G. Slepian, his article on the Troitzky endgame can be found on page 43 of this magazine.
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1. Editorial

With this issue *EG* marks the popularly celebrated new millennium with the opening page of Volume IX. But pages, like days in the biblical proverb, are numbered - joke. The next few years will transform *EG*, though the steps of the transformation are hidden from us. The magazine will take to the digital ether, remotely manipulated by button, mouse and, for all we know today, the twitch of a virtual earlobe. Change itself is so protean - the visual eerily and disturbingly taking over from the other senses - that the once solid notions of palpable shape and measurable movement dissolve into the ungraspable. Does 'anticlockwise' mean anything to a child growing up with dot matrix and the light emitting diode?

Your editor's enthusiasm is not wilting, but it is another matter with his disposable energy. There are many tourneys and much other material awaiting dissemination. In December 1999 the pipeline simulates a traffic jam. Technology may well reduce or even eliminate postage to relieve this blockage, and the same technology may even reduce, though hardly eliminate, the number of unsound, anticipated and poor studies that we see published. The sooner the better. Long live quality. Long live high standards. Hoist these flags to the masthead, even if as java applets fluttering in the corner of your screen. But that's the wrong note to end on.

Are not quality and high standards values, and have we not just pointed out that the physical is on the way out? Let's not forget that chess is essentially abstract. Fingers crossed it could all be good news after all!

2. *C* After a noticeable absence from the oracle database scene, Ken Thompson of BELLE fame has entered the pawnless 6-man endgame fray. This is wonderful news. We understand that his results so far confirm the results obtained by Lewis Stiller in conjunction with Noam Elkies, but this time more data has been kept.

3. Magazines

3.1 *ORBIT* is a new (1999) composition magazine, a quarterly from Makedonia. Its editor is Zhivko Janevski, maestro of self-mates, so studies content - biographical data, for instance - will be incidental. The helpmate and selfmate originals section is edited by Zoran Gavrilovski.

3.2 *VERTIKAL* is the current general chess magazine in Ukraine, apparently monthly, with some coverage of composition. A 28-page special issue in 1999 celebrated problem composer and Kotovski vesti columnist Viktor Melnichenko's 60th birthday.

3.3 *Sahovski Glasnik* (ISSN 1331-2901) from Zagreb (Croatia) is in its 74th year (not all years consecutive). The composition section is edited by Josip Varga.

4. *EG/34* 3.1 David Gurgenidze adds to the list of missing study
tourney awards by drawing attention to 64 - *Shakhmatnoe obozrenie* of 1976, where the announced judge was An.G.Kuznetsov. At least two problem awards for that year were made and published.

3.2 Chingiz Aitmatov JT-60 (1988).

Issue 31 of *Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia* (ix1999) carries an article on the current state of composition in Kirgizia (or Kyrgyzstan). To general astonishment a study by A.Botokanov [dlf5 0000.26] is given as having won first prize in this tourney, but no other details are supplied. AJR is investigating further.

**Obituary**

† Wallace D. Ellison (1911-1999)

A British study-composer over a long period, teacher of mathematics, and for a short period (in 1969) valued collaborator with Walter Veitch in EG's *Spotlight* column. Harold van der Heijden's figure for Ellison's studies output: 25.

**An Episode with Ellison**

by W.Veitch

*V1* W.Veitch (ca. 1950)

1. Kg5 f3 2. gxf3 Bxf3

An unpretentious puzzle which I forgot about when I came across the next.

*V2* F.Lazard

=2/3 pt *L'Italia Scacchistica* 1923

```
      _ _ _
     _ _ _
  _ _ _ _ _
  _ _ _ _ _
  _ _ _ _ _
  _ _ _ _ _
  _ _ _ _ _
      _ _ _
```

1. Bf1 Bf3 2. Bg2!

Lovely sparkle here, and anticipating me totally, 1923 being the year I was born! Sadly, however, a fatal flaw was discovered in a dual draw by 1.h4.

The search to save the Lazard and its sparkle was now on, but despite the many possibilities all my efforts kept being frustrated by duals.

Meeting Ellison in 1969, I mentioned this subject to him, and he decided to devote some time to it. But he too met problems, writing: "The dual draw can be achieved in various ways which makes it very persistent. Reshuffling the Q-side pieces fails to provide a cure, the version with bKc6 the most disappointing because it removes the dual perfectly only to introduce another by an unfortunate accident. Since bPg3 must be Black's only P
and white men would destroy the stalemate, extra material is practically ruled out. Hence wB must move to f1 with a capture or be put there initially as shown below."

W.D.Ellison's version (1969)

\[ g5c6 0440.21 \]
\[ \text{5/4 Draw} \]


"The trouble is caused by wB and bK being on the same rank. Out of the frying pan into the fire!"

Without enthusiasm Ellison therefore moved wB to f1, adding bPg5, the solution then: 1.Kxg5 Bf3 etc. "This is about as near as one can get to Lazard's study, but some of the charm has vanished along with the duals."

Ellison then persisted with with two more elaborate versions:

\[ g5a6 0444.21 \]
\[ \text{6/5 Draw} \]

W.D.Ellison 1.Bd3+ Kxb7 2.Bxf1 etc.

"Otherwise I think that W has to give up wR for gP."

\[ g5b5 0444.22 \]
\[ \text{6/6 Draw} \]

W.D.Ellison "More fanciful and could be full of holes."

"These are merely illustrations of a type of position which might work: long shots do come off sometimes (but not too often)."

I remember having doubts about both positions, but failed to record them.

At this time we lost touch. He was elected Chairman of the Assistant Masters Association, which shows the high regard in which he was
held in his profession, and no doubt he was then fully engaged representing its interests nationally and internationally.

For my part my work took me abroad, and my interest in chess, long on the wane, died completely.

So this is an episode with no real end: two Ellison ideas left in limbo. But perhaps more is now known. Today’s databanks may know of a study showing Lazard’s idea to perfection, perhaps even one by Ellison in his later years. Alternatively, some keen reader may feel moved to tackle the problem, including the correctness or otherwise of $I4IV5$.

Bearing in mind Ellison’s heavy professional, administrative and social duties at that time, it is most remarkable that he was able to fit in any chess at all, let alone come up with the many incisive comments and fecundity of ideas he produced. Clearly a man of exceptional intelligence and energy.

† Theodorus Cornelius Louis KOK 23xi1906-v1999
From all accounts, Kok was a very likeable man - unambitious, laconic and laid back, with a nice line in humour. He composed with great facility but was never in a hurry to publish. Indeed, he seems to have attached relatively little importance to the creative side. Maybe his Roman Catholicism had something to do with it (he joined the Ruy Lopez club and contributed originals to its magazine), or perhaps it was just temperament. His studies were mostly, but not exclusively, sent to Netherlands outlets such as De Schaakwereld and Residentiebode, and many were incorporated into articles or saved up for books, some of which were published by others decades later. A famous first prize (key 1.Sa8!! - see No.416 in ‘1234’) competed in Czechoslovakia. The late John Selman, who was in prolonged contact with Kok, acquired some of the material which was then rediscovered by Jan van Reek after Selman’s death.

Kok’s Problemen en Eindspelstudien was self-published in December 1938, Wege zur Endspielstudie (consisting of Bauernendspiele and Schwarze Damen in Zugzwang in German translation, edited by Jan van Reek, and with a photo) in 1992. Personal details can be found in problemist Harry Johnson’s article Imitating Kok in the November 1996 number of Harrie Grondijs’ Stes Journal, from which we learn, for example, that ‘the summit’ of Kok’s chessplaying career was in a tournament in which he was ‘lucky not to end last, because one contestant had five zeroes, and I only four’, and that ‘in 1945, after the war, he had stopped playing chess because of his professional career. He had felt that after his retirement as an actuary plenty of time would remain to become world chess
champion after all’. Harold van der Heijden puts Kok’s output at 250 studies. He was a significant figure in our world.

42nd FIDE PERMANENT COMMISSION FOR CHESS COMPOSITION and WORLD CONGRESS OF CHESS COMPOSITION Netanya (Israel), 23-30x1999

Taking into consideration that the congress was organised, by the imperturbable Uri Avner and helpers, at short notice after the initial venue in Montenegro became for overriding political reasons unavailable, that such friendly facilities and so full a programme were in place is truly remarkable: choice of hotel accommodation, availability of PCs, excursions to a kibbutz and to the Sea of Galilee, bathing and sunbathing, books (many on studies) and magazines on offer, a noticeboard for lists and announcements - all these added to the traditional open solving and team solving (WCSC) were woven into the core activities of sessions of the full PCCC.

As regards the PCCC some 28 countries sent delegates, notable absentees being Spain, Mongolia, Kazakhstan, Greece and Denmark. The deaths of two Ukrainian study composers Anatoly ZINCHUK and Pyotr GOLOVKOV were reported, as well as that of Th.C.L.Kok (Netherlands). The nine extant subcommittees were constituted according to who was present (delegates and others) and a tenth, for the general topic of ’judging’ was formed and had one meeting. All the various FIDE competitions were reported on and discussed, including the now less controversial topic of individual world championships, to take place on a 3-year basis, the first period being 1998-2000 and with unrestricted entry; there was controversy, however, when on a vote joint compositions were excluded, leaving the door open to clandestine collusion. On recommendations by the qualifications subcommittee several titles were awarded - but none related to studies. The 2000 venue will be Pula (Croatia, 2-9Sep) for the third time, with Wageningen (Netherlands) the favourite for 2001.

In the main solving, ie the WCSC, the six-round team event was won by Russia, with studies specialists Comay (Israel) and Rumyantsev (Russia) taking the first two places in the individual championship. An extraordinary contribution to the WCSC was made by veteran Bo Lindgren (Sweden), who not only organised the solving, helped by Dirk Borst (Netherlands) and Ward Stoffelen (Belgium), but himself composed a number of the originals, including studies. The publication of a WCSC original is the decision of the composer. The two Japanese solvers scored more on the studies than the
combined efforts of the three Britons (IGM Mestel included)!
Under 'Any Other Business' AJR proposed that to lessen confusion about sources the diagram caption to a composition honoured in a quick composing tourney organised at these congresses should be standardised, apart from 'Whisky' or 'Vodka' or 'Urals' etc., to:

WCCC, [town], [year]

where WCCC stands for World Congress of Chess Composition. In this, there is no serial number, no reference to FIDE, and no reference to the PCCC, all of which factually mislead when applied to such tourneys. The suggestion will be included as an appendix to the minutes.

AJR had the new experience of sharing a hotel room with mercurial Georgian composing machine David Gurgenidze, who deemed the time at Netanya one of his most productive fortnights. AJR verily believes that if David composes fewer than 50 studies in a three-year spell he takes himself to the doctor to find out what is wrong...

To come closer to studies matters. Two quick thematic study composing tourneys organised independently of the host country were well supported, but the awards were understandably not included in the sheets distributed at the concluding banquet, let alone to each competitor. Instead they were posted on a noticeboard - and then removed. No doubt they will be included in a complete account awaited from the Israeli organisers. Such quick tourneys, popular as they are and amazing as the talent is to compose fast, are clearly unsatisfactory in their current form: there is no way that the judging of a 'quick' tourney, however international it may be, should count towards qualification for the title of international judge.

The third studies judge for the FIDE Album 1995-97 selection tourney will be Emilian Dobrescu (Romania), but as yet there is no reserve judge. The section director (AJR) is confident that the process will be smooth since all three judges can be expected to communicate by e-mail.

Netanya 1999
FIDE PCCC - Studies Subcommittee
convener/speaker: A.J.Roycroft
informal minutes
There were the following four items reported verbally to the full Commission.

1. Study of the Year  The FIDE Album 1995-97 judges will be requested to choose one study representing each of the three years and suitable for popularising studies in non-specialist chess columns. The selections can be publicised on the Internet.

2. Open Solving  The subcommittee expressed its regret that no study was included in the Open Solving event at Netanya.
3. FIDE Web Site

The subcommittee reported with pleasure that Hannu Harkola (Finland) had agreed to incorporate official subcommittee material in his FIDE-related web site for world-wide access by composers, judges and tourney organisers. The two major items will be the Guidelines for Organisers of Formal International tourneys for Studies promulgated at the PCCC Meeting in Bratislava in 1993, and the report set out below. The website can be found at http://www.sei.fi/~stniekat/pccc

4. Studies 'extracted from databases'

Six signatures (Noam Elkies opted not to sign) were acquired for the following report. It is a tentative first effort to address a current thorny subject, and as such is in the nature of a discussion paper rather than a firm statement.

PROPOSAL FOR THE GUIDANCE OF TOURNEY ORGANISERS, COMPOSERS AND JUDGES

0. DEFINITIONS

cconversion - the consequence of a move in an odb solution (ie series of optimal moves by both sides) where the force present changes, ie by capture or promotion.
database - see odb
depth - the number of consecutive optimal moves needed by the winning side to checkmate or to conversion.
metric - the component of the algorithm used to generate on odb whereby the program can refer to all target winning positions. There are in general only two metrics: checkmate; and (winning) conversion. The first task of the algorithm is to obtain or generate all winning positions according to the chosen metric.
odb - 'oracle' database, otherwise known as total information database or tablebase. An odb is generated by algorithm implemented by computer program for specific chess force. When complete an odb can yield on request the true result of any position for the force in question, and the optimal move or moves (if any) where there is a win. Odb’s for five chessmen (the kings included, but with no more than a single pawn) have been in the public domain since the 1980’s. Pawnless odb’s with six chessmen have been generated and many results published, but with rare exceptions six-man odb’s are not yet (in 1999) publicly available. It is commonly assumed that odb’s for one more chessman will be produced every ten years. Although not yet in general use the term 'oracle database' is useful to distinguish it from other types of database.
opimal - an optimal move in a position that is a win is a move that will win in fewer moves than any other move (if any), or a move of the defence that will delay loss longest. A similar definition can be applied to a position that is drawn. Technically, an optimal move by the winning side reduces the depth
by 1, and an optimal move by the
defender maintains the depth unal-
terred. See also metric.

