ENDINGBURGH...
Five out of nine papers presented at a two-day conference on "Advances in Computer Chess" related to some aspect of the endgame. I therefore made sure that I would be there — "there" being Edinburgh (in one of University buildings) on 10-11.iv.78.

The 'End-Papers'
No. 1: For GBR class 0000.10 Beal and Clarke (M.R.B.) described how the data base of all possible positions had been built up, complete with the correct result and the best move(s). The data base is then used, not to play chess, which is trivial, but to test the validity of reasoning about patterns.

No. 2: Bratko described the components of a system designed to allow a chessplayer to pass on (ie, have converted into a program) his knowledge and skill for an elementary endgame. Using AL1 (a specially developed 'Advice Language One') tables comprising 'conditions', 'rules' and 'advice lists' are constructed, rather like the well know 'decision tables'. An algorithm for 0100 was created in only a few days, and for the far more difficult 0103 six weeks were spent finding 12 pieces of 'advice'. Proving there correctness is another matter...

No. 3. Niblett and Kopec described, and later demonstrated, the optimal 0103 data base. (This work was in fact first done and published by Thomas Ströhlein, Munich, in 1970, but only a single analytical line is contained in his doctoral thesis.)

I found this topic the most fascinating of the five, since it showed that the long-awaited contributions of computers to endgame theory are about to begin. Unfortunately, the motivation of the workers in the field is the pursuit of artificial intelligence, not the resolution of endgame theory. Developments will be slow. (More in the next issue.)

No. 4: Max Bramer described an "optimal algorithm" for 000.10, an ending in which the longest win takes 38 ply. Among many cogent observations was one concerning the use of master players to test algorithms. A master player can never prove that an algorithm is correct. At most he can demonstrate its incorrectness.

No. 5: Clarke (M.R.B.) showed the use of computer programs for dissecting examples of 'corresponding squares' (also called 'related' or 'coordinate' squares) in 0000.nn endings. His principal example was the Lasker and Reichhelm position.

"E G" welcomes Neil McKelvie.

ANALYTICAL NOTES to replace Walter Veitch's Spotlight EG-readers with claims of unsoundness now have an address to write to again. It is on the back page. Neil McKelvie emigrated from England to the U.S.A. in 1954. Before that he played for the Battersea Club in the London League, and for Cambridge University from 1950-53. Neil's grandfather was D. C. McKelvie, senior, a well know draughts (checkers) player. Neil's current o-t-b ELO (USCF) rating is 2343. He recalls losing a game to Heinz Fraenkel — in 14 moves!
REVIEWS

SACHOVE KONCOVKY, by Frantisek Pithart, Prague 1974. Author is a Czech o-t-b master. There are 246 diagrams on 132 pages in this nicely produced book. The contents are intended to be practical, with each of 6 chapters devoted to the appropriate piece/pawn ending. Some unusual game positions in the Q-chapter. The author borrows the "+/ =", "+/ -" style notation introduced by David Hooper to denote economically the results with respectively, W to move, Bl to move, from a position.

ZAUBER DES ENDSPIELS, by Henrich Kasparjan, Rau Verlag, Düsseldorf, 1974. The 250 Kasparyan studies were selected by the well-known West German problemist Werner Speckmann, who provides an enthusiastic introduction and who also translated from the source, apparently '269'. Bold type from the main line makes the often complex analyses as easy to follow as one can reasonably expect. Definitely recommended for anyone with a knowledge of German but no Russian. (Grandmaster Kasparyan himself did not know the book was being prepared.)

AN ILLUSTRATED DICTIONARY OF CHESS, by Edward R. Brace, Hamlyn (London, etc., '77. Whatever this 2,000 items work's value to players and to the AutolyCUS in all of us, there is no value here to studies enthusiasts. The author's preface states "Definitions are given for all terms used in ... endgame studies". This is so untrue as to make one wonder how William Hartston and Svetozar Gligoric allowed their names to be associated with the 'dictionary'. Even the 'illustrations' are barely more than ordinary diagrams.


Before reading E. Umnov's article I was unaware that Troitzky published 90 studies prior to Rinck publishing his first. The 18-page article devoted to Troitzky and his importance for the study in the 20th Century draws on TTC liberaIly for non-Russian sources, but takes me to task for not explicitly acknowledging Troitzky's place. On a technicality, p.340 of TTC does acknowledge it, though elsewhere (p.81) I prescribe caution in attributing personal influences and specific trends — one is far safer with events! ... The remainder of the Soviet book's studies are the cream of USSR Individual and Team Championships; selected WCCT, Petrov Memorial, "Soyuz-Apollo" (ie, Tbilisi 1975 'blitz' to urney) and Socialist Countries Team Tourney studies (the complete result of the latter still does not seem to have been published). Except insofar as other 'foreign' tournaments may be named as sources for Individual Championship diagrams, they get no mention. the unstated assumption is that the book is primarily concerned with USSR performance.

