IGM John Nunn offers...
A few analytical notes...
EG63.4172 (Mitrofanov). After 1. Sc7 a3 2. Se6 + Kh4 3. Kh2 a2 4. Sd4 Kg 5 W can win by $5 . \mathrm{Sb} 3$, as after 5. ..., Kf4 6. Kg2 g5. If 6. ..., Ke4 7. h4 Kd5 8. g5 Kc4 9. Sa1 Kc3 10. h5 wins after either 10. ..., Kb2 11. h6 Kxa1 12. h 7 followed by Q-exchange, or 10. ..., gh 11. g6 Kb2 12. g7 Kxal 13. g 8 Q and hP deprives Bl of his stalemate defence. To resume: after 6. ..., g 5 , as given in the solution, there is 7 . Sa1 and now: 7. ..., Ke4 8. Sc2 Kf4 9. Kf2 Ke4 10. Kg3 Ke5 11. Kf3, or 7. ..., Ke3 8. h4 gh 9. g5 h3 + 10. Kh1, or 7. ..., Ke5 8. Sc2 Kd6 9. h4 gh 10. g5 Kd5 (h3 +; Kxh3, Kd5; g6) 11. Kh3 Kc4 12. g6 Kc3 13. Sa1, and again hP leads to a Bl loss.
EG63.4180 (Kazantsev). After 1. c5 g6 + I cannot see W drawing, e.g., 2. Ke6 (Kf4 g5 + ;) 2. ..., g5 3. d4 (Kd7, g4; Kxc6, g3; Kd7, g2; c6 g1Q; c7 Qa7;) 3. ..., g4 4. d5 g3 5. d6 (dc, g2; c7, g1Q; Kd7, Qxc5;) 5. ..., ed 6. cd g2 7. d7 g1Q 8. d8Q Qe3 + 9. Kf5 (Kf7, Qxc3;) 9. ..., Qf3 + 10. Ke6 Qxc3, and W's checks run out when bK reaches Q -side, for example 11. $\mathrm{Qd} 1+\mathrm{Kh} 4$ 12. $\mathrm{Qh} 1+\mathrm{Kg} 3$ 13. $\mathrm{Qg} 1+$ Kf3 14. Qf1 + Ke3 15. Qh3 + Kd2.
EG65.4301 (Vandiest). Cooked by 5. $\mathrm{Qb} 8+\mathrm{Ke} 7$ 6. Sd5 + Ke6 7. Qc8 + .
EG66.4420 (I. Kovalenko). No solution after 1. Sc3 h1Q 2. Ra5 Qb7 3. b4 and now Qb5 (not the given 3. .. Qf7) 4. Sxb5 ab 5. Ra7 (Rxb5, g2; Rg7, h2; Rxg2, h1Q; wins) 5. ..., g2 6. Rd 7 g 1 R and Bl wins!

EG69.4642 (Vandiest). The position after 9 moves is so favourable for W
that he can win in a number of ways, for example 10. $\mathrm{Be} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 411$. Qxh6 Qh3 + 12. Ke2 Qh2 + 13. Kd3 $\mathrm{Qg} 3+(\mathrm{Qh} 3+$; Kd4) 14. Kc4 Qc7+ 15. Bc6 Qf7 +16 . Kc3 and wins, for instance 16. ..., Kf5 17. Qg6 + Qxg6 18. $\mathrm{Be} 4+$ and 19. hg.

EG70. 4693 (Hurme). No solution, since 1. Re3 h2 2. Rxel Be4 draws. EG71.4787 (Vandiest). Once again W has such a good position after 14 moves that he can win without too much trouble, for example 15. Qh6+ Kf7 (e8) (Ke7; Qg7+) 16. Bg6 + Ke7 17. Qg7 + Kd6 18. Qc7 + Ke6 19. Qd7 + Kf6 20. Qf7 + Kg5 21. Qf5 + Kh6 22. Qh5 + Kg7 23. Qh7 + Kf6 24. Be4, and now if bQ plays to h2, h3, g1, e1, c1 W plays Kd7, while on bQf1, d1, a1 W plays Kd8. In all cases Bl loses bQ or is mated.
EG71.4790 (Vandiest). Cooked by 1. a7 e2 2. a8Q e1Q 3. Qa6+ Kc5 4. Qc6+ Kb4 5. Qd6+ Kb5 6. Bc6+ Kc4 7. Qd5 + Kd3 8. Qf5 + Kd2 (Ke3 (e2); Qe4+) 9. Qc2 + Ke3 10. Qe4 + Ke 2 (else mate in 2) $11 . \mathrm{Qxd} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 2$ 12. Qe4+ Kd2 13. Qb4+ Ke2 14. Bb5 + Kd1 (Kf2; Qh4+) 15. Qa4+ Kd2 16. Qd4 mate.
EG71.4791 (Vandiest). The solution is rather confused since many of W's moves seem to be unnecessary. The most efficient method is 5 . Qd5(d6) + Ke3 6. Qe4(e5) + Kf2 (Kd2; Qd4+) 7. Qf4+ Ke2 8. Ba6+ Kdl 9. Qxg4+.

I apologise for being rather hard on Mr. Vandiest in the above, but Q+B vs. $Q$ endings are very hard to get right!


No. 5117: D. Godes (Ryazan). 1. Sg8 e6 2. Sxf6 +Kg 7 3. Sh5 +Kg 64. Sxf4+Kf5 5. Se2 Ke4 6. Kf2 e5 7. d5 Sxd5 8. Bbl mate.


No. 5118: V.S. Kovalenko (Primorski Krai, ie 'Maritime Province" in the Far East). 1. Sc7 + Kc6 2. Sxa6 Kb6 3. Bc5 + Kxa6 4. Bxg1 Be5 + 5. Ka8 Sd5 6. Bf2 Bh2 7. Bd4 Sc7 + 8. Kb8 $\mathrm{Sb} 5+$ 9. Ka8 Sxd4 stalemate. Eliminated.


No. 5119: G. Atayants (Karachaevsk). 1. a7 Ra1 2. g6 h3 3. Sa3 Rxa3 4. g7 h2 5. Kf7 Rf3 + 6. Kg8 Ra3 7. Kf7.


No. 5120: E. Asaba (Moscow). 1. Ka2 Rxh3 2. Bd6 Rh1 3. Kxb2 Rd1 4. Sc4 Bxd6 5. Kc2 Rd4 6. Kc3 Rd1 7. Kc2, or, diverging on move 2, 2. ..., Ra3 + 3. Kxb2 Ra6 4. Sc4 Bxd6 5. b5 or 2. ..., Rh6 3. Sf7 Rf6 4. Bxf4 Rxf4 5. Se5 Rxb4 6. Kb1.


No. 5121: A. Alekseyev (Voroshilovgrad Region). 1. Ra7 + Kg6 2. Rb6+ Kf5 3. Ra5 + Ke4 4. Rb4 + Bc4 5. Rxc4+ Kd3 6. Rh4 Rxh4 7. Ra3 + Kc4 8. Ra4 + .


No. 5122: L. Kapusta (Sumy). 1. Kc3 Bb5 2. g6 Be8 3. g7 Bf7 4. Kd4 Kg3 5. Ke5 Kg4 6. Kf6 Bg8 7. Kg6 Bb3 8. Sd7 Kh4 9. Se5 Bc2 + 10. Kf7 Kh5 11. Kg8 Bb1 12. Sf7 Bg6 13. Sd8 Bb1 14. Se6 Bf5 15. Sf4 + Kh6 16. Kh8 wins.


No. 5123: L. Katsnelson and L. Mitrofanov (both Leningrad). 1. $\mathrm{Kg} 6+\mathrm{Se} 6$ 2. Bxe6 + Kd8 3. a8Q + Qxa8 4. Qd6 + Ke8 5. Bd7 + Rxd7 6. Qe5 + Kd8 7. Qxh8 + .


No. 5124: Y. Makletsov (Yakut Autonomous Republic). 1. Rh4+ Kb 3 2. $\mathrm{Rh} 3+\mathrm{Kb} 2$ 3. $\mathrm{Rxg} 7 \mathrm{Bb} 8+4$. $\mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{a} 1 \mathrm{Q}+$ 5. $\mathrm{Rg} 1 \mathrm{Qa} 8+$ 6. $\mathrm{Rg} 2+$ Kb1 7. Rb3 + Kc1 8. Rc3 + Kd1 9. Rd3 + Ke1 10. Re3 + Kf1 11. Rf3 + Qxf3 stalemate. Eliminated.


No. 5125: L. Mitrofanov. 1. Rg4 Ke3 2. Rxg2 f3 3. Rg8 f2 4. Sf6 f1Q 5. $\mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 4$ 6. $\mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Kd} 5$ 7. $\mathrm{Se} 3+$.


No. 5126: I. and L. Melnichenko (Chernigov Region). 1. Se7 Kb2 2. Sxc6 a3 3. Sa5 a2 4. Sb3 Kc2 5. Sa1 + $\mathrm{Kb} 16 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{c} 4+7$. Kd2. Eliminated.


No. 5127: E. Kudelich (Chernovits Region). 1. g4 Sel 2. Ra2 Rc3+ 3 . $\mathrm{Sg} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 1$ 4. c8Q Bxc8 5. $\mathrm{Rg} 2+$ Sxg2 stalemate.


No. 5128: V.N. Dolgov (Krasnodarsky Krai). 1. Bf6 Sf7 + 2. Kg7 Sd6 3. Be5 Sf5 + 4. Kf6 Se3 5. Bd4 Sd5 + 6. Ke5 Sb4 7. Bc3 Sc6 + 8. Kd5 Sb4 + 9. Kc4. Eliminated.


No. 5129: A. Zinchuk (Kiev). There were 31 studies by 22 composers for judge F.S. Bondarenko. 1. Sd3 + Kb5 2. $\mathrm{Rg} 5+\mathrm{Ka4}$ 3. $\mathrm{Sc} 5+\mathrm{Kb4} 4$. Sb 3 Kxb 3 5. Ra5 Kb2 6. Rb5 +Kc 3 7. $\mathrm{Rc} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 2$ 8. $\mathrm{Rc} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 3$ 9. Rc1 Kb2. "'A position of Salvio, 1604." 10. Ral Kxal 11. Kc2 g5 12. hg h4 13. g6 h3 14. g7 h2 15.g8Q h1Q 16. Qg7 mate.


No. 5130: D. Gurgenidze (Georgian $\mathrm{SSR})$. 1. $\mathrm{b} 8 \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Rh} 3+2 . \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Rg} 3+3$. Kf1 Rf3 + 4. Kel Re3 + 5. Kd1 Rd3 + 6. Kc1 Rc3 + 7. Kb1 aRc2 8. Qb3 + Rxb3 9. Kxc2.


No. 5131: A. Manyakhin (Lipetsk). 1. Sb4 Be4 2. Sf7 h3 3. Sg5 h2 4. Sxe4 h1Q 5. Sd2 + Ka1 6. Sb3 + Kb1 7. Sd2 + Kc1 8. Sd3 + Kd1 9. Sf2 + , or, diverging on move 1,1 . ..., Bb 5 2. Sf7 h3 3. Sd6 h2 4. Sxb5 h1Q 5. $\mathrm{Sa} 3+\mathrm{Ka1}$ 6. aSc2 +Kb 1 7. $\mathrm{Sa} 3+$ Kcl 8. Sd3 + Kd1 9. Sf2 + .


No. 5132: N. Kralin (Moscow). 1. $\mathrm{Qe} 1+\mathrm{blQ}$ 2. Bg7 Bh6 3. Bf6 (Bh8? b1Q;) 3. ..., Bg7 4. Bxg7 g1Q 5. $\mathrm{Kc} 4+\mathrm{Qxg} 7$ 6. Qe5 + Qb2 7. Qe1 + Qb1 8. Qe5 + Qxe5 stalemate.


No. 5133: N. Kralin. 1. Kb7? Rxc5 2. Rg8 Ke7, so 1. Rg8 Kc7 + 2. Rxf8 Rf1 3. Rc8 + Kxc8 4. f8Q + Rxf8 5. g7 Re8 6. g8R (g8Q? Sc7+;) 6. ..., Rxg8 7. Bxg8 Kc7 8. Bd5.


No. 5134: A.G. Kopnin (Chelyabinsk). 1. Sc3 Ka6 2. Rh7 and now 2. $\ldots, \mathrm{Kb} 7$ 3. Sd5 wins, or 2. ..., Sg8 3. Sd5 also wins, as does 2. ..., Sg6 3. Rh6 Se7 4. Sd5, but 2. ..., Sf5 is not so simple. Any offers of analysis? (AJR).