1. In recent years judges and
editors have been faced with the
insurmountable difficulty of dis-
tinguishing between a 'malyutka'
(five men only) study composed
traditionally and one that may
have been extracted from an odb.
The studies subcommittee has
considered the situation and
reports as follows.

2. The skills needed to extract
'studies' (ie optimal series of
unique moves to win or to draw)
from an odb are distinct from
the talent, creativity, technique
and persistence needed for
traditional study composing.

3. The subcommittee proposes
two principles:
3.1 Traditional and odb studies
should not compete in the same
tourney.
3.2 However, the use of com-
puters should be encouraged,
because they can both assist in
ensuring soundness and be a
source of ideas.

4. The subcommittee therefore
makes the following recommend-
ations.
4.1 The use of odb's to verify the
correctness of variations is accep-
table.
4.2 The use of odb output in a
main line is acceptable, provided
only that the initial position has
at least one more chessman
present than is the maximum

supported by odb's on the
market.

4.3 Obscure lines of play should
be accompanied by prose text
explaining what is happening.
This explanation must satisfy the
judge. The source of the text may
be collective.

4.4 Separate tourneys for odb
'studies' should be organised.
4.5 Judges of study tourneys
should familiarise themselves
with odb technology and with
current publicly available odb's.

Signed:
Y. Afek (Israel)
Hillel Aloni, Netanya
Ofer Comay, Israel
Gady Costeff, Israel and USA
David Gurgenidze, Tbilisi
Nikolai Kralin, Moscow
John Roycroft, London

Netanya, October 1999

ORIGINALS - 7
editor: Noam Elkies

Starting about ten years ago, Hlinka
and Vlasak have been developing
a new tactical/geometrical study
motif in which forced material gain
emerges from a web of mutual
attacks. This new theme seems
hard to define, or even to name: in
his 9/95 article in EBUR, Vlasak
showed the four examples then
existing (all by either
Hlinka-Vlasak or Hlinka alone) under the title "Grip theme", but in recent e-mail Vlasak seems to disassociate himself from that coinage — he attributes the name to L. Salai, Jr., and further writes that that "Grip" is a questionable translation from the Czech, suggesting alternatives along the lines of "vise-grip" or "pincer". In 1997, Hlinka and Vlasak submitted a new setting of this theme to this column; I’m happy to present it here, and regret only that communication problems prevented its earlier appearance:

No 11443 M.Hlinka, E.Vlasak, 1997

No 11443 M.Hlinka, E.Vlasak,
1.Qg6+/i Kd8 2.Rxc6/ii Rg4!
3.Rh8!/iii Rxg6+/iv 4.Kf7+ Be8+
5.Rxe8+ Kd7 6.Rxe7+ Kd8
7.Re8+!/v Kd7 8.Ree6!!/vi and
wins after 8...Rxc6 9.dxc6+ Kd7
10.Re6 Raxc6! 11.dxe6+ Kc5
12.c7 Rh7+.

The heavy setting is mostly explained by the complicated mechanism of the theme (however named), in which all four Rooks participate as well as the White pawn and Black King. Here some heavy analysis is also needed, to dispose of 3...Rxc6! : after 4.Kf7+ Kc7 5.Qb1 Rb6 white has saved the Queen but must still prove a win. For instance the composers analyze 6.Qc1+? Kd6! 7.Rd8! Re4! (against Qe3) 8.Qg5 Rbb4! 9.Qf5 (9.Qg3+ Rf4+ 10.Kg7 e5! 11.dxe6 Kxe6) 9...Rf4 10.Rxd7+ Ke5
11.Rc7+ Kb5 12.Qxf4 Rxf4+
13.Kxe7 a5 to a draw. Instead they
prescribe 6.Qe1!, intending 7.Qe5.
Black cannot stop this with
7...Rg5? because of 8.Qc1+. If
6...Rgb4 7.Kxe7 Bg4 8.d6+ Kb7
9.d7 or 6...Rd6 7.Qa5+ Kb7
Four main defenses remain:
6...Rbg6 7.Qe5+ Kb6 8.Rb8+ Ka6
14.Qe8+ Ka5 15.Qc7+ Rb6
16.Qxa7+ Ra6 17.Qc7+ mates.
6...Rg6 7.Qe5+, and now Rbd6
8.Kxe7! Ba4 9.Rd8 Rg7+ 10.Qxg7
Rxd8 11.Qc3+, or 7...Kb7 8.Rb8+
Ka6 9.Qa5+ Kb5 10.Qxa7 Rxb8
6...Rbb4! 7.Qe5+ Kb7 8.Qb8+
(8.Kxe7?! is less clear) Ka6 9.Rh6+
Rb6 10.Rxb6+ axb6 11.Qa8+ Kb5
12.Qb7! (ejecting Bd7 from the
a4-e8 diagonal) and now Bf5
13.Qe6+ Ka6 14.Kxe7 Rh4
(14...Rg7+ 15.Kf6! Rg6+ 16.Kxf5
Rxc6 17.dxc6) 15.d6 Rh7+ 16.Kf6
Bd7 17.Qa8+ Kb5 18.Qd5+ Kbd4
19.Qe4+, or 12...Rf4+ 13.Kxe7 and
again two branches:
Bf4 14.Qc6+ Ka6 15.d6 Rd4
Ra4 19.Qd3+ b5 20.d7, or 13...Bh3
Re4+ 17.Kf6 Rf4+ 18.Kg5 Rg4+
6...Kb7 7.Qxe7 Rf4+ 8.Kg7 Rg4+
9.Kh7 Ka6! (again following
H.v.d.Heijden; Kc7 10.Ra8 Ra6
11.Qd8+ Kd6 12.Qf6+ wins)
10.Rf8 Rg6 11.Qa3+ Kb7 12.Rf7
R6h+ 13.Kg8 Rg6+ 14.Rg7!
(clearer than 14.Kf8 Rh8+ 15.Ke7
Bb5!, gaining tempo for 16...a6)
14...Rxg7+ 15.Kxg7 Ra6 16.Qe7
Kc8 17.d6 Rc6 18.Kf7 a6 19.Qe5

Umnov provides lighter fare, a
malyutka with a delightful logical
point:
No 11444 G. Umnov, 1999

No 11444 G. Umnov Rook against
Bishop and pawn is usually a "dead
draw", but here White must be
careful not to let Black capture the
pawn while keeping his King
trapped on the edge of the board.
After 1.Bf8!/i Rh7/ii 2.Bh6
Rh8/iii White would lose with
3.a4? Rh7 4.a5 Rh8 5.a6 Rh7 6.a7
Rxa7, so 3.a3! Rh7 4.a4 Rh8 5.a5
Rh7 6.a6 Kf6 7.a7 draws (also Rh8
7.a7; as Harold notes there is alas
no variation where White can only
draw by completing the Excelsior,
e.g. if 7...Kf6 White holds either by
promoting or playing 8.Kg4).
Conversely if 1...Rf7 2.Bh6 Rh7/iv
White loses with 3.a3? but draws
with 3.a4! reaching the same
positions a move earlier. The
thematic lines 1...Rh7+: 3.a3! (a4?)
and
1...Rf7: 3.a4! (a3?) show the Israel
St. Petersburg match theme of reciprocal change between try and solution. This and eight positions of mutual Zugzwang in a study with only five men!

[The Zugzwang count includes positions with Kf6, but not the position Kh5, Bh6, a7/Kf5, Rh8, which need not arise WTM. This ninth Zugzwang requires some precise Black maneuvers to win after 1.a8Q Rx8 2.Bg7, since the usual trick of going to the first rank for 3.Kh4(h6) Rh1+(#) fails with Bg7 covering a1! The winning line runs 2...Ra4! 3.Br8! Rxg4! 4.Kh6 Rg6+! 5.Kh7 Kf6 followed by ...Kf7 and the familiar procedure for flushing out the Bishop from the top three ranks.]

i) Black threatened Rh7# as well as Rxa3, and 1.Bc1? shows the danger White faces: 1...Re7! 2.Be3/v Re7 3.Bg5/vi Rg7 4.Be3 (Bh6 Re1) Rg3 5.Bf2 Rg2 6.Be1 (Bh4 Rg8) Rh2+ 7.Bh4 Rx2a and wins (8.Bg3 Ra1 etc.)

ii) Ra8 2.Bg7 Ra4 3.Bf8 Rg4 4.Bc5 Rc4 5.Bd6 Rc6 6.Bb4 Rh6 7.a3 draws. 1... Re7 is the other main line.

iii) Or Kf6; here and later Black can shuttle his King between f6 and f5, and/or his Rook between h7 and h8, but cannot lose the move.

iv) 2...Rf6 3.Be3 Re6 4.Bf2 Re2 5.Bg3 draws

v) 2.Bd2(h6) Rc2 3.Bg5 Rh2+ 4.Bh4 Rx2 reaches the same end more quickly.

vi) 3.Bc1 Re1 4.Bg5 Rg1 5.Be7 (Bh4 Rg8) Rg7 6.Bf8 Rg8 7.Bh6 Rg1 wins (but not Rh8 and White escapes after all with 8.a3!)

Since presently available databases cover the 0310.10 material of Umnov's study, the correctness of the study can be guaranteed. By finding so economical a setting, the composer has paradoxically run afoul of a recent movement to exclude from competition any study contained by an existing database, on the grounds that the study might have been extracted from the database rather than composed in a creative human act. We can anticipate much debate on the philosophical and practical merits of such proposals; fortunately in case of Umnov's study these concerns can be put aside, because the studies in our column do not participate in any tourney: we print them for the benefit of the reader, who can enjoy them regardless of their provenance. This column will thus not discriminate against studies that were or might have been extracted from exhaustive databases. None of this is meant to suggest that No 11444 was in fact thus extracted. To my knowledge it is not (yet?) feasible to search a database for a position showing reciprocal change between try and solution. It is true that this particular instance of the theme could have been discovered starting from a computer-generated list of mutual Zugzwangs in 0310.10; but AJR assures me that Umnov is most unlikely to have composed this study with database assistance.
Apropos exhaustive computer analyses and mutual Zugzwangs: I closed the previous column with the challenge to find some or all of the six mutual Zugzwangs with Q+B vs. Q+R in which the B side stands to win. Here are the positions, computed by Lewis Stiller in 1992 and published here for the first time:

1. Ka3 Qb3 Be3 Kc1 Qe1 Rd2
2. Kc1 Qc4 Bc3 Ka1 Qa3 Rb2
3. Kb3 Be3 Qh5 Kd1 Qe1 Re2
4. Ka3 Qd3 Bh6 Kc1 Qg4 Rf4
5. Kd2 Qd3 Bb1 Kb2 Qa1 Rb2
6. Kc3 Qc5 Bd5 Kc1 Qa6 Rf1

As with the three mutual Zugzwangs with Q+S vs. Q+R, these six *C* positions, once known, can be understood by *H* (human) analysis. We point out the highlights here, leaving the interested reader to work out other variations. In #2, BTM gets pin-mated on either 1...Qb3 2.Qa6+ Qa2 3.Bxb2# (Q pinned) or 1...Qa2 2.Qd3(e4) and 3.Qb1# (R pinned); WTM 1.Bd4 Qa2? 2.Qd3? Qc4+! 3.Qxc4 (pin-stalemate) but 2.Qc2! wins, so 1...Qe3+! 2.Bxe3 Re2+ 3.K(Q)xc2 stalemate. In #4, BTM has only 1...Qh4 (1...Qg5 2.Qc3(e3)+, met by the quiet 2.Kb3! and the additional mate threat at c2 overwhelms Black, whose first move gave up the checking replies 2...Qg8(d1,e6).

We trust the 5-man databases for the WTM draw after 1.Qf1+ Ke2! 2.Bxf4. #6 is the most complicated, but none of its many lines are difficult or long. For instance, if Rf1 moves off the first rank then 2.Qe3+ Kb1 (Kd1 3.Bb3#) 3.Qg1+ mates, while if it moves on the first rank then White has at least 2.Kb3+ Kd2 3.Qe3+ winning the Queen on Kd1 4.Bf3+ (Rxf3?) or Ke2 4.Bc4+. This leaves 1...Rf1+ 2.Bxf3 when the 4010 database confirms a quick White win, e.g. 2...Qf6+ 3.Kb3+ Kd2 4.Qf2+. Most moves of the Qa6 quickly succumb to Kd3+ or Qe3+, while 1...Qe2 allows 2.Qa3+ Kb1 3.Be4+! and mates next.

WTM presumably gets nowhere with 1.Qe3+ Kb1 2.Be4+ Ka1, 1.Kb4+ Kb2(b1), or 1.Kb3+ Kd1. Note that most of the nine mutual Zugzwangs in 4301/4310 hinge on such rare tactical effects as sacrifice of White or Black pieces, pin-mate (also in #1), stalemate including pin-stalemate, and (in #5) mate with one or two self-blocks. The fact that Stiller's computation treated these unusual cases correctly, and that no further mutual Zugzwangs have been found, bolsters our confidence in his computations. Support from another direction is on the way: after a long hiatus in exhaustive six-man analysis, several programmers are now independently working on the project, and will soon verify Stiller's results and obtain new ones such as complete lists of Zugzwangs and their BTM depth. We eagerly await the new data, which will surely appear in the pages of coming issues of EG.
Many thanks to Spotlight’s contributors Marco Campioli (Italy), Luis Miguel Gonzáles (Spain), Peter Gyarmati (Hungary), Harold van der Heijden (Netherlands), Eduardo Iriarte (Argentina), Michael Roxlau, Peter Schmidt (both Germany) and Julien Vandiest (Belgium).

