

No. 136 - (Vol.IX)

ISSN-0012-7671 Copyright ARVES
Reprinting of (parts of) this magazine is only permitted
for non commercial purposes and with acknowledgement.

April 2000



Editorial Board

John Roycroft,
17 New Way Road,
London,
England NW9 6PL
e-mail: roycroft@dcs.qmw.ac.uk

Ed van de Gevel,
Binnen de Veste 36,
3811 PH Amersfoort,
The Netherlands
e-mail: evg@qad.com

Harold van der Heijden,
Michel de Klerkstraat 28,
7425 DG Deventer,
The Netherlands
e-mail: harold_van_der_heijden@wxs.nl

Spotlight-column:
Jürgen Fleck,
Neuer Weg 110,
D-47803 Krefeld,
Germany
e-mail: juergenfleck@t-online.de

Originals-column:
Noam D. Elkies
Dept of Mathematics,
SCIENCE CENTER
One Oxford Street,
Harvard University
CAMBRIDGE
Mass 02138
U.S.A.
e-mail: elkies@math.harvard.edu

Treasurer:
Harm Benak,
Kamperfoeliezoom 50,
2353 RS Leiderdorp,
The Netherlands

EG Subscription

EG is produced by the Dutch-Flemish Association for Endgame Study ('Alexander Rueb Vereniging voor schaakEindspelStudie') ARVES.

Subscription to EG is not tied to membership of ARVES.

The annual subscription of EG (Jan.1-Dec.31) is **EUR 16** (or **NLG 35**) for 4 issues. Payments should be in EUR or NLG and can be made by bank notes, Eurocheque (please fill in your validation or guarantee number on the back), postal money order, Eurogiro or bank cheque. To compensate for bank charges payments via Eurogiro or bank cheque should be **EUR 21** (or **NLG 46**) and **EUR 25** (or **NLG 55**) respectively, instead of 16 (or 35).

All payments can be addressed to the treasurer (see Editorial Board) except those by Eurogiro which should be directed to: *Postbank, accountnumber 54095, in the name of ARVES, Leiderdorp, The Netherlands.*

Subscribers in the U.S.A. or U.K. can pay in an alternative way by making out a postal order or a cheque to a contact person.

For the U.S.A. the subscription is \$22, to be made out to:

Ph. Manning, 2890 Lee Rd, Shaker Hts, OH 44120.

For the U.K. the subscription is £12, to be made out to:

W. Veitch, 13 Roffes Lane, Caterham (Surrey), England CR3 5PU.

It is of course possible with any kind of payment to save bank charges by paying for more years or for more persons together, like some subscribers already do.



As promised in our last column, several programmers have embarked on exhaustive computer analyses of 6-man endgames, at last continuing Lewis Stiller's 1992 research. Ken Thompson, who created most of the 5-man databases, once more takes the leading role, and is posting his results on the Web as they emerge. A table at

<http://cm.bell-labs.com/cm/cs/who/ken/chesseg.html>

contains longest wins, deepest mutual Zugzwangs, and statistics for a growing list of pawnless 6-man endgames. (Some of the more lopsided endgames, such as 2330, were compiled to set the stage for an assault on 6-man endgames containing one pawn.) This is relevant to us because Thompson's online database finally resolves the status of the mutual Zugzwang Kd1,Ra2,Sc2/Kf1,Sb3,Sc4 from our first column. Pointing a Web browser at

<http://plan9.bell-labs.com/magic/eg/wkd1wra2wnc2bkf1bnb3bnc4>


(Ken naturally uses "n" rather than "s" for Knight), we learn that only a half-point is at stake here,

though BTM must defend precisely for a few moves, starting with 1...Sc5! This is the only move to draw; the next-best move, 1...Sbd2, loses in 105. White can force a few more unique moves, e.g. 2.Sd4 Se3+!/i 3.Kd2 Kf2!/ii 4.Kc3+ Kg3!/iii 5.Ra3 Kf5! "and draws"/iv. The following notes list in each case Black's longest lasting alternative and all moves that last at least 100 moves:

- i) Se4 and Sb6 lose in 149 and 127 moves respectively
 - ii) and here Sd5(g4) loses in 149 (136)
 - iii) Kf1? loses in 28
 - iv) while 5...Kf2 loses in 130.
- So, it seems that an aristocratic full-point Zugzwang must use at least seven men.

Our one original this time is a gem contributed by the great Jan Rusinek:

No 11489 Jan Rusinek, 1999



e1e4 1350.23 6/6 Win

No 11489 Jan Rusinek 1.Kf2/i Rb1/ii 2.Bxd3+!/iii Kxd3/iv 3.Qxh2 Rf1+!/v 4.Kxf1 c1Q+ 5.Be1!/vi Be2+ 6.Kf2 Qc5+ 7.Kg3 Qe5+/vii

8.Kf2/viii Qxh2, and we have a midboard pin-stalmate with wB incarcerated on e1 during play!

i) 1.Bxd3+? Rxd3 2.Kf2 Rxd2+ wins. 1.Bf4!? c1Q+ 2.Kf2 is not good enough; HvdH points out the amusing continuation Rb1 3.g3+ Kd4! 4.Be3+ Ke5! 5.Bf4+ Kf6! 6.Bg5+ Kg7! 7.Bh6+ Kxh6 8.Qxh2+ Kg7 winning.

ii) 1...Bd1 2.Qxh2 c1Q 3.Qh4+ and White does not lose. Likewise 1...Be2 2.Qxh2 c1Q 3.Qh7+, or even 2.Bxe2. 1...Rb7 2.Bxd3+ Kxd3 3.Qf1+ draws. After 1...Kd5!? HvdH gives either 2.Bxd3 Rxd3 3.Qa1 Rxd2+ 4.Ke3 h1Q 5.Qa5+ (Qxh1? Rd1 -/+) with perpetual check, or 2.Qxh2 c1Q 3.Qh6! Qc5+ 4.Qe3 Qxe3+ 5.Kxe3, when Be2 6.Bxe2 dxe2+ 7.d3 holds and White also looks safe against "normal" play.

iii) 2.Qxh2? Rxf1+! 3.Kxf1 c1Q+ and 4.Kf2 Qxd2+ 5.Kg1 Qc1+ 6.Kf2 Qe3+ 7.Kf1 Be2+, or here 5.Kf1 Be2+ 6.Kg1 Qc1+, ends in mate, while the thematic try 4.Be1 Be2+ 5.Kf2 Qc5+ 6.Kg3 Qe5+ 7.Kf2 (Kh3 Bg4+) loses to Qf5(f6)+! 8.Kg3 Qf4+.

iv) Kd4(d5) 3.Bxc2! Rxh1 4.Bxh2 Rxh2 5.Kg3 draws.

v) 3...c1Q 4.Qh7+ and either perpetual check or a draw on material after Kc4 4.Qc7+ Kb3 5.Qb6+ Ka2 6.Qa6+ Qa3 7.Qc4+ Q(R)b3 8.Qxg4.

vi) 5.Kf2? Qxd2+ still ends in mate, e.g. 6.Kg1 Qc1+ 7.Kf2 Qe3+ 8.Kf1 Be2+ 9.Kel Qc1+ 10.Kf2

Qf1#.

vii) The White King will also shuttle between g3 and f2 after Qg5+ 8.Kf2 Qf5+ 9.Kg3 etc., avoiding 8.Kh3? Qg4# or 9.Kg1? Qf1#. With the Black King on d3 instead of e4 Black cannot stop this with ...Qf4+.

viii) Kh3? Bg4+

Readers of *Strategems* will be reminded of the finale of another recent Rusinek study (1998, #0011) where even sharper play -- though without a thematic try -- ends in a similar pin-stalemate with wSf3 pinned by bQf4 instead of wPg2/bQh2.

SPOTLIGHT

editor: Jürgen Fleck



Many thanks to Spotlight's contributors Marco Campioli (Italy), Harold van der Heijden, W.G.Sanderse (both Netherlands), Michael Roxlau (Germany) and Ignace Vandecasteele (Belgium).

EG 131

No 11213, L.Katsnelson. The correction of this study given on p.15 in EG 135 is unsound, too: 1.... Kb4 2.Sa6+ Ka4 3.Rc1 (3.Kh2 g3+ 4.Kg1 Bb6) Kb5 4.Ra1 Bb6 wins for Black.

EG 132

No 11268, J.Vandiest. According to the notes on p.15 in EG 135 this study can be saved by choosing 13.... Bh5 as the main line.

However, there is the dual 15.Qg4+ Kh7 16.Qh4+ Kg7 17.Qg3+ Kh8 (17.... Kh7 18.Kf6) 18.Qxe5+, which even saves three moves over the intended 15.Qf6+.

EG 135

No 11446, B.Sidorov. A dual win: 3.Be5.

No 11447, V.Kovalenko. Unsound: not only does 3.... f5 draw (as mentioned in EG 135), but also 4.... Ke3 5.Kg4 (5.h5 f5 6.h6 f4+ 7.Kg2 Ke2 draw) Ke4 6.h5 f5+ 7.Kh3 Ke5 draw.

No 11449, V.Kovalenko. Anticipated by EG 92.6863 (Davranyan and Zinar), which had even three echo stalemates.

No 11452, Y.Lubkin. Auto-anticipation: Die Schwalbe 1996. In Die Schwalbe Spotlight's editor suggested the following setting: c1a5 0000.44 b3d2f5h4b4d5f7g7 5/5+, 1.f6 g6 2.d4 (2.Kc2 Kb5 3.Kd3 Kc5 4.Ke3 Kd6 5.Kd4 Ke6 6.Kc5 Kxf6 and now 7.Kxd5 g5 and 7.Kxb4 g5 only lead to a draw) Kb5 3.Kd2 Kc6 4.Ke3 Kd7 5.Kf4 Kd6 6.Kg4 Kd7 7.h5 Ke6 8.h6 etc.

No 11455, E.Markov. No solution: 9.... Kd6.

No 11457, K.Tarnopolsky. Thanks to his distant passed pawn White can win by more mundane means, e.g. 1.b5 Sxf2 2.b6 Sd3 3.Ke7 Sc5 (3...Sb4 4.b7 Sa6 5.Sd4+ followed by Sxe6) 4.Kd6 Sb7+ 5.Kc7 Sc5 (5.... Sa5 6.Sd2) 6.Kc6 Sa6 7.Sd4+ Kg4 (7.... Ke5 8.Kb5) 8.Sxe6 Kxg3 9.Kb7 Sb4 10.Kc8.

No 11459, A.Kasantsev. No solution, Black wins by 1.... Bd7

2.Be4 (2.Bb3 Bxf5) Ke7 3.Bc2 Kf6 4.Bd3 Bc8 5.Be4 Ba6 6.Kg1 g3 7.Kh1 Bc4 8.Kg1 Ke5.

No 11462, V.Kovalenko. It is interesting to note that without bPb2 the position is only drawn. In that case Black is saved by the stalemate defence 3.... Qd7.

No 11467, A.Grin. No solution: 3.... Sf7.

No 11472, P.Arestov. A dual win: 3.Sdb5 c2 4.Rc8.

No 11473, Y.Lubkin. The forcing introductory play leads straight to G.Kasparyan, L'Italia Scacchistica 1963, 3rd prize.

No 11477, A.Belyavsky. The line 1.... Kf4 is marred by the dual 3.Ra8.

No 11486, A.Kotov. My computer suggests the incredible 1.b6 b1Q 2.Kc7. However, it seems that Black can hold the rook ending arising after 2.... Rh1 (not 2...c4 3.Rh3) 3.c4 Qxb6+ 4.Kxb6 Kb8.

No 11487, B.Sidorov. White even wins after 3.Ke6 Kxe8 4.Be7 and mate next move.

G4 p.43, T.Gorgiev. A few notes would have been helpful. At first sight 1.... Se6 2.Kd5 Sc7+ looks like a cook, but 3.Kd6 Kb8 4.Kd7 Sf4 5.a4 Sfd5 6.a5 Sa6 7.Kd8 Sdc7 8.Kd7 seems to lead to a positional draw.

S8 p.47, G.Slepyan. According to the database there is a dual win by 2.Sd5 Kd7 3.Sd4 f4 4.Sf6+ Kd6 5.Sf3 followed by Sf6-g4-f2. Ignace Vandecasteele suggests to correct this by starting with wKh6 (now the solution is unique: 1.Sc6

f5 2.Kg7!), but this setting gives up the good try 2.Nd5.

B1 p.51, I.Bondar. A dual win:
1.Bb4 Rxe3 2.Rg8+ Kd7 3.Bxc5 Re5 (else Bf5+) 4.Ba4+ Kc7 5.Rg7+.

B2 p.51, D.Petrov. The intended solution fails: 2.... Ra3 3.Rd4+ Kh5 4.Rb4 Sc7 (threatening Sd5+) 5.Ke2 (there is nothing better) Rxb3 6.Rxb3 Kxh4 draw.

However, something else works:
2.Be7 Rxa2 3.Rg5+ Kh3 4.Kf3 and mate in a few moves.

DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS


editors: John Roycroft
Harold v.d. Heijden



Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992

This informal tourney was judged by Oleg Pervakov (Moscow). The provisional award was published in Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 3(7) 1993 pp17-19. 32 studies were entered, 2 of which were excluded because the judge was the composer.

No 11490 V.Kolpakov and Yu.Seryozhkin
1st prize Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



g2e2 4001.01

3/3 Win


No 11490 V.Kolpakov and Yu.Seryozhkin 1.Qa6+ Ke3 2.Qd3+/i Kf4 3.Qg6, with domination of bQ:

- Qb2 4.Qg4+ Ke3 5.Qe4+ Kd2 6.Qd3+ Kc1 7.Qd1, and the b2 square is blocked, or
- Qa1 4.Qg4+ Ke3 5.Qe4+ Kd2 6.Qd3+ Kc1 7.Qd1+ Kb2 8.Sd3+ Ka2 9.Qa4+ Kb1 10.Qb3+ wins, or
- Qa3 4.Qf6+ Ke3 5.Qf3+, or
- Qc3 4.Qg4+ Ke3 (Ke5; Qg7+) 5.Sd1+, or
- Qc4 4.Qg4+, or
- Qc7 4.Qg3+, or
- Qc8 4.Qg3+ Kf5 5.Qg4+, or, finally,
- Ke3 4.Qe4+ Kd2 5.Qd3+ Ke1 6.Kf3 (Se4? Qf4;) Qc6+ 7.Se4, after which the stalemate try 7...Qf6+ is frustrated, so White wins.

i) 2.Qd3+? Kf4 3.Qf3+ Kg5 4.Se4+ Kg6 5.Qf6+ Kh7, and Sg5+ is frustrated by the presence of bPh6. "Therefore it is logical to eliminate this pawn, but 2.Qxh6+? Ke2

3.Qa6+ Kd2 4.Qd3+ Ke1 5.Kf3, allows the stalemate riposte Qc6+ 6.Se4 Qf6+. So, with or without bPh6 there is no win. How is White to make headway?" "The composers have added something to the fund of this classic and much worked on material. Memorable logic!"

No 11491 L.Mitrofanov and V.Razumenko
2nd prize Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



e6h8 0013.32

5/4 Win

No 11491 L.Mitrofanov and V.Razumenko (St Petersburg)

1.Bf4/i Sxc5+/ii 2.Kf7 Se6 3.Kxe6 (Bxe3? Sd8+;) e2/iii 4.c7 (Kf7? c1Q;) e1Q+/iv 5.Kf7 Qxc3 6.Be5+ Kh7 7.Bxc3 c1Q 8.c8Q Qf4(Qf1)+ 9.Bf6 wins.


i) 1.Be5+? Kh7 2.c7 Sxc5+ 3.Kf7 c1Q 4.c8Q Qf1+ 5.Bf6 Qc4+ - on the c-file.

ii) c1Q 2.c7 Qg1 3.c8Q+ Qg8+ 4.Qxg8+ Kxg8 5.c6 e2 6.Bg3 wins.

iii) c1Q 4.c7 Qxc3 5.Be5+.

iv) K~~g7~~5.Be5+ Kh6 6.c8Q e1Q 7.Qh8+ Kg5 8.Qg7+ Kh5 9.Qh7+ and 10.Qxc2 with an easy win.

No 11492 V.Prigunov (Kazan)
3rd prize Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



a1f8 0034.22

4/5 Win

No 11492 V.Prigunov (Kazan) As first published there was an irrelevant introduction, in this version stripped by the composer, with the judge nodding his approval.

1.a6 Ba2 2.Kxa2 Sc3+ 3.Ka3/i Ke7 4.Se4/ii Sb5+ 5.Kxa4 Sc7/iii 6.a7 Kxe6 7.Ka5 Kd7/iv 8.Kb6 Sa8+ 9.Kb7 c4 10.Sc3 Kd6/v 11.Sd5 Kxd5 12.Kxa8 c3 13.Kb8 c2 14.a8Q+ wins.

i) 3.Kb2? Sb5 4.Sf5 Sc7 5.a7 c4 draw.

ii) 4.Se2? Sb5+ 5.Kxa4 Sc7 6.a7 Kxe6 7.Ka5 Kd6 8.Kb6 Sa8+ 9.Kb7 c4 10.Sc3 Kd7 11.Sd5 Kd8 12.Kc6 Ke8 13.Sc7+ Kf7 14.Sb5 Ke7 15.Sc3 Kd8 16.Sd5 Ke8, and Black is in control of the reci-zug.

