
One of the leading Dutch composers and columnists offers a considered answer to the related questions: how can today's best studies be characterised, and what lies ahead? Since the fewer the exclamation marks in a chess book the more serious its intent, this work is to be taken very seriously indeed. It is neither a popular work nor an anthology. Rather it meets a long-sensed specialist need, at least in the English language for which we thank our enthusiastic, generous and energetic Dutch friends who comprise the ARVS. The specialist minority addressed is that of active composers and others prepared to think about the state of the endgame study.

In the third of the book's four chapters the author explores in depth the richness to be found among the echoes and syntheses of the modern study, a richness that arises from identical or different themes woven into tries and (serial or parallel) main lines. But in search of innovation van Reek remains dissatisfied and fearlessly proclaims that future development lies in the even more complex concatenation of ideas. He puts it in these words: "The ultra modern endgame study consists of linked endgame studies. In each main line of an ultra modern endgame study, more than one phase can be distinguished. Each phase has a different material setting and usually a different theme..." And in the fourth chapter we encounter examples, including (because there are always forerunners) some from the past and the present.

If the author is right we can but pray for the breed of super-composers, not to mention solvers, to spring up and multiply that can operate at such rarefied altitudes. Can today's peak really be tomorrow's trough? In making a point this way we exaggerate - van Reek clearly states that the ultra modern endgame study is closely related to the modern endgame study, which has been with us for many a year and is far from dead.

Considered as a discussion paper the book leaves scope for debate. For instance, the inimitable studies of Pal Benko, with their extraordinarily deep but still precise manoeuvres, do not immediately fit into van Reek's scheme. Nor should restraints be placed on stylistic freedom. And no one expects beginners to start at the top. But beyond question The Ultra Modern Endgame Study is a valuable contribution. It is a firm stepping stone, a landmark even, strategically placed and timely, bringing us within sight of the opposite shore.

But what river are we crossing? No less stimulating than the book's main thesis is its treatment of terminology. The word 'theme' occurs where others might prefer 'thought'. The distinction this reviewer makes is that a chess
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thought becomes a theme when it is expressed in as precise terms as its constituents allow. In the interests of emphasis on creativity van Reek abandons such attempts to tie down meaning. Instead he gives it freer rein, in my view to the detriment of discussion. What I should dearly like to see is the promulgation, after necessary hard work, of an accepted comprehensive and structured terminology corresponding to the hierarchy that extends from art at one extreme through to chess elements (based on BMR as set out in the final chapter of TTC) at the other. The subject is relevant here because van Reek talks in terms of themes, thoughts, ideas, phases, main lines, tries and 'endgame elements'. Some terms are defined, others not. He also introduces the term 'general idea', defined by reference to such aspects as 'miniatures' and 'romantic studies'. His purpose is to draw attention, by giving a name, to the areas of innovation of the ultra modern study, to distinguish them from innovation at the thematic level, which is the hallmark of the modern endgame study. But to place two such ill-assorted aspects under the same heading obfuscates when the aim should be enlightenment.

R1 Jan van Reek
Mention, Shakhmary v SSSR, 1969


R1 is the author's first example and well illustrates the vocabulary difficulty. He draws attention to three 'endgame elements' (a term denoting Korol'kov's straightforward classification of themes) in the solution, namely: systematic manoeuvre by a pawn; repetition of idea by W and Bl; and P-promotion (to Q). Now it seems to me that this is already to some extent arbitrary (and therefore unsatisfactory) because other aspects are arguably prominent in R1: pawn symmetry; clearance of the e-file (6.e8Q wins only because wQe8 covers e1); supporting variations requiring accurate play in practical P endings; a strong element of humour. When the composer tells us that the theme, the artistic intention, was repetition of an idea by W and Bl, this is even more subjective and arbitrary. In the first place, a composer may no longer be accessible for purposes of knowing his intention; in the second place the composer may change his mind, or at least his preferred emphasis; and in the third place if the endgame study is a serious activity that bridges art (with its criteria of beauty and originality) and science (with its criteria of soundness and express or implied principles), discussion ought at some point to leave subjectivity and arbitrariness behind. What is still lacking, surely, is a logical test (or tests) to determine whether an alleged theme really is a theme, a test (or tests) to determine whether an alleged motif (this is one of many words that van Reek does not employ) really is a motif or not, and so on.

But van Reek's book is not primarily about terminology. Whether or not we accept the thesis of the ultra modern endgame study (which may be summarised as 'if there are no new themes, we must combine old ones in new ways') we cannot deny that the author has
SNIPPETS

1. From a 5-page article in Shakhmaty v SSSR (ii.89) we learn of the notable and varied musical talent of the following Russo-soviet study composers.

1.1. Yury Nikolaevich TYULIN (1893-1978), musical authority, also a correspondence player.

1.2. Aleksey Mefodeyevich BELENKY (1905-85), concert pianist and accompanist.

1.3. Vitaly Alexandrovich CHEKHOVER (1908-65), orchestra leader and accompanist for gymnastics.

1.4. Alexander Pavlovich DOLUKHANOV or (post-war) DOLUKHANYAN (1910-68), pianist and composer, including for films. Died in a traffic accident, as did Shatzkes.

1.5. Boris Abramovich SHATZKES (1931-85), son of a well known pianist and himself highly accomplished. Turned to study composing when there was insufficient time for tournament play.

2. On p.1 of EG51, in an item about Jindrich Fritz, the late Soukup-Bardon refers to the 'Romanian theme'. This theme is the following. In an apperently lost/drawn position Bl finds a quiet manoeuvre to reach a quasi-draw/win, but W finally finds a winning/drawing path. In 1950 a match was organised with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Romania as national participants. The above (studies) theme was proposed by Romania and became familiarly known in Czechoslovakia as the 'Romanian theme'. Nos. 55, 54 in Fritz' 1959 collection were his successful entries. The 1938 study by Fritz, '20 years ahead of its time' in the opinion of Soukup-Bardon, was a favourite of the composer, who wrote that 'the piece exchanges take place as a result of active play and not in the usual humdrum manner'. (Our thanks to J. Pospisil of Prague.) Readers may like to consider the 'Romanian theme' in the context of EG97's leading article.


3. The diagram for EG83.5978 omitted bBg7.
4. Will anyone noticing an unexplained phrase or loose end in EG's pages, please write to us? We dislike unsolved mysteries and wish to clear up as many as possible before our quarter century of editorship comes to a close.

\[\text{Freek Spinhoven, for many years studies columnist of Schakend Nederland, died 23.V.89. He was always a friendly correspondent, and had offered to assist with the preparation of an index to EG...}\]

\[\text{REVIEWS}\]

*Chess Tactics for Advanced Players*, by Yuri Averbakh. In English, but published in East Berlin by Sportverlag, 1986. Over 600 diagram in 328 handsome pages. Although this tidy volume is intended to teach the middle game, no EG reader will disapprove of the hundreds of illustrations taken from studies or from the ends of studies. Examples of 'double attack' (interpreted in the broadest sense) lead to a definition of a 'combination' and a classification of combinations. The 'harmonious cooperation of pieces' attracts much attention and leads to the new term 'elementary contact' in an attempt to disclose the meaning and essence of such phrases. The author's reasonable contention is that the understanding of the theory's exposition, which is clear, leads to improved play. If it is the positions and exercises that attract attention, the theory is worth anybody's study. The trouble is that many 'piece contacts' prove double-edged, like Newton's Law of Motion which states that to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction: one man may defend another - good! - but at the same time the defended piece reduces mobility by taking a square away from (ie, blocking) the defending man's move options - bad! If in chess Newton's 'opposite' will apply, but rarely his 'equal', nonetheless, since some squares are more important than others the accumulation of 'elementary contact' observations will seldom lead to a better than tentative conclusion about a position.

*Erfolg im Endspiel*, by J. Awerbach, Sportverlag Berlin, 1987. This is an 'abbreviated Averbakh', in other words a German language single volume of 208 pages, which exercises. Don't worry, solutions are there too!

"How to Solve Problems and Studies", by Ya. Vladimirov, 112 pages, 1986, in Russian. Chapters reflect the sequence of rounds in championship solving contests, with numerous examples taken from WCSC events. 15 pages on study solving come near the end. Three rules-of-thumb stemming from Anatoly Kuznetsov will be familiar to most solvers: unclear variations mean you're on the wrong track; if you think W wins/draws 'anyway', you're missing a defence; and pretty means you've solved it, boring means you haven't. One could add, 'when in doubt push a pawn'. And if really stuck, consider a quiet re-grouping or partial undoing of an earlier move.

What other solving hints do EG readers find effective?


Příbřej, 22.vi.85.

1st Prize, OKS, 1986.
Award: Sachova Skladba 19, 4v.1988.

No. 7305: E. Asaba and I. Mosleva. Straz lidu, 6.xii.86.
+ nd Prize, OKS, 1986.

No. 7306: M. Hlinka and E. Vlasak. Straz lidu, 15.ii.86.
1 Hon. Men., OKS, 1986.


No. 7307: V. Miltner and E. Vlasak.

No. 7308: Josef Stasiak.
1. Ba1, and either h5 2. e5 h4 3. e6 h3 4. e7 h2 5. e8Q h1Q 6. Qe2+ Kc1 7. Ka3 Qh3+ 8. Kxa2 wins, or Kb1 2. Kb3 Kxa1 3. Kc2 h5 4. e5 h4 5. e6 h3 6. e7 h2 7. e8Q h1Q 8. Qe5 mate.

No. 7309: L. Kekely.

No. 7310: J. Polasek.
1) 3. f7+? Kxf7 4. Kd5 Bb5 5. a7 Bf1 and draws.

No. 7311: Vladimir Kos.
1. Rg3 Bc4 2. Kc7 Ka7 3. Ra3+ Ba6 4. Ra2 Sb2
5.Rxb2  d1Q  6.Rb7+  Bxb7 stalemate.

