DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS


No. 5757: L.A. Mitrofanov and A. Sochniev (Leningrad). 1. Sb5 (Kxd4? g2; 1. ..., f4+ (Sxb5; Rxb5) 2. Kxf4 (Kxd4? f3;) 2. ..., Se2 + (Sxb5; Rxb5) 3. Rxe2/i g2 4. Rxc2/ii Kh1/i1i 5. Sd4 g1Q 6. Sf3 Qg2 7. Rc1 + .


iii) 4. ..., Kf1 5. Kf3 wins, or 4. ..., Kh2 5. Sd4(c3).

This is the fourth joint study from the top of the award. The Soviet composers have always been specialists in this form of mutual assistance, but here is a very exceptional situation.
No. 5758: A. Arestov (Rostov, Region). 1. Kf6? Sxc6 draws. 1. Rh8 + Ke7 2. Rh7+ (Rx8b, Rx5a; and Kd6c) 2. ..., Ke6 (Ke8; Rxc7, Rx5a; Re8+) 3. Rxc7 Rx5a 4. Re7+ Kd6 (Kxc7; c7) 5. c7 Sc6 6. c5+ with 3 replies: 6. ..., Kxe7 7. c8Q, or 6. ..., Kxe5 c8Q, or 6. ..., Rxc5 7. cS mate.

No. 5759: G. Amiryan (Erevan). 1. Kg1/i g4/ii 2. Rf1/iii Ke5 (else Rf4+ and fRb4) 3. Rb5+ (e4? Kxe4) 3. ..., Ke6 (Ke4; Rf4+) 4. e4 (Rb6+? Ke5) 4. ..., g3 5. e5/iv Ke7 (else Rf6+ and fRb6) 6. Rb7+ Ke8 7. e6 g2 8. Rb8 + Ke7 9. Rf7+ Kxe6 10. fRb7 and wins. This would be a very long solution on a 1000 x 1000 board!

i) 1. Rb4+? Kf3 2. e4 g4 3. e5 g3 4. Rb3+/v Kf4 5. Kg1 Kg4/vi 6. e6/vii Kh3 7. e7 Rg2+. 1. Rd1? Kf3 2. Kg1 (e4+, Kxe4) 2. ..., g4 3. Rf1 + Kg3 4. e4 + Kh4 5. e5 g3 and either 6. Rb8 g2, or 6. e6 Kh3.

ii) 1. ..., Kd5 2. e4 + Ke4 3. Rb8 Kd4 (Rc1; Rc8+) 4. e5. 1. ..., Ke5 2. e4 g4 3. Rb5 + Kf4 4. e5 g3 5. e6. 1. ..., Kf5 2. e4 + Ke5 3. Rb5+. 1. ..., Rc1 2. Rf1 Rc2 3. Kh1 and either 3. ..., Ke5 4. Rg1 Kf5 5. Rb4+ or 3. ..., Rc1 4. Rg1 Rc2 5. Rxc5.

iii) 2. Rb4 +? Kf3 3. e4 (Rd1, Kg3) 3. ..., g3 4. Rb3 + Kg4. 2. Rd1? Kf3 3. Rf1 + Kg3 4. e4 + Kh4 5. e5 g3.


vii) 6. Re4 + or 6. Rb4 + each met by 6. ..., Kh3.


ii) Extraordinary. wSb2 is needed on that square in order either to keep the long diagonal blocked (3. Sd1? a2 4. h6 g5 5. h7 a1Q) or to ensure that Bl promotes on b1, not a1 (see (ii)).

iii) 3. ..., ab 4. h7 b1Q 5. h8Q Qh6 6. Sb6, another extraordinary wS sacrifice, this time to save wQ, which was threatened by Qg2+; followed by Qh2+.
No. 5761: V. Razumenko (Leningrad).
1. Qb8 + Ke7 2. Qe5 + Kf8 3. Bd5 (for Qf6 + )
Bf3 + Kh3 11. Qd7 + Kh2 12. Qd2 + Kh3 13. Qg2 mate.
i) 3. ..., Qf1 4. Ke7, with the threat of
5. Qh8 + Ke7 6. Qd8 mate.
ii) 4. ..., Qe7 5. Qh8 mate. 4. ..., Qg7
5. Qb8 + Ke7 6. Qc7 + Kf8 7. Qd8 mate.
iii) 5. ..., Qf2 6. Qh8 + Ke7 7. Qg7 +

No. 5762: B. Gusev (Moscow).
1. Rg2 + Kh6 2. Bf1 Sa2 (Rx e3; Rg6) 3.
Rg6 Re8 4. e4 Kxe4 5. Kb3 Sc1 + 6.
i) 1. ..., Qf1 2. Bf7. 1. ..., Kh4 2. Bf7
ii) 1. ..., Sc3 8. Kxc3 Sd4 + 9. Kb2
Rx g6 10. Bd3 +. David Hooper:
"Very neat. An 'ideal' stalemate".

No. 5763: G. Gorbunov (Saratov Regi-
on). 1. Se5 + /i Sxe5/ii 2. c7 Re1 + /iii
believe in the originality here... (AJR).
i) 1. c7? Sxe5 2. Se5 + Kh5 3. Sc6 Re1
ii) 1. ..., Kh5 2. Bf7. 1. ..., Kg5(h4)2.
Sf3 +. 1. ..., Kh3 2. Be6 + Kh2 3.
Sf3 + Kg2 4. Sxg1.
iii) 2. ..., Sxc4 3. c8Q + Kh4 4. Qh8 +
Kg3 5. Qg7 + Kh2 (Kf2; Qd4 + ) 6.
Qh8 + Kg2 7. Qxc4.
iv) 4. Ke6? Sxc4 5. c8Q Rd4 draws. 4.
Kc5? Sd7 + 5. Kd5 (Kc6, Rc1) Rb1 +
Re8 9. Bf7 (Bc6, Re7 + ) 9. .... Ra8.
vi) 6. ..., Rg8 7. Kf7 Rh8 8. Kg7 Ra8

No. 5764: N. Kralin (Moscow). The
source is a book, in which the study
appears as an original on p.75.
1. Bf7 + Kh6 2. Sg6 Kh7 3. Sf8 +
Kb6 4. Kg6 Kh7 and there is no more
than a repetition of moves. 1. Sf7 Se8.
A good square since if wB attacks b5
from f7 (without check) then bSd6

No. 5765: V. and L. Kapusta (Sumy, USSR). The theme was the battle of Kulikov Field, fought 600 years before on 8.ix.1380, in which Dmitri Donskoi defeated the Tartar horde. Both problems and studies were represented in the award. We reproduce the two studies.

i) 2. ..., Kg6 3. Sf8 + Kg5 4. d8Q + Qf6 5. Se6 + Kg6 6. Qe8 + .

