AUTHORSHIP AND ATTRIBUTION IN CHESS COMPOSITIONS
by Alexander Hildebrand, Sweden.

(This article's contents apply to all branches of composition, but the examples are taken from the studies field).

What is plagiarism and what is adaptation? What is development of a theme and what is mere mastication or dilution of an idea? When is a composer justified in calling a composition with a "borrowed" theme his own and publishing it under his own name? When should one put "after NN" in the superscription?

The composer, and not only the inexperienced one, is often faced with these questions. There are excellent and respected authors who consider themselves morally justified in restating a pawn in the composition of another composer and then publishing the work under their own names. Is the original composer supposed to tolerate this act of theft? How should tourney judges regard such phenomena?

The aim of this article is to bring some clarity into this subject and to prompt discussion. The point of view brought forward here is, it goes without saying, my own personal point of view.

New ideas do not grow on trees, not today. The majority of ideas and themes handled by contemporary composers are already expressed in one way or another. It is through association that we stumble across new "idea impulses" and "combined themes" when we examine the works of other authors. With the aid of our powers of imagination and creativity we hunt for new variations, forms, conglomerate ideas and so on. But, to insist upon the point, for the most part the paths we are on have already been well trodden. There is no sin in this, even when we are fully conscious of the fact. The problem is simply to know where to draw the line. That is, to know what is permissible and what is not, because it is a question of ethical behaviour, not of hard-and-fast rules. Let us take some examples.

THEME WITH VARIATIONS

It was in the year 1895 that Aleksey Troitzky (1866-1942), one of the pioneers of the modern study, discovered the H1 mating position with a lone bishop against two pawns. The solution: 1. Bh6+ Kg8 2. g7 Kf7 3. g8Q+ Kxg8 4. Ke6 Kh8 5. Kf7 e5 6. Bg7 mate. The final position, achieved by dint of zugzwang, is of course a beautiful find. Then, 14 years later,
Troitzky himself published in *Niva* (St. Petersburg newspaper, 1909) a new version of the idea, in the following form: wKd7 wRb5 wBg5; bKf8 bRg8 bPe7, h7 - Win. The solution:

1. Bh6 + Kf7 2. Rf5 + Kg6 3. Rg5 + Kf7 4. Rg8 Kxg8 5. Ke6 Kh8 6. Kf7 and 7. Bg7 mate. One may well ask why the composer published this study at all. It is less economical and as regards the solution less elegant by far than his 1895 work. Of course the composer is free to do what he wishes with his own output, giving it assorted configurations and variations, even if as here these are superfluous, as the second thematic version is clearly weaker than the first. However, it was not only the composer who concerned himself with this idea. Thus it was that in 1939 the following studies with the same idea were published. We give them in notation only.

**J. Ohman, Revista Romana de Sah, 1939:** wKf7 wBe7, c2 wPc7; bKc8 bBc3 bPa7, d7 - Win. The solution:

1. Bd6 Ba5 2. Bd3 Bxc7 3. Ba6+ Kb8 4. Ke7 Bxd6+ 5. Kxe6 etc. This study, published without even "after Troitzky" as acknowledgement, has scarcely any right to exist. It has an inferior form, and offers absolutely nothing new when compared with Troitzky's piece of 1895.

**U. Gandolfi, L'Italia Scacchistica, 1939:** wKe4 wBf8 wSf2 wPg7; bKg8 bRg8 bSe2 bPe6, e7, h6, h7 - Win. The solution:

1. Sg4 Sg3 + 2. Ke5 Sf5 3. Sxh6 + Sxh6 4. ghQ(R) + Ksh8 5. Bxh6 Kg8 6. Kxe6 etc. Compared to Troitzky, this is a monster! The construction is horrible; a chained king and a walled-in rook that does not play. The introductory play is worthless and without finesse. After the first move mate in 1 threatened! Afterwards there is a slaughter of several "spectators". Here too the composer (maybe this was a good thing!) omitted to mention "after Troitzky". I mean good for Troitzky for the present study could hardly give a good impression to anyone who did not already know Troitzky's studies on this theme.

In 1947 the present writer published this version of the Troitzky theme: **A. Hildebrand (Skakbladet, 1947), "after Troitzky":** wKd8 wBc1, d7; bKf8 bBh5 bPe7, h7 - Win. 1. Bh6 + Kg8 2. Be6 + Bf7 (Kh8; Kxe7; Bf7; Kf8) 3. Kd7 etc. I now consider this study as a youthful peccadillo, as I was at that time a mere beginner in composing. This version also adds nothing new to the Troitzky theme and were better forgotten. It does have nevertheless the form of a miniature, and the attribution is more accurate as it carries the appended word "after Troitzky". Perhaps that was right and proper. The question however is whether it would have been more correct to describe it as a study by Troitzky with the label "version by A. Hildebrand". Which is more appropriate must remain a matter of personal evaluation.

**U. Gandolfi, L'Italia Scacchistica, 1939:** wKd8 wBel, d7; bKf8 bBh5 bPe7, h7 - Win. The solution:

1. Bh6 + Kf7 2. Be6+ Bf7 (Kh8; Kxe7; Bf7; Kf8) 3. Kd7 etc. I now consider this study as a youthful peccadillo, as I was at that time a mere beginner in composing. This version also adds nothing new to the Troitzky theme and were better forgotten. It does have nevertheless the form of a miniature, and the attribution is more accurate as it carries the appended word "after Troitzky". Perhaps that was right and proper. The question however is whether it would have been more correct to describe it as a study by Troitzky with the label "version by A. Hildebrand". Which is more appropriate must remain a matter of personal evaluation.