No. 7312: C.M. Bent. 34 diagrams were sent to the judge, Evzen Pavlovsky, for this informal tourney.


No. 7315: V.A. Kalyagin (USSR). 1.h5  g4/i  2.h6  g3  3.Se6+/ii  Kf5/iii  4.h7  g2  5.Sd4+  Kg6  6.h8Q  g1Q  7.Qg8+ wins.


ii) 3.Sh5+?  Kg5  4.h7  g2  5.h8Q  g1Q+ drawn.
iii) Kg4 4.Sd4. Ke5 4.h7 g2 5.h8Q+. Kf3 4.Sg5 Kg4 5.h7 g2 6.Sh3 Kxh3 7.h8Q+.

No. 7316: D. Gurgenidze (USSR).

No. 7317: E.A. Asaba (Moscow).

No. 7319: V.A.Kalyagin (USSR). 1.Kb3 Bg8 2.a4+ Kb6 3.a5+ Kb5 4.c4+ Rxc4 5.Rb7 mate.


No. 7321: M. Hlinka (Czechoslovakia). 1.b6+ Ka6 2.b7+ Ka7 3.b8Q+ Kxb8 4.Rg8+ Kb7 5.Rg7+ Kb6 6.Rg6+ Ka5(b5) 7.Rg1 Sd3+ 8.Ke3, and: cdQ 9.Rxd1 Sc1 10.Rd8 Sb3 11.Rd1 Sc1 12.Rd8 draw, or c1Q 9.Rxc1 Sxc1 10.Rg8 Sb3 11.Rg1 Sc1 12.Rg8 draw.


No. 7323: I. Bondar (Gantsevichi). 1.Sh8+ Kg7 2.g5 Bh7 3.Kh5, and: Bg8 4.g6 Kxh8 5.Kh4 (Kh6? Bf7;) Kg7 6.Kg5 Kf8
i) Kg8 5.g6 Kh8 6.Kg5 Bg8 7.Kf6 wins.

"W's subtle play avoids Bl's stalemate resources."

No. 7324: G.A. Nadareishvili
2 Hon. Mention
Moscow Tourney, 1987


i) Kf6 4.hRf7+ Kg6 5.Rg7+ Kf6 6.eRf7+ Ke6 7.Rf2, winning.

DVH: "Haven't I seen this before? You can't win in two awards with the same study...."

A less commendable tradition is for the Commended positions and solutions not to be published in the 'award'. There were 4 - by Amiryan, Dolgov, Davranyan/Zinar, and Matous. The non-publication is no fault of the judge.

No.7326: M. Hlinka (Czechoslovakia). Judge: D.Gurgenidze. There were 39 originals by 34 composers. 1.Ra7 c3 2.Rxa3 c2+ 3.Kb2 Bg5 4.f4 Bxf4 5.Sc3+, with:

i) Bxd2 7.Rh3+ Kg1 8.Kxc2 draw. 
"We observe the skillful introduction and subtle separation of the variations which cleverly interweave. The whole is balanced and set with mastery. So Glinka the composer takes the floor again, this time for chess!"

i) d2 2.Bf3 Be7 3.Sh3.
"Two model mates charm us and all the preceding play is laid out with a touch that is light and elegant."

"The author has worked much with this material lately and not without success. Here he has shifted the position and come up with new nuances."

"Once again the form is of the utmost refinement."
DVH: chameleon stalemates.

No.7330: A.Maksimovskikh and V.Shupletsov (Kurgan region). 1.d7 Bxd7 2.Bd8+ Sc7 3.Bxc7+...
Ka6 4.Sd6 Rf6+ 5.Kg7 Rb6
6.Bc4+, with:
Ka5 7.Sb7 mate,
Rb5 7.Sb4 mate,
Bb5 7.Sb4+ Ka5 8.dSc6+ Bxc6
"In each of 3 mating positions a model mate is embellished by bR being pinned."

```
No. 7323: G.A. Nadareishvili (Tbilisi). 1.Sc4+ Kf3 2.Sg5+ Ke3
10.Kg4 Kg2 11.Kh4 Sf2.
"Nadareishvili's nimble knights prove themselves more agile than bQ."
```

```
No. 7330 A. Maksimovskikh and V. Shupletsov (vi.86, ii.87)
Spezial Prize, 64-Shakh. Ob., 1986
```

```
No. 7331: O. Pervakov (vii.86)
1 Hon.Men., 64-Shakh. Ob., 1986
```

```
No. 7332: O. Pervakov (Moscow).
12.Re6 Qe7+ 13.Sxe7 wins.
"The composer has dreamed up a complex mechanism of sliding bat-
teries...."
```

```
No. 7333: A. Zinchuk (Kiev).
"Sharp play by both sides culmina-
tes in a model stalemate."
DVH: not model, as b4 is covered twice.
```

```
Win 6 + 6

No. 7330
A. Maksimovskikh and
V. Shupletsov (vi.86, ii.87)
Spezial Prize, 64-Shakh. Ob., 1986
```

```
No. 7331: O. Pervakov (vii.86)
1 Hon.Men., 64-Shakh. Ob., 1986
```

```
No. 7333: A. Zinchuk (v.86, xii.86)
3 Hon.Men., 64-Shakh. Ob., 1986
```

```
Win 4 + 5

No. 7331
O. Pervakov (vii.86)
1 Hon.Men., 64-Shakh. Ob., 1986
```

```
No. 7333: A. Zinchuk (v.86, xii.86)
3 Hon.Men., 64-Shakh. Ob., 1986
```

```
Draw 5 + 5

No. 7332: G.A. Nadareishvili (Tbili-
si). 1.Sc4+ Kf3 2.Sg5+ Ke3
3.Rxe2+ Kxe2 4.Sc3+ Ke1 5.Bg2/i
Sf4+ 6.Kg7 Sg2 7.Sf4+ h1Q 8.Sxg3 draw.
10.Kg4 Kg2 11.Kh4 Sf2.
"Nadareishvili's nimble knights prove themselves more agile than bQ."
```

```
Draw 4 + 4

No. 7333: A. Zinchuk (Kiev).
1.Sc7+ Kc5 2.Sc3 Sd2+ 3.Sxd2
Bd5+ 4.Ka2 Bc4+ 5.Ka3 g1Q
"Sharp play by both sides culmina-
tes in a model stalemate."
DVH: not model, as b4 is covered twice.
```
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No. 7334: V. Vinichenko (Novosibirsk) and B.G. Olympiev (Sverdlovsk). 1.f7+ Rg7 2.Qe5 Qd8+ 3.Kh5 Qf8 4.Bg6 b4 5.Qf6 b3 6.Kh4 b2 7.Kh3 Qxf7 8.Bxf7 b1Q 9.Qd8+ Kh7 10.Qh4 mate. This was published as an original in the twice-monthly magazine’s New Year solving competition - in which Vinichenko was one of the winners! (See 64-Sh.Ob. 17/87 p26.)

No. 7335: G.A. Nadareishvili and V. Smyslov. The joint composers supply the caption ‘the chess clock’. The solution tells us why. 1.b4 Kb5 2.b3 Kb6 3.a4 Kc6 4.b5+ Kc5 5.b4+ Kb6. Now the button has been pressed to stop the W ‘clock’ and it is the turn of bPP to start ‘ticking’. 6.Kg4(f4,h4) h6 7.Kf4 g5+ 8.Kf5 g6+ 9.Kg4. Switching on the ‘dials’ on the left. Kb7 10.a5 Kc7 11.b6+ Kc6 12.b5+ Kb7. The opponent’s turn again. 13.Kf3 h5 14.Kg3 g4 15.Kf4 g5+ 16.Kg3. Switch to the left. Kb8 17.a6 Kc8 18.b7+ Kc7 19.b6+ Kb8 20.Kg2 h4 21.Kf2 g3+ 22.Kf3 g4+ 23.Kg2 h3+ 24.Kxg3 and Bl’s flag has fallen! The play is based on a game of the ex-world champion. Yes, there are duals in some moves of wK, but all is forgiven for the humour.


No. 7337: G. Amiryan (Erevan). The solution combines mating threats (wRg1-g8 and wRd1-d8) with tempoing, so that when Bl hP moves are exhausted bRb2 must move along the rank and W can then play wRa1. 1.Ra4 Rb2 2.Ra7

No. 7337  G. Amiryan (xii.86, ix.87) Commended. 64-Shakh. Ob., 1986

Win 7 + 9

No. 7338  S. Zakharov = 1/2 Prizes, Armenian Central Chess Club, 1987

Draw 5 + 4

No. 7339  S. Kasparyan and S. Varov = 1/2 Prizes, Armenia Central Chess Club, 1987


"In (almost: AJR) miniature form the theme of stalemate is expressed with subtle play, thematic tries and (reciprocal) zugzwang."

No.7340: A.Sochniev (Leningrad). 1.d7 Bxd7 2.ed c1S+ 3.Kxc3 Ke7

"An original scheme for a positional draw is brought about by a systematic movement of pieces. The study is adorned by an underpromotion. The conclusion is somewhat blurred and Ba3 plays a static role."

No. 7340: A. Sochniev 3rd Prize, Armenian Central Chess Club, 1987

No. 7341: A. Stavritsky 4th Prize, Armenian Central Chess Club, 1987

No. 7342: A. Manvelyan 5th Prize, Armenian Central Chess Club, 1987

6.Bxf7+ Qxf7 7.Sg7+ Kxh4 stalemate.

"The conclusion is original, with wB immured and wS pinned."

No. 7343: Yu. Peipan Special Prize, Armenian Central Chess Club, 1987


"4-fold R-sacrifice is the interes-
ting idea, and every time declined. The solution's brevity is the study's weakness."