EG 125
No 10662, G.Costeff. Recently I came across the following companion piece to this study, disguised as a mate in 16: G.Werner, Die Schwalbe 1995, 2nd prize, c8h1 0443.36 b1a2a4a1b1b6e5g4a3b2b7e6g2e2 6/10+, 1.Bd1 (1.Bc6?) Sh3 2.Bf3+ Sg1 3.Bd5 exd5 4.e6 d4 5.e7 d3 6.e8B d2 7.Ba4 d1Q 8.Bxdl Sh3 9.Bf3+ Sg1 10.Bc6 (compared to the try 1.Bc6 the e-pawns have disappeared) bxc6 11.b7 c5 12.b8Q c4 13.Qf3 c3 14.Qh4 e2 15.Rxg1+ Kxg1 16.Qe1 mate. This problem could also figure as a study, as this sequence is the only way to win. I leave it to the readers to convince themselves that there is no win for White in the unusual positions arising from 4.Kxb7 or 6.e8Q.

EG 130
No 11065, P.Arestov. The composer corrects this by adding a wPg3.

EG 131
No 11213, L.Katsnelson. The composer submits the following correction: g3a5 0131.03 c4d8b8.g2g4h3 3/5 =, 1.Rc5+ Ka4 2.Kh2 g3+ 3.Kg1 Bb6 4.Sd7 Ba7 5.Sb6+ Kb4 6.Rb5+ Kxb5 stalemate.

EG 132
No 11255, L.M.Gonzáles. The composer confirms that the main line should read 1.... Qb2+.

No 11268, J.Vandiest. The study can be saved by choosing another 13th move as the main line. "No 11268 shows the remarkable instance of a study which is correct (or so it seems) in spite of its composer. Fact is that, in my first draft of it, I first interposed the bB, and only afterwards the bS. I was under the (false) impression, at that time, that this course of events enhanced the solution, but as things have turned out now the opposite is true. So I submit to your scrutiny: 13.... Bh5 14.Qxh5+ Kg7 15.Qg6+ (15.Qg4+ Kh7 16.Qh4+ Kg7 17.Qg3+ Kh8 draw) Kh8 16.Qf6+ Kh7 17.Qe7+ Kg8 18.Qd8+ Kh7 19.Qc7+ Kg8 20.Qb8+ Kg7 (20.... Kh7 21.Qb7+ Kg8 22.Qa8+ Kh7 23.Qh1+ as below) 21.Qxe5+ Kh7 22.Qc7+ Kg8 23.Qb8+ Kh7 24.Qb7+ Kg8 25.Qa8+ Kh7 26.Qh1+ Sh3 (26.... Kg8 27.Qxg1+ Kh8 28.Kf6 Qg8 29.Qh2+ Qh7 30.Qb8+ Qg8 31.Bf8 wins) 27.Qxh3+ Kg8 28.Qg3+ Kh7 29.Qc7+ Kg8 30.Qb8+ Kg7 (30.... Kh7 31.Qb7+ Kg8 32.Qa8+ Kh7 33.Qh1+ Kg8 34.Qg1+ Kh8 35.Kf6
Convincing, I hope?"
(Julien Vandiest, additional lines in
brackets by JF).
No 11312, V.Prigunov. This was
given as unsound in a previous
Spotlight. However, the position
after 1.... Kh4 2.Bxb3 Rb1 3.Sf6
Rxb3 4.e7 Re3 5.e8Q Rxe8+
6.Sxe8 Kxh5 is a simple win for
White: 7.Kh7 Bf8 8.Sg7+ Kg4
9.Ke6. So it seems that there is
nothing wrong with this study.
EG 133
p.555, P.Hage. The finale is not
unique, e.g. 5.Qxb7 Kd1 6.Qb2
wins.
A7a, p.561, I.AIiev. The database
points out two cooks: Firstly 2.b5
Sxe5 3.b6 Kg7 4.b7 Sd7 (4.... Sc6
8.Kg3 Kf6 9.Kg2 Ke6 10.Bg3 Kg7
11.Kd5 Kd7 12.Kc5 wins) 5.Kg4
Kf7 9.Be4 Ke7 10.Be5+ Ke8
wins; or 11.... Kf7 12.Bd6 wins)
Sa6 15.Bc7 Kf7 16.Kc6 wins, and
secondly 1.Bh6 Sxb3 2.e6 Sc5 3.e7
Se4 4.Bg5 Sd6 (so far foreseen by
the composer) 5.Bf6 Kg8 6.Kg6
and wins.
A7b, p.562, I.AIiev. The source
says "Die Schwalbe 1998!", but in
fact the study was not published
there because of its similarity to
Mario Matouš, «64» 1987,
h5h7 0003.30 d7.c5e5g5 4/2 +,
1.e6 (1.c6?, 1.g6+?) Nxc5 2.e7 Se4
(2.... Nd7 3.Kh4) 3.g6+ (3.e8Q?
Nf6+) Kg7 4.e8S+ Kf8 5.g7+ Kf7
6.Kh6 and wins. The latter study is
taken from the wonderful collection
"Matouš under the Microscope",
compiled by Emil Vlasák.
A10, p.563, F.Bondarenko.
After 1.... Bc6 the flashy 2.Bd5 is
not necessary, as 2.b7 Kc7 3.Bd5
wins, too.
No 11322, V.Kirillov,
V.Kondratev. No solution: 3....
Ke2 4.Ra3 Ke1 (releasing the
stalemate after 5.Ra2 Bxa2) wins
for Black. White is at a loss for a
reasonable move: 5.Rh3 Ba2 is
hopeless (6.Rh1+ Ke2 7.Rh2+ Kf3
11.Re1 Kf2 12.Rh1 Be5), while
5.Kb1 allows 5.... Kd2 6.Rb3
(6.Rc3 Bd3+ Bd3+ 7.Ka2 Ke1 and
wins.
No 11323, P.Arestov. A dual:
5.Bd3+ Kxd3 (else 6.gxh3) 6.Rxb8
draw.
No 11324, Y.Afek, N.Kralin.
Unsound. Not only are there a
couple of wins for Black on move
1 (1.... Sf5 2.Bf8 Q3d4+ 3.Kf7 Sd5+
4.Ke8 Sc7+ 5.Ke7 Sc6+ is par-
ticularly simple), but the finale is
spoilt by the dual 5.Ke7 Sd5+
6.Ke8 Se5 7.g8Q and there is no
win for Black (7.... Ra6 8.Kf8).
No 11326, G.Nekhaev. Both twins
are cooked by 7.Kd7 Kxa4 8.Kc6
a5 9.Kc5 g5 10.h5 g4 11.Kd4 and
wins.
No 11327, V.Kondratev,
Yu.Solovyov. Unsound: 2.Sa2+
Kdl 3.Sc3+ is an immediate draw. Furthermore there is 1.Sc5 mate.


No 11334, K.Osul. No solution: 5.... g1Q 6.h7+ Kf7 7.h8Q Sg5+ 8.Kh4 Se6 wins for Black, e.g. 9.g8Q+ Qxg8 10.Qxg8+ Kxg8 11.Kg4 Kf7 12.Kf5 Sc5 13.Ke5 Sb3.

No 11337, G.Amiryan, S.Tkatchenko. This has been poorly analysed. First of all there is the dual 9.Kf4, and now either 9.... Kg1 10.Kg3 c5 11.Rh4 Bf1 12.Rg4 draw (12.... h2? 13.Kf3+ even wins for White) or 9.... c5 10.Kc5 Kg3 11.Rg6+ Kh2 (11.... Kg3 12.Rh6 Kg4 13.Rg6+ Kh5 14.Rg8 draw) 12.Rh6 c4 13.Kd4 Bf1 14.Rg6 draw. Moreover, the main line is spoilt by the odd 5.... Be4 (better Bb5 at once), which is merely an invitation for White to play 6.Ke5 Bf2 7.Kf4 with a draw: 7.... c5 (7.... Kg1 8.Kg3 see above) 8.Rh5 c4 9.Kc3 Kg3 10.Kd4 Bf1 11.Rh8 h2 12.Rg8+ Ke2 13.Rh8 Kg1 14.Rg8+ Bg2 15.Rh8. Finally the analysis of the try 4.Rh7 is full of mistakes: 4.... Kxh2 5.Kd6 Bf3 6.Ke5 Kg3 7.Rg8+ Bg4 wins for Black (with the rook on the 6th rank the c-pawn could be taken now).


No 11346, B.Kaznelson. Not original, compare A.Gulyayev, Shahmaty v SSSR 1947, 3rd prize.

No 11348, N.Kralin. Perhaps the
line 9.... Kb5 10.Rc5+ Ka6
11.Rc6+ Ka7 12.Ra6+ Kb8
13.Ra8+ Kc7 14.Rc8+ Kd7 15.Rb8 stalemate should figure as the main line. After the given 9.... Rb8 white has an alternative draw by 10.Rb6 Be5 11.Rb4+


No 11350, V.Kalyagin, B.Mitrofanov. The given solution does not make much sense. 3.... Rb5+? is clearly bad, as it only helps White to bring his king closer, while 4.... Rc5+? gives away a rook for nothing. It seems to me that 3.... c1Q is the intended main line of this study.

No 11351, V.Katsnelson. No solution: after 3.... Rh2 White will lose his last pawn, and there is no promising mating attack in sight.


No 11367, M.Gogberashvili. No solution, 1.... Bb1 is a win on material.
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Bc3+ and only now 7.Ka4 and wins.

No 11376, D.Gurgenidze. It seems that computers are not good at detecting printer's errors. The solution should read 17.Kb6, and there is no unsoundness.


No 11385, A.Skripnik. Unsound. White can win by an ordinary mating attack against the cornered black king. Here is a sample line: 1.Rd7 (intending Ke2, Re7 and Se4, when the bishop is dislodged and the knight c2 enters the attack) Kg2 2.Ke2 Rg4 3.Re7 Be5 4.Re8 Ra4 (trying to generate some counterplay) 5.Sg4 Ra2 6.Rg8+ Kh2 7.Kf1 Kh3 8.Se1 Bb6 9.Rg3+ Kh4 10.Sf3+ Kh5 11.Rg5+ Kh6 12.Se5 and wins.


No 11392, V.Kalandadze. MR wonders what the pawns d3 and h3 are for. There seems no harm in removing them.

No 11410, A.Frolovsky. According to the notes there are duals galore. However, I fail to find any fault in this masterpiece. First of all, 3.Ka3 throws away the win: 3.... Sf4 4.Rg3 Se2 5.Rg5 Kc6 6.Bf3 Bxf3 (now the white king is too far away) 7.Kb3 Be4 draw. The "numerous duals from move 11 onwards" refer to move-repeating sequences like 11.Kb1 Kd7 12.Ka1 Kc6, which Spotlight's editor does not consider as flaws. The route to victory is strictly unique. Finally, note ii) should read 6.Kc4 6.Kc2? Bc6) Kb7 (the threat was Rg7) 7.Kd3 followed by Bd2 and Ke3.

No 11411, V.Nestorecsu. Is there a win after 2.... Ka5 (intending 3.Rli7 Ka4)?

No 11412, Gh.Umnov. Sent to more than one tourney, see EG 128.10954. Unfortunately, there is the dual 4.Rh3, see Spotlight in EG 129.

No 11416, H.Steniczka. According to the notes 2.Qe6 is a dual. However, I see no win for White after 2.... Qb4.

No 11417, L.Katsnelson. Unsound, there is an alternative draw by 1.Kf2 g4 2.Rb1+ Kxa7 3.Ra1+ Kb7
4.c6+ Kb8 5.Rb1+ Ke8 6.Ra1 Rb8 7.Ra5 Rb2+ 8.Kf1. Black’s main threat Rg2 is very dangerous, but first of all his king must decide on a move. 8... Kd8 is basically the direction where he wants to go, but this gives White a couple of useful tempi: 9.Rd5+ Ke7 10.Rxe5+ Kd6 (10... Kf6 11.Rf5+ and 12.Rf4) 11.Rd5+ Ke6 (11... Kxe6 12.Rxd4 followed by e5) 12.Rd7! (but not 12.Rxd4 Rg2 13.Rd7 Rxg3 14.Rxc7 Rh3 and Black wins) Rb5 (here 12... Rg2 13.Rxc7 Rg3 14.Rg7 is good for White) 13.Rxc7 Rxe5 14.Rg7 Rh1+ 15.Kf2 h5 16.c7 Rc1 17.Rh7 draw. 8... Kb8 is no improvement, as the king is simply too far away from the action. A sample line is 9.Rxe5 Rg2 10.Re6 Rg3 11.Rxh6 Rh3 (11... Rg2 12.Rg6 g3 13.h6 draw) 12.Kf2 Rh2+ 13.Kg2 Rg2+ 14.Kh3 f2 15.Rf6 g3 16.h6 and White is not worse.


No 11424, V.Kalandadze. Play and finale are anticipated by Y.Bazlov, Roycroft-JT 1978, EG 57.3791 (d6c3 0131.02 h8d8h5.d3d7 3/4+, 1.Sg3 d2 2.Se4+ Kd3 3.Sxd2 Bf6 4.Rh2 Bg5 5.Sf5 Bf6+ 6.Sc5 Ke4 7.Rh5 Bg3 8.Bg5 Bh4 9.Rg4 Ke4 10.Re4z). It follows that No 11427 by A.Hildebrand is anticipated, too.

No 11435, V.Anufriev. It seems that wRd5 should be on d4 in the original position. Otherwise the thematic try doesn’t make sense.