"A remarkable positional draw in which wS marks out the diamond d5-c7-b5-c3-d5 while bK has his own smaller version e8-f7-e7-d8-e8."


iii) Sa7 6.Ka5 Sc8 7.Kb5; followed by 8.Kc6 and 9.Kb7.

iv) "Wot, no d6 square?"

v) Sc7 11.Sd5 Sa8 12.Sb6+.

"A shame that the try 4.Se2? is a less natural move than the solution's 4.Se4!"


No 11493 A.Skrinnik
=4th/5th prize Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



a5e5 0403.42 6/5 Win

No 11493 A.Skrinnik (Krivoi Rog, Ukraine) 1.a7 Rxh2 2.Rd5+/i Ke4 3.Re5+/ii Kf4 4.Re4+/iii Kf3 5.Rf4+ Kg3 (Ke3;Rf3+) 6.Rf3+ Kxg4 7.Rg3+ Kh4 8.axb8Q (Ka4? Sd7;) Ra2+ 9.Kb6 Rb2+ 10.Kc7 Rxb8 11.Kxb8 Kxg3 12.g6 and will promote with check.
i) 2.Ra6? Ra2+, and 3.Kb5 Sxa6, or 3.Kb6 Rxa6+.
ii) 3.axb8Q? Ra2+ 4.Kb6 Rb2+ 5.Kc7 Rxb8 6.Kxb8 Kxd5 draw.
iii) 4.Re2? Sc6+ 5.Kb6 Sxa7 (or Rh8) 6.Rxh2 Sc8+ 7.Kxc5 Kxg5 8.Rg2 d3 draw.

No 11494 N.Kralin
=4th/5th prize Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



d7e4 0001.13 3/4 Win


No 11494 N.Kralin (Moscow)

1.Sd6+/i Kf4/ii 2.f6, with:
- e4 3.Sxf7 e3/iii 4.Se5 Kxe5/iv 5.f7 e2 6.f8Q e1Q 7.Qe8(Qe7)+ wins, or
- g4 3.Sxf7 g3 4.Sg5 (symmetry!) Kxg5/v 5.f7 g2 6.f8Q g1Q 7.Qg8(Qg7)+ wins.
i) 1.f6? Kf5 2.Ke7 e4 3.Sd6+ Kf4 4.Sxf7 e3, and 5.Se5 is not available.
ii) Kd4 2.f6 (Ke7? f6;) e4 3.Ke7/vi e3 4.Sf5+ Kd3 5.Sxe3 Kxe3 6.Kxf7 g4 7.Ke8(Ke6) g3 8.f7 g2 9.f8Q g1Q 10.Qc5+ wins.
iii) Kf5 4.Ke7 e3 5.Sd6+ Kg4(Kg6) 6.Sc4 e2 7.Se5+ wins.
iv) Ke4 5.f7 f2 6.Sf3 Kxf3 7.f8Q+ wins.
v) Kg4 5.f7 g2 6.Sf3 wins.
vi) 3.Sxf7? g4 4.Sd6 g3 5.Sf5+ Ke5 6.f7 g2 7.f8Q g1Q 8.Qd6+ Kxf5 9.Qe6+ Kf4 draw.

"Both the foregoing's ideas are known, but the originality is nevertheless plain enough. The lightness of Skrinnik's is a surprise, and the elegance of the 6-octave melody of

rook sacrifices, while in Kralin's there is harmony and cooperation in White's play."

No 11495 V.Razumenko
1st honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992




a5a7 4004.11 4/4 Draw

No 11495 V.Razumenko (St Petersburg) 1.c7 Sd5 2.Sd3/i Qa3+ 3.Kb5 Qxd3+ 4.Kc5 Sb6/ii 5.c8S+ Sxc8 6.Qc7+ Ka6 7.Qxc8+ Ka5 8.Qa8+ Qa6 9.Qb8 e1Q 10.Qd8+ Ka4 11.Qd1+ Qxd1 stalemate.
i) 2.c8S+? Ka8 3.Sd3 Qa3+ 4.Kb5 Qxd3+ 5.Ka4 Qc2+ 6.Kb5 Qb3+ 7.Kc5 Qc3+ wins.
ii) Kb7 5.c8Q+ Kxc8 6.Qe8+ Kc7 7.Qd7+ draw.

"Lively play embellished by sacrifices and a minor promotion ends up with stalemate involving two black queens."

No 11496 V.Anufriev
2nd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



f1a4 0016.12 3/5 Draw

No 11496 V.Anufriev (Tula) 1.Bd5/i Se6 2.Bxb7/ii Sc5 3.Be4/iii d2 4.Ke2 Sxe4 5.b7 Sb3 6.b8Q Sc3+ 7.Ke3 d1Q 8.Qf4+ Ka5 9.Qc7+ Kb4 10.Qf4+ Ka3 11.Qf8+ Ka2 12.Qf2+ Ka1 13.Qf1 Qxf1 stalemate.

i) 1.Bc4? d2 2.Ke2 Sb3 3.Bd5 Sf5 4.Bxb7 fSd4+ 5.Kd1 Ka5 wins.


ii) 2.Bxe6? Sb3 3.Bd5 Sc5 4.Ke1 Kb5 wins.

iii) 3.Bc6+? Kb4 4.b7 Sa6 wins.

"Inventive play by both sides yields a stalemate due to precise play by wK".


No 11497 V.Kondratev (Gavrilov-Posad) 1.Sd3 Sf2 2.Sxf2 a3 3.Sd1 a2 4.Kd2 Kb1 5.Bd6 a1Q 6.Ba3 Qa2 7.Sc3+ Ka1 8.Kc1 wins.
"A good introduction leads to a curious final position where Black is in complete zugzwang."

No 11497 V.Kondratev
3rd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



c1a1 0014.12 4/4 Win

No 11498 V.Anufriev
4th honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992




h3h1 3102.02 4/4 Win

No 11498 V.Anufriev 1.Se2, with:
- Qa3+ 2.Sf3/i Qxf3+ 3.Sg3+ Kg1 4.Rb2z e3 (Qd3;Rg2 mate) 5.Rb1+ Kf2 6.Rf1 mate, or
- Qd1 2.Sg2/ii Qd3+ 3.Se3 Qd7+/iii 4.Sg4 Qxb7 5.Sf2 mate.
i) 2.Sg3+? Kg1 3.Rb1+ Kf2 4.Sf5 Qd3 draw.
ii) 2.Sg3+? Kg1 3.Rb2 Qd7+ 4.hSf5 Qh7+ draw.
iii) Qxe3+ 4.Sg3+ Kg1 5.Rb1+ Kf2 6.Rf1 mate.
"Echo-sacrifices, zugzwang, mates

and a stalemate defence with non-capture - it may be short but it's capacious and memorable."


No 11499 B.Gusev
5th honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



d2h5 0401.11 4/3 Win

No 11499 B.Gusev (Moscow)
1.Rh8+ Kg6/i 2.g4 Rg3 3.Sd5 Kg7/ii 4.Rh4 Kg6 5.Ke2 Kg5 6.Rh5+ Kxg4 7.Sf6 mate.
i) Kg4 2.Rg8+ Kh3 3.g4 wins.
ii) Rxg4 4.Rg8+ Kh5 (Kf5;Se7+) 5.Sf6+. Or Kg5 4.Rg8+ Kh4 5.Sf6 Rg2+ 6.Kd3 f3 7.Se4 (also: Ke3) f2 8.Ke2 f1Q+ 9.Kxf1 Rxg4 10.Rh8 mate.
"A subtle and harmonious miniature with a pure mating finale - the side-variation is a not-compulsory bit of added interest."

No 11500 V.Vinichenko
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



alg8 0080.36 6/9 Draw

No 11500 V.Vinichenko 1.d7 Bc7
2.Be6+ Kh7 3.f7/i b3 4.g6+, with:
- Bxg6 5.f8S+ Kh8 6.Sxg6+ Kh7
7.Sf8+ draw by perpetual, or
- Kxg6 5.f8S+ Kf6 6.d8Q+ Bxd8
7.Bd4+ Ke7 8.Bc5+ Ke8 9.Bd7+
Kf7 10.Be6+ Kf6 11.Bd4+ Kg5
12.Be3+ Kh4 13.Bf2+, with
another perpetual check.

i) 3.Ka2? gxf6 4.gxf6 Bd6 5.Bc1
b3+ 6.Ka1 b2+ 7.Bxb2 axb2+
8.Kxb2 Be5+ wins.

"A synthesis of two systems of
perpetual check, but wouldn't it
have been possible somehow to
avoid the conglomeration of
pieces?"

No 11501 E.Kolesnikov (Moscow)
Yes, wK is in check. 1.Kb3 c1S+/i
2.Kxa3 Sxh8 3.Se6/ii Sg6 4.Sd4
Se5 5.Sb3 Sc4+ 6.Ka4 Se2 7.Sd4
Sc1/iii 8.Sb3 Sd3 9.Sc5 Sxc5
10.Kb5 draw.


i) Sxh8 2.Kxc2 Sb4+ 3.Kb3 a2
4.Kb2 Sf7 5.Sd7(Se6) Ke2 6.Sc5
Se5 7.Sa6 eSd3+ 8.Ka1 draw.
ii) 3.Kb2? Sf7 4.Se6 Se5 5.Sc5

Sc4+, and if 6.Kc2 Se3+ 7.Kd2
Sd5, or 6.Kb1 Sd2+ 7.Kb2 Ke2,
with a black win.

iii) Sxd4 stalemate, or eSc3 8.Kb3
Sd6 9.Sc2 dSb5 10.Se3+ Ke1
11.Sd5 Sc1+ 12.Kc4 draw.


"Yet another 3S vs S piece by this
composer. A pity the start catches
one in the throat."

No 11501 E.Kolesnikov
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



b4f1 0107.02 3/5 Draw

No 11502 O.Kovbasa
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992




d3a4 0010.12 3/3 Win

No 11502 O.Kovbasa (Kiev) 1.c4
Kb3 2.Be5 a4 3.c5 a3 4.Kc3 a2/i
5.Kf2 Kc4 6.c6 Kd5 7.c7, with:
- h2 8.c8Q h1Q 9.Qa8+ wins, or

- Kxe5 8.c8Q a1Q 9.Qh8+ wins.
 i) Kc4 5.c6 h2 6.Bxh2 Kd5 7.c7 a2
 8.Be5 Kxe5 9.c8Q a1Q 10.Qh8+
 wins.

"An exquisite miniature with familiar diagonal catches of bQ. Unfortunate that the off-beat manoeuvre of wK is not unique - 4.Ke3 or 4.Ke2."

No 11503 V.Neishtadt
 commendation
 Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



h5d8 4340.33 6/7 Draw

No 11503 V.Neishtadt (Barnaul)

1.Qg8+/i Kd7 2.Bxc6+Qxc6
 3.Qxh7 Qf3+ 4.Kg6 Qe4+ 5.Kf7
 Qxh7 6.g6 Qh8 stalemate.

i) 1.Qb6+? Kd7 2.Qc7+ Ke6
 3.Qe7+ (Bc8+,Kd5;) Kd5 4.d7
 Qxg5+ wins.

"Our fan of the romantic remained true to himself here!"

No 11504 Yu.Roslov (St Petersburg)
 1...Rf4+/i 2.Kg3 Rf8
 3.Bc8 Rxc8 4.b7 Bf4+ 5.Kf3/ii
 Be4+ 6.Kf2/iii Bg3+ 7.Ke3 Bf2+
 8.Ke2 Bd3+ 9.Kd2 Be1 10.Kd1
 Bc2+ 11.Kc1 Bd2+ 12.Kxd2 Rd8+
 13.Kxc2 Kxa7 14.c7 draw.
 i) Be3+ 2.Kxe3 Re4+ 3.Kd2 Re8


4.c7 Kxb6 5.c8Q Rxc8 6.Bxc8
 causes White few problems.

ii) 5.Kh4? Bg3+ 6.Kh5 Bg6+
 7.Kg5 Bh4+ 8.Kg4 Bf5+ and
 9...Kxa7.

iii) 6.Ke2? Bd3+ 7.Kf3 Be2+ 8.Kf2
 Bg3+ 9.Kg2 Bf1+ 10.Kg1 Bh2+
 11.Kh1 Bg2+ wins.

"Here we have a choice symmetrical play using a familiar mechanism."

No 11504 Yu.Roslov
 commendation
 Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia, 1992



f2a6 0370.31 5/5 BTM Draw

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996

This informal tourney was judged by O.Pervakov (Moscow). The provisional award was published in Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia No.19 (ix97). Text (incl. signed): "...can't call it successful - instead of 5 prizes I feel I can award only 3, and then only at a pinch. OK, one should not over-generalise, but one does detect a tendency for the standard of *Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia* studies to fall. Also, it is time for the magazine editors to think up ways of making the annual com-

posing tourneys more attractive to composers.


"On the other hand it is a pleasure to say that every time - here too - there is at least one outstanding study.

"Several studies [the judge supplies details] had to be eliminated [for the usual specific reasons], despite otherwise being strong candidates for honours." 34 studies by 22 composers entered.

No 11505 S.Tkachenko

1st prize

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996



g4e8 0072.13

5/6 Win

No 11505 S.Tkachenko (Ukraine)

1.Bg6+/i Kf8 2.e7+ Kxe7 3.Sc6+ Kf6 4.Sxd4 Bd1+ 5.Kh3/ii Kxg6 6.Sb2 Bh5 7.Kxh4/iii d5 8.Sa4 Bd1 9.Sc3 Bh5 10.Sc6 Bf3/iv 11.Se5+/v K- 12.Sxf3, and a 'Troitzky' win.

i) Black threatened to play

1...Bxe6+ or 1...Bxa7. Not

1.Bc6+? Ke7, when the S-fork is illegal.

ii) The point - the whole study's point - will become clear, we promise.

iii) Now and only now this move.

"A miraculous reci-zug has ap-

peared on the board. But doesn't Black have a move of his d-pawn?"
iv) d4 11.Sxd4 Bg4 12.Kxg4 h5+ 13.Kh4.


v) Taking advantage of the weakening of the e5 square resulting from the forced advance of the d-pawn.

"A superb piece by the leading Ukrainian study composer! The latest tourney successes by Sergei - and especially their high quality - speak for themselves. Here is a world class composer!"

No 11506 S.Radchenko

2nd prize

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996



h8g5 0400.31

5/3 Win

No 11506 S.Radchenko (Ukraine)

1.Kg8/i Kg6/ii 2.h4 f5 3.Kf8/iii Rxe6 4.Kg8 Kxh6 5.Kf7 Re1 6.Rh8 mate.

i) 1.h7? Kg6 2.Kg8 Rg7+ 3.Kf8

Rxh7 4.Ra6 (Ra2,f5;) Rxh2 5.Ke8

Kg5, drawing.

ii) Kxh6 2.Ra6 Kg6 3.Kf8 Rh7

4.Ke8 Rxh2 5.e7 wins, for instance,

Re2 6.Kf8 Kg5 7.e8Q Rxe8+


8.Kxe8 f5 9.Ke7.

iii) 3.h5+? Kxh6 4.Ra6 Kxh5 5.Kf8

Rxe6, and wK is too far off.

"The finale is not exactly dazzlingly new, but the play is out of the ordinary and highly instructive. The theory of rook endings is enhanced."

No 11507 V.Kovalenko
3rd prize
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996




f2h1 1343.03 3/7 Win

No 11507 V.Kovalenko (Russian Far East) 1.Be4 Rf1+ 2.Kxf1 Sg3+ 3.Qxg3/i Bh3+ 4.Qg2+ Bxg2+ (fxg2+;Kf2) 5.Kf2 h3 6.Bh7(Bg6) Bf1 7.Kxf1 f2 8.Be4 mate.

i) 3.Kf2? Sxe4+ 4.Kxf3 Sd2+ 5.Ke2 Kg2 6.Qg7+ Kh3 leads to no more than a draw.

"A merry, even daring, study-problem with sacrifices and counter-sacrifices, mates and stalemates. It's impossible not to smile!"

No 11508 V.Dolgov and V.Kolpakov
1st honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996




a4h8 4400.01 3/4 Win

No 11508 V.Dolgov and V.Kolpakov 1.Rh1+ Kg8 2.Qb3+ Rf7 (Qf7;Qb8+) 3.Rg1+ Kh8 (no analysis of Kh7;) 4.Qh3+ Rh7 5.Qc3+ Rg7 6.Rh1+ Kg8 7.Qc4+ Rf7 8.Rg1+ Kh8 9.Qh4+ Rh7 10.Qd4+ Rg7 11.Rh1+ Kg8 12.Qd5+ Rf7 13.Rg1+ Kh8 (no analysis of Kh7;) 14.Qh5+ Rh7 15.Qe5+ Rg7 16.Rh1+ Kg8 17.Qe6+ Rf7 18.Rh4 a5 19.Qg4+ Rg7 (no analysis of Qg7;) 20.Qc4+ Rf7 21.Qe6 Qc5 22.Rc4 Qa7 23.Qg6+ Kf8 24.Rc8+ Ke7 25.Qe4+, with:
- Kd7 26.Qe8+ Kd6 27.Rc6+ Kd5 28.Qe6+ Kd4 29.Rc4+ Kd3 30.Qe4+ Kd2 31.Rc2+ Kd1 32.Qe2 mate, or
- Kf6 26.Qf4+ Kg7 27.Qg5+ Kh7 28.Qg8+ Kh6 29.Rc6+ Kh5 30.Qg6+ Kh4 31.Rc4+ Kh3 32.Qg4+ Kh2 33.Qh4+ Kg2 34.Rg4+ Kf1 35.Qh3+ Ke2 36.Re4+ Kd2 37.Qh2+ Rf2 38.Qd6+ Kc1 39.Re1+ Kb2 40.Qa3+ Kc2 41.Qb3+ Kd2

42.Rd1+ Ke2 43.Qd3 mate.
 "Two kinds of systematic movement. A rare theme expressed as a light miniature. The study was composed for the 1989-91 WCCT, but was faulty. Is it now cured? The question is hardly rhetorical, seeing that in a line 43 moves long the composers might have got around to supplying just one two-ply commentary..." We feel bound to comment that the two 'echo' sequences are so game-like that they carry next to no aesthetic weight. And if alternative white moves really fail in every case we shall be really astonished. We have already four corrected notation errors in the source.