The following H2 study, also on the Troitzky theme, is something quite different. The solution:

Ka8, or 4. Kc6 d5. 1. ..., Kc7 2. Ba6 Kxb8 3. Kd6 Ka8 4. Kc7 d5 5. Bb7 mate. Indeed the Troitzky theme again, but in a quite independent form. The solution is enriched by a manoeuvre to lose a tempo, making a new and fresh impression. The study by the talented Finnish composer Julius Gunst needs no 'after Troitzky' annotation. Even the famous Leonid Kubbel concerned himself with the theme. He gives us full details in his '250 Selected Studies'.

In his commentary to the study, published in Shakmatny Listok in 1929, he supplies the original Troitzky study and remarks that he, Kubbel, has always been fascinated by the theme. Kubbel's study has the following form: wKb5 wBa6, e5 wSc6; bKd5 bBf8 bPa7, d7 - Win. Solution: 1. Sb8 Bd6 2. Bxd6 Kxd6 3. Kc4 Kc7 4. Kd5 Kxb8 5. Kd6 Ka8 6. Kc7 and 7. Bb7 mate. As we can see, the struggle in this expression acquires intensity. The play is active, and wK participates in a witty persecution of his opposite number. This is what gives Kubbel's study its own right to exist, so that the appendage 'after Troitzky' is superfluous. To this we may add Kubbel's further comment, that in fact he started, not from the work of Troitzky, but from the work of Gunst.

RIGHT AND WRONG

So we have the following possibilities when contemplating the publication of studies with themes that are already known.

1. Under the composer's own name, when the theme is varied in an original manner, or with a significant (!) improvement in construction.

2. Under the composer's own name with the subscript 'after NN', when the alteration (or alterations) to the theme or construction by comparison with the original are clear, but small.

3. Under the names of both composers, as is done with collective, or joint, compositions. However, if it is not a joint composition, but only an improvement on another composer's work, then it is mandatory to obtain the permission of the other composer before publishing it under the two names (for example, Lindgren and Hildebrand).

4. Under the name of the original composer, with a subscript, as for example: A. Troitzky (version by A. Hildebrand).

5. As 4, but with the subscript 'correction by NN'.

Let us consider H3 as an example. We can see that we have to do with the famous Réti theme. What then has A. Werle added to vary this much worked on theme? Really not much. After 1. dc a5 we have the Réti position. The point here is the temptation 1. d6?, and nothing more. Thus it is a mere pitfall for the solver. Which of the above 5 possibilities would you, worthy reader, recommend for this case?

In my view it is No. 4 that is applicable. Or are we so generous that we can accept No. 2? This is naturally a
manner of judgement. However, I think that this version is not sufficiently distinct for No. 2 to be invoked.

Bo Lindgren
Tidskrift for Schack, 1946

Inadmissible is in my opinion an occurrence like the following. In 1946 Bo Lindgren published H4, a study with the all-4-promotions ("Allumwandlung") theme. The intended solutions: 1. Rxa5 Qxa5 2. Sd6+ Ka8 3. c8R+ and so on. If 2. ..., Ka6 3. c8B+. If 2. ..., Ka7 3. c8S+. If 2. ..., Kc6 3. c8Q+. However, the study was shown later to be defective.

Vitaly Halberstadt
British Chess Magazine, 1950
(after Bo Lindgren)

Then, 4 years later, V. Halberstadt published the following study (H5). Here the solution runs: 1. Sd6+ Ka6 2. Bxb7+ Ka7 3. Sc8+ Kxb7 4. Sd6+ and so on, as in H4. Halberstadt was an extremely skilled and highly regarded composer. But in my view he has behaved incorrectly here.

The study is, and remains, a study by Bo Lindgren. Halberstadt ought therefore to have weighed up the following alternatives, in order to be above reproach.

1. To publish the study under the name of Bo Lindgren with the subscript either "version by V. Halberstadt", or "correction by V. Halberstadt".

2. Make contact with Bo Lindgren and propose the new version under the names of both composers.

What is the opinion of readers?
Naturally, the situation is different if one is innocent unaware of any anticipation. In such a case one speak only of "an accident at work".

GREATER STRICTNESS IN TOURNEMENTS

Composers taking part in tourneys not intending to enter with adaptations of unoriginal ideas must be especially careful. They should specifically draw the attention of the judge to the earlier study, to facilitate comparison. This must apply to cases where there may be doubt about the originality of the entry. This is what A Werle did, to take an example, when he sent H6 in for the 1968 annual informal tourney of Tidskrift for Schack. The solution: 1. Qe7 Rb8 2. ba Kxa7 3. Qxc5+ Ka8 4. Qb6 Qxd3 5. Bg2 h1Q 6. Bxh1 Qf1 7. Bd5 Qd3 (a1) 8. Bg2 wins. Werle supplied the information that he had reworked an idea of N. Rossolimo published in 1931, namely: wKg2 wQe6 wBal wSf3; bKh7 bQb4 bRf8 bPg7, h6. The solution: 1. Qd7 Rg8 2. Qf5+ Kh8 3. Qg6 Qf4 4. Kf2 Qc1 5. Bd4 Qh1 6. Bb2 Qh3 7. Kg1 wins.

Werle's study was accepted as an independent study on the Rossolimo theme for the purposes of the tourney.
There is much more that could be added, but the restricted article length does not allow this. It is therefore no more than an attempt to initiate a broader discussion of what is and is not admissible when publishing compositions with known anticipations of various degrees and kinds.

THE LAWS OF CHESS

FIDE has amended Article 12.4 to read as follows, the single paragraph replacing the first 2 paragraphs of the existing Article.