No 11437, J.Infantozzi. As Hv’dH points out, this study was already published in 1964 (Problemas SEPA) and reprinted in EG (19.980)!

CORRESPONDENCE editor: John Roycroft

Submissions to the editor -
John Roycroft, 17 New Way Road, ENGLAND NW9 6PL or e-mail: roycroft@dcs.qmw.ac.uk - should be marked 'for EG correspondence section'

re: EG134

from Walter Veitch, Caterham:
.....the October issue of EG, an unrelieved 50-page dirge, regarding which I can only echo Hildebrand’s regret (p.613) that the competition was ever started. It is particularly unfortunate that such a ponderous issue should be the last of the EG subscription year. It will not help with renewals.

from Jim Vickery, Leeds:

Just a note to say what a splendid achievement EG/34 was - worth the annual subscription in itself! It is reassuring to see that ‘classic’ studies are still being produced.
Grigoriev-100 1995-97

This formal international tourney was judged by Yuri Averbakh and An.G.Kuznetsov [chief editor and studies editor of Shakhmaty v Rossii]. Set theme: there were two sections:

1) pawns only
2) like-piece endings

The provisional award was published in Shakhmaty v Rossii 11-12/97 and 5-6/98 and signed by both judges (named in brief preamble).

Remarks: see also Uralsky Problemist 14 (1998) p12 No.4
While AJR was suffering visa problems (on 21vii98 he was stopped at Sheremetevo-1 passport control and denied entry to Moscow from Georgia. The solution took time, effort, a miracle, and a great deal of money - though with a possible insurance claim) prior to the July 1998 FIDE PCCC, he learned that veteran An. ('Tolya') Kuznetsov had recovered (another miracle) from a burst stomach ulcer and was in top tongue again - the former highly knowledgeable, witty and sarcastic form had returned to the uniquely experienced columnist. The news cheered us - and we cheered.

PAWNS-ONLY SECTION

award in Shakhmaty v Rossii 11-12/1997

No 11445 I.Agapov
1st prize Grigoriev-100

PAWNS-ONLY SECTION

I.Agapov (Izhevsk)

1. Kh6/i, with two main lines:
- Kh8 2.e5 Kg8/ii 3.e6 fxe6/iii
4.Kg5 Kg7 5.Kf4 Kh6 6.Ke5 Kxh5
12.Ka3, or (perhaps 'and' is more appropriate to a study)
- e5 2.Kg5 Kg7 3.Kf5 Kh6
Kg4;) Kh4 6.e5 Kg3 7.e6 fxe6
8.Ke6, followed by
9.-11.Kd5-c4-xb3, winning, thanks this time - see (iv) - to the rather fine g8-a2 diagonal.
- e5? Kg7 2.h6 Kh7, covering g6. Or 1.h6? Kh8 2.e5 Kh7.
- e6 3.Kg5 Kg7 4.h6 and 5.Kf6, winning.
- e5? Kg7 2.h6 Kh7, covering g6. Or 1.h6? Kh8 2.e5 Kh7.
- e6 3.Kg5 Kg7 4.h6 and 5.Kf6, winning.

PAWNS-ONLY SECTION

No 11445 I.Agapov
1st prize Grigoriev-100

I.Agapov (Izhevsk)

1. Kh6/i, with two main lines:
- Kh8 2.e5 Kg8/ii 3.e6 fxe6/iii
4.Kg5 Kg7 5.Kf4 Kh6 6.Ke5 Kxh5
12.Ka3, or (perhaps 'and' is more appropriate to a study)
- e5 2.Kg5 Kg7 3.Kf5 Kh6
Kg4;) Kh4 6.e5 Kg3 7.e6 fxe6
8.Ke6, followed by
9.-11.Kd5-c4-xb3, winning, thanks this time - see (iv) - to the rather fine g8-a2 diagonal.
- e5? Kg7 2.h6 Kh7, covering g6. Or 1.h6? Kh8 2.e5 Kh7.
- e6 3.Kg5 Kg7 4.h6 and 5.Kf6, winning.

PAWNS-ONLY SECTION

I.Agapov (Izhevsk)

1. Kh6/i, with two main lines:
- Kh8 2.e5 Kg8/ii 3.e6 fxe6/iii
4.Kg5 Kg7 5.Kf4 Kh6 6.Ke5 Kxh5
12.Ka3, or (perhaps 'and' is more appropriate to a study)
- e5 2.Kg5 Kg7 3.Kf5 Kh6
Kg4;) Kh4 6.e5 Kg3 7.e6 fxe6
8.Ke6, followed by
9.-11.Kd5-c4-xb3, winning, thanks this time - see (iv) - to the rather fine g8-a2 diagonal.
- e5? Kg7 2.h6 Kh7, covering g6. Or 1.h6? Kh8 2.e5 Kh7.
- e6 3.Kg5 Kg7 4.h6 and 5.Kf6, winning.
13.e8Q b1Q, level pegging.

vii) Kg5 5.h6 Kg6 6.h7 Kh7
7.Kf6 Kg8 8.Ke7 Kg7 9.e5 and
10.e6, winning.

"The natural start position is
peaceful and clear, but it divides at
once into two complex and contrast-
ing variations, each with its own
subtleties, sacrifices, pawn marches
and especially king marches, from
wing to wing, h to a and b, until it
emerges that the real nugget is the
remote P-pair on b2 and b3."

No 11446 B.Sidorov
2nd prize Grigoriev-100

No 11447 V.Kovalenko

No 11446 B.Sidorov (Apsheronsk)
1.b7/i f1S/ii 2.b8B Kg2 3.e8S
(e8Q? h1S;) Sg3+ 4.Bxg3 Kxg3
5.Sg7 h1Q 6.Sf5+ wins, but not
6.Kh6? Qxh4+ 7.Sh5 Kg4 8.c7
Qg5, with at least a draw.
i) 1.e8Q? f1S 2.Qb8 Sg3+ 3.Qxg3
stalemate. 1.e8S? f1Q - 'reversed'
promotion sequence!! - 2.e7 Qe1
3.Sg7/iii Qe7 4.Sf5 (b7,Qf8;) Qe8
5.c7 Kg2 6.b7 Qh8 7.Sh6 h1S wins
for Black.
ii) f1Q 2.b8Q Kg2 3.Qb2 Kh3/iv

4.Qe3 Kg2 5.Qg7 h1Q 6.Qb2 Kg3
7.Qe5 Kg2 8.Qe4, with exchange
on h1 and then 10.g7, winning.
iii) 3.b7? Kg2, and there is no
escape from 4...Qxh4+ 5.Kxh4 h1Q
mate.
iv) Qf2 4.Qxf2+ Kxf2 5.e8Q h1Q
6.Qf8 Kg3 7.Qa3 Kf2 8.Qb2 Kg3

"If the first study was pure classic,
this is pure romantic." "The
miracle of promotion is especially
close to chessplayers’ hearts at the
turn of the year. Here they pour out
from Father Christmas’ sack of
presents!"

No 11447 V.Kovalenko

No 11447 V.Kovalenko (Bolshoi
Kamen) "After the first two, are we
now back on terra firma? As we
shall see, not quite." The author’s
solution: I.f6/i gxf6/ii 2.g4/iii
hxg4/iv 3.h4 g3/v 4.Kxg3 Ke4 5.h5
Kf5 6.Kh4 Ke6 7.h6 Ke7 8.h7
wins.
i) 1.Kg5? Ke4. Or 1.g4? hxg4
2.hxg4 f6, drawing.
ii) g6 2.Kg5 Ke4 3.Kh6 Kf5 4.Kg7
Ke6 5.h4, with the first of several
reci-zugs.

iv) h4 3.Kf5 Ke3 4.Kxf6 Kf4 5.Kxf7 Kg3 6.g5 Kxh3 7.g6 Kg2 8.g7 h3 9.g8Q+, the check doing the crucial damage.

v) Source: "f5 4.h6 (?!sic!) g3 5.Kg3 Ke3 6.h7 wins", but alas for soundness, we read in Shakhmaty v Rossi i-vi98 p71 that at this point 3...f5 can (and should) be played, with: 4.h5 g3 5.Kf3 g2 6.Kxg2 Ke2 7.h6 f4 8.h7 f3+, and pawns promote 'at the same time', with a draw the legitimate outcome. Study eliminated - provisionally awarded third prize. No other changes to the P-section award.

"These next two are 'special' because they are evolutions of Grigoriev’s ideas, which patently live on today!"
stalemate, or
- exf6 2.Kxc2 Kd7 3.Kd3 Kd6
stalemate.
i) 4.Kc4? Ke5 5.Kd3 Kd5. Or if
Black winning.

No 11450 A.Kuryatnikov and
E.Markov
1st honourable mention
Grigoriev-100

No 11451 B.Sidorov
2nd honourable mention
Grigoriev-100

c8a5 0000.23 3/4 Win
No 11451 B.Sidorov 1.Kd8 b5 2.c5
b4 3.c6, with:
- bxa3 4.c7 a2 5.c8Q a1Q 6.Qe5
mate, or
- b3 4.c7 b2 5.c8Q b1Q/i 6.Qc5+
Qb5 7.Qc3+ Kb6 8.Qc7 mate.
i) This is not check, explaining the
avoidance of 1.Kb7?
"The two mates are pure. A very
good puzzle!"

No 11452 Yu.Lubkin
commendation Grigoriev-100

e3c8 0000.55 6/6 Win
No 11452 Yu.Lubkin (Moscow)
1.f5 Kd7 2.Kf4 Kd6 3.f6 gx6
4.gxf6 Kd7/i 5.Kg4 Kd6 6.h5 Ke6
7.h6 Kxf6 8.Kh4 g5+ 9.Kh5 g4

No 11453 Karen Sumbatyan commendation Grigoriev-100

No 11454 A. Grin special mention Grigoriev-100

No 11453 Karen Sumbatyan commendation Grigoriev-100

No 11454 A. Grin (Moscow) 1.a6+, with:
- Kb6 2.g7 h2 3.g8Q h1Q 4.Qd8 mate, or
- Kc7 2.b6+ Kxb6/ii 3.g7 h2 4.g8Q h1Q 5.Qb8+ Kxa6 6.Qb5 mate.
i) axb6 3.a7 Kb7 4.a8Q+ Kxa8 5.g7 h2 4.g8Q+ wins.

No 11455 Evgeny Markov Uralsky Problemist (14), 1998

No 11454 A. Grin (Moscow) 1.a6+, with:
- Kb6 2.g7 h2 3.g8Q h1Q 4.Qd8 mate, or
- Kc7 2.b6+ Kxb6/ii 3.g7 h2 4.g8Q h1Q 5.Qb8+ Kxa6 6.Qb5 mate.
i) axb6 3.a7 Kb7 4.a8Q+ Kxa8 5.g7 h2 4.g8Q+ wins.

No 11455 Evgeny Markov Uralsky Problemist (14), 1998

No 11454 A. Grin (Moscow) 1.a6+, with:
- Kb6 2.g7 h2 3.g8Q h1Q 4.Qd8 mate, or
- Kc7 2.b6+ Kxb6/ii 3.g7 h2 4.g8Q h1Q 5.Qb8+ Kxa6 6.Qb5 mate.
i) axb6 3.a7 Kb7 4.a8Q+ Kxa8 5.g7 h2 4.g8Q+ wins.

i) Kf8 2.f7 Kxf7 3.Ke5 wins.
This study had been entered, we read, for the Grigoriev MT, but was un honoured.

LIKE-PIECES SECTION

award in Shakhmaty v Rossii 5-6/1998 (ie May-June)
24 positions were received, covering all four possible types, allowing the judges to create sub-sections with a prize and an honourable mention in each.

No 11456 Karen Sumbatyan
ii) Kxe5 2.b6 Kxd6 3.b7. Or Kxe6 2.b6 g4 (Kd7;e6) 3.b7 g3 4.b8Q g2 5.g8Q and 6.Qg2. So Black says no to both invitations to capture.
v) 4.Kg2? Ke6 5.b6 Sf4 6.Kg3 Se2, followed by Sd4 8.b7 Sc6, and the b-pawn is held up.
vi) Sg4 7.b7 Kc7 8.e6 S- 9.Kg3 wins.
vii) There is no room on e4!

"Everything is here: an effective opening, non-trivial mid-solution play incorporating counter-forks by bS and the latter’s loss; then there’s the instructive unhurried white play, compensated, fairy-tale style, by a deflecting fork right at the end. IGM Averbakh to columnist: 'your pupil, he’s not bad, you know...'. Columnist: 'We do our best'."
No 11457 K.Tarnopolsky
honourable mention Grigoriev-100 knight vs. knight [GBR class 0004]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f8</th>
<th>f7</th>
<th>e7</th>
<th>d7</th>
<th>c7</th>
<th>b7</th>
<th>a7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>7c</td>
<td>7d</td>
<td>7e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8f</td>
<td>8g</td>
<td>8h</td>
<td>8i</td>
<td>8j</td>
<td>8k</td>
<td>8l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No 11458 D.Pletnev
prize Grigoriev-100 - bishop vs. bishop [GBR class 0040]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d8</th>
<th>d7</th>
<th>d6</th>
<th>d5</th>
<th>d4</th>
<th>d3</th>
<th>d2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>7c</td>
<td>7d</td>
<td>7e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8f</td>
<td>8g</td>
<td>8h</td>
<td>8i</td>
<td>8j</td>
<td>8k</td>
<td>8l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No 11457** K.Tarnopolsky
(Moscow) 1.g4+i Kf6/ii 2.b5 Sxf2 3.b6 Sd3 4.b7 Sc5 5.Se5 Sxb7 6.Sd7+ wins.
i) 1.b5? Sxf2 2.b6 Sd3 3.b7 Sc5 4.b8Q 5.Se7+.

ii) On f4 the king would be subjected to a promotion check from b8, while on g4 the white knight is allowed to cover the (i) line crucial d7 square with tempo - 1...Kxg4 2.Sxe5+. There is also 1...Ke4 2.Sxg5+ Kf4, hoping for 3.Sxe6+? Ke5 4.Kxe7 Sxf2 5.b5 Kd5 6.Kd7 Sg4 7.b6 Se5, when Black is safe, but 3.b5! Ke5 4.Se4, when Black is mated.