No 11509 E.Markov
 2nd honourable mention
 Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996




a4c4 0040.33 5/5 Win

No 11509 E.Markov 1.d8R/i Bf5
 2.Rxd2 Bg6 3.Re2 Bf5 4.Re4+
 Bxe4 5.fxe4 Kd4 6.Ba5 bxa5
 7.Kxa5 Kxe4 8.Kxa6 wins.
 i) 1.d8Q? Bd7+ 2.Qxd7 d1Q+
 3.Qxd1 b5+ 4.Ka5 stalemate.
 "Imaginative and consistent play by Black aims at stalemate or

positional draw. White refutes this with an underpromotion to rook, the sacrifice of the exchange and the unexpected 6.Ba5!! It is a pity that the stalemate of bK is obvious to the unaided eye from the start."


No 11510 G.Slepian
 3rd honourable mention
 Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996



a8c5 0006.20 3/3 Draw

No 11510 G.Slepian (Belarus)
 1.h5/i Sh6 2.e7 Sd5 3.e8S Kc6
 4.Sg7/ii Kd7 5.Sf5 Sxf5 6.h6 draw.
 i) 1.e7? Sxe7 2.h5 Kb6 3.Kb8 Sd5
 4.h6 Sc7 5.h7 Sa6+ 6.Ka8 Sd5
 7.h8Q dSc7 mate.
 ii) 4.Ka7? Kd7 5.Sg7 Se3 6.Kb6
 Ke7 7.Kc5 Kf7 8.Kd4 Sg2 9.Sf5
 Sxf5+ 10.K- Sh6, blocking the
 h-pawn for a 'Troitzky' win.
 "A non-standard approach to the
 popular 'Troitzky line' theme. The
 too-soon advance of the e-pawn is
 punished by the white king being
 mated. Then White promotes to
 knight, steering round a position of
 domination, and at the right
 moment sacrifices said steed to get
 a Troitzky-in-White's-favour draw."

No 11511 G.Nekhaev
4th honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996




e5b8 4014.13 5/6 Win

No 11511 G.Nekhaev 1.Bxf4 Qxg6
2.Sh4 Sxh4 3.Kd4+ e5+ 4.Bxe5+
Ka8 5.Qc8+ Ka7 6.Kc3 Sf3(Sf5)
7.Bb8+ Kb6 8.Bc7+ Kc5 9.Bd6+
Kd5 10.Qc4+ Kxd6 11.Qa6+ and
12.Qxg6 wins.

"Successive synthesis of pas-
sive-active sacrifice of a knight and
active-passive sacrifice of a bishop.
In the judge's view an interesting
idea but as a whole found
somewhat wanting."

No 11512 A.Selivanov
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996




b8a6 0033.10 2/3 Win

No 11512 A.Selivanov (Moscow
and Sverdlov region) 1.g7 Bg3+
2.Kc8 Sd6+ 3.Kd7/i Se4 4.Ke6/ii
Sg5+ 5.Kf5/iii Sf7 6.Kg6 Se5+
7.Kf6/iv Sg4+ 8.Kg5, with:
- Bf4(Bh4)+ 9.Kxg4 wins, or
- Sf6 9.Kxf6 Be5+ 10.Kxe5 wins.
i) 3.Kd8? Sf7+ 4.Ke7 Sh6 draw.
ii) 4.Ke7? Bh4+ 5.Kf7 Sf6 draw.
iii) 5.Ke7? Bd6+ 6.Kf6 Be5+
7.Kxe5 Sf7+ 8.Kf6 Sh6 draw.
iv) 7.Kh5? Sd7 8.Kg5 Bh4+
9.Kxh4 Sf6 draw.

"The author's favourite material
still yields new ideas. Here an idea
of Rinck's finds elaboration. Chess
really is inexhaustible!"

No 11513 V.Kovalenko
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996




a6a8 0000.33 4/4 Win

No 11513 V.Kovalenko 1.b6, with:
- f4 2.b7+ Kb8 3.b5 f3 4.b6 axb6
5.Kxb6 f2 6.a6 f1Q 7.a7 mate, or
- axb6 2.Kxb6 Kb8 3.a6 f4 4.a7+
Ka8 5.b5 f3 6.Kc7 f2 7.b6 f1Q
8.b7+ Kxa7 9.b8Q+ Ka6 10.Qb6
mate.

"Echo-chameleon P-mates are
added to a Dvizov study (1965).
It's a forward step that costs, it is

true, a couple of pawns and departure from miniature form.

No 11514 V.Prigunov
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996




a6c6 0310.41 6/3 Win

No 11514 V.Prigunov (Ryazan, Russia) 1.Bd5+ Kxd5 2.d7 Kc6 3.d8S+ Kd7 4.b7 Kc7 5.Se6+ Kb8 6.Kb6 Rg6 7.g8Q+ Rxc6+ 10.Kxc6 Rg6+ 9.Sc6+ Rxc6+ 10.Kxc6 h5 11.Kb6 h4 12.c4 h3 13.c5 h2 14.c6 h1Q 15.c7 mate.

"Lively play with an assortment of study nuances ending up with a familiar pawn checkmate."

No 11515 V.Kalyagin
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996



d5e7 0403.11 3/4 Draw

No 11515 V.Kalyagin (Ekaterinburg) 1.Rg1/i Rh5 2.Ke4 g4 3.Rd1 Kd8 4.Kf4 g3 5.Kf3 Rf5+ 6.Kg2 Sf2 7.Re1 Rg5 8.Re3 draw.


i) 1.d8Q+? Rxd8? 2.Ke5 Sg3 3.Rf7+ Kxf7 is an ideal stalemate, but 1...Kxd8! is not!

"The very nice try, is, alas, in stark contrast with the yawn-inducing solution."

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997

This informal tourney was judged by Boris Gusev (Moscow). The provisional award was published in Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia - 22 (1998). 43 studies by 34 composers entered. Remarks: extraordinarily quick publication, and even quicker publication of top 3 in "64"!

No 11516 Oleg Pervakov
1st prize
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



g2h6 0310.65 8/7 Win

No 11516 Oleg Pervakov (Moscow) 1.Bf8+/i Kxh5 2.Bb4 Rh4 3.Bd2/ii Kg6 4.f5+/iii Kh5 5.a5 h6 6.a6 Rh3 7.Bxh6/iv Kxh6/v 8.a7 d2 9.a8Q d1Q 10.Qh8+ (Qf8+? Kh7;) Kg5 11.Qg7+ Kxf5

(Kh5;Qxf7+) 12.Qg4+ Ke5 13.f4+, with a decisive battery salvo. So the rook has all this time been in this puzzled state - why was it never gobbled up?

i) 1.Bb4? Rxh5. Or 1.Kxh3? d2 2.Kh4 Kg7.

ii) 3.a5? Rxf4 4.a6 Rf5 5.a7 Rg5+ and Rg8;, drawing.

iii) Blocking the 5th rank in the event of 4...Kxf5 5.a5. But Black has his own ideas.

iv) 7.a7? Rg3+ for stalemate.

There is no point to 7.f4? Rh4 8.f3 Rh3 9.Be1 d2 10.Bxd2 d3 11.Be1 Rg3+. Waiting play is no more effective: 7.Bf4? d2 8.Bxd2 d3 9.Bf4 Rh4 10.a7 d2 draw.

Releasing the stalemate with 7.Bg5? likewise fails: 7...fxg5! and not 7...hxg5?

v) d2 8.Bxd2 d3 9.f4 Rh4 10.f3, and now that h6 is available for bK the stalemate has evaporated.

"The Pervakov trademark - horse-power and energy. The author somehow finds a way to maximise a theme, and he does so again here, in this, no question, interesting study."

No 11517 A.Kotov (Priozersk)

"The diagram presages something romantic! Clearly quick action is in order, for if 1.Bd6+? Ka7 2.axb7 Qe8+ 3.Kb4 Kxb7. 1.a7+ Qxa7/i 2.Bd6+ Ka8 3.Rc8+ Qb8 4.Rxb8+ (Bxb8? Bg1;) Ka7 5.Bf3/ii gxf3 6.Rg8/iii Bg1 7.Bb8+ Ka8 8.Bxf4+ Ka7 9.Bb8+ Ka8 10.Bxg3+ Ka7 11.Bb8+ Ka8 12.Bh2+ Ka7 13.Bxg1 Rxc1 14.Rxc1 wins.

"The problem-like R-manoevre is beautiful, lying in wait for a sacrifice which has not taken place on the execution square. Something to stay in the mind!"

i) Kxa7 2.Ra4+ Kb8 3.Bd6+ Kc8 4.Bxg4+ Kd8 5.Rxa8 mate.


ii) With the threat 6.Rxb7+ Ka8 7.Rb8+ Ka7 8.Ra8 mate.

iii) This time the threat is a standard one: 7.Bb8+ Ka8 8.Bc7+ Ka7 9.Bxb6 mate.

No 11517 A.Kotov

2nd prize

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



b5b8 3450.16


5/10 Win

No 11518 A.Kuryatnikov and

E.Markov

3rd prize

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997




d1g5 0071.01

3/4 Draw

No 11518 A.Kuryatnikov and E.Markov "Here the flavour is of chamber music or lyric poetry. The position is almost level. All White has to do is give up his knight for the black pawn." But the dull 1.Bd4? loses to Bd5; followed by Be7; and Bf6;. So: 1.Sf7+ Kf6 2.Sd8/i c5 3.Kd2 Ke7 4.Kc3/ii Bd5 5.Sc6+ Bxc6 6.Kb3/iii Bb4 7.Kc4 Kd6 8.Bb8+ Ke6 9.Ba7 Bd5+ 10.Kb5 Kd6 11.Bb8+ Kd7 12.Ba7 Kd6 13.Bb8+ Kd7 14.Ba7 Kd6 15.Bb8+ Kd7 16.Ba7, an echoed positional draw, Bc6+ 17.Kc4 Kd6 18.Bb8+, and it's here-we-go-again time.

- i) 2.Sh6? Kg6 3.Be3 (Sg8,Bd5;) Bf8 4.Sg4 Bf3+ wins.
- ii) Not fearing 4...Kxd8. White would lose by playing 4.Bb6? Bd5 5.Kc3 Kd6, when the dark bishop attains the d8-h4 diagonal. iii) 6.Kc4? Kd6 7.Bb8+ Ke6 8.Ba7 Bd5+ 9.Kb5 c4 wins.

No 11519 V.Tarasiuk and S.Tkachenko
special prize
Shakmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



h2g5 0342.11

5/4 Win

No 11519 V.Tarasiuk and S.Tkachenko (Ukraine) "All White has to do is swap his pawn for the black rook! But before this he must make his knights clasp hands. So, let's try 1.hSf7+ Kf4, and 2.Se6+ Kg4 3.Sd6 Rc2+ 4.Bg2 Ra2 5.Sc5 Bd3 draws, or 2.a7 Rc2+ 3.Kg1 Rc1+ 4.Kf2 Rc2+, and White has to rest content with repetition, seeing that 5.Ke1? is met by the murderous Ke3 6.Kf1 (Kd1,Rb2;) Rc1+ 7.Kg2 Be4+." The right way: 1.dSf7+ Kf4/i 2.a7 Rc2+/ii 3.Kg1/iii Rc1+ 4.Kf2 Ra1/iv 5.a8Q Rxa8 6.Bxa8 Be4 7.Bxe4/v f5/vi 8.Sg5 fxe4 (Kxg5;Sxf5) 9.Sh3+ Ke5 10.Sg4+ and after 11.Se3, when the Troitzky scissors-grip wrings out the victory.

- i) Bxf7 2.Sxf7+ Kg6 3.Sd6 Rh8+ 4.Kg1 wins.
- ii) Be4 3.Bxe4 Kxe4 4.Sd6+ and 5.Sxc8.
- iii) 3.Kh3? Rc3+ 4.Kh4 Rc2 5.Sg4 Ra2 6.a8Q Rxa8 7.Bxa8 Bxf7 draw.

iv) The clue to the precise key move (1.dSf7+!) is that if instead Rc2+ 5.Ke1 Ke3 6.Sg4+ can be followed by 7.a8Q.

v) Frankly expecting a Troitzky win after Kxe4 8.Sd6+ and 9.Sf5+. However, Black brings his counterplay to a climax with his next move.

vi) For stalemate after a bishop move. But what if White takes advantage of the tempo offered by the imminent 8...fxe4, to leave the pawn blocked in the winning zone, for instance with 8.Sg4? Well,

8...fxe4 9.Se3 achieves the desired end - but for Black, because it's stalemate again, and in the centre of the board.

"A study to grace any tourney. So why not the first prize, and only a 'special'? There's a story to tell. The study participated in the 5.WCCT but was ruled out in the judging because of an anticipation. Well, the judge P.Joita, well known in study circles, has a right to his opinion, and on top of this a thematic tourney makes its own demands on purity in realising the idea. But let us look at the matter from the strictly aesthetic standpoint. Here are the two finales - first the present example, and second the anticipation.

f2f4 0012.01 e4f7h6.f5 4/2.

V.Yakimchik ()

d5d7 0036.10 e5b7d2.d4 2/4.

"The former is clearly a reversal of the latter. But there is one small difference - the positioning of one of the white knights has miraculously transformed the situation, for all of a sudden the surprising possibility of a Troitzky family position intrudes, not after just 2 moves as in the try (leading to the stalemate in the Yakimchik) but, due to a curious and far from obvious 'feint', after 4 moves! How absurd!


"To my mind this is a perfectly good justification for the present joint study's existence in its own right as something original. But to award it first prize would have risked calling down on myself the

obloquy of those not concurring with my reasoning. So, let's have the opinion of the readership. Reactions, please!"

No 11520 V.Katsnelson and K.Pochtarev

1st honourable mention

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



e7h7 0710.42

7/5 Win

No 11520 V.Katsnelson and K.Pochtarev (St Petersburg)


1.Bf5+ Rxf5 2.g4 Re5+ 3.Kf6 hRg5 4.Rh3+ Kg8 5.c4 b5 6.a4 bxa4 7.bxa4 Rxc4 8.Kxe5 Rxc4 9.Ra3 Rd4 10.a5 Rd8 11.a6 Kf7 12.a7 wins.

"The starting position is very natural indeed. The discovery of such a unique win for White when Black is a whole rook ahead is happy indeed. It is unfortunate that the second half of the solution demonstrates the win in a technical manner, somewhat marring the overall impression."

No 11521 A.Stavrietsky 1.Rf6 Rh4+ 2.Kg1 Ba7+ 3.b6 Bxb6+ 4.Rxb6 Rh1+ 5.Kxh1 f2 6.Sc2+ bxc2 7.Rb3+ Ka2 8.Rb1 cxb1Q+ 9.Bxb1+ Kxb1 10.Kg2 draw.


"What impresses here, I would say, is the non-stop play by both sides from start to finish. A merry piece!"

No 11521 A.Stavrietsky
2nd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



h2a3 0444.22 6/6 Draw

No 11522 V.Kondratev
3rd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997




f2e8 3104.11 4/4 Win

No 11522 V.Kondratev 1.Rb7
Qa2+ 2.Kg3 Qa3+ 3.Kg4 Qa4+
4.Kg5 Qa5+ 5.Kg6 Sd7 6.h8Q+
Sf8+ 7.Qxf8+ Kxf8 8.Rb8+ Ke7
9.Sc6+ K- 10.Sxa5 wins.
"Elegant. A known systematic
movement (by two pieces) leads to
a situation where bQ is caught on a
fork by a white knight lost to view

in the course of play."

No 11523 Karen Sumbatyan
4th honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



g3h7 3102.14 5/6 Draw

No 11523 Karen Sumbatyan
(Moscow) 1.Rh5+ Qxh5 2.Sf6+
Kh8 3.Sxh5 h2 4.Kxh2 b4 5.Sxb4
d2 6.Sd5 d1Q 7.dSf6 Qf3 8.Kg1
Qh3 9.Sf4 Qf3 10.S4h5 drawn.


"We know many a study where a
queen fights against knights that
shut in the king in a corner, setting
up a zugzwang to shatter the
positional draw. Here the composer
has given us a position where one
of the knights has the temerity to
get away with barking at the queen,
in such a manner that the opponent
has to concede the positional
draw."

No 11524 Gregor Slepyan
(Belarus) 1.Sg2+ Sxg2 2.Bg3+,
with:
- Ke2 3.Bxh4 Sxh4 4.Kxh2 Sf6
5.Kg3 Sf3 6.Kf4 Kf2 stalemate, or
- Kf1 3.Bxh4 Sxh4 4.Kxh2 Sf6
5.Kg3 Sg2 6.Kf3 Kg1 7.Kg3 Kh1
8.Kh3 Se1 9.Kg3 Sg2 10.Kh3 Kg1
11.Kg3 Kf1 12.Kf3, positional

draw.