No. 5767: P. Joitsa (Bucurest). Judge: Constantin Raina (Lugoj, Romania).


No. 5770: V. Nestorescu (v.82 and vii.84)
3/4 Prizes, Revista Romana de Sah, 1982

Win

No. 5772: A.V. Sarychev (v.82)
1 Hon. Men., Revista Romana de Sah, 1982

Draw

No. 5771: F.S. Bondarenko
and A.I.P. Kuznetsov (v.82)
5th Prize, Revista Romana de Sah, 1982

Draw

No. 5773: P. Joitsa (vii.82)
2 Hon. Men., Revista Romana de Sah, 1982

Draw

No. 5774: V. Petrovici (Bucurest). I: 1. Qe8+ Kg4 2. Qe4+ Kh5 3. Qf3 + Qg4 4. Qf7 + Kg5 5. f4 + Qxf4 6. Qg6 mate.

No. 5771: F.S. Bodarenko and the late A.I.P. Kuznetsov (USSR). 1. Kf2? c5 2. e6 + Kc6 3. Qa5 Qb8. 1. e6 + Ke8 1. ...
Sgd4 g3 + 5. Kg1 f3 6. Qg2 gf 7. Sc6 Qxc6 stalemate.

Kxh7 (h4, a6; h5, Rh8;) and now 12. ...
a5 13. ba b4 14. a6 b3 15. a7 b2 16.
a8Q b1Q + . 1. Bh1 + g3 + 2. Bxg2 +
(Rxg2? Kh4;) 2. ...
Kf4 3. Rg8 Rb8 4.
Rg3 Rh7 5. Rg8 Rb8 6. Rg3.

Rd2 Qxc3 + 3. Rc2 Qe1 mate. 1. Kc2?
Sxd1 2. Sb3 Sc3 + 3. Kc1 Kh3. 1. Sh3
Kxb3 2. Be4 + Kxc4 3. Rd4 + . 3. Kh2?
Sxd1 4. Kxa2 Sd2, with a 'Troitzky'
win. 3. ...
Kxc3 4. Rd2. 4. Ra4?
Sd3 + 5. Kg1 Se2 + 4. ...
Kc1 Q5 5. Ra2
Sd3 + 6. Kg1 Se2 + 7. Kg1 with perpe-
tual check. Or 4. ...
a1R 5. Rc2 + Kb3
6. Rb2 + Kc4 7. Rxf2. 7. Rxh7 Sd3 +
8. Kg2 Sb4 + 9. Kg1 Ra2 10. Kg1 Rh2
11. Rc1 Kd3. 7. ...
Sd3 + 8. Kb2 Ra2
9. Kg1 Rxf2 stalemate.

No. 5774: V. Petrovici (Bucurest). I: 1. Qe8 + Kg4 2. Qe4 + Kh5 3. Qf3 +
Qg4 4. Qt7 + Kg5 5. f4 + Qxf4 6. Qg6
mate.
II: 1. Qe2+ Qg4 2. Qxb5+ Qg5 3. Qe2+ Qg4 4. Qe8+ Kg5 5. Qe5+ Qf5 + 6. Qxf5+ Kxf5 7. h3 Kg5 8. Kg7 Kf4 9. Kf6 Ke3 10. Kg5 wins.

No. 5774: V. Petrosici (viii.82, x.82 and vii.84)
3 Hon. Mens., Revista Romana de Sah, 1982
Draw 5 + 4

II: remove bBh3, add bSb5

No. 5775: G.M. Kasparian (i.82)
4 Hon. Mens., Revista Romana de Sah, 1982
Win 4 + 5

No. 5776: J. Rusinek (vii.82)
5 Hon. Mens., Revista Romana de Sah, 1982
Draw 5 + 4

No. 5777: N. Micu (vii.82)
1 Comm., Revista Romana de Sah, 1982
Win 4 + 5


Kxf7 8. Kh7 a1Q 9. g8Q+ Ke7 10. Qg7+


No. 5778: I. Mozes (i.82)
2 Comm., Revista Romana de Sah, 1982

No. 5779: V. Kichigin (iv.82)
3 Comm., Revista Romana de Sah, 1982

No. 5780: I. Krikheli (vii.82)
4 Comm., Revista Romana de Sah, 1982

No. 5781: M. Kovacevic (Yugoslavia).

No. 5782: P. Raican (Tulcea, Romania).
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No. 5786  L. Tamkov (viii.82)  Commended, Revista Romana de Sah, 1982

No. 5787  Em. Melnichenko (x.82)  Commended, Revista Romana de Sah, 1982


No. 5789  A. Khait (xi.82 and ix.83)  Commended, Revista Romana de Sah, 1982


Commenting on this award (see the AJR’s preamble to No. 5767) David Hooper exclaims ''Oh, dear!'' (No. 5779); ''Goodness!'' (No. 5784) and ''Why bother?'' (No. 5786).
No. 5790: Edward A. Asaba (Moscow). Judge: P. Perkonoja (Finland).
ii) 5. f8Q? Rxf8 6. Bxf8 Sc3 + and 7. ...

No. 5791: Nikolai I. Kralin (Moscow). 1. g8S+/i Bxg8 2. d7 + Kh5 3. Rh6 + (d8Q? Qh1 ;) 3. ..., Kxh6
4. Qa6 + Qxa6 5. ba f4/ii 6. d8S Kh5 7. a7 and now:
7. ..., h6 8. a8R/iii Bh7 9. Ra5 wins,
ii) 1. d7 + ? Kh5 2. Rh6 + Kxh6 3. g8S + Kh5 4. Sf6 + Kg6.
iii) 8. a8Q? Bh7 9. Qe4 Bf5 +.
v) 9. ..., Bb3 10. a8Q Bd1 11. Qd5(c8).