"Columnist to Averbakh: We’ve seen this mate. Wasn’t it in one of your studies?" Reply: ‘It was! But that was a long time ago, and for another thing it wasn’t quite the same...”"

**No 11458** D.Pletnev (Moscow)

ii) 2.Kf7? Be3 3.f6 g4 4.Be5 h5 5.Kg6 Bc5 draw.

iii) Bc3 6.e6 fxe6 7.f7 Bg7 8.Bd4 wins.


"Study-game."

**No 11459** A.Kazantsev
1.f5/i Bc4 2.f6/ii g3+ 3.Kxh3 Bh4 4.Kxh4 g2 5.g7 g1Q 6.g8Q Qxg8 7.f7 Qxf7 (Kxf7;Bb3) 8.Bg6 Qxg6, with a pure mirror stalemate.
i) 1.Be4+ g3+ 2.Kh1 Ke7 3.Kg1 Kf6 4.Kh1 Bd7 5.Kg1 Be8 6.f5 Ke5, after which White will either
lose his pawns or, just as bad, concede the long diagonal.

ii) To prevent 2...Ke7, see (i).

Columnist to Averbakh: "Not entirely new, but pointed and brisk.
And this year Aleksandr Petrovich ticks up to 92 on the clock!"

No 11459 A.Kazantsev
honourable mention Grigoriev-100
bishop vs. bishop [GBR class 0040]

No 11460 Nikolai Ryabinin
prize Grigoriev-100 - rook vs. rook
[GBR class 0400]

Black’s move, and after g2 11.Rg3,
and the position will be known to chess camp-followers.

i) l.h5? g2 2.Rg3 Rb3+. Or
1.Rh1? g2 2.Rg1 Kf7. But how to
choose between 1.Kc4 and 1.Kc3 -
do they both work? No! 1.Kc4? b5
2.Kc3 Rg2 (Ra2? Kb3) 3.h5 Kf7
4.h6 Kg8 5.h7 Kh8 6.Kb3 b4, and
the zugzwang sword hangs over
White’s head.

ii) The considerations we have seen
in (i) also handle 2.Kb3? and
2.Kb4?

b5 8.Kb2 b4 9.Ka2 Kg8, and
10.Rh4 Kh8 11.Rb4 Kh7 12.Rh4
Rf1 13.Rg4 Rf3, or 10.Rh5 Rf1
Kh7 14.Rh5 Rf6 15.Rh1 g2 16.Rg1
Rg6 17.Kc3 Kh6 18.Kd3 Kh5
19.Ke3 Kh4 20.Kf3 Kh3, or
10.Ka3 Kh8 11.Kb2 Rg2 12.Kb1
Kh7 13.Ka1 b3 14.Kb1 Kg8
15.Rh4 Kh8 16.Rh3 Kh7, and
Black wins every time.

iv) Now we have a position of
reciprocal zugzwang in White’s
favour which would not have been
the case after 2.Kb3?

and Kh7;

vi) 9.Kxb4? g2 10.Rg3 Rb1+,
while if 9.Kb2? b3, and the
zugzwang grips White by the short
hairs.

"Just as in one of Grigoriev’s
analyses!"
No 11461  A.Golubev
honourable mention Grigoriev-100 - rook vs. rook [GBR class 0400]

a5a8 0400.13 3/5 Win


i) 4.Rh5? c5 5.Rxc5 Rxc4 6.Rxc4

ii) There are little duals, but who cares?

iii) Rc3 10.c6 Kd8 11.c7 Rxce7 12.Rh8+, and 13.Rh7, winning.

"Precise defence and powerful attack: truly a miracle of rooks in their natural habitat."

No 11462  V.Kovalenko (Bolchoi Kamen) 1.Qb4+ Kg8 2.h7+ Kh8 3.Qd4+ (Qxb2? Qe7;) Qe8
(b1Q;Kf7+) 4.Qxb2 Qh5/i 5.Qb8+ and mates, thanks to the blocking of the h5 square.

i) Kh7 5.Qh2+ Kg8 6.Qg3+ and mate thanks to the blocking of the e8 square.

"A real windfall!"

No 11463  A.Golubev
honourable mention Grigoriev-100
queen vs. queen [GBR class 4000]

c6h3 4000.24 4/6 Win

No 11462  V.Kovalenko 1.Qg1 Qc3+i 2.Kd7 (Kd6? Qb4+;) Qd3+ 3.Ke7 Qa3+ 4.Ke8 Kh4 5.Qg3+ Kh5 6.Qh3+ Kg5 7.f4+ exf4 8.exf4+ and 9.Qxa3, with capture of bQ on the third rank. A vivid throwback to Leonid Kubbel of the 1920's!

i) Kh4 2.Qh2+ followed by a p-check from f3 or f4, depending on where bK will stand, after which bQ is captured in the second rank.
Aleksandr Kazantsev Jubilee Tourney

This international formal tourney usually abbreviated to Kazantsev-90JT was judged by A.P. Kazantsev, assisted by Oleg Pervakov. The award signed by Kazantsev, 'high priest of Caissa'. 35 entries by 26 composers from Russia, Georgia and Ukraine, 11 published.

Text of award (by judge): "Dear fellow study enthusiasts who honoured my 90th birthday by taking part in this jubilee tourney. The quality of the entries has delighted me. With Oleg Pervakov I have selected the 'best of the best'. They will receive my book as recompense. It is a matter of pride for me that we veterans are being followed by such a young band taking on ideas that I would never have given form to (such as multi-variation problems and even batteries). I think that you are all real artists labouring unselfishly and doing what you do because you must. I wish you every success, my friends. Continue to give pleasure to all lovers of true beauty!"

No 11464 I.Antipin
=1/3 prize Kazantsev-90JT

b6f4 4013.12 4/5 Win

No 11464 I.Antipin (Krasnodar)
6.Kc5 Qxe4 7.Bf6+ Kf5 (Kxf6;Qxe4) 8.Qg5 mate.

i) Not falling for either Qxh6
   2.Qd2+ wins bQ, or Kg4 2.Qd1+
   Kh3 3.Qh1+ Kg4 4.Qg2+ Kh5
   5.Qh3 mate.

ii) Qxh6 3.Qd4+ Kf4 4.Qd2+. Or
    Kf6 3.Qd8+ Kf7 4.Qf8 mate. Or
    Qxe4 3.Qg3+ Kf6 4.Qg7+ Kf5
    5.Qg5 mate. A recurrent theme of
    this study, and one of its attractions, is the epaulette mate by wQ.
    Then there is Sc2 3.Qd6+ Kxe4
    4.Qf4+ Kd5 5.Qc4 mate - though also 5.Qd2+.

iii) Qxe4 5.Bf6+ Kf5 6.Qg5 mate.

iv) Qxe4 6.Bf6+ Kd5 7.Qe5 mate
    (also 5.Qd2+).

"A whole string of epaulette mates contribute to a far from trivial struggle. The presence of both queens and of quiet moves by both sides are a pleasing surprise."
No 11465 Pavel Arestov
(Krasnogorsk, Moscow region)
i) "So there’s a menacing white battery (K+B) ready for the touch-paper - but in fact what White has to do first is take precautions against a black battery that is not even yet formed."
iv) Black is prepared for 7.e8Q? Kc7+ 8.Kc3 Rd3+ 9.Kxd3 Bxe8 - batteries! Is that it?

No 11466 A.Sadykov
i) "By sacrificing both his pieces White has prevented a new queen appearing on the board. For if now b1Q 6.c8Q+ Kb2 (Kd2;Qd8+) 7.Qh8+ with perpetual check or stalemate. Is Black downhearted?"
ii) No! If now 6.c8Q+ Kb2, and White will lose the ensuing endgame.
"A brief duel, but short, sharp and sweet."

No 11467 A.Grin (Moscow) LKf2
h4/i 2.g3/ii h3 3.g4 Sxg4, and the rest is not new: 4.Kxg2 h2 5.Kg2 Ke3 6.Kh1 Kf3 stalemate.
ii) 2.g4? Sf7 3.Kg2 Sg5, and it’s time for White to resign.
"This honour goes uniquely to a
malyutka by the 88-year-old Moscow professor."

No 11467 A. Grin

special prize Kazantsev-90JT

f1d2 0003.11 2/3 Draw

No 11468 Velimir Kalandadze

honourable mention
Kazantsev-90JT

a7d1 0200.03 3/4 Win

No 11468 Velimir Kalandadze
(Georgia) 1.Rd4+ Ke1/i 2.Re4+
Kf1 3.Rf4+ Kg1 4.Rg4+ Kf1/i
5.bRf4+ Ke1 6.Re4+ Kd1 7.Ra4
h1Q 8.Rxa2 Qh7+ 9.Ka8 Qh8+
10.Kb7 Qh7+ 11.Kc6 Qh1+ 12.Kb6
and wins.

i) Kc2 2.bRc4+. Or Ke2 2.Rb2+..

ii) "Seeing that gl is taboo to a
white rook, the black king can
change direction..." "But now the
white rooks swap roles."

No 11469 A. Manyakhin

honourable mention
Kazantsev-90JT

a8a3 0030.31 4/3 Draw

No 11469 A. Manyakhin (Lipetsk)

Advancing the g-pawn is obvious,
but: 1.g5? d3 2.g6 d2 3.c7 Bxc7
4.g7 d1Q 5.g8Q Qd7 6.Qg6 Qb5
Bd4+ 10.Ka8 Qd5+ 11.Kb8 Qd8+
12.Kb7 Qd7+, and Black wins. "If
only the f3 pawn were lifted from
the board. Eureka!" 1.f4 Bd6/i
2.g5 d3 3.g6 d2 4.c7/i Bxc7 5.g7
d1Q 6.g8Q Qf3+ 7.Ka7 Qe3+
(Qe6;Qg1) 8.Ka8 Qe4+ 9.Ka7
Qd4+ 10.Ka8 Qd7 11.Qg6/iii Qb5
14.Qb6 Qxb6 stalemate.

i) Bxf4 2.g5 d3 3.g6 d2 4.c7 Bxc7
5.g7 d1Q 6.g8Q Qf3+ 7.Ka7 Qe3+
Qd7 11.Qg3+ Bxg3 stalemate.

ii) 4.g7? d1Q 5.g8Q Qa4+ 6.Kb7
Qb5+ 7.Ka7 Bc5+, and the win is
clear.

iii) 11.Qg1? Qc8+ 12.Ka7 Qb8+
Qa7+ wins.

iv) "Alas, the bishop cannot land
on the e5 square."

"A superb study in the logical style."
So why not among the prizes? The composer had already published a win (reversing the colours) that featured in the Richkov and Stapanov memorial tourney."

No 11470 V.Neishtadt
honourable mention
Kazantsev-90JT

b1h4 1010.86 11/7 Win
No 11470 V.Neishtadt (Barnaul)
1.Qc1 d2 2.Qg1/i d1Q+ 3.Qxd1
g1Q 4.Kc1/i Qxe3+ 5.Kb1 Qg1
6.Qc1 Qd1 7.b8S Qd3+ 8.Ke1 Qd1
9.g6, after which the h6-d1 diagonal is open and White wins,
i) 2.Qd1? g1Q 3.Qxg1 d1Q+
4.Qxd1. The drawback to 2.Qxd2?
will be apparent later.
ii) 4.Qc1? Qd1 5.b8S Qd3+ 6.Ke1
Qd1 7.Qb1 Qd2 8.Qf1 Qd1+
9.Qxh1 stalemate.
"Once again the logical style, and once again a meddling white pawn must be eliminated. It's a pity the composer seems unable to tidy up his settings."

No 11471 Sergei Tkachenko
honourable mention
Kazantsev-90JT

g1g4 0013.13 3/5 Draw
No 11471 Sergei Tkachenko
(Ordesa, Ukraine) 1.Kf2/i g1Q+
2.Kxg1 Sc1 (else Kh2) 3.Be6+
Kxe3 4.Bc4/i h2+ 5.Kh1 h5
6.Ba2/i h4/iv 7.Bc4, and now the
draw is clear, Kh3 8.Bf1(Be6)+
Kf3 2.Bxa2 Kg2.
ii) The kernel position. It's Black's
move, his knight is out of range,
and his king must guard h2. h5
5.Kh1 h4 6.Kg1 h2+ 7.Kh1 Kh3
8.Bf1(Be6)+ Kg3 9.Bc4, positional
draw. This is why Black releases
wK.
(Bxh5,Sc4;) h4, with mate to
follow.
iv) Sa2 7.Bh5 Sc3 8.Bf3,
controlling both of the invasion
points d1 and e4.
"A whole series of reci-zugs,
though the play is somewhat dry."
**No 11472** P.Arestov
commendation Kazantsev-90JT

[Chessboard diagram]

a2c1 0742.11 6/5 Win

**No 11472** P.Arestov
Rb1+ 7.Ka2 Rb2+ 8.Ka3 Rxc2
9.Rd1 mate.

i) e2 2.Sd4, for Sb3. Or Bd2
2.Rh8 Be1 Rh1, winning.

5.Sxb1 c2.

iii) Rb1+ 6.Sxb1 c2 7.Rb8, there
being no longer a knight on b7.