No. 5135: P. Sisolyatin. 1. Kel h3 2. $\mathrm{Rg} 5+$ is all that my handwritten source gave. Again, any offers of a full solution? (AJR).


No. 5136: J. Fritz (Prague). Judge: Jaroslav Polasek (Prague), who had 40 originals on his plate. 1. Bd7 Rxh4 + 2. Ke5/i Sf5/ii 3. Rd3/iii Sg7 4. Bxe6 Rh5 + 5. Kf6 Rh6 + 6. Kf7 Sxe6 7. Re3 Sc7 8. Rg3/iv Se6 (B-; $\operatorname{Rg} 7+)$ 9. Re3, with draw by repetition.
i) 2. Kf3? Rh3 + 3. K- Rxe3 4. Kxe3 e5. 2. Kd3? Sf5 3. Rxe6 Rd4 + .
ii) 2. ..., Rh6 3. Bxe6 $\mathrm{Sg} 6+$ 4. Kt5 $\mathrm{Rh} 5+5 . \mathrm{Kf} 6 \mathrm{Bg} 7+6 . \mathrm{Kf} 7 \mathrm{Sh} 8+7$. Ke 7 .
iii) 3. Rb 3 ? $\mathrm{Bg} 7+4$. Kxe6 Sd4 + . iv) 8. $\mathrm{Kxf} 8 \mathrm{Rf} 6+9 . \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Sd} 5+$.


No. 5137: Ladislav Salai, Junior (Martin). 1. Kg3/i Qa4+/ii 2. Kg4 $\mathrm{Qb} 4+$ 3. Kh5 Qa4 4. Kg5 Ka7 5. Qc5 + Ka8 6. Qf8 + Ka7 7. Qf2 + Ka8 8. Qc5 wins.
i) 1. Bb 6 ? $\mathrm{Qa} 3+$ 2. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Qb}+$ and wins wB.
ii) 1. ..., Ka 7 2. $\mathrm{Qc} 5+\mathrm{Ka8}$ 3. Qc3 Ka7 (b6; Qh8 +) 4. Qe3 + Ka8 5. Bb6 and wins, for instance 5. ..., Kb8 6. $\mathrm{Qe} 5+\mathrm{Ka8}$ 7. Qh8 +, for instance 5. ..., Kb8 6. Qe5 + Ka8 7. Qh8 + , or 5. $\ldots$, Qc6 6. Qa3 + Kb8 7. Qf8 + Qc8 8. Qd6 +Ka 8 9. $\mathrm{Qa} 3+\mathrm{Kb} 8$ 10. Qa7 + .


No. 5138: The late Alexander P. Kuznetsov (Moscow). 1. Rf5 + Kxf5 2. Kg7 Re8 3. Kf7 Rxe6/i 4. g4+ Ke5 5. g5 Kd5 6. c4+ Ke5 7. g4, or, a 'main line' alternative, 5. ..., Kf5 6. $\mathrm{g} 4+\mathrm{Ke5} 7 . \mathrm{c} 4$.
i) 3. ..., Rh8 4. g4 + Kg5 5. e7 Rh7 + 6. Kf8 Kf6 7. g5 + .


No. 5139; A.V. Sarychev (Baku, Azerbaidjan SSR). 1. e5 Re6 2. Bxc6 Sf 7 3. Bg 2 Rxe 5 4. $\mathrm{Kg} 6 \mathrm{Sh} 8+5 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ Rxa5 6. Be4 Re5 7. Bh7 Re8 8. Bg8 Sg6 9. Bf7, or, echoing, 6. ..., Rh7 7. Bh7 Sf7 8. Bg6.

This echoed idea has an ancestry, including S. Isenegger (Switzerland). For the 2 Hon.Men. study see K5 in the article by A.G. Kopnin.

No. 5140: IGM Jan Timman (Netherlands). The study is extracted from p. 151 of the excellent book Analyses en Studies, 1983 by the composer.


1. Rc5 Ba7 2. Bxb7 + Kg4. Stronger than 2. ..., Rf5 3. Bd5 Rf4+ Ke5. 3. Ba6 And not 3. Bc8 + ? Kg3 4. Be6 Rh2 and wins. Now if 3. ..., Rb2 4. Bc 4 , or if 3. ..., Ra2 4. Bb5. Now there are two subtle lines:
2. ..., Rf4 + 4. Kd5 Rf5 + 5. Kc6 Rxc5 + . Or 5. ..., Bxc5 6. Bc8. 6. Kb7 and $b B$ is lost. 3. ..., Kg3. Threatening Rf4 + and Rf5 + . 4. Bd3 Rf3 5. Bg6. W's moves 4 and 5 are unique for drawing purposes. Now 5. ..., Rf6 is met by 6 . Ke5.


No. 5141: Ludek Sedlak (Rostok, Prague). 1. a7 Sc2/i 2. Bxc2 Rf1 3. a8Q/ii Ral + 4. Kb5 Rxa8 5. b7 + Kxb7 6. Bxe4 $+\mathrm{Ka7} 7$. Bc6 stalemate, or 6. ..., c6+7. Bxc6 $+\mathrm{Ka7} 8$. Bxa8 Kxa8 9. Kc6 Be5 10. Kd7 Bxf6 11. Ke8 draw.
i) 1. ..., Bxa7 2. ba Kb7 3. Bxe4+. ii) 3. $a b Q+$ ? $K x b 8$ 4. $b c+K x c 75$. Bxe4 Rf4.


No. 5142: Y.M. Makletsov. 1. $\mathrm{Se} 8+/ \mathrm{i} \quad \mathrm{Kf7} / \mathrm{ii} 2 . \mathrm{Sd} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 7 / \mathrm{iii} 3$. Rd7+/iv Kb8 4. Kh6/v g1Q 5. $\mathrm{Rd} 8+\mathrm{Qg} 8$ 6. Sf 7 mate.
i) 1. $\mathrm{Se} 6+$ ? Kf 7 2. $\mathrm{Rf} 8+\mathrm{Ke7}$. 1. Rd7 + ? Kh8 and 2. Rd8 +Kh 7 , or 2. Kh6 g1Q.
ii) 1. ..., Kf8 2. Kf6 Kg8 3. Sd6 + and 4. Sf7 with 5. Rh8 mate.

1. ..., Kg8 2. Sd6 + transposes.
iii) 2. ..., Ke7 3. Re8 + and 4. Re1.
iv) 3. $\mathrm{Sf} 5+$ ? Kh 7 4. $\mathrm{Rd} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 85$. Kh6 g1Q, but not 3. ..., Kf7? 4. Rd7 + Kf8 5. Kf6.
v) 4. $\mathrm{Sf} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 8$ 5. Sh6 +Kh 8 6. Kf6 g1Q and now 7. Rd8 +Kh 7 is given, but 7. Sf7 + mates in 3 -- a major dual amounting to a cook.

No. 5143: Jaromir Urban and Miroslav Krejci (Unhost, Brno). 1. Sc3/i Be5 (clQ+; Sb1+) 2. Rd4/ii, and now 2. ..., Bxd4 is stalemate, and 2. $\ldots, \mathrm{clQ}+3 . \mathrm{Sb} 1+\mathrm{Kb} 3$ is also stalemate, so 2. ..., Bf6 3. Ra4+/iii Kb3 4. $\mathrm{Rb4}+\mathrm{Kxb4} 5 . \mathrm{Kb} 2$.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Rb} 8+? \mathrm{clQ}+2 . \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Qxd} 2.1$. Rc8? Be5 + .
ii) 2. Rab8 + ? Kb3 3. $\mathrm{Rb} 8+\mathrm{Bxb} 84$. $\mathrm{Se} 2 \mathrm{Be} 5+5$. d4 Bf6.
iii) 3. Rb4? c1Q + 4. Rb1 Bxc3 mate. 3. $\mathrm{Sb} 1+$ ? Kb 3 .


No. 5144: Emil Vlasak (Usti over Labem). 1. Rg1 (Sd2? b2;) 1. ..., $\mathrm{fgQ}+2 . \mathrm{Kxg} 1 \mathrm{~d} 2 / \mathrm{i} 3 . \operatorname{Sxd} 2 \mathrm{Sf} 3+4$. Kh1 Sxd2 5. Sxb3 Sxb3 6. Bh8 Kg8 7. Bxf6.
i) 2. ..., Sxf5 3. Sb3 Sxg7 4. h7.


No. 5145: D. Gurgenidze. The "Open Championship of Azerbaidjan" was an unusual event. Announced in 1979, it was for Soviet composers who were invited to enter with a combination of published work with unpublished work -- in the case of studies, 2 originals had to be offered. The points awarded were: 1st Place - D. Gurgenidze, with 36; 2nd, V.D. Israelov, 35; 3rd and 4th, S. Belokon and E.L. Pogosyants, 24; 5th, I. Garayazly, 20; 6th and 7th, G.N. Zakhodyakin and V. Samilo, 18; 8th, B.N. Sidorov, 17. The '"originals" are given here, but we do not know where they were "originally" published, if anywhere at all. 1. $\mathrm{Bd} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ 2. $\mathrm{Bxg} 8 \mathrm{Sf} 3+3 . \mathrm{Kg} 2$ Sh4 + 4. Kf2/i Kxg8 5. Kg3/ii Sf5 + 6. Kg2 Sh6 7. Rd1 Sf7 (Sc6; Rd6) 8. Rh1 Sh6 9. Rd1.
i) 4. Kg 3 ? Sf5 $+5 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rxg} 8$. ii) 5. Rd1? Sg6 6. Rd8 +Sf 8 .


No. 5146: D. Gurgenidze. 1. ..., $\mathrm{e} 1 \mathrm{Q}+2 . \mathrm{Kg} 2$ (Kh2? Qf2 + , and $\ldots$, clQ;) 2. ..., clQ 3. Qd4 + Kb7 (Ka6; $\mathrm{c} 8 \mathrm{Q}+, \mathrm{Qxc} 8$; Qb6 mate) 4. Qd5 + $\mathrm{Ka} 7 / \mathrm{i} 5 . \mathrm{Qa} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 7$ 6. Qb3 + Kc8 7. $\mathrm{Qb} 8+\mathrm{Kd} 7$ 8. $\mathrm{Qb} 5+\mathrm{Kc} 8$ (Kd6; Qd3 +) 9. Qa6 + Kd7 10. Qa4 + Kc8 (Kd6; Qd4 +) 11. Qa8 + Kd7 12. $\mathrm{c} 8 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Qxc} 8$ 13. Qd5 $+\mathrm{Ke8} 14$. $\mathrm{Qg} 8+$ (also, alas, $\mathrm{Qh} 5+$ ) 14. ..., Kd7 15. e8Q+ Qxe8 16. Qd5 mate. i) 4. ..., Ka6 5. Qa2 + Kb5 6. Qb3 + Ka6 7. c8Q + Qxc8 8. Qb6 mate.


No. 5147: V. Israelov. 1. $\mathrm{Bh} 7+/ \mathrm{i}$ Kxe3/ii 2. g8Q (gf? a2;) 2. ..., Rxg8 3. Bxg8 a2 4. Bc3 Sxc3 5. Bxa2 fg (Sxa2; gf) 6. Bc4 g2 7. Bf1 and a draw whatever piece promotes on g1. i) 1. Bxd5 + ? Kxd5 2. gf Ke6 3. Kd1 Kf7 4. Bc3 g2 5. K-Rb1.
ii) 1. ..., Kf3 2. g8Q Rxg8 3. Bxg8 Sxe3 4. gf. 1. ..., Ke5 2. gf + K- 3. g8Q.


No. 5148: V. Israelov. 1. Rc6 Rbl + (Sc7; Rxh6) 2. Kh2 Bb7 3. Rxe6 Rh1 + 4. Kg3 Rxh3 + 5. Kxh3 Bc8 6. $\mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Bxe} 6+7$. Kh 5 Kg 7 stalemate.


No. 5149: S. Belokon. 1. Ra4 Bg2 2. $\mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{~h} 1 \mathrm{Q} 3 . \mathrm{Bd} 4+\mathrm{Kh} 2$ 4. $\mathrm{Be} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 3$ 5. Ral/i Bf1 6. Ra2 Bg2 7. Ral Bfl 8. Ra2.
i) 5. $\mathrm{Ra} 3+$ ? Bf 3 6. Ra 1 Qg 2 .