No. 7344: V. Kalyagin and V. Kirillov (Sverdlovsk). 1...Rb7+ 2.Ka2 Be6+ 3.Ka3 Bd6+ 4.Ka4 Bd7+ 5.Ka5 Bc7+ 6.Ka6 Bc8 7.Rh5+ Kg4 8.Rh4+ Kg3 9.Rh3+ Kg2 10.Rh2+ Kg1 11.Rh1+ Kg2 12.Rh2+ Kg3 13.Rh3+ Kg4 14.Rh4+ Kg5 15.Rh5+ Kg6 16.Rh6+ Kf7 17.h8Q Rb6+ 18.Ka7 Rb7+, positional draw. "The play is remarkable enough, and there is a subtle try in 7.h8Q? Not so good is the fact that at the end it is Bl who is fighting for the draw."


No. 7347: N. Rezvov (Odessa). 1.b8Q Qxb8 2.Be6+ Kh2 3.Be5+ Kh1 4.Bd5 Bc4 5.Sg3+ Kh2 6.Bg2, and Qb2+ 7.Se2 mate, or Qf8+ 7.Sf5 mate, or hg 7.Bxg3 mate. 593
"The composer has realised a complex idea of *sui generis* echo mates, two by discovery, and a chameleon echo." We fail to see the chameleon echo.

No. 7347: N. Rezvov
4 Hon. Mention, Armenian Central Chess Club, 1987

No. 7349: Yu. Peipan
2 Commended, Armenian Central Chess Club, 1987

No. 7348: O. Pervakov
1 Commended, Armenian Central Chess Club, 1987

No. 7350: V. S. Kovalenko
3 Commended, Armenian Central Chess Club, 1987
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No.7351: A.Kotov (Leningrad region). 1.d7 Rc8 2.dcS Bh7+ 3.Kh6 Bxbl 4.Sc7 Ba2 5.Sc5g6 mate. "1...Rc8 and 2.dcS are surprises, but the solution is short and the mating position not new."

No.7352: Gavrikov vs. Campora OHRA (Holland), 1987. position after White's move 67

No. 7352 Gavrikov vs. Campora OHRA (Holland), 1987. 67...Sf4+ 68.Kh2 Sf1+ 69.Kg1 Se3 70.Bb8 Sd3 71.Bc7 Sg4 72.Bb8 gSe5 73.Bc7 Ke2 74.Bd8 f4 75.Be7 f3 76.Bh4 Sg6 77.Bg3 Sc7, W resigned.

No.7353: Anders Gillberg (Sweden). Judge: Alexander Hildebrand (Sweden). The award was modest for a formal tourney, and EG is serving its readers with the definitive version, that is, after eliminations during confirmation time. A reserve study (by Vandecasteele) was introduced to make up for the disappearance of the leading pair of studies (by Dobrescu, by Gillberg) and another by Gillberg. EG is not reproducing these, as there are greater excitements to report. Do readers approve? What should EG's selection policy be? Have we got it right? Do write to us and let us know your views. The eliminations during confirmation time emphasise the difference that severe testing makes. They also emphasise the rare quality of the award-making process when the task is undertaken conscientiously. Probably there should be a clear distinction between study composing tourneys where stringent testing (for soundness and anticipations) will be applied, and other tourneys. Quality control? Seal of Approval
ii) Rxd6+ leads to the same play, but bRf2 is prevented from playing to the first rank after ...d2.
iii) d2 5.Kxc6 e1Q 6.Ra8+ Kxa8 7.e8Q+ wins.
iv) W strives to promote with check.
v) But how can Bl draw after 7.Ra1? For example, Re1 8.Rd1 Rxd1 9.d8Q, and whither should bR play? One senses the composer’s intention that there is a thematic point here. Failing to find any I corresponded (via Alexander Hildebrand!) with Gillberg, who supplied this line: "Re1 10.Qc7+ (Qd7+,Kb6;) Kb8 11.Qe8+ (Qd8+,Kb7; or Qf8+,Re8) Kb7 12.Qb5+ Kc8 13.Qa6+ (Qd7+,Kb8;) Kb8 14.Qb6+ Kc8 drawn". But W should play 12.Qe4+ (in place of 12.Qb5+??) and if Kc8 13.Qa8 mate.

We can all overlook things, but how can such mass oversight over such a long period happen, when supposedly well motivated composer, judge, solvers and other competitors even have confirmation time at their disposal? All too easily, it seems! Perhaps nobody tried to understand the study deeply - 'an abyss may defy detection if it is buried deep enough'!! [AJR has a schoolboy fondness for mixed metaphors and Irishisms - self-contradictions that nevertheless make sense. The classic Irishism is 'a hole at the closed end', taken from the description of a gun-breech, explaining how detonation is engineered.] If readers wonder why, in the light of our introductory remarks we reproduce this study at all, we have to say that the flaw is in the final award, EG endeavours to give final awards (faulty, if that’s what they are) and at least we have before us a fine example of the administrative complexities of awards. It could have been another award, it just happens to be Postsjakk. It’s like pollution - the Earth’s level of pollution worsens as detection systems become more refined.

Rules for Conducting Formal International Tourneys

As regards formal international tourneys our strict comment is that if the chess world wants sound studies, then (a) composers must submit full analyses, and (b) insufficient analysis has to be a valid reason for a judge rejecting a study. We may allow that if the judge has time he may (through the director in order to preserve anonymity) ask
for analysis; additional or corrected analysis may validly follow, but no correction to the position (or only the most trivial alteration affecting at most a single man) is to be condoned after the final closing date for entries.

vi) 8.Rb1? Re1 9.Rd1 Rxd1 10.d8Q Rc1 11.Qa8+ Kb6 12.Qb8+ Ka6 draw, as W can make no further progress.

vii) 10.d8Q? d1Q+ 11.Rxd1 Rxd1+ drawn.


i) e1Q 2.c8Q+ Kh7 3.Qf5+ g6 4.Qxf4.


iii) Qh4 6.Qg8+ Kh6 7.Qxg7+ Kf5 8.Qg6 mate, or Kh6 6.Qh3+ Kg5 7.Qg4+ Kh6 8.Qg6 mate.


DVH: Entertaining dénouement.
i) Kg2 2.Qg5+ Sg3 3.Sf4+ Kf1 4.Qh5+ Se2 5.Sxe2 fe 6.Qf5+ draw.

ii) 2.Qxe2? f1Q 3.Qe3+ Qf2 wins.


iv) Qxh3 4.Qxh3 Sg2 5.Qf5 eSf4 6.Qb5 draw.


No.7356: Nikolai Kralin (Moscow). 1.Se4+i Kb5 2.Sc3+ Ka6/ii 3.a8Q+ Ba7 4.Re6 (Rd8? Bf7+?) Ba4+ 5.Kxa4 Qxa8 6.Sd5 (for mate) Bb8 7.Sxb6 Qa7 (Ka7; Sc8
  ii) Kc5 3.Rd5+ Kc6 4.abQ.

No. 7356: N. Kralin
1st Prize, Schweizerische Schachzeitung, 1985-86

No. 7357: Ignace Vandecasteele (Belgium). 1.c7 Bd1+ 2.Kh4 Bb4 3.Kg5, with:

No. 7358: D. Gurgenidze (USSR).
  i) 2.Qe7+ 3.Qxe7 Qh2+ 4.Kf1 Bxc1.
"Wonderful harmony of two self-block checkmates. It might have been better without the first 3 moves."


iii) a1S 5.Sc3+ Kd2 6.Sxa2. Rg2


"A good piece of analysis and a beautiful mate."

No. 7360: Beat Neuenschwander
(Switzerland).


v) f5 6.gf Kxh5 7.f6.

"A beautiful repetition of triangulation."

No. 7361: the late Rolf Richter
(East Germany).

1.Sh4, and Qc6+

2.Be6 Qxe6+ 3.Sg6+ Qxg6+

4.Kxg6 d1Q 5.Ra8+ mates, or Qh1 2.Bh3, with Kg8 3.Rg7+ Kf8 4.Sg6+ Ke8 5.Rg8+ Kf7 6.Rf8 mate, or a1Q 3.Rxa1 Qxa1 4.Sg6+ Kg8 5.Be6 mate.

"Three good jokes."

No.7362: V.Nestorescu (Romania).

1.Qg3+/i Kd4 (Kd5(f5);Qxh2)


No. 7362 V. Nestorescu (viii.86)
2 Hon. Mention, Schweizerische Schachzeitung, 1985-86

No. 7363 D. Gurgenidze (viii.86)
3 Hon. Mention, Schweizerische Schachzeitung, 1985-86


No.7364: Em.Dobrescu (Romania).
Rg6 2.Rb5+ Rg5 3.Bd5 Sf2 (Rf5;Bf3+) 4.Bf3+ fSg4 5.Rxg5+ and 6.Bf4+.

d6 5.Bd1+ Kg6 6.Bxg5 Kxg5
(Sf2;Bc2) 7.g4.

No. 7365: D. Probst (Switzerland).
10.Rxe1+ Rxe1 11.Rd2+ Rxd2
12.Sc3 mate.
iii) Ke5 3.Sa4+ Kb3 4.aSc5+ Kc4
iv) Ke5 4.Sc4+ Kf5 (Kf6;Rf3+)
5.Rg5+ Ke4 (Kf6;Rf3+,Ke7;Bc5+)
6.Rh4+ Kf4+ Ke2 8.Rf2+
vi) Re1 10.Rd2+ Rxd2 11.Sc3
mate.