**No 11473** Yu.Lubkin
commendation Kazantsev-90JT

[Chessboard diagram]

d6f6 3170.11 4/5 Draw

**No 11473** Yu.Lubkin (Moscow)
1.g5+ Ki7 2.Ra7+ Kg8 3.Ra8+ Be8
4.Rxe8+ Ki7 5.Re7+ Kg6 6.Rxh7
Kxh7 7.Bf8 (Ke6? Bg7;\) e3 8.Ke6
e2 9.Kf7 e1Q 10.g6+ Kh8 11.Bg7+
Bxg7, with a (known) stalemate.

**No 11474** I.Yarmonov
commendation Kazantsev-90JT

[Chessboard diagram]

d3d6 0000.68 7/9 Win

**No 11474** I.Yarmonov (Mariupol)
1.c8S+ Ke7 2.Ke2 Kxc8 3.Kxf2
Ke7 4.Kc2 Kd6 5.Kd3, with a pair
of echo-variations:

- a4 6.Kd4 a5 7.c5+ Kc6 8.Kc4
a6 9.Kd4 Kb5 10.g3/ii fxg3/ii
11.Kd5 and 12.c4 mate, or

- Ke5 6.a4 Ke6 7.Kd4 Kd6 8.c5+
Ke6 9.c4 Kd7 10.Kd5 Kc7 11.c6
Kb6 12.g4 fxg3/iii 13.Kd6 and
14.c5 mate.

i) 10.g4 is also possible, but not
10.Kd5 stalemate?

ii) Ke6 11.gxf4 Kb5 12.c6 Kxc6
13.c4 Kd6 14.c5+ Ke6 15.Kc4
wins.

iii) Kc7 13.gxf5 Kb6 14.c7 Kxc7
15.c5 Kd7 16.c6+ Ke7 17.Kc5 Ke8

'KoroIkov-90% 1997

This formal international was judged by A.Sochnov
(St.Petersburg). The provisional
award was published in Zadachy i etudy No. 16, 1998. 32 studies were published of which 8 were found defective. "A small entry for such a prestigious event but the quality of the remaining 24 was high enough, so the tourney must be called a success. The contribution of the St Petersburg composers was especially noteworthy - a fine response to the 'jubilee/memorial' tourney of their fellow citizen. It was likewise a pleasure that so many composers entered material in the romantic style for which Korolkov was so justifiably renowned."

No 11475 S.Zakharov
1st prize Korolkov-90

No 11475 S.Zakharov
(St Petersburg) 1.cSe4+/i fxe4/ii


ii) Otherwise it's perpetual check.


v) The supplied line "Kb3 11.Rb2+ Ka3 12.Rc3+ Qb3 13.bRxb3+ axb3 14.Rc1 b2 15.Rc3+" is given, but, as Ed points out, 15...Ka4 seems to win.

"A complex idea, synthesising two whirligig mechanisms around a loose knight on different sets of squares in thematic try and in solution, clockwise and anti-clockwise, all in a free and open setting. It is non-trivial to sift out the one holding thread in this labyrinthine solution. An imposing work by the talented Petersburg composer."

No 11476 V.Kondratev (Ivanovsk region) "The material may be level, but with Black threatening g1Q+; one wouldn't be in White's shoes."

1.c8Q g1Q+ 2.Qe1 Qg6+i/iii 3Ka1 Qf6+ 4.Kb1 Qf5+ 5.Ka1 Qe5+ 6.Kb1 Qe2/iv 7.Qa3+ Kxa3 8.BQ+ Sb4 9.Qf3+ Qxf3 10.Sb5+ Kb3 11.Sd4+/iii Kc3 12.Sxf3 a3

i) It looks as if a standard staircase movement will soon win.

ii) How is White to save himself now?

iii) So the queen is won back, but care is still needed.

iv) "Precise to the end!"

"Classic crystal clarity."

No 11476 V.Kondratev
2nd prize Korolkov-90

![Chess board](attachment:board.png)

b1b3 0004.22

4/4 Draw

No 11477 A.Belyavsky
3rd prize Korolkov-90

![Chess board](attachment:board.png)

d8e3 0400.11

3/3 Win

No 11477 A.Belyavsky
(St Petersburg) "Such an attractive and natural position from a game!
Can it really be a study? Let's see.

After 1.d7, the situation is simply that White must promote his own pawn or take Black's without losing his own. The play divides:


i) Kb2 6. Qb5+ Ka1 7. Qc6 a2 8. Qc1 mate. The subtlety of White's move 3 in this line is now explained, for 3. Ke7? would allow the saving 5... Rc7+.

An interesting miniature with a pair of contrasting mating variations on opposite sides of the board. The author has synthesised and developed a known idea in a simple-looking and compact form. 3. Ke8!! is a paradoxical move."

No 11478 V.Razumenko
4th prize Korolkov-90

![Chess board](attachment:board.png)

g2h6 3013.35

5/8 Win
No 11478 V. Razumenko  
(St Petersburg) "The Petersburg composer's favourite material - queens fighting it out, especially when there's a plurality in the offing - and here with something fresh. \(1.h8Q+\) Kg5 2.Qg7+ Kh4 3.Qf6+ Qg5 4.Qf2+ (f8Q? Sxd3;) g3 5.Qd4+ Qg4 6.f8Q/ii c1Q/iii 7.Qd8+/iv Qg5 8.Bxe6 a1Q/v 9.Bxg4 Qxd8 10.Bd7+ Kg5 11.Qg7+ and 12.Qxg3 mate.  
i) 1.f8Q+? Kxh7. The position cries out for immediate action.  
ii) 6.Qf6+(?) Qg5 7.f8Q c1Q 8.Qd4+ Qg4 9.Qd8+ Qg5, serves only to lengthen the solution.  
iii) Qxd4 7.Qd8+ Kg4 8.Bxe6+. Now we see a second set of queens on the board.  
iv) 7.fQf6+? Qg5 8.Bxe6 a1Q 9.Bxg4 Qxf6 and Bd7 is not available.  
"A try, quiet moves, an effective finish - and everything done on a backdrop of multiple majesties. Impressive."

No 11479 I. Bondar and V. Bartosh  
ii) Giving up the pawn to create counterplay.  
"Interesting, well executed, and subtle, with plenty of black counterplay and an unexpected position of domination."

No 11480 V. Neishtadt  
1st honourable mention Korolkov-90

```plaintext
h3h7 0323.31  6/4 Win
```

```plaintext
h1h4 4072.24  7/8 Draw
```
No 11480 V.Neishtadt (Barnaul)
ii) Both sides excel in finding quiet moves.
v) A beautiful combinative point.
An effective combinational study."

No 11481 N.Kralin and V.Neishtadt
2nd honourable mention
Korolkov-90

No 11482 L.Katsnelson
3rd honourable mention
Korolkov-90

No 11481 N.Kralin and V.Neishtadt (Moscow and Barnaul)
"You want romanticism? Here it is.
l.g3+ (Bb2? fxg2;) Kh5 (for stalemate) 2.Bb2 b3+ 3.Ka3 Ra1+ 4.Bxa1 c1B+/i 5.Bb2 Bg5/ii
ii) Anticipating the chance to play 6...Bxc5 7.Qxc5 stalemate.
iii) Thematic try: 6.Qxg4+? Kxg4 7.Rc7 Kh5 8.b6 (Bd7,Bc5;) Be3 9.Ba1 Bc1+ 10.Bb2 Be3, with positional draw based on perpetual threat to mate. Promotion to bishop by both sides, sacrifices, a thematic try and positional draw based on perpetual mating threat. Known ideas matted together into one by the author-team."

No 11482 L.Katsnelson (St Petersburg) "With Black threatening Qb2; and c2; this messy position with White’s forces so uncoordinated would make any
player uneasy. 1.a6 Qg6+ 2.Kd7
Qg7+ 3.Kc6 (Kd6? Qxg8;)
Qg6+ 4.Kd7 (Kc5? Qxg8;)
Qxg8/ii 5.a7+ Ka8
6.b7+ Kxb7 7.a8Q+ Qxa8
8.Rb1+ Ka6 9.Ra1+ Kb7
10.Rb1+ Ka7/iii 11.Kc7 (Ra1+? Kd8;)
Qb8+ 12.Rxb8 c2 13.Rb7+ Ka8
14.Rb8+, with no alternative to this (third)
positional draw.
i) Qb3+ 2.Kd7+ Qb5 3.Ke7 draw.
ii) Declining the first positional
draw.
iii) Declining the second.
"Three positional draws following
on in an unconstrained way
complement sacrifices by both
sides."

No 11483 B.Gusev and
K.Sumbatyan
4th honourable mention
Korolkov-90

![Chess Diagram](image1)
c4h6 0130.14 3/6 Draw

No 11483 B.Gusev and
K.Sumbatyan (Moscow) "Another
game-like [Russian: 'igrovaya']
position. Whither away the wK? Solving starts with the
thematic try: 1.Kd4? f5 2.Rxc2 f2
3.Rc1 Kg5 4.Rf1 Kg4 5.Ke3/ii
Kg3 6.Rxf2 Kg1 7.Kxe4 Kx2
8.Kd5 Bh2 9.e4 d6, and Black

wins. 1.Kd5! f3/iii 2.Rxc2 f2
3.Rc1 Kg5 4.Rf1 iv e3 5.Ke4
Kg4/v 6.Kxe3 Kg3/vi 7.Rxf2 Bg1
8.Kd4 Kxf2 (Bxf2+;Kd5) 9.e4
Bh2(Bd6) 10.e5, managing to block
bPd7 so as to reach a draw.
ii) 5.Rxf2? Bg1, or 5.Kxe4 Kg3
6.Kd5 Kg2.

iii) Kg5 2.Rxc2 Kf5 3.e3 draw.
Kf3 7.Rb1 Be5 8.Rd1 Bg7 9.Rb1
Bh6 10.e4 Bg7 11.Rf1 Kg2 12.Ke2
Bd4 13.Rc1 Bc3 14.Ke3 Be1
Bd4 winning.
v) 5.Bf4? Kf3, followed by Kg2;,
Rd1; and Kf1;
vii) Bg1 7.Ke4 Kg3 8.Kd5 draw.
"The move selection on the first
move is most intriguing."

No 11484 S.Berlov and
† L.Mitrofanov
commendation Korolkov-90

![Chess Diagram](image2)
c8a8 4130.13 4/6 Draw

No 11484 S.Berlov and
† L.Mitrofanov (St Petersburg)
"Again we start with a thematic try:
1.Rg5? Qh3+ 2.Rg4 Qh8 3.Rh4
Qc3+? 4.Qxc3 bxc3 5.Rh1 Ka7
   - Ba4 9.Kc3, or
   - Bg6 9.Ke3, draw.
"Nothing very complicated, but an exquisite study in which both sides sacrifice queens and a Réti nuance as icing on the cake."

No 11485 V.Katsnelson commendation Korolkov-90

b1e2 0560.21 5/5 Draw

No 11485 V.Katsnelson
(St Petersburg) "Black has many threats, so...
1.g3+/i Ke3 2.Rxb2 d2 3.Re3/ii, with:
   - Kxd4 4.Rxb4+/iii Kxc3 5.Rc4+ Kd3 6.Re1 draw, or
i) The reason for not choosing 1.g4? will emerge, we promise.
ii) 3.Rxb4? d1Q+ 4.Kb2 Qd2+ 5.Ka3 Bd5 6.Ka4 Kd3 7.Kb5 Qg5 8.Ka4 Qd8, and Black's attack proceeds apace. We can see now the drawback to 1.g4?, as Black could now play 3...Kf4 4.Rc1

Be4+. The main line is now at a junction.

No 11486 A.Kotov commendation Korolkov-90

c8a8 0400.33 5/5 Win

No 11486 A.Kotov (Prozersk)
1.c4/i Ra1 2.b6 b1Q 3.Rd1 d6 4.Rf1, with:
   - Qxf1 5.b7+, or
   - Qf5+ 5.Rxf5 Rbl 6.Rf1, or
   - Qb2 5.Rxa1 Qxa1 6.b7+, or
i) 1.b6? b1Q 2.c4 Qxb6 3.Ra3+ Qa7.
"Zugzwang in the presence of overpowering black material superiority."
No 11487 B.Sidorov  
special prize Korolkov-90  
for a 'grotesque'

No 11488 E.Kudelich  
special honourable mention Korolkov-90

f6d7 3684.36 7/13 Draw

No 11487 B.Sidorov (Apsheronsk)
ii) "Setting up a battery with a threat of mate in 1."
"The composer also pens a quatrain in memory and honour of Korolkov:
Страну чудес открыл он первым,
Уйдя от догмы и оков.
Романтике остался верным
Король этюдов - Корольков.
He held the key where magic lies
Shunning all dogma and dull eyes
Life-long romantic lore was his
King Korolkov the study whizz."

No 11488 E.Kudelich (Tyumen region)  
1.f8B/i Bc4+ 2.Kh8, with:
- Rb8 3.d8S a1Q/ii 4.Sf7+ Bxf7 stalemate with wB pinned, or
- Sf5 3.d8S f1R/iii 4.Sf7+iv Bxf7 5.Bxg7+ Sxg7 stalemate.
i) 1.d8Q? Bc4 2.Kh8 Bxf7 3.Qf8 Rb8 4.Qxb8 a1Q 5.Qa7 Qe5 6.Qc7 Qd4 7.Qd7 Qf4 8.Qc7 f1Q wins.  
Or 1.f8Q? Bc4+ 2.Kh8 Rb8 3.Qxb8 a1Q 4.d8Q f1Q 5.Qg8 Bxg8 6.Qxg8 Qa8 7.Qxa8 Qf7 wins.
ii) Rxd8 is stalemate with wB pinned.  
Or Sf5 4.Bxg7+ Sxg7 stalemate with wS pinned.  
iii) Rb8 4.Bxg7+ Sxg7 stalemate with wS pinned.  
"Four assorted promotions accompany stalemates ringing the changes with the pins."
The following article by T. Gorgiev (1910-1976) was published in *Shakhmaty v SSSR* 4/1971.