"MODERN CHESS THEORY" is the title of a new monthly magazine. It is devoted exclusively to (guess what) openings.

AJR
"C* The endgame Rook against Knight

Computer contributions to our knowledge of the endgame are here to stay. We believe that they are both interesting and important. We intend to use "C* to identify articles based on computer material, and in particular to identify a position generated by a computer program.

Thomas Strohlein was a post-graduate mathematics student at the Technische Hochschule in Munich when he obtained his doctorate with a 64-page thesis on combinatorial games. This was in 1970. His thesis was published, but unnoticed by chessplayers in general. The thesis sports no diagrams, and the only chess moves in it relate to our diagramposition, which has historic importance. So have his computed findings.

Strohlein develops an algorithm for generating all optimal play with three or four chessmen, applies it via a computer, and gives the major results. We summarise them in a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPR Class</th>
<th>Maximum length</th>
<th>No. of positions</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Moves published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>wKa1 wQb2 bKe6</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>wKa1 wRb2 bKc3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wKa1 wRh8 bKd5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0130</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>wKa4 wRe3 bKa7 bBa6</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0103</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>see diagram</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>wKa2 wQa3 bKe4 bRh2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reproduces, in its central three columns, material in Strohlein's thesis. "Maximum length" means that there are no positions with longer solutions. "No. of positions" gives the total of distinct positions showing the maximum length of solution. W is to play in all cases. In the 1000 and 0100 cases length includes the mating move. In the other cases it terminates with win of the B1 piece (or mate, but without stalemate). "Moves published" relates to the contents of the thesis.
No. 3286: C. M. Bent. 1. Ke2 Sxd1
2. Sf1† Kg2 3. Sxh2 Sc2 (Sf2; Se5)
4. Sb6 Bc6 (Be6; Sf1) 5. Sg4 Bf3†
   i) 7. ... Sxe4 stalemate. Or 7...
   Sd3t 8. Kd2 Bf5 9. Se3t:

No. 3287: J. Vandiest
Original

This study encloses in one and the same position several previous ideas which were published in La Nation Belge (1951), Schakend Nederland (1959). (JRH traced!) No. 390 in EG 10. All notes are by JV.

1. Sf5/i,
A) 1. ... Qb4/ii 2. Kg6/iii Qb6t/
   viii 5. Qe6+/ix Kg7 6. Qd7t Kg8/x
   7. Sf5/xi Qg1/xii 8. Sf7t/xiii Kf1
   (g)7/xiv 9. Sg6t Kf6 10. Qe7t Kf5
   11. Qe5 mate;

B) 1. ... Qc1t 2. Kh5/xv Qa3/xvi
   3. Qb8t/xvii Kf7 4. Sd6† Ke6/xviii
   5. Qe8† Kd7/xix 6. Qe8† Kg7 7
   Sb5† wins.
   i) 1. Kg6? Qg4† 2. Kh6 (2. Kh7
   Qb4† 3. Sh5 Qe7†) Qh4† 3. Sh5 h2,
   or 1. Kh6? Qh4†, or 1. Kf6† Qf7†.
   Kg5 Qxg7†, or 1. Qf6†? Kg8, or
   finally 1. Sf6†? Kf7 2. Qg7† (Or 2.
   Qf6† Kc8 3. Kg8. Qg8 4. Qd6† Kg7
   5. Qg3† Kf8 6. Qg7 mate.
   ii) Threatening 2. Qb8 mate. Not
   2. Sd6† Qd2† 3. Kh5 (Best) Qd1†
   4. Kh6 Qc1† 5. Kh7 Qb1† 6. Sf5
   Qb7† = (B).
   iv) Or 2. ... Qg4† 3. Kh7
   Qb5† 4. Sh6 Qxe5, or 3. Kh5? Qb4
   4. Kg6. 4. Sd6 Qh4† 5. Kg6 Qg4†,
   etc.) Qb4 (3. ... Kg8) 4. Sh6† 4.
   Qg7 (4. Qe6†. Qb2† 5. Kg6 Qg2†;
   B) Qb2† 5. Kg6 Qg2† 6. Kh6 (6.
   Kh7? Qe4 7. Kg6 Qe8† 8. Kg5 h2)
   Qd2† (Or 6. ... Qe2† 7. Qd7t Qe8
   - 7. ... Kh7 8. Sd6† Ke6 9. Qe8†
   - 8. Qd6† Kg8 9. Qg3† Kf8 10. Qg7
   mate; not 6. ... Qe4† 7. Qg7† Ke8
   8. Sd6†) 7. Kh7 Qg5 (7. ... Qe2 8.
   Qd8†, etc., or 7. ... Qb4 8. Kg6 Qg4†
   9. Kg6 wins) 8. Qc5† Kf7 9. Sh6†
   Kf6 10. Qd6 mate.
   v) Not 3. Kh7? Qb7† (B), nor 3.
   Sd6† Qb1† 4. Kh6 Qc1† 5. Kh7
   Qb1† 6. Sf5 (6. Kh8? Qg6 =) Qb7†,
   vi) 3. ... Qd8† 4. Qg8†, or 3. ...
   Qb(a)7t 4. Qh8† Kf7 5. Qg7†, or
   3. ... Qc1t 4. Qg7t Kg8 3. Qg8 mate.
   vii) Threatening 5. Qf6† Kg8 6.
   Qg6†, followed by mate.
   viii) 4. ... Qb1† 5. Kh6 mates, or 4.
   Kg8? 5. Qe8† Kg7 6. Qg8†.
   ix) After 5. Qf6†? Kg8, the square
   g6 is under Bl’s control.
   x) 6. ... Kf7† 7. Se8† Ke5 8. Qd6†
   Kf5 (e4) 9. Qg6†, or 6. ... Kh8 7.
   Sf7† Kg7 8. Sd6† Kf8 9. Qe6†
   Kg7 10. Qf7† Kh8 11. Qg8 mate.
xi) Not 7. Qf7+ Kh8 8. Qf6+ Kg8 9. Sf5 Qd1+ 10. Kh6 Qd2#.