No. 7366: W. Naef (Switzerland).
1.Rd4+/i Sxd4 (Ke6(c5);Rh1)
2.cd/ii Sg4+ 3.Kf4 Sh2 4.Rf2/iii c3
5.Rxh2/iv cd 6.Rxd2 (Rh1? d1Q+)
f2 7.Ke3 f1S+/v 8.Kd3/vi, and
drawn.
i) 1.Rg8? Bxd2+ 2.Kf2 Bxc3.
ii) 2.Rxc1? Sg4+ 3.Kf4 Se2+
iii) 4.Rxc1? f2 5.d3 c3 6.Ke3 f1Q
7.Rxf1 Sxf1+.
iv) 5.Kg3? cd 6.Rxd2 Bxd2
v) f1Q stalemate. f1R 8.Ke2.
f1B 8.Kf2.
Kc4.

No. 7367: Z.R. Caputto (Argentina). This unusual analytical study,
which challenges classification,
was dedicated by the composer to
IM Dr Enrico Paoli on the occasion

Kxh5 5.Rd4 Kg5 6.Re4 Re2+ 7.Kd1 (Kf1,Rf2+;)
Kf5 8.Rd4 (Re8,Kf4;)


iii) Kg5 6.Rh3 Kg4 7.h7.


vi) Rg2 13.Qd4. e2 13.Kd2 Rf1

vii) e2 14.Qd4+ Rf2 15.Qg4+.


ix) d1Q 16.Qxe3+ Kh2 (Kf1;Qd3+) 17.Qh6+.

No.7368: V.Israelov. This set of seven studies has been kindly compiled for EG by Mr Aliofsadzade of Baku, judge of the 1981-83 tourney. They represent all four study tourneys of Baku’s chess journal which began life in 1981, and in which relatively little space is devoted to chess composition. 1.Se7+ Kf7 2.Sd5 c6 3.Sc3 Se3+ 4.Kf2 Sg4+ 5.Kg3 Se3 6.Kf2, drawn.
No. 7370: I. Garayazli
Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty (Baku), 1984

Win 4 + 3

No. 7371: I. Garayazli
Prize, Shakhmaty (Baku), 1985

Win 5 + 6

No. 7374: A. Nastetanyan
Commended, Shakhmaty (Baku), 1986-87

Win 7 + 6

No. 7372: I. Garayazli
Judge: A. Sarkisov
4 + 3

No. 7373: M. Muradov
Hon. Mention, Shakhmaty (Baku), 1986-87

Win 4 + 3

No. 7371: I. Garayazli

No. 7374: A. Nastetanyan
1. d8Q Qxd8 2. Sxd8 Sxc7 3. Se6 Se8 4. f6 ef 5. f5 g5 6. h3, and mates.

No. 7375: Pal Benko (Budapest and New York). 1.Qd1 Qa8/i 2.Qd8 Bxd8 3.b7 Qxb7 4.cdS+, with:
i) Qe8 2.Qe2(e1)+/iv Be5 3.Qxe5+ Kxe5 4.b7 Qc6 5.c8Q Qg6+ 6.Kh8 Qh6+ 7.Kg8 Qg6+ 8.Kg8 Qh6+ 9.Kg8 Qg6+ 10.Kd7 b4 2.Qd8 Bxd8 3.cdS+ Kd7 4.Sc6 Kc6 5.Kg7 b3 6.h7 b2 7.h8Q b1Q 8.Qe8+ Kd7 9.b7 wins.
Kd5 2.Qa1+ Ke6/v 3.Qa6 Kd7 4.b7 wins.
Qd7 2.Qb3+ Kc7(d6) 3.Qa3+ and 4.Qa8 wins.
ii) f3 7.Sb3 f2 8.Sd2 wins.
iv) 2.Qd8 Bxd8 3.c8Q+ Kd5 4.b7 Qe7 5.b8Q (Qxf5+,Kc6;) f6+ 6.Kg6 Qe8+, drawn.
v) Kf4 3.c8Q Qxc8 4.Qxf6 wins.

No. 7376: Ervin Janosi (Budapest). 1...Sb1+i 2.Kb2 Sc3 3.bSd3 Bd4 4.Bf1 Sxa4+i 5.Ka3 Sb6 6.Sb4+ Kc3 7.Sd2+ Kd4 8.Sc3+ Kc3(c5) 9.Sc4+ and the third pure ("sza-
bad") checkmate.
i) Bc5 2.Bd5+ Kc3 3.Sc2+ and the first checkmate.
ii) Bg7 5.Sc6 Bh8 6.Sc5+ Kb4 7.Sc6+ Kxa4 8.Sc5+ and the se-
cond mate.

No. 7377: D. Gurgenidze. 1.Sa5 ba 2.Rxd2 h1Q 3.Rd1+ Qxd1 4.Sxd1 Kb1 5.Kd2 a1Q 6.g5 a4/i 7.g6 a3 8.g7 ab 9.Sc3 mate, not 9.g8Q? Qa7 draws.
i) Ka2 7.g6 Kb3 8.g7 wins.
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No. 7378: Mario Matous (Prague).
1.f6+ Kf8 2.g6 Rf5 3.g7+ Kf7 4.Sc4 Bc7 5.Se5+ Bxe5 5.Bb3+ Kxf6 7.g8Q mate.

No. 7379: M. Zinar (USSR).

No. 7380: J. Pinter (Budapest).

No. 7381: P. Gyarmati.

1.f6 Bc4 2.Kb7 with:
Kb3 3.e4 Kxb4/ i 4.e5 Kc5 5.Kc7  
Se4 3.b5 Sxf6 4.b6 Bd5+ 5.Kc7  
Se8+ 6.Kd7 Sf6+ 7.Kc7 Bg2 8.b7  
drawn.

Sd4+ 7.Kc5 Kc3 8.f8S drawn.

No. 7382  
O. Carlson and  
L. Parenti (x.87)  
2 Comm., Sakkfclet, 1987

No. 7383  
Yu. Makletsov (x.87)  
3 Comm., Sakkfclet, 1987

No. 7384  
P.A. Cathignol  
1st Prize, Diagrammes, 1975-1984  
award: x-xii.88

No. 7384: Pierre-Antoine Cathignol  
(France). Judge: Guy Bacqué, the  
studies columnist of the revamped  
magazine. Past intentions to hold  
an informal tourney (some years  
ago AJR had suggested Jean-Claude  
Letzelter as a competent native  
composer-judge) collapsed, for  
reasons unspecified, though the  
award's preamble hints at differences  
between 'les chroniqueurs' and  
'la rédaction'. Whatever the history,  
justice is now both done and  
seen to be done - a really noble ef- 
fort by the new team. Original stu- 
dies by 23 composers from 8 coun- 
tries had appeared in the 10-year  
period. The judge sifted these 38  
(this number of originals divided  
by the 10-year period produces a  
tourney record of sorts!), regretting  
in his award the overall low stand- 
ard.

Corresponding squares: wS/bB:  
b3/e7 c2/a5 e1/c3 d4/d8 a5/d8 f3/f6  
"etc". So, not 1.Sb3? Be7, but  
1.Se2 Bc5 2.Se1 Be3 3.Sf3 Bf4  
4.Sd4 Bc7 5.Sc6 Bg3 6.Sa5 Bf4  
Bb6 13.Sd7 mate.

1.Ra6+ Sxa6 2.b3+ Kxb4 3.f7  
Qe2+/i 4.Qb2 Qxb2+ 5.Kxb2 g1Q  
6.f8Q+ Ka5 (Qc5;Sc6+) 7.Qd8+  
Qb6 8.Sc6 mate.

i) g1Q 4.f8Q+ Sc5 5.Sc6+.  
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"A beautiful study with quite a long solution and a sizeable table of corresponding squares that bB has to occupy to secure a draw."


"At first sight it does not look possible for bQ to be captured, given the distance between it and bK. But a series of well-devised moves (especially by wK on moves 5 and 6 when BI's 5...Qa7 hopes for stalemate) demonstrates the solution's surprising clarity."


"A good study with a very tempting try."


"A good and unexpected Q-sacrifice. It is a pity about the shortness of the solution."

zugzwang, and wins. "3...Bc3 puts the fear of God into us, and 5.Sc3, dotting the i's, is a move in the style of Gurvich."

viii) 4.Qxh7 Bxf5 wins. 4.f6 g5+ 5.hg Bxg6 6.K- (Qg8) e5 wins.

In front of my astonished eyes the future World Champion Mikhail Tal found key moves of the solution while looking over GM Yuri Averbakh’s shoulder during the 1958 Portoroz Interzonal. The reason for reproducing this study here is that the position after Bl’s move 2 was entered by Jean-François Baudoin (France) as an original and was indeed awarded third honourable mention, the judge commenting "A surprise underpromotion." There can never be absolute proof of plagiarism, but it is always possible to ask the suspect composer to supply full supporting analysis by return of post, warning him that failure to comply will be interpreted as admission of guilt.

No. 7390: Milenko Dukic (Yugoslavia). 1.hg hg 2.g4+ Kxg4 3.Bh2

No. 7390: Commended, Diagrames, 1975-1984
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Kf3 4.Bg1 Ke2 5.f4 wins.
"The solution is clear, short and easy."

No. 7391: V. Fenoglio (?country).
1.Qd8 Qa2 (Qh4;Kf7+) 2.Ke7+ Qg8 3.Bxg7+ Kxg7 4.Qd4+ Kg6 5.Qg4 mate. A pair of model mates.
"Study-problem: forced mate in 5."

No. 7392: G. Briet (France).
"Likewise a forced mate, in 6."

No. 7393: Olivier Mathieu (France).


No. 7394: J.-L. Turco.

No. 7395: O. Poisson
Win 3 + 2
No. 7395: Olivier Poisson (France).
i) 2. Rb5? Ka2 3. Kc3 b1S+.
"Nothing amiss except that originality is lacking in the last three studies."

