous response to the "Appeal for Money" in EG 40 helped produce the fine issues culminating in EG 47 and EG 48 without an increase in the subscription. Both issues have 48 pages, and EG is now as up-to-date as it can reasonably be. But the largesse has now been swallowed up and there has been no net increase in subscribers (about 170, world-wide). You may not know that Mr. van Spijk has always printed EG below its real cost, but even he has to increase his charges occasionally. His increase is long overdue, and is inevitably large. So must ours also be. The increase can nevertheless be phased: there will be two phases.

PHASE 1 (end of Vol. III).

EG 49 and EG 50: £ 2.00* (in US Dollars - $ 5.00*, almost a reduction!!). It is my firm intention (but not a promise) to include in this 2-issue subscription a complete index to EG 1-50.

PHASE 2 (start of Vol. IV).

EG 51-54: £ 4.00 (in US Dollars - $ 10.00). EG 51 will be scheduled for i. 78 or ii. 78, so that for the first time in EG-'year' will coincide with the calendar year. This will have two editorial advantages: First, less confusion over late subscriptions (that is, knowing which EG-'year' a payment relates to). Second, renewal time will no longer overlap with the peak of EG preparation, which occurs in the months vii to xi with the spate of informal magazine tourney awards of the previous year.

Need I assure you of my declared intention to continue to produce this still unique international magazine to a high standard? All I am asking of you is a subscription.

John Roycroft
Editor and Publisher
London, iv.77

**This amount is NOW DUE!
(Exception for about 20 enthusiasts who have already paid in advance.)

ERRATUM: EG 47, p. 401. Replace line 10 by 'was the first of 12 international composing tourneys, whose stature.'
ROOK PROMOTIONS IN THE DEFENCE
by A. van Tets (Pretoria, S.Africa)

The object of this article is to show that promotion of an advanced P to a R could be a last resource to avoid defeat in natural looking positions. The following or similar positions may occur in actual games.

I was intrigued by a remark in the article „Promotion Tasks with Minimal Force“ by J. D. Beasley in EC45, in which he wrote that the most economical P = R setting he knew with wK + wP only was a-gaining 7 Bl men and with a capturing start. Without a capturing start he needed at least 9 Bl men, but he felt that „...a setting with 8 ought to be possible“. By trying to check this statement, I have found eventually A1, a setting with only 4.

A. van Tets

though more common drawing theme in the same type of setting.

A2 A. van Tets

1. g8R/i Rd2/ii 2. Rg7/iii Ba8/iv 3. b7/v Bxb7 4. Rh7/vi Kxb7 5. Rxb7+ draws.

i) 1. g8Q? Rh3 wins.
ii) 1. ... Rh3 2. Rg2 draws.
iii) 2. Rb8? Ra2 (waiting) 3. Rxb7 Ra1+ wins.
v) Threatening 5. Rxh2.
Admittedly it is not really necessary to add a wP in order to introduce the alternative stalemate theme, but a bB locked up in the corner by bK such as shown in A3, does look very artificial. Therefore in spite of the extra P A2 is more likely to occur in a game than A3.

A3 A. van Tets

1. g8R/i Rc2/ii 2. Rh8 Ka7+ 3. Rxa8+ draws.

i) 1. g8Q? Rh4 wins.
ii) 1. ... Rh4 2. Rg2 draws.
Investigating defensive possibilities of this kind have led me also to another type of setting, which is shown most economically in B1.

B1

A. van Tets

Draw 3+4

   i) 1. ... dxc2 2. Re3 draws.
   ii) 2. ... Bg4 3. Re2 draws.
   iii) 3. Rf8+? Bf5 4. Ke2 Kg5 5. Rg8+ Kh4 6. Rh8+ Kg3 wins.

By adding a little bit of white material a lot of variations in play can be reached in this type of setting too. It is therefore hardly surprising that at least positions of the B-type are known for many years in the literature. Lazard has possibly set the first example of such a position with B2, in which a minor piece is first sacrificed to the back.

B2

F. Lazard

2nd Prize, L'Opinion, 1935

Draw 5+5


In B3 and B4 I have found some other variations of the same theme. Introductory play in these leading to the main theme shows that sometimes minor pieces have to be sacrificed to the back on a critical square.

B3

A. van Tets

Draw 4+4

   i) 1. Sc2? d1Sf wins.
   ii) 2. Sb3? d1Qf wins.
   iii) 2. ... Bc6 (or Bf5) 3. Sb3 Kc3 (Kxb3 4. c8Q draws) 4. c8Q+ Bxc8
   3. c8? Bxc8 wins in the same way.

B4

A. van Tets

Draw 5+4

1. 3. ... Bg5 4. Be7 Bxe7 5. d8Q (or 5. d8R) draws.
   ii) 4. ... Bxh2 5. Rd3+ Kf2 6. Rxb3 draws.
vi 3. ... Ba4 4. c8R+ Kxb3 5. Rc2 draws, or 3. ... Be6 (or Bf5) 4. cdQ? draws (see iii).

1. Ec3+i! Kxc3 2. Se7/ii B4 Bxex7/iii
2. d8R Ke4 (or Bb4) 4. Rd2 draws.


STUDIES -- WHAT NEXT?

This title pulls together three thoughts.

Popularity

1. In an address to the participants at the FIDE Commission meeting at Ribe, Gia Nadareishvili considered the relative lack of popularity of studies and proposed as a remedy the wide publication of examples of “the popular study”. This he defined as having four components:
   — an affinity to the practical game
   — a main line displaying an ingenious motif, attractive combinations or geometrical features
   — the solution must not have complex sidelines
   — the final move must crown the solution.

The speaker drew attention to the interest shown in studies by world class players, many of whom are assisting him in the preparation of a new book, to be titled “Studies Through the Eyes of Grandmasters”, by means of which it is hoped to attract more players towards studies.

Codex

2. In EC43 (pp. 279-281) I set out a suggestion, indeed a rationale, for a Codex for studies. The advance that this suggestion might achieve is a better comprehension of the nature of studies by the specialists who are most concerned: editors, judges, writers, and, to a lesser degree, composers, solvers, and tourney organisers. A separate Codex for each major branch of composition would greatly facilitate debate, whereas the “One-Codex” path that the FIDE Commission seems bent on pursuing will inevitably prolong and confuse the current uneasy alliance among the specialists in the various genres. I put this point of view in an address at Ribe to the delegates, under the heading of “Any Other Business”. My words were politely received, and they have been circulated. We shall have to wait to see if they will have any effect.

Endgame Theory

3. Composers cannot be expected to know more theory than is to be found in the textbooks. It is therefore unfortunate when studies are placed under an analytic cloud merely because theory is incomplete. This happens quite frequently. The time has come when it is possible to compile a complete list of all endgame classes, with and without promoted men, and to state whether the result is known or if it is not known. Where the result is not known, but may be provisionally
surmised, a statement of "provisional theory" should be promulgated (by FIDE, of course — who else?) so that studies can be composed on this basis. If "provisional theory" is confirmed, then it will be permanently sound, but if it is not confirmed, then it will be in order for all studies composed during the period of provisional theory, and in accordance with it, to be considered as correct studies, given the state of theory at the time of composition. In this way, not only shall we have entirely new masterpieces, but these masterpieces themselves will contribute towards the clarification of that theory whose present state denies the rightful existence of just these studies. So, we can have progress, not stagnation. An extensive article elaborating this idea, and incorporating many examples, is awaiting (i.77) for publication in PROFLEM. (Yugoslavia.)

A. J. Roycroft

Provisional award in the "PECKOVER JUBILEE" FORMAL INTERNATIONAL TOURNEY sponsored jointly by the Chess Endgame Study Circle of New York and by E G (the 4th Jubilee Tourney of E G). Judge: A. J. Roycroft. (See Nos. 3019-3041 in this issue.)

Closing date (for anticipation purposes the effective date of publication): 15.xi.76.

There were 132 entries (84 composers; 17 countries)*, the heaviest workload I have so far faced as a judge, excepting FIDE Album judging, where ranking is not required, only grouping. But what a pleasure it turned out to be! As many as 70 entries were of publishable standard. There can be no more than 22 in the award, so there will be disappointed composers, inevitably. After the initial chore of eliminating unsatisfactory studies, the general standard showed itself to be magnificent, whether an entry came from a famous name or from a newcomer to a tourney of this stature. We feel we must mention just one negative feature of the entries: at least two 'composers' entered thinly disguised studies that had already been published and were not their own work — it is sad to record that they were compatriots of the blameless and brilliant Jan Rusinek. Naturally, Richard Harman's system proved invaluable in these cases, and in providing the judge with a wealth of partial anticipations. As for transatlantic cooperation, it was smooth: Neil McKelvie received and 'anonymised' all the significant entries, assisted by Chris Becker, so that the judge, donning his editor's hat, was able to prepare the diagrams and solutions for E G. Testing (apart from the exceptional Special Prizes, both of which are untested) was also bravely undertaken on the American side: NMcK is Elo-rated at 2322.

My comments appear in bottom-up sequence. This is the way we usually present awards at the London CESC, in order to provide a climax. It also facilitates a 'positive' approach, with the question 'What is better here than in the previous study?'. Finally, my comments are deliberately worded to avoid betraying the composer's idea, in order not to spoil solver's fun.

A memorable tourney in honour of a fine composer. Vive Peckover!

AJR, London, v.77

Claims of second solution, serious duals, or 'no solution' to reach Prof. Neil McKelvie, 109-23 71st, Road, Forest Hills, NY 11375, U.S.A. by 12.ix.77. Serious anticipation claims to AJR, with full details. Final award: E G 50.

* USSR 64½ (40); Poland 13 (4); Czechoslovakia 12 (5); U.S.A. 9 (9);
Romania 5 (5); Finland 4¼ (4); Great Britain 4 (2); Yugoslavia 4 (1);
Hungary 3 (3); Netherlands 3 (3); Bulgaria 2 (2); E. Germany 2;
Israel 2; Argentina; Belgium; Brazil; Eire.