No. 5150: S. Belokon. 1. Qa7 Re8 2. Qb7+/i Kd8 3. Kb8 Rf8 4. Qc7+ Ke8 5. Kc8 Rg8 6. Qh7/ii Kf8 7. Kd8 Bg 7 8. Qg 6 Bh 8 9. Qh5 Kg7 +10. Ke7 Ra8 11. Qg4+ Kh7 12. Qh3 + Kg 8 13. $\mathrm{Qg} 2+$.
i) 2. Qf7? Re5 3. Qg8 Kd7 4. Qh7 + Re7 5. Qh3 + f5.
ii) 6. Qd7 + ? Kf8 7. Kd8 Rg5, or 7. Qh7 f5 8. Qf5 Kg7 + 9. Kd7 Rf8.


No. 5151: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Sd5 (Se8? $\mathrm{Qb} 7+$;) 1. ..., $\mathrm{Qa} 8+(\mathrm{Qb} 7+$; Kd6) 2. Kd6 Kb7 3. Se7 a5 4. c8Q + Qxc8 5. Sxc8 a4 6. Se7 a3 7. Sc6 a2 8.
Sa5 + Kb6 9. Sb3 Kb5 10. Kd5 Kb4 Qxc8 5. Sxc8 a4 6. Se7 a3 7. Sc6 a2 8.
$\mathrm{Sa} 5+\mathrm{Kb6} 9 . \mathrm{Sb} 3 \mathrm{Kb5}$ 10. Kd5 Kb4 11. Sa1 (of course not Sd4? Kc3;) 11.
..., Kc3 12. Ke4 Kb2 13. Kd3 Kxa1 11. Sa1 (of course not Sd4? Kc3;) 11.
..., Kc3 12. Ke4 Kb2 13. Kd3 Kxa1 14. Kcl and Bl is stalemated. David,
Hooper suggests that this is "book" 14. Kcl and Bl is stalemated. David,
Hooper suggests that this is "book" after W's move 5.


No. 5152: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Sb6+/i Bxb6 2. Kc4/ii and now either 2. ..., Rxb5 3. Bxb5 + Ka5 4. b4 mate, or 2. ..., Rxa6 3. Rb4+ Ka5 4. b3 Sc3 5. Ra4+ Sxa4 6. b4 mate.
i) 1. Kc4? Rxa6 2. Sb6 + Rxb6, or 2.
$\mathrm{Rb} 4+\mathrm{Ka} 53 . \mathrm{b} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 6+4$. Kd5 drawn. ii) 2. Rxb6? $\operatorname{Re} 5$ 3. $\mathrm{Kc} 4 \operatorname{Re} 4+$.


No. 5153: Jan Timman, Netherlands IGM. 1. f7 Bf8. Bl has to stop Bg7. With W's next move wBc5 is the threat, so Bl's response is forced. 2. b4 cb 3. Kb2. Now W has to defend against the following Bl winning process (once wPf7 is eliminated): with wKb 2 and wB on the c3-h8 diagonal, Bl occupies the h6-c1 diagonal with $b B$, brings $b K$ to $d 1$, and gives check on cl , forcing wK into the corner; then, with bKc 2 , the other bB can play to b1, after which b2+; Bxb2, Bxb2 mates. 3. ..., Kf5 4. Kal Kg6 5. Bb2 Bc5 6. f8Q Bxf8 7. Ba3 $\mathrm{Bg} 7+$ 8. Bb2 Bh6 9. Bcl. All bBxwB moves stalemate.


No. 5154: I. Garayazly. 1. d7+ (Sae3? f1Q + ; Sxf1, f2 mate) 1. ..., Ka 7 2. $\mathrm{Bb} 8+\mathrm{Kb} 7$ 3. Sxe3 $\mathrm{f} 1 \mathrm{Q}+4$. Sxf1 f2 5. d8Q stalemate, note that it is Bl who is stalemated! For the other 'original'' by this composer, see No. 5316 -- in a future EG.


No. 5155: G.N. Zakhodyakin. 1. h7 $\mathrm{Qf} 3+2$. $\mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Qf} 6+3$. Bc3 $\mathrm{Qb} 6+4$. Bb4 (Kc1? Qh6 + ;) 4. ..., Qd4 + 5. $\mathrm{Bc} 3 \mathrm{Qb6}+$ 6. Bb4 Qxb4 + 7. Kc1 $\mathrm{Qe} 1+8 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Qb} 4+$ 9. Kc1 $\mathrm{Qa} 3+$ 10. Kbl.


No. 5156: G.N. Zakhodyakin. 1. Bf5 + Kxf5 2. Kh7 Qe7 (for Bf6;) 3. Re3 Qa7 4. Ra3 Qb7 5. Rb3 Qc7 6. Rc3 Qd7 7. Rd3 and draws, as if ever QxR; then g 8 Q .


No. 5157: V. Samilo. 1. Kh1? h3. So, 1. h3, with either 1. ..., g3 2. Kf1 Kf6 3. $\mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Ke} 54 . \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{Kd} 45 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Kc} 36$. Kf3 Kd2 7. d4 Ke1 8. Kg2 Kxe2 9. d5 Kd1 10. d6 e2 11. d7 e1Q 12. d8Q + $\mathrm{Qd} 2+$ 13. $\mathrm{Qxd} 2+$, or 1. ..., gh 2. Kf1 Kf6 3. Kg1 Kes 4. Kh2 Kd4 5. Kxh3 Kc3 6. d4 draws, but not 6. Kg4? h3/i 7. Kxh3 Kd2 8. d4 Kxe2 9. d5 Kf3 10. d6 e2 11. d7 e1Q.
i) Bl in his turn must avoid a trap: 6. ..., Kd2? 7. d4 Kxe2 8. d5 Kf1 9. d6 e2 10. d7 e1Q 11. d8Q.


No. 5158: V. Samilo. 1. Bh7 + Kxe3 2. Bxb1 Sb5 3. Kc6 Sc3 4. Bg6 Sf4 5. Kxc7 Sxg6 6. h4 and 7. h5, with h6 to follow, and Troitzky plays the remainder.


No. 5159: B.N. Sidorov. 1. $\mathrm{b} 5+\mathrm{Ka} 7$ 2. $\mathrm{b} 6+\mathrm{cb}$ 3. Bxb6+ Ka6 4. Ba5 Kxa5 5. b4 + Ka6 (K-; Sxf4, d2; Sd5) 6. b5 + Ka5 7. b6 d2 8. b7 d1Q 9. b8Q.


No. 5160: B.N. Sidorov. 1. Rh1 + elQ + 2. Rxel + Kxe1 3. Ba5 + Kf1 4. $\mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 2+5 . \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 6. Bc 7 Kh 1 7. Kh4 wins.

EG notes
EG74 was delayed for an unusual reason -- a prolonged postal strike in The Netherlands. Proof-correcting was largely done by telephone, a procedure not to be recommended, as it leads to secondary errors and (yawn, yawn) EG75 was delayed when important material had to be inserted, and then proofs failed to arrive. No. 5023. The stipulation should read "'Draw".
EG71, p.142. We learn that the Polish Problemista is ''alive and well', but we think that this is not the same thing as "appearing regularly", However, a 1983 issue (''182-184'') has been received. We wish it well. EG74, p.218. Ken Thompson's BELLE is no longer World Computer Champion, having lost in the last round of the x .83 event in New York to the new champion, CRAY BLITZ programmed by Bob Hyatt.

## AWARD IN THE 6th EG-JUBILEE TOURNEY FOR ENDGAME COMPOSITION IN HONOUR OF C.J. DE FEYTER (NETHERLANDS), COMPOSER AND AUTHOR

Judge: C.J. de Feyter, International Judge.

The tourney was announced by circular and in EG62 in November 1980. Although the term for entering was rather short (closing date 31-12-1980), and the entries had been limited to three per composer, 52 studies from 37 composers and 16 countries were received. The entries were submitted to me on anonymous diagrams, leaving to me the lengthy and difficult but highly enjoyable task of testing and ranking.

I am sorry I had to eliminate 11 studies because of major flaws; 1 study published elsewhere, and 4 studies lacking originality. An account is given at the end of this report.
From the remaining entries several presumably from first-time composers - appeared to be too elementary for a serious contest. Nevertheless, I appreciate all of these contributions as a cordial greeting.

Part of the entries bear witness of the modern tendency to produce grotesque positions lacking any tie with practical play. Although - as may be known - my personal preference goes to natural positions with a limited number of pieced, I have tried to rate these "modern mansubat" at their true value.

I made a first choice of about 15 studies, which were then submitted to the scrutiny of Mr. Harman, who found related studies in a few cases but - in my opinion - no killing anticipation.
I came to the following results, and felt quite happy to discover several of my old friends after the 'démasqué":


No. 5161: 1st Prize: J.H. Marwitz (Netherlands).
The aesthetic drawback of Bl having the move is compensated by the quality of this first move. Bl has to save bRf5 while finding time to stop wPb7. After 6 moves Bl has consolidated his advantage (a rook) but appaers to be driven into a position resembling a balance, with wPb 7 as pivot and $w R$ and $b R$ as the arms moving up and down perpetually:

1. ..., Bd2 + ! 2. Kxd2 Rd5 + 3. Ke3! $\mathrm{Re} 5+4$. Kd4 Re4 + 5. Kc5 Sxb7 6. Kb6 Ra5! 7. Bb5 + Kf8 8. Rf1 +! Kg7 9. Rb1! Re5! 10. g6! Rg5 11. Rb4/i Re5 12. Rbl drawn. A kind of "perpetuum mobile".
i) 11. Rb2? Sd6! 12. Kxa5 Sc4+; 11. Rb3? Sc5!


No 5162: 2nd Prize: J.H. Marwitz (Netherlañds).
A delicately balanced position not hinting at a win for either side:

1. Sfd4 f3 2. gf gf 3. Kxf3, still two P's ahead, but ready to be liquidated: 3. ..., Bxg3 4. b6 Kc8 5. Sc5 Bb8! 6. Sde6 (for 7. b7 mate) 6. ..., Bd6 7. ba Bb8, a final attack, only to be refuted by underpromotion: 8 . a8B! and wins. (Not 8. a8S, as W cannot avoid the exchange of one wS.)


No. 5163: 3rd Prize: A. Koranyi (Hungary).
I know about 30 studies with exactly the same material; but this drawing line is quite new to me:

1. c 7 Sg 3 2. $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Sgf} 5+3 . \mathrm{Kf} 8!\mathrm{Sc} 8$ 4. Ke8 Sfe7 5. Kd8 Kd5 6. Bd7 Bg6! 7. Be8/i Bd3 8. Bb5 Bf5/ii 9. Bd7 Bg6 10. Be8 draw.
i) $7 . \operatorname{Bxc} 8 \mathrm{Sd} 6+8 . \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{Bf} 5+$ and 9. .., Bxc8.
ii) 8. ..., Bxb5 stalemate.

No. 5164: 4th Prize: R. Missiaen (Belgium).
A pawnless position with a rich and difficult content: 1. Re5 Bg6 2. Re6 Bf7 3. Re7 $\mathrm{Bg} 6 / \mathrm{i}$ 4. Se2 Sd6 5. Re6 Sc4+ 6. Kc3 Bf7/ii 7. Rf6 Bg8 8. Rf8 Bd5 9. Kd4 Sb6 10. Sc3 + wins.
i) 3. ..., Sd6 4. Rd7! Sc4+ 5. Kc3 Be6/iii 6. Re7 Bg8 7. Rg7! Be6 8.

Sd3! Kb5 9. Rg5 + Kc6 10. Rg6 Kd7(5) 11. Sc5(f4) + wins.
ii) 6. ..., Bf5 7. Ra6 + Kb5 8. Rh6 Kc5 9. Rh5 Se3 10. Kd2 Sc4+ 11. $\mathrm{Kc}(\mathrm{e}) 1 \mathrm{Se} 3(\mathrm{~d} 6) 12 . \mathrm{Sg} 3$ wins.
iii) 5. ..., Be8 6. Re7! Sd6 7. Re6 $\mathrm{Sb} 5+8 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Bf}(\mathrm{d}) 7$ 9. $\mathrm{Ra} 6+\mathrm{Kb} 4$ 10. $\mathrm{Sd} 3+\mathrm{Kc} 4$ 11. $\mathrm{Se} 5+$ and wins. Not difficult to guess the author!


No. 5165: 1st Hon. Mention: Per Olin (Finland).
On the borderline of what I would like to call a "modern mansuba" although not wholly improbable as an actual game. The skirmishes between the many set or future batteries on both sides, with checks and crosschecks, are amusing and fascinating: 1. $\mathrm{Sd} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ 2. $\mathrm{Se} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 83$.