No. 5792: J. Vandiest (Belgium).
1. Qg7+/i Ka8 (Kb8; Qg8 +) 2. Qg2 + (Qg8 +? Qb8 +;) 2. ..., Kb8/
ii 3. Qg8+/ii Kb7/iv 4. Qd5 +
7. Qg6 + 8. Ka5/xiv Qg4 9. Se6 Qg1
(Qg3; Ka6) 10. Qd8 + Kb7 11. Qe7 + Kb8/xv 12. Sc5 Qb1/xvi 13.
i) 1. Qxa3 +? Kb7 2. Qa6 + Kb8 3.
Sc6 + Kc7 4. Qa7 + (Qb6 +, Kd7;)
4. ..., Kc8 5. Qa8 + Kd7 6. Qd8 +
Sa5+/xviii Kc7 3. Qg7 + (Qb6 +,
Kd7; 3. ..., Kd6.
ii) 2. ..., Ka7 3. Sc6 + Kb7 (Ka8;
Sd8 +) 4. Sa5 + Kc7(c8) 5. Qb7 +
Kd8 (Kd6; Qb8 +) 6. Sc6 +.
iii) 3. Sa6 +? Kc8 4. Qa8 + (Qc6 +,
Kd8;) 4. ..., Kd7 5. Sc5 + Ke7 6.
Qb7 + Kf6. 3. Sc6 +? Kc8 4. Qg8 +
Kd7 5. Qg7 + (Qd8 +, Ke6; with
Qe7 +, Kf6; or Sc4 +, Kf7;) 5. ....
Kc6 6. Qc7 + (Sc4 +, Kd5;) 6. ....,
Kf5, while, in this, no better is 4.
Qh3 + Kb7 5. Qd7 + Qc7 6. Sa5 +
Kb8.
iv) 3. ..., Kc7 4. Sd5 + 5. Kb7 6. Qd8 + Kc7; Qg7 +. 3. ..., Kc7; Se6 +, or Kb8 (c8); Se6 + 6. Qd5 +.

v) 4. ..., Ka7(b8) 5. Sc6 + Kc7(c8) 6. Qd8 + Kb7 5. Sc6 +, or Kb8 (c8); Se6 +) 6. Qd8 + Kb7 7.

vi) 6. ..., Qe2 + 7. Kb6 (Kc6(a4), Qa6 +) 8. ..., Qf2 +. 6. ..., Qb8 + 7. Ka6 Qg7 8. Qg8 + Qd8 9. Qe6 + Kb8 10.


x) A 'problem' move. 11. Ka7? Qg7 + 12. Kc6 (Kb8, Qa8 +; or Kb6, Qb2 +) 12. ..., a2 13. Qa6 + 


xiv) The same 'problem' move. 8. Ka7? Qf7 + 9. Kb6 (Ka8(a6), a2;) 9. ..., Qg6 + . 8. Kb5? Qe8 + 9. Kc6 (Kb5(b6), Qd8 +) 9. ..., Qe2 + . 8. Sc6? Qb1 + 9. Ka7 (Kc6, Qc2 +; Kd6, Qh2 +) 9. ..., Qg1 + 10. Sc5 (Ka8, Qb6; Qg7 +) 11. Kc8 (Kb6, Qg6 +; or Ka6, Qf6;) 11. ..., Qg4 12. Qc6 + (Qe6 +) Kd8 13. Qe6 + Kc7 14. Qc7 + Kb6.


xviii) 2. Qg7 + Qc7. 2. Sa5 + Ke7.

3. ..., Rh8(g8) 4. Re7 + Kd8 5. Sb7 +.

No. 5793: A. Sochnev
4th Prize, Herbsman, Mem. Ty, 1984

No. 5794: L. Falk
5th Prize, Herbsman
Mem. Ty, 1984

Draw
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On 2. ..., Kf2 there is 6. Re4, drawing.


iv) 7. Q(B)xh5? Qa1 + . 7. Qe5? Qg4.


ii) 4. ..., Re1 5. Qh2 + Kxg4 6. Qxh7.

i) 1. h7? Rh5 2. f8Q + Be7+ wins, or, in this, 2. Kg2 Be7 3. Sf6 Rh6, with: 4. Sxe4 + Kd5 5. Sg5 (Sf6+, Ke6; 5. ..., Bf8, 6. ..., Ke5 and 7. ..., Kg6. 4. Kg3 Kd6 and 5. ..., Ke6.
ii) 2. ..., Rh6 3. f8Q + Be7 + 4. Qxh6.
iv) 4. h8Q? Rg6 + 5. Kh3 (Kf1, Rg1 mate) 6. ... Rh6 +.
v) 4. ..., Rg6 + 5. Kh4 Rh6 + 6. Kg4 and 7. f8Q.
vii) The only way to prevent promo-

i) The only way. After 4. Rd7 Be6 + or 4. Ba3 d4, W has achieved nothing.
iii) 4. ..., Bxe7 5. Bb2 mate. 4. ..., b5 is a cunning defence, for Bl now threatens 5. ..., d4.
iv) If 6. ..., d4 7. Ra7 and W wins.

No. 5799: L. Falk and A. Hildebrand
1 Comm., Herbtman Mem. Ty 1984
Award: TFS $15 and EGR 1.86
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iv) 3. Kf3? Rf1 +, a thematic try.
v) 4. Kg2? Rg1 +, another thematic try.

No. 5800: J. Vandiest (Belgium). 1. Qd4/i, with two lines, 1. ..., Qh1 + and 1. ..., Qa3.
i) 1. Qe2 +? Ke2 2. Qf3. 1. Qe2 +? Kf3. 1. Qf3. 1. Beb5 Qhl + 2. Ka2 (Kb2, Qc1 +) 2. ..., Qf3 3. Kb2 (Qd4 +, Kel; Qg1 +, Kd2;) 3. ..., Qe3. After 1. Qd4 the only playable moves are 1. ..., Qh1 + and 1. ..., Qa3, both implementing the theme of T.B. Gorgiev, but here the board is turned instead of, as with Gorgiev, inducing a chameleon echo with a pawn. Bad replies to 1. Qd4 would be 1. ..., Ke1 2. Qe3 +, or 1. ..., Qa5(b8, f8) 2. Bxb5 + Ke1 3. Qg1 + Kd2 4. Qe1 mate, or 1. ..., Qa4 2. Be4 + Ke1 3. Qe3 +.
Kb1 Qh3 or Qh7 +.

i) 2. ..., Kc1 3. Qc3 +. 2. ..., Ke1 3. Qe3 +. 2. ..., Qh2 3. Qb2 +, the main reason for 2. Ka2. 2. ..., Qd1(e1, b4) 3. Bc4 +/vii.

iv) 3. Bxb5 +? Ke1 4. Qg1 Kd2 5. Qf2+ Ke3 with a draw, the c5 square not being available.


ii) An important thematic try is 3. Kc2?, with the variation 3. ...,

vii) 3. Bxb5 + Ke1(c1) 4. Qg1 + Kd2 5. Qf2+ Kcl (Kd1; Ba4 +) 6. Qf1 +

No. 5801 A. Koranyi
3 Comm., Herbsman Mem. Ty.
1984

No. 5801: Attila Koranyi (Budapest).

v) The purpose is the loss of a single
tempo for a position of reciprocal zugzwang, for if 7. Bal? e3 8. c5 Qd2 and with W in zugzwang it is only a draw.

vi) 11. c7? Qd6+ draws.
The composer draws attention to "a distant partial anticipation": Troitzky, Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1907 - wKg2 wRg8 wBd6 wPc5, e2, f3 bK6 bQh4 bPc6, f4, h5.