Judge’s Comments:
No. 3041.
Bl’s best reply to one promotion choice is different from his best reply
to the alternative. This gives the solver moments of bewilderment.
No. 3040.
Yes, a capture key, and a dual on move 9, but colourful and ingenious.
No. 3039.
Instinctively one wants to check or centralise wK on move 1. Both lose.
No. 3038.
Variety, but somehow without the richness that would raise it higher.
No. 3037.
The sacrificial introduction and inventive finale are reminiscent of
several Duras studies. Some force (wK, bP’s) relatively passive.
No. 3036.
Undeniably artistic self-blocks by bQ’s in two mating variations.
No. 3035.
A natural, simple-seeming ending that conceals fold upon fold, none
of which is especially deep, but each contributing to a rich texture.

Honourable Mentions
No. 3034.
A composing achievement (doubling an idea) that was very hard to
evaluate. I would expect opinions to differ widely on its merits.
No. 3033.
Curious and compellingly original manoeuvres are required of W to
draw this endgame that looks rather ordinary at first glance.
No. 3032.
W disdains a capture with check on move 1, apparently allowing Bl an
irresistible plan to ensure promotion on h1. For over half a century
Gorgiev produced consistently studies of the same high quality. We
shall miss him greatly.
No. 3031.
The composer plays a game of bluff with us (resembling poker!) over
the choice of promotion piece.
No. 3030.
Suspension of disbelief is required, several times, in face of W’s moves.
No. 3029.
At first sight all these checks are indigestible, and to the detriment of
the composition. But at the end there is a transformation.
No. 3028.
Rarely can a R-ending have included so many surprises. It’s even a
surprise when it peters out into a humdrum P-ending.
No. 3027.
As Bl’s manoeuvres to preserve his cP develop W’s chances look slimmer
and slimmer. wB has to thread his way through a minefield, but
finally springs a mine of his own.

Tourney announcement
For “baby” studies – – maximum 5 men. Closing date 1.ix.77. Judge: V.
Dolgov. Address: “Putj k Kommunizmu”, Ul, Sovjetskaya 180, 641730
Dalmatovo Kurganskoi Cblast, U.S.S.R. (Write “Chess Composing Tour-
ney” on envelope.)
Obituary
Vitold Vitoldovich YAKIMCHIK. 1911 - 28.v.77. The loss of another great talent.

Special Prizes.
No. 3026.
A meticulous exploration of the almost uncharted region of \( Q + P \) against \( Q + P \) (ie, GBR class 4000.11).
No. 3025.
A piece of profound, and very original, analysis on the fringes of end-game theory (GBR class 0107).

Prizes.
No. 3024.
Like the nitrogen cycle in nature we seem to witness here an ecological cycle on the chessboard. No piece can survive without the others.
No. 3023.
Flawless engineering skill.
No. 3022.
The capture key is atoned for with a B-sacrifice. Then there is a march by wK to be left on an unfavourable square. The finale is stunningly simple, and reminds one of a Peckover finish (see No. 152 in 'American Chess Art').
No. 3021.
The end position is known (F. Simkhovic, Chess Amateur, 1924), but the play is an example of masterly disguise employing an assortment of tactical points.
No. 3020.
An exquisite positional draw with W a R behind on material.
No. 3019.
There is a light touch about this little masterpiece that defies words. Very original. Very beautiful. It is hard to believe, but the same composer submitted another, quite different, but equally startling, study which, alas, proved unsound!

JOSEPH EDMUND PECKOVER was born in London (England) on 15. xi.96. After attending schools in England, France and Switzerland he served with the British army in Egypt and Palestine during World War I. In 1919 he emigrated to Canada and, while living in Regina (Saskatchewan) edited an endings column in the Regina Daily Leader. His permanent residence in the U.S. began in 1921. He served for a year (1942-3) in the U.S. army in World War II. Along with many incidental or temporary occupations he has worked principally as a free-lance portrait artist, concentrating more recently on coloured pencil portraits of children. He has an omnivorous mind and is an omnivorous reader. His lifelong interest in the noble British sport of cricket continues. Edmund Peckover is possibly the leading authority on cricket's history and manifestations in his adopted country.

Believe it or not, but there is an 18th Century link between the (far from common) names Peckover and Roycroft (but only, as far as I know, between the names). On 25.iii.1748 a serious fire destroyed 82 houses in the City of London, between Cornhill and Lombard Street. Among the destroyed premises were a tavern (the Three Tuns: proprietor, Roycroft) and a watchmaker's (Peckover). The fire started at 1 a.m. at a barber's (Eldridge's) situated between the tavern and the watchmaker's. (See the FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION JOUR-
I like to think of Phillip Stamma, the London edition of whose book appeared in 1743, having his watch mended at Peckover's and then imbibing at Roycroft's tavern — perhaps even talking about studies!

VARIATIONS ON A PAWN ENDING THEME by T. G. Whitworth.
(a talk given to The Chess Endgame Study Circle on 1. iv. 77)

W1

N. D. Grigoriev
Izvestia, 1926

Win 2+2
1. Kd4 b5 (1) 2. f4 b4 3. f5 b3
4. Ke5 Ka3 5. f6 b2 6. f7 b1Q
7. f8Q Ka4 8. Qa8# wins (i)
1. Kb5 2. Ke6 Kb4 3. f4
Kf7 b5 7. Kg7 b4 8. f6 wins.

In EG44 J. D. Beasley presented (in NC9) W1 by Grigoriev. He showed that in such a position B1 has two plausible defences, to run his own P or to march bK over to stop wP. After 1. Kd4, B1 can still try either defence; it is only after several moves that it becomes clear that neither is adequate.

W2

A. Mandler
Narodni Osvobozeni 1938

Win 2+2
1. ... Kb5 2. Kd5 K
a6 3. f4
Kb7 4. f5 Kc7 5. Ke6 Kd8 6.
Kf7 b5 7. Kg7 b4 8. f6 wins.

The next two studies, selected for me by J. R. Harman from his index, use the same winning idea. Eut in W2 the move 1. Kd6 puts an immediate stopper on one of B1's potential defences, and B1 has to concentrate on the problem of exploiting his own P. An immediate advance would not succeed: 1. ... b5 2. Kc5 Kb3 3. Kxb5 Kc3 4. Kc5 Kd3 5. Kd5. So B1 must prepare for the running of his P by bringing bK to meet it; but W of course, still wins: 1. ... Ka3 2. Kc5 Ka4 3. f4 b5 4. f5 b4 5. Kc1 b3 6. Kc3 Ka3 7. f6 b2 8. f7
b1Q 9. f8Q#.

W1

A. Mandler
Narodni Osvobozeni 1938

Win 3+4

W4

Ljubojevic vs. Browne
(AMsterdam 1972)
Position after white's 39th move

Win 2+2

Black to play

456
In **W3** B1 seems at first glance to have only one line of defence, the pushing of his own Ps. But in fact, after the first two moves, the other possibility emerges of bK going across to stop fP, and it is this that obliges W to play his 3rd and 4th moves accurately. 1. Ke6 b5 (1. ... d5 2. cd b5 3. Kxc7 b4 4. d6) 2. cb d5 3. Ke5 d4 4. b6 cb f. Kxe4 b5 6. f4 b4 7. f5 b3 8. Kc3.

In **W4** we have a position (the colours have been reversed) that is virtually **W1**. Just as in Grigoriev's study W wins by 1. Kd4, so in this game position B1 could have won by 39. ... Kd5, a move which would have enabled B1 to cope with either of B1's defences.

**W5**

T. G. Whitworth

Original, after a game position

Ljubojevic vs. Browne

(Amsterdam 1972)

A little elaboration of this game position (or of Grigoriev's study) yields W5. In this, only the first two moves are new. They lead to a familiar position in which B1, with two plausible defences, cannot exploit both of them simultaneously: to begin marching bK across the board would impede the running of bP. 1. Kd4 Kh4 2. g6 hg 3. Kxe4 g5 4. c4, or 3. ... Kg5 4. Ke5.

**W5** — full analysis.

1. Kd4/i Kh4/i 2. g6/i III hg 3. Kxe4/iv g5/v 4. c4 g4 5. c5 g3 6. Kf3 Kh3/vi 7. c6 g2 8. c7 g1Q 9. c8Q† Kh4 10. Qh8† Kg5 11. Qf7(g8)† wins.

i) Not 1. g6? hg, for that gives B1 a clear run to promote gP. And not 1. Kd2? Kg4 2. c4 Kxg5 3. c5 Kf6, drawing.

ii) 1. ... Kg4 2. g6 hg 3. Kxe4 Kg5 4. Ke5 Kh4 5. c4 and W wins in the same manner as in the main line. 1. ... e3 2. Kxe3 3. g6 hg 4. Ke4.

iii) This would not have been right on move 1, but now it is right. The point of delaying it until move 2 is to force B1 to 'waste' his first move by moving bK. The point of playing it now is as follows: B1 has two defensive resources, namely to take bK over to stop cp, and to promote his own K-side P; now, by forcing B1 hP onto the g-file, W can prevent B1 from exploiting both these resources at the same time; if bK moves over to g-file it will block his own P, once that P stands on the g-file. W must not play 2. c4? Kxg5, with a draw. Nor must W play 2. Kxe4? Kxg5 3. Ke5 (c4, Kf6;) h5, drawing.

iv) After 3. c4? Kg5 B1 draws. The text move is essential, to meet 3. ... Kg5 with 4. Ke5 — see (v) for the continuation.

v) If 3. ... Kg5 4. Ke5 Kh4 5. c4 g5 6. c5 g4 7. Kf4 g3 8. Kf3 and W wins as in the main line. If in this, 4. ... Kh6 5. c4 Kg7 (g5; is no better) 6. c5 Kf7 7. Kd6 Ke8 8. Kc7 g5 9. Kb7 g4 10. c6 and W wins.

vi) Too late for bK to run back for wP.