Shf6 + /i Bh2 + 4. Se4 + Rcc3 + 5. Sd6 + Kg7 6. Bxc3 + Rxc3 7. Rxh2 Re3 8. Rah8 Rxe4+ 9. Kd7 Be6+ 10. Kc7 Qa5 + 11. Kb8 Bh3 12. R2xh3 Rb4+ 13. Ka8 Qxg5 14. Se8 mate.
i) 3. $\mathrm{Sc} 7+? \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 4. $\mathrm{Se} 6+$ Bxe6! 5. Bxe5 + Rxe5 + no win.


No. 5166: 2nd Hon. Mention: J. Vandiest (Belgium).
Simplification and extension of a position of Grigoriev ( $\mathrm{wKg} 1, \mathrm{~Pa} 2, \mathrm{a} 6$ f2, g2, h3; bKa3, Pa7, b6, c7, d7, h4 see: '’Pionnenkunstenaar!" Vol. 3 p. 53): 1. a5! e6! 2. Kf2/i Ka7 3. Kf3 e5 4. Ke4 Ka6 5. Kd5/ii f3 6. c7 Kb7 7. Kd6 f2 8. a6 + Kb6 9. c8Q f1Q 10. Qc6+/iii Ka5 11. a7! Qf6 + 12. Kc7 Qf7 + ! 13. Qd7/iv Qc4 + 14. Kb7, giving two variations: 14. ..., Qa6+/v 15. Kb8 Qb6+ 16. Kc8! Qa6+ 17. Kd8 Qf6 + 18. Qe7! Qf3! 19. Qc5 + Ka6 20. Qa3 + Qxa3 21. a8Q + wins. i) 2. Kf3? e5 3. Ke4 Ka7 4. Kd5 f3 5. c7 f2! 6. c8Q f1Q 7. Qc7 + Ka8 8. Qc6 + Ka7 9. Qb6 + Ka8 10. a6 Qf5 + 11. Kc4 Qc2 + drawn.
ii) 5 . Kxe5?, then in the main line: 11. a7 Qf4+! 12. Kd7 Qf7 + 13. K any Qxa7, or 12. Ke7 Qg5 + 13. Kf7 Qf5 perp. ch.
iii) $10 . \mathrm{Qb} 7+$ ? Ka5 11. a7 Qf6 + 12. Kd7 Qf7 + 13. Kc8 Qe8 + 14. Kc7 Qf7 $+15 . \mathrm{Kb} 8 \mathrm{Qe8}+16 . \mathrm{Qc} 8 \mathrm{Qb} 5+$ 17. Ka8 Qd5 + 18. Kb8 Qb5 +19.

Qb7 Qe8 + 20. Qc8 Qb5 + 21. Ka8 Qd5 + 22. Qb7 Qd8 + 23. Qb8 Qd5 + drawn.
iv) 13. Kb8? Qf8 + 14. Kb7 Qb4+ drawn.
v) the second variation: 14. ..., Qb3 + 15. Kc8 Qf3! 16. Qd2 $+\mathrm{Kb5} 17$. $\mathrm{Qb} 2+\mathrm{Kc} 5!18 . \mathrm{Qxe} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 4!19$. Qb8 + Kc3 20. Qc7 + Kd3 21. Qd6+ $\mathrm{Kc} 2!$ 22. $\mathrm{Qc} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 2(1)$ 23. Qb6+ Kc2(1) 24. Kb8! Qf8 + 25. Kb7 Qf3 (7) +26 . Qc6(7) + and wins. Much analytical work to save many pawns!


No. 5167: 3rd Hon. Men. A. Avni (Israel).
W draws although Bl has the advantage of a whole Q and - after the first move - a R: 1. $\mathrm{Rg} 5+\mathrm{Kxg} 52$. Bd8 + Rf6 + (to avoid mate) 3. Bxf6 + Kh6! 4. g4 (for perp. check) Bxd4 5. Bxd4 Qe5! (an unacceptable present) 6. f4! Qe6 + 7. Kf8 Qe4 8. Kf7 Qg6+ 9. Kf8 Ke4 10. Kf7, and both sides have to be content with a draw. A rather surprising solution; one wonders which of the sides should feel lucky.

No. 5168: 4th Hon. Men. R. Missiaen (Belgium).
An ultraminiature, with a straight wK march to recapture a lost piece, and dual-avoidance at the end: 1. ..., Kd4 2. $\mathrm{Sf} 3+\mathrm{Ke} 3$ 3. Sg5! Bg8 4. Kb8! Sd5! 5. Kc8 Kf4 6. Sh3 + Kg3 7. Sg5

Sf6 8. Kd8 Kg4 9. Sf7/i Bxf7 10. Ke7 drawn.

## i) 9. Se6? Bxe6 10. Ke7 Kf5 and Bl loses.

The four commended studies are very fine; but their placement is affected by prior art.


No. 5169: 1st. Comm.: I. Vandecasteele (Belgium).
Reminiscent of T. Balemans, 4 Comm. Selman Mem. Ty 1978 (Kd1, Be5, Pd4, d7; Kd3, Bb6; win); but the solution is much longer and very difficult:

1. $\mathrm{Bf} 6 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Bb} 8 / \mathrm{ii} 2$. d7 $\mathrm{Bd} 6+/ \mathrm{iii} 3$. $\mathrm{Kb} 2 / \mathrm{iv} \mathrm{Bc} 7$ 4. Kcl/v Ba 5 5. Kc2 Bb6 6. Kd2/vi a5 7. Kc2/vii Bc7 8. Kb2 Bb6 9. Ka3 Bc7/viii 10. Ka4 Bb6 11. Bh4 Ka5 12. Be1 Bd8 13. Bxa5 Bf6/ix 14. Bb6 Be7 15. Ka5 Bf6 16. Ka6 Be7
2. Kb7 Bf6 18. Kc8 Be7 19. d8Q Bxd8 20. Kxd8 wins;
i) 1. d7? Bb6 2. Bf6 $\mathrm{Ba5} 3 . \mathrm{Ka} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 7$ ! 4. Ka3 Ba5 5. Kb2 Bb6 6. Kc2 Ba5 7. Kc1 Kc3 8. Kb1 Bb6 9. Ka2 Ba5 10. Ka 1 Bb 6 11. Kb1 Ba5 12. Kcl Bb6 13. Kd1 Kd3 14. Ke1 Ke3 15. Kf1 Ba5 16. Kg 2 Bb 6 17. Kg 3 a 5 18 . Kg 4 Ke 4 19. Kg5 a4 20. Kg6 a3 21. Kf7 a2 22. d5 Kxd5 drawn.
ii) 1. ..., Bb6 2. Ka4 Kd5 3. d7 Kc4 4. Bh4 as in main line; or 3. ..., Ke6 4. d8Q Bxd8 5. Bxd8 Kd5 6. Bf6 win.
iii) 2. ..., Bc7 3. Ka4 Bb6 4. Bh4! or 3. ..., Kc3 4. d5 Kc4 5. d6 Bb6 6. d8Q Bxd8 7. Bxd8 Kd5 8. Bc(e)7; or 3. ..., a5 4. Ka3 Kc3 5. Ka2 Bb6 6. Kb1 Kc4 7. Kc2 Bc7 8. Kb2 Bb6 9. Ka3 Bc7 10. Ka4 Bb6 11. Bh4.
iv) 3. Ka4? Bc7, drawn, see (i).
v) 4. Kc2? Ba5 5. Kd1 Kd3 6. Kcl Kc3 7. Kb1 Bb6 8. Ka2 Ba5 9. Ka1 Bb6 10. Kb1 Ba5 11. Kc1 Bb6 12. Kd1 Kd3 13. Ke1 Ke3, see (i).
vi) thr. 7. Ke3, e.g. 6. ..., Bc7 7. Ke3 a5 8. d8Q Bxd8 9. Bxd8 a4 10. Be7 wins.
vii) 7. Ke3? now fails as the a-pawn cannot be stopped.
viii) 9 . ..., a4 10. Kxa4, followed by a détour to e8.
ix) 13. ..., Kxd4 14. Bxd8 Kd5 B moves and wins.


No. 5170: 2nd Comm.: P. Benkö (USA).

Slightly resembling but much better than F.J. Prokop, C.S.S. 1970 (Kb6, pb5, f4, f6; Ke6, Sh5; win). An excellent main line with a sharp struggle for tempo:

1. Kb6!!/i Sg4/ii 2. Kc7 Se3/iii 3. Kd7 Sc4 4. Ke6 Sb6 5. f6 Kg6 6. Ke7! Sd5 + 7. Kd6! Sb6 8. Ke6 Kh7 9. Ke7/iv Sd5/v 10. Kd6 Sb6 11. Kc6! Sc4 12. Kd7 Kg6 13. Ke7 wins.
i) 1. b6? Sg 4 2. b7 Se 5 3. $\mathrm{Kb} 6 \mathrm{Sd} 7+$ 4. Kc7 Sc5 drawn.
ii) 1. ..., Sf3 2. Kc7 Sd4 3. b6 Sb3 4. Kd6 Sa5 5. Ke6 Sc6 6. f6 win.
iii) 2. ..., Sf6 3. Kd6 Se4+ 4. Kc6 Sd2 5. Kd5 Sb3 6. b6 Sa5 7. Ke6 Sc6 8. f6+ and wins.
iv) 9. f 7 ? $\mathrm{Kf} 7=$, or. $9 . \mathrm{Kf7} \mathrm{Sd} 5=$. v) 9. ..., $\mathrm{Sc} 8+10 . \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{Sb} 6+11$. Ke8 and wins.


No. 5171: 3rd Comm.: Y. Hoch (Israel).
In Averbakh, Lehrbuch der Endspiele III p. 201, No. 36a a related position ascribed to S. Neuwirt (Kc8, Rc7; $\mathrm{Ka} 8, \mathrm{Pg} 3, \mathrm{~g} 6, \mathrm{~h} 3$, Black to move) is given. This study shows a slight improvement:

1. b7/i Rh8/ii 2. Kg 2 Ke 2 3. Kg 3 Ke 3
2. Kg 4 Ke 4 5. c6 Rg8 + 6. Kh5! Kf5 7. Kh6 Kf6 8. Kh7 Rb8/iii 9. b6 Ke6 10. Kg6/iv Rg8 + 11. Kh6 Kf6 12. Kh7 $\operatorname{Re} 8$ 13. c7 $\operatorname{Re} 7+$ 14. Kh6 Rel 15. Kh5 wins, as bK cannot maintain the pursuit;
i) Neither 1. c6? Ke 2 2. b7 Rh8 +3. $\mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 8+4$. Kh3 Kf3 5. Kh4 Kf4 6.

Kh5 Rg5 + 7. Kh6 Rxb5 8. c7 Rb6+ 9. Kh5 Rb5 + 10. $\mathrm{Kg} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 6=$, nor 1 . Kh2? Ke2 2. b7 Rg8 + 3. c6 Kf2 4. Kh3 Kf3, nor. 1. Kg2? Ke2 2. b7 $\mathrm{Rg} 8+3 . \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Kf} 3$... 6. Kh6 Kf6 7. Kh7 Re8 8. c6 Re7+ 9. Kh6 Re8 10. Kh5 Kf5 11. Kh4 Kf4 is sufficient for win.
ii) 1. ..., Rg 8 2. c6 Ke 2 3. c7 Kf 24. $\mathrm{c} 8 \mathrm{Q}+$.
iii) 8. ..., Re8 9. c7 Re7 10. Kh6 Re1 11. Kh5 + .
iv) $10 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ ? $\mathrm{Kd6}$ 11. c7 Rxb 7 and Bl. wins.


No. 5172: 4th Comm.: J. Vandiest (Belgium).
A correction of EG No. 2964 (1977) from the same author (Kh7, Bc8, Pc6; Ke8, Pa6, e3, win), demolished by John Nunn (EG 61, p. 323), who expresses the opinion that a correct elaboration of the intended theme: threefold repetition of the same manoeuvre, should prove to be impossible. Nevertheless the author succeeded in saving the idea:

1. c7 e2 2. Bg4! elQ 3. c8Q $+\mathrm{Kf7} / \mathrm{i}$ 4. Qf5 + !/ii Ke7/iii 5. Qd7 + Kf8 6. Qxg7+ Ke8 7. Kg8 Qe7 8. Qg6 + Kd8 9. Qb6 + Qc7 10. Qe6! a5/iv 11. Qf6+ Qe7 12. Qb6+ Qc7 13. Qe6 a4 14. Qf6+ Qe7 15. Qb6+ Qc7 16. Qe6 a3 17. Qf6+ Qe7 18. Qd4+! Kc7 19. Qa7 + Kd6 20. Qxa3 + wins. i) 3. ..., Ke7 4. Qd7 + Kf8 5. Qxg7 + , or 4. Qc5 + .
ii) Not 4. Qc4+? because of 4. ..., Kg6! 5. Qd3 +Kg 5 6. Qf5 $+\mathrm{Kh} 4 \underset{7}{7}$.