xii) 7. ... Qb2 (a1) 8. Sh6+ Kh8 9. Qe8# Kg7 10. Qf7# Kh8 11. Qg8 mate.

xiii) 7. ... Qb2 (al) 8. Sh6+ Kh8 9. Qe8# Kg7 10. Qf7# Kh8 11. Qg8# Kh7 12. Qh8 mate.

xiv) Or 8. ... Kf(q)7 9. Sg8# Kg8 10. Qe8# Kg7 11. Qf7# Kh8 12. Qg8# Kh8.


xvi) Or 2. ... Qd1# 3. Kg6 Qg4# Kf6#, etc. (A). Not 2. ... Qg1? 3. Qg6# Kg8 4. Sd8# Kh7 5. Qh6 mate. And if 2. ... Qd1# then 3. Kg6 Qg1# 4. Kh6 Qc1# 5. Kh7.


xviii) 4. ... Ke7 5. Qe8# Kh8 6. Qf7# Kh7 7. Sc4#, or 4. ... Kf6 5. Qf7# Ke6 6. Qf7#, or still 4. ... Kg7 5. Qc7# Kh8 6. Qd8# Kh7 7. Qe7# Kg8 8. Qg5# Kf7 (Cr 8. Qf7# Kg8 9. Qf7# Kh8 10. Qg6# mates.

xix) Or 5. ... Kf6 6. Qf7# Kc5 7. Sc4#.

There are quite a lot of quiet moves.
No. 3289: J. Vandiest.

Win 3+3

No. 3289: J. Vandiest.

The Discovered Checks

i) 1. ... a1Q? 2. d8Qf Kh3 (2. ... Kg3? 3. Qe3t Kh4 4. Bf5t, etc.) 3. Qd7t! Kg4 (3. ... Kh3 4. Qe7t Kh4 5. Bf5t, etc.) 4. Qe6t Kh3 (4. ... Kg4 5. Qg6t, or 4. ... Kh4 5. Qf7t Kh4 6. Qg7t, etc.) 5. Qf8t mate, or still 4. ... Kh8t 5. Qd7t! Kg3 6. Qe8t, etc.) 5. Qe6t! Kg3 (5. ... Kh4 6. Qe7t Kh3 7. Bf5t Kg2 8. Qe2t Kg3 9. Qf3t Kg2 10. Bb3t Kh1 11. Qf3t Kg1 12. Qg2 mate) 6. Qg6t Kh4 (6. ... Kh3t 7. Bf5t Kh4 8. Qg5 mate, or 6. ... Kh4t 7. Qf7t Kh3 8. Bf5 mate, or 6. ... Kh4t 7. Qf7t Kh3 8. Bf5t, etc.) 7. Qf7t Kh3 (7. ... Kg3 8. Qf3t Kh4 9. Qf4t, etc.) 8. Qf3t Kh2 9. Qf2t Ke1 (Kc3 10. Qf6t, or 9. ... Kd1 10. Qf1t) 10. Qc2 mate.

ii) Not immediately 2. Bxh7t a1Q 3. d8Qt Kh3 4. Qd3 Kh2 =.

iii) 2. ... Kg3t 3. Bxh1 a1Q 4. Qg5t Kh3 5. Qg7t Kh4 6. Qf2t, etc., or 2. ... Kh3 5. Qd7t Kh2 (3. ... Kh4 4. Bxh1 a1Q 5. Qe4t Kc3 6. Qf3t, etc., or 3. ... Kg4t 4. Bxh1 a1Q 5. Qf3t Kh4 6. Qf2t) 4. Qe2t Kg3t (1. ... Kh3? 5. Qh5t and 6. Qxh1) 5. Bxh1 a1Q 6. Qf3t.