LIBURKIN (1910-1953). Do you know unpublished or rare studies by this great composer? Please send positions, sources and solutions to W. D. Rubinstein, Dept. of Sociology, R.S.S.S., Australian National University, Canberra A.C.T., AUSTRALIA. WDR intends to publish a complete collection.

AJR
No. 2965: J. Hoch. This study was published in Shahmat, the Israeli monthly. There have been 'Ring' tourneys in Israel for more than 30 years. They cover all compositions published in Israel in a given year, no newspaper or column having its own tourney.

The 3 outlets for original studies are SHAHMAT, AL-HAMISHMAR (daily newspaper), THE JERUSALEM POST (also daily).

Judge of this tourney: Aveshalom Yoshe. No prize was awarded, just H. M. and Commended. 1. ... Sb4† 2. ab Kxb4t (Qf7f; Kbl) 3. Kb1 /ii Qg1†/ii 4. Kc2 Qxa1/iv 5. Ra5 Qv/v 6. Bc3† Kc4 7. b3 mate, i) 1 ... Sc3† 2. bc Qf7† 3. Kb2 Qb3† 4. Kc1.

ii) 3. Ra5† Qf7† 4. Kbl Qf1†.

iii) 3. ... Qh7† 4. e4 Qh1† 5. Ka2.

iv) 4. ... Qg8† 5. Kd2 Qh6† 6. Ke3 Qd6† 7. Ke1.

v) Or 5. ... Kxa5 6. b4†.

The fall of the powerful bQ at the hands of a mere wB and wP is remarkable... but the idea is not new.

In his general comments on the tourney the judge writes: "Endgames differ from other compositions in their strong connection with actual play. I am personally much impressed by missions that seem impossible. In other words, when the inferior side (at least on the face of it) succeeds in drawing, or when a win is extracted from a position considered to be devoid of chance, such accomplishments cause me pleasant surprises. It is the extent of such surprises that constituted for me the guidelines of my classification. A good key-move and clever traps make important additions to the above guidelines."

JRH was consulted for anticipations by the tourney organisers.


ii) 1. ... Qxf8 2. Sxb5 Kxe6 3. Sc7 Kf6 4. Bd6 Qg6 5. Ke7 Sf5 6. Qc6 Qxd6† is not sufficient for B1 to win.

iii) Or 2. ... Qxf4 3. Sb6(f6)†.

"The minor pieces impose a perpetual check on an adversary whose powerful Q seems to dominate the board."

No. 2967: O. Komai. 1. Se4† Qxe4† /i 2. Kxe1 Bxh4†/ii 3. Kg5† Bxg5† 4. Kf1 h1Q stalemate, or 4. ... h1R 5. Kg2.

i) 1. ... Kc3 2. Bd4† Qxd4† 3. Rxd4 h1Q 4. Rd3† and 5. hg.

ii) 2. ... Bd3† 3. Kd1 h1Q 4. Rg3†
Ke4 5. Kxd2. 2. ... h1Q 3. hg and Rd4†.

"...beautiful endgame meeting all requirements mentioned in my introduction. It should be emphasised that the final stalemate picture is not new."

No. 2967
1 Commend, Israel ‘Ring’ Tourney, 1974

1. ... Kd7 2. h7 b1Q 3. c8Q† and h8Q†.

No. 2968: J. Kopelovich. 1. c7 Sxg7
/ 2. h7 b1R/ii 3. Kh6/iii Rb8/iv
4 g6 Kf6 5. g7 Rb1 6. g8S† Kf7
7. Sf6 Rb8 8. Sd7/v Rf8 9. Se5†
Kf6 10. Sg6 and h8Q, but not 10.
Sg4†? Ke7 11. Kg6 Se6 for ...Rh8,
and also not 10. Sd7†? Kf5 11. Sc5
Rh8.

i) 1. ... Kd7 2. h7 b1Q 3. c8Q† and

ii) 2. ... b1Q 3. h8Q Qh1† 4. Kg6
Qxh8 stalemate.

iii) 3. Kg6? Rb8 4. Kg7 Se8† 5. K-
d6.

iv) 3. ... Se8 4. h8Q Rh1† 5. Kg6
Rxb8 stalemate.

Kg5 Se6† wins.

"... one more convincing proof that
P's can be very powerful when
conducted with precision and ima-
gination."

No. 2969: J. Rusinek. Judge: Al P.
Kuznetsov. 1. Be6† Kf8 2. Rxf3
Re1 (else Re3) 3. Se2 Rxe2 (Bxe2;
Re3) 4. Rd3 (bBf1 is obstructed)
4. ... d1Q 5. Rxd1 Rd2 6. Re1 Be2
7. Rgl Bg4 (bBd2 is obstructed
from ...Rg2;) 8. Re1 Re2 9. Rd1
(bBf4 is now obstructed) 9. ... Bd2
10. Ra1 Ba5 (bBf2 is obstructed
from ...Ra2;) 11. Rd1 Rd2 12. Re1,
positional draw. The move 3 No-
vozny sacrifice is almost routine,
but the perpetual Grimshaw on
d2 and e2 (interference without
sacrifice) is new in a study, so the
award states.

No. 2970: D. Gurgenidze and V.
Kalandadze. 1. e8S Rg1 (Rxf1;
Sd6) 2. Kh5 Rf1 3. g5 Rgl 4. Kh6
Rf1 5. g6 Rgl 6. Kh7 Rf1 7. g7
Rgl 8. Kh8 Rf1 9. g8Q(R) Rg1 10.
Qg7 Rf1 11. Kh7 Rg1 12. Qg6 Rf1
13. Kh6 Rg1 14. Qg5 Rf1 15. Kh5
Rgl 16. Qg4 and wins, for example,
16. ... Rf1 17. Sd6 (Kh4 also suf-
fices) 17. ... Rf5† 18. Kh4 Rb5† 19.

No. 2970  D. Gurgenidze and V. Kalandadze
2nd Prize.
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1975

No. 2971  L. Katsnelson
3rd Prize.
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1975

No. 2972  A. Popov (Moscow). 1. Rh2+ Rh4 2. Qd1+ Kg3 3. Qc1+ i
Qe5+ Qxe5 stalemate.

ii) 3. ... e3 4. Kxe3 Rxh2 5. Qc5+ Kh6 (else perpetual) 6. Qf8+ Qg7
iii) Otherwise the R-ending wins for B1.
vi) If 8. ... g5 9. Qd6+ secures a perpetual.

JRH: Same mate in Prokop (1925), No. 1984 in '2500'.

No. 2973  D. Gurgenidze
Special Prize.
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1975

No. 2974  A. Popov
4th Prize.
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1975


JRH: Nearest is Kasparian (1936), No. 582 in '2500', also No. 1733 in
Chéron III.


i) 3. Rg3? Bh8 4. Rg8 Bd4 draw.

JRH: Similar are Kaiev (1932), No. 468 in '2545' and van Breukelen (1969), EG7.257.

No. 2975: E. Pogosjants. 1. Be4/i Kxe4 2. Rxe4 h2 2. a8Q h1Q 3. Qa1+ Kh2 4. Sg4+ Kg2 5. Qa8+ Kg1 6. Qa7+ ... 11. Qd5+ Kg1 12. Qd1+ Kg2 13. Se3+ Kh2 14. Qxh5+ Kg1 15. Qd1+ Kh2 16. Sg4+ Kg2 17. Qd5+ Kg1 18. Qc5+ ... 23. Qa8+ Kg1 24. Qa1+ Kg2 25. Se3+ Kh2 26. Qxe5+ Kg1 27. Qg3+. This study appeared in an article by Dolgov on the 'ladder' or 'staircase' theme. The article was itself the 14th in a series on the composer's 'laboratory'.

JRH: Clearly related to Dolgov (1975), EG45.2658. The last phase was shown by Reichhelm (1905), No. 39 in American Chess Art.

No. 2977: N. Kralin. 1. a7/i h2 2. a8Q h1Q 3. Qa1+ Kh2 4. Sg4+ Kg2 5. Qa8+ Kg1 6. Qa7+ ... 11. Qd5+ Kg1 12. Qd1+ Kg2 13. Se3+ Kh2 14. Qxh5+ Kg1 15. Qd1+ Kh2 16. Sg4+ Kg2 17. Qd5+ Kg1 18. Qc5+ ... 23. Qa8+ Kg1 24. Qa1+ Kg2 25. Se3+ Kh2 26. Qxe5+ Kg1 27. Qg3+. This study appeared in an article by Dolgov on the 'ladder' or 'staircase' theme. The article was itself the 14th in a series on the composer's 'laboratory'.

JRH: Clearly related to Dolgov (1975), EG45.2658. The last phase was shown by Reichhelm (1905), No. 39 in American Chess Art.
No. 2977: N. Kralin. 1. Sh2/ι g1Q 2. a8Q Qxh2 3. Kc7/ι Ke5 4. Qa5/ι Ke4 5. Qa4/ι Kd5 6. e4/fe 7. Qa2/ι. and there are 3 variations where dP will disclose an attack on bQh2 with check, on the next move.

i) 1. a8Q? g1Q 2. Kc7/ι Kc5 3. Qa5/ι Ke4 4. Qa4/ι Kd5 5. Qa5/ι Kd4 6. e4/fe is a thematic try, embellished with the variation 5. ... Ke6 6. Qe4/ι Kf5 7. e4/fe. However, 2. ... Ke6 draws.

No. 2978: V. Yakimchik


No. 2979: A. Maksimovskikh


No. 2980: Y. Dorogov


ii) The threat was 4. Bf2/ι and 5. g4 mate.

iii) 6. ... Sxe3 7. fe Sg4 8. g7 Sf6/ι 9. Kh8 and 10. e5.

iv) At this moment 7. Bf2/ι is bad: 7. ... Sxf2 8. gf g4 9. g7 gf 10. g8Q Sg4 11. Qd8/ι Kh3 12. Qd3/ι Kg2 13. Qt4 Sh2 and 14. ... Kg1, draw.