"... when a player having the move claims a draw and demonstrates that at least 50 last consecutive moves have been made by each side without the capture of any piece nor the move of any pawn. This number of 50 moves can be increased for certain positions, provided that this increase in number and these positions have been clearly established in the Laws of Chess before the commencement of the game." The "2 Ss vs. P" paragraph is now classified as FIDE Interpretation 12.4 (1978). A new Interpretation 12.4 (1982) reads: "In endings consisting of king, rook and pawn versus king, bishop and pawn" (ie, GBR class 0130.11) the 50-move rule will be extended to 100 moves if wPa2 and bPa3 and bB on black squares, or any equivalent configuration. (Note: the actual wording by FIDE of this last bit is excessively verbose, to cover W and Bl, a-file and h-file, and the square-colour of the B.)

This may seem to complicate the realm of studies, where many very clever compositions depend on the 50-move rule. However, there is another point of view, which I hold, namely that in studies there is no "game", there are no "players", and hence there can be no "claim" and no "commencement to a game". Hence, this view holds, the 50-move rules does not apply to studies, and solutions should proceed as if no such rule exists. But studies and the game have a common interest in endgame theory and all related discoveries.

AJR

REVIEWS

Practical Rook Endings, by Edmar Mednis, 72 pages, Corapopolis (USA), 1982. There are only 2 studies here, incidental to the main purpose, namely to teach R-endings via principles, plans and examples, with copious text. Excellent.

De Wetten van het Eindspel, by N.V. Krogius, 70 pages, Amsterdam, in Dutch from original Russian, 1973. Just 5 studies here, where the aim is to help the player build on elementary knowledge to give him technique in a wide (over-ambitious for such a small book?) variety of endgames.

Vom Mittelspiel ins Endspiel, by Vladimir Budde, 124 pages, J. Beyer Verlag, Hollfeld (W. Germany), 1982. No studies, just 32 well-chosen games illustrating various themes of exchanging into an endgame.
Pawns in Action, by A. Sokolsky, 86 pages, "The Chess Player", Nottingham, 1976 (translated into English). There is some endgame, but no study, material here. The reader is invited to consider aspects of pawn play in positions where most players might not consider the pawns at all.

Kunstschach in der Schweiz, by Hans Henneberger, 154 pages, Lucerne, 1980, in German. This handsome anthology announces that it contains chess problems and studies of Swiss composers for the years 1966-1976. However, the 29 studies range wide of these dates. Fontana (7), M. Henneberger (7), Isenegger (7), Issler (1), Naef (7) are the enticing representatives.

Richtig und Falsch, by K. Richter and H. Staudte, 84 pages, 129 diagrams, 1978 (2nd edition), de Gruyter. Many endgames in this revision, but no studies -- they appear to have been deliberately expurgated on account of suspect soundness, although the book's title ("Right and Wrong") might have justified their retention.


Six Hundred Endings, by Portisch and Sárközy, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1981, 198 pages. This is an English translation of the original Hungarian work already reviewed in EG. It is a pleasantly laid out treatise on the whole practical endgame field, with many examples of studies and games -- all in the English descriptive notation. Curiously, the games are given dated sources, the studies not.

"Zamechatelnye Etyudy" (Superb Studies), by G.M. Kasparyan, Erevan 1982, 328 pages, 1062 diagrams. With 287 composers represented this is truly a labour of love by Kasparyan, no doubt relaxing from his classifying labours (when he is not continuing to compose!). The anthology has no chapters, making it ideal to browse in, provided that one takes care when turning the flimsy pages and keeps patience with the sometimes murky diagrams. Given that the selection is made from many styles, with different standards, out of assorted cultu-
res even in quite distinct epochs, what unifies them? The author gives his answer: originality of thought, a worthy finishing touch, vividness of the idea. ... And printed, a Westerner notes with envy, in 20,000 copies.

"The Best Endings of Capablanca and Fischer", under the general heading of "Classification of Chess Endings", Chess Informant, Belgrade, 1978, 136 pages, apparently edited by A. Matanovic. The book comprises the positions, moves, and some supporting analyses, of 204 endings played (or, in Capablanca's case, devised) by the two great players. All right. But what is this "classification" business? Let me quote from the preface: "All endgames are classified into four groups: PAWN ENDINGS, QUEEN ENDINGS, ROOK ENDINGS and MINOR PIECE ENDINGS. The strongest piece in a given position (except for the K) determines the group to which an endgame belongs. Further classification within these groups is done by process of elimination - the basis of the entire system of information in chess -- developing from simple to more complex forms." Is everything clear now? Well, perhaps the succeeding pages will help: pages 11 to 64 (sic!) list what purport to be codes, accompanied by symbols (which mean "doubled pawns" or "pair of bishops", etc.). And the diagrams themselves are accompanied by the codes, sometimes with unexplained letter-suffixes. It seems that a "classification" comprises a piece-symbol, one or two digits, a "/" and sometimes a letter. Give me the GBR code any day!

"Encyclopedia of Chess Endings" (Belgrade, 1982, by Chess Informant, 384 pages, 1610 pawns-only diagrams) is apparently the first of five volumes of this classificatory exercise that employs a system that seems foreign to the material. There are numerous studies, indexes of players and composers, and the whole hardcover volume is a pleasure to handle. What I do not yet know is what I shall use it for.

AJR
iii) In the distant future W will promote, on c8 or d8 or e8. B1 tries to cope with all these possibilities. But the a7 square was the only one that would have succeeded.

iv) This would have been an instantly drawing check had bK been on b6.

v) 9. de? e2 10. c6 e1S and 12. ..., Sf4 mate.

vi) 10. dc + ? Kc8 11. c7 e1Q 12. c6 Qxh4 + 13. Kxh4 Kxc7 14. Kg3 Kxc6 15. Kf3 Kd5 and wins the (pawn-minus!) P-endgame by capturing all the gP's in exchange for eP, being careful that after wK eventually plays wKxbP e3 bK can play Kg6-g5. Had bK stood on a6 then 10. ..., Kc8 would have been impossible, and after 10. dc B1 would have to choose between 10. ..., e1Q 11. c7, when neither 11. ..., Kb7 12. c6 + Kc8 (or xc7) stalemate, nor 11. ..., Qxh4 + 12. Kxh4 Kxc7 13. Kg3 Kd6 14. Kf3 is to be recommended (W wins in this last line), and 10. ..., e1S 11. c7, when 11. ..., Sd3 is met (this is the very remote "point" about the square a6 for bK) by 12. c8Q with check.

vii) 10. ..., e1Q 11. d7 and bK is out of range, so bQ must cover d8, with stalemate.

viii) Showing why bK avoided the 8th rank. b5 threatens mate on f4.

ix) But this shows the final point of the original zugzwang: W promotes to S, with check, and gains the tempo to cover f4.