iv) Or 4. ... Kh3 5. Qg2t Kh4 6. Qg7t.

v) 5. ... Kg1? 6. Qg2 mate, or 5. ... Kf1? 6. Qg2t Kc1 7. Qg1t.

vi) 6. ... Kf4t? 7. Qg5 mate.

vii) Not 7. ... Kh3? 8. Bg2t Kg4 9. Qf5t Kh4 10. Qf4t, or 8. ... Kh4t 9. Bf1t Kh1 10. Qg2 mate.

viii) Offering more possibilities than 8. ... Kf4 9. Bb7t.

ix) The only move, as it will turn out.


xi) Or directly 10. ... Kc7t 11. Qc5t, etc. Not 10. ... Kf5? 11. Qg5t Kf4 12. Qg3 mate, or 10. ... Ke6? 11. Qg6t Kf7 12. Qf5t Kh6 13. Qc7t Kf8 14. Qg5t, etc.) 12. Qd6t Kf7 (12. ... Kf5? 13. Qg6t) 13. Bb5t Ke6 14. Bc5t Kf7 15. Qd7t Kf8 (Or 15. ... Kf6 16. Qg7t) 16. Qe8 mate.


xv) 13. ... Ke8? 14. Qd6t Kf5 15. Qd7t, etc. Not 16. Qg3t Kf4 17. Qg5 mate.


No. 3290: J. Vandiest.

Win 4+4
No. 3290: J. Vandelst.


A) 8. ... Kg7 9. Qe5t Kg8 10. Qd5t Kg7 11. Qd4t Kg8 12. Qe4t Kg7 13. Qd4t Kg8 14. Qb7t Kh7 15. Qxh4t Kg7 16. Qe4t Kh7 17. Bg6t Kg8 18. Qd5t Kg7 19. Qf7t Kh8 20. Bd3 Qg7/ii 21. Qf5 Qb7t/vii 22. Kg3 Qb8t/viii 23. Kh3 Kg7/i 24. Qf6t Kf8 25. Qb7t Kg7 26. Bg6.

B) 8. ... Qc3t/xiv 9. Kg4 Qd4t/xv 10. Kh5 Qf2/xvi 11. Qe8t Kg7 12. Qe7t Kg8 13. Be4 Qe2t/xvii 14. Kg6 Qg4f 15. Kh6 Qf4f 16. Kf5 Qf7/f 17. Qg7f Kg6 18. Kg5 Qg7f 19. Qg6f Kf7 20. Qf6f Kg6 21. Qxg4f Kg7 22. Qd4f Kg8 23. Qf8f Kg7 24. Qg7f Kg6 25. Qh8f Kg5 26. Bd3t Kh- 27. Qh7f Kg5 28. Qh4f Kg4 29. Bh7f Kh6 30. Bd3f Kh8 31. Bf7f Kg6 32. Bg8f Kh7 33. Qh6f Qh8 34. Qf6t mates.

i) A 'problematic' move.

ii) 1. ... Kf7 2. Bxg4f, or 1. ... Kf8 2. Qg5f, or 1. ... Kd8 2. Qb6f, shorter.

iii) 3. ... Kg5, 3. ... Kg7 or 3. ... Kd5, in each case followed by 4. Qxc4t, is longer, but allows for a few minor duals.


vii) 21. ... Qf5t 22. Qh7 mate, or 21. ... Qg7t 22. Qh7t Kg5 23. Qg6f, or 21. ... Qg7t 22. Qf6t Kh5 23. Kg4 Qg5 24. Bc4t Kh4 25. Qh8t.

viii) 22. ... Qh7t 23. Kh3 Qg7 (23. ... Kg8 24. Qh7t Kg5 25. Qh4 mate) 24. Qf7t Qg5 25. Qf8t Qg7 (25. ... Kh5 26. Qf7t Kh6 27. Qh7 mate) 26. Qf5 Qg8 (26. ... Qg5 27. Qh7 mate, or 26. ... Qg7 27. Qh7t Kg5 28. Qh4 mate) 26. Qf6t Kh5 27. Be2t mates, or 22. ... Qg7t 23. Kh3, etc.

ix) 23. ... Qg8t 24. Qf6t Kh5 25. Be2t, or 23. ... Q-6t 24. Qh7t Kg5 25. Qh4 mate.

x) 27. ... Kg6 28. Bd3t Kh- 29. Qh7t Kg5 30. Qh4 mate, or 27. ... Kh5t 28. Qh4t Kg7 29. Qg3t Kh7 30. Bd3f Kh8 31. Qh6f Kg8 32. Bc4 mate.

xi) 28. ... Qg8t 29. Be6 Qc6 (29 ... Qh8 30. Qg5t Kh7 31. Bf5t mate) 30. Qf8t Kh7 31. Bf5t.

xii) 30. ... Kh7t 31. Ba2t.

xiii) 30. ... Kf7t 31. Ba2t.