Qh5 + Kg3, or 4. Qd7 + ? Qe7.
iii) 4. ..., Ke8 5. Kg8 Qe7 6. Qc8 + Qd8 7. Qe6 + Qe7 8. Qc6 + Kd8 9. Qc8 mate.
iv) 10. ..., Qa7 11. Qd6 Ke8 12. Qf8., or 10. ..., Qe7 11. Qc8 mate.


No. 5173: Special Prize for the best analytical achievement: J. Vandiest (Belgium).
A 50 moves long solution (tribute to the jubilar!) without any dual; in vain Bl tries seven different approaches to force win:

1. Qd7+/i Kc5 2. Qa6+/ii Qb6 3. Qa3 + Kc6 4. Qa4+/iii Qb5 5. Qe4+/iv Qd5 6. Qe8+/v Kb6 7. Qxe3 + Bc5 8. Qe1!/vi Qa8 + 9. Kd7 Qc6 + 10. Kd8 Qd6 + 11. Ke8 Qf8 + 12. Kd7 Qf7 + 13. Kd8 Qf8 +/vii 14. Kd7/viii Qd6+ 15. Ke8 Qd5/ix 16. Qh4!/x Qe6+ 17. Kd8 Qe5/xi 18. Kd7/xii Qd + 19. Ke8 Qe6 +20. Kd8 Qc6/xiii 21. Qe1/xiv Qa8 22. Kd7 Qc6 + 23. Kd8 Qd6 + 24. Ke8 Qf8 + 25. Kd7 Qf7 + 26. Kd8 Qf8! 27. Kd7 Qd6 + 28. Ke8 Qd5! 29. Qh4! Qg8 + 30. Kd7 Qf7 + 31. Kd8 Qe6/xv 32. Qh7!/xvi Qd6+/xvii 33. Ke8! Qf8 + 34. Kd7 Qd6+ 35. Ke8 Qe6 + 36. Kd8 Qxf6 +/xviii 37. Ke8! Qf8 38. Kd7 Qd6 + 39. Ke8 Qe5 + 40. Kf7! Qe7+/xix 41. Kg6 Qe4+ 42. $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Bd} 4+43$. Kh6 Qh4+ 44. $\mathrm{Kg} 6 \mathrm{Qe} 4+45 . \mathrm{Kh} 6 \mathrm{Be} 3+46 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ Bd4 + 47. Kh6 Qh4 + 48. Kg6 Qg4 + 49. $\mathrm{Kf7} 7 \mathrm{Qd} 7+50 . \mathrm{Kg} 6$.
i) 1. $\mathrm{Qg} 2+$ ? Kb6 2. Kd8 e2 3. Qf2 + Kb7 4. Qf3 + Qc6 5. Qb3+ Qb6+
win for Bl.
ii) 2. Qf5 + ? Kb6 3. Qg6 Qc6+ 4. Kd8 Kb7 5. Qh7 + Kb8 6. Qb1 + Qb7 7. Qc1 Qd7+ 8. Qxc7+ Bxc7+ 9. Kd7 Ba5, win, or 5. Qf5 Qc7+ 6. Ke8 Qc8 + , win, or 3. Qe6 Qc6+ 4. $\mathrm{Kd} 8 \mathrm{Bc} 7+$ 5. Ke7 $\mathrm{Bd} 8+$ 6. Kf7 Qxe6 + 7. Kxe6 Bxf6 win for Bl.
iii) 4. Qa8 + ? Kb5 5. Qd5 + Qc5 +; 4. Qc3 + ? Qc5 5. Qd3 e2.
iv) $5 . \mathrm{Qa} 8+$ ? Kb 6 6. $\mathrm{Qb} 7+\mathrm{Ka} 5!7$. Qe4 e2! 8. f7 Qb8 + 9. Kd7 Qc7 + and $\mathrm{Qe} 7+$.
v) 6. Qxe3? $\mathrm{Qg} 8+$; 6. Qc 2 ? Qc 5 , 6. $\mathrm{Qa} 4+$ ? $\mathrm{Kb6} 7$. $\mathrm{Qg} 4 \mathrm{Qc} 6+8 . \mathrm{Kd} 8$ Kb7 9. Qe6 Qc7 + and Qc8 + .
vi) The key-move! 8. Qh6? Qe6 + 9. Kd8 Ka6 10. Kc7 Bd6+; 8. Qg3(h3, c1)? Qe6+ 9. Kd8 Qxf6 10. Kd7 Qe7+; 8. Qc3? Kc6!; 8. Qe2? $\mathrm{Qg} 8+9 . \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{Qf} 7+10 . \mathrm{Kd} 8 \mathrm{Bd} 411$. Qe7 Bxf6, or: 8. Qf4? Qg8 + 9. Kd7 Qf7 + 10. Kd8 Be7+! 11. fxe Qxf4 12. e8Q Qc7 mate.
vii) First attempt to win.
viii) 14. Qe8? Qxf6 +15 . Kc8 Be7! 16. Qa4 Qf5 + 17. Qd7 Qf8 + wins. ix) Second attempt: zugzwang.
x) Again a quiet move, and the only one! If 16. Qe2? Qg8 + , or 16. Qf1? Qe6 + 17. Kd8 Ka7! 18. Qa1 + Kb8 19. $\mathrm{Qb} 1+\mathrm{Bb} 6+20 . \mathrm{Qxb6}+\mathrm{Qxb6}+$ 21. Ke7 Kc7, or 16. Qa1? Qe6 + 17. Kd8 Kb7! 18. Qh1 + Ka7 19. $\mathrm{Qa} 1+\mathrm{Kb} 8$ !, or 16. Qb1 + (c3)? Kc6!, or finally 16. f7? Qc6 + 17. Kd8 Qc7 + .
xi) Third attempt!
xii) Again the only move. 18. f7? Qd6 + 19. Ke8 Kc7 and mate; 18. Qh8? Qb8+; 18. Qh7? Qb8 +19. Kd7 Qc7 + ; 18. Qh6? Qd6 + 19. Ke8 Qe6 + 20. Kd8 Ka6! a. Bb6 +; 18. Qc4(a4, g4, h3, h1)? Qxf6 + mate in three moves.
xiii) Fourth attempt.
xiv) 21. f7? Qd6 + 22. Ke8 Kc7!; 21. Qc4 eg? Qxf6+; 21. Qh8(7)? Qa8 + and Qb7 + ; 21. Qh6? Qd6 +22 . Ke8 Qe6 + 23. Kd8 Ka6 and 24. ..., Bb6+; 21. Qg5? Qd6+ 22. Ke8

Qe6 + 23. Kd8 Bd4 24. f7 Bf6 + 25. Qxf6 Qxf6 + 26. Ke8 Qg6 27. Ke7 Qg7 28. Ke8 Kc6!; 21. Qf4? Qd5 + 22. $\mathrm{Ke} 8 \mathrm{Qg} 8+23$. Kd7 Qf7 +24. Kd8 Be7+!
Now we come back to the 8th move. xv) The fifth attempt!
xvi) Again the only move! If: 32. f7? Qd6 + 33. Ke8 Kc7; or 32. Qh8? Qd6+ 33. Ke8 Qb8+; or 32. Qh6? Ka6; or 32. Qg5? Bd4; or Q else Qxf6+.
xvii) The sixth attempt.
xviii) The seventh and last attempt to win.
xix) The rest is theory, but another ten moves without dual, till wK, just like the celebrator of the Jubilee, finds his well-earned rest!


No. 5174: Beginners-prize: J. Ham (Netherlands).

1. $\mathrm{Ra} 8+\mathrm{Kf7} 2$. $\mathrm{f} 6 \mathrm{cxb}+3 . \mathrm{Kb} 1 / \mathrm{i}$ Qe8 4. Rd8!/ii c5 5. Kcl b2 + 6. Kb1 c4 7. Kxb2 c3 + 8. Kxb3 c2 9. Rxe8 c1Q 10. Rf8 + and 10. e8Q + wins.
i) 3. Kb2? Qxe2+; 3. Kxb3? Qd5 + and 4. ..., Qxa8.
ii) An interesting try: 4. Rxe8? Kxe8 5. Kb2 c6! 6. Kxb3 c5 7. Kc4 Kd7; but not: 5. ..., c5? 6. Kxb3 Kd7 7. Kc4 Ke8 8. Kd5 Kd7 9. Kxe4 wins.

No. 5175: Special prize for the best "'modern mansuba': C.M. Bent (Great Britain).

1. $\mathrm{Sc} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 5$ 2. $\mathrm{Be} 3+\mathrm{Rd} 4$ 3. $\mathrm{Sa} 6+$ Kb5 4. Sc7 + Kc5 5. Sa6+ Kxd5 6.
$\mathrm{Se} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 67 . \operatorname{Bxd} 4 \mathrm{Sxd} 3 / \mathrm{i} 8 . \operatorname{Bg} 1 \mathrm{Bg} 8$ 9. Ba7 Bh7 10. Bg1 drawn.
i) 7. ..., Sf3? 8. Be3(d2) and wins.

$$
\text { No. } 5175 \text { (Great Britain) C.M. Bent }
$$

Special Prize for 'Best Modern Mansu-


Reserves:


No. 5176: I. Makhno \& V. Shanshin (USSR).

1. Sf2 Rc4/i 2. Sd1 + Kc2 3. Sxc3 Rxc3/ii 4. d7 Sb6+5. Kb7 Sxd7 6. Bg7 6. Rb3+/iii 7. Kc7 Sc5 8. Kd6 Sb7 + 9. Kc7 Sc5 10. Kd6 drawn; i) 1. ..., Rxh4 2. Sd1 +Kc 2 3. Sxc3 Sxc3 4. d7; 1. ..., Rf4 2. Sd3 + .
ii) 3. ..., Kxc3 4. $\mathrm{Bg} 7+$ and 5 . d7, or 3. ..., Sxc3 4. d7 Rd4 5. Bg7.
iii) 6. ..., Rd3+ 7. Kc7 Sc5 8. Kb6 $\mathrm{Sd} 7+$ 9. Kc7 Sc5 10. Kb6 drawn (echo!).

No. 5177: E. Leun \& E. Asaba (USSR).

1. f6 Rxg5 2. f7 Rg1 3. $\mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 2+4$. Kf3!/i Rg6 5. e5 Rg5 6. Ke4! Rg4+
2. Kf3 Rg5 8. Ke4 Rf5 9. f8Q RxQ stalemate.
i) 4. Kf1? Bxe3 5. Kxg2 Bh6 wins.


No. 5178: V. Nestorescu (Romania). 1. Rg3 Kxh5 2. hxg4 + Kh4/i 3. Bh2 Rf6 4. Rg1! Rg6 5. Bf4 Rxg4 6. Rh1 mate;
i) 2. ..., Kg 5 3. Rg 2 Kh 4 4. g5 Kh3 5. $\mathrm{Rh} 2+\mathrm{Kg} 3$ 6. Rh1! Kg2 7. Rh8 Rxg1 8. Kd4 Kf3 9. Rf8 + Kg4 10. g6 Kh5 11. $\mathrm{Rh} 8+$ and wins, in the footsteps of Chéron, amorig others.

Account of the studies to be eliminated:
Halski: Ke1/ Kh8 Insoluble after 3.
..., Qc1 4. Kxf2 Qc5 + !
Ruszczinski: Kh3/Kh5 Cook 2. Sd2
Sxc7 3. g4+.
Kopac: Kd1/Kd4 Insoluble after 6.
..., Kg5 7. Bh7 Kh6.

Kopac: Kf5/Kh2 Several duals, e.g. 4. Kg6 Kg4 5. Kf7 Kf5 6. Bh2.

Dobrescu: Ke1/Kg7 Insoluble: 8 . Kg 5 Rf8 9. Se8 + Kf7 10. d8Q Rg8+! 11. Kf5 Be4 + .
Kirillov: Kb6/Ka8 Cook 1. Bd4 Sd3 2. Sg 2 .

Dukic: Kc1/Kb5 Many solutions.
Olthof: $\mathrm{Kd} 5 / \mathrm{Kg} 8$ Dual in main line: 12. Kg7.