"A multi-P study with long-distance and precisely calculated play by both sides that is a great pleasure to observe, with B1 promoting twice to bS, and W countering with precisely the same promotion, and that basic zugzwang that encompasses the whole breadth of the board from a-file to h-file!"

No. 4822: A. Belyavsky,


i) Clearly wP is safe, for 4. ..., Bxb6 5. e8Q + Kxc7 6. Kxc6 drawn. But the move actually puts B1 into zugzwang: if bK were forced away from d5 (by having the move in this position) then bBxb6 would win.


iv) The position is now repeated, so B1 tries what succeeded in other variations -- playing bB over to the K-side, where is more space to manoeuvre. What could be the disadvantage here?

v) Bk had to play to c8 to prevent wKb7, and now bB wins wPb6. All is in order for dP to advance. 12. ..., Bxb6 + 13. Kxb6 d5 has no point.


"To start with no one would think that wK, after clever manoeuvring to avoid clever zugzwang pitfalls, would stalemate himself on the apparently inaccessible square a8. The 'opening' of the author on the pages of Shakmaty v SSSR was successful, and
it remains to hope for an equally promising 'middle game.'" (Korolkov means that we want to hear more from this composer.)

No. 4823: V. Anufriev

4th Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1980

1. Rg8/i Qa5 + 2. Bc5 + Ke7 3. Bd5 + Kf6 4. Rg6 + Ke5 5. Rg5 +


"So it turns out that even with the classic material RBB vs. Q new and interesting finds may be made. The graphic legibility ('chyotkaya grafika') and echo produce a favourable impression on solver.

No. 4824: D. Gurgenidze

1. Sc3 + Ka1/i 2. Sc4 Re8 + (Rb2; Bxb2+) 3. Ke5 R8d8 + 4. Ke4 Rxd4 + 5. Ke3/i f1Q/iii 6. Kxd4 and if it were W to play here there would be the (ii) variations. But it is not, and B1, remarkably, has, so it appears, nothing better than 6. ..., Qa6, which is the only safe move that prevents both Kc4 and Kd3, but after 7. Bc1 the position is mirrored, so the logic is identical: 7. ..., Qf1 8. Ba3. Draw.


"Unquestionably highly interesting. There is, though, the 1951 study by the Finn V. Kivi: wKf5, wBd3, wSe8; bKh5, bPa3, f3 - 1. Kf4 a2 2. Sg7 + Kh4 3. Sf5 + Kh3 4. Bf1 + Kh2 5. Sd4 a1Q 6. Sxf3 + Kh1 7. Bh3 with positional draw. Gurgenidze has found a witty loss of tempo due to the existence of a reciprocal zugzwang to refresh the older colours."

No. 4825: D. Gurgenidze

1 Hon.Men., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1980

Qg4 7. Be2 Qh3 8. Bf1 Qf5 9. Bd3 Se5 + 10. Ke7 Sg6 + 11. Kf7 (Kd77
Sh8 +; ) 11. ..., Qd5 12. Be4 Qc4 13. 
Bd3 Qa2 14. Bb1 Qb3 15. Bc2 Qc4
Qg4 19. Be2, positional draw.
The broad intention os boldly execu-
ted, and inventively, but at a price --
for instance bBh8 us dead. Consider
N. Kralin (1978): wKe8 wBf6 wSe4
wPc5, c6, e6, f5 bKc7 bQe3 bBb1 - 1.
Be5 + Kxe6 2. c7 Qxe4 3. Kd7 Qh4 4.
Bf3 Qg5 5. Bf6 6. Be5 Qh7 7.

No. 4826: Kh. Mamataliev

1. h7 Rh5+ 2. Kxh5 fg+ 3. Kh4/i 
Rh8 (g5 +; Kh5) 4. Se5 de 5. Sxg5 
Kf7 6. Sxf8 g5 + 7. Kg5 Kg7 8. Kg4 e5 +
Operating zugzwang against Bl. 11.
..., Kh8 12. Kf7 13. Kg6 14. Kh6 and
15. Kg6 mate.
Rh8 6. Kxh8 Kf8, and a draw only.
ii) 9. Kxe5 e6 and zugzwang opera-
tes against W.
Comparing this with Troitzky (116 in 
TTC) Koralov points out that the
tempo play is similar, but with the
mate being by wS in the Mamataliev
and by wB in the Troitzky. He also 
oberves that the recent study has a
romantic setting, the older one a 
classical.

No. 4827: L. Silaev

Bb3 + Kd6 7. Kg3 mate.
i) 1. Ba3? c6 2. Sc5 + Kc3 3. Sxa4 +
Kh3 draws. 1. Bf2 intends Sc5 + and 
Sa6.
ii) 2. ..., Kb4 3. Bxb5 Kxb5 4. Sd7 
wins.
iii) With wBf2 (only) the move... Ba7 
can be met by Sd3 or Se4.