"An artful synthesis of variations (stalemate and positional draw) based on the special peculiarity of the h8 square when the pawn is on f5 with respect to the Troitzky line. If only the introduction had been more successful."


No 11524 Gregor Slepian
5th honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



h1e1 0317.11

4/5 Draw

No 11525 S.Sudakov
special honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



h4h2 0013.21

4/3 Win

No 11525 S.Sudakov 1.Kg4, with:
- Sxa2 2.h4 Sc3 3.h5 Se4 4.h6
Sf6+ 5.Kf5 Sh7 6.Kg6 Sf8+ 7.Kg7
Se6+ 8.Kf6 Sf8 9.Ke7 Sh7 10.Kd6
Kg3 11.Kc5 Kf4 12.Kb5 Kg5

13.Kxa5 Kxh6 14.Kb5/i Sf6/ii
15.Kc6 Sg4 16.a5 Se5+ 17.Kb5 Sf7
18.Kc5 wins, or

- Sxa4 2.h4 Sc5 3.h5 Sd7 4.h6
Sf8 5.Bd5/iii a4 6.Bc6 a3 7.Bd5
wins.


i) 14.Kb6? Sf8 15.Kc6 Se6 16.a5
Sd4+ 17. Kb6 Sf5 18.a6 Sd6 draw.

ii) Sf8 15.a5 Se6 16.Kb6 wins.

iii) 5.Kf5? Kg3 6.Kf6 Kh4 7.Kg7
Kh5 8.Bb3 Kg5 9.Bf7 a4 10.Bc4
Kh5 11.Ba2 Kg5 12.Bf7 a3 13.Ba2
Kh5 14.Bb3 Kg5 15.Bf7 Kf5
16.Kxf8 a2 17.Bxa2 Kg6 draw.

"This special honour is for the attempt to combine the uncombinable. Two not quite new theoretical positions with study-like finesses and with quite different material arise immediately after the first move when Black is faced with a tricky choice."

No 11526 V.Shupletsov
1st commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



c1c4 3120.12


5/4 Win

No 11526 V.Shupletsov 1.Bf7+
Kc3 2.Be1+ Kd3 3.Bg6+ Ke2
4.Bh5+ Kd3 5.d8Q Qxg1 6.Qa5
Qe3+ 7.Kd1 g1Q 8.Qf5+ Qe4
9.Be2+ Ke3 10.Qf2+ Qxf2 11.Bd2

mate.

"A most rare pure mate, in the board's centre with two active self-blocks by black queens! It's all heading for honours, technically speaking, except that at every step we sense the author's perspiration. Mating studies, especially those ending up with a mid-board finale, are hellishly hard to compose. And it is always vexing when the introductory play is at odds with the curtain, which is, ideally speaking, essentially a matter of pure aesthetics."

No 11527 V.Kovalenko
2nd commendation Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



d6g7 3201.10


5/2 Win

No 11527 V.Kovalenko (Russia)
1.Rh2 Qxa2 2.Rg3+ Kf6 3.Rf3+ Kg5 4.Rg2+ Kh4 5.Rf4+ Kh5 6.Rh4+ Kxh4 7.Rh2+, with:
- Kg4 8.f3+, or
- Kg5 8.f4+, winning.

"A highly curious and beautiful idea. With the first move a white rook sets up an ambush behind the white pawn. On move 5 it transpires that the other white rook interferes with a simple win of the

queen by discovered attack. And so we understand White's glee at divesting himself of the superfluous burden."

No 11528 V.Shupletsov
3rd commendation Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



d1f1 0042.14

5/6 Win

No 11528 V.Shupletsov 1.Bd3+ Kg1 2.S6e5 Bxd3 3.Sf3+ Kf1 4.Sd2+ Kg1 5.Ke1 Be4 6.Sxe4 h1B 7.Sg3 hxg3 8.h4 gxh4 9.Ke2 h3 10.Se5 Kh2 11.Sf3 mate.


"A pleasant study on the stalemate theme. Promotion to promotion to bishop to secure a draw is an unlucky guest in the study palace. It is all the greater consolation when White's defeat of the stalemate culminates in a pure mate by the remaining solitary knight."

No 11529 Sergei Osintsev (Ekaterinburg) 1.Sf2+ Kh4 2.a7 Bxa7 3.Bxd6 Rd5 4.b8Q Bxb8 5.Bxb8 Rd2+ 6.Ka1, with:
- Rxf2 7.Bg3+ Kxg3 stalemate, or
- Bd5 7.Bg3+ Kxg3 8.Se4+ Bxe4 stalemate, again!

"A study with twin stalemates. I think that the remarks applied to


the 1st commendation can be repeated here. In support of this we draw the reader's attention to the study by Bazlov that took 7th prize in the Selivanov-30 jubilee tourney. The results of that contest were published while we were working on the present award. The theme is the same, and the finale practically identical, but so naturally and tastefully accomplished!"

No 11529 Sergei Osintsev
4th commendation Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



b2h3 0374.20 5/5 Draw

No 11530 G.Nekhaev
5th commendation Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997



a5e4 0411.02 4/4 Draw

No 11530 G.Nekhaev 1.Rh6 h1Q
2.Bg6+ Kf3 3.Rxh1 Rxh1 4.Kb4 b2

5.Kc3 b1Q 6.Sh4+ Kg4 7.Bxb1
Rxb1 8.Sg6 Kf5 9.Se7+ Ke6
10.Sg6 Kf5 11.Se7+ positional
draw.


"A study with adequately cerebral content and subtle play, but otherwise irritatingly insignificant."

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998

The provisional award of this informal tourney was published in *Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia* No.28 and was judged by Oleg Pervakov. Text: "... while quantity was satisfactory quality left something to be desired. In the hunt for complexity and beauty some composers are at risk of making themselves hostages to gazing at the allurements of mirages"

46 studies entered by 27 composers.

No 11531 Nikolai Kralin
1st prize
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



b6a1 0711.01 4/4 Win
No 11531 Nikolai Kralin (Moscow)
1.Bg7+ Rb2+/i 2.Bxb2+ Kb1
3.Ka7/ii c1Q 4.Sa3+ Ka2 5.Bxc1
Rc3 6.Bb2, with:

- Rc5 7.Sb1 Ra5+ 8.Kb8 (Kb6? Rh5;) Kxb1 9.Bc3+ and 10.Bxa5, or

- Rc6 7.Sb5 Kxb2 8.Sd4+ and 9.Sxc6, with a similar line on 6...Rc8.

i) Kb1 2.Sd2+ Kc1 3.Sxf3 gives White a win, on the following lines: Ra3/iii 4.Sd4 Kd1 5.Rf7 Rc3/iv 6.Bh6 Ke1 7.Re7+ Kd1 8.Rg7 Ke1 9.Be3 Rxe3 10.Sxc2+ and 11.Sxe3, sweeping the last black pieces from the board.

ii) "Now wK has to make a sensible move to some square on the a-file, so as (after 3...b1Q) to set up a 'draughts' tactic with 4.Sa3+ Rxa3+ 5.Bxa3+ and 6.Bxc1. We can try approaching bK, with:

3.Ka5? c1Q 4.Sa3+, but Ka2 5.Bxc1 Rc3 6.Bb2 Rc5+ 7.Kb4 Rc3 - a counterpunch of deep cunning overlooked by most of the solvers in the Russian solving championship: the rook is not for taking because of stalemate, and Rb3+; must be parried. There remains only 8.Ka5 Rc5+ 9.Ka4 Rc6/v 10.Kb5 Rc5+ 11.Ka6 Rc6+ 12.Ka7 Ra6+ 13.Kb8 Ra8+ 14.Kc7 Rc8+ 15.Kxc8 stalemate, the alternative being 15.Kd6 Rb8. A really great try with deeply buried point 7...Rc3!!"

iii) 3...Rb2+ 4.Bxb2+ Kxb2 5.Sd1.

iv) 5...c1Q 6.Rf1+ Kd2 7.Bh6+ Kd3 8.Bxc1. Or 5...Rg3 6.Rf1+ Kd2 7.Bh6+ Kd3 8.Rf3+ Rxf3 9.Sxf3.

v) 9...Rc8? 10.Sb5 Ra8+ 11.Sa7 wins.


"The loose-limbed starting-point,

imaginative play by both sides, the embellishment with sharp collisions of batteries, and above all the convoluted conspiratorial try - everything here gladdens the eye."

No 11532 Nikolai Ryabinin

2nd prize

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



a7h6 0710.41

7/4 Win

No 11532 Nikolai Ryabinin

(Zherdevka) "wR must shift, but where to - c8, d8 or e8? We can rule out f8, but if we accept the first move the alternatives must take their turn." 1.Rd8/i Rxb7+ 2.Ka8 R7b4 (Rf7;Rd1) 3.Rd7 Rb8+ 4.Ka7 R8b4 5.Rd6 Rb7+ 6.Ka6 R7b4 7.f7+ Kh5 8.Rd5 Rb6+ 9.Ka5 Rb7 10.f6+, with:

- Kh6 11.g8S+ Kg6 12.f8S+ Kf7 13.Sh6+ (Rd7+? Kxg8;) Kxf8 (Ke8;f7+) 14.Rd8 mate, or

- Kh4 11.Rd4+ Kh5 (Kh3;Rd3+) 12.Ka4/ii Rb1 13.Rd5+ Kh4

14.f8Q, covering a3 and avoiding 14.Rb5? R1xb5 15.f8Q Rb1 16.Qc5 Ra1+ 17.Qa3 Ra7+ 18.Kb5 R1xa3 19.g8Q R7a5+ 20.Kc4 R5a4+,

when it becomes clear that had wR been on c8 (instead of the selected d8 on move 1) the relative move

"14.Rc5" would obstruct wQf8's path to a3.

i) "The Golden Mean!"


ii) 12.Rb4? Ra3+ 13.Ra4 aRb3.

"Geometrically speaking a powerful and fascinating mechanism. There is a dissonance arising from the contrasting variation-pair. But there's always a trace of tar somewhere in the honeypot. No doubt at all, such a complex idea demanded exceptional mastery and technique from the composer - who duly supplied it!"

No 11533 Gherman Umnov

3rd prize

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



f7g2 0430.22

4/5 Win

No 11533 Gherman Umnov

(Podolsk) 1.Kg8 Bf6/i 2.Rf7/ii Be5 3.Rg7+ Kf3 4.h8Q Rh2 5.Rf7+ Ke4 6.Rf4+ Bxf4 7.Qd4+ Kf3 8.Qxf4+, winning bB and the 'game'.

i) Ba1(Bc3) 2.Rg7+ Kh1 3.h8Q+ Rh2 4.Rg1+ and 5.QxB. Or Kf3 2.Kxh8 Rg2 3.Re5 a5 4.Rxd5 a4 5.Ra5 Rg4 6.e4. So we see why Black chooses f6 for his bishop.

ii) 2.Rg7+? Kh1 3.h8Q+ Rh2 4.Rg1+ Kxg1 5.Qxf6 Rg2+,


perpetual check.

"A chiselled study with light construction exhibiting echo-sacrifices of wR in both try and solution. If not on the grand scale, nevertheless the taste is just right!"

No 11534 Sergei Radchenko

special prize

Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



d7h8 0400.01

2/3 Draw

No 11534 Sergei Radchenko

(Rostov-on-Don) "This R-ending with a trivial look about it conceals a surprise or two." 1.Rg4/i Ra7+/ii 2.Ke6 h3 3.Rg1 Ra5 4.Rg4/iii Ra7 5.Rg1 Ra5 6.Rg4 Rh5 7.Kf7 h2 8.Rg8+ Kh7 9.Rg7+ Kh6 10.Rg6+, perpetual check.

i) 1.Rg1? h3/iv 2.Ke6 h2 3.Rh1 Rh5 and Black wins easily.


ii) bR targets the h7 square for himself. If Rh5 2.Ke6 h3 3.Kf7.

iii) wK is cut off from bP. 4.Kf7? Kh7 5.Rg4 Kh6. And no better is 4.Rg3? Rh5 5.Kf4 Rh4, when bK comes out into the centre of the ring.

iv) 1...Rh5? 2.Ke6 h3 3.Kf7, and h2 4.Rg8+ with perpetual check, or Rh4 4.Kg6 drawing easily.

"An original angle on earlier work by Mesman (1959) and Kondratev/Kopnin (cf. No.84 in FIDE Album 1986-88)."

No 11535 Konstantin Osul
1st honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



e8c8 0047.21 5/5 Draw


No 11535 Konstantin Osul (Moscow) 1.h8Q Sxh8 2.Bxa2 fSg6 3.Sf3/i Bxf3 (Bg2;Sd4) 4.Bd5 Be2 5.Bc4 Bf3 (Sf7;Be6+) 6.Bd5 Bh5 7.Be6+/ii Kxc7 8.Bg4 Sf7 9.Kxf7 Se5+ 10.Kf6 Sxg4+ 11.Kg5, and the exchange of dagger-thrusts ends in White's favour.

i) There was no mistaking the threat 3...Bc6 mate. If 3.Be6+? Kxc7 4.Bd7 Bd5, and this time mate is inescapable.

ii) 7.Bf3? Sf7 8.Kxf7 Se5+ and 9...Sxf3.

"A rather special 'anti-Gurvich' (cf. (ii)). White keeps his cool right up to the finish when the sharp tactical exchange ends in an honourable peace."

No 11536 N.Kralin
2nd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



b1b4 3243.22 6/6 Win

No 11536 N.Kralin 1.Rb5+ Kxb5 2.Bc6+ Kxc6 3.d8S+ Kd6 4.e8S+ Ke7 5.Rxf2 Kxe8 6.Se6 Be5 7.Re2 with:

- Sd3/i 8.Sc5 Sxc5 9.Rxe5+ and 10.Rxc5, or

- Sf3 8.Sg5 Sxg5/ii 9.Rxe5+ and 10.Rxg5, winning.

i) Bg3 8.Sxd4+ Kf7 9.Sf5.

ii) d3 9.Re3 Sd2+ 10.Kc1 Sc4

11.Re4 b5 12.Sf3 wins.

"Two underpromotions, homogeneous echo-variations, ebullient play... Just a pity that bQ takes on a statist role of a fat lump of bait."

No 11537 David Gurgenidze (Georgia) This composer's favourite material makes another appearance. 1.Rd3+/i Ke6 2.Re4+ Kf5 3.Rxe8 Rg1+/ii 4.Kh6 b2 5.Rf3+ Kg4 6.eRf8/iii Kh4 7.R8f4+ Rg4 8.Rf5 Rg6+/iv 9.Kxg6 b1Q 10.Kh6 Qb6+ 11.Rf6 wins.

i) 1.Rd4+? Kc7 2.Rxe8 Rg1+ 3.Kh6 b2 draw.


ii) b2 4.Rf3+ Kg4 5.Rb3 and it's all over.

iii) 6.Rg8+? Kxf3 7.Rxg1 h4 8.Kg5 h3 9.Kh4 h2 10.Rb1 Ke3 11.Kg3 Kd3 draw.

iv) Rg8 9.R3f4+ Rg4 10.Rxh5+. No better is Rb4 9.Rf4+ Rxf4 10.Rxf4+ Kg3 11.Rb4 h4 12.Kg5.

"A study in the traditional Georgian style: elegance, supported by translucent and digestible variations, with sharp and pointed play. And yet, and yet... There are more significant productions than this in the grandmaster's output with the given material."


No 11537 David Gurgenidze
3rd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



g7d7 0800.02

3/5 Win

No 11538 Pavel Arestov
4th honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



e7e4 0402.44

8/6 Win

No 11538 Pavel Arestov
(Krasnogorsk) 1.f3+ Ke3/i 2.Ra3 Rxf7+/ii 3.Ke6/iii Re7+ 4.Kf6 Rf7+ 5.Kg6 Rg7+ 6.Kxg7/iv a1Q (d1Q;Sb2+) 7.Rxa1 d1Q 8.Sb4 Qd2/v 9.Re1+ Qxe1/vi 10.Sc2+ Kd2 11.Sxe1 wins.

i) Kd5 2.Rc5 mate. Or Kf5 2.Rc5+ Kg6 3.Sf4+ Kh6 4.Rh5+ Kg7 5.f8Q mate.

ii) "Stalemate counterplay. At some point bR will have to be taken, but on which square exactly?"

iii) 3.Kd6(Kd8)? a1Q 4.Rxa1 Kxd3 5.Sh3 Ke2 draw.


iv) "wK forges the last link in the mating net." [Yes, AJR knows it's a mixed metaphor.]

v) Qxa1 9.Sc2+. Or Qb3 9.Ra3 Qxa3 10.Sc2+.

vi) Kf4 10.Sd5+, and Kg5 11.Re5+ Kh4 - note wK on g7! - 12.Sf6 Qg2+ 13.Kh6, or Kf5 11.Se7+ Kg5 12.Re5+ Kf4(Kh4) 13.Sg6 mate.

"The broad spectrum of study ideas here - mate, stalemate, domination, forks - unfortunately do not benefit from the over-accentuated finale."

No 11539 A.Stavrietsky
5th honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998




g1g8 3203.30

6/3 Win

No 11539 A.Stavrietsky (Tambov)
 Both sides have powerful threats.
 1.Rg7+ Kh8 2.Rf8+ Qxf8 3.Rh7+
 Kg8 4.g7 Qxf2+ 5.Kxf2 Sg4+
 6.Kg3 Kxh7 7.Kxg4 Kxh6 8.g8R,
 "the final flag-wave in this un-
 complicated but somehow mis-
 chievous roller-coaster of a study!"