No. 7396: V. Anufriev and B. Gusev (viii.86)
1st Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1986 award: ix.88

No. 7396: V. Anufriev and B. Gusev.
Judge: Karyn Sumbatyan (b. 1959), who is a Muscovite APN journalist specialising in Arabic languages. When he is evaluating a contemporary study he looks first and foremost for the thought that is fresh. ... Yes, we all do that, it's the 'ouch!' that turns us on, of course. But let it not be forgotten that to produce an award that will withstand lasting close scrutiny, such subjective choice (the 'ouch!') should be tested against the objectivity of a comprehensive data base that allows an exhaustive search for anticipations. See EG 89.6557, Judge Zinar found out later that this is a study by the Italian composer A. Dall'Ava (Prize in Thèmes-64, 1961) (see Sh.vSSSR viii86 and xi.87). Well, how much worse is this than a player scoring a point by copying a game found in a book or magazine?! The judge prefaces his award as follows. "The editorial high-jump bar for studies is set way up and to qualify (for publication) is not easy even for the experienced composer. But the quite ruthless selection process and the presence of stringent quality control (OTK = Department of Technical Control) to pass the fine mesh of the solvers not only does not scare them off, but is all the greater spur to those who are confident of their new work's high class!
"But elsewhere we experience proliferating competitions, more or less devoid of immunity from elementary defects, organised all over the place by all who feel like it, with no point of comparison with this journal's tourney. One has seen judges' reports incorporating statements to the effect that, say, studies honoured in Shakhmaty v SSSR - in a class with the prize-winners of any other tourney, but awarded honourable mentions were at the level of prizes in the local tourney. To my mind Shakhmaty v SSSR can do without such compliments. I suspect that one day the self-styled tourney organisers will come to their senses.
"Maybe it is high time to phrase the question point-blank: should we not, to put it bluntly, be putting a stop to amateurish tourneys? To sanction tourneys only to those chess periodicals (there is no shortage) where the column is run by an
experienced master consistently checked by a group of zealous solvers? [So, is elitism to replace spreading the gospel? AJR] Otherwise there will be no end to the ceaseless devaluation of excellence. "Enough of this pessimism. All together now, as loud as you can, raise a cheer!" [Probably written with ironic intent. AJR]

[In fact the answer that both keeps the highest standards and allows democratic freedom is in principle simple. Two types of composing tourney: one "seal-of-approval" with the strictest well-publicised defined standards, the other free-for-all with no-holds-barred and minimal controls.]

So much for the hard-hitting preamble. The judge now comments on the present study. "W will not escape without transferring wB somehow to contest the long diagonal (a1-h8), but neither 1.Bd6? Kd5+ nor 1.Bf4? Ke4+ is any good. Therefore: 1.Kg8. It is now BI who has to make his mind up. Ke4. This recognises that Kd5 2.Bf4 Bb2 (Ke6:Bh6,Bh8:g7) 3.Bc1 Bc3 4.Bd2 Bd4 5.Be3 Be5 6.Bf4 Bf6 7.Bg5 Bb2 8.Bc1 is a job for life for wB on the c1-h6 diagonal.


4.Kxh8? a1Q 5.g7 Kg6 6.Kg8 Qa2+ 7.Kh8 Qb2 8.Kg8 Qb3 9.Kh8 Qc3 10.Kg8 Qc4+ 11.Kh8 Qd4 12.Kg8 Qd5+ 13.Kh8 Qe5 14.Kg8 Qh5 15.h8S+ Kf6 16.Bb4(a3) Qd5+ 17.Kh7 Qe4(d3)+ and QxB. Long draw-out, maybe, but crystal clear. a1Q. Anticipating a similar win after 5.ghQ? Qa2+ 6.Kg7 Qb2+ 7.Kg8 Qb3+ 8.Kg7 Qc3+ 9.Kg8 Qc4+ 10.Kg7 Qd4+ 11.Kg8 Qd5+ 12.Kg7 Qe5+ 13.Kg8 Qe6+ 14.Kg7 Qg6 mate. But W is on his guard. 5.ghS, and after Qa2+ 6.Sf7 (Kg7? Qe6;) Kg6, once again we have h8S+, and a draw. Just seven men in total, and seven moves. But what a show! A perpetual chase in two echo variations, two entertaining ladder ascents by bQ, and an effective flying leap by bB from corner to corner, then a brilliant little stalemate, and finally the micro-miracle of two under-promotions to bS. Amazing!" One might add that the starting position is natural enough to satisfy the most sceptical player who 'never looks at studies because they are artificial'.

No.7397: O.Pervakov. "A complete-
te change of *dramatis personae* - only the heavy pieces. 1.Qg2. The brutal onslaught by 1.Rd5+? Ke2+ 2.Kc2 Qg3 3.Rd2+ Kf1 4.Qf6+ Kg1, is a failure. Re2. Alternatives lose quickly: Qe2 2.Rd5+ Rd3 3.Qg1+, or Qg3 2.Qf1+ Kd2 3.Rd5+ Ke3 4.Qc1+. 2.Rd5+ Rd2.

We can see that bR is pinned both ways, on the file and on the rank. But how can W take advantage? 3.Rd6? is tempting, with the intent to pin bQ after Qe2 4.Qh1+ Qe1 5.Qf3+ Qe2 6.Qb3+ Ke1 7.Re6, but there follows Rd1+. If W chooses 3.Rd4?, expecting Qe2 4.Qc6 Qe3 5.Qa4+ Ke2 6.Re4, the stumbling-block is 3...h4 4.Qf3+ Qe2 5.Qc6 Ke1 6.Qh1+ Qf1 7.Qxf1+ Kxf1 7.Rxd2 Kg1, drawing. The riddle is solved only by: 3.Rd8 h4 4.Qg4+ Qe2 5.Qa4.
The difference lies in the open fourth rank! Ke1 6.Qhx4+ Kd1 7.Qh1+ Kf2 8.Rf8+ Kg3 9.Qg1+ Qg2 10.Rg8+. 7.Qh1+ Qe1 8.Qf3+(g2) Qe2. And now that bhP has been eliminated, W can play: 9.Qe6 Qe3 10.Qa4+ Ke2 11.Re8 Rd1+ 12.Qxd1+ and 13.Rxe3, winning. Once again we have a miniature in mint condition, with the subtlest of counterplay and profound bilateral a-h and 1-8 geometry! This study is as close to perfection as the previous one. To expect more sacrificial content (though there is some) and less dryness from the present study, would be asking something absurd, like blaming the joint authors for lack of 'logic'. I frankly confess that a comparison of these two high class productions was far from easy, and yet my opinion is that the first outweighs the second -- by no more than a gramme.

No. 7398: Em. Dobrescu and V. Nestorescu (Bucharest). "The board shows a middle-game rather than an endgame. After 1.Re1+ Kf8 there is the ambush 2.Qf1, forcing Qf6+ 3.Kg4 Rf2, after which once more W's position is unenviable. He launches into a counterattack with a sacrifice. 4.Re8+ Kxe8 5.Qb5+ Kf8 6.Qxc5+ Kg8. One would say that as Bl has two extra pieces, a powerful attack and a readily defended bK, W is once more in trouble. All the same, 7.Qc8+ Qf8 8.Rb8, and we have a curious 'collision' wherein the Q-exchange fails: Qxc8 9.Rxc8+ and 10.Rxc1. On top of that wQ is threatening to leap aside with check, not to mention the capture on f8. Bl must play Kg7, but 9.Qc7+ Qf7 10.Rb7. The logical situation is repeated. And yet again after Kg6 11.Qc6+ Qf6 12.Rb6. bK retreats, but Nemesis
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is in his wake: Kg7 13.Qc7+ Qf7 14.Rb7 Kg8 15.Qe8+ Qf8 16.Rb8. We are witnesses to a complex dynamic positional draw with a perpetual partnership of wQ and wR on ranks 8, 7 and 6. Once again a study of the greatest interest, with antecedents. First was Gurvich (1960) with a pair of 'doublings' (by wQ and wB), and then Dobrescu (1980) with three-fold doublings using the same positional draw mechanism, on diagonals. It is curious that the successful, integrated introduction arose out of solvers’ demolition of the first published version.

No. 7399  S. Tkachenko (xii.86) 4th Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1986

Draw

No.7399: S.Tkachenko (Kiev).
i) 1.b8Q? e1Q+ 2.Kxf3 b1Q and there are no checks.
iii) Qxh4 is stalemate, and so is Bg3 10.Rxh2+ Kh2.
"A solver’s delight: sacrifices, checks and mates, stalemates and zugzwangs. V.S.Kovalenko’s 1970 ‘Merani’ study (EG24.1286) comes to mind, but my goodness what giant strides composing technique has made!"

No.7400: M.Gromov (Vladimir).
iii) Now that wPc3 has been swept away the a1 square is covered. "Choosing W’s first three moves demands far-sighted and precise calculation. We submit that the diagram is like a famous adjourned..."
position in the 1985 World Championship match: both players are deep in thought and the onlookers gaze in wonder as the champions switch their darting eyes from one side of the board to the other!"


i) AJR was verbally assured (xi.88 in Moscow) that an alleged cook by 1.Rb3 reported in xi.86 is itself faulty.


"A battle hymn! It is surprising how W plaits a mating noose for bK out of almost nothing. The author has clearly not striven for purity in the final position, the play being old hat. But that is a quite acceptable tendency in the development of the contemporary study."

No. 7402: V. Dolgov and A. Maksimovskikh. 1.Rd3 Be3+ 2.Kg6/i Rb3 3.Rd7, with:

Rb1 4.Bc5 Bf4 5.Kf5 Rf1 6.Kg4 (for Bb4) Bh6 7.Kh5 Rh1 8.Kg6 Bf4 9. Kf5 Rf1 10.Kg4, positional draw, wK stepping round the 4-square white diamond g4-h5-g6-f5-g4.


"A pair of positional draws, and curious echoed rhomboid movements by wK. The technique is at a high level, but we could do without the monotony."


ii) The only way to stop wS catching the runaway pawn.
"The distinctive feature is the splendid grandmasterly 4.Kb7!! with the temporary brake on wP. But the idea is anticipated, and even 4.Kb7 has distant relatives."