No. 4828: N. Kralin

Kf3 Bh7 5. Kg4 e4 6. Kg5 Kg7 7. Kg4 
f8Q + Kxe6 14. Qxe8 +.
ii) 1. e7? Kd7 2. f6 Bg6.
"A study with a troubled history,
twice corrected by the composer and 
finally given a corrected form in this 
final inverted form (?)"
No. 4829: V. Nikitin.
iii) 5. ..., bc 6. a6 d3 7. a7 d2 8. a8Q +.
"Yet another example of a clever and successful expression of reciprocal zugzwang."

1. g8Q h1Q 2. Qg3 h5 3. Kb3 c4 + 4. Kc3 (x.79) (Kxc4? Qh4+;) 4. ..., h4 5. Qf3/i Qh2 6. Qd1 + Kf2 7. Sg4 + Kg3 8. Qd6 + and 9. Qxh2.
"O+S vs. Q, with avoidance of 2 concealed stalemates."

No. 4831: N. Rezrov.
ii) 5. ..., Qxg6 + 6. Bf6 + Kh7 7. Rh8 mate.
iii) 9. ..., Qb1 + is met effectively by 10. Ke6.
"With cut-and-thrust sacrifices and a bold relationship of W and Bl force."
No. 4832: S. Belokon.

No. 4833: L. Katsnelson.
1. g7 Rg8 2. Rxh3 Bf8 3. Bb8 (for Rh8) Bc3 4. Rxb8+ (Rxg7; Rc8 mate) 5. Rh3 Kd8 6. b6 and now there really is no defence against wRh8.
   i) 2. ..., 0-0-0 3. Rc3 is mate. Now, however, castling is a threat, and 3. Bc7? is met by 3. ..., Be3.
   "The normal way to prevent castling is to give check or to control the intervening square. Here, however, it is bR that is impeded. A fresh thought, works on us very well, and excellently executed."

No. 4834: L. Averbakh.
   "A nice discovery with 2 symmetrical echo-variations".
This special prize was for an "ultra-miniature", that is, one with 4 men.

No. 4835: V. Razumenko.
1. 0-0/i Rg2+ 2. Kh1 0-0 3. Rc7+ Kb8 4. Rbl+ Ka8 5. Ra1+ Kb8 6. Bc5 Re2 7. Rxc4+ Rxe5 8. Rbl+ with mate to follow.
   i) 1. Re7+? Kd8 2. 0-0 Rg2+ 3. Kh1 Sg6. After 1. 0-0 Sf3+ is to be met by 2. Rxf3 Rh8 3. fRh7, with a decisive attack.
"W castles short and Bl castles long, presented with unity and economy".

This special prize was for an example of double castling.

The composer's article in which this study appeared as an original proposed a classification of castling studies based on the presence or absence of castling in the solution. If castling occurs, then naturally there are three possibilities: W castles, Bl castles, both castle; if castling does not occur, there are two possibilities: prevention in the course of the solution; demonstration of illegality by retrograde analysis. As the author's examples show, this classification is no restriction on ingenuity in devising reasons for castling -- indeed, his article led to the 10th Thematic Tourney of the magazine.

No. 4836: M. Matous (Czechoslovakia).
1. Rh5 Rd3 + 2. Ke2 Rxd8 3. cdR Bg4 + 4. Ke1 and a separation into: 4. ..., Bb4 + 5. Rd2 Bxh5/i, stalemate, or 4. ..., Bxd8/ii 5. Rg5 Bxg5, also stalemate.
   i) 5. ..., Bxd2 4. Kxd2 Bxh5 7. Kc1, with the safety of a1 in view.
   ii) 4. ..., Bxh5 5. Rg8 + Kh2 6. Rh8. "Promotion results in 2 stalemates, one of them with pin of the new wR."

This special prize was for "a foreign newcomer".

No. 4837: M. Zinar.
1. Kc3 h3 2. Kb2 Kb4/i 3. c3 + Kc5
   i) 2. ..., h2 3. Ka3 and 4. b4, the first mate.
   ii) 4. ..., h2 5. Kd3 and 6 b4, the second.
   iv) 6. ..., h2 7. Kd3 h1Q 8. b4 + Kd5 9. c4, the third checkmate.

The judge draws attention to the T.R. Dawson (1923) precedent: wKa1 wPa4, b3, b5, c2, e4, e5, f3 bKa5 bPb6, b7, e6, f7, g3, g7. 1. Kb2 Kb4 2, c3 + Kc5 3. Kc2 f6 4. Kd3 fe4 5. Ke2, but points out that Dawson gives us one fewer stalemate, and lacks something of the paradoxical 'reculer pour mieux sauter'!

No. 4838 Kh. Mamatattev (x.80)
2nd Special Commend., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1980
No. 4837 M. Zinar
1st Special Commend., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1980

Win

Win

No. 4838 Kh. Mamatattev
2nd Special Commend., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1980
No. 4838: Kh. Mamatiliev.


"This addition to variations on the Saavedra theme is highly expressive, with 3 sacrifices one after the other."

No. 4839: P. Benko.

i) 1. Kf7? Re1 2. Be6 Rf1 + 3. Kg8 Rg1 + 4. Kh8 Rg7 5. e8R/ii Rf7, an incredible move, threatening 6. ..., Rf4 to eliminate the hP and depending on 6. Bxf7 being stalemate -- which it is.


iii) 5. e8Q Rh7 + 6. Kg8 Rh8 + (also 6. ..., Rg7 + 7. Kf8 Rg8 +).


No. 4840: J. Rusinek.


No. 4841: V. Nestorescu.

i) 2. Ra4? b6 3. f5 Rh8 4. Bb3 + Kxf6 5. Bg8 Kxf5.

ii) 2. ..., b6 3. Rg5 Rh8 4. Bb3 + Kxf6 5. Bg8.