Bent: Kd6/Kh8 Cook 1. Re8 + .
Moreno Ramos: Kd2/Kb2 Dual in main line: 9. Qc3 and 10. Qcl.
Van der Heyden: Kf6/Kg8 Duals after the first move.
Angelini: Ka7/Kf7; Missiaen: Kh1/ Kel; Afek: Kf6/Kh8; and E. Melnichenko: $\mathrm{Ke} 8 / \mathrm{Kg} 8$ : Originality lacking. Finally, Melnichenko: Kh1/Kh8 had to be disqualified because of publication in "'64", Feb. 1981.
This award becomes definite 3 months after publication of the report.
Entries eliminated or not mentioned in this report revert immediately to their composers.
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No. 5179: L. Nyeviczkey (Hungary). 1. f7 Bxf7/i 2. d7 Rd5 3. Be4 Bg6 + 4. Kxg6 Rd6 + 5. Kf7 Rxd7 + 6. Ke6 Rc7 7. Kd6 Rc8 8. Bb7 Rb8 9. Bc6+ Rb5 10. Bd7 h3 11. Kc6 wins. i) 1. ..., Rh5 + 2. Kg 7 Bxf 7 3. d 7 Rd 5 4. Be4.

This study was the only sound one among the three for solution in the 1983 World Solving Championship. (It is, I think, new to EG's pages. AJR).


No. 5180: M. Matous. Judge: V. Neidze, FIDE International Judge, resident in the Georgian SSR but the studies columnist of the Latvian SSR chess magazine.

1. $\mathrm{Kf} 2 / \mathrm{i} \operatorname{Bg} 2 / \mathrm{ii} 2$. $\mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Qg} 7 / \mathrm{iii} 3$. Qh4 + Sh2 4. Qh8/iv Qg6 5. Qh7 Qg5 6. Qh6 Qg8 7. Qcl +Sfl 8. Qxf1+/v Kh2 9. Qg1 + Kh3 10. Bxg2 + Kh4 11. Qh2 +Kg 512. Qg3 + .
i) 1. Qxf1 +? Kh2 leaves nowhere, while 1. Kxf1? Ba6 loses, and 1. Qh4+? Sh2 helps Bl.
ii) Defends against the threatened 2. Qxf1 +. 1. ..., Sh2 2. Bf3 + and 3. $\mathrm{Qc} 1+$, and the same W 2nd move answers 1. ..., Qa6.
iii) But now 3. Qxf1 + ? would not win: 3. ..., Kh2 4. Qg1 + Kh3 5. $\mathrm{Bxg} 2+\mathrm{Kh} 4$ 6. Qh2 +Kg 5 . To succeed W transforms the mating threat. iv) $w Q$ fulfils a triple function: attacks bQ; defends the long diagonal; sacrifices herself for the mate Bxg2. v) This move and the continuation now win, due to the unprotected state of bQg8, in contrast to the thematic try capture 3 . Qxf1+?


No. 5181: V. Anufriev. 1. Bd6+ Kd8/i 2. c7 + Kc8 3. c6. W improves the position of his Ps, preparing, after 3. ..., Bxf2 + 4. Kh2 Bg1 + 5 . Kh1, an effective defensive combination: W threatens to capture on d7 and check on h3. But 5. ..., Qa8 pins wPc6. 6. Bg2 Qxa4 7. cd + Qxd7. Bl has succeeded in keeping control over h3. Now if 8. Bf4? Qd3 and Bl wins. 8. Bh2. The big surprise. Stalemate follows either 8. ..., Bxh2 9. Bh3 Qxh3, or 8. ..., B else 9. Bh3 Qxh3, in the latter case with pin of wBh2. i) Or 1. ..., Kc8 2. cd + and 3. fe.

No. 5182: R. Dadunashvili.' 1. b8Q+
Kc6 2. Qe8 + Rd7. Any bK move loses bR. 3. Kb8. Threatens 4. Kc8 to win
pinned bR. Bl's defence is an attempt to avoid a fork by wQ. 3. ..., Rxa3/i 4. Qc8 + Kd6 5. Qf8 + Re7 6. Kc8. The pieces are shifting to the right. Again bR has to be protected. 6. ..., Ra4 7. d3. Taking away the e4 square. 7. ..., Ra2 (Ke6; gf) 8. Qd8 + Ke6 9. $\mathbf{Q g} 8+\mathbf{R f} 7$ 10. Kd8. The picture for the third time. 10. ..., Rc2 11. Qg6 + Rf6 12. Qe4 + Kf7 13. Qh7 + Ke6 14. Qd7 + Ke5 15. d4 + .
"'A patterned three-fold movement of a complex of pieces culminates in win of bR. An abundance of tries, needed to demonstrate the author's geometrical thought, lessens the general impression of this study puzzle."
i) 3. ..., Rd1 4. Qg6 + . Or 3. ..., Rh1
4. d4 Rh7 5. Qe6 + Rd6 6. Qe4 + .


No. 5183: G. Amiryan. 1. Bb1 a2 2. Rh1 a1Q (Ka3; Rh5), and now the balance of forces is different, so W
must proceed differently. 3. Rg1. The purpose is to prepare a perpetual check up and down the g -file. Bad is 3. e5? Kb5 4. e6 Kc4 5. e7 Qa4 6. Bg6 or 6. Rel Qd7, with advance of bPa6 to win for Bl. 3. ..., Kb5 4. Bd3+ (Rg5 + ? Kc4;) 4. ..., Ka4 (Ka5; Rg6) 5. Bb1 Ka5 6. Rg5 + Ka4 7. Rg1 drawn, or 6. ..., Kb6 7. Rg6 + Kc7 (Kb5? Bd3 + ) 8. Rg7 + Kd6 9. Rg6 + . "'A synthesis of 2 aspects of positional draw -- blockade and perpetual check -- merged in an interesting form and without a single capture."


No. 5184: A. Bor and L. Katsnelson. 1. ..., Sb6 + 2. Ka5 Sd7 3. Se5 (Ka6? Sc 8 ;) 3. ..., Sb8. Giving the impression that Bl has neutralised the threats. 4. Sf7 + Kd7 5. de Kxc7 6. b6 + Kxb7 7. Sd6 + . Not 7. Sd $8+$ ? Kc8 8. ba Sc6+. 7. ..., Ka8 8. b7 mate. ''Unconstrained and satisfyingly interesting play, topped off with a smothered pawn checkmate."

No. 5185: V. Khortov and L. Mitrofanov. 1. d8Q Rd4 + 2. Kxd4 Sc6+ 3. Kd5 Sxd8 4. Bc4+ Kb4 5. e7 Se6 6. Kxe6 c2 7. e8Q Kxc4 8. Qh8 Kb3 9. Qa1, or if 7. ..., clQ 8. Qb5 + Kc3 9. Qb3 +Kd 4 10. Qd3 $+\mathrm{Kc5} 11$. Qd6+. "'An elegant piece with its splendid move 8. Qh8!."


No. 5186: I.L. Kovalenko. 1. g6 (W was in check!) Bxg6+2. Ka1 Rxf7 3. Re2 Rf2 4. Rf2 Rc5 5. Rd2 + Kel 6. $\mathrm{Re} 2+\mathrm{Kf1}$ 7. Rf2 +Kg 1 8. $\mathrm{Rg} 2+$ Kh1 9. $\mathrm{Rg} 1+\mathrm{Kxh} 2 \mathrm{10} . \mathrm{Rg} 2+\mathrm{Kxh} 3$ 11. $\operatorname{Rg} 3+\mathrm{Kxh} 412 . \operatorname{Rg} 4+$, or if 2. ..., Rxe8 3. f8Q Re1 4. Qf1 4. Qfi Be8 5. Qd3 + Kc1 6. Qc3 + Kd1 7. Qd3+.
"'Interchange of perpetually checking pieces: wR and wQ."

No. 5187: E.L. Pogosyants. 1 . $\mathrm{Sa} 3+/ \mathrm{i}$ Ka1 2. d8Q Rd7 + 3. Qxd7 Rd5 + 4. Kc2 Rxd7 5. Sb5 R-6. $\mathrm{Bb} 2+\mathrm{Ka} 27 . \mathrm{Sc} 3$ mate. i) 1. d 8 Q ? $\mathrm{Rd} 7+$ 2. Qxd7 Rd5 + 3. Qxd5 stalemate.
"A piquant miniature."


No. 5188: V. Vlasenko. 1. f7 Re6 + 2. Kd4 Rf6/i 3. a7 Rd6+ 4. Ke5 Rd8 5. Ke6/ii Ra8 (Kg6; Ke7) 6. Kf6 Kg4 7. Kg 7 Rxa7 8. Kxh6 Rxf7 stalemate. i) 2. ..., Rd6 + 3. Ke5 Rd8 4. Kf6.
ii) 5. Kf6? Ra8 6. Kf5 Kh4. Or 5. Kf5? Rc8 6. Ke6 Kg6.
"Reciprocal zugzwang." (But exactly what position? AJR)


No. 5189: V.N. Dolgov. 1. Rg6+ Kh 7 2. $\mathrm{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 8$ 3. $\mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 74$. $\mathrm{R} 2 \mathrm{~g} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 65 . \mathrm{Rg} 6+\mathrm{Kh} 76 . \mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{~g} 7+$ Kh8 7. Ra7 c1Q+8. Kxc1 Rc2+ 9. Kd1 (Kxc2? Bd3 + ;) 9. ..., Be2 +10 . $\mathrm{Kel} \mathrm{Bc} 4 / \mathrm{i}$ 11. Rh6 +Kg 8 12. Rc6 $\mathrm{Re} 2+13$. Kd1 Bb5 14. Rc5 wins. i) 10. ..., Bg4 11. Rd6 Rc8 12. Rh6 + Kg8 13. Rg6 + .


No. 5190: A. Mamedov. 1. c7 Sd5 + 2. Ke2 Sxc7 3. Sf5 Kh1 (Kh2; Sh4) 4. $\mathrm{Sg} 3+\mathrm{Kh} 2$ 5. Sf1 +Kh 3 6. Kf2 Sd5 7. Kg1 Sf4 8. Sg3 Kxg3 stalemate.


No. 5191: N. Mansarliisky. 1. Sd7+ Ke6/i 2. b7 Rh8/ii 3. Sef6 Ke7 4. Sb6 Kxf6 5. Ka6 Kg5/iii 6. Sc8 Rh6 +7. Ka5 Rh1 8. Sd6 Rh8 9. Sf7 + .
i) 1. ..., Kd4 2. Sec5 Rh8 3. b7 Kd5 4. Sa4 Kc6 5. Sab6 Kc7 6. Sf6 Rd8 7. Sfd5 + Kc6 8. Se7 + and 9. Sec8. ii) 2. ..., Rb5 3. Sec5 + and 4. Sb6. iii) 5. ..., $\operatorname{Ke} 5(f 5)$ 6. Sc8 Rh6 +7. Ka5 Rh1 8. b8Q + (or Sd6 + ) .


No. 5192: N. Rezvov. 1. Sbc6 Rg7 2. Se7 + Kf8 3. S5g6 + Ke8 (hg; Sd5) 4. Bh6 Rf7 5. Sf4 (Sd5? Bg7;) 5. ..., Rxe7 6. Sd5 Re6 7. Sc7 + draw.


No. 5193: V. Samilo. 1. Sd6 + Kxb4 2. Sd3 +Kc 3 3. Se5 Bg 8 4. Kg6 Kd4 5. $\operatorname{Sdc} 4$ wins.


No. 5194: A. Zinchuk. 1. Kg6 Se5 + 2. Kxf5 g3 3. Sf3 Sxf3 4. Kg4 g2 5. Kh3 g1Q 6. d8Q + Kxd8 7. c7 + $\mathrm{Ke} 7 / \mathrm{i} 8 . \mathrm{c} 8 \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Qh} 2+9 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Se} 5+10$. $\mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Sf} 7+$ 11. $\mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Se} 5+12 . \mathrm{Kg} 5$ $\mathrm{Qg} 3+13$. Kh5 Sd7 14. Qb7 drawn. i) 7. ..., Kxc7 is the conclusion of a Troitzky study. The ''Special Commend" was for the development of a known idea.


No. 5195: Em. Dobrescu (Romania). Judge: C.M. Bent. 32 entries from 10 countries. 1. c5 Ba5. 1. ..., Ba 72. Ke6 $\mathrm{Sg} 7+$ 3. Kxf7 Sxh5 4. Kg6 Rh2 5. Rg5, drawn. 2. Ke6 Rg7 3. Ra1 Sg3 4. Rh3 Rb5 5. Rg1 Sh5 6. Rgh1 $\mathbf{R g} 6+$ 7. Kf7 Rg7 + 8. Ke6 Sg3 9. Rg1 Sf5 10. Re1. Not 10. Rd1? Rg3 11. $\mathrm{Rh} 7+\mathrm{Sg} 7+$ 12. K- Bc3. 10. ..., Rg3 11. Rh7 + Rg7 12. Rh3 Sg3 13. Rg1. Positional draw. ''In the main variation of this hard-fought struggle, in which so many pieces are threatened, it is astonishing that there is no capture. Attack and counter-attack alternate sharply."