No 11540 Vitaly Kovalenko
 special honourable mention
 Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998




c1g8 0000.54 6/5 Win

No 11540 Vitaly Kovalenko
 (Bolshoi kamen) 1.f3/i c3 2.Kb1,
 with:
 - f4 3.f4 Kf8 4.f7/ii Kg7 5.f5
 Kf8 6.f6z a2+ 7.Kxa2 c2 8.g7+
 Kxf7 9.Kb2 wins, or
 - f4 3.g7/iii Kf7 4.g5 Kg8 5.g6/iv
 a2+ 6.Kxa2 c2 7.f7+ Kxg7 8.Kb2
 wins.
 i) 1.f4? c3 2.Kb1 f4 3.f5 Kf8
 4.f7 Kg7 5.f6+ Kf8, with a reci-zug
 to please Black rather than White:
 6.g7+ Kxf7. And if 1.f4? c3
 2.Kb1 f4 - naturally!
 ii) 4.f5? Kg8 5.f7+ Kg7, and
 having the move is no help to
 White.
 iii) 3.g5? Kf8 4.g7+ Kf7 5.g6+
 Kg8. It's getting familiar.

iv) Echo. The last few moves are
 familiar.
 "Prokop's old idea shown here with
 pawns only."

No 11541 V.Kovalenko
 commendation
 Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



d7a8 1303.13 3/6 Win

No 11541 V.Kovalenko 1.Kc8
 Ka7 2.Qc7+ Ka6 3.Kb8 b4 4.Qc6+
 Ka5 5.Ka7 (Kb7? h1Q;) b3 6.Qc5+
 Ka4 7.Ka6 (Kb6? Sd5+;) b2
 8.Qc4+ Ka3 9.Ka5 b1Q 10.Qc5+
 Kb2 11.Qc3 mate.

"A systematic manoeuvre ends in
 checkmate, and there are two active
 self-blocks. A good development of
 Mouterde's 1922 study."

No 11542 A.Kuryatnikov and
 E.Markov (Saratov) 1.b7 Kxb7
 (g1Q;b8Q) 2.hxg7 g1Q 3.g8Q
 Qh2+ 4.Kg7 Qg3+ 5.Kxf7 Qxg8+
 6.Kxg8/i Kc6 7.Kf7 Kd7 8.Kg6/ii
 Kxd6 9.Kf6/iii e5 10.Kf5/iv Kd5
 11.b3 b4 12.cxb4 (c4+? Kd4;) Kd4
 13.b5 e4 14.b6 exf3/v 15.b7 f2
 16.b8Q f1Q 17.Qe5+ Kd3/vi
 18.Qb5+ wins.
 i) "Another P-ending starts here."
 ii) 8.Kf6? Kxd6 holds, for instance:

9.Kg5 Kc5 10.Kxf4 Kc4 11.Ke5 Kb3 12.Kxe6 Kxb2 13.f4 Kc3. Or 9.b3 e5 10.Kg5 Kc5 11.Kg4 Kd6 12.Kf5 Kd5. Or 9.Kg6 Kc5 10.b3 e5. So White must improve his precision.

iii) The reci-zug (see (ii)) is now in White's favour.


iv) 10.Kg5? Kd5 11.Kf5 b4 12.cxb4 Kd4 13.b5 e4 14.b6 exf3 15.b7 f2 16.b8Q f1Q 17.Qe5+ Kc4, and a draw because wPb2 has not shifted to b3.

v) e3 15.b7 e2 16.b8Q e1Q 17.Qxf4+.

vi) What has happened to the c4 square?

"A complex pawn study (whose analysis failed to fit onto an A4 sheet despite the authors' dense handwriting). But is the first phase necessary? In my opinion such extra analysis did not work to the study's advantage in the award."


No 11542 A.Kuryatnikov and E.Markov
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



h8c6 0000.66

7/7 Win

No 11543 V.Kondratev
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



h8c3 0017.01

3/4 Draw

No 11543 V.Kondratev (Ivanovsk reg.) 1.Bd6 Sf6 2.Sf5 e2 3.Bb4+/i Kxb4 4.Sd4 e1S 5.Kg7 Sf6d7 6.Kf7/ii Sd3 7.Sc6+/iii Kc5 8.Sb8 S3e5+ 9.Ke8(Kg8) draws.

i) 3.Se3? Sg6+ 4.Kg7 Se8+ 5.Kxg6 Sxd6 wins.

ii) 6.Sc6+? Kb5 7.Se5 Se6+ 8.Kf7 dSc5 9.Sd7 Sd8+ 10.Ke8 cSb7 wins.


iii) 7.Se6? S3e5+ 8.Ke7 fSg6+ 9.Kd6 Kc4 wins.

"A fresh nuance in the fashionable SSS vs S endgame."

No 11544 A.Kuryatnikov and E.Markov (Saratov) Black threatens to cut off wK from bP by playing Bf6;. 1.Kd4 Bf6+ 2.Kc5 c3 3.Kb4/i Be6 (else Rc8) 4.Rb7 c2 (Be5;Rb5) 5.Rc7 Be7+ (Bf5;Kb3) 6.Ka4 Bg4 7.Kb3 (Rxc2? Bd1;) Bd1 8.Kb2 Bf6+ 9.Kc1 Bg5+ 10.Kb2, and Black must concede the draw by repetition.

i) An ambush 3.Rc8? Be6 4.Rc7 Be5 5.Rc6, leads nowhere pleasant after: c2 6.Kb4 Bd6+ 7.Ka5 Bf5.


No 11544 A.Kuryatnikov and
E.Markov
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



e3h5 0160.01

2/4 Draw

No 11545 V.Kondratev
commendation
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998



h6c1 0433.10


3/4 Win

No 11545 V.Kondratev (Gasvrilov
Posad) 1.d8Q Be3+ 2.Kh7 (Kh5?
Rxf8); Sf6+ 3.Qxf6 Rh2+ 4.Kg7
Rg2+ 5.Kf7 Rf2. Ферзь отыран?
Нет, ещё не вечер! Which one
guesses means 'You may have won
the queen, but it's too early to
celebrate!' 6.Rg1+ Kd2 7.Rg2
Rxf8 8.Qb2+ and 9.Qxf2 wins.
"Odd little piece of geometry."

Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993

This informal tourney was judged
by M.Hlinka (Slovakia). The
provisional award was published in
Shakhmatnaya poezia No.5,
"1995-96". Text: "... A Grin study
was disqualified for prior
publication in *The Problemist*." 25
studies published by 22 composers.
Remarks: this chess composition
magazine appears to have arisen
from an eponymous section of the
Urals-based larger, games-centred
(other board and card games were
included) magazine *Intellectual
Games*, the first number of which
carried the date vi1990. Neither
magazine is securely founded, and
neither is regular.

No 11546 V.Kondratev
1st prize
Shakhmatnaya poezia 1993



e5h8 0110.02


3/3 Win

No 11546 V.Kondratev
(Chelyabinsk) 1.Ke6, with:
- e1Q 2.Be5+ Kg8 3.Rg7+ Kf8
4.Rb7 Kg8 5.Rb8+ Kh7 6.Kf5
wins, seeing that 'Qb1;' is not an
option, or
- f2 2.Be5+ Kg8 3.Rg7+ Kh8

4.Rf7+ Kg8 5.Rxf2 e1Q 6.Rh2 wins.

"A fresh 6-man study with exquisite moves by wK and wR, leading to mate. It develops a 1928 study by Réti with the same material, but the original stalemate try is replaced by an echo variation."

No 11547 A.Golubev
2nd prize
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993



b8a5 3110.33 6/5 Win

No 11547 A.Golubev (Yaroslav region) 1.Kb7 Qb4+/i 2.Rxb4 cxb4 3.Bf3 e2 4.Bxe2 a3 5.c3 b3 6.axb3 a2 7.b4+ Ka4 8.Bd1+ Kb5 9.b3 a1Q 10.Be2 mate.


i) David Blundell indicates: Qxc2 2.b4+, with:

- axb3 3.Ra4 mate, or
- cxb4 3.Rg5+ and mate.

"White prepares mate to meet Black's counterplay. It is beautiful how all the men move to their finale destinations. Pudovkin's effort in 1983 (in *Schach*) is significantly improved upon."

No 11548 I.Zamotaev and V.Kovalenko

3rd prize
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993




g1h3 3072.01 4/5 Draw

No 11548 I.Zamotaev and V.Kovalenko (Primorsky krai) 1.Bd7+ Bg4 2.Sxf4+ Kg3 3.Se2+ Kxf3 4.Bc6+ Qxc6 5.Sd4+ Kg3 6.Se2+ (Sxc6? h3;) Kh3 7.Sf4+ Kg3 8.Se2+ Kf3 9.Sd4+ Kf4 10.Sxc6 Kg3 11.Sd4 h3 12.Kh1 h2 13.Se2+ Bxe2 stalemate, not 13.Sf5+? Kh3 14.Sh4 Bd1 15.Sg2 Kg3 16.Sh4 Be2, and 17.Sf5+ Kh3 18.Sh4 Bf1 wins, or 17.Sg2 Bd3 18.S- Be4+ 19.Sg2 Bxg2 mate.

"An even higher placing awaited this study, were it not for the clumsy intro."


No 11549 V.Romasko (Ukraine) 1.h8Q+ Qxh8 2.Sd7+ Kg8 3.Rb8+ Kg7 4.Rxh8 Bc4+ 5.Kd6 Kxh8 6.Se5 Rf6+ 7.Ke7 Re6+ 8.Kf8 Rf6+ 9.Ke7 Re6+ 10.Kf8, positional draw.

No 11549 V.Romasko
1st honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993



e6f8 3431.10 4/4 Draw

No 11550 V.Kovalenko
2nd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993




c5a5 0042.01 4/3 Win

No 11550 V.Kovalenko 1.Sc3 Bb1
2.Sxb1 a2 3.Sd2 Ka4 4.Se5 a1Q
5.Bc2+ Ka3 6.eSc4+ Ka2 7.Bb3
mate.

"Highly elegant! A pure mate with
active self-block of a1. It is an
improvement on the same
composer's 1hm in the 1991 Bron
MT."

No 11551 V.Kovalenko
3rd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993




g3h6 0444.22 6/6 Win

No 11551 V.Kovalenko 1.g8S+
(Rxh5+? Sxh5+;) Sxg8 2.Rxh5+
Kg6 3.Bd3+ e4 4.Sxe4/i Rxc4+
5.Kxc4 Sh6+ 6.Kh3 Kxh5 7.Sg3
mate.

i) 4.Bxe4? Kf6 5.Bd5 Rxc4+
6.Kxc4 Sh6+ 7.K- Bxd2 draw.
"Romantic."

No 11552 S.Rumyantsev
4th honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993




f8g5 3141.11 5/4 Draw

No 11552 S.Rumyantsev (Omsk)
1.Se6+/i Kg4 2.Rg5+ Kh3 3.Bf1+
Kh2 4.Rxc6 Qh7 5.Sg5 Qxc6
6.Sf3+ Kh1 7.Bg2+ Kg2 8.Sh4+
draw.

i) 1.Se4?? Kxg4 2.Rg5+ Kf4
3.Rxg3 Qd8+ 4.Kg7 Qd4+ 5.Kh6
Qxe4 6.Rh3 Kg4 wins.

"It's no easy job for the solver to find 4...Qh7! The subsequent play including the fine 5.Sg5!! leads to a surprising stalemate."

No 11553 A.Almamedov
1st commendation
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993



d6f5 0040.44 6/6 Win


No 11553 A.Almamedov
(Azerbaijan) 1.e4+ Kg4 2.f3+
Kxh5 3.b8Q Bh2+ 4.f4 Bxf4+ 5.e5
Bxe5+ 6.Ke6 Bxb8 7.Kf5 h2 8.Bf3
mate.

"It's appealing that at the start W blocks the squares e4 and f3, so as to force bK onto h5. Then these pawns are sacrificed, freeing the f3 square for delivering checkmate."

No 11554 V.Nikitin (Borovichi)
1.h5 g5/i 2.f4 g4 3.Kg3 Ke3 4.Kh4
g3 (Kxf4;g3+) 5.Kxg3 Ke4 6.Kh4
Kxf4 7.g4 fxe4 stalemate.
i) gxf4 2.Kg3 Ke3 3.Kh4 Kf2
4.Kxh5 Kxg2 5.Kxh6 Kxf3 6.Kg7
Kg2. Draw.


"A pair of stalemates in this elegant P-ending."

No 11554 V.Nikitin (Borovichi)
2nd commendation
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993



f2d2 0000.44 5/5 Draw

No 11555 V.Vavilov
3rd commendation
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1993



f8c8 0032.12 4/4 Draw

No 11555 V.Vavilov (Chelyabinsk)
1.dxe4/i Bxh7 2.Kg7 Bxe4 3.Sa6,
with:

- bxa6 4.Kf6 a5 5.Ke5 a4 6.Kd4
a3 7.Kc3 Bd5 8.Kc2 Ba2 9.Kc3
Bc4 10.Kc2 a2 11.Kb2 draw, or
- b5 4.Kf6 Bh7 5.Ke5 Kb7 6.Sb4
Kb6 7.Kd4 Ka5 8.Kc3 draw.


i) 1.Sc6? bxc6 2.Sg5 exd3 3.Sf3 c5
4.Sd2 Be6 5.Ke7 c4 6.Sb1 d2
7.Sxd3 c3 wins.

"An excellent first effort: Réti theme with tries."

Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1998

The provisional award of this international tourney was published in *Shakhmatnaya poezia* No.12 Oct-Dec 1999 and was judged by Boris Gusev (Moscow). 9 studies published. judge's report: ".... unable to single out a prize-worthy sound and original entry ..."

No 11556 A.Manvelyan
1st honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1998




g1f6 0045.00 4/3 Win

No 11556 A.Manvelyan (Armenia)

1.Se4+ Ke5 (Kf5;eSg3+) 2.Sf2 (Sc5? Bd4+;) Kd4/i 3.Bxe1 Bc3 4.Sd2 Ke3 5.Sd1+ (fSe4? Bxd2;) Ke2 6.Sxc3+ Kxe1 7.Sf3 mate.
i) Sc2 3.Sd3+. Or Sf3+ 3.Kg2 Sh4+ 4.Kh3 Bd4 5.Sg4+ Kf4 6.Kxh4 wins.

"A light and airy pawnless 'aristocrat' with appealing harmonious play, arriving on the scene late in the day by several decades. The mate has been seen before more than once but the approach to it is new."

No 11557 E.Fomichov and V.Vinichenko
2nd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1998



flh1 0731.20 5/4 Win

No 11557 E.Fomichov and V.Vinichenko 1.Rh7+ Rh2/i 2.g7, with:

- Rxa3 3.Rxh2+ Kxh2 4.g8Q Rf3+ 5.Ke2 Rxf4 6.Ke3 Rf1 7.Qh7(Qh8)+ Kg2 8.Qg7+ Kh3 9.Ke2 wins, or
- Bh4 3.g8Q Rf2+ 4.Ke1 Rxf4+ 5.Rxh4+ Rxh4 6.Qd5+/ii Kh2 7.Qd2+ Kh1 8.Qd1 Rg7/iii 9.Kf2+ Kh2 10.Qd6+ Kh3 11.Qe6+ R7g4 12.Kf3 Kh2 13.Qxg4 Rxg4 14.Kxg4 wins.

i) Bh4 2.Rxh4+ Rh2 3.Sh3 wins.


ii) 6.Kf2? Rf7+ 7.Qxf7 Rf4+ 8.Qxf4 stalemate.

iii) Rh2 9.Qf3+ Rg2 10.Qh3+ Rh2 11.Qf1 mate. Or Rf4 9.Qd5+ Kh2 10.Qd2+ Kg3 11.Qe3+ wins.

"Out of the ordinary, so interesting. We opine that it arose from the Q vs RR domination position reached after 8.Qd1! after which the prior play gave birth to a Q vs RB domination. As a result on the one hand the content is enriched, on the other hand the overall effect is

laboured."

No 11558 S.Osintsev
1st commendation
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1998




g6d8 0304.21 4/4 Win

No 11558 S.Osintsev (Ekaterinburg) 1.b7 Rg5+ 2.Kh6 Rh5+ 3.Kg7 Rg5+ 4.Kf8 Rg8+ 5.Kxg8 Sf6+ 6.Kf7 Sxd7 7.Se6 mate.

"Another mating study with elegant play. But it is schematic, unrounded. Two pieces make all the running, the others are just witnesses."

No 11559 V.Kalashnikov
2nd commendation
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 1998



g5f7 0413.36 6/9 Draw

No 11559 V.Kalashnikov (Ekaterinburg) 1.Rd7+ Kf8 2.Rd8+

Kf7 3.Rd7+ Ke8 4.f7+ Kf8 5.Bxc7 Rg1+ 6.Kh4 Rh1+ 7.Kg5 Rg1+ 8.Kh4 Rg4+ 9.Kh3 Rg3+ 10.Kh2 Rxd3 11.Rxd3 b1Q 12.Rd7 Qc2+ 13.Kg1 Qb1+ 14.Kh2 Qc2+ 15.Kg1 draw.