No. 4841: V. Nestorescu.

i) 2. Ra4? b6 3. f5 Rh8 4. Bb3 + Kxf6 5. Bg8 Kxf5.

ii) 2. ..., b6 3. Rg5 Rh8 4. Bb3 + Kxf6 5. Bg8.
No. 4842: Y. Makletsov.
1. g7 Ra8 + 2. e8Q Rxe8 + 3. g8S + Kg5 4. Kg7 Sf5 + 5. Kf7 (Kh8? Re1;)
5. ..., Sd6 + 6. Kg7 Ra8 (Sf5 +; gives perpetual) 7. h8Q Ra7 + 8. Se7
Rxe7 + 9. Kf8 Re8 + 10. Kg7 Sf5 +
Kg7 + 11. Kh7 Re7 + 12. Kg8 Kg6 13. Kf8
draw, bR having had his chance, in his turn, of giving perpetual.

No. 4843: Em. Dobrescu.
1. Bb7 + Kf7 2. Rf8 + Ke7 3. Re8 +
Bg7 Rxg7 7. Rx3 Bd2/ii 8. Rd2/iii
Rf4 + Kc5 12. Rf5 + Kd6 13. Rd5 +
Rd3 + Kc5 17. Rd5 + Kb4 18. Rf5,
positiona draw.
Rd8 + Rd7 + 7. Kg8 Rxd8 + and 8.
..., c6 wins.

No. 4844: Z. Fekete.
1. e6 Re2 2. e7 a4 3. Bh4/i Re3 +/ii
4. Kc4 a3 5. Kd5 (Kc5? Rxe7; 5. ...,
7. ..., Rd2 + 8. Ke6 (Ke8? Rf2; 8.
ii) 3. ..., a3 4. Rxg2 Rxe7 5. Rf2 +.

No. 4845: G.A. Nadareishvili.
1. Be4/i Bxe4 2. 0-0 + Kd2 3. Rf8
Rh7 4. Rf7 Rh6 5. Rd6 Bg6 6. Kh1
Be4 + (Rg6 stalemate) 7. Kg1 Rh8 9.
Rf8.
i) The thematic try 1. 0-0 + fails to
1. ..., Kxc2 2. Rf8 Rh7 wins.
No. 4846: J. Lamoss.
1. Sd8 Qxd8 2. Bf2+ Kg5 3. Bh4+ Kxh4 4. Sd4 and if 4. ... Kg5 (to defend against the threatened mate) 5. Se6+ wins.

No. 4847: G. Costeff.


No. 4848: E. Janosi.


No. 4849: L. Katsnelson and L.A. Mitrofanov.

No. 4850: Cs. Meleghegyi.

Win

No. 4851: A. Bor and L.A. Mitrofanov.

Win

No. 4852: J. Mikitovics.

Win

No. 4853: D. Gurgenidze.

Win
No. 4854: Salai. (Father and Son - is this unique?)


No. 4855: O. Komai.


No. 4856: S. Makhno and V. Shanshin.


i) 1. ..., g1 Q 2. Bd4 + Kxd4 3. Se2 +.


No. 4857: L. Katsnelson.


No. 4858: Y. Akobiya.


No. 4858: Y. Akohya.  
Commended, Magyar Sakkelet, 1981

No. 4860: M. Dukic.  

No. 4859: C.M. Bent.  
Commended, Magyar Sakkelet, 1981

No. 4861: V. Kichigin.  
1. a6 b2 2. a7 B+ 3. Kc7 Qh1/i 4. c6 Qh2+ 5. Kc8 Qh3+ 6. Kb7 wins.

No. 4859: C.M. Bent.  


No. 4860: M. Dukic.  
Commended, Magyar Sakkelet, 1981

No. 4862: E. Melnichenko.  

For No. 4863, see p. 184.
No. 4864: A. Koranyi.


v) 7. ..., Bf2 8. a4 Be3 9. Sc5.

vi) 8. Sc1? Bg7 9. a4 Bb5 10. Sb3 (Se2, a5) Bf6 11. Sc5 Bb7.


No. 4865: A. Koranyi.


No. 4866: V. Nesterescu.

No. 4866: V. Nestorescu
3rd Prize, J. Ban Memorial Tourney, 1980

Win 4 + 4


No. 4868: A. Koranyi
5th Prize, J. Ban Memorial Tourney, 1980

Draw 6 + 5

No. 4867: E. Janosi
4th Prize, J. Ban Memorial Tourney, 1980

Draw 3 + 8

No. 4869: L. Katsnelson
6th Prize, J. Ban Memorial Tourney, 1980

Win 3 + 3

No. 4868: A. Koranyi.
ii) 3. ..., Bc8 + 4. gSf5 Bxf5 + 5. Sxf5 e1Q 6. Rg7 + Kh6 7. Se7.
iii) 4. Rxg3? e1Q 5. Kg7 + Kxh6 6. Sf5 + Kh5 7. Sg3 + draws, but Bl wins by playing instead 4. ..., Be8 + 5. Sxc8 e1Q.
iiv) 5. ..., e1Q 6. Sg8 + Kh5 7. Sf6 +.
iv) 7. ..., e1Q stalemate. 7. ..., e1R 8. Rxe3 Rg1 9. Re6 +.

No. 4867: E. Janosi.
i) 1. f8S + Bxf8 2. Qc2 b1Q 3. Kd5 + Qxc2 stalemate, but 2. ..., b1B wins.

No. 4869: L. Katsnelson.

No. 4870: D. Gurgenidze.
   i) 3. ..., Rxa6 4. Rg6 Ra5 5. Rg5 Ra7 6. Rg7 Ra8 7. Rg8, positional draw.

No. 4871: Em. Dobrescu.

No. 4872: I. Bilek.
There is only one square on the board where wK can stand and lose, with the move: a1.

No. 4873: Cs. Meleghegyi.
No. 4873: Cs. Meleghegyi.