Win: 1. Bf8 + Kh7 2. Rg7 + Kh8 3. Be7 Qe1 4. Bf6 Qxe2 + 5. Kh1 Qc6 6. Bd4 Qc7 7. Bf6-d4-a1 h3 11.-13. Bf6-d4-a1 h2 14.-16. Bf6-d4-a1 BQ- 17. W wins bQ. After h4-h3-h2 in the Troitzky Bl is in zugzwang. In the present study there is a reciprocal zugzwang (not just Bl).

No. 5802: Noam Elkies (New York).
1. Qe5/i Qg7/ii 2. Bg6 Rxg6/iii 3. f6 Qxf6/iv 4. g5 + Qxg5 5. Qh8 mate.

1. Kh4? Qg7 2. Bg6 (to stop bQg5)
2. ..., Rg6 3. f6 Qxg6.

1. Kg5? 2. Qe3 mate.

1. ..., Rb6 2. Qe3 + .

1. ..., Rxf5 2. gf Kxh5 3. Qf6 (also Qe5 AJR).

1. ..., Rg6 2. Qe3 + Kg7 3. Qe7 + Kh8 (Kh6; g5 + and Qh7)
4. Qe8 + .

1. Rb6 2. Qf4 + Kg7 3. Qc7 + Kh8 (Kh6; g5 + ) 4. Qe8 + .


1. ..., Qh8 2. Kh4 and the pawns' advance decides: 2. ..., Qg7 3. Qf4 + with g5, f6, g6 + , or 2. ..., Kh7 3. g5 Ra6(f8) 4. Qc7 + Qg7 5. f6.

iii) Not only was Qf4 mate threatened, but also 3. g5 + Kxg5 4. Qe3 mate.

2. ..., Qh8 3. Kh4 Kg7 + 4. Bh5 Kh7(g8) 5. g5 wins, but not 4. Kg3? Qh6 5. Qc7 + Kg8, when 6. Bh7 + Kh8, or 6. Qxf6 Qf4 + stalemates.

1. ..., Qa7 stops both mating threats and prepares a perpetual against 3. Qxf6? Qe3 + , but loses to 3. g5 + Kxg5 4. Qg3 + , with 5. Qh4 + 6. Qh7 + and 7. Qxa7.

iv) To stop 4. Qh5 mate. 3. ..., Kg5 4. fg Rxe5 6. Qf4 + and there is no stalemating draw as Wk escapes to f6 or to the a3-f8 diagonal.

v) 2. ..., Qa7 3. Qe7 Ra8 4. Qe4 Rg8 5. f7 Qa5 + 6. Kh4.

1. ..., Q else on rank 3. Qe3 + Kh7 4. Qe7 + . Also, 2. ..., Rf8 3. f6 Qd3 + (Rg8; Qf4 + , Rg5; Kh4, Qg8; f7) 4. Kh4 Rg8 5. Be8 and the threat of 6. Qh5 mate decides.

vi) To meet the 'g5' threat with 4. ..., Qc4 + 5. Bg4 Kg8 6. g6? Rxf6 7. Qxf6 Qxg4 + .

No. 5803: Yohanan Afek (Tel-Aviv).

No. 5802: Noam Elkies (New York).
1. Qe5/i Qg7/ii 2. Bg6 Rxg6/iii 3. f6 Qxf6/iv 4. g5 + Qxg5 5. Qh8 mate.

1. Kh4? Qg7 2. Bg6 (to stop bQg5)
2. ..., Rg6 3. f6 Qxg6.

1. Kg5? 2. Qe3 mate.

1. ..., Rb6 2. Qe3 + .

1. ..., Rxg6 2. gf Kxh5 3. Qf6 (also Qf4 AJR).

1. ..., Rc6 2. Qe3 + Kg7 3. Qe7 + Kh8 (Kh6; g5 + and Qh7)
4. Qe8 + .

1. Rb6 2. Qf4 + Kg7 3. Qc7 + Kh8 (Kh6; g5 + ) 4. Qe8 + .


1. ..., Qh8 2. Kh4 and the pawns' advance decides: 2. ..., Qg7 3. Qf4 + with g5, f6, g6 + , or 2. ..., Kh7 3. g5 Ra6(f8) 4. Qc7 + Qg7 5. f6.


ii) 3. ... Bf7 4. b7 Kc7 5. Be4, a positional draw.


No. 5804: Ernest Levonovich Pogosyants (Moscow). 1. Ke2/i Kc5/ii 2. Ke3 Kd5 3. Bg2, with the following 'echo' variations:

3. ... Re8 4. Bh1 Re7 5.Bg2 Re6 6. Bh1,

3. ... Ra4 4. Kg4 Rb4 5. Bh1, with a second draw of the "Villeneuve-Esclapon" type, at 90°.


No. 5807: Vladimir Mikhailovich Archakov (Kiev) and Mikhail Afanasievich Zinar (Feodosia). 1. b4 h5 2. b5
h4 3. b6 h3 4. b7 h2 5. b8Q h1Q 6. Qb7 Qf1/i 7. Qb5 Qh1 8. Qh1, drawn by perpetual self-stalemate threat.

1) 6. ..., Qxb7 stalemate. 6. ..., Qh6 + 7. Kb1 draw, 6. ..., Qg1 7. Qb6, and Qe3 + may follow. David Joseph's winning idea in drawing form. It is a matter of taste whether wbP starts on b2 or b3. On b2 there is a (trite) excelsior, but Bl's last move is not likely to have been a good one. wPb3, as in the diagram, is more natural from a game standpoint.

No. 5807  V. M. Archakov and M. A. Zinar
(after D. Joseph)
Original

Draw 4 - 4

No. 5808  Em. Dobrescu
1st Prize Axel Akerblom Memorial Tournament, 1983
Award: Tidskrift for Schack, xi.83

Win 2 - 4

No. 5808: Em. Dobrescu (Romania). This memorial tourney was for studies in which the W force is restricted to wK and one other man. Lars Falk of Linköping was the judge and

returns: "the technical difficulties of creating good studies in minimal form are considerable, which may have affected the level of the submissions, which was not especially high. Of the 17 entries some were defective and many lacked originality. Unfortunately the most beautiful one had a minor error. Only studies with an artistic element have been retained but in view of the memorial status of the competition I have otherwise tried to be generous".