**TWO DIRECTIONS**

The evolution of the treatment by composers of the 'two knights theme' has been curious. In the early days fantastic ideas associated with winning with the two knights against assorted force provided the principal fascination. Quite a few such studies were composed - such as *G1*.

---

**G1** T. Gorgiev 1963

```
c3d8 0005.11 4/3 Win
```

```
```

Endgames with two knights pitted successfully against a pawn then began to attract attention. Thanks to Troitzky’s researches into positions where the pawn had already passed the ‘Troitzky line’ but which were still won due to some special configuration of the pieces. Troitzky himself contributed to this trend, along with numerous other composers. The trend continues to this day.

The other trend spotlighted positions where the pawn was within the Troitzky line but where paradoxical ideas might bear fruit. Hidden combinative possibilities resulting in a draw were typical. Let us illustrate.

---

**G2** T. Gorgiev, 1960

```
d5c7 0007.20 4/3 Draw
```

```
G2 T. Gorgiev White immediately sacrifices his knight: 1.Sc6 Sxc6 2.a7 - advancing beyond the 'zone' - Sxa7 3.a4 Sc6 4.a5 Sb4+ 5.Kc5 Sa6+ 6.Kb5 Kb7 - if bS moves the drawing zone comes into force, but otherwise it is stalemate.
```

In *G3* we see an effective drawing manoeuvre.
A different stalemate idea can be seen in G4, where the first move does not exactly leap to the eye.

In G5 we managed something different, namely a positional draw.

Barring a trivial oversight by the defender, two knights with their king will not checkmate a king on his own. This fact was known long ago, probably right from the beginnings of chess. But what if we add a pawn to the weaker side? Can an
increase in the defence armoury alter the outcome? Well, for the most part it can. For there arises an endgame named after Troitzky, one of the most complex of chess endings whose secrets were revealed only at the start of the 20th century. As he was the pioneer, Alexei Alexandrovich Troitzky, a classic of study composing, fully deserves the eponymous distinction.

Troitzky’s analyses showed that if one of the two (white) knights blocks the (black) pawn which is no farther advanced than a certain rank, then White wins by force. The winning idea is for king and free-to-roam knight to hem in the black king to a corner of the board, for which purpose the tied knight always plays a part. With this phase complete the hitherto tied knight moves (thereby releasing the pawn to advance) and runs to the aid of the two main attackers to give checkmate. The liberated pawn may even promote. Naturally this description of how to win is in bare outline only, for in practice the process is both lengthy and hard, at times taking over 50 moves. Where must the black pawn be held up? All depends on the pawn’s file - the set of eight files (four wing-files mirrored) determining the contour of the ‘Troitzky line’.

Blockade on the Troitzky line guarantees the win, but it has to be emphasised that passing the line does not guarantee the pawn’s side a draw. There are winning positions beyond. To take one example, if bP is blocked on f4, then for drawing purposes bK has to reach the h1 corner. If, as in S2, this is not possible, then White wins.

A natural question arises: can the Troitzky endgame give rise to new ideas, original motivations, for studies? Troitzky himself supplied the answer (S3).


i) bB has no other square - so, domination!

ii) As A.Gurvich cogently observed: "It’s comical and pitiful: White has made seven moves, and Black only one."


So, domination. But what if Black has a knight rather than a bishop? Well, consider S4.


i) Kh3 3.Kc2, first win of bS (+Troitzky).


The echo feature has always been prized in studies of the widest
range of style. Here too the Troitzky endgame has offered com-
posers significant possibilities. See S5.

1.Rh7+ Kd8 2.Rg7 dSf3+ 3.Kd1/i, with the following two
echo-variations:
- g1Q+ 4.Rxg1 Sxg1 5.f3!!/ii
  Sxd7/iii 6.Ke1 Sf6 7.Kf1 Sh3 8.f4
  and 9.Kg2, or
- Sh4 4.Rxg2 Sxg2 5.f4!! Sxd7
  6.Ke2 Sf6 7.Kf2 Sh4 8.f5 and
  9.Kg3.
In both these lines wK induces a
bS to take a pawn.
  i) 3.Ke2? g1Q 4.Rxg1 Sxg1+ and
     5...Sf3, with a 'Troitzky line' win.
     Sf2 8.Ke5 Sf6 and Black wins,
     seeing that wK's approach to the
     h8 corner meets 'access denied'.
  iii) Sd3 6.f4 Sf2+ 7.Kd2 Sg4
     Sf6+ 11.Kg6 and 12.f5 with a
draw, wK reaching h8 this time.
For another example, see S6. After
1.Qg1+ Ka8 2.Qg8+ Kb7 3.Qd5+, with a pair of independent lines:
- Qxd5 4.exd5 Sc4+ 5.Kxb5
  Sd6+ 6.Kb4 Se2+ 7.Kc5 Kc7, or
- Ke7 4.Qe5+ Qe6 5.Qe7+ Ke8
  6.Qf8+ Kb7 7.Qc7(Qf7/Qg7)+
  Qe7+ 8.Qxe7+ Kxe7 9.Kxb5 aSb3
  Kd7.
Here the blockade of wP on the
Troitzky line leads to a pair of
chameleon echo stalemates!
The S6 pure stalemate in the centre
of the board can serve as a motif
for a try (see S7). Here White's
plan is to make the aP cost Black
his rook. 1.dSf7+ Kf4/i 2.a7
Rc2+/ii 3.Kg1/iii Re1+ 4.Kf2 Ra1
f5/v 8.Sg5!! fx4 9.Sh3+ Ke5
10.Sg4+ and 11.Se3, blocking
dP on the Troitzky line.
i) There is no hope in: Bxf7
ii) If Be4 3.Bxe4 Kxe4 4.Sd6+ and
    5.Sxc8.
    Re2 5.Sg4 Ra2 6.a8Q Rxal 7.Bxa8
    Bxf7 draw. It is at this moment that
    the difference between 1.dSf7+!
    and 1.hSf7+? becomes apparent: if
    now 4...Rc2+ there is 5.Ke1! Ke3
    6.Sg4+ and 7.a8Q.
iv) In the hope of reaching a stan-
dard Troitzky endgame after
  7...Kxe4 8.Sd6+ and 9.Sf5.
v) Black is stalemated after any
move by wB! If 8.Sg4? fxe4 9.Se3,
stalemate again, despite the
'Troitzky' material.
v) There is an easy win after Kxg5
Without reservation we can agree
with the judge's opinion, namely
that 'this study would grace any
tourney'. Naturally the honour
bestowed on this study fails to
reflect its high quality and the
judge's reasoning (which can be
read in Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia
Finally, S8, a 'baby' (malyutka),
1.Sc6 f5 2.Kg8/ii f4 3.Sg4 Kd7
4.eSe5+ Ke6 5.Sf3 Kf5 6.Sf2,
winning, bK's way to h1 being
barred.
i) At first sight it is odd to lose a
tempo, disregarding the pawn's
advance to the Troitzky line. But cf. 2.Sd5?, when there follows Kd7 3.Sd4 f4 4.Sf3 Ke6 5.Sf6 Kf5 and reciprocal zugzwang. All that is left is to play 6.Kf7, when Black is stalemated. This is distinct from S6 and S7, but still stalemate in the middle of the board. In such a short article it is no easy task to exhaust all significant themes. One has only to list the positional draw, the synthesis of positional draw with stalemate, underpromotion... However, studies illustrating these themes already exist either with the Troitzky material per se, or in association with the Troitzky line. So we hope the reader will agree that the Troitzky ending is established as a feature of the study today - a feature with a big future and holding promise of creative discoveries.

S1

S2

b7c5 0002.01 3/2.

S3 A.Troitzky and M.Aizenshtadt =4/5th pr Shakhmaty v SSSR 1940

S4 G.Slepin
2nd HM Kasparyan MT 1996

f1h1 0005.02 3/4 Win
DECISIVE MOVES BY THE QUEEN

The pathos of unexpected, even self-sacrificing, moves of the queen, the chessboard’s mightiest piece, makes such a strong an impression on the chessplayer, stirring his imaginative roots, incisively bringing to the surface his sense of beauty and truth. Study composers in particular are forever directing their attention to this highly interesting theme, having delivered many a memorable manifestation.
There is no way (in M1) to bring bPh2, about to promote, up short. So White, losing no time, takes advantage of bK’s vulnerability.

1. b6+Ka8 2. g7 h1Q.
2...Sc4+ 3.Kb5 h1Q 4.g8Q+ Bb8
5.a7 Sa3+ 6.Kc6 Qh2 7.axb8Q+ Qxb8 8.b7+ Ka7 9.Qg1+ Ka6
10.Qb6 mate. If, in this, 5...Qh2
6.Qxb8+ Qxb8 7.axb8Q+ Kxb8
8.Kxc4, then the three white pawns are more than a match for bS.

3.g8Q+ Bb8 4.a7 Sc6+!
The only, and on the face of it adequate, defence, opening up wK to checks from bQ. But the combat is just reaching its climax.

5.dxc6 Qh5+! 6.Qg5!!
Quite unexpected! What lies behind this eye-opening Q-sacrifice is the need to switch the powerful bQ to a square of a different colour. The move gives Black no choice. [But when did you last refuse to take a queen placed *en prise*?]

6...Qxg5+ 7.Ka6 Bxa7.
The return sacrifice of the queen fails: 7...Qb5+ 8.Kxb5 Bxa7 9.c7! Kb7 10.bxa7, and White wins.

8.c7!, and wins.
Just a pair of pawns against queen and two minor pieces! A rare position indeed, in which Black cannot simultaneously ward off both the threats: 9.b7 mate and 9.c8Q+. Note, though, that if Black did not still possess a knight then he could indeed draw by 8...Qa5+! 9.Kxa5 Bxb6+! 10.Kxb6 stalemate.

M2 A.Manyakhin
2nd prize, Sovetskoe zaurale, 1985

How is White to save himself in M2, seeing that he is about to suffer a discovered check?

1... Ba3+ 2.Kc2! Qc4+
There is now the threat to play 5...Qc1+ or 5...Qc3+ with mate next move. Must White surrender? No!

5.Qh1+!!
Brilliant! This queen sacrifice, absolutely germane to our theme, at a blow destroys the mating net that ensnares wK. Note that 5.Qg2+ is a mistake: 5...Kxg2 6.a8Q+ Kf2, and Black’s threats overwhelm.

5...Kxh1 6.a8Q+ Kg1
7.Qh1+!!
A repeated, or echo, sacrifice of the queen, underscoring the first. Once more bK must step outside the mating arena.

7...Kxh1 8.d8Q Kg1.
Now follows the culminating queen sacrifice, the third such, disclosing the whole combination’s rationale.

In M3 we see another case of echoed queen sacrifices.

M3 A.Manyakhin
commendation Olympiev-60JT 1997

In M4 White cannot sit back and think.

1.Qb5+ Kc7 2.Qe5+ Kd7 3.Bc8+ Kd8 4.Bf5!
Although it’s Black’s turn to move, there is nothing obvious that he can do. In response to the white bishop’s spot-on move he finds a right cascade of sacrifices - just as in M2, but this time with colours reversed.

4...Qh8+ 5.Kxh8 a1Q+
6.Kg8 Qh8+.

Another queen sacrifice, this time angling for: 9.Bxd7? f1Q 10.Bf5
Qa6! 11.Kf7 Qa7+ 12.Qxa7 stalemate. Despite this line all Black’s exertions are things of the past and the end is no longer in doubt.


White has surmounted the hazards of the tempting try (the teasing capture on d7), by handing out checkmate. Black’s sacrifices were in vain.

This small selection of examples on the attention-grabbing theme of our headline can be rounded off with an as yet unpublished study submitted for the tourney commemorating 80 years since the birth of the late FIDE International Master of Composition Aleksey Grigoryevich Kopnin (1918-1991).

M5 A.Manyakhin

In M5 wK is poorly protected. Immediate promotion will fail:
1.f8Q? Qd7+! 2.Kg2 Qg4+ 3.Kh1 Bf3+ 4.Qxf3 Qxf3+ 5.Rg2 Kf1 6.Rg6 Qh5+ wins. White resorts to a sacrifice.

1.Re2+! Bxe2 2.f8Q. The mighty queen’s delayed entrance does not prevent Black from tightening the screw.

2...Qh1+ 3.Kg3 Qg1+ 4.Kh3 Qg4+ 5.Kh2 Bf3! A refurbishment has restored the mating net encircling the white leader. Is there a way out?

6.Re6+!
The only effective resource, and well calculated. Not 6.Qe7+? Kf1, nor 6.Qe8+? Be4!, when Black can trumpet his victory.

6...Kf1 7.Re1+!
The other rook offers himself. If the sacrifice is declined the draw is plain.

7...Kxe1 8.Qe7+ Kf1 9.Qe1+!! Yes! The queen makes the move that is decisive!

9...Kxe1 stalemate

One’s confidence is firm, quite firm, that the search for new ways of expressing this theme will lead to further, and no less beautiful, gems of discovery.
Aleksandr Manyakhin
Lipetsk, Russia
15xii1998

NEW IDEAS ON THE DOMINATION THEME

It is thanks to the computer that we have the fundamental proof that two bishops ‘always’ win against a knight.

Now the great French composer Henri Rinck looked into all possible distributions of force, with the
exception of these two: two bishops against rook and knight (GBR class 0161.00), and two bishops against rook and two knights (GBR class 0162.00). Here is an example of each of these two classes.