"A solid enough study on the positional draw theme based on perpetual check - 4 of them as listed by the composer. But somehow warmth is lacking. There is not enough, well, hardly absurdity, but surely surprise."

ARTICLES

editor: John Roycroft




FOUR KNIGHTS BEAT THE QUEEN!

In 1913 Sackmann published *B1*.

B1 F.Sackmann

Münchner Zeitung, 1913




a8e6 3002.20 5/2 Win

1.f8S+ Kf6 2.g8S+ Kg7 3.S4f5+ Kxf8 4.Sxd6 wins.

B2 arrived on the scene many years later. We take it from No.11 of *Zadachy i etyudy* (1996).

B2 I.Bondar
special pr Simkhovich-100MT 1995



h3h1 1006.02 2/5 Draw
Not 1.Qf3? e1S 2.Qg3 g1Q 3.Qxe1
Sf2+ 4.Qxf2 Qg4 mate, but 1.Qc1+
g1S+ 2.Kg3 Sh2 3.Qb1 Sf1+ 4.Kf2
Sg4+ 5.Ke1, with:
- Sg3 6.Qe4+ Sxe4 stalemate, or
- Kg2 6.Qe4+ Sf3+ 7.Qxf3+ Kxf3
stalemate No.2.


Arising from these two studies is
the poser of how to evaluate the
struggle of four knights against the
queen.

The counter, "Don't they lose?"
meets with the riposte "No, they
must win!"

It seemed logical to me that united
knights must win, by analogy with
theory's assertion that four minor
pieces (consisting of the bishop pair
and two knights) will win.

This is corroborated by the ex-
periment of playing out B3 with
N.Aleiko of Gantsevichi as op-
ponent and the use of the Genius-2
chess program.


B3 I.Bondar
first publication



c8b5 4302.21 6/4 Win
1.Sd5 Rc3+ 2.Sxc3+ Kc6 3.Qxd6+
Qxd6 4.b8S+ Kb6 5.a8S+ Ka5
6.gSe4, after which, the knights
being united, they win. The plan is
for the knights to constrict the
black king to a corner. For
example:

c3a1 3009.00 ??c4d4d3b5 5/2.
- checkmate is imminent.

B4 N.Aleiko and I.Bondar
The Problemist (E757 xi1998)




a7c5 3002.20 5/2 Win
1.c7 Kb5+ 2.Ka8 (Kb8? Ka6;) Ka6
3.b8S+ Kb6 4.c8S+ Kc7 (Kb5;
SSSS vs. Q) 5.Se6+ Kxc8 6.Se7, a
pure mate with the three remaining
knights.

I.Bondar,
Belarus, 1999


In 1954 Shakhmaty v SSSR published a comment from A.Kakovin (Kadievka) all but accusing V.Yakhontov of plagiarism ("his 'creative' technique calls for censure"), adducing as evidence *K1* and *K2*.

K1 A.Troitzky, 1896



h7c8 0003.32 4/4 Draw
 1.f3 Se5 2.Kg7 Sxf3 3.Kxf6 g4
 4.Kf5 g3 5.Kg4 g2 6.Kh3 g1Q
 7.b7+ Kxb7 8.c8Q+ Kxc8
 stalemate.

K2 V.Yakhontov,
 Shakhmaty v SSSR 1950



b8e7 0003.21 3/3 Draw
 1.h6 Kf6 2.h7 Kg7 3.Kc7 b4 4.Kd6
 Sc3 5.Kc5 b3 6.Kb4 b2 7.Ka3 b1Q
 8.h8Q+ Kxh8 9.g7+ Kxg7
 stalemate.

In 1954 V.Korolkov defended Yakhontov in the following article.

In defence of a young study composer

by V.Korolkov

While making new discoveries Soviet study composers have also worked to improve and rework positions already in the public domain. It may happen even in the output of eminent native exponents that a fuller or more pointed expression can be devised, enriching the solution with new detail or bettering the construction. In recent years Z.Birnov in particular has proved to be a great master in reworking known ideas, positions by Troitzky, Kasparyan and others being massaged into a string of high quality compositions. This kind of work can be beneficial for new composers as well, providing them with the necessary skills, training them in a variety of styles, and contributing to their creative development.

Several years ago the young composer V.Yakhontov delighted us with *K2*, a reworking of a long familiar idea whose best expression hitherto had been by Troitzky. The first thing that strikes us about *K2* is its extreme economy. The composer has set this difficult idea in miniature form, with no more than six chessmen. But there is more. Despite the "wit and depth of the idea, the subtlety of its expression, and first class construction", as pointed out by V.Platov, Troitzky's study does suffer from a drawback, namely that in the play there is no link between the

chessmen on the king's wing and the position of the black king, nailed down as he is by the pair of white pawns. Yakhontov, however, not only shows such a content-connection but integrates it into the study's structure. Prepared by the prior play, this effect occurs with 4.Kd6!, when the white king threatens to approach the black king and his own pawns: in the event of 4...b3, the draw is to be had with 5.Ke7 b2 6.h8Q+ Kxh8 7.Kf7. Only after 4...Sc3 does the white king change his mind and chase the running black pawn. In earlier handlings of this theme (Troitzky's among them) the knight lands on its thematic stalemating square (where it is in the final position), by capturing a white piece or pawn, while in Yakhontov's case the knight has to move in order to support his own king (checkmate is threatened), in this way arriving on the c3 square without capture.

While not decrying Troitzky's achievement with *K1*, we have to acknowledge the creative success of the young composer who has succeeded in setting this known idea with utter unity and beautiful form. It is therefore with puzzlement that we read Kakovin's comment.


Over half a century later EG's editorial comment on this incident is that either young Yakhontov knew of the Troitzky study or he did not. If he did, then 'after Troitzky' should have been part of

the source, and he was at fault for the omission. If he did not, then he should have been encouraged for being able to outdo Troitzky from sheer natural talent. But in either event Kakovin's comment was inappropriate and unhelpful.

Picture (or 'figurative' to use a painter's term - the contrasting word is 'abstract') compositions, sometimes called 'scaccographic', tend to be heavyweight in appearance, lightweight in content. But they had better be sound, especially if they are dedications! Our fingers are resolutely crossed for this welcome contribution by the recently created FIDE international judge from Saratov.

THREE *PICTURE* STUDIES by Arkady Khait


Kh1 *Kommunist* (Saratov), 1983
dedicated to V.Evreinov
(for 75th birthday)



b4h7 0372.73 11/7 BTM Win
Kh1 1...Bd2+ 2.Kc5 Be3+ 3.Kd6
hxg3 4.cxb7 Bf4+/i 5.Ke7 Re3+

6.Kf8 h2/ii 7.b8Q h1Q 8.Se6 (for eSg5(fSg5)+) Rxe6 9.Qxf4 Re8+ 10.Kxe8 Qe4+ 11.Qxe4 Bxe4 12.Sg5+ wins.
 i) Bxa7 5.Sg5+ Kg8 6.Sxf3 h2 7.Sd5 h1Q 8.Se7+.
 ii) g2 7.b8Q g1Q 8.Se6 Rxe6 9.Qxf4 Qc5+ 10.Sd6 Qxd6+ 11.Qxd6 Rxd6 12.a8Q wins.

Kh2 Zarya molodozhna
 Saratov 1990
 dedicated to the singer
 Alla Pugachova




a5h7 0745.48 9/13 Win
Kh2 1.c8Q? bxc6. 1.Se7 g6 2.c8Q Bg7 3.Qg8+ Kh6 4.Qxf7 Rg5 5.Sg8+ Kh5 6.Qxg7 Kg4 7.Qxb7 a2 8.Sd2 Sxd2 9.Qh1 f3 10.Sxf6+ Kf4 11.Qh2+ Ke3 (Rg3;Qxd2+) 12.Re6+ Re4 13.Sd5+ Kd3 14.Sb4+ Kxc3 15.Sxa2+ Kc4 16.Qxd2 Rxe6 17.Bb3+ Kxb3 18.Sc1+ Kc4 19.Qd3+ Kxc5 20.Sb3 mate.

Kh3 1.b8Q Kg7 2.Qc7+ Kh6/i 3.Qd8 Kg7 4.Qe7+ Kg8 5.b7 g1Q+ 6.b6 Qg3 7.Rxb3 Qf4 8.Rxh3 Bxh3 9.Qxg5 Qf7 10.Qxg6+ Qxg6 11.b8Q+ Kh7 12.Qxh2 Bg2 13.Qe5 Bh1 14.h5 Qg2 15.Qc7+ Kh8 16.b7

Qg1+ 17.Qb6 Qg7 18.h6 Qf7 19.Qd4+ Kg8 20.Qg7+ Qxg7 21.hxg7 Bxb7 22.Kxb7 wins - you can extend the solution to the 25th move if you like.

i) Kf6 3.Qd6+ Kg7 (Kf5;Qd5+) 4.Qe7+ Kh6 5.Qxg5+ Kg7 6.Qe7+ Kh6 7.Qf6 Kh7 8.b7 g1Q+ 9.b6 Qg3 (h1Q;b8Q) 10.Rxg3 h1Q 11.Rxg3 Qxb7+ 12.Kxb7 Rxg3 13.Qf7+ Kh8 (Kh6;Qf4+) 14.Ka7 wins.

Kh3 dedicated to 'everyone with a 25 to celebrate!'
first publication




a7h6 0730.55 7/9 Win

Rare material - or 'eye-openers'

by Aleksandr Manyakin
 Lipetsk (Russia), 1999
 Rook and bishop against two pawns, at least one of which is about to promote, is a force rarely encountered, even in studies. Composers are shy of tackling it. But chess is chess and its devotees are - devotees. So close attention *has* been given to rare force provided only that the associated play is lively and the nuances pointed. But is this the case with

the force we propose to examine here? A few examples will, we trust, clear up the question.

M1 R. Réti
Kölnische Volkszeitung, 1928



b6d7 0110.02 3/3 Win

In *M1* White's material plus does not make it easy for him.

Promotion to queen cannot be prevented, and only one thing is clear: start with a check. But with which check? 1.Bc6+? Kd6 2.Rd4+ Ke5 3.Re4+ Kd6 4.Rxe3, is met by 4...e1Q 5.Rxe1 stalemate.

The correct line:

1.Bf5+ Kd6 2.Rd4+ Ke7.

After 2...Ke5, the bishop will be overcome, but to no avail. Here comes the nub.

3.Re4+ Kd8!

So that if now 4.Rxe3? e1Q 5.Rxe1 and once more it's stalemate.


4.Bd7!!

Now we have it! Black can have his queen!

4...e1Q 5.Bb5 and 6.Re8 mate.

The strongest chess piece is reduced to helplessness.

M2 R.Réti
Basler Nachrichten, 1929




b2d1 0110.02 3/3 Win

M2 1.Rd3+ Ke1 2.Rf3 Kd2 3.Bf1! e1Q 4.Rd3 mate.

The basis of this study is the gain of a tempo to facilitate the transfer of White's rook to the strong f3 square.

Both studies proved defective as initially published, but both were subsequently corrected by other composers - the first by Rinck, who moved wR to f3 (eliminating a dual), the second by Chéron, who moved wR to g3 (eliminating a cook).

M3 I.Alyoshin and B.Sevitov, 1941



c7h6 0110.02 3/3 Win

M3 1.Be3 d1S! 2.Bd2 b1S!


The knight pair must now be hobbled [In 1999 it is commonly

agreed by those who have looked at the *C* oracle output - though not yet conclusively demonstrated and adopted by theory - that the GBR class 0116 is a general win] while the white king approaches.

**3.Be1 bSc3 4.Rf1+ Kh5
5.Bd2 Kg4 6.Re1 Kf3 7.Kc6 Kf2
8.Kc5 Kf3 9.Kc4**, winning.

A memorable study - two black underpromotions to knight - has been constructed with this rare force, just right for demonstrating the limitless pleasures chess offers. A beautiful eye-opener!

M4 V.Kondratev
1st prize, Intelletualnye igry 1993



e5h8 0110.02 3/3 Win

In *M4* again White faces a future black promotion (actually threatened with check), forcing him to concentrate on the poorly situated black king. But exactly how is this 'plan' to be carried out? Let's take a closer look.

**1.Ke6! e1Q+ 2.Be5+ Kg8
3.Rg7+ Kf8 4.Rb7 Kg8 5.Rb8+
Kh7 6.Kf5.**

This wins, but it turns out that Black has better.

**1...f2 2.Be5+ Kg8 3.Rg7+
Kh8 4.Rf7+ Kg8 5.Rxf2 e1Q**


6.Rh2.

In this line the newly fledged black queen cannot stop mate. White has got the upper hand thanks to the motif seen in *M1*. A great product of chess artistry!

M5 A.Manyakhin

(entered for)

Rostov-on-Don-250AT 1998[?]



f5a1 0110.02 3/3 Win

**M5 1.Ke4! c5 2.Kd3 c4+ 3.Kc2!
c3 4.Kb3!**

De-stalemating bK.

4...c2 5.Rc7.

Having surmounted all the stalemate dangers White has got round to putting his opponent into zugzwang.

5...Kb1 6.Be4!

It's easy to slip up: 6.Rxc2? a1S+ draws.

6... a1Q 7.Rxc2 Qd4


8.Rc4+!

If White goes for the win by playing 8.Rd2+? Qxe4 9.Rd1 mate, he comes unstuck with 8...Kc1! 9.Rxd4 stalemate.

8...Ka1 9.Rc1 mate.

The study shows a synthesis of stalemate in the try with mate in the solution.

M6 A.Manyakhin
(entered for) L.Topko-60JT 1999



e6h5 0110.02 3/3 Win

Again an unstoppable pawn. And again White deems he has the better of it.

M6 1.Bf3+ Kh6 2.Kf7! e1Q.

An imperious queen makes her presence felt. A combination comes to the rescue.

3.Rxg6+ Kh7 4.Rg5!

Now it's Black's turn. The queen wastes no time.

4...Qe3 5.Rh5+ Qh6 6.Be4+ Kh8 7.Rxh6 mate.

But hasn't Black another way to keep the pot boiling?

4...Qh4 5.Be4+ Kh6.

Seeing no profit from either 5...Qxe4 6.Rh5 mate, or 5...Kh8 6.Rg8 mate.

6.Rg6+, and

6...Kh5 7.Bf3+, or


6...Kh7 7.Rg4+.

The strongest piece must wring her hands at being so useless to her consort.

Apropos, if after the appearance of a bQ in *M1*, *M2* and *M4* she makes no move, this is not the case with *M5* or *M6*, where her participation is significant.

Our last three citations share a different stipulation.

M7 G.Nadareishvili and V.Neidze
special prize, Kazantsev-JT 1986



d4g3 0110.02 3/3 Draw

In *M7* White has no joy from 1.Bh2+? Kg2 2.Rg8+ Kxh2 3.Rh8+ Kg2 4.Rg8+ Kf2 5.Rf8+ Ke2 6.Re8+ Kd2, after which promotion (threatened with check) profits.

1.Rg8+ Kh3 2.Rh8+ Kg4 3.Rg8+ Kh5 4.Rh8+ Kg6 5.Rg8+ Kf7!

If 5.Kh7 6.Rh8+ Kxh8 7.Kc4 a1Q 8.Bd4+.

6.Rg7+ Ke6 7.Rg6+ Kd7 8.Rg7+ Kc6 9.Rg6+ Kb5.


Not 9...Kb7? 10.Rg7+ Ka6 11.Kc4 a1Q 12.Ra7 mate!

10.Rb6+ Ka5 11.Kc4! a1Q 12.Rb5+ Ka6 13.Rb6+ Ka5 14.Rb5+.

The draw is positional, with perpetual check.

To end with we shall see two possibilities offered by reversing the colours of the same force.

M8 E.Pogosyants
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1978



a8e6 0330.20 3/3 Draw

1.Ka7!

White's drawing aim is not furthered by 1.b7? Ra6+ 2.Kb8 Kxd6 3.Kc8 Bd7+ 4.Kd8 Rb6, when the game is up.

1...Bd7!

1...Kxd6 2.b7 Rc7 3.Kb6.

2.b7 Bc8! 3.d7!

If 3.b8Q? then 3...Ra6 is Réti's mate.


3...Kxd7 4.b8S+ and 5.Sxc6

drawn.

The composer has endowed the pieces with rare character.

Everything is clear, and quite natural. Harmony reigns.

M9 A.Manyakhin
first publication



h8f6 0330.20 3/3 Draw

The taker of the white side assumes a burden - how is the game to be saved?

1.e7 Re1.

Capture of the pawn yields stalemate. So Black does his best to improve his position.

2.Kg8 Rg1+ 3.Kh8 Re1

4.Kg8 Rxe7.

He's not happy with a positional draw either.

5.h8Q+ Kg6.

So far so good - but now there's an ingenious loophole.

6.Qh7+ Rxh7 stalemate.

Just one move the queen has made - but with her seizure it's stalemate, and the deed is done.

The material of rook and bishop against two two pawns does not deserve to be forgotten by composers, who, without doubt, will find yet more opportunities for sharp play.

COMPUTER
SECTION
editor: John Roycroft



Four *C* items:


1. The 8 GBR class **8000** recizugs (*ICCA Journal*)
2. A Kopnin study commented on by computer
3. Corrections to typographical errors in the solution to GBR class **0107** in EG/21.
4. The same *ICCA Journal* contains copious material, mostly

of a technical nature, on the ending of the game conducted on the Internet between Garri Kasparov and 'The World'. Both sides, it goes without saying, used computers as much as they possibly could. Guy Haworth comments at length elsewhere in EG.