1. Qe4+ i Kc1/ii 2. Qe1 + Kh2 3. Qe5 + Kb1 4. Qd4, with:


"A masterly study in which zugzwang play is underscored by the hP's march. The composer has previously treated the GBR class 1330, but the win here is on an even higher level than his 1966 Troitzky
Memorial study. The analysis is of course complicated in a study of this kind, but no significant duals were discovered.


i) 1. ..., Kg8 2. Re8 + Kf7 3. Rxc8 and 4. Rxc6, a theoretical draw.

iii) This position is now a reflection of a 1980 study by the same composer, in *Schweizerische Schachzeitung*, iv) 4. ..., Bd5(45) 5. Kh3 Sf1 6. Rc1.

"bK is forced to f5 by exact play, whereupon W saves himself in an original position in which wR holds up against four minor pieces. The introduction is awkward due to the hunting-down of the cP."


i) 1. ..., Sc6 2. Kc7 Sa5(Ke7) 3. Ba3.

 iii) Completing the zugzwang.

"A very nicely constructed study where the play develops exactly and with good points towards two positions of stalemate, one in the solution, the other in tries. The placing would have been higher had the author not already used the idea in an earlier study, though in an inferior form."

David Hooper: "Delicate, better than 2nd Prize".


"A study in classical style, impressing with the precision of bK moves and wS march. The S-promotion is parried by an unexpected stalemate."
No. 5811  
G. Werner
2 Hon. Men., Akerblom Memorial Ty, 1983

No. 5813  
A. Koranyi
1st Prize, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984
Award: Magyar Sakkelet, x.84 and i.85

No. 5812  
A. Hildebrand
Commended, Akerblom Memorial Ty, 1983

No. 5814  
A. Koranyi
2nd Prize, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984

No. 5812: A. Hildebrand. 1. Kf7/i Bh6/ii 2. Rc5 e3 3. Rxc3 e2 4. Rg3 e1Q 5. Rg7+ Kh8 6. Rg8+ Kh7 7. Rg7+ with perpetual check or stalemate.
i) 1. Re5? c2 2. Kf7 Bh6 3. Rc5 c1Q.


4. ..., Be4 5. h3/iii Bf3 (Ba8; h4) 6. Qf4 Ba8 7. Qf5+/iv Kg8 8. Qf7 + Kh8 9. Qh5 +.
i) 5. h3? c4 6. Qd7 c3 7. Qd3 + Kh6 8. Qe3 + Kh5 wins.
ii) 7. ..., c3 8. Qf4 + Kh5 9. Qf3 +.
iii) 5. h4? Ba8 6. Qd7 c4 7. h5 Kh6 8. Qc7 c3 9. Qf4 + Kh7 10. Qf5 + (Qh6 +, Kg8;) 10. ..., Kg8 11. Qf7 + Kh8 12. h6 Be4 (c2? Qh7+) and Bf wins.
No. 5815: Emil Melnichenko (New Zealand).
1. Qc6 Qc7 2. Qd6 Qd7 3. Qe6 Qc7 4. Qh3 Qe3 5. Qh5 Qxf6 6. gf Rxh7 + 7. Kxg6 Rxh5 8. Kxh5 i
9. Kg6 wins.

No. 5816: A. Koranyi

No. 5817: D. Gurgenidze (Chailuri, Georgian SSR).
1. Rg8 + Kxd7 2. Qxg6 Rxax5 + 3. Kf4 Ra4 + 4. Kg3 Ra3 + 5. Kh2 Ra2 + 6. Kg1 Ra1 +

No. 5818: J. Vandiest (Belgium).
1. b6 c2 2. b7 c1Q 3. b8Q + Ke7 4. Qe5 Qa3 5. Bg4 + Kd8 6. Qb8 + Ke7 7. Qe7 + Kf8 8. Qc8 + Kf7 9.

No. 5819: Pal Benno (Hungary).
This study and the next are practi-

No. 5819: Pal Benno
- 1/2 Hon. Mention, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984

No. 5820: Pal Benno
- 1/2 Hon. Mention, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984

No. 5822: J. Marwitz and F. Spinhoven
1 Commend, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984

No. 5823: J. Marwitz
2 Commend, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984

No. 5820: Pal Benno. 1. Ba2, with 1. ..., Ke2 2. c4, or 1. ..., Ke3 2. Bb1, or 1. ..., Ke4 2. Kd2.

No. 5821: Edward Asaba (Moscow), 1. Kh1 a2 2. Rg1 Sb1 3. Sg8 + Kh5 4. Sf6 +, with either:
4. ..., Kh4 5. Rg4 + Kh3 6. Rg5 a1Q 7. Rh5 mate, or
4. ..., Kh6 5. h4 and 6. h5 e4 7. Rg6 mate.

No. 5821: E. Asaba
3rd Hon. Mention, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984

No. 5822: J. Marwitz and F. Spinhoven
1 Commend, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984

No. 5823: J. Marwitz
2 Commend, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984

No. 5824: M. Hlinka
3 Commend, Tipografia Jubilee Ty, 1984


iv) 5. ..., Sxg4 6. Se6+ Kg8 7. Sg5 Bg2 8. Kxg4, or, in this, 7. ..., Sxh2 8. Sxh3.


vi) 7. ..., Sxh2 8. g4 Kf7.


This solution was easy to prepare for EG because, and this is almost unique in AJR’s experience, Suomen Shakki adopted ‘our’ solution presentation conventions.


iv) 6. ..., Kd1 7. Ba5 + Kc1 8. Rh1 + -- see note (i).


No. 5828 A. Maksimovskikh and V. Shupletsov (ix.84)
1. Hon. Mention Suomen Shakki, 1983-4

No. 5829 I. Krikheli (xi.1984)
2. Hon. Mention, Suomen Shakki, 1983-4
i) 2. ..., Ka7 3. Sc7 Qb6(b7) 4. Sb5 + .
ii) No note to this move, just two exclamation marks.
iv) 6. ..., Qb6(d5)+ 7. Kc(b)4 Kd6 8. e8Q Qxc5 + 9. Kb3 Qd5 + 10. Ka3 Qc(a)5 + 11. Kb2 Qf2(b6) + 12. Kb3(Bb5).

No. 5831: V. Kozyrev (Morozovsk). Judge: N. Krajin (Moscow), whose long award is headlined "Bold fantasy and sound taste". 39 published entries by 41 composers (ie, some joint compositions), 6 finally unsound, 4 unsound but later corrected and allowed to continue in the tourney.
"The beauty is not only in the repetition of identical pictures with reciprocal zugzwangs and pins, but also in the echoed tries (sacrificial stalemates), two added symmetrical mates and other motifs, integrated into a single mould. A superb miniature in the excellent style of the Czech Havell!"

No. 5832: M. Matous (Czechoslovakia). It is tempting to start with the strong 1. Be3 +?, but after 1. ..., Kd3 2. b7 Rd8 3. Bf4 e5 Bl is safe. 1. b7 Rd8. 1. ..., Rb6 2. Be3 +. 2. Bf4 e5 +. A diverting alternative: 2.