No. 5196: Y. Hoch (Israel). 1. f6 $\mathbf{R b 2}+$. 1. ..., Rg 1 is bad: 2. Rxe8 Rxg 7 3. fg Kxg7 4. Ke3. 2. Ke3 Rxb3 + 3. Kd4 aRxa3 4. g8Q + Kxg8 5. Rxe8 + Kh7 6. Re3 Kg8. 6. ..., Rxe3 is stalemate. 7. Re8 + Kh7 8. Re3. Positional draw. '"After bB has been captured there is a very clever
stalemate that enriches rook endgame theory."
M. Matous was provisionally awarded 3rd Prize with: wKd2 wRf3 wBf4 wSd4; bKa1 bRg7 bBc4 bPa2, b3. $4+5$ Win. 1. Sc2 + . 1. Sxb3 + ? Kb1 leads to a dead end. 1. ..., be 2. Rf1 + Bxf1 3. Kc1 Re7 4. Bd2 Rc7 5. Bb4 Re8 6. Be7 Re6 7. Bf8 Rg6 8. Bc5 Rg4 9. Ba3 and mates. ''Such duels between R and B are not new. Specially noteworthy here are the 2 introductory sacrifices and the length of the space between the duelling pieces." The prize was withdrawn -"anticipated".


No. 5197: M. Shablinsky (USSR). 1. Kf3 Ke6/i 2. Kg4 Kf6 3. Sd2 Kg6 4. Se4 Kh6 5. Kf5 Kh5 6. Sf6 + Kh6 7. $\mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Kh} 5$ 8. Kf6 d2 9. Kg7 d1Q 10. Sf6 mate.
i) $1 . . . ., \mathrm{g} 4+2 . \mathrm{h} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 53 . \mathrm{Sd} 2 \mathrm{~h} 3$ 4. $\mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{~h} 2 \mathrm{5} . \mathrm{Sf} 3+$.


No. 5198: F.Moreno Ramos. 1. Qe8 + Kc7/i 2. Qxb5 Bxb5 3. Kf8/ii Kd8/iii 4. c4 Bxc4 5. c6 Ba6 6. c4 Bxc4 7. c7 + Sxc7 8. e7 + Kd7 9. e8Q + Sxe8 10. $\mathrm{e} 6+\mathrm{Kd} 8$ 11. e7 + Kd7 stalemate. i) 1. ..., Kxc5 2. Qf8 + Kb6 3. e7 Bc4 4. Qb8 + Ka6 5. Qa8 + Kb6 6. Qb8 + 1. ..., Kb7 2. c6 + Qxc6 3. Qf7 + Qc7 4. Qxf1 Se7 + 5. Kf8 Sg6+ 6. Kg8. ii) 3. c4? Bxc4 4. Kf8 Sf4 5. e7 Sg6+ 6. Ke8 Sxe5 7. Kf8 Sg6 + 8. Ke8 Kc8 9. c3 Kc7 10. c6 Kc8 11. c7 Sf4 12. Kf8 Se6 + 13. Ke8 Sxc7 + 14. Kf8 $\mathrm{Bb5}$ and W is in zugzwang.
iii) 3. ..., Sf4 4. e7 Sg6 + 5. Kf7 Sxe5 + 6. Kf8 Sd7 + 7. Kf7.


No. 5199: A. Sochniev. 1. Se6 + Kh8 2. Sd4 Rc5 +/i 3. Kd6 bRc3 4. Se2 Rc2 5. Sd4 R2c3 6. Se2 Rc2 7. Sd4. i) 2. ..., $\mathrm{Re} 3+$ 3. Kf 4 cRc 3 4. Sb 5 cRd3 5. Be4 Rb3 6. Sd4 bRc3 7. Sb5 Rb3 8. Sd4.


No. 5200: P. Rossi. 1. Ra7 + Kd8 2. Sc6 + Ke8 3. Sd6 + Kf8 4. Ra8 + Kg 7 5. $\mathrm{Rxg} 8+\mathrm{Kxg} 8$ 6. $\mathrm{Bxg} 2 \mathrm{Re} 1+$ 7. Kxa2 Re2 + 8. Kxa3 Rxg2 9. Se7 + Kh7/i 10. dSf5 Ra2+/ii 11. Kxa2 g2 12. Ka1 g1Q 13. Kb4 drawn.
i) 9. ..., Kh8 10. $\mathrm{Sg} 6+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ 11. Sh4 Rf2 12. Se4 Rf4 13. Sxg3 Rxh4 14. Se 2 .
ii) 10. ..., Re2 11. Sxg3 Rxe7 12. Sf5 Rd7 13. Kb4 Kg6 14. Se3.


No. 5201: O. Carlsson and the late J. Mugnos (Argentina). 1. Rc3 +, with two lines: 1. ..., Kb8 2. Rb3 + Ka7 3. $\mathrm{Rb} 7+\mathrm{Ka} 84 . \mathrm{Be} 4 \mathrm{~g} 1 \mathrm{Q} 5 . \mathrm{Rb} 2+\mathrm{Ka} 7$ 6. Rg2 Qh1 7. Ra2 + . 1. ..., Kd8 2. Bf5 e6 3. Bg5 + Kd7 4. Rd3 + Kc7 5. Bf4 + Kb6 6. Rd6+ Kc5/i 7. Rc6 + Kd 5 8. $\mathrm{Bg} 4 \mathrm{~g} 1 \mathrm{Q} 9 . \mathrm{Bf} 3$ mate.
i) 6. ..., Ka5 7. Bd3 glQ 8. Ra6+ Kb4 9. Bd6 + Kc3 10. Ra3 mate.


No. 5202: P. Raican (Romania). 1. Kb3/i Bd4 2. Bel Bc3 3. Bh4 Bel 4. $\mathrm{Be} 7 \mathrm{Bb} 45 . \mathrm{Bf} 6 \mathrm{Bc} 36 . \mathrm{Kxc} 3$.
i) 1. Kb5? Bd4 2. Bh4 Bf2 3. Be7 Bc5 4. Bf6 Bd4.


No. 5203: B. Rivkin (Moscow). The first theme for studies was: 'In a mating conclusion W , apart from wK , has only one other man (piece or pawn).' 1. Se4 Sf3/i 2. h4 gSxh4 3. $\mathrm{g} 5+\mathrm{Sxg} 54 . \mathrm{Sd} 6$. Now there are two lines: 4. ..., hS-5. Sf5 + gf 6. Rf6 mate. Or 4. ..., f5 5. Rf6 (Rf7? gS—;) 5. ..., f4 6. Re6 f3 7. Re7 f2 8. Rh7 + (else f1Q protects f7) 8. ..., Sxh7 9. Sf7 mate. The theme is doubled: in one line $w S$ is sacrificed for $w R$ to mate, and in the other wR is sacrificed for wS to mate -- in both cases it is the only W piece remaining. i) The threat was 2. Rf7. If 1. ..., hg 2. Rf7 g5 3. Rxf6 + Kh5 4. $\mathrm{Sg} 3+$ Kh4 5. Rh6 mate.


No. 5204: N. Kralin (Moscow). 1. Sf5 +/i Kg2 2. Sh4 + Kg3/ii 3. Kf5 + Kxh4 4. Bh2/iii and now either 4. ..., Sf7 5. Kf4 Sxh6 6. Bg3 mate, or 4. ..., Se6 5. Kxe6 Kg5 6. Kf7 Kxh6 7. Bf 4 mate. In both cases the mate is pure, and the theme is again doubled, this time by the same $W$ mating piece. i) $1 . \mathrm{Ke} 4+? \mathrm{Kg} 22$. Sf 3 Sf 7 .
ii) 2. ..., Kg1 3. Kf6 h2 4. Sf3 + .
iii) We have a position of reciprocal zugzwang and Bl to move.
One reason the Moscow team did so well (in fact they won the whole competition ahead of Byelorussia and the first Ukraine teams) was that they were able to organise themselves during the six months allowed for composing, so that the themes proposed could be discussed, previous examples identified, and so on.


No. 5205: S. Rumyantsev and G. Umnov (Russian Federation). 1. Bf5 $+\mathrm{Kh} 6 / \mathrm{i} 2 . \mathrm{g} 5+\mathrm{fg} 3 . \operatorname{Se} 5 \mathrm{~h} 44$. $\mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Kh} 5$ 5. h3, with two lines: 5. , Bxh3 6. Kg7 Bxg4 7. Bg6 mate, and 5. ..., Sg3 6. Kg7 Sxf5 + 7. Kh7 Bxh3 8. Sf6 mate. Again, the mates ate both thematic.
i) $1 . \ldots, \mathrm{Kh} 82$. g 5 , and if $2 . \ldots$, fg 3. Sxg 5 for Sf7 mate, while otherwise W wins easily.


No. 5206: K. Sumbatyan (Moscow). This time the theme was 'Perpetual threat of discovered attack on a piece, with check to bK'. 1. $\mathrm{Sg} 7+\mathrm{Qxg} 7 / \mathrm{i} 2$. Bc4 + Kf5 3. Bd3 + Se4/ii 4. Bxe4 + Kg 5 5. Bg 2 /iii $\mathrm{Kh} 4 / \mathrm{iv}$ 6. $\mathrm{Bf} 2+\mathrm{Kg} 5$ 7. Bd4 Kf5 8. Be4 + Ke6 9. Bd5 + Ke 7 10. $\mathrm{Bb} 7 / \mathrm{v} \mathrm{Kd} 811 . \mathrm{Bb} 6+\mathrm{Ke} 7 / \mathrm{vi}$ 12. Bd4. Positional draw.
i) 1. ..., Kd6 2. Bc5 + Kxc5 3. Sxd7 + ii) Bl's counter-sacrifice, freeing the g5 square.
iii) Commencing the demonstration of the theme, with the threat of $\mathrm{Se} 4+$ iv) 5...., Qh6 6. Be3 + , or 5. ..., Qf8 6. $\operatorname{Sh} 7+$.
v) Superb echo. 11. $\mathrm{Sd} 5+$ is threatened, while if 10 ..., Qf8 11. Bc5 +, or $10 . \ldots, \mathrm{Qh} 611 . \mathrm{Sg} 8+$. See (iv). vi) The c8 square is protected, just as h3 was on move 6.

No. 5207: A. Kopnin (Russian Federation). 1. Bg8 Rb4 2. Kc3 eRb5 3. Bc4 Rb6 4. Rf8 + Kc7 5. Rf7 + Kd8
6. Rf8 $+\mathrm{Ke7} 7 . \mathrm{Rf} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 8$ 8. Rf4 (for Bf7) 8. ..., Ke7 9. Rf7 + Kd8 10. $\mathrm{Rf} 8+\mathrm{Ke} 7$ 11. Rf7 +Ke 8 12. Rf4, drawn. '"Very economical, but the play is prosaic..."

The above study was awarded 2nd Place for Theme 2. However, the Shakhmaty v SSSR article from which EG has taken it does not give the whole award, so the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th Place studies remain unpublished. It seems that the USSR has no mechanism, or no will, to publish the full results of competitions such as these. Now, according to international conventions, or common-sence, or the impracticability of any other attitude, a study does not exist unless it is published. However, if one asks in the USSR whether the award is 'official', one invariably gets the answer 'yes'. But we have to say that no award is 'official' unless it is complete, signed and published, with the date and details of the competition. Meanwhile, EG tries to fill the gaps. If these studies are obtainable, we shall publish them! Wish your editor luck -- he needs it!


No. 5208: A. Kalinin and An.G. Kuznetsov (Moscow).

1. Be5/i Bxa5 + 2. Ke8 Rh5/ii 3. $\mathrm{Bb} 2 / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Ra} 2$ 4. $\mathrm{Rg} 3+\mathrm{Kh} 75 . \operatorname{Rg} 7+$ Kh6 6. Rg2/iv Kh7 7. Rg7 + Kh6 8. Rg2.
i) 1. Sc4? Ra8 + and 2. ..., Rxh2.
ii) 2. ..., Rh1? 3. Rf8 +Kh 7 4. Rh8 +
iii) 3. $\mathrm{Rg} 3+$ ? Kh 74 . Bb 2 Be 1 .
iv) Threatening both $7 . \mathrm{Bg} 7+$ and 7 . $\mathrm{Bcl}+$.