No. 2981  V. Khortov
Commended, (xi.75)
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1975

Draw 7+5

No. 2982  A. Maksimovskikh
Commended, (ii.75)
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1975

Win 3+4

No. 2983  V. Vlasenko
Commended, (i.75)
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1975

Draw 4+6

No. 2984  V. Vlasenko
Commended, (viii.75)
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1975

Win 6+5

   i) 2. ... Sf6+t 3. Ke7 Sg8t 4. Kf7.
   ii) But not 6. Sxh3? h5 and b5 has f5 available.

JRH. This mode of confining b5 is shown in Tjavalovsky (1960), No. 236 in '2545'.

No. 2983: V. Vlasenko. 1. Rg1/i h2 2. Rd1/i Ke4 3. f3+t Ke3 4. Rh1. Zugzwang No. 1. 4. ... Kf4 5. Rf1. No. 2. 5. ... Kg3 6. Rd1.
   i) 1. Rg4+t Ke5 2. Rg1 h2 3. Rd1 (h1) Kf4 4. f3 Kg3(c3), or, in this, 3. Rf1+t Ke4 4. f3t Kf4.
   ii) But not 2. Rf1? nor 2. Rh1?

   i) 1. ... Rxd5 2. fg Rd8 3. hg Kg5 4. g8Q Rxg8 5. Bxg8 h5 6. Be6 h4 7. g4.
   ii) Playing for stalemate. If 4. ... Kg6 5. h5f Kf6 6. d6 Ke6 7. d7 Ke7, then wK occupies e6 and wins with the advance h5-h6.
No. 2985  V. Yakimchik
Commended,
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1975

ii) 4. ... Kb7 5. Sd6† Ka6 6. Sf5.

No. 2986  J. Rusinek
1st Prize, Szachy, 1975


No. 2987  J. Fritz
2nd Prize, Szachy, 1975

1. Rg8† Kf8 2. Rg8† Ke7 3. Be8† Kd6 4. Be6† Ke7 5. Rc6† Kd7(d8) 6. Bf3 Bxf3 7. Rh6 h1Q† 8. Rxh1 Bxh1 9. 0-0-0† wins.

No. 2988  V. Israelov
= 3/4th Prize, Szachy, 1975

Rb5† Ke7 10. Rb7† Kd6 11. Rd7† Kc5 12. Rd5† draw.
i) 1. Rxb8? Bxb4 2. Ra8† Kb6 3. Ra1 Sf3† 4. Kh1 e1Q.
iii) 10. ... Kxd5 11. Sb4† and 12. Be6 draw.

   ii) There is another positional draw after 5. ... Sxg7 6. Ke8 Kg6 7. Rd7 (for Sg5f) 7. ... Kg6 8. Sd4 Kg5 9. Sf3 Kg4.

No. 2989: G. Nadareishvili (x.75)

Win 4+3

   iii) If 4. ... Kc6 5. Be8t wins.

No. 2990: M. Matous (xii.75)

Win 4+6


No. 2991: Y. Bazlov (1.75)

Draw 4+5


No. 2992: A. Ivanov (iv.75)

Draw 4+4


No. 2993 J. Koppelomaki (xii.75)

4 H.M., Szachy, 1975

iii) 8. ... Bd5 9. Bc6 Bxf7 10. Bd5† Bxd5 11. e8Q wins.

No. 2994 V. A. Bron (v.75)

1 Commend, Szachy, 1975

No. 2994: V. A. Bron. 1. h7 Bxh7 2. Re8† Ka7 3. Re7† Kb8 (Ka8; Re8†) 4. a7† Ka8 5. Sxa4 Rxa4 6. Kf7 Rh4/i 7. Kg7 Rxh3 8. Rf7 Rh1 9. Rc7 Rh2 10. Rf7, positional draw.
i) 6. ... Rf4† 7. Kg7 Sf6 8. Rf6.

No. 2995 J. Hoch (xii.75)

2 Commend, Szachy, 1975

ii) 1. Kf6 Bf4 2. Kf5 Bf2 3. Re6† Kg7 4. Re7† Kh6 5. g4 e1Q 6. g5† Kh5 7. Rh1 mate.

No. 2996 V. Kondratiev (ix.75)

3 Commend, Szachy, 1975

No. 2996: V. Kondratiev. 1. Bf5† Ka1 2. Ke7 and two variations: 2. ... b1Q 3. Bg7† Qb2 4. h6 Qxg7†

JRH: Cf. Janosi (1969), EG27.1484. The 4th Commend, by Z. Boleslawski, is a case of SNAP!, since it is identical with Platov (1925), No. 712 in '2500'. Judges really MUST consult JRH!


No. 2998: S. Chimedtzeren, 1. Be4 Qe3 2. Eh1 Qe8 3. Ka3 Qf8# 4. Ka2 Qg8# 5. Kd1 Qh8# 6. Kb1 wins. "After a subtle 2-move introduction there follows an elegant geometrical duel between bQ and wK. An excellent miniature!"


JRH. Cf. Zepler (1928), No. 2019 in Chéron IV.

Kd1 7. Se3 mate. "An original introduction leads to a sudden classic mating finale, without any middle phase."
JRH: Cf. Troitzky (1938), No. 393 in '1357' and No. 278 in '2500'.

No. 3000
J. Fritz
1 H.M.,
L'Italia Scacchistica, 1975


No. 3001
B. G. Olympiev
2 H.M.,
L'Italia Scacchistica, 1975

JRH: Another closed S-tour by the same composer. For instance, EG35.1993.

No. 3002
A. T. Motor
3 H.M.,
L'Italia Scacchistica, 1975

1. a8Q? blQ draws, as h7 is now controlled. "A happy elaboration of a 1961 study (in Shakhmaty v. SSSR) by An. G. Kuznetsov and B. A. Sakharov."
JRH: Perhaps the 1961 study is No. 763 in FIDE.

No. 3003
I. Murarasu
Commended,
L'Italia Scacchistica, 1975

20. Qe1† Ka2 21. Qe2† Ka1 22. Qe3† Ka2 23. Qh3† Ka1 24. Qh8† Ka2 25. Qa8† wins.

JRH: The root of this was shown by Horwitz and Kling (1851), No. 712 in T1000, but the fight against wQa8† seems new.

No. 3004

L. Mattei
(v.75)

Commended,
L’Italia Scacchistica, 1975


JRH: I have 4 studies with 0-0-0† termination, where wK attacks bRb2, but none has the intricate fore-play seen here. Selesniev (1923), No. 923 in '2545'.


No. 3006

T. G. Whitworth
Original


i) 2. ... Sxe1 3. de Sb3† 4. Kd1 Sg2 5. e5 Se3† 6. Ke2 Sf5 7. e6.

ii) 3. ... Sxe1 is again answered by 4. de.

No. 3007

C. M. Bent
(x.75)

Original, dedicated to
H. Fraenkel (Assiac)

No. 3006: C. M. Bent (x.75)

Commended,
L’Italia Scacchistica, 1975

No. 3007

C. M. Bent
Original, dedicated to
H. Fraenkel (Assiac)

Draw

3+4
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   ii) 2. ... Sg3 3. Sf5. 2. ... Sf2 3. Sg4.


No. 3008: R. Missiaen

1. c8S Sg7f (Kh3; Kg6) 2. Kg6 Se6 3. Kf6 Sf8 (Sf4; Be7) 4. Be3 (Kf7? Sd7) 4. ... Kg3/i 5. Sb6 Kg4 6. Bh6 wins, 6. ... Sh7+ 7. Kg6, but not 6. Kf7 Sh7+ 7. Kxe6 Sf6+

   i) 6. ... Sd7† 3. Ke7 Se5 (b8) 6. Bf4†.

JRH: There are several examples of S-promotion to reach this ending.

No. 3009: J. Roche

   ... Ra1† 4. Kg2 Kxd4 5. Bf6† and 6. Bxa1, or 3. ... Rg7† 4. Kf1 Kxd4 5. Ef6† and 6. Bxg7.

   i) 1. Sd8? Rd7 2. Se6† Kf5.
   ii) 1. ... Ke5 2. Sd8 (f8) draws.

No. 3010: V. Bunka

1. Be8+ Kb8 2. Ba7† Kxa7 3. Sd8† Kb6 4. Se4† Kb5 5. Sa7† Kxc4 6. Be6† Kd4 7. Sc6† Ke4 8. Bd5† Kf5 9. Se7† Kg4 10. Bf3† Kxb4 11. Sf5† Kg5 12. h4† Kxf5 13. g4 mate.

No. 3011: T. Krabbe


i) Sh3?, can't get rid of f3, and the “Henneberger-R” is rambling forever.

ii) If 15. Kb2?, Rxb3t enables B1 to draw at two points during the solution: 27. ... Rxb1 or 36. ... Rxe2.

iii) If 15. ... Re4t 16. Kc3 Re5t (Fc4t? 17. Kd6 Rd4t 18. Ke7) 17. Kb4 Rb5t and we're back in the solution.

iv) 29. ... Rd4t 30. Kc5 Rd4t 31. Ke5 Rb5t loses more quickly.

JRH: The basic idea of this study is that B1 vainly attempts to obtain stalemate by continuously checking with and offering bR; this stalemate try is defeated when bR can no longer check, or cannot check without destroying the stalemate net. The realist such study appears to be Kling (1863), No. 2120 in '2500'. Arbitrarily eliminating those studies which require 4 or fewer consecutive checks from bR, I have over 50 compositions in my collection representing 34 composers, of whom Henneberger is the most prolific with 11. These 50 or so studies are fairly evenly distributed in time. The record number of B1 checks appears to be held by T. Petrovic (1857, in Problem 45/48), but I have found it impossible to establish the sequence between moves 36 and 42 (Problem gave the solution in truncated form with gaps which are to be filled with presumed obvious moves); if, in fact, Petrovic is unsound, then the present study appears to hold the record. I do not know of any composition in this field which utilises Krabbe's form of attempted stalemate.
No. 3014: N. McKelvie


JRH: Cf. Kubbel (1925), No. 1305 in '2500'. But there is earlier, A. R. Pulyan (1914, Chess Amateur): wKc5, wPd6: bKc3, bSg8; bPb7, c8, c7; 2:5 =. 1. dc Se7 2. c8Q Sxc8, but not 1. d7? Sf6 2. d8Q Se4 mate.