xiv) 8. ... Qg7t 9. Qe8f, or 8. ... Qg8t 9. Qe6t.

xv) 9. ... Kg7 10. Qf7t and 11. Qh7t mate.

xvi) 10. ... Qg5t 11. Kh6 Qe7 12. Qg6t, or 10. ... Qg7 11. Qe8t Kg7 12. Qe5t Kg8 12. (12. ... Kf7 13. Qh7f Kh8 14. Qf7t) 13. Kh6 Qd7 14. Qb8f, or 10. ... Qf4t 11. Qe8t Kg7 12. Qe7t Kg8 13. Kh6 Qg7 14. Qb8f, or 10. ... Qg4t 11. Qe8t Kg7 12. Qe7t Kg8 13. Kh6 Qh7 14. Qb8t.

xvii) 14. ... Kg8 15. Bd5t Kh8 16. Qe8t Kg7 17. Qb8t F6f 18. Qg5 mate.

xviii) But not 15. Kg5 Qe3t 16. Kh5 Qe2t.

"The idea of variation A won a first prize in Ceskoslovensky Sach (1960) and, later on, in an improved setting, again a first prize in Schakend Nederland (1961).

In both versions, however, wPh2 remained a mere dud, its main function being to prevent a stalemate. I had to set up this third version to feel finally 'satisfied' about its presence on the board: in variation A it is now indispensable after 20. ... Qa8t 21. Bf4 Qa6 22. Qh7t Kg5 23. h4f (no win without this possibility!), whereas, in variation B, it even decides the game after the queens get off the board. So perhaps these two first prizes were not entirely justified" (JV)
No. 3291: L. Mitrofanov and V. Razumenko.
1st Prize,
IX All-Russian Tourney, 1976

Draw
4+4


Judge: V. A. Bron.

No. 3292: Y. Dorogov and D. Pikhurov.
2nd Prize,
IX All-Russian Tourney, 1976

Win
6+5


No. 3293: V. Kozyrev
3rd Prize,
IX All-Russian Tourney, 1976

Draw
4+5


i) 8. ... f1Q 9. e8Q Qb5t 10. Kxd6 Qxe8 stalemate.

No. 3294: F. Aitov
Special Prize,
IX All-Russian Tourney, 1976

Win
3+2

No. 3294: F. Aitov. 1. Sc3 Kxc3 2. h7 f2 3. h8Qt Kd3/i 4. Qb2 f1Q 5. Qb5.


JRH: Nearest seems Rinck (1932) No. 987 in '1414'. H. M. (1,2,3,4): A. Sadykov; E. Pogosjants; B. Clympiev; E. Asaba. Comm: (1,2,3,4): V. Kondratyev; P. Gaidukov; E. Asaba; V. Kondratyev. But no positions were printed in '64.
No. 3295: E. Dobrescu (xi.76)
1st Prize,
Magyar Sakkelet, 1976

Win
5+4


No. 3296: B. Perenyi (v.76)
2nd Prize,
Magyar Sakkelet, 1976

Win
4+4


i) 1. Bxb7 h4 2. Bc8† Ke4 3. f5 hg 4. fg g2 5. Bb7† Kb8.


i) 1. ... g2 2. Sxb3 Kb1 3. Kxg2 a1Q 4. Sxa1 Kxa1 5. Kg3.

No. 3298: E. Pogosjants (v.76)
4th Prize
Magyar Sakkelet, 1976

Win
4+5


ii) 5. c3? Se3†.
5. Qe1† Rb4† 6. Qxb4 Se3† 7. Ke3 Sd5†.

No. 3299  Cs. Meleghegyi
2 H.M.,
Magyar Sakkelet, 1976

No. 3300  G. A. Umnov (xI.76)
2 H.M.,
Magyar Sakkelet, 1976

No. 3301  V. A. Bron (vI.76)
3 H.M.,
Magyar Sakkelet, 1976

No. 3299: Cs. Meleghegyi. 1. Rf7 (a5? Ra3:) 1... f3/i 2. a5 Rg6f/i
3. Ke7 Rg7f/i 4. e6 f2 5. Ke8 Rg8f
i) 1... Rg6† 2. Rf6 Rxf6t 3. ef Kf8 4. a5 wins.
ii) 2... f2 3. Rxf2 Ra3 4. Kf6 Rxax5f 5. e6 wins.
iii) 3... Rg5 4. e6 Rxax5f 5. Rxf3 Ra7† 6. Kf6.
JRH: The final phase was shown by Grigoriev (1937), No. 107/8 on p. 263 of Awerbach Lehrbuch der Endspiele, III.

i) 6... Sa3 7. Kxb2 b4 8. Rd5.
JRH: This way of confining bS was shown by Kasparyan (1946), No. 1937 in Cheron III.


JRH: There is one prior study showing wP pinning bP and simultaneously offering to that P: Genttner (1935), No. 177 in '1357'.

   i) 7. b7? Ke7 8. Bd5 Kb6 draw.