"A miniature again, with classic material, a thrilling battle, and an unexpected denouement. A new success by the active young Czech following in the footsteps of Jindrich Fritz."

No. 5832: M. Matous (vii.84) 2nd Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5833: G. Slepyan (Minsk). "The number of chessmen shows a sharp increase - doubled. Does this mean that we are in for romantic perpe- teia?" 1. d7. 1. b7? Rg2 + 2. Kf4 Rg8 3. d7 Sd6, drawn. 1. ..., Ke5. 1. ..., Rg2 + 2. Kf4 Rg8 3. Sc7 + Kd6 (to stop Sg8) 4. dQ + Rxd8 5. Bxd8, and d6 is occupied. So Bl sets in motion play for a checkmate. If now 2. dQ? Rg2 + 3. Bg3 (late!) 2. ..., Rxe3 + 4. Kh5 Be2 mate. 2. Bg3 +. The sacrifice avoids the first unpleasantness, but the initiative stays with Bl. 2. ..., Sxe3 3. d8Q Se4 + 4. Kh6 Rh2 + 5. Kg7 Rg7 +. This counter-sacrifice brings W new trials and tribulations. 6. Kh7 Sg5 + 7. Kg8. Otherwise there are forks. 7. ..., Be4 +. The forks are not to be avoided. 8. Qd5 +. The study's centre. But even this stunning sacrifice will not clarify the outcome of this enthralling battle. 8. ..., Bxd5 + 9. Kh8. The immediate 8. Kh8? would have led to a draw: 8. ..., Se6 + 9. Ke7 Sxd8 10. Kxd8 Ba6. Now bB is on a different diagonal. 9. ..., Kb6 10. b7 Se6 + 11. Ke8 Sc7 + 12. Kd8 Sa6. Bl has contrived to hold up the second wP as well, but here comes another sacrifice. 13. Sc7 Sb8 14. Ke8 Sd7 15. Se8 + Ke7 16. Sf6, putting the final full stop to the saga. A knightly, chivalrous tournament indeed, with a wealth of liberal sacrifices one after the other. It is impossible not to agree with the opinion of a solver, that such a study is not be composed nor solved without fearless imagination.

No. 5834: L. Topko (Krivoi Rog). 1. Be4 + Kh8. 1. ..., Kh6 2. Sf5 + and 3. Sd6. 2. Sf3 d5. To stop Sg5 and Sf7 mate. 3. Bg6. The first subtelty: it is necessary to anticipate 3. ..., Bg4 4. Sg5 Bh5. 3. ..., Be6 4. Sg5 Bg8 5. Bh7. The second subtelty: it is necessary to win a tempo, for if 5.

Yet another excellent miniature with a memorable reciprocal zugzwang (emphasised by the thematic try), sacrifices, and checkmate - and all this with a surprising economy of initial material.

No. 5834: L. Topko (v. 84)
1. Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5835: B. Buyannemekh (v. 84)
2 Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5835: B. Buyannemekh (Ulan Bator). 1. Re4+ Kh5 2. Rh4+ Kg6 3. Rh6+ Kf7. There was a wS-fork after 2. ..., Kxb4; while here 3. ..., Kxh6 can be met by either Bc3+, or Sf5+. 4. Rh7+ Kg8 5. Rg7+. Already the third sacrifice. 5. ..., Kh8. There are no more checks, so what now? 6. Sf5 Se5+ 7. Kd6. Straight into check, but 7. Ke6? d1Q


Now is the right moment.
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mate to come. 14. ..., Rb6 + 15. Ke1 Rh6. 15. ..., Rf6 is an alternative --

"The title-holding Georgian duet have made a study in the 'logical' style, in which we see a so-called indirect preparative manoeuvre, previously shown by Gurgenidze, combined with a conclusion from a Nadareishvili composition. In our opinion a successful fusion!"

No. 5837: V. Vlasenko (Kharkov region). 1. Ba6 Be5 2. Sc4. There is a thematic try: 2. Be2? Ke8 3. g3 Kf8 4. Kxh2 Kg8 and bK whisks off to the 'fortress' square h8. 2. ..., Bc7 3. Sd2 Bf4 4. Se4 Ke7 5. g3. The tempo has been gained. 5. ..., Be1 6. Kxh2 Kf7 7. Be4 + Kg6 8. Bg8, denying bK the saving corner. "Although the study suffered somewhat from the correction, there was no way it could be ignored."


No. 5839: V. Khokhlov (xi.84) 1 Comm., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5838 A. Vostroknutov (xi.84) 5 Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984
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No. 5839: V. Khokhlov (Dnepropetrovsk). 1. e7. Why? To open the g8-a2 diagonal. 1. ..., Bxe7. Or 1. ..., f1Q 2. e8Q+ Ka7 3. Qe7+ Ka8 4. g8Q 2. g8Q f1Q 3. Qa2+. The alternative 3. Qd5? is premature, 3. ..., Qa6+ 4. Kc7+ Ka7 5. Qd4+ Ka8, and d8 is covered by bB. 3. ..., Kb8. 3. ..., Ba3 4. Qxa3+ Kb8 5. Qd6+ mates. 4. Qb2+ Bb4. Unblocking the square e7. If 4. ..., Kc8 5. Qb7+ mates. 5. Qe5+ Ka8 6. Qd5. The battery wins, now that there is access to the d8 square. 6. ..., Qa6+ 7. Kc7+ Kb7 8. Qd4+ Ka8 9. Qd8+ Ka7 10. Qb8 mate. “Another study with a logical key, with the so-called 'direct' manoeuvre and a concluding wK + wQ battery. A successful composing debut!”


"A pity that the systematic movement does not arise out of the process of play: its mainspring is already set, unwinding on the very first move..."

"Subtle, skiful use of reciprocal zugzwang motivations. However, the combinational introduction and final play are rather heterogeneous."

No. 5842: N. Grechishnikov (vi.84)
4 Comm., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5843: V. Kuzmichev (iv.84 and vi.84)
5 Comm., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5844: A. Maksimovskikh and V. Shupletsov (iv.84) Special Prize, Shakhmaty v. SSSR, 1984

No. 5845: V. I. Kalandadze (Tbilisi).
Kal if there were no bPd6. 9. Ke2 a1S +. 10. Ke3. "The idea of leaving a pawn uncaptured in order to ensure a win is naturally not new, but in the starkly economical setting it appears original. It is gratifying, year by year, to see the collection of miniatures expanding."