No. 7404: S. Dolmatov and B. Rivkin. 1.b6 Se8/i 2.Sc7 Kd7

No. 7404: S. Dolmatov and B. Rivkin. 1.b6 Se8/i 2.Sc7 Kd7

No. 7405: Mario Matous (Prague). 1.Ka2 b4/i 2.Qf4 Qh8/i 3.Qh6 (Qh4? Qc8;) Qa8 4.Qh1 Qc8 5.Qe1 Qd7 (Qa8;Qf1) 6.Qd1+ Qxd1 7.Be8+ Qd7 8.Bxd7 mate.
"...but the motivation is unsubtle.
In my view this is a step backwards by comparison with other outstanding output of the Czech master.

No. 7406: A. Manvelyan (Erevan).

i) \text{wPg5} must be preserved.
ii) Otherwise \text{wB} perishes.
iii) \text{wBh7} is immune from \text{bQ} because of \text{wRa8-a7}.
iv) 6. Bb1? Kg8 and \text{W} is in zugzwang.

"A surprisingly entertaining introduction but a somewhat pointless systematic movement. Why does Bl play it, seeing that he cannot play for a win?"

No. 7407: V. Vlasenko (Kharkov region).
1. a7 Sa6/i 2. Bd5 d2/ii 3. Ke2 c3 4. aQ Qd1Q+ 5. Kxd1 c2+ 6. Ke2 c1Q 7. Qxa6+ Kb1 8. Qa2, and Bl’s play for stalemate has set up the checkmate. [Cf. the next.]

No. 7408: V. Kosovets (Yurga).

i) As first printed, with bSg2 instead of bSf1, Sf4+ 2. Ke4 Rc5 3. b8Q Rxc6 gives Bl good winning chances.

No. 7409: A. Manvelyan (Erevan).
6 Hon. Men., Shakhmaty v. SSSR, 1986

Draw 4 + 2

No. 7407: V. Vlasenko (Kharkov region).

Win 3 + 4

No. 7408: V. Kosovets (Yurga).

Draw 4 + 5

No. 7409: A. Manvelyan (Erevan).

6 Hon. Men., Shakhmaty v. SSSR, 1986

Win 3 + 4

No. 7408: V. Kosovets (Yurga).

Draw 4 + 5

No. 7409: A. Manvelyan (Erevan).

6 Hon. Men., Shakhmaty v. SSSR, 1986
No. 7409: V. Kondratev and A. Kopnin
Comm., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1986

Win

No. 7410: E. Asaba and E. Pogosyants
Comm., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1986

Win

No. 7411: V. Razumenko
Comm., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1986

Win
ii) 6. Qxb5? Qf8+ 7. Ke6+ Kg8 is premature since the g5 square is protected.
iii) 7. Ba1(b2)? Bc6 8. Ke5 (Bc3,h5) Qg7+ 9. Kf4 QxB.
iv) Qf8+ 10. Ke6 Kg8 11. Qg5.

No. 7412: Vazha Neidze (Tbilisi).
1. Bc5, with:
Sg4 (Sd1;Be2+) 2. Be2 Be5+ 3. Kf5 Bhx 4. Bxg4+, and Kh6 5. Bh8 mate, or Kh4 5. Be7 mate.
"All the foregoing commended studies are not bad, but we have seen the brush-strokes before in the works of other composers. Speaking in general there is nothing wrong in that but to stand out at the top something more is needed than improvements on old ideas. Such is the present-day level of selection in Shakhmaty v SSSR!"

ii) Kc8 4. Kb3 e4 5. Ka4 e3 6. Ka5 e2 7.a4 e1Q, the first bQ and the first stalemate.
v) Ke6 15. Ka4 e3 16. Ka5 e2 17.a4 e1Q, the second bQ and the second stalemate.
No. 7414 V. Anufriev (viii.86)
after A. Kudenich (x.85)
Hon. Mention, Special Section,
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1986

Win
8 + 7

No. 7414: V. Anufriev, after A. Kudenich (x.85).
1.gf Rb1/i 2.Ka8 a1Q 3.Ra7 Rb7/ii 4.Ra2+/iii
Kd3/iv 5.f8Q Qh1 6.Qxd6+ Ke2 7.Qh2 Qxh2 8.d4+ Kd3
i) Rf1 2.f8Q a1Q+ 3.Kb8, and wPf6 is too strong.
ii) Qb2 4.f8Q Qb6 5.Qe8 and 6.f7.
iii) 4.Kxb7? Qh1+ 5.Kc7 Qh8
6.Kd7 Qxf6 7.Ke8 Qg6. 4.Rxa1?
iv) Kb3 5.Rxa1 Rxh7 6.Ra6 wins.

No. 7415 V. Archakov and M. Zinar
Commended, Special Section,
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1986

Win
2 + 6

No. 7415: V. Archakov and M. Zinar.
1.Kg1/i, with:
d3 2.Kf1/ii,
i) 1.Kg2? h4 2.a6 h3+.
ii) 2.Kf2? g5 3.a6 g4 4.a7 g3+.
iii) 3.Ke2? f5 4.a6 f4 5.a7 f3+.
The three pawn checks concluding
the three annotations are each
called a 'lateral check', with associa-
tions of an elbow in the ribs or a
shove in the back.

No. 7416 I. Krikheli
1st Prize, Sarychev MT, 1988
award: Shakhmaty (Baku), ii.89

No. 7416: the late I. Krikheli of
Gori, Georgian SSR. Judges: V.Is-
raelov and I. Khalilov. 70 com-
peters contributed 98 entries for this
formal memorial tourney.
1. Qc4+ Kh8 2.Qfl fRc8+/i 3.Kb6/ii
d1Q 7.Qb6/iii Rf8 8.Sf7+ Kg8
(Rxf7;Qd8+) 9.Sh6+ Kh8
(gh;Qb3+) 10.Sf7+ Kg8 11.Sh6+,
perpetual check.
i) bRc8+? 3.Kxb7 Rc1 4.Qxf2
would allow W to win.
5.Kf5 Re1 wins, or 4.Kc7 bRc8+
iii) 7.Sf7+? Kg8 8.Qa2 Kf8 9.Sh8
Qd7.
"A study on several levels, con-
structed on the grand scale, with
excellent introductory play and a beautiful finale."
DVH: The point, of course, is the pair of stalemate variations.

"A minor piece ending in the spirit of Sarychev. Play covers the whole board, B1 has counterplay, and there is a central zugzwang. There is a good, if not unfamiliar, finale."
DVH: Surely we've seen this sort of thing before?

No. 7418: D. Gurgenidze (Georgian SSR). 1.Rhl+ Kg3 2.hRgl+ Kxg3 3.Qe3+ Kg2 4.Qxe8/ii Rc5+/iii 5.Kf4 Rc4+ (diQ;Qe2+) 6.Ke3 d1Q 7.Qa8+ Kh3 8.Qg2+ Kh4 9.Qg3+ Kxg3, the third stalemate, "two of which are chameleon echoes. Stalemate themes are well known, but this remains a successful piece of work."
i) 1.Qh7+? Kg2 2.Qg7+ Rg6 3.Qb7+ Qc6 wins.

No. 7419: A. Sochniev (Leningrad). 1.Rb3+/i Kg2 2.Rg3+ Kxg3 3.Qe3+ Kg2 4.Qxe8/ii Rc5+/iii 5.Kf4 Rc4+ (d1Q;Qe2+) 6.Ke3 d1Q 7.Qa8+ Kh3 8.Qg2+ Kh4 9.Qg3+ Kxg3, the third stalemate, "two of which are chameleon echoes. Stalemate themes are well known, but this remains a successful piece of work."
"An interesting positional draw!"


No. 7422: V. Kondratev and A. G. Kopnin (Chelyabinsk). 1.Bh2 Be5 2.Bxe5 Rxe5 3.Rxd7, with: eRxd5 4.Ra7+ Kb8 5.Rb7+ Kc8 6.Rc7+ Kd8 7.b7 Kxe7 8.b6+ Kb8 stalemate, or dRd5 4.Ra7+ Kb8 5.Ra8+ Kxa8 6.b7+ Kb8 7.b6, and Bl has no way to lift the stalemate. "The same stalemate in two variations - one WTM and the other BTM."

No.7423: D.Gurgenidze (Georgia) and L.A.Mitrofanov (Leningrad).
"A beautiful sacrifice of wQ combined with giving up wR also (on h8) - and bQ is ensnared."

i) 4.Rb8b7 Qe3 5.Rb2 Qf3+ 6.Kg1 Qxg4+ 7.Kf1 Ka6 drawn.
"A mechanism for systematic movement."

No.7425: M.Zinar (Odessa region). 1.gh e1S+ 2.Kc1 Sd3+ 3.Kd2 Kb1 4.h8Q a1Q 5.Qxa1+ Kxa1 6.Kxd3 ba 7.Kc2 b4 8.g4 Ka2 9.g5 hg 10.h6 g4 11.h7 g3 12.h8B, wins.
"A synthesis of known ideas."

No.7426: F.S.Bondarenko (Dnepropetrovsk). 1.Kb4 Bh2 2.Se3+ Kh5 3.g4+ hg 4.Sg2 a3 5.f7 a2 6.f8Q a1Q 7.Qf3+ g4 8.Qd5+ g5 9.Qf7 mate.
"Good introductory play and a neat finale."

"W gives up a wealth of material for stalemate."


No. 7431: V. Razumenko (Leningrad). 1.Qd2+ Kg1 2.Kg3 Bd5 3.Sg4 c1Q 4.Qd4+ Kh1 5.Sf2+ Kg1 6.Sf4+ Kh1 7.Qh8+ Kg1

No. 7432: V. Kichigin (Perm). 1.a7 b6 2.a8Q+ Bxa8 3.Ra7+ Kb4 4.Rb3+ ab 5.a3 mate.