However, 1. dc Se7 2. c8Q seems to draw also. (AJR)

No. 3015: P. Monsky

1. Rel Kc7 2. Re7† Kd8 (Kc8; Kc6) 3. Rel Kd7 4. Kb6/i and the solution ends "draws".


No. 3016: A. J. Sobey

No. 3018: G. Paros. The late Hungarian composer's name was 'Schlegl' before he changed it to Paros. Presumably the study was published in *Magyai Sakkvilag*. 1. Bc1 Kf6 2. f3 Kf5 3. f4 Kf6 4. f5 Kf7 5. f6 Kf8 6. f7 wins. An exercise in reciprocal Zugzwang. (See EG43, p. 303).

No. 3019: J. Rusinek
1st Prize, Peckover Jubilee Tourney 1976
Award in EG48, vii.77

No. 3020: V. A. Bron
2nd Prize, Peckover Jubilee Tourney, 1976
Draw
4+4

No. 3021: V. Khortov
3rd Prize, Peckover Jubilee Tourney, 1976
Draw
5+5
1. Kg5 Rh6 2. Rxh6 Rxa6 3. Kb7 Rh6 4. g4 Sg4 5. Rf2 Sg6 6. Rh5 Sxh5 7. g5 and draws.

No. 3021: V. Khortov. 1. Rg8+ Kxh7 2. Rxg5 Rxa6+ 3. Kxb7 Rh6 4. g4 Sg4 5. Rg5 Sg6 6. Rh5 Sxh5 7. g5 and draws.


No. 3018: G. Paros. The late Hungarian composer's name was 'Schlegl' before he changed it to Paros. Presumably the study was published in *Magyai Sakkvilag*. 1. Bc1 Kf6 2. f3 Kf5 3. f4 Kf6 4. f5 Kf7 5. f6 Kf8 6. f7 wins. An exercise in reciprocal Zugzwang. (See EG43, p. 303).

No. 3019: J. Rusinek
1st Prize, Peckover Jubilee Tourney 1976
Award in EG48, vii.77

No. 3020: V. A. Bron
2nd Prize, Peckover Jubilee Tourney, 1976
Draw
4+4

No. 3021: V. Khortov
3rd Prize, Peckover Jubilee Tourney, 1976
Draw
5+5
1. Kg5 Rh6 2. Rxh6 Rxa6 3. Kb7 Rh6 4. g4 Sg4 5. Rf2 Sg6 6. Rh5 Sxh5 7. g5 and draws.

No. 3022: D. Gurgenidze. 1. ab/i Rb8† 2. Bb4f Rxb4† 3. Ke2 Rc7† 4. Kd3 Rb3† 5. Kd4 Rb4† 6. Kd5 bRxb7 7. Re8† Kd2 8. a8Q Ra7 9. Qb8 aRb7 10. Qd8 Rd7† 11. Kc6 and, after the solver has blinked several times he sees that W wins!
   i) 1. Bb4† Ke2 2. Rh8 Rxa6.

   i) 3. Ra1? h1Q 4. Kb2† e1Q†.
   ii) 6. ... Qxh8 7. Rf1† Kh2 8. Rh1† Kxh1 stalemate.

   ii) 1. ... Ra5 2. Rf3† Ke1 3. Bxe2 Kxc2 4. Rxf8.
   v) 4. Bxe2? Bd6† and 5. ... Se5.
   vi) But not 4. ... eRd2? 5. Rf1 mate.

i) 1. ... Sh6 2. Sf6+ Kh8 3. Rg8 wins.


iv) 4. ... eSg5 5. Ke5 Kh6 7. Rh8f Kh7 8. Sh5 wins; and note the line 4. ... Sh7 5. Sf6+ Se6. Sxh7 Kg7 7. Re8 wins, with the trap 5. Sf4f Se8 6. Sh5 Sd6 when the game is still alive (this line not supplied by the composer).

v) 5. ... Kh7 6. Ra8 Kh6 7. Rh8f Sh7 8. Ke6. 5. ... Kh5 6. Sc7 fSe5 7. Rxf8f Kh7 8. Sh3(e6) wins.


a different one from the main line, wins again.


xi) 13. ... Kh4 14. Sd5 Kg3 15. Se3 and bK and bK will be 'stalemated' on the h-file (see next note).

xii) 14. ... Kg4 15. Kg5+ Kh6 16. Sf4f Kh5 17. Kg3 Kh7 18. Sg3 Sf6f 19. Sf6 wins.

xiii) wR and wS combining, without wK, to drive bK to the edge, and impending 'stalemate'.

xiv) 20. ... Ke8 21. Sf6f Kh8 22. Ke4 Kh8 23. Ke3 Kh8 24. Sb6 wins. This study has not been subjected to close analytic scrutiny. (AJR)


iii) 2. d6? e2 3. d7 e1Q 4. d8Q Qe6† 5. Ka4 Qa6† 6. Qa5 Qc4†.

iv) 2. ... Ke1 3. Qh4† Qf2 4. Qh1† Kd2 5. Qh8 (also Qa1) Qf7 6. Qd4† Ke2 7. Qe4† Kf2 8. Qh4† (also 8. Qd6).

v) 2. Qc4? e2 3. Qd4† Ke1 4. Qd6 Kf1 see No. 3026b.

vi) 4. ... e1Q 5. d8Q Qe4† 6. Ka5 Qf5† 7. Kb6 Qe6† 8. K7 Qa6†.

vii) 5. Kb5? Qd5† 6. Ka6 e1Q 7. d8Q Qe6† as in (i).

viii) 7. Kb3? e1Q 8. d8Q Qe6†.

This study has not been subjected to close analytic scrutiny. (AJR).

No. 3026a: (Pospisil). 3. Qc3/i Kf1 4. Qh5† Kg1 5. Qg4† Kh2 6. Qh5† Kg3 7. Qg6† Kh3 8. Qe6/i Kg2 9. Qb5†/ii Kg1 (g2) 10. Qe5† Kf1 11. Qd3 Qf4† 12. Ka5 Kf2 13. Qc2 Qe5 14. Qd2/v Qe3 15. Qc2 Qa7† 16. Kd4 and either wins wPd5 or exchanges Q's.


3. Qb1† Kd2 4. Qb2(b4)† Ke3 5. Qb6† Kf3 6. Qf6† Kg2 7. Qg6† Kf1 as in main line win.

i) 8. Qd3† Kg2 9. Qe4† Qf3 10. Qc2 (Qg6†, Kf1; Qa6, Qxd5;) Kg3 11. Qd2 Qe4† and 12. ... e1Q.

ii) 9. Qe5† Kg2 10. Qe4† Qf3 as in (ii).

iv) 14. Qc5† Kg2 15. Qc2 Qxd5†.

v) 4. d6 Kf2 5. d7 e1Q 6. d8Q Qb4† 7. Kc6 (Ka6, Qa1†;) Qc1† 8. Kd7 Qb7† 9. Ke6 cQc6† 10. Qd6 (Qd6, Qe8†) Qe4† 11. Qe5 (Kf6, Qb2†) 11. ... Q7c6† 12. Qd6 Qg6 13. Qf6† Qxf6†.


vii) 7. Qf6† Kg2 8. Qg7† Qg3 9. Qb2 Qf2 10. Qg7† Kf1 wins.

No. 3026b: (Pospisil). 5. d7/i Qb5† 6. Ke2/i Qc6† 7. Kb3(b2) (Kd3, Qa5†; or elSt;) 7. ... Qb7† 8. Ke2 (c4/i Kf2 9. Kd3 (Q8d6, Qe8f) Qe4† 11. Qe5 (Kf6, Qb2†) 11. ... Q7c6† 12. Qd6 Qg6 13. Qf6† Qxf6†.


ii) 6. Ka3 Qa5† 7. Kb3 (Qa4, e1Q;)
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7. ... e1Q 8. Qd3t/ix Kg2 9. d8Q aQb4f 10. Qa2 Qf2t, or 9. Qc2t Qf2.
   i) 8. Ka3 Qa8f 9. Kb3 (Qa4t, e1Q; Qxa8, Qalt;), 9. ... e1Q 10. Qd3t/x
     Kg1 11. Qd4t/ix Kh1 12. d8Q Qb1t 13. Ke3 Qe6t 14. Kd2 cQe1t 15.
     Ke2 Qa2t.
   ii) 11. Qd4t Kh2 12. Qh8f Kg2 13. Qa8f Kh3 14. Qh8t Qh4, or, in
     this, 12, Qb2t Kh3 13. Qh8t Qh4.
   iii) 8. Kh2 9. d7 Qxd7 10. Qe4f Kf5 11. Qf4f Ke2 12. Qg3f (b4f)
     Qd1 wins.
   iv) 7. d7 Qb1t 8. Qb2t (d8Q, Qb5f;), 8. ... Qf5 9. d8Q Qb5f 10. Ke2
     Qa4f 10. ... Qe3f 11. Ke2 Qa4f 12. Kbl Qe1f 13. Qc4f (Qclf, Kg2;
     Qf5t, Kh3;), 13. ... Kg1 14. Qf4t Kh1 15. Qh8t Kg3 16. Qg5f Kh3.
   v) 6. Qh4f Kg2 7. d7 Qxd7 8. Qe4f Kf5 9. Qf4f Kel 10. Qg3f (b4f)
     Qd1 wins.
   vi) 11. Qe4 f4 12. Qf4f (Qd3t, Kg1;), 12. eQf2 13. Qc4f (Qclt, Kg2;
     Qg5t, Kh3;), 13. ... Kg1 14. Qg4f Kh1 15. Qf2t Kg2 16. Qc2t Qc6f
     wins, with... Bd2 threatened.

mate.