**B1**  I.Bondar commendation, Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1995

```
g1e8 0454.00 5/4 Win
```

The same general idea can be seen in refined form in **B2**, another 'aristocratic' (ie, no pawns) study, this time by D.Petrov.

**B2**  D.Petrov

1st prize, Chigorin MT, 1959

```
e3f5 0423.00 4/3 Win
```

My own efforts to create a study where the bishop pair wins against rook and two knights came to nothing when Genius-2 tested them and always discovered duals! Despite my failure I hope that this particular unploughed studies cornfield will find an inventive owner to exploit it.

I.Bondar
Belarus
1999

---

**COMPUTER SECTION**
editor: John Roycroft

*GBR class 0039 (111)*
The Stiller/Elkies partnership has released (for **EG**) the unique maximum length (92 moves, to conversion) won position and optimal play in the 6-man endgame; three knights against bishop. Seeing that in the starting position three of the four white men occupy corner squares and Black is under no constraints - an impression confirmed by the play, where Black has the initiative most of the time - this is *prima facie* strong evidence that this material is a general win. If so, then Ivan Bondar is justified in basing studies on this result. But 'theory' in the shape of the agreement of more than one independent authority is still lacking.
An as yet unresolved argument 'against' is that the bishop is not ready to give check, so that the whole family of positions (50%?) where the bishop is ready to give check remains unresolved. Perhaps also, positions where wK is initially adjacent to a corner square rather than occupying it need examination.

[An objection sometimes made to the GBR code is that it fails to allow for promoted force, such as in the instance under discussion. To meet this objection we now propose the introduction of a pair (or pairs) of brackets following the code - or, in the extended GBR code, preceding the relevant sub-list of squares. A repeated digit '1' shows the number of white pieces (of the type), and a repeated '3' the number of black. This expansion of the convention preserves the compact and powerful 4-digit representation (of orthodox chess force). AJR]

*C*

```
    a b c d e f g h
  1  b8 a7 b6 a5 b4 a3 b2 a1
  2  b7 a6 b5 a4 b3 a2 b1 a0
  3  b6 a5 b4 a3 b2 a1 b0 a9
  4  b5 a4 b3 a2 b1 b0 a9 a8
  5  b4 a3 b2 a1 b0 b9 a8 a7
  6  b3 a2 b1 a0 b9 a8 a7 a6
  7  b2 a1 b0 b9 a8 a7 a6 a5
  8  b1 b0 b9 a8 a7 a6 a5 a4

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
  1  a8 b7 c6 d5 e4 f3 g2 h1
  2  a7 b6 c5 d4 e3 f2 g1 h0
  3  a6 b5 c4 d3 e2 f1 g0 h9
  4  a5 b4 c3 d2 e1 f0 g9 h8
  5  a4 b3 c2 d1 e0 f9 g8 h7
  6  a3 b2 c1 d0 e9 f8 g7 h6
  7  a2 b1 c0 d9 e8 f7 g6 h5
  8  a1 b0 c9 d8 e7 f6 g5 h4
```

al2 0039 (111) 4/2 Win with optimal play White wins in 92 moves
In the following play unique winning moves (for example, 1.Sc5 is clearly unique) are not indicated because the computer did not supply them, any more than it marked reci-zugs. However, equi-optimals are listed. The metric is to conversion, not to checkmate, as is shown by the pair of equi-optimals on move 91.

1 Sb3-c5 Kc2-c3 2 Sh1-f2 Kc3-d4
3 Sc5-a6 Bg8-c4 4 Sa6-b4 Kd4-c3
5 Sb4-c6 Bc4-d5 6 Sc6-a7 Kc3-c4
7 Sa7-c8 Kc4-d4 8 Sh8-g6 Bd5-e4
9 Sg6-f8 Kd4-d5 10 Sc8-b6+ Kd5-c6 11 Sb6-c4 Kc6-d5 (Kc6-c5)
12 Sc4-e3+ Kd5-d4 13 Se3-g4
Be4-f5 14 Sg4-f6 Kd4-e5
15 Sf6-e8 Bf5-c2 16 Sf2-g4+
Kd4-f4 17 Sg4-f6 Ba2-c4
18 Sf6-g7 Kf4-e5 19 Sf6-h5
Ke5-d6 20 Sf8-g6 Ba4-c2
21 Sg6-f4 Bc2-b3 22 Sg7-f5+
(Sh5-g3) Kd6-e5 23 Sf5-g3 Bb3-f7
24 Sf4-d3+ Ke5-d4 25 Sh5-f4
Bf7-c4 26 Sd3-c1 Kd4-e3
27 Sh4-h5 Bc4-f7 28 Sh5-f6 Bf7-c4
29 Sg3-f5+ Ke3-f4 30 Sf5-d6
Kf4-e5 31 Sf6-e8 Bc4-e6
32 Sc1-d3+ Ke5-d4 33 Sd3-f2
Kd4-e5 34 Sd6-e4 Be6-d7
35 Se8-c7 Ke5-d4 36 Se4-f6
Kd4-e5 37 Sf6-h5 Bd7-e6
38 Sh5-g3 Be6-c4 39 Sg3-e4
Ke5-d4 40 Se4-d6 Kd4-c5
41 Sc7-e8 Bc4-b5 42 Sd6-e4+
Kc5-d4 43 Sd8-f6+ Ke5-f6 44 Sd6-f5+
(Sf4-g3) Kd4-e5
45 Se4-g3 Bc6-b5 46 Sf5-c7
Ke5-f6 47 Se7-d5+ Kf6-e5
48 Sd5-c3 Bb5-d3 49 Ka1-b2
Ke5-f4 50 Sg3-h5+ Kf4-g5
51 Sh5-g7 Kg5-f6 52 Sg7-e8+
Kf6-e7 53 Se8-c7 Bd3-e4
54 Sc7-a8 Ke7-d6 55 Sa8-b6
Kd6-c5 56 Sb6-c8 Be4-e6 (Kc5-d4)
57 Sc8-e7 Kc5-d6 (Kc5-d4)
58 Se7-g6 Be6-f7 59 Sg6-f4
(Sg6-h4) Kd6-e5 (Bf7-g8 Bf7-e4)
60 Sf2-d3+ Ke5-f6 (Ke5-f5)
61 Kh2-c1 (Sc3-e4+ Sf4-g2)
Bf7-g6 62 Sd3-f2 Kf6-g5 (Kf6-f5)
63 Sf2-h3+ (Sf4-h3+ Sf4-g2)
Kg5-f6 (Kg5-f5) 64 Ke1-d2 Bg6-e8
(Bg6-f5) 65 Sc3-e4+ (Kd2-e3)
Sh3-f2) Kf6-g7 66 Kd2-e3 (Kd2-c3
Se4-g3 Sf4-e6+ Sh3-f2) Be8-d7
(Be8-c6) 67 Sh3-g5 (Sh3-f2)
Bd7-f5 68 Se4-g3 (Se4-c5 Se4-c3
Se4-d2) Kg7-f6 69 Sg5-f3 Bf5-g6
(Bf4-h3) Kf6-e7 72 Ke5-d6
(Sf3-d4) Bg6-e4 73 Sf3-d4 Be4-g6
(Be4-h3) 74 Sf4-d5+ Kf6-g5 75 Kd6-e5 Kg5-e4 (Bg6-h7
Bxh6-c3 Bxh6-b1) 76 Sg5-e2 Kg4-g5
77 Sd5-e3 (Se2-f4 Se2-c3) Bg6-h5
78 Sd4-e6+ (Se2-g3 Se2-f4 Se2-c3)
Kg5-h4 79 Se3-f5+ Kh4-g4
80 Se2-f4 Bh5-e8

*G*

a3e2 0503.00 3/3 Win with optimal play White wins in 73 moves

The play seems of less interest than that in 0039 because it depends on the knight being per-

We are informed that this material has 1050 distinct positions of mutual zugzwang.

*G* GBR class 0503

The Stiller/Elkies axis has been at work again. The results we give were extracted by the computer in July 1992 but are published here for the first time. The maximal length of a win is 73 moves (to conversion), and the mutual zugwangs total 705. There is one other maximum length win position.

---

We are informed that this material has 1050 distinct positions of mutual zugzwang.

*G* GBR class 0503

The Stiller/Elkies axis has been at work again. The results we give were extracted by the computer in July 1992 but are published here for the first time. The maximal length of a win is 73 moves (to conversion), and the mutual zugwangs total 705. There is one other maximum length win position.

*G*
manently severed from its king, allowing White to work with threats against it and against bK gradually to improve his position. Nevertheless, clues to indicate that White is making progress rather going round in circles are elusive!

1 Rb4-c4+ Kc2-d2 2 Rb5-e5 Se7-g6 3 Re5-e6 Sg6-f8 4 Re6-b6 Rh1-h7 5 Ka3-b2 Rh7-d7 6 Rb4-h4 Rd7-h7 7 Rh4-e4 Rh7-d7 8 Kb2-a2 Rd7-f7 9 Re4-h4 Kd2-e3 (Kd2-e2) 10 Rh6-b3+ Ke3-f2 11 Rh4-h2+ Kg2-g1 12 Rh3-b2 Rf7-f6 13 Rh2-g2+ Kg1-f1 14 Rg2-c2 Kf1-g1 15 Rh2-b1+ Rh6-f1 16 Rb1-b6 Rf1-e1 (Sf8-d7) 17 Rh6-f6 Re1-f1 18 Rh6-h6 Sf8-d7 19 Rh6-h2 Rf1-e1 20 Rc2-g2+ Kg1-f1 21 Kg2-f3+ Kf1-g1 22 Rh2-g2+ Kg1-h1 23 Kg2-g5 Sd7-e5 24 Rf2-f8 Re1-e2+ 25 Ka2-a1 Se5-c4 26 Rh8-h8+ Re2-h2 27 Rh8-g8 Rh2-h4 28 Kg5-g1+ Kh1-h2 29 Kg8-g2+ Kh2-h3 30 Kg2-g3+ Kh2-h1 32 Kg2-e2 Rh4-d4 33 Kg3-c3 Rd4-e1+ 34 Ka1-a2 Sc4-d6 35 Rc3-e5 Kh1-g1 36 Ka2-b2 Kg1-f1 37 Re2-e6 Kf1-g2 (Kf1-f2) 38 Kb2-c2 Rd1-d4 39 Kg2-c3 Rd4-d1 40 Re5-e5 Kg2-f3 (Kg2-g3) 41 Re6-f6+ Kb3-g4 42 Rh6-f2 Rd1-c1+ 43 Kc3-d4 Rc1-c7 44 Kd4-d5 Sd6-f7 45 Re6-e1 Kg4-g3 46 Rf2-f6 Rc7-a7 47 Re1-g1+ Kg3-h4 48 Rh6-f2 Ra7-a5+ (Sf7-g5) 49 Kd5-c4 Sf7-g5 50 Rf2-h2+ Sg5-h3 51 Kg1-g8 Ra5-a3 52 Kg8-h8+ Kh4-g4 53 Rh2-g2+

Kg4-f5 54 Rh8-f8+ Kg5-e6 55 Kc4-b4 (Rg2-e2) Ra3-d3 56 Kg2-e2+ Kc6-d7 57 KB8-f5 Rd3-g3 58 Rf5-d5+ Kd7-c6 59 Rd5-d4 Kg3-g6 60 Re2-h2 Sh3-g1 61 Rd4-d3 (Rh2-c2) Rg6-g5 (Rg6-g4) 62 Rd3-c3+ (Rh2-h6 Rh2-c2) Kc6-d7 (Kc6-b6) 63 Rh2-h6 (Rh2-h7) Kg5-g8 (Rg5-g4) 64 Rc3-a3 Kd7-c7 65 Ra3-a7+ Kc7-b8 66 Ra7-e7 (Ra7-f7) Kb8-c8 (Sg1-f3 Rg8-f8) 67 Kb4-c5 (Kb4-a5 Kb4-b5) Sg1-f3 68 Kc5-b6 Sf3-d4 69 Re7-b7 Rg8-f8 70 Kb6-a7 Rf8-e8 71 Ka7-a8 (Rf6-f6) Kg8-d8 (Sd4-f5 Sd4-f3 Sd4-e6 Sd4-c2 Sd4-e2 Re8-f8 Re8-g8 Re8-e6 Re8-e5 Re8-e4 Re8-e3 Re8-e2 Re8-e1 Re8-d8) 72 Rh6-d6+.

*C*

From computer work actually performed in 1992 the renowned Stiller/Elkies stable offers one of the three maximum length (64 moves - to conversion) play positions in the 6-man endgame three rooks against the queen.

*C*

![Diagram](image-url)

e1c2 3900.00 (111) 4/2 Win

1 Ke1-f1 Qe4-d3+ (Qe4-f4+)
Marco Campioli writes that he "possesses the chess-playing programs: FRITZ5, FRITZ5.32, MCHESS7.0, CHESS GENIUS GOLD and REBEL10." He cannot comment on other programs. He continues: "From the standpoint of the composer and tester of studies FRITZ5 and FRITZ5.32 are superior because they deliver in a single run different lines of play. The identification of 'waste of time', in particular, appears to be infallible, as is the identification of (white) inversion of move order. "To achieve the same result with the three other programs requires analysis of moves which may not be the 'best', and some human interpretation as well."

Organised output we have seen from Marco comes via the ChessBase medium.

FIDE ALBUM 1995-97 Selection Tourney, mini-report from Section Director - Studies (AJR)
87 batches have been received:

JohAf [23] Batch No.1
AmAv [2] Batch No.2
FGen [2] Batch No.3
LKek [2] Batch No.4
GrSl [15] Batch No.5