No. 7437: E. Pogosyants (Moscow).
1.Ka7 Kc7 2.Qd3 Ra5+ 3.Qa6 Rxa6 4.Kxa6 Kc6 5.g4 b5 6.Ka5 Kc5 7.g5 b4 8.Ka4 Kc4 9.g6 b3 10.g7 b2 11.g8Q+wins.

No. 7438: Attila Koranyi (Hungary).
1.c6 Rd6+ 2.Kh7 Rxc6 3.Rg8+ Kh5 4.Rxc6 Rxe8 5.Be2+, with:
   - Rg4 6.Rc5+ d5 7.Rxd5 mate, or
   - Sf3 6.Rc5+ Rg5 7.Bxf3 mate, or
   - Sg4 6.Rd6 Re8 (Rg5;Rh6 mate) 7.Rd5+ Re5 8.Rxe5 mate.

"4 thematic mates, 3 of them pure. The initial position is very natural, with no piece under attack! A positive point is that bK moves in the course of the solution. 6.Rd6 (after 5...Sg4;) is a remarkable finesse. Most amazing of all is that so many variations have been produced with the material R+B vs. R+S."

No. 7439: Jan Rusinek (Poland).
1.Sf2 Qxf2 2.Se2+ Kxd1 3.Sc3+, with:
   - Ke1 4.Rh1+ Qf1 5.Bh4 mate, or
   - Kc1 4.Rh1+ Qe1 5.Be7 d1Q.
6.Bg5+, and eQd2 7.Se2 mate, or dQd2 7.Rxe1 mate, or Qe3 7.Bxe3 mate.
"Also 4 thematic mates - one with two pinned bQQ! Another attractive mate is 5.Bh4 (after 3...Kd1).
The decisive reason for the second place is that it is too reminiscent of a 4-mover, with only two quiet moves."

dRf5 7.Sf4 mate, or fRf5 7.Sg5+ 6.g3 mate. "Two thematic ideal mates after lively play. Not quite brilliant, but a convincing presentation."

No. 7441: Mario Matous (Czechoslovakia). 1.h3 bcQ 2.Be7+ Qg5 3.Kh2 c1Q 4.Sd2, with:
aQxd2 5.Re4+ Qf4+ 6.g3 mate. cQxd2 5.Re4+ Qf4+ 6.Rxf4 mate. "This study gives a romantic impression with 3 bQQ on the board. Two thematic mates, one especially fine with two pinned bQQ, the third bQ remarkably not blocking bK. The Novotny interference by wS leading to the two thematic variations is a good feature."

No. 7442: Gad Costeff (Israel). 1.Bd8+ g5 2.Sg7 Qd7 3.Re6 Qxg7 4.Rf6 (for Rf4 mate) g4+ 5.Kf2 g3+ 6.Ke3 d4+ (Qg5+;Rf4 mate) 7.Ke4 Qg4+ 8.Rf4 mate. "Three thematic mates with small differences in the mating positions. Of course it seems a little anaemic because the mating move is always the same, but it is hardly possible to require more from such a construction."

No. 7443: Lars Falk (Sweden). 1.Sxa3, with:
Sxe2 2.Sb5 b1Q 3.Rxe2+ Qb2 4.Sc3 mate.
“A small and pretty study with two short variations each resulting in an ideal thematic mate. 2.Sb5 (after Sxe2;) is a clever invention. The passive bBa1 influenced the evaluation.”

No. 7443: L. Falk (Sweden)
6th Place, 3.WCCT, 1984-88

No. 7444: J. Haring (Netherlands)
7th Place, 3.WCCT, 1984-88

No. 7445: Andrzej Lewandowski and Adam Wengrzyń (Poland).
1.Sc5 Rb1+ 2.Kc2 Rb2+ 3.Kxc3 Rh5 4.Bf7+ Kb1 5.Bg6+ Ka2 6.Sd3 Bxa6 7.Sc1+ Ka3 8.Be7+ Ka4 9.Be8 Ka5 10.Bd8+ Rb6 11.Sb3 mate. “Rather long introductory play speaks for good composing technique, for only the less important chessmen, the pawns, will be captured. The ideal mate is a beautiful final decoration, but as there is only one a higher placement was ruled out.”

No. 7446: Nikolai Kralin and Iosif Krikheli (USSR).

No. 7444: Jac Haring (Netherlands).
1.Ba4+ Kxb6 2.Bc3 Rb5 3.Bd4+, and:

“Again two thematic variations with wS galloping in each finale. Alas, the mates are not pure and the P-walls on the a- and d-files leave an impression of stiffness.”
"The difficult solution gets better and better as it develops. Best of all is the clever roundabout route of wR to the f-file ambush. Of course, the ideal mate is also positive."


"A sympathetic study with a sharp solution. The mating picture is unusual, wB and wR returning to game starting squares. The only slur, but a disturbing one, is the brutal capture of b5."

No.7448: Ofer Comay (Israel). 1.Se4 Sf2+ 2.Sxf2 dRf5 3.Sd5 Rx5 4.Se4 dRf5 5.Rb5, with Rx5 6.Rg3 mate, or Rg1 6.Sf6 mate. "Certainly, there are two thematic mates, but the introductory play is rather constrained and moreover the mate 'cage' is already in the initial position. In its favour is fR pinned beyond bK's field."

No.7449: Paul Joitsa and Virgil Nestorescu (Romania). 1.e7 Se5 2.Kxe5 c2 3.Kc4 Sc3+ 4.Kf3 Sd5 5.Ba5+ Sc3 6.e8Q c1Q 7.Qe2 mate. "The theme was really not best suited to miniatures. In this miniature the play is interesting and lively enough and the ideal mate is quite nice."

No.7450: S. Djulinac (Yugoslavia).
"A real R&P end-game study. wK and wR collaborate admirably."

"The mate is indeed thematic, but the play is somehow featureless. The high spot of this miniature is the sacrifice of bR for counterplay."

"There are two thematic mates but I cannot help feeling that this is just a torso."

"The mate is quite OK, but the initial position displays too many 'implements' for that content."

"This meets the thematic stipulation, but hardly more. The analysis supplied for the try 1.Rb8+? was faulty: the right line is Kd7 2.Ra7+ Kd6 3.Rd8+ Kc5, drawing."

No. 7455: Osmo Kaila (Finland).
Se3 2.Rxc5+ Qd5/i 3.gf mate.
"Several mates, but this is a mansuba, not a real study."

No. 7456: Erkki Puhakka (Finland).
"A pawnless slaughter."

No. 7457: Jaroslav Polasek and Emil Vlasak (Czechoslovakia).
"Otherwise like the 12th Place study, but the miniature form is absent, nor is the artificial BTM start to be admired."

No. 7458: David Gurgenidze (Georgian SSR). Judge: V. Neidze.
This 23rd multi-section tourney marked 30 years of the newspa-
per's chess column run since incep-
tion by D.K.Kanonik. 46 study com-
posers sent in 66 studies. The
provisional awards were published
in the newspaper column, and the
final award (all genres) has been
published in a 56-page booklet
with a print run of 700. I.d7 Sf6+
2.Kf3 e1S+ 3.Ke3 Sxd7 4.Rc8+
Kg7 5.Rc7 Sg2+ 6.Kd3 Sf4+

No.7459: G.Amiryan (Erevan).
1.Rd4 glQ 2.Ra4+ Qa7 3.e8Q e1Q
4.Qd8 Qd2+f 5.e7e7 Qd8+ 6.Qxe8
Qxa4 7.Kc7+ Ka7 Qb8+ Ka6

i) A second solution at this point
has been reported. 4.Ke6 Kc7

No.7460: C.Kondratev and A.Kop-
nin (Chelyabinsk).
1.c7 Ke3+i
2.eSc6 Bxc6 3.Sxc6 Rg4+ 4.Kf1
Rc8 8.Sc7 Rxc7 9.Sc5+, 10.Sxc7

i) Kg3 2.eSc6 Bxc6 3.Sxc6 Ra4
4.Kf1 Ra8 5.Sa7 Kf3 6.c8Q Rxc8
7.Sc8 Ke3 8.Sb6 Kd3 9.Sc6 Kc4

No.7461: A.P.Grin (Moscow).
1.Kd5 Ba3 2.Ke6 Bc1 3.Kf7 Bh6
4.g5fg 5.g4 Kc7 6.Ke7 Kxc6
7.Kc6 draw.

i) A second solution at this point
has been reported. 4.Ke6 Kc7


No. 7464: Vassily Smyslov (Moscow). From time to time another study by the ex-world Champion is 'discovered', so the publication of all his 'missing' studies is most welcome. They are in a 3-page article by the composer himself in issue No. 7/1989 of the Bulletin of the Central Chess Club of the USSR. The dates run from 1936 to 1987. We select a scintillating pair of reverse-colour 'twins'. Before consulting the solutions the reader is invited to make a wild guess (from comparing the diagrams) as to why the defence is successful in the first while the attack wins through in the second. i) c6/i c2/ii 2.Bd2 Bb2 3.d6 bc 4.Kc6 c1B/iii 5.d7+ Kc7 6.d8Q+ Kxd8 7.Kd6 c5 8.Kxc5 Kc7 9.Ke4, and it's a draw. The exchange of wB can never be forced, because W does not need to retain wPa5: after its loss wK sits on a spartan throne on a2, and his wB vassal roams with diagonals to spare.


iv) This is the (counter) point, avoiding.


13. Qb1+ Kg7 14. Qb2+ Kg8 15. Qb8+ Kg7 16. Qa7+ Kg6 17. Qg1+ wins.


   i) 4. h4? Sc8+ 5. Ka8 Sb6+ 6. Ka7 Sc8+, drawn.