No. 3028: L. A. Mitrofanov and A. Kotov 1. b5 f1Q 2. Rxfl Rcl 3. b6
b7t Qxb7t 10. Ke4 Qb6 11. Kd7 Qxc5 12. e8Qf Qxc8t 13. Kxc8
wins.

(AJR: A study by the same composi-
ner-pair, and showing a closely
related idea, was awarded 1st
Prize in a Kharkov tourney (? Leninska Smena) in 1976. This
award is in course of preparation
for a future issue of EG.)
No. 3029: D. D. Makhatadze. 1. a8Q h1Q 2. Qe4† Kh3 3. Qf5†/i Kxh4 4. Qe4† Kg5 5. Qd5†/ii Kh6 6. Qe5† Kh7 7. Qb5† Kh8 8. Qa5† Kh7/iii 9. Qb7† Kh6 10. Qe6† Kg6 11. Qd5† Kh4 12. Qe4† Kg3 13. Qe5†/iv Kf2 14. Qxe3† Kf1 15. Qf3† Ke1 16. Qe4† Kd1 17. Qf3† Kxd2 18. Qd5† Ke1 19. Qe6† Kbl 20. Qxb6† Kd1 21. Qd4† Rb2 22. Qg1† and either 22. ... Qxg1 stalemate, or 22. ... Rb1 23. Qd4†.


ii) 5. Qe6†? Kh6 6. Qh8† Kg6 7. Qg8† Kf6 8. Qe8† Kg5 9. Qf8† Kg4 10. Qd4† Kh3, or 10. Qd7† Kg5.

iii) 8. ... Kg7 9. Qb7† Kh6 10. Qxb6†, though NMvK suggests bK may escape perpetual by 10. ... Kf5.

iv) 13. Qe3†? Kh2 14. Qe5† Rg3 15. Oxe5† Rh3 16. Qf6†? Kf2 wins.


i) 1. c7? Re1 2. c8Q Rxg3 3. Rxe8 Rxd3.

ii) 1. ... Rxe8 2. Ra8† Kbl 3. Rxa1† Kxa1 4. c7 Rc3 5. Be5, or 1. ... Rg2† 2. Kf7 Rd1 3. c7 Rc2 4. Be2.

iii) 3. Re2† Kd3 4. c7 Rh1 5. Kg8 Rgl† 6. Kf8 Rh1.

iv) 4. ... Kb3 5. Re3 wins.

v) 5. ... Kxb2 6. Be5 wins.

vi) Threatening both 7. Rg1† and 7. Bc5. 6. Be5? Rxc7 7. Rg2† Kbl 8. Rg1† Rcl.

vii) 6. ... Rxc7 7. Rg1† wins both BR's.


ii) 5. Sc1(c5)? Bg2 6. Sd3† (Rd1,
No. 3032  
† T. B. Gorgiev  


No. 3033  B. Breider  
7th Hon. Men. Peckover Jubilee Tourney. 1976


 i) 1. ... b5 2. Bd3t Kg5 3. Bxh7.

 ii) 2. Kd2? b5 wins.

No. 3034  H. Osadnik  
8th Hon. Men. Peckover Jubilee Tourney. 1976


iv) 3. ... Ke4 4. Bxd7 e2 5. e6 e1Q 6. e7 Qh4# 7. Ke6 Qg4# 8. Kd6 draw.
v) 4. Bxd7 e2 5. e6 e1Q 6. e7 Qh4# 7. Kf7 Qf4# 8. Kg7 (g8) Qg5# 9. Kf7 Qd5# 10. Be6 Qh5# 11. Kf8 Ke5 wins.
v) 8. ... Qh4# 9. Ke6 Q_. 10. K-
draw.

No. 3036: E. I. Dvizov. 1. a8Q, with near-echo variations:
i) 1. e1Q 2. Kxa2 Qxf2 3. Qh8# Kxg3 4. Qg7# Kf4 5. Qf6# Kg3 6. Qg5 mate.
ii) 1. ... Qg1# 2. Kxa2 e1Q 3. Qh8# Kxg3 4. Qh3# Kxf2 5. Qf3 mate.


   iv) There is, alas, a dual here: 9. Kh8 Be8 10. Bxg8 Kf8 11. g6 leading to the same conclusion.

No. 3041: V. S. Kovalenko. 1. Fb7/vi Ra1/ii 2. g7 h3 3. g8Q Kxb5 4. Rh6+ Ke5 5. Kg2 Ro1 6. Rh1+ wins.
i) 1. Ra7? Rc6 2. g7 Rg6† 3. Kh2 Rg3 draw. 1. Rg8? h3 2. g7 Rg2† 3. Kh1 Ka2 draw.


iii) 3. g8Q? h2† 4. Kh1 Rc1† 5. Kxh2 Rh1† 6. Kg2 Rg1† 7. Kxg1 stalemate.

No. 3042: D. Gurgenidze
1st Prize, Tbilisi 'Blitz' Tourney, 1975

No. 3043: An. G. Kuznetsov
1. Rb5† Ke4 2. Rf5† Ke3 3. Rf3† Kf2 4. Rf3† Kg1 5. Rf1† Kh2 6. Rf2† Kg3 7. Rg2† Kh3 8. Bf1 Rxh8 9. Rg8† wins.

No. 3044: L. Katsnelson and L. Mitrofanov
= 2/3 Prize, Tbilisi 'Blitz' Tourney, 1975

No. 3045: V. Nestorescu
4th Prize, Tbilisi 'Blitz' Tourney, 1975


i) 5. ... dlR 6. g3 Rd5 7. Rf1t Rd1t 8. Rf7 Rd5 9. Rf1t.


JRH: Cf. Gorgiev (1975), Chess in Armenia tourne.

No. 3049: V. Kalandadze. 1. cSe2† Kh2 2. Sf1† Kh3 3. a8Q Re8† 4. Kxe8 Sxc7† 5. Kf7 Sxa8 6. Sg1† Kh4 7. Sf3† Kh5 8. Sg3† Kh6 9. Sf5† Kh7 10. Sg5† Kh8 11. Se7 Rf4t 12. Kg6 Rg4 13. Kh5 Rh4t 14. Kg6 draw.
No. 3050: V. A. Kopelkov
= 1/4 H.M., Tbilisi 'Blitz'
Tourney, x.75

No. 3052: G. Kakabadze
= 1/4 H.M., Tbilisi 'Blitz'
Tourney, x.75

No. 3051: V. Neidze
= 1/4 H.M., Tbilisi 'Blitz'
Tourney, x.75

No. 3053: E. Pogosjants and
S. Tolstoy (i-iii.74)
1st Prize, Bulletin
Problemistic, 1974
Award: x-xii.75

No. 3051: V. Neidze. 1. Qe1† Kh5
2. Qe2† Bg4 3. Qe8† Kh4 4. Qe7†
Rg5 5. Ke3. Zugzwang. 5. ... Kh5 6.
Qh7 mate.

JRH: Cf. Belokon (1963/5) No. 294
in EG8.

No. 3052: G. Kakabadze. From, of
course, Tbilisi. 1. a5 Rg5 2. ab h5
3. h4 Rxb5 4. b7 Rb6 5. Kh7 Kf8
6. a7 Rxb7† 7. Kh8 Rxa7 stale-
mate.

No. 3053: E. Pogosjants and
S. Tolstoy. Judge was Constantin
Raina (Romania), who had 20 en-
tries to consider. 1. Sc5† Kb4/i 2.
Rxc1 b2/ii 3. Rb1/iii Sg4/iv 4. Kd6/
v Ke3 5. Sa4† Kb3 6. Sxb2/vi Se3
i) 1. ... Ka3 2. Rxb3† Ka2 3. Kxf6
wins. 1. ... Kb5 2. Rxc1 b2 3. Rb1
Kxc5 4. Kxf6 wins.
ii) 2. ... Sg4 3. Sd3† Ka3 4. Ra1
mate. 2. ... Sd5† 3. Kd6 Sc3 (Se3;
Sd3†) 4. Sd3† Ke4 5. Sb2† Kb4
(Kd4; Ke6, Sa2; Rc4†) 6. Ke5 Ka3
(Se2; Sd3†) 7. Sd3 Sa2 (b2;
Rxc3†) 8. Re6, but not 7. Rxc3?
Kc3 b1S†.
iii) 3. Cd3†? Kb3 (Ka3? Rc3†, Ka2: Re2) 4. Rb1 Se4 5. Rxb2† Ke3, or 5. Sxb2 Sc3. After the main line move 3. Rb1 there are two variations.


vii) 6. ... Kc3 5. Sa4† Kb3 6. Rxb2f.


xiv) 12. ... Sc6 13. Re4, 12. ... Sc6 13. Re4 wins.

JRH: R vs. S is 'book', eg Frink (1926) Chess Amateur, and Sulc (1956), No. 477 in '2545'. The main points are the introductory moves in the principal variation and in note (iv).

No. 3054: V. Nestorescu. I: 1. e3/i Rf3† (Re4, Bc1) 2. Kg2 Rxe3 3. Bb4† Ke2 4. Rd2† Ke1 5. Rxd6† Ke2 6. Rd2† Ke1 7. Kg1 wins bR using the battery.


draws, as wK obstructs wBh4.

JRH: As old as Horwitz and Kling, see No. 587 in T1000.