***C* GBR class 8000**

All eight reci-zugs in the pawnless 6-man endgame are listed together on p.210 of the xii1999 issue of the Journal of the *International Computer Chess Association*. To our mild dismay the *ICCA* journal is henceforth to be the *ICGA* journal, with the 'G' for 'Games', as the association is widening its remit to include games other than international chess - and will soon change its own name to *ICGA*.


No 11560 *C*



a7b1 8000.00

3/3 =/-. .


No 11561 *C*



e2b2 8000.00

3/3 =/-. .

No 11562 *C*




h1a1 8000.00

3/3 =/-. .

This position is already known as the climax to Noam Elkies study published in his article in the *American Chess Journal* in 1993. [See EG122.]


No 11563 *C*



a3d1 8000.00

3/3 =/-.


No 11566 *C*



e2b2 8000.00

3/3 =/-.


No 11564 *C*



b1d1 8000.00

3/3 =/-.


No 11567 *C*



g3c3 8000.00

3/3 =/-.

No 11565 *C*



f5c1 8000.00

3/3 =/-.

C GBR class 0134


Noam Elkies informs us that "Ken Thompson finally completed the exhaustive computer analysis of 0134 and posted his results on the Web. He also sent a list of the nearly 8000 mutual zugzwangs, the deepest of which is only 10 moves shorter than the 190-move length of the extremal line." EG hopes to reproduce this formidable list in printed form for the widest possible appreciation, with win-depths.

<http://plan9.bell-labs.com/magic/eg/>

At AJR's request Noam compared the solution to the late composer-analyst A.G.Kopnin's subjoined study (EG79.5532) against the database online to the world at the above address. We reproduce the comparison, out of which we think that Kopnin's shade emerges with honour. Following EG's long-established 'house rules' the "!" move-suffix is replaced by "*" to indicate a unique white winning move.

Elkies: "There do not seem to be essential lines that descend into the hundred-move bowels of the database. Unfortunately there may be cooks, depending on what's considered the main line. The analysis begins.

60th anniversary of the Soviet state publishing house *Fizkultury i sport*
3rd prize A.Kopnin
(Chelyabinsk)



g5c7 0134.00

3/3 Win

1.Kf4* Kd6 2.Sb5+* Kd5 3.Rg1
No "*" but the only alternatives are the time wasters 3.Sc3(c7)+ Kd6(d4) 4.Sb5+* Kd5 etc.
3...Bg4
Kc4?[-6] 4.Sa3+, also

4.Sa7(c7,d6+)[+1(2,8)] Kc5? [-8]

4.Rg5 is even quicker than

Sa3(a7,c3,c7)[+2,4,4,5]

4.Sa3

Again the only alternatives are the time-wasting 4.Sa7(c3+,c7+)[+2] Kd4 5.Sb5+* Kd5.

Black's next move is forced because after 4.Sa3 Kd4? 5.Sc2+ wins (Kd5 6.Se3+).

4...Kd6 5.Rg2

Again unique except for time wasting: 5.Sb5+[+2] Kd5 6.Sa3 Kd4 or here 6.Sa7(c3+,c7+)[+2] Kd4

7.Sb5+* etc. Now my guess as to the intended artistic content is the following pair of echo lines:

A) Bf3[-3] 6.Rd2+ Ke6 7.Sb5* Sc4 8.Rd4

B) Ke6 6.Rg3 Bf3 7.Rh3* Kd5 8.Sb5 Bg4 9.Rh6* Sf7 10.Rf6 with (B) having the extra refinement 10...Se5 11.Sc7+ and wins.

But, in both cases, White has alternative wins that are slightly more complicated and usually at most a move or two longer, at each juncture not indicated by "*". Thus:

A) 6.Rd2+: also 6.Sb5+[+2] Ke7 (Ke6 7 Sd4+) 7.Ra2

(Rd2[+70],Rh2[+140])

Kf6 8.Ra6+ etc. Note the trick

6...Kc5 7.Rg5* At the same move, 6.Rh2[+1] with several lines, not all of which merge into the 6.Rd2+ analysis.

Finally, in the main (A) line, instead of 8.Rd4 White also has 8.Sc7+[+60].

B) 6.Rg3: According to the database there's one other winning move, 6.Rb5, which takes no

longer though with several variations: 6...Bd1, Kf6(d5)[-1], Bh5[-4]. Likewise at 8.Sb5 White may of course repeat with 8.Rg3[+2] but there's also 8.Rh2, equally long with several variations: Kd6(e6) 9.Rh6+ (this also answers 7...Kd6[-1]) Kd5 and now 10.Ra6 or Sc2, and two moves longer 10.Rh2(Sb5); or 8...Bg4 9.Sc2 Kd6 10.Rh6+ Be6 11.Sd4* Sc5 12.Sxe6* Sxe6+ 13.Kf5*. (I suppress various White lengthening alternatives.) Finally at the very end 10.Sc7+ takes only [+1] more move than 10.Rf6, and after 10...K~ 11.Rh7 wins in addition to 11.Rf6; so if my guess about the intended solution is correct, this would be a cook too.

NDE

The study as composed and published (EG79.5534):
 1.Kf4/i Kd6 2.Sb5+/ii Kd5 3.Rg1 Bg4/iii 4.Sa3/iv Kd6/v 5.Rg2 Ke6/vi 6.Rg3 (for Re3) Bf3 7.Rh3 Kd5/vii 8.Rh2(!), with:
 - Ke6 9.Rh6+ Kd5 10.Sc2 Sf7 11.Rf6 Bh5 12.Rf5 and 13.Rxh5, or
 - Bg4 9.Rd2+ Ke6 10.Sb5 Sc4 11.Rd4 Be2 12.Re4+ and 13.Rxe2.
 i) 1.Sb5+? Kd7 2.Kf4 Sc4 3.Kxf3 Sd2+.
 ii) 2.Rb5? Sc6 3.Kxf3 Sd4+.
 iii) The threat was 4.Rg5, and if 3...Kc4 4.Sa3+ Kd4 5.Sc2+ Kc3 6.Sc1.
 iv) 4.Rg2? Bd7 5.Rd2 Kc5 6.S-Sg6 and 7...Sf8, draw.
 v) Kd4 5.Sc2 Kd5 6.Se3.

vi) The threat was 6.Rd2+ Ke6 7.Sb5. "The critical position. The desired move is 6.Rh2, taking control of the key squares d2 and h6, but Black has Kf6 7.Rh6+ Kg7 8.Rh2/viii Kf6 9.Rh6+ Kg7 10.Rb6 Sd7 11.Rb7 Be6. Therefore White undertakes a preparatory manoeuvre to shunt bK and bB onto the adjacent diagonal."
 vii) Kf6 8.Rh6+ Kg7 9.Rb6 Sd7 10.Rd6.
 viii) 8.Rh1 Sd3 9.Kxg4 Sf2.
 "This subtly motivated study with 'Rinck' material cedes nothing to any of the latter's domination work."

C

AJR hopes he has rectified here all the typographical errors and omissions (his, not the computer's) in the 243 moves of the maximal length solution to GBR class **0107** published in EG121 on pp871-773:

1...Sc6-b4
 15.Kf5-e4
 25...Kb2-c2
 35...Sc5-b3+
 36...Sf4-e6
 166.Ra7-h7
 187.Kf5 Sd7
 188.Se6+ Kf7
 230.Sa5-c6+
 231.Sc6-e7+

THE LONGEST WIN IN GBR CLASS 3102: A "FOUND" ENDGAME STUDY

Some seven years after Lewis Stiller's pioneering work with the exhaustive computer analysis of

6-man endgames, several programmers have picked up the torch, among them Ken Thompson who already analyzed many 5-man endgames in the same way in the 1980's. Unlike Stiller, Thompson is able to save the results of his computation for further investigation and even Web query; this will make it possible to answer many of the tantalizing questions that were necessarily left open by Stiller's research.

Thompson has yet to analyze all of the 41 classes listed by Stiller (though this task may be done by the time this text is printed), but he has also looked at several which Stiller did not try. Stiller's list seems to include all the pawnless 6-man classes which are so delicately balanced between win and draw that the longest wins exceed a hundred moves and may be forever beyond full human comprehension.

Thus Thompson's new classes are either easy general wins or easy general draws; but they still contain many tasty morsels in particular positions. Indeed, if classes such as 0107 [RS-SS] are much too deep for full human enjoyment, then one expects there to be simpler classes at the right level of difficulty for us.


One of the newly analyzed endgame classes is 3102 [RSS-Q]. This is of course a general draw, but many win endgames are known from the literature. Thompson finds that there are two maximal

positions, which merge after White's first move and are wins in 27 with best play. Since Thompson produces a permanent database in addition to the winning line, one can investigate equi- and sub-optimal lines in order to better understand the analysis. Here this yields the pleasant discovery that White's winning play is essentially unique throughout: the only alternatives are time-wasting repetitions and, at one point, different Rook triangulations on the same file.

The position thus satisfies the technical criterion of correctness for an endgame study.

I believe that it also satisfies the aesthetic criterion of artistic play; the position and analysis is reproduced next, so you may judge for yourself.

No 11568 *C* K.Thompson 2000



c7a6 3102.00

Win

In the following solution, we list all of Black's alternatives which do not lose trivially (i.e. by immediate checkmate, loss of Queen, or a series of natural checks leading to

one of these outcomes), and all of White's alternatives that do not give away the win nor extend it by an obvious move repetition. We quantify how bad such an alternative is by how much it hastens or postpones the "win" (checkmate or safe Queen capture); for instance, in note (i), "[-24]" means that 1...Ka7? lets White win 24 moves earlier, i.e. in 26-24=2 moves, while "[+1]" means that 2 Rh4 then postpones the win to move 2+1=3, and likewise 2 Sc3? to move 2+22=24 (indeed it transposes to the main line).

1 Sc5+ Ka5/i 2 Sb7+ Ka6 3 Sc3 Qa1 4 Sc5+ Ka7 5 Sb5+ Ka8
 After this forcing introductory play, bK is confined to the corner, but White must still work hard to get at it. Note that Qa1 stops both horizontal and vertical Rook checks.

6 Sd4 Qa7+/ii 7 Kc6 Qb8/iii
 8 Ra2+ Qa7 9 Rf2 Qe7/iv 10 Sde6 Kb8/v 11 Rh2 Qe8+ 12 Kb6 Qg8/vi

Black is now limited to shuffling the King between b8 and c8; if 13/14/15...Qe8?[-11/10/9] 14/15/16 Rh7. To make progress, White must triangulate with the Rook on the h-file so as to answer ...Kc8 with Kc6 when Black cannot reply ...Qg2+. White must also be ready to answer ...Ka8 with a vertical check, and thus avoids Rh5(h6)? when bK is on b8.

13 Rh4(h1,h3) Kc8
 14 Rh5(1,3,4,6) Kb8 15 Rh2 Kc8
 16 Kc6 Qe8+ 17 Kd6 Qg8/vii

18 Rh3/viii Qe8

Now Black can only shuttle the Queen between e8 and g8. To win White must answer ...Qg8 with Ke7, but only with the Rook on h3 or h4 as will become clear.

19 Rh4 Qg8/ix 20 Ke7 Kb8 .
 21 Sd7+ Kc8/x 22 Rc4+ Kb7
 23 Rb4+ Ka7(a8)/xi 24 Ra4+ Kb7
 25 Sd8+ Kc7(c8) 26 Ra7(a8)+
 Now the 4th-rank placement of the wR prevents 26 Rc4#??, but White still wins in a few moves, choosing between immediate checkmate (Kc7 27 Ra7+ Kc8 28 Sb6+ Kb8 29 Rb7/Sc6#) and win of the Queen (27 Se6+).

i) 1...Ka7?[-24] 2 Rh3, also Rh4[+1], Sb4[+2], Sc3?[+22]

ii) White threatened 7 Rh8+, and 6...Qxd4?? 7 Ra2+ is worse.

6...Ka7?[-18] 7 Sc6+ (also Kc6, Rg2[+5]) 8 Sd7

6...Qa5+?[-12] 7 Kc6 Qa7/xi 8 Sde6 (Sf5[+6],Rf2[+11],Rh3[+12])

Qa1 9 Rh4 (Sc7+[+4],Sd4[+6]) and now Ka7 10 Rh7+ (Rh3[+2]) or Kb8[-2] 10 Sd4 (Rh7[+2])

Qa8+ 11 Kd6 or Qc3[-2] 10 Rf4 (Rh7/h2[+5],Sd7+[+7]) with the point ...Kb8 11 Rf8+ Ka5 12 Sc7 (with lengthening duals).

iii) 7...Qa5?[-15] 8 Rf2(g2,h1) and others; Qg7?[-12] 8 Sde6,

or 8 Ra2+[+12] Qa7 transposing.

iv) 9...Qb8?[-11] 10 Sde6; 9...Qa5?[-13] 10 Rf3(g2,f1) and others;

9...Qg7?[-14] 10 Sde6 (Rh2[+6],Ra2+[+16]) etc.

v) 10...Qe8+?[-11] 11 Kd6 (Kc7/b6?[+13]) etc.

- vi) 12...Kc8?[-12] 13 Rh7
(Ka5/Ra2/h1/h3/h4/h6[+12])
- vii) 17...Kb8?[-5] 18 Sd7+
(Rb2+[7]) etc.
- viii) Against ...Qg3+. Two
lengthening duals: 18 Kc6[+2]
Qe8+, and 18 Kd5[+8], to which
the best response is Kb8 19 Kc6
Qe8+ 20 Kb6 Qg8 and we are back
at move 12, though Black may also
play 18...Qe8[-6].
- ix) 19...Kb8?[-2] 20 Sd7+
(Rb4/g4[+4]) Kc8 21 Rc4+ Kb7
22 Rb4+ Kc6 23 Rb6+ Kd5 24
Sf6+. But after White's next Black
is forced to play ...Kb8 after all.
- x) Or 21...Kb7?[-1], Ka7/a8?[-2]
reaching the same positions a move
or two sooner.
- xi) 23...Ka6?[-2] 24 Sb8+ and 25
Sc6+ explains why wR must be on
the 3rd or 4th rank. We already
saw 23...Kc6?[-2] 24 Rb6+.
- xii) Kb8[-5] 8 Sd7+


THE KASPAROV-WORLD GAME
Guy Haworth and Peter Karrer

Kasparov-World, initiated by Microsoft and also sponsored by First USA, was a novel correspondence game played on the World Wide Web at one ply per day. The *World Team* was led by moderator Danny King and four, talented young coaches: GM Etienne Bacrot (France, 16), FM Florin Felecan (USA, 19), Irina Krush (USA, 15) and WIM Elisabeth Pähtz (Germany, 14). They each independently nominated a move and the *World Team* made its choice by

democratic vote.


This was the first time that any group had attempted to form on the Web and then solve shared problems against fixed, short-term deadlines. The author first became involved in his role as a Web consultant, observing the dynamics and effectiveness of the group. These are fully described, together with observations on the technology contribution, in Marko *et al.* To move swiftly to the endgame, suffice it to say that the *World Team* far exceeded initial expectations and reached move 51 and **4000.12** position *K1* which is now a computer target. Black is fighting for a draw, and without the Black Pawns *has* a draw. This had been foreseen for three weeks, during which time the *World Team* had requested an **8000.00** endgame table (EGT). To everyone's surprise, two EGTs were created within days, independently drawn up to the Distance-to-Conversion (DTC) and Mate (DTM) metrics respectively (Nalimov *et al.*). Elkies and Stiller provided information to confirm that the two new EGTs agreed with Stiller's EGT. *World Team* thoughts turned to EGTs for **5000.01** and **4000.11**.

K1



f6b1 4000.12 after 50...d1=Q

K2




f6a1 4000.11 after 55.Qxb4

Serious analysts in the *World Team*, including FIDE World Champion Khalifman, had carried the vote thus far. However, the analysts' 51...Ka1 and 52...Kc1 lost out to 51...b5 and 52...Kb2, seriously increasing Black's difficulties. The game continued to **4000.11** positions *K2* and *K3*. At this point, the technology that had empowered suddenly depowered, a familiar risk in life today. Krush's essential recommendation of 58...Qf5, was delayed by e-mail glitches and then not displayed to the voters by

Microsoft. They saw only one coach for 58...Qf5 against two for 58...Qe4 which duly won. The *World Team* bulletin board already knew this was a loss and the rest is history.

To general consternation, Microsoft refused to rerun the vote, the media ran the story and the *World Team* soon resigned.

K3



g7b1 4000.11 after 58.g6

Post-hoc analysis proceeded by hand and by computer. Peter Karrer (2000), in a feat of programming, which the first author salutes, produced subset-EGTs for $KQKQP \approx$ and $KQPKQP \approx$, the ' \approx ' denoting a variant of chess with promotion option $P=Q$ only. Karrer (2000) shows that only 0.09% of $KQKQP(d2)$ positions change value if $P=S$ is allowed as well as $P=Q$. One might conjecture that the % is much less with the P on d3, d4.... Practical players, if not theorists, will accept information this close to perfection. Peter's *Distance to Mate* (DTM) $KQPKQP \approx$ lines are given here

with that caveat and in that spirit.

Below, we list and annotate:

- a) the game as played,
- b) an M-optimal line (minimaxing DTM) after Black's resignation,
- c) a 58...Qf5 line, which Ken Regan believes, from Kasparov's immediate post-game analysis, was the most likely continuation, and
- d) the 'endgame that got away': fitting, M-optimal but imaginary. 58...Qf5 still leads to a well deserved but much deeper win: **4000.10** arrives on move 84, not move 68. Kasparov described this game as "phenomenal ... the most complex in chess history."