No. 7471: V. Bratsev (Cherkassk district). 1...g3 2. Rf6 Be7 3. Kf4 gf


No. 7473: Harrie Grondijs (Rijswijk, Netherlands), corrected by SN columnist and tourney judge Jan van Reek.
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The judging task was delegated to AJR for No. 7481. The tourney was dedicated to the memory of Sergei Ivanovich KAMINER, one of several Russian study composers who fell victims to Stalinist oppression and terror. The 45 entries from composers in 11 countries were of a high standard, the top three standing out. The 'special' honours were awarded for corrections for four months, and EG presents the definitive verdict, after solvers, including a powerful Czech contingent, and the judge himself, had injected much analytical labour.


ii) Re4 2.Kxe4 Sc3 + 3.Kf4 Sxa2 4.Kg3 Bg2 5.a8Q.


No. 7473: H. Grondijs (iv.87, v.89)
1st Prize, KNSB 1987
correction by J. van Reek
award: Schakend Nederland, xii.88 and v.89

No. 7474: Jan Timman (Amsterdam).
This study caused analytical controversy and we give here the definitive outcome, incorporating the Schakend Nederland solution, v.89. 1.Rd3 Sb5/i 2.ab Sb3 3.c3/ii Sd4 4.Rxd4 Bxc3 5.Bb2/iii (h8B? Be1;) Bxb2 6.h8B Bc3 7.Be5 de/iv 8.Re4 Bb2/v 9. h5 Ba3 10.Rc4, with:

Bb2 11.h6/vi e4 12.h7 Bh8 13.d6 e3 14.d7 e2 15.Rh4 wins, or


No. 7474: J. Timman (x.87)
2nd Prize, KNSB, 1987

No. 7475: J.H. Marwitz (i.87)
3rd Prize, KNSB 1987

No.7475: Jan H.Marwitz (Dalfsen, Netherlands). 1.h8Q+i Qxh8
2.d7/ii Kf7 3.Rg7+ Kxf6/iii 4.c7
Qxg7/iv 5.c8Q Rxh8 6.Qe8 Rxe8
7.deS+ Kf7 8.Sxg7 Kxg7 9.Kf3
Kg6 10.Kf4 Kg6 11.g4 wins.
i) 1.Rg8+? Kf7 2.h8Q Rxg2+
3.Kxg2 Qe2+, drawing by perpetu-
al check.

No.7476: Genrikh M.Kasparyan
(Erevan, USSR).


2.d7/ii Kf7 3.Rg7+ Kxf6/iii 4.c7
Qxg7/iv 5.c8Q Rxh8 6.Qe8 Rxe8
7.deS+ Kf7 8.Sxg7 Kxg7 9.Kf3
Kg6 10.Kf4 Kg6 11.g4 wins.
i) 1.Rg8+? Kf7 2.h8Q Rxg2+
3.Kxg2 Qe2+, drawing by perpetu-
al check.

No.7476: Genrikh M.Kasparyan
(Erevan, USSR).


2.d7/ii Kf7 3.Rg7+ Kxf6/iii 4.c7
Qxg7/iv 5.c8Q Rxh8 6.Qe8 Rxe8
7.deS+ Kf7 8.Sxg7 Kxg7 9.Kf3
Kg6 10.Kf4 Kg6 11.g4 wins.
i) 1.Rg8+? Kf7 2.h8Q Rxg2+
3.Kxg2 Qe2+, drawing by perpetu-
al check.

No.7476: Genrikh M.Kasparyan
(Erevan, USSR).


2.3c7? Kf7 3.Rg7+ Ke6 4.d7.Qa8
5.Re7+ Kxf6.

No.7477: Michal Hlinka (Kosice,
Czechoslovakia). 1.f4/i b2
(Bxf4;Kxb5) 2.Rh2+ Bd2 3.Rh1
Kxc3 4.d4/ii b4 5.d5/iii Bc1
6.Rh3+ Kc2 7.d6/iv Bc1
b3 11.Kc7/v b2 12.Re6 Qxd7+
Kd3 16.f6 Kc4 17.f7 Qd5+ 18.Kc7
Qxc6 19.f8Q drawn.
i) 1.Rh4? b4 2.Rxb4 Ba3.

No.7477: Michal Hlinka (Kosice,
Czechoslovakia). 1.f4/i b2
(Bxf4;Kxb5) 2.Rh2+ Bd2 3.Rh1
Kxc3 4.d4/ii b4 5.d5/iii Bc1
6.Rh3+ Kc2 7.d6/iv Bc1
b3 11.Kc7/v b2 12.Re6 Qxd7+
Kd3 16.f6 Kc4 17.f7 Qd5+ 18.Kc7
Qxc6 19.f8Q drawn.
i) 1.Rh4? b4 2.Rxb4 Ba3.

2.3c7? Kf7 3.Rg7+ Ke6 4.d7.Qa8
5.Re7+ Kxf6.

No.7477: Michal Hlinka (Kosice,
Czechoslovakia). 1.f4/i b2
(Bxf4;Kxb5) 2.Rh2+ Bd2 3.Rh1
Kxc3 4.d4/ii b4 5.d5/iii Bc1
6.Rh3+ Kc2 7.d6/iv Bc1
b3 11.Kc7/v b2 12.Re6 Qxd7+
Kd3 16.f6 Kc4 17.f7 Qd5+ 18.Kc7
Qxc6 19.f8Q drawn.
i) 1.Rh4? b4 2.Rxb4 Ba3.

2.Re2? Ke8 3.g6 Bg4 4.g7
Sd7+ 5.Kb7 Rg6.
i) 2.Be5? c2 3.Qxb4 Kb1 4.Bf4 
   Qc2.

ii) 3.Kh3 Bf5+ 4.Kg2 b1Q 5.Bxa1 
   Qe4+ 6.Qf3 Qc2+ 7.Qf2 Be4+ 
   Bg3+.

iii) b1Q 4.Bxa1 Qe4+ 5.Qf3 Qc2+ 

iv) 8.Kg1? Qa7+, or 8.Kf2? Qf8+, 
    with promotion on b1.

No. 7478: Em. Dobrescu (ix.87)
   2 Hon. Men., KNSB, 1987

No. 7479: Mario Matous (Prague).
   1.Bg7+ Ke7 2.Bf6+ Kf8/i 3.eSc5 
   Se7+ 4.Kh7 Qxf6 5.Sd7+ Kf7 

   i) Ke8 3.Sc5 Qa8 4.Sd6+ Kf8 

No. 7480: Nico Cortlever (Zutphen, 
   Netherlands). 1.Ra1 Rd2/i 2.Sxh6 
   Rxe2 (Kxh6;Kg2) 3.Sf5 gh+ 4.Kh1 
   Rb2/ii 5.Sg3+ Kg4 6.Sf1 Kh3 
   7.Sc3 (zugzwang, it says here) Kg3 
   8.Sf1 Kh4 9.Sc2/iii Kh3 10.Rf1 
   Rxd2 11.Rf3, and wR is a despera-
   do, drawing.

   i) gh+ 2.Kg2 Rd2 3.Sxh6 Rxe2+ 

   ii) Kg4 5.Sc3+ Kg3 6.Sf1+ Kh3 
       7.Rc1 Rb2 8.Rc3+, but not, in this,
       5.Sd4? Rb2 6.Sb3 Kh3 7.Sc1 Rb1 
       8.Rxb1 abB 9.Sc3 Kg3.

        10.Sxh2 Kg3 11.Sf1 Kf2 12.Sh2 
        Ra4.

No. 7481: after the late Carel Mann, 
   correction by Jan van Reek (Ne-
therslands). The study was composed by Mann in 1907. The correction relates to the introduction, moves 1-6. 1...Qb5 2.e8Q Qf1+ 3.Kh2 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Qd1+ 5.Be1 Qxe1+ 6.Kg2 Qxh4 7.Qc8+ Kf4/i 8.Qf8+ Ke3 9.Qf3+ Kd4 10.Qd1+ Ke5 (Kc4;Qa4+) 11.Qd6+ Kf5 12.Sg3+ Kg5 13.Qd5+ Kf4 (Kg6;Qg8+) 14.Qf5+ Ke3 15.Qf3+ Kd2 16.Se4+ Kc2 17.Qc3+ and mates in 3.


ii) Kh5 8.Sg3+ Kg5 9.Qd8+ Kg4 10.Qd4+ Kg5 11.Qd5+ - see main line.


iii) Qa2+ 3.Kc3 Qb2+ 4.Kc4, with Qd2 5.Kb3 e2, main line, or e2 5.Qh1+ as after 1.Qe4 Qb2+ (see i)).

iv) 4.Qe4+? Kc1 5.Qc6+ Kd1 6.Qh1+ (Qf3,Qd4;) e1Q 7.Qh5+ Qe2 8.Qd5+ Kc1 9.Qc3(c6)+ Kb1 10.Qf5(g6)+ Qe4 wins.


viii) 2.Ka4? e2 or Qc3.

ix) Qd2 3.Kb3 e2 4.Qe5+ follows the main line.


  iii) 4.Sc3? Kf7 5.Se6 Bxf5 6.Sb5 Bxe6+, and B1 wins (theory says so, so it must be right!).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BTM</th>
<th>Black to Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTM</td>
<td>White to Move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oth</td>
<td>over-the-board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GBR: code (after Guy/Blandford/Roycroft) denotes chessboard force in at most six digits. Examples: two white knights and one black pawn codes into 0002.01; wQ bQ wR codes as 4100; w/Bb vs. bS codes as 0023; the full complement of 32 chessmen codes as 4888.88. The key to encoding is to compute the sum '1-for-W-and-3-for-Bl' for each piece-type in QRBS sequence, with wPP and bPP uncoded following the 'decimal point'; the key for decoding is to divide each QRBS digit by 3, when the quotient and remainder are in each of the 4 cases the numbers of Bl and W pieces respectively.
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