No. 3056: E. Dobrescu
(lv-ix.74)

1st H.M., Buletin Problemistic, 1974

i) 1. ... Kd2 2. Re2† Ke3 3. Bb1.
ii) 2. Re4†? Ke3 3. Re4† Kd2 4. Rb2 Ke3 (Kd1? Be2†) wins, the supplied analysis being lengthy, and as follows: 5. Re2† Kf3 6. Rd2 Qc3† 7. Rb2 Qa3† (Qxb3? Rb3) and 8. Qxb3. Or 5. Bh7 Qb7 6. Rh2 (Bg6, Qa6†; or Bg8, Qh1†) 6. ... Qa7† 7. Kb1/vi Kf4 8. Kb2 Kg3 9. Rh3 Kg4 wins. Or 5. Bg6 Qb6 6. Rb3/vii Kd2 7. Rc2/viii Kd1 8. Rb2 Qd4† 9. Rb2 Kc1 wins. Or 5. Bf5 Qa3† 6. Kb1 Qb4 7. Kc1 (Rb2, Qe1†) 7. ... Qa5 wins wB since ... Qa1 mate is the major threat.

iii) 2. ... Qxc2 3. Rb8† with perpetual R-checks from 8th rank, or stalemate. 2. ... Qc4 3. Rb8. 2. ... Q else 3. Rb8 draws.

iv) The threat was 3. ... Qa6† 4. Kb2 Qb6. Also 3. ... Ke3.

v) 3. ... Qg7 4. Re2 (Rb8? Qa7†) 4. ... Ke3 5. Rb2.

vi) 7. Kc2 Qb8†. Note also the line 6. Re2† Kd4 7. Rh3 Qg2 8. Rh5 Qf7† 9. Bb1 Kc3 10. Ra6 Qf6 11. Ra3† Kc4 12. Ka2 Qe6(f7, f2)†.


JRH: I have 9 examples of this underpromotion, of which Centurini (1856), No. 2143 in '2500', is earliest.

No. 3057: V. A. Bron
(lv-ix.74)

2 H.M., Buletin Problemistic, 1974

No. 3057: V. A. Bron, 1. Kg6/i Kg7/ ii 2. e6 Kg8 3. e7 Ff8 4. e8B/iii Ba3 5. Bg7 and 6. Bf7 mate.

ii) 1. ... Bf8 2. Kf7 Ba3 3. e6† Kh7 4. Bg7 and 5. Bf8.


iv) 4. ... Bf7? 5. Bg7 Bg5 6. Ds6 Be7 7. Df5 wins.

JRH: I have 9 examples of this underpromotion, of which Centurini (1856), No. 2143 in '2500', is earliest.

No. 3058: A. P. Kuznetsov
and A. T. Motor
(lv-ix.74)

3 H.M., Buletin Problemistic, 1974

No. 3058: A. P. Kuznetsov and A. T. Motor, 1. Kg6/i Kb3 Qe6†. 

vii) 7. Rd3† Ke2 8. Rg3 Qa5† 9. Kb2 Qe5† 10. Kb3 Qe6†.
No. 3058: Al P. Kuznetsov and A. T. Motor. 1 Sf2/i Ke3/ii 2, Sd1f Kd2/iii 3, Sb2 Kc3 4, Sa4+ Kb4 5, Sb6 Kc5 6, Sd7f Kd6 7, Sf6 Ke5 8, Kg4 d3 9, Kf3 wins.
   i) 1. Sf6? d3 2, Sd5f Kf3 3, Sc3 d2 4, Kxh4 Kf4 5, Kh3 Kf3 6, Sd1 Ke2 draw. 1. Kxh4? d3 2, Sf2 d2 3, Sd1 Kf3 4, Kd3 Ke2 draw.
   ii) 1. Sf6? d3 2, Sd5f Kf3 3, Sc3 d2 4, Kxh4 Kf4 5, Kh3 Kf3 6, Sd1 Ke2 draw.
   iii) 1. Sf6? d3 2, Sd5f Kf3 3, Sd3 d2 4, Kxh4 Kf4 5, Kh3 Kf3 6, Sd1 Ke2 draw.
   iv) 1. Sf6? d3 2, Sd5f Kf3 3, Sd1 Ke2 draw.

JRH: Cf. by the same composers, EC42 2415, EG36 2051 and EG45 2708.

No. 3059 F. S. Bondarenko (x-xii.74)
1 Commended Buletin Problemistic, 1974

No. 3060: I. L. Kovalenko. 1. Rg1 Rxf7 2, Rg8 Rf7f/i 3, h8Q Rxg8 4, Qc3/i Rg1f/ii 5, Kxb2 Rg2f 6, Kb3 c4 7, Ka3 b4 8, Qxb4 Rg3 9, Kb4 Rg5 10, Qa5 Kb8 11, Kd5 Rg5 12, Kd6 Kd6 13, Qa5 Rg5 14, Qa5 Kb8 15, Kb4 wins.
   i) 1. ... Rf1f 2, Kxb2 Rf2f 3, Kc1 Rf1f 4, Kd2 Rf2f 5, Ke3 Rf3f 6, Kf4 Rf4f 7, Kg5 Rg5 8, Kh6 Kc1 wins.
   ii) 1 ... Rf1f 2, Kxb2 Rf2f 3, Kc1 Rf1f 4, Kd2 Rf2f 5, Ke3 Rf3f 6, Kf4 Rf4f 7, Kg5 Rg5 8, Kh6 Kc1 wins.
   iii) 1 ... Rf1f 2, Kxb2 Rf2f 3, Kc1 Rf1f 4, Kd2 Rf2f 5, Ke3 Rf3f 6, Kf4 Rf4f 7, Kg5 Rg5 8, Kh6 Kc1 wins.

JRH: A Bl excelsior ('via Averrnus') is known, cf. Bron (1970), EG32 1783, Lilja (1949), No. 15 in '123', but this version does not seem to be anticipated.

No. 3061 M. Kovacevic (x-xii.74)
... 3 Commended Buletin Problemistic, 1974
No. 3061: M. Kovacevic. (I do not know if the composer is also the master of the same name — AJR.)
1. c5/i Qxc5 2. e3 Qxe3 3. b6f Qxb6 4. Ed4 Qxd4 5. Sb5f.

No. 3062 A. Motor and C. Petrescu
4th Commended, Buletin Problemistic, 1974

No. 3062: A. Motor and C. Petrescu (iv-ix.74)

No. 3063 V. Petrovici
5th Commended, Buletin Problemistic, 1974

i) 1. c3? d5 2. h6 d4 3. h7 Kg7 4. cd c3 5. Ke3 f4, or in this, 2. Ke3 Kg5 3. Kd4 f4.

JRH: While there is no exact anticipation, the idea of threatening mate, pinning bQ and sacrificing wB to force a fork of bK and bQ is well known, for example, Troitzky, No. 1244 in '2500', which is chosen from 25 similar studies.
No. 3064  F. S. Bondarenko
Mention, Buletin Problemistic, 1974

Win 7+8

i) 1. ... g4 2. Kg2 Be7 3. Kg3.

No. 3065  N. E. Sviridenko
Mention, Buletin Problemistic, 1974

Draw 4+5

ii) 4. ... Bf7? 5. Sxf7 a2 6. S− a1Q 7. f7 mate.
iii) 5. Se4? Bf7 6. Sd6 a1Q.

No. 3066: R. Voia. Judge of the 20 published studies (all from Romania or the USSR) was E. Janso (Romania). It appears that 'places' were allocated instead of prizes.


i) 1. Sd6? d3 2. Sc4 h5 3. g7 (Kf5, Sh6+; Kg5, Sg8/): 3. ... Sh6 4. Kf6 h4 5. Kg6 Sg8 6. Kf7 Sh6+. 
ii) 4. ... Sg4 5. Qd1 Ke3 6. Qxg4. 
iii) 6. ... Ke3 7. Qh3 Ke2 8. Qh5t. 

vii) 11. ... d1Q 12. Qxe3 Ke1 13. Qf2 mate.

JRH: The final Q vs. S procedure seems to be known, eg Troitzky, No. 735 in T1000.
   i) 1. Sh8? d1Q 2. a7 Qd5.
   ii) 4. a8Q? Qd5f 5. Qxd5 stalemate.
   iii) Better than 4. ... d5 5. Bc6.

JRH: Another study with wS+wB vs. bQ where bQ simultaneously pins and offers itself to wB is Troitzky (1924), No. 1055 in '1234'.


ii) 1. ... Ba4 2. b6 Bc6 3. Be8.


No. 3070: V. S. Kovalenko (x-xii.75)

2 H.M., Buletin Problemistic, 1975


No. 3071: A. T. Motor (vii-xi.75)

3 H.M., Buletin Problemistic, 1975

No. 3071: A. T. Motor. 1. c6 Bxe2 2. Kc5 Kg7/3. Kd6 Bg4 4. Kc7/ii Bf3 5. Kd7 (Kb7? Kg6) 5. ... Bg4† 6. Kd8 (Ke7? Be8) 6. ... Be2 7. Kd7 (iii Bg4† and it's a positional draw.


No. 3072: D. Pikhurov and Y. Dorogov (i-iii.75)

Commended, Buletin Problemistic, 1975


ii) For instance, 8. ... Kd2 9. c5 Ke1 10. c6 Kf1 11. c7 g2 12. c8Q Sg5† 13. Kf4 g1Q 14. Qc1t.


No. 3073: D. Pikhurov (iv-vi.75)

Commended, Buletin Problemistic, 1975


ii) For instance, 8. ... Kd2 9. c5 Ke1 10. c6 Kf1 11. c7 g2 12. c8Q Sg5† 13. Kf4 g1Q 14. Qc1t.
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ii) 2. ... Ra3 3. d6 R 4. d7.
iii) 3. Sf3? Kg3 4. Kc2 a3 5. Sd2 a2 6. Bxa2 Rxa2 7. Sb1 Ra4 8. Kc3 Rc4† and 9. ... Rc5, while in this
6. Kxb2 abQ 7. Sxb1 Ra4 8. Kc3 Rc4†.
iv) 5. ... Rc1† 6. Kxb2 Rd1 7. Sf7 Kg3 8. Be6 Kf4 9. d7 Rd2† 10. Kc1, or 6. ... Rc8 7. d7 Rc8 8. Be6 a4
v) 6. ... Ra1 7. Sf3† Kg3 8. Sd2 Rc1† 9. Kxb2 wins.