Commenting on 'appears original', David Hooper: 'Rubbish. It was all done in 1930 by Sultan Khan, who had never read a chess book. See 'A Pocket Guide to Chess Endgames', p. 71. Sultan Khan was, of course, a genius.'

No. 5845: V.I. Kalandadze (x.84)
Special Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5846: B.N. Sidorov (iii.84)
Special Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984


No. 5848: M. Zinar (Feodosia). 1. a8Q? fails to 1. ..., Sf2 + 2. Sxf2 g2 + 3. Qxa3 Rg3 +. 1. a8R Rh3 2. b8R. Rxh2? Rxh2 and mates on

6. f8R. Now W wins, since after 6. ..., Sf2+ 7. Sxf2 g2+ 8. Rxf3 Rg3+ 9. Rfx3 bK has the square f2 available.

"Please supply spare rooks" (David Hooper).

No. 5848: M. Zinar (v.84) Special Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5849: S. Osintsev (i.84) Special Comm., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5850: M. Zinar (ii.84) Special Comm., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5851: V. Pomogalov (vii.84) Special Comm., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1984

No. 5849: S. Osintsev (Sverdlovsk).

1. R2c3+ Kh2 2. Rc2+. When bK plays to the g-file wPg7 will promote with check. 2. ..., Kg3. 2. ..., Bxc2 3. Rxc2 + Kh3 4. Rc3 + Kh4 5. Rc4+, with perpetual check. 3. g8Q + Bxg8 4. R2c3 + Kf2 5. Rc2 + Ke1 6. Rc1 + Qd1 + 7. Rxd1 + Kxd1. And now, all of a sudden: 8. Kb3. The 4 promotion replies draw: 8 ..., a1Q is stalemate, 8 ..., a1R or 8 ..., a1S + 9. Kb2 captures the promoted piece, and 8. ..., a1B also leads to stalemate after 9. Ka2 Bf6 10. Kh1 Bxc4. AJR: there is a least some play after 10. ..., Bh7 + 11. Ka2 Bc2.


1. ..., h5 2. Kf6 h4 3. Ke5. We've had two "Reti" moves, and all is clear: 3. ..., Kxc6. Or 3. ..., h3 4. Kd6. 4. Kf4, and as there is no break on the king's wing it's a draw. "Poor" (David Hooper).

No. 5851: V. Pomogalov (Chita region). 1. Kd7. Blocking wPd6 but retaining the option of playing wK to left or right. Now, either:
1. ... Be3 2. Ke6 d4 3. d7 Ba5. The c3-f6 diagonal is blocked. 4. Kb5 Bd8 5. Ke4, drawing, or:
1. ... Be3 2. Ke6 d4 3. d7 Bg5. The diagonal e3-b6 is blocked. 4. Kf5 Bd8 5. Ke4.

No. 5852: J. Fritz (v.83)
1st Prize, Sachove Umeni, 1983

No. 5854: M. Matous (iv.83 and x.83)
3rd Prize, Sachove Umeni, 1983

No. 5853: G. Amiryan (vi.83)
2nd Prize, Sachove Umeni, 1983

No. 5855: S. Pivovar (viii.83)
1st Hon. Men., Sachove Umeni, 1983


Pauli Perkonoja’s award in the Herbstman Memorial Tourney (C. 31.xii.84) of EG (in EG82) and Tidskrift för Schack (x.85 and xi.85)

(The bare award conceals Herculean labours on the part of the judge. No one else can either visualise what has been rejected or imagine what may have been involved in rejecting a study that has beauty as well as complexity. The award carries no mention of confirmation period -- but then the judge has been several times individual World Solving Champion. Every reader is invited to drink a toast in his own home to Pauli Perkonoja -- and silently to remember the late Alexander Herbstman in so doing. Readers are also asked to keep in mind that the text is the outcome of a chain of translation: from Finnish into Swedish and thence into English with minor editorial emendations. AJR).

There were 70 entries, a respectable number. Some showed Herbstman’s favourite themes. After long testing the remaining (ie, sound) entries were only on an average level, which was somewhat disappointing. I find it especially saddening that two very good compositions did not pass my scrutiny.

Choosing the best was not the most difficult task, but to settle on their order was another matter. My choice will certainly not please everybody, but in my opinion a judge does not exist that can make an ideal verdict. Without more ado, my award.

1st Prize: No. 5790

Thanks to the latest discovery in the GBR class 0023 endgame the composer has managed to show his idea in a very elegant manner. The play proceeds with natural and quiet moves. It is a pity that the composer had to abandon the miniature from by adding a necessary b Pgs, but luckily this disappears in the course of the solution. 6. Bc5 is a particularly fine move, forcing bR onto the bad square f6, helping W to reach his goal -- a beautiful model. A real masterpiece!

2nd Prize: No. 5791

An endgame study with Allumwandlung (all 4 promotions) is not all that rare nowadays, but it is always worth consideration, especially when presented as tastefully as in this case. The position does not look as artificial as is usual in Allumwandlung endgames. After lively introductory play W succeeds in exchanging QQ, and only then do we meet the real content: promotion to wS, and then, depending on how B1 reacts, to wR, wB or wQ. It is remarkable that W has to play 9. b5 in the zugzwang position, a move that later prevents a dual. This too is an agreeable, harmonious endgame study.

3rd Prize: No. 5792

I am no great fan of analytical endgames, but I try to understand them too. The fewer the bPP the better a study of this type is, I feel, because the weaker side will have more freedom of action for bQ. The two variations of satisfactory length from move 7 deserve a prize, in my opinion.

1st Honourable Mention: No. 5793

A lively thing with daring sacrifices, stalemate and positional draw. A slight blemish is the fact that wRf8 does not participate in the stalemate.

2nd Honourable Mention: No. 5794

An endgame with 2 interesting variations: in the first bK is induced into a perpetual check mechanism with promotions to wS and to wR; in the second bK is forced into a bad position making the equalisation of force possible.

3rd Honourable Mention: No. 5795

In this study one must note an odd perpetuum mobile at the end of the so-
olution, especially the B1 caterpillar mechanism, driven by real horsepower.

4th Honourable Mention: No. 5796
Due to the heavily charged position the play is forcing. The curious final position compensates for this, a stalemate with an incarcerated wB and pinned wS. The idea is not so easy to show.

1st Commendation: No. 5797
A positional draw where the solver expects rather a win for Bl. The try 1. h?? is a valuable addition.

2nd Commendation: No. 5798
The best thing about this study is wB’s manoeuvring on the queen’s side.

3rd Commendation: No. 5799
The end is good, with perpetual check or stalemate, but the introduction makes a brutal impression.

4th Commendation: No. 5800
Two slow variations that finally (after the solver has fallen asleep a few times) end up in similar zugzwang positions. The study would hold more interest were the solution shorter.