JRH: The last phase is known, eg Korn (1957), No. 85 in 'American Chess Art'.

   i) 4. ... Kxh7 5. Sf6† Kg7 6. Ke7.

JRH: Cf, Pogosjants (1966), No. 1956 in EG 34.

i) 1. Sxc5†? Kb4 2. Rxc6 h2.

ii) 2. ... Kc3 3. Se2† Kb2 4. Rxc6.

No. 3308: J. Lazar. 1. f7† Kf8 2. Bf6 Qf2/i 3. Bd8 Qg3 4. Bf6 Qf2 5. Ed8 Kg7 6. Bf6† Qxf6 7. f8Q† and either 7. ... Kxf8 8. Sh7†, or 7. ... Qxf8 8. Se8†.

i) 2. ... Qc6† and 3. ... Qxf6 met by 4. Sh7†.

JRH: Cf. Belokon (1972), No. 2226 in EG 38; Zaburin (1973), No. 2275 in EG 39; van den Ende ('65), No. 84 in EG 3.


i) 1. ... b1S 2. h8S† Ke7 3. Sg6† Kd7 4. Se5† wins, but not 2. h8Q? Exc3† wins.

ii) 2. ... Bxc3† 3. Qxc3 e5 4. Qe4† Ke7 5. Ra6.
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No. 3310: D. Gurgenidze and V. Neidze (vi.76) 1st Prize, Szachy, 1976 Award: ix.77

No. 3311: D. Makhatadze (ii.76) 2nd Prize, Szachy, 1976

No. 3312: E. Dobrescu (x.76) 3rd Prize, Szachy, 1976

No. 3313: J. Fritz (v.76) 1 H.M., Szachy, 1976

JRH: The same mate concludes Kasparyan (1933), No. 725 in '2500'.

i) 1. ... Sb2 2. Rxb2† Kc1 3. Rxa2† Kd1 4. Ra1† Ke2 5. Ecl Bb7† 6. Kd4 Rg7 7. d3 Rxe7 8. Bf4.

No. 3316: H. Aloni. 1. Rb3 Sf5/i 2. e6 e2 3. e7 e1Q 4. e8Q Qxe8 (Qh4†; Kg6) 5. Rb1† Ka2 6. Rb2† Ka3 7. Rb3† Ka4 8. Rb4†.
i) 1. ... Sf1 2. Ra3† Kb2 3. Rxa5 e2 4. Rb5† Kc2 5. Rc5† Kd2 6. Rd5† Ke3 7. e6 Kf4 8. Re5 wins.

i) 5. ... baQ 6. Rb1† Qxb1 stalemate.
No. 3318: A. Lewandowski. 1. Sd5 Sf3+ 2. gf Rg7† 3. Rg6 Rxg6† 4. Kh1 B+ 5. Sf4† Bxf4 stalemate.

No. 3319: Y. Dorogov. Judge was Axel Ericsson, who celebrated his 75th birthday on 9.viii.76. His studies number about 50, dating from 1953.
1. g7 ed 2. g8Qf Bg5† 3. Qxe8 dc 4. Qe3† Bxe3 5. Kg7 Kh2 6. Rh7† Kg3 7. Rg7† Kh4 8. Rh7† Kg5 9. Rg7† Kh6 10. Rh7† Kg6 11. Rg7† Kf6 12. Bf7† Ke5 13. Rf5† Ke4 14. Bd3† Kxd3 15. Rd5† Bd4 16. Rxd4† Kxd4 17. Kd2.
JRH: For final phase see Schwers (1922), p. 25 of Rueb (B) IV.
No. 3320: J. Koppelomäki. 1. Sc3 Qxc3 2. e8B (e8Q? Qf3f) 2. ... Kxd8 3. f8B/1 Kxe8 4. g8B/ii Kd7 5. Bd5 Qxe5 6. Bf3 Ke7 7. Be3 Qxc5 8. f7 wins.
   i) 3. f8Q? Qc8f 4. Ka7 Qb7f.
   ii) 4. g8Q? Qc8f 5. Ka7 Qc7f 6. Kxa6 Qc6f 7. Kxa5 Qd5f.
JRH: The study is not anticipated, but Lommer has 4 wB promotions (No. 1048 in '1357').


No. 3324: J. Rusinek. 1. e7 Kd7 2. e6† Ke8 3. Bxb8 Sxe7† 4. Kg7 Sg6 5. Kg8 Be4 6. Sc3 Se7† 7. Kg7 Sf5† 8. Sxf5 g2 9. Kg8 g1Q 10. Sg7† Kd8 11. e7† Kxe7 stalemate.
No. 3324  J. Rusinek (vi-viii.76)

H.M.,

Tidskrift for Schack, 1976

No. 3325  F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov (xii.76)

H.M.