No. 4874: F. Moreno Ramos.

No. 4875: E. Paoli.
1. d5 cd 2. c5 a4 3. c6 a3 4. c7 a2 5. c8Q a1Q 6. Qe6+ Kxh5 7. Sg3+ hg 8. Qh3+ Kg6 9. Qh7+ Kf6 10. Qg7+ wins.

No. 4876: R. Richter (East Germany)
The 60 entries were judged by Gia Nadareishvili of Tbilisi (USSR), who remarks that the standard was satisfactory. "Tungsram" is the United Incandescent Lamp and Electrical Company, who shared the sponsorship with the Hungarian Chess Federation. The 4 prize-winners were published in Magyar Sakkelet (v.81), but the complete award (including 3 non-studies sections) appeared in a smart brochure, in English but undated, received by AJR in vi.82.

Draw

Win 5 + 5

The 60 entries were judged by Gia Nadareishvili of Tbilisi (USSR), who remarks that the standard was satisfactory. "Tungsram" is the United Incandescent Lamp and Electrical Company, who shared the sponsorship with the Hungarian Chess Federation. The 4 prize-winners were published in Magyar Sakkelet (v.81), but the complete award (including 3 non-studies sections) appeared in a smart brochure, in English but undated, received by AJR in vi.82.


i) As 1. ..., Bf3 is now to be met by 2. Bg4, B1 must activate bB1.


vii) There is a trap to avoid: 7. Be6? Bxd1 8. Sxd1 Be5 9. Bxe5 is stalemate.

No. 4877: A. Botokanov. The most logical move seems to be 1. Kxf2?, but then follows 1. ..., Rh2 2. Kg1 Rf6 3. Ke1 d2 + 4. Kd1 Rb6 with a win for B1. Neither does 1. S5g4 suffice, because of 1. ..., Kg1 2. Kf3 Rh3 +. After the actual keymove 1. Sf3, there are two lines:

ii) 6. ..., e4 7. Rxd3 ed is stalemate.
iii) 7. ...., Kg3 8. Rh8 Rh3 9. Rg8 Rh7 10. Kg2 Kh3 11. Kg3 +...
"The study shows the struggle, in two variations, of wR vs. bRPP, with stalemates that are unusual with this force. In addition, there is practical value for over-the-board play".

"The repeated sacrifices and wR's perpetual check made an agreeable impression."

No. 4879: A. Koranyi. The introduction is clear, given that the P-endgame is hopeless for W after 1. Kxg3? Kg2 2. e7 e2 3. eQ e1Q +. Therefore: 1. e7 g2 2. e8Q g1Q. At this point tempting is 3. Qb5 +? Kf2 4. Qb2 e2 5. Qd4 + Kf1 6. Qa1 + e1Q 7. Qa6 + Qe2 8. Qa1 + Kg2 9. Qg7 + Kh1 10. Qb7 + eQg2 and will win. The situation is quite different after the right continuation: 3. Qh5 + Ke1 4. Qa5 + Kf2 5. Qa2 + e2 6. Qxa7 + Kf1 7. Qa1 +
e1Q 8. Qa6 + Kf2. If 8. ..., Kg2 9. Qc6 + Kh3 10. Qd7 +. In the try shown at move 3 Bl had the defence 8. ..., Qf2; but now the disappearance of bPa7 makes 9. Qa1 + Kg2 10. Qa8 + possible. 9. Qa2 + Qe2 10. Qa7 + Kf1 11. Qa1 + Kg2 12. Qa8 + Kh3 13. Qh8 + draws.

"The successful defence of wQ vs. bQQ has some theoretical importance".

Note by AJR: Michael Clarke, lecturer in computing science at Queen Mary College, London, told me in 1981 that he had solved the general Q ending Q vs. QQ with the aid of a computer. *C*

No. 4880: A. Zinchuk

W must prevent bPg5 from promoting, as we shall see.

ii) Bad is 3. Kg6? g3 4. f6 g2 5. f7 g1Q + 6. Kh7 Qc5 7. Kg8 Qg5 + 8. Kh7 Qd8 9. Kg7 Sc5 10. f8Q Se6 + .

iii) 9. ..., g1Q 10. f8Q Sxf8 stalemate.

"wK has proved himself to be no less powerful than bS and bP."

No. 4881: R. Richter


"2 variations lead to the same mate."

No. 4882: M.R. Vukcevich (USA).

A phenomenal composing and solving talent who can clearly turn his hand to studies when he so wishes. Dr. Vukcevich won the special prize in this tourney for the composer scoring most points for entries honoured in more than one section.

i) 1. Rg3 + Kf5 2. Rg5 + Kxf4 3. Rg4 + Kf3 4. Rg3 + Ke2 wins.
ii) Or if 1. ..., Kg5 2. f4 +.
iii) 4. ..., Kg4 5. f3 + Kg3 6. f4.
"When the checks ran out a battery came to the rescue."

"Old stalemates in new dress."

v) 1. ..., Kh2 + 2. Kxh7 Sf6 + 3. Kh8 Sd7 4. f8Q Rh1 stalemate.
"Very good key-move."

No. 4883: A.V. Melnikov.
i) 1. ..., Kh2 + 2. Kxh7 Sf6 + 3. Kh8 Sd7 4. f8Q Sxh1 stalemate.
ii) But not 2. Kh8? because of 2. ..., Se7.
iii) Again not 3. Kh8? Kg5 4. f8Q Rh1 + 5. Kg7 Rh7 mate.
"Old stalemates in new dress."

No. 4884: V. Yevreimov.
ii) 1. Bf1? Kg1 2. Bxh3 Kh2 3. Bf1 Kg1, drawn.
iii) 11. Kxe3? Kg1 12. c8Q h1Q stalemate.
"As with every P-ending, exact calculation is required."