No. 3074: A. T. Motor
Commended, Bulletin Problemistic, 1975

No. 3075: A. T. Motor
Commended, Bulletin Problemistic, 1975

No. 3076: D. Pikhurov and C. Petrescu
Commended, Bulletin Problemistic, 1975


No. 3078: D. Pikhurov and C. Petrescu. 1. Ke2 Se3 (Kh7; Rg4) 2. Kd3 Ba7 3. Ra6 Bc5 4. Rc6 Ba7 5.
i) 5. Eb3? Sd1 6. Rc8† Kg7 7. Rc7† Kf6 8. Rxa7 Sf2† and 9. ... Sxh3.

1. b7 Bd6

i) B1 resists playing ... Bh4 since this would lose a tempo.

ii) 9 ... Bg7 10. h8Q Bxh8 stalemate.

No. 3078: P. Racolta.


Tourney Announcements

KOR. LKOV 70th birthday JUBILEE. In addition to normal prizes there will be special awards for themes favoured by the FIDE Grandmaster himself, who will be the judge. Closing date: 1.ix.77.

Send (2 copies) to: L. I. Katsnelson, M-66 "DO VOSTREBOVANIYA", 108065 LENINGRAD, USSR.

CORGIEV MEMORIAL: entries to — PRAPCR YUNOSTI, 'International Chess Competition', UL CSENNAYA 24, 320079 DNIEPROPetrovsk, USSR. Closing date: 1.vii.77. (Sorry! AJR.)

NEW BOOKS AND REVIEWS

ADVANCES IN COMPUTER CHESS - 1,

Edinburgh University Press, 1977. Of the 7 papers in this fascinating collection, the most valuable for the endgame is 'Describing Pawn Structures', by S. T. Tan. Two other papers are relevant to K+R vs. K and to K+P vs. K. (See also EG46, p. 371.)

THE WORLD COMPUTER CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP,

by Hayes and Levy, Edinburgh University Press, 1976. This is a full and highly informative account of the 1974 event won by the Soviet program KAISSA. Considering that the endgame is the most scientific part of the game of chess (it has a theory that is well known and non-volatile), it never fails to astonish me that computer chess is still so weak in the endgame. Here we find plentiful evidence of this enormous anomaly. Special routines for the endgame are rare instead of the norm; "W now plays the endgame very weakly"; "inability to evolve a plan"; "Computer chess is at its worst in the endgame, which is agreed to be intellectually the deepest part of chess". The book
concludes with details of Levy's challenge — the bet that he will not lose a match against a computer before 31. viii. 78.

Batsford books on the endgame:
BISHOP ENDINGS L.C. KNIGHT ENDINGS are the two most recent volumes to appear in this series of updated translations of the 'Averbakh' treatises. The 133 pages and 267 diagrams of the S-volume will cost you £4.75. For this you will get Grandmasterly instruction and some occasionally Korn-ian phrases, such as “the trammelled bK induces a simple win”, and “the naturally centralized reserve knight deprives the hostile king of a great many squares, manning significantly simpler winning lines…” (In EG46, p. 371, I expressed doubt as to whether there had been updates in the Batsford edition to the original 'B vs. S' in Russian.
Kevin O'Connell has pointed out that there were 24 new examples, which were indeed listed in the book itself. My apologies to all concerned.)

600 VÉGIJÁTEK, by S. Portisch and B. Sarközy. This is the second (1976) edition of a Hungarian collection of 600 practical endings first published in 1973. There is the same number of pages (282), and a comparison of the two indexes shows but small variation in the content. At a guess, analytical corrections have been made and a little material replaced. There are many studies included, but neither source nor date, but only the author’s name, is supplied for the individual position — a bibliography and list of magazine sources is given at the end of the book.

BRILLIANCE IN CHESS, by Gerald Abrahams, 1977. Into this vehicle for the witty Abrahams pen (I almost wrote 'tongue') a few studies find their way. Most of the 150 or so positions are well known. But “Lloyd” for “Loyd” … really, Gerald!

POZITSIONNAYA NICHYA, by G. M. Kasparyan, 1977. This is a revised and expanded version of the author’s 1962 book. Then there were 214 positions; now there are 423. The only completely new section in these positional draws is one devoted to perpetual check. The other 4 sections are: fortress and blockade (naturally subdivided according to the chess piece blockaded); pinning and immobilising (by attack); perpetual attack; other kinds of positional draw. The perpetual check section has 10 sub-divisions according to the checking force: S, B, SS, BB, BS, 3-4 minor pieces, R or RR, RB, RS, other.

FIDE ALBUM 1968-70. Of the 805 selected compositions, 124 are studies. In fact the proportion of studies selected in relation to those submitted is noticeably higher for studies than for other genres — but any attempted conclusions drawn from this are controversial.
Kasparyan, with 11 studies, has most inclusions, followed by Pogosjants (10), Bron (9), Nadreishvili (9), Mitrofanov (8), Perkonova (8), Gorgiev (6) and Katsnelson (6). AJR.

Obituary. Matus Gorbman, Krivoi Rog (Ukraine), composer and contributor of originals to EG, died 6.I.77.

Obituary International Master Tigran Borisovich Gorgiev (30.vili.10 -13.xii.76). Gorgiev was a doctor of medical science specialising in microbiology. He lived in Dniepropetrovsk in the Ukraine and was the author of 3 books on studies, and numerous articles. Many of his compositions feature in the FIDE Album series. His output totalled about 400 studies, about 30 of them 1st Pr. winners. He was at
Tbilisi in 1975, all smiles and friendliness through the language barrier, and it makes me sad that

G1  T. B. Gorgiev
4 H.M., 64 1930

Win 3-4-3

I missed the opportunity to tell him that it was his study (G1) that first opened my eyes to the beauties of this mini-world. (This must have been in 1942, in the booklet “Chess: An Easy Game”.) An equally classic, but far more sophisticated, example is G2. An appreciation of Gorgiev’s achievements and style, specially contributed by the veteran Soviet composer A. V. Sarychev, will appear in EG49.

G2  T. B. Gorgiev
1st Place, Match (Ukraine vs. Romania) 1958

Draw 3-4-4

Gandolfi (EG47, p. 047): Daniel de Mol (Wetteren, Belgium) has traced 51 studies in his (incomplete) files of L’Italia Scacchistica. With Mr de Mol’s help we shall return to the subject of Gandolfi again.

SOLVING
An international, all-genres solving contest was held in Varna (Bulgaria) in x.76. Great Britain was not represented. The team placings were Yugoslavia first, Finland second, and the USSR third. The occasion was a fruitful test run for the first such official contest, to be held during the FIDE Commission’s meeting in the autumn of 1977. In the Bulgarian event each country was represented by a team of two, each member scoring separately. Both scores counted. There were 6 rounds: 2-ers (3 in 20 minutes); 3-ers (2 in 45); helpmates (3 in 60); more-movers (2 in 60); selfmates (3 in 60); studies (2 in 90). In each round team placings were determined by penalty points: 0 penalties for first place, 1 penalty point for second, and so on. The team with fewest penalty points wins the whole event. Each competitor may hand in his solution before the expiry of the time limit, thus allowing ties to be split and an individual championship to be awarded. The compositions to be solved were selected by lot before each round from submissions by three neutral countries. ... If we must have competition among the nations, then by all means let us have it this way! (Acknowledgements to Dr Hemmo Axt, in SCHACH-ECHO, xi.76.)

AJR

FIDE ALBUM 1974-6: Director for the ‘tourney’ to select for this period will be AJR (studies), supported by Judges Dunder (Finland), Nadareishvili (USSR) and Fritz (Czechoslovakia). Further details to be announced.
Index to book titles frequently abbreviated in EG by the number of studies the work contains, or otherwise

'111' Suomalaista Lopputehtavaa, by A. Dunder and A. Hinds, Finland, 1971

'123' Suomalaista Lopputehtavaa, by B. Breider, A. Dunder and O. Kaila, Helsinki, 1972

'123a' Toiset 123 suomalaista lopputehtavaa, a supplement to Suomen Shakki, 1971

'289' Etyudy, by G. M. Kasparyan, Moscow, 1972

'293' Shakhmatny Etyud v Gruzii, by G. Nadareishvili, Tbilisi, 1975

'500' 500 Endspielstudien, by A. Troltzky, Berlin, 1924

'555' Etyudev Minlatur, by G. M. Kasparyan, Erevan, 1975

'623' Knia Sachovyvch Studii, by L. Prokes, Prague, 1951

'636' Etyud v Peshechnom Okonchanii, by F. S. Bondarenko, Moscow, 1973

'650' Sovyetsky Shakhmatny Etyud, by A. P. Kazantsev and others, Moscow, 1955

'1234' Modern End-Game Studies, by M. A. Sutherland and H. M. Lommer, London, 1938; revised by H. M. Lommer, New York, 1968

'1357' End Game Studies, by H. M. Lommer, London, 1975

'1414' Fins de Partie, by H. Rinck, Barcelona, 1952

'2500' 2500 Finales, by G. M. Kasparyan, Buenos Aires, 1963

'2545' Shakhmatnye Etyudy: Dominaisia, 2 vols., by G. M. Kasparyan, Erevan, 1972 and 1974

'T1000' A Thousand End-Games, 2 vols., by C. E. C. Tattersall, Leeds, 1910-11


'Fritz' Schaakstudie, by J. Fritz, Prague 1954


The Chess Endgame Study Circle and EG. Subscriptions: see p. 449.

How to subscribe:
1. Send money (cheques, dollar bills, International Money Orders) direct to A. J. Roycroft.
3. If you heard about EG through an agent in your country you may, if you prefer, pay direct to him.

New subscribers, donations, changes of address, ideas, special subscription arrangements (if your country's Exchange Control regulations prevent you subscribing directly):
A. J. Roycroft, 17 New Way Road, London England, NW9 6PL.
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