5th Commendation: No. 5801
Amusing wQ sacrifices, but otherwise the study seems rather stiff.

6th Commendation: No. 5802
A neat little study in which W is ready to sacrifice almost everything to achieve a beautiful model. A better placing in the award might be expected, but I have a feeling that something is missing.

There are a further 3 'special commendations' for miniatures.

1st Special Commendation: No. 5803
A pair of pretty variations ending in positional draw or stalemate.

2nd Special Commendation: No. 5804
An agreeable combination of two different types of draw in the GBR class 0130.10: the Villeneuve-Esclapon type and the Ercole del Rio type.

3rd Special Commendation: No. 5805
A fine additional example of the GBR class 0301.10. After quite a long line of play bR arrives on a square where it is lost to a fork by wS.

Turku, Finland
5.vii.85
Pauli Perkononoja
International Judge of the F.I.D.E. for endgames.

***Confirmation limit date for the above provisional award: 31.iii.86. Sent analytical or anticipation comments to Alexander Hildebrand, Box 323, S-75105 UPPSALA 1P, Sweden.

Tourney announcement
Hungarian Chess Federation: closing date - 30.ix.86.
Address: Tivadar Kardos, Janicsár u.5, H-1134 BUDAPEST, Hungary.
XXVII F.I.D.E. Permanent Commission

The team and individual world championship solving contests provided the main, and great, excitement at Riccione (Italy: 15-22.ix.85). Ofert Comay (Israel) won the individual title, and with it an International Grandmastership; Pauli Perkonenoja (Finland) was a worthy second, and Graham Lee (Great Britain) a most welcome third. All, of course, are very strong in studies, Graham being an o-t-b FIDE Master. Naturally, all support EG. The same can be said for David Friedgood and Norman Macleod, the other members of the British solving team. No FIDE master or grandmaster (composing) titles were awarded for any genre, as far as be ascertained (information is suprisingly hard to nail down), but Mario Gamorani and Gior- gi Mirri (both Italy) are now FIDE Judges in 'all orthodox types', which has to include studies. This raises the niggling question of how a tourney director who wishes to have a FIDE Judge for his tourney obtains a list of (surviving) title-holders in the tourney genre: PROBLEM (Yugoslavia), once described as the 'official organ' of the Commission, is no more, and in any case never offered this information service, and there is no publicised address to write to, unless it is the personal home address of the Commission’s President (Jan Hannelius, Lukonrinne 32, KANGASALA 36200 Finland). It would be entirely reasonable to make a charge for such an information service... Riccione produced no FIDE ALBUM news, since it was an 'off year', but EG may be able to publish some early results of the studies section of the 1980-82 tourney in a future issue.

REVIEWS

T + F contre T, by Francis Meinsohn, undated. This 196-page French language brochure devoted to the GBR class 0410 is No. 4 in a series 'Cours Gambit' for practical players. It is an excellent distillation of how to win short solution positions and how to aim for a certain draw. We learned from it about the 'arnaques' (trappy positions) due to Ruskow and Zytogorsky arising out of the S-file position of Lolli (1963).

D + F contre D, by Francis Meinsohn, undated. No. 5 in the series 'Cours Gambit' is devoted to the GBR class 4010. It has exactly the same format as No. 4, but is based this time on selected studies of Henri Rinck.

Chess Catalog, by Clarence W. Hewlett, 1977. These seven stapled sheets give a complete set of computer-generated WTM positions for the GBR class 1000. The accompanying description informs us that there are 18,081 legal WTM positions of this very basic endgame. They are presented on 462 'diagrams' normalised to show bK on a8-d8, b7-d7, c6-d6, d5. With bK indicated by lower case k and wK by upper case K, the location of wQ is shown by a number in the range 1 to 10, signifying the solution depth. The one position of maximum depth is: bKd6 wKhl wQg2. (The compiler’s address on the orange cover reads: 920 Northgate Avenue, Waynesboro, Virginia 22980, U.S.A.)
EG

Volume VI begins in February 1986
1986 subscriptions to EG83-86:
£ 8.-- or $ 15.--

EG83 is planned to have 64 pages devoted largely to 5-man endgames. There will be a major article on GBR class 0002.01 (two knights against pawn) by David Hooper. There will be details of another endgame that takes more than 50 moves to win, as demonstrated by the computer generated combinatorial data base process of Ken Thompson. As well as the usual features, 1986 will include computer news of the GBR classes: 4010, 4001, 4000.10, 1060, 1033, 1006. Only in EG.

ERRATUM: EG80.5552 wKf2 bKh2

How can EG attract more over-the-board players? Send your suggestions, ideas, whatever they are, practical or impractical, to AJR who will read them all, but will not be able to correspond.

EG’s “Analytical Notes”: send your analytical comments on the soundness of the studies published in EG to:

David Friedgood, EG Analytical Notes, 1 Waverley Place, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 8AS, England.

Founded in 1965 and affiliated to the British Chess Federation, The Chess Endgame Study Circle produces the international quarterly EG for all enthusiasts for the chess endgame and chess endgame study.

All correspondence and SUBSCRIPTIONS to the editor and publisher: A.J. Roycroft, 17 New Way Road, LONDON NW9 4PL, England.

Subscriptions may also be paid to: A.J. Roycroft Chess Account, National Westminster Bank, 21 Lombard Street, LONDON EC3P 3AR England.

THE CHESS ENDGAME STUDY CIRCLE
next meetings: Friday, 10th January, 1986, 6.15 p.m. and Friday, 4th April, 1986 (same time and place).
(Suggestion: telephone Alan C. Martin beforehand on 01-349 3294)

"Many-sided Creativity", by G.E. Akopyan, 'Aiastan' Erevan, 1984, 80 pages, in Russian. The chess life and work of Joseph Oganesovich Byuzandyan (1906- ) started late but included quite a few endgame studies, 26 of which are in this light blue volume. He was also a formidable eagle-eyed analyst, never taking analysis on trust, and there is a chapter bringing some of these items together.

"Selected Compositions", by Rafael Kofman, Moscow, 1985, 368 pages, many hundred excellent diagrams. This volume brings together the compositions of 5 composers who have not previously had their own collections published, and who are 'senior'. The case of Alexander P. Kuznetsov, the only study composer among them (96 of his studies are here) is special, for the died several years ago. A full page photograph is included.

Decorative Chess Problems and Studies, by V.M. Archakov, 1985, Kiev, 88 pages, in Russian. 52 of the 255 entertaining positions are studies, 32 by Pogosyants.

Studies with any aspect of asymmetry are being collected by reader Alexander George (Wolfson College, Oxford OX2 6UD, England). Please send him any examples you know.