No. 3326: V. A. Bron (xii.76)

H.M.,

Tidskrift for Schack, 1976

No. 3327  D. Gurgenidze and V. Neidze (xii.76)

H.M.

Tidskrift for Schack, 1976

No. 3328  D. Petrov and V. Tyupin (viii.76)

Commend.  

Tidskrift for Schack, 1976

No. 3324: J. Rusinek


No. 3325: F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov.

A Novotny exercise - see W’s moves 2 and 4. 1. b8S† Ka5 2. d5 Rxd5 3. Ce6† Kh5 4. Se3 Rxe5 5. Sxd6† K - 6. Sf5 wins.

No. 3326: V. A. Bron


No. 3327: D. Gurgenidze and V. Neidze.


No. 3328: D. Petrov and V. Tyupin.

Commend.  

JRH: Nearest is Korolkov (1957), No. 182 in Kasparyan’s ‘Positional Draw’. 

JRH: Dall Ava (1960), No. 1470 in ‘2545’ and Kasparyan (1959), No. 1468 in the same.
No. 3328: D. Petrov and V. Tyupin.

JRH: A similar manoeuvre is shown in Birnov (1939), No. 620 in '2500', and Zakhodyakin (1931), No. 819 in the same.

No. 3329: Al. P. Kuznetsov and An. G. Kuznetsov

Commended,
Tidskrift för Schack, 1976

No. 3329: Al. P. Kuznetsov and An. G. Kuznetsov
i) 1. ... Ka3 2. Bh6, explaining why 1. Be7? is wrong.

No. 3330: C. Jonsson

Commended,
Tidskrift för Schack, 1976

No. 3330: C. Jonsson
1. Rc8† Bxc8 2. Ra3† Bb7 3. Bd4† Kb8 4. Be5† Kc8 5. Re3† Kd8 6. Bf6† Ke8 7. Re3† Se4 8. Bxe4 Re7† 9. Be6† Kf8 10. Re8 mate. The battery reversal theme of the First WCCT.

No. 3331: E. Dobrescu (xii.76)

Commended,
Tidskrift för Schack, 1976

No. 3331: E. Dobrescu

"A complicated study with many side-variations", but none are given in the source.

No. 3332: E. Vladimirov

Original

Win

No. 3332: E. Vladimirov
No. 3333: Viktor Kichigin. 1. Qa8† Qg8† 2. Sf7† Kh7 3. Qh1† Kg6 4. Qb5† Kxf6 5. Qh4† Ke6 6. Qe7† Kxe7 stalemate. 

i) 5. ... Kxf7 6. Qc4† Kg7 7. Qxg8† Kxg8 stalemate. 

No. 3334: V. A. Bron. 1. Bb1 Kb4† 2. Ka2 Bxg7 (e1Q;g8Q) 3. hBQ/i Bxh8 4. Bxg5 eIQ 5. Bd2† QxQ stalemate. 

i) 3. Bxg5? e1Q 4. hBQe6 mate. 

JRH: no anticipation found.

No. 3335: T. Amiryan. This and the next study were kindly sent to me as corrections. 1. e4 h5 2. e5 h4 3. e6 h3 4. e7 h2 5. Rh6 Rxh6 6. e8Q h1Q 7. Kxc7† Kxa7 8. Qa4† Ra8 9. Qd4† Ka8 10. Qd8† Ka7 11. Qb8 mate. 

JRH: no anticipation found.


ii) 5. ... Rxh4 6. Sf1† Kf2 7. a8Q Kxf1 8. Qf3† K- 9. Qxa3. 

JRH: no anticipation found.
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No. 3337: A. Lewandowski

Gazeta Cz-enstochowska, 1976

3 H.M.

No. 3337: A. Lewandowski. 1. b7 b1Q 2. bcQ Qb4† 3. Kg8 Se7† 4. Kg7 Sxc6 5. Sf3† Kg4/1 6. Se5† Kg3 7. Kg8 Kh3 8. Rh6† Kg2 9. Rd8† Kfl 10. Rf6† Ke2 11. Rf2† Ke3 12. Rf3† Kd2 (Ke4; Rf4†) 13. Rf2† Ke3 14. Rf3† Ke2 15. Rf2† Kb1 (Kb3; Rb2†) 16. Rf1† Sc1 17. Rxe1† Ka2 18. Rf2† Kb1 19. Re1† Ka2 20. Re2† draws/ii.

i) 5. ... Kh5 6. Rh6† and 7. Rh4†.

ii) 20. ... Ka3 21. Sc4† Ka4 22. Ra2† Kbl (Kb3; Rb2†) 16. Rf1† Sc1 17. Rxe1† Ka2 18. Re2† Kb1 19. Re1† Ka2 20. Re2† draws/ii.

No. 3338: N. Kralin

Gazeta Cz-enstochowska, 1976

No. 3339: N. Kralin. 1. e8S/i Qxe8f 2. Kxe8 Rxb3 3. g7 Rxa3 4. g8Q Ra8† 5. Kf7 Rf8† 6. Ke6 Rxg8 7. g6 Kg6 8. Bh7† wins.

i) 1. e8Q? Qf3†. 1. h8Q? Qf3†.