No. 4885: A. Zinchuk.
i) 1. Kg2 + Kc5 2. Ke6 Kd6 or 2. g7 Rb8. No win.
"Very good key-move."

No. 4886: A. Koranyi.
i) Bad is 3. Ke3? Kh2 4. Ra1 Kg2 5. e5 Kg3 6. Rg1+ Kh4 7. Rf1 Kg5, after which bK captures wPe5, returns to g2, and finally advances eP. "A witty saving combination."

No. 4887: F.M. Ramos (Spain).
   i) 1. ..., Rg3 2. Rg1 Kxa7 3. b6 + and 4. h6 wins.
   iii) 4. Rcl? Rc3 5. Rhl Rcl drawn.
   v) 6. Ra4? or to other a-file squares, then 6. ..., Ra1 draws.
   vi) 7. ..., R7 8. h7 Rhxh7 9. Kxb6 wins.
"Stalemate avoidance with forcible decoy of bR."

No. 4888: Emil Melnichenko (our New Zealand friend).
"Mating attack with limited force."

No. 4889: E.L. Pogosyants.
   i) 4. ..., Kg8 5. Sf7 + Kh8 6. Rg8 + Kh7 7. Rg7 +
   ii) But on no account. 8. Kxh5? Kh7 and W is in zugzwang.
"A quite unusual positional draw."

No. 4890: N.D. Manarlisnky.
   i) 4. ..., Kg8 5. Sc7 + Kh8 6. Rg8 + Kh7 7. Rg7 +
No. 4890: N.D. Mansarlinsky.
i) 1. b7? Sxd6 2. b8Q d1Q.
ii) 2. ..., Sa7 (b6) 3. b8Q+ and 4. QxS.
iii) 5. Qh8+? Kxe4 6. Qh7 (h4)+ Kd5 wins.
iv) 7. Qb2+? Kf4 8. Qb8 Qe2+ wins.
"Interesting perpetual attack against 2 Bl pieces."

No. 4891: V. Pachman.
Judge: J. Fritz. There were 48 originals in this informal tourney. 12 were unsound, and 1 anticipated.
1. Ra3 Sc4 2. Ra1 Sc3 + 3. Kcl h2 4. Bf2+ Kf8 5. Bg3 + Kb7 6. Bxh2, and, compared with the thematic try in (i), it is now Bl to move - and W wins.
If 4. Be3 +? Kb7 5. Ra7 + Kc6 6. Rh7 Ss3.

No. 4892: D. Gurgenidze.
1. Rd3 + Ke4 2. Re3 + Kf4 3. Rf3 +

No. 4893: Viktor Novikov.
i) 2. ..., Kc6 3. dRd3 d1Q + 4. Rxdl and the possibility 5. bRb1 draws.

No. 4894: J. Rusinek
1st Hon. Men., Sachove Umeni, 1980
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No. 4894: J. Rusinek.

No. 4895: Mario Matous.
The judge draws attention to the 2 quiet moves. 6. Qd5 and 7. Qd7.

No. 4896: V. Bron.

No. 4897: Jaroslav Polasek.

No. 4898: Emil Vlasak.

No. 4899: V. Pachman.
No. 4900: Jan H. Marwitz.

F. Spinshoven, Schakend Nederland's studies columnist, and Pauli Perkonoina of Finland, were the judges. Enormous labour went into the remarkable award, which laid out in detail anticipations and analytical flaws in practically all the rejected studies. 13 having been eliminated, this left 41 for consideration, and the award in fact contains 15. Readers can judge for themselves the quality, not only of the winners, but of the solution presentation, which naturally we have not changed, only translated (or tried to!) and EG-ified.

1. ...,


D: 7. ..., Sf5 8. Se6 + Kc8 9. Re7 + Kb8 10. Sd7 + Ka8 11. Sd5. Threatens Sb6 + and Rb7 mate. 11. ..., Se3 +. 12. Kf3 Sd5 13. Rc8 + Ka7 14. Rxe6 wins. Br is tied to a-file, and if b5 moves it is mate in 3, so all W has to do is deflect b5 with wK. For instance 14. ..., Ra2(a3 +) 15. Ke4. Although 14. ..., Ra5 15. Ke4? is bad because of 15. ..., Sc3 + and 16. ..., Sa4, nevertheless wK can approach b5 by the longer g4-g5-h6-g7-f7-e6 route. (Harrving br on a-file fails because of ..., Sb4 +; tactics: AJR)

"A study with rich content and a surprise mid-board checkmate in Variation A."

No. 4901: G. Rol.

Be6 + Rb7 3. f4 Bc8. Now Se6 is threatened. 4. f5 Bxf5. Otherwise f6 follows. 5. e6 Bxe6 6. Ke7 and now A, B.


9. ...,


10. ...,

Bd7

11. Bg2 (f3, e4, d5) Be6

12. Bc6 Bd7

13. Kh7 Bf5

14. Kxg7

Bxg6

15. Kf6 Bd7 16. Kxg7 Kd6 and bK takes wPc3. (See judge's comment below).


7. Kxf8? Bxc6 8. c8Q+ Rb8. 7. ...,

Bf5.


"An artistic study with 4 brilliant positional draws."
No. 4863: A. Melnikov.
1. c6 Se5 2. c7 Sf7 + 3. Kf6(f5) Sd6
Kg7 Se8 + 8. Kf6 Sd6 9. Ke5 Se8

No. 4864a: A. Koranyi
1. Qc4/i c1Q + ii 2. Qxcl Kg2 3.
Qc6+ Kg1 4. Qh1 + /iii Kh1 5. Kf1
Bh5/vii 8. Sb3 Bf6/viii and the
remainder as in No. 4864 after 7. ...
Bf6.
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