No. 5209: A. Frolovsky (Tula). 49 composers entered 74 studies for this tourney judged by Anatoly G. Kuznetsov. Confirmation time: 6 month from the appearance (? in vii.83) of the v. 83 issue of Shakhmaty v SSSR. 1. $\mathrm{Sg} 3+$ ? and now not 1. ..., Kg 1 ? 2. Rc1 +, but 1. ..., Ke1 2. Re2 + Kd1 3. Se 4 , with a view to 3. ..., $\mathrm{Qb} 1+4$. Kd4, when 4. ..., Kc1 5. Kc3 Kd1 6. Kb3 wins, but 4. ..., Kxe2 5. Sc3+ Kd 2 6. Sxb1 Kc 2 and B is safe. 1. $\mathbf{S d 2}+\mathbf{K e 1}$. Note the line 1. ..., Kg1 2. $\mathrm{Sf} 3+$, when 2. .., Kh1 3. Rh2 mate, or 2. ..., Kf1 3. Ke3 for 4. Rf2 mate. Of course, 1. ..., K2 2. Sb3 + .
2. Sf3 + Kd1 3. Rd2 + Kc1 4. Sd4. Now if 4. ..., Qb1 + 5. Kc3 Qe4 6. $\mathrm{Sb} 3+\mathrm{Kb} 17$. Rd1 +Ka 2 8. Ral mate or 4. ..., Qxb2 5. Se2 + Kb1 6. Sc3 + Kcl 7. Rd1 mate. But Bl has a cooler line. 4. ..., Kb1. To answer 5. Se2? not with 5. ..., Qa5? 6. Sc3 + Kal 7. $\mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Qf5}+$ 8. Kb3 Qe6+ 9. Ka3 $\mathrm{Qe} 7+10$. b4, but with 5. ..., Ka2 and W's illusion is destroyed. So, W has to stop this move. Eureka! 5. $\mathbf{R d 1}+\mathbf{K x b 2}$ 6. Rd2 + Kb1. 6. Ka3 7. Sc2 + , or 6. ..., Kc1 7. Sb3 + . 7. Se2. Now consider 7. ..., Qe5 8. $\mathrm{Sc} 3+$ and 8. ..., Ka1 9. Ra2 mate, or 8. ..., Kc1 9. Rc2 mate, the previous line mirrored, with the same pieces. 7. ..., Qa5 8. Sc3 + Ka1 9. Rf2. This quiet move covers f 5 and puts Bl in zugzwang. After 9. ..., Qa3 there is the classic conclusion 10. Rf1 $+\mathbf{K b 2}$ 11. Rb1 mate. "A natural position, which could literally have been taken from a game. Witty play by both sides. 5. Rd1 + and 9. Rf2 are excellent points. There is a wide range of movement over the board, from $h$-file to a-file, with an echo, sacrifices and forks. A classic miniature, worthy of the memory of V.N. Platov."


No. 5210: B. Buyannemekh (Mongolia). 1. Kc6 +Kb 8 2. Kb6 Kc8 3. Bh3 Qh1 4, Bf5 Qh4 5. Rd5 + /i Kb8 6. Rb5 Qg5/ii 7. Kc6+Ka7/iii 8. Rb7 + Ka6 (Ka8; Rxf7) 9. Bd3 + Ka5 10. $\mathrm{Rb} 5+\mathrm{Ka} 6$ 11. e6. bQ is lost.
i) 5. Rxf7 + ? Kd8 6. Kc6 Ke8 7. e6 Qd8 8. Bg6 (another battery) 8. Qg5 and W is not making progress. ii) bQ continues to defend d8. If 6. Qd8 + 7. Ka6+ Kc7 8. Rb7 +
Kc6 9. Be4 + Kc5 10. Rb5 mate.
iii) 7. ..., Ka8 8. Kc7 Qe7 + 9. Bd7.


No. 5211: S. Timofeev (Donetsk Region). 1. Se8. bR is attacked, but if the piece is saved Bl has a hopeless ending after 2. hg. 1. ..., g2 2. Sxf6 + Kh8 3. Ra1. Not 3. Re5? Kg7. 3. ..., Bc1 4. Rxc1 g1Q 5. Rc8. Bl's defensive idea was 5. Rxg1? stalemate. Now W threatens 6. $\mathrm{Ke} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 77$. $\mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 6$ 8. Rg6. 5. ..., Qg7 6. e5 Qf7. We are at the core of the study. What is to be done about the 7th rank? 7. Rb8? Qg7+ 8. Ke8 Qf8 + . 7. h3. Zugzwang for the first time. 7. ..., Qg7 8. Ke8 Qc7. 8. ..., Qf6 + 9. Kd7. 9. Rd8 Qg7 10. h4. Zugzwang for the second time. 10. ..., Qc7 11. e6 Qg7 12. e7 Qxf6 13. Kd7 + and 14. e8Q, winning. 'A study with two phases. To begin with a stalemating introduction with non-thematic force, then a zugzwang melody with Platovlike force. The phases work well, one complementing the other. Has a new bright star entered the study firmament?"

No. 5212: A. Sekov (Ust-Kamenogorsk). 1. Bf6 + Ke4. 1. ..., Kc4 2. $\mathrm{b} 3+\mathrm{Kc} 53 . \mathrm{b} 4+$ and wether bK of bQ takes, wB+. 2. Sc3 + Kf4 3.

Sxd5 + Ke4 4. Sc3 + Kf4 5. a3. This is the first domination position, but not the end. 5. ..., b4 6. ab. But now bQ has a safe square. 6. ..., Qal 7. Kf2. Status quo! Domination again, and zugzwang. 7. ..., a5 8. b5. But not 8. b3? Qa3. 8. ..., a4 9. b6, and wins. 'Wouldn't we call this oldfashioned? Indeed, in the best traditions of old domination studies -- all is natural, elegant, spacious and clear. And, my goodness, beautiful!'"


No. 5213: E. Bogdanov (Lvov). 1. $h 8 Q+\mathbf{Q x h 8}$ 2. fg +. After 2. ..., Kxg5 it will suddenly be checkmate. 2. ..., Kg7. Or 2. ..., Kh7 3. g6+ Kh6 4. Be3 + , and either 4. ..., Kh5 $5 . \mathrm{g} 7+$ or $4 . \ldots, \mathrm{Kg} 75 . \mathrm{Bd} 4+\mathrm{Kf} 86$. $\mathrm{g} 7+\mathrm{Qxg} 7$ 7. Bc5 mate. 3. Bd4+ Kf8. This conceals not only 4. Bxh8? stalemate, but also 4. Be5? Qf6+. 4. Kd5 Qh7. Or 4. ..., Qxd4 + 5. Kxd4 Kxf7 6. Ke5 Kg6 7. Kf4 Kh5 8. g6 wins, avoiding another stalemate af-
ter 8. Kf5? 5. g6 Qh5 + 6. Ke6 Qh6. Else g7 follows. 7. Be5. Else there is a check from bQ on e3. 7. ..., Qh8 8. g7+ Qxg7 9. Bd6 mate.


No. 5214: B. Buyannemekh. Bl intends 1. ..., Ka2, against mate, and wS is accordingly in gravest peril. 1. Sg 5 ? $\mathrm{Qh} 2+2$. Kb3 $\mathrm{Qb} 8+3$. Kc 2 (Kc4 Qf4; Kb3, Qxg5; covers c1) 3. $\ldots, \mathrm{Qb} 2+4$. $\mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 5+5 . \mathrm{Kc} 2$ $\mathrm{Qe} 2+6 . \mathrm{Kb} 3 \mathrm{Qd1}+7$. Ka3 Qd6+ (Qd2? Se4, Qa2 + ; Kb4, Qb1 + ; Ka3, Qb2 + ; Ka4, Ka2; Ka5 draws) 8. Kb3 $\mathrm{Qd} 5+$ 9. Kc2 Qg2 + . 1. Sf6 Qe7 2. Sd5. And now compare the main line with the bracketed variation in the long thematic try of the preamble. 2. ..., Qe2 + 3. Kc1 Qe1 + 4. Kc2 $\mathbf{Q b 1}+\mathbf{5} . \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathbf{Q a 2}+\mathbf{6} . \mathrm{Kc} \mathbf{Q b 2}+7$. Kd1 Kb1 8. Ke1, and W consolidates. Echo! ''Nice 'malyutka' with the rare, so-called 'symmetrical thematic try'. True, it has a dry-ish, academic air...."

No. 5215: V. Kondratyev and A. Kopnin (Chelyabinsk). 1. g8Q + Qxg8 2. Sf6 + Kf8 3. Bc3. Now there is a divergence. 3. ..., Qh8 4. $\operatorname{Sd} 7+$ Kg 8 5. $\mathrm{Sf} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ 6. Se8 + (else f6;) 6. ..., Kh7 7. Sf6 + Kh6 8. $\mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ 9. Sf6 + . And 3. ..., Qg7 (Qg5? $\mathrm{Sh} 7+;) 4 . \mathrm{Sd} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 85 . \mathrm{Sf} 6+\mathrm{Kh} 86$. Ba1 Qf8 7. Sd7 + Qg7 8. Sf6 Qh6 9. $\mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Qg} 7$ 10. Sf6 Qg 5 11. $\mathrm{Se} 4+$ Qg7 12. Sf6, positional draw. "A conglomeration of old and new the-
mes, namely positional draw, perpetual check, 'declining capture', domination, forks... so, why only an honourable mention? Because the position is essentially there at the start, because the play is too simple, not deep enough, and only the move 6. Ba1 stays in the mind. Some of the capture-declining does not ring true, the motivation being too obvious..."


No. 5216: B.N. Sidorov (Apsheronsk) and V. Shanshin (Osh). 1. Be7? can be met by 1. ..., g1Q 2. Se4 + Ka2 3. $\mathrm{Sc} 3+\mathrm{Ka} 14$. Ba3 Qb6. 1. Sa4 Kxa4. 1. ..., ghQ 2. Sc3 Qh7 3. Bc7, with $\mathrm{Sb} 5+$ to follow, eg after 3. ..., Qe7 4. Bd6+. 2. Sg3 g1Q 3. Se2 Qc5 4. $\mathrm{Sc} 3+\mathrm{Ka} 3$ 5. Bc7 Kb4 6. Bd8. This time threatening $\mathrm{Be} 7+$ and $\mathrm{Sd} 5+.6$. ..., Ka3 7. Bc7. ''Positional draw with a 'sliding fork'. Not a new idea, but rather well put together."

## Tourneys

Alexander HERBSTMANN Memorial, announced jointly by EG, by the Swedish Chess Problem Society, and by Tidskrift för Schack, with a closing date of 31.xii.84. Judge: Pauli Perkonoja (Finland). Send entries to AJR, with ''Herbstman Memorial" on the envelope. There are 5 principal prizes in Swedish kronor, and further book prizes.

Mongolian Chess Federation and the editorial board of Sportiin medee announce their 3rd international tourney. Judge: Pauli Perkonoja (Finland). Closing date: 1. viii.84. Send in 2 copies to: S. Chimedtzeren, PO Box 803, Ulanbator - 13, MONGOLIA. There will be 3 prizes, honourable mentions and commendations.

## New magazines

IDEE UND FORM, for all branches of composition, with studies edited by Beat Neuenschwander. (R.C. Handloser, Weidweg 44, 3032 Hinterkappelen, Switzerland.)

PAT A MAT, which may or may not have a studies section. Issued by the Bratislava Chess Problem Circle. (Dr. Bedrich Formanek, Zimna 2, 82102 Bratislava, Czechoslovakia.)

The Chess Endgame Study Circle and EG 4 issues p.a. EG $75-78$ for $1984 £ 4.00$ or $\$ 10.00$.
Calendar year.

1. Send money (cheques, dollar bills, International Money Orders) direct to A.J. Roycroft.

Or
2. Arrange for your Bank to transfer your subscription to the credit of: A.J. Roycroft Chess Account, National Westminster Bank Ltd., 21 Lombard St., London EC3P 3AR, England.
Or
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, 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

Editor: A.J. Roycroft.

## THE CHESS ENDGAME STUDY CIRCLE

AJR has been fortunate in being awarded an Industrial Fellowship (by The Royal Society and the Science and Engineering Research Council) to be spent at Professor Donald Michie's Machine Intelligence group in Scotland. This is expected to last 18 months. Accordingly, he can no longer guarantee to organise meetings of The Chess Endgame Study Circle in London. However, enthusiastic members have offered to try to keep the 20 -year tradition going, in principle on the first Friday in July, October, January and April, and in the West End of London. If you would like to be kept informed, send a stamped, selfaddressed envelope to: Alan C. Martin, 241 Nether Street, London N3 1NY.