No. 3340: A. Zlatanow

Gazeta Cz-enstochowska, 1976

No. 3340: A. Zlatanow (Bulgaria).

I: 1. Ra1 Rf6xh7 2. Kb1 Ra8 3. f8Q Rxg8 4. a8Q Rxh8 5. c8Q Rxc8 stalemate

II: 1. Rh1 Rf6xh7 2. Kg1 Ra8 3. c8Q Rxe8 4. a8Q Rxa8 5. f8Q Rxf8 stalemate.

JRH: Cf. Kubbel (1922), No. 1584 in Chéron III.


No. 3343: A. Motor. 1. c8Q† Kxc8 2. e6 fe† 3. Kxe6 Kd8 4. Kf7 Se7 5. g6 Se8 6. Ke6 Sg7† draw.

No. 3344: V. Kichigin. 1 h8Q Re8† 2. Qxe8 Sd6† 3. Kd8 Sxe8 4. h7 Sd8 5. Ke7 Sf5† 6. Kf7 wins. There were 4 more studies in the award.
No. 3345: A. Lewandowski. 1. Rf8+/i Kh7 2. Rb8 Be2+/ii Ka5 g2 4. Rb1 Bf1 5. Rb4 g1Q 6. Rh4+/ii Kg8 7. Rg4/iii Qxg4 stalemate.

i) 1. Re7? g2 2. Re1 Be2 3. Ka5 Bf1 4. Re4 Be2 wins.

JRH SNAP's this with Yakimchik (1974), 9th Comm. in Lokker Memorial, which had wRf8 and bKh7, and the line 5... Bc4 6. Rb1 Bf1 7. Rb4 g1Q 8. Rh4 and 9. Rh4+ given. Also Bron (1927), No. 1823 in Chéron III,

No. 3346: Al. P. Kuznetsov. Judge: Dragutin Gaja, Belgrade. There were 62 studies from 40 composers. 1. Rf7+/ii Sd7/i 2. Rxf4 d2 3. Re4+/iii Kd8 4. Rd4 d1Q 5. Rxd1 Sxd1 6. Bd4 Ke7 7. g7 Kf7 8. g3 Kg8 9. g4 Kf7 10. g5 Kg8 11. g6.
JRH finds 1 similar mate, by Kalandadze (on p.35 of his Georgian collection).


ii) 1. ... Kf4 2. Sh3t Kxg4 3. Sf6t Kh4 4. g3 mate.

No. 3350: V. Kalandadze 1. Rb4t Re4 2. g3t Kf5 3. Ra5t Re5 4. g4t Kf6 5. Rb6t Re6 6. g5t Kf7 7. Ra7t Re7 8. g6t Kf8 9. Rb8t Re8 10. Rxe8t Rxo8 11. gh c1Qt 12. Ka2 Qe6t 13. b3 Qe2t 14. Ka3.

No. 3350: V. Kalandadze. 1. Rb4t Re4 2. g3t Kf5 3. Ra5t Re5 4. g4t Kf6 5. Rb6t Re6 6. g5t Kf7 7. Ra7t Re7 8. g6t Kf8 9. Rb8t Re8 10. Rxe8t Rxo8 11. gh c1Qt 12. Ka2 Qe6t 13. b3 Qe2t 14. Ka3.


JRH has 15 studies terminating in continuous attack by wS on bR where the latter is tied to defend bS attacked by wK. Earliest: Zpeler (1932), No. 744 in FIDE. Similar is Rinck (1938), No. 1306 in '1414'.

JRH has 15 studies terminating in continuous attack by wS on bR where the latter is tied to defend bS attacked by wK. Earliest: Zpeler (1932), No. 744 in FIDE. Similar is Rinck (1938), No. 1306 in '1414'.

JRH has 15 studies terminating in continuous attack by wS on bR where the latter is tied to defend bS attacked by wK. Earliest: Zpeler (1932), No. 744 in FIDE. Similar is Rinck (1938), No. 1306 in '1414'.
Guy-Blandford-Roycroft (GBR) code for completely representing chessboard force. Class 1032 is the code for wQ, no rooks, bB and 2wS. 4870 is the code for wQ, bQ, 2wR, 2bR, wB, bB, no knights. 0065 is the code for 2wS, bS. In other words, the digit position denotes, from left to right, Q, R, B, S; the digit value is the sum of '1' for each W piece and '3' for each B1 piece. '9' is reserved for additional (promoted) force, in the appropriate position. Pawns are denoted by uncoded decimal place digits: 0000.35 would denote no pieces of any kind, 3wP and 5bP. It is often useful to call the force so coded a 'class', especially when discussing endgame theory. The GBR code is convenient for indexed retrieval of chess positions and for representation in computer systems.