This is an absorbing QP-finale for endgame enthusiasts. They will continue to benefit from the work of the web-enabled teams formed during the game. New 6-man tables and evaluation services are available from Nalimov, Thompson and Wirth as in the references. The author and others are contemplating ancillary projects and data-mining software to help find the finest gems to present in attractive problem and study settings.

Notation:

- ' *unique M-optimal move,*
- " *literally-unique value-preserving move;*
- [...] *equi-optimal move(s),*
- ⁿ *one of n unlisted equi-optimal,*
- ^v *value changing move,*
- d* *lost depth of d moves*
- and {...} *commentary.*

a) with Krush/Regan annotation.

G. Kasparov -World: The World

Wide Web, 21st June - 22nd

October, 1999, ECO B52, 1-0.

1.e4 c5 2.Sf3 d6 3.Bb5+ Bd7
4.Bxd7+ Qxd7 5.c4 Sc6 6.Sc3 Sf6
7.0-0 g6 8.d4 cxd4 9.Sxd4 Bg7
10.Sde2 Qe6! 11.Sd5! Qxe4
12.Sc7+ Kd7 13.Sxa8 Qxc4
14.Sb6+ axb6 15.Sc3! Ra8 16.a4!
Se4! 17.Sxe4 Qxe4 18.Qb3 f5!
19.Bg5 Qb4! 20.Qf7 Be5 21.h3!
Rxa4! 22.Rxa4 Qxa4 23.Qxh7
Bxb2 24.Qxg6 Qe4 25.Qf7 Bd4
26.Qb3 f4! 27.Qf7 Be5 28.h4 b5
29.h5 Qc4! 30.Qf5+ Qe6 31.Qxe6+
Kxe6 32.g3 fxg3 33.fxg3 b4!
34.Bf4!? Bd4+ 35.Kh1! b3 36.g4
Kd5! 37.g5 e6! 38.h6!? Se7 39.Rd1
e5 40.Be3 Kc4 41.Bxd4 exd4
42.Kg2 b2 43.Kf3 Kc3 44.h7 Sg6
45.Ke4 Kc2 46.Rh1 d3 47.Kf5
b1=Q 48.Rxb1 Kxb1 49.Kxg6 d2
50.h8=Q d1=Q {K1, **4000.12**}
51.Qh7! b5? 52.Kf6+ Kb2?
53.Qh2+ Ka1 54.Qf4 b4?? {losing
in theory and in practice: Qd5 was
required} 55.Qxb4 {K2, **4000.11**}
Qf3+ 56.Kg7" d5 57.Qd4+!" Kb1'
58.g6" {K3} Qe4? [Qf5'] -39
59.Qg1+' Kb2 60.Qf2+' Kc1
[Ka1'] -8 61.Kf6' d4' 62.g7' 1-0.
b) **62.g7'** {and now} Qc6+'
63.Kg5' Qd5+' 64.Qf5' Qg2+'
65.Qg4' Qd5+' 66.Kf4' Qg8'
67.Qg1+' Kc2' 68.Qxd4'
{**4000.10**} 68...Qf7+' 69.Kg3'
Qb3+' 70.Kh4 [Kg2] Qg8' 71.Qf6
[Qg4] Kb1³ 72.Qg6+' Ka1⁴ 73.Kh3
[Kg3] Ka2 [Kb2] 74.Kh2 [Kg2]
Kb2³ 75.Qg4 [Kg1] Qb8+⁸ 76.Qg3'
Qg8' 77.Kg1' Kb1³ 78.Qg2' Ka1

[Kc1] 79.Qf1+ Kb2' 80.Qf8' Qa2⁶
 81. g8=Q [Qf2+] {5000} Qb1+'
 82.Qf1' Qxf1+' 83.Kxf1' {1000}
 Kc3' 84.Qe6⁴ Kb2⁵ 85.Qc6⁵ Ka1⁵
 86.Qb7⁵ Ka2° 87.Ke2' Ka1 [Ka3]
 88.Kd3³ Ka2° 89.Kc3² Ka1²
 90.Qb2# 1-0.

c) Ken Regan's conjectured 'most likely 58...Qf5 game continuation'.

58...Qf5' 59.Kh6' Qe6' 60.Qg1+'
 Kb2 [Ka2, Kc2] 61.Qf2+' Kb1'
 62.Qd4' Kc2! -6 (62...Ka2'
 63.Kg5' Qe7+' 64.Qf6' Qe3+'
 65.Qf4" Qg1+' 66.Kf6' Qb6+'
 67.Kg7! -7 Qe6' 68.Qf6! -10
seemed dangerous for Black)
 63.Kg5' Qe7+' 64.Qf6?! -12 {a-
 ready on the slippery slope} Qe3+'
 65.Kg4?° (65. Qf4', 65. Kh5)
 Qg1+"! 66.Kf5⁵ d4" 67.g7¹⁸ d3"
 68.Qc6¹⁵ Kd2" 69. Qg6¹⁷ Qc5+"
 70.Ke4⁵ Kc1!"! 71.g8=Q¹³ d2" {no
 checks and 72. Qg5/Qh6 leaves Bl.
 with a perpetual check} ½-½!
d) 58. g6" {and now} Qf5'
 59.Kh6' Qe6' 60.Qg1+' Ka2 [Kb2,
 Kc2] 61.Qf2+' Kb1' 62.Qd4' Ka2'
 63.Kg5' Qe7+' 64.Qf6' Qe3+'
 65.Qf4" Qg1+' 66.Kf6' Qb6+'
 67.Kf7' Qb7+' 68.Ke6' Qc8+'
 69.Kf6' Qd8+' 70.Kf5' Qc8+'
 71.Kg5' Qc3' 72.Qh2+' Ka1'
 73.Qe2' Kb1' 74.Qf2' Qc1+'
 75.Kg4' Qc3' 76.Qf1+' Kb2 [Kc2]
 77.Kf5' Qc7' 78.Qe2+' Kb1'
 79.Qd3+' Ka2' 80.Qa6+' Kb3'
 81.Qe6' Ka2' 82.Qf7' Qc2+'
 83.Ke6" Qe2+' 84.Kxd5'
 {4000.10} Ka3' 85.Qa7+' Kb3'
 86.Qb6+' Ka3' 87.Qd6+' Ka4'
 88.Qd7+ [Qc6+] Ka3' 89.g7'
 Qd1+' 90.Kc6' Qa4+' 91.Kc7'

Qa7+' 92.Kd8' Qb8+' 93.Ke7'
 Qe5+' 94.Kf7' Qf4+' 95.Kg6'
 Qg3+' 96.Kf6' Qh4+' 97.Ke5'
 Qg3+ [Qg5+] 98.Kd4' Qg1+'
 [Qf2+, Qf4+, Qh4+] 99.Kc4'
 Qc1+' 100.Kb5' Qb2+' 101.Kc6
 [Ka6] Qc2+ [Qc3+] 102.Kb7 [Kb6]
 Qb3+ [Qe4+] 103.Ka6' {a 14 move
 K-walk} Qg8' 104.Qd4' Ka2'
 105.Kb5' Qe8+' 106.Kb4' Qe1+'
 107.Kc4' Qe2+' 108.Kd5' Qb5+'
 109.Ke6' Qe8+' 110.Kf6' Qc6+'
 111.Ke5' Qe8+' 112.Kf4' Qf7+'
 113.Kg3 [Ke3] Qg6+' 114.Kh3³
 Qf5+⁵ 115.Kh4 [Kg2] {an 11 move
 K-walk} Qf7 [Qh7+] 116.Qd2+'
 Ka1³ 117.Qe1+ [Qd1+] Ka2'
 118.Qe2+' Kb3' 119.Qg4' Qg8'
 120.Kh3 [Kg3] Ka3 [Kc3]
 121.Kg3' Ka2³ 122.Kg2 [Kf2]
 Qd5+⁷ 123.Kg1' Qc5+ [Qg8]
 124.Kh1" Qc1+' 125.Qg1" Qh6+'
 126.Qh2+" Qxh2+' 127.Kxh2°
 {0000.10} Ka3² 128.g8=Q⁴ {1000}
 Kb4' 129.Qe8¹¹ Kb3⁴ 130.Qc6⁵
 Ka2⁴ 131.Qb7⁶ {and mate on
 m137} 1-0.

Acknowledgements

The *World Team's* endgame play was supported by information from the following, in αβ-order and with apologies for omissions: Noam Elkies, Rob Hyatt, Thomas Lincke, Peter Marko, Carter Mobley, Eugene Nalimov, SmartChess Online, John Tamplin and Christoph Wirth. Post-game computation and analysis was by Peter Karrer, Irina Krush and Ken Regan.

References

- Hyatt, R. (2000). <ftp://ftp.cis.uab.edu/pub/hyatt/TB/> Server providing Nalimov's EGTs and statistics.
- Karrer, P (2000). KQKQP[≈] and KQPKQP[≈]. *ICGA Journal*, v23.1.
- Krush, I. and Regan, K. (1999). Kasparov-World post-game analysis <http://www.smartchess.com/SmartChessOnline/SmartChessOnline/archi ve/MSN-Karparov/>
- Marko, P. and Haworth, G.McC. (1999). The Kasparov-World Match. *ICCA Journal*, v22.4.
- Nalimov, E.V., Wirth, C. and Haworth, G.McC. (1999). KQKQKQ and the Kasparov-World Game. *ICCA Journal*, v22.4.
- Tamplin, J. (2000). <http://chess.livethenet.com/chess/endings/index.shtml> (Karrer, Nalimov, Thompson) EGT evaluations.
- Thompson, K. (2000). <http://cm.bell-labs.com/cm/cs/who/ken/chesseg.html> 6-man EGT maximals, mutual-zugs and statistics.

SIX-MAN ORACLE SURVEY, 1 Guy Haworth

This is a list in GBR order of existing 6-man endgame tables (EGTs) created by Nalimov (DTM, Distance to Mate) or Thompson (DTC, Distance to Conversion). An ^s indicates a past result by Stiller only. *max ww* denotes the maximum depth of wtm 1-0 positions in the endgame; *max bl* denotes the maximum depth of btm 1-0

positions. *max ww* and *max bl* are listed for both the DTM and DTC metrics.

Note the counter-intuitive relative values of DTM's *max ww* and *max bl* where these are in italics and the GBR code is marked ^{nb}. It is not always true that *bl* = *ww* or *ww*-1 as for DTC: these figures may not correspond to consecutive positions. For example, **1100** has DTM *max ww* = 6 but {Ka1 Qe6 Rf7 / Ke5 b}sets DTM *max bl* = 16: 1...Kxe6 {**0100**}. The first move converts to a maximal subgame position, always the case where the DTM figures are highlighted here.

References

- Hyatt, R. (2000). <ftp://ftp.cis.uab.edu/pub/hyatt/TB/> Server providing Nalimov's EGTs and statistics.
- Tamplin, J. (2000). <http://chess.livethenet.com/chess/endings/index.shtml> EGT evaluations.
- Thompson, K. (2000). <http://cm.bell-labs.com/cm/cs/who/ken/chesseg.html> 6-man EGTs.

	---DTM---		---DTC---		
	max	ww	bl	wwbl
0008	9		8	-	-
0026	106		106	38	s -
0062	4		3	-	-
0107	262		261	243	242
0116	238		237	223	222
0134	-		-	190	189
0143	-		-	98	98
0161	152		152	140	140
0170	-		-	83	83
0260	45		45	37	37
0305	7		6	-	-
0323	80		79	-	-
0332	5		4	-	-
0503	89		89	73	73
0530	-		-	54	54
0620 ^{nb}	-		23	21	- -
0701 ^{nb}	-		37	35	- -
0800	40		39	18	s -
1313	-		-	27	27
1331	-		-	26	26
1340	-		-	42	41
1430	-		-	21	21
1601	174		174	153	153
1610	-		-	85	84
2006 ^{nb}	-		69	72	- -
2060	81		81	-	-
2330	-		-	14	13
2600 ^{nb}	-		48	49	- -
3111	-		-	99	98
3120	-		-	44	44
3203	43		42	-	-
4103	-		-	71	71
5003	60		60	-	-
5030	71		71	-	-
6002	1		1	-	-
6020	21		20	-	-
6200 ^{nb}	-		29	23	- -
7001 ^{nb}	-		42	40	- -
7010	34		33	-	-
8000	50		50	44	44

REVIEWS

editor: John Roycroft



REVIEWS - or (better) *new titles*
Probleme s^L[pi studii alese, by
 Virgil Nestorescu, Bucharest, 1999.
 ISBN 973-99050-0-5. 188 pages,
 bi-coloured figurine notation. Of
 the 300 diagrams, Nos 168-295 are
 studies by the author. Some
 photographs are incorporated. This
 latest, and most welcome, selection
 of problems and studies by the
 active Romanian veteran is attrac-
 tively produced.

Chess Study Composition, by
 Emilian Dobrescu, Amsterdam
 1999. ISBN 90-72939-16-6. 302
 pages, over 144 diagrams.
 Non-figurine notation. In (very fair,
 if not faultless) English. Essays,
 graphs and tabular material enhance
 the fully analysed studies in this
 handsome, long-awaited and
 much-revised volume. We cannot
 do this scholarly treatise (which
 must be unique in study literature)
 justice in a short review. We may
 revert to it in a subsequent **EG**, but
 for the time being you, dear reader,
 will simply have to buy, and revel
 in, this ARVES 'book of the year',
 a well earned laurel.

*Attila Korányi - Selected Chess
 Studies and Problems*, edited, ap-
 parently, by Pál Benko, who has
 provided a biographical preface
 devoted to the life of his friend and
 talented countryman who died in
 1997. Kecskemét, 1999. 146 pages.

No ISBN. In (alas, poor quality) English and Hungarian. Monochrome figurine algebraic. Problems and studies are intermingled.

'The chess muse beyond the Urals', by A.P.Maksimovskikh, Shadrinsk, 1999. ISBN 5-7142-0267-8. 528 pages. Hard cover. Edition size: 999. In Russian. The subject-matter is principally the author himself and his problems and studies, the latter forming diagrams 259-494. This would be enough for a highly significant opus, but several further sections are added for other Urals composers and the story of the development of chess composition, including organised solving, in Maksimovskikh's home ground of Dalmatovo lying in the Urals hinterland between Chelyabinsk and Kurgan. The author prefaces the diagrammed section with a moving account of his background and long uphill struggle in life - he seems to have had a disability from an early age - and fulsomely acknowledges the support he has received, firstly from the women in his family after the men had become war victims, then from ally after ally. Many of his later studies have been co-authored by Shupletsov, though there are numerous joint compositions besides. Two further study composers still resident in the region (several no longer live there) are mentioned: I.A.Morozov and A.Shilin. The book lists numerous newspaper columns whose chess editors have influenced the search

for new talent in the region.

"ALBUM RUSSIA 1995-1997". Moscow 1999, but No.8 in the Uralsky Problemist series. 176 pages. From p86 to p117 is the studies section: 144 studies. Semi-stiff purple cover. It really is a Russian Album 'FIDE-style', but all the composers are, by definition, Russian. Edition size: 500. Well produced and on good paper.

Official booklet of the 1998 St Petersburg congress. Moscow 1999, but No.6 in the Uralsky Problemist series. 78 pages. Tables, awards, photos, caricatures; introduction and Selivanov greetings speech are also in English. Edition size: 500.

"Etyudnaya Mozaika / Study Mosaic - 7", by Gurgenzidze and Akobia, Georgia and China, 1997. 16 pages (covers included). Tavariani obituary (I intend to adapt this for EG) and three awards are included. Edition size unknown.

"100 Miniatures" by David Gurgenzidze. Tbilisi 1999. 104 pages. All are by Gurgenzidze. No originals as far as I can see. One study per page. Semi-stiff cover with decoration by Neiko Neidze. 1 photo.

"Tiny Endgames", by David Gurgenzidze, Tbilisi 1999. 60 pages. By 'tiny' is meant 'malyutki' or 'baby', ie all have just 5 men. There are originals, plenty of photographs, including on the back cover one of the moment in St Petersburg in 1998 when FIDE

President Ilyumzhinov congratulated DG on the title of First World Champion of Studies. We are fairly confident that none of the studies has been 'database-checked'.

Karavan Mansub, by Mezdnun Vagidov, Baku 1999. 262 pages. In Russian. Evocatively illustrated and with 126 diagrams (problems, studies and the like), but the text is the main thing, covering the development of chess from the 6th to 16th centuries 'along the Great Silk Road'.

The art of the endgame, by V.Smyslov, Moscow 1996. 160 pages. In Russian. Sandwiched between otb endgames won by the author are seven of his studies published between 1938 and 1986. *Ukrainian composition yearbook for 1998*. Nikolaev (Mikolaiv), 1999. 352 pages. Non-figurine (German letters!) algebraic notation, but text in Russian as well as Ukrainian. Numerous study composing tourney awards are incorporated on the pages, which are cluttered but clear.

Simplicity, Lightness, Beauty, by David Gurgidze, Tbilisi 1999. 136 pages. Almost exclusively in Georgian. 250 studies with solutions in figurine algebraic, all by the author. The volume is a logical follow-up to the same author-composer's 'Tiny' and 'Miniatures' titles listed above, because only three diagrams (129, 149 and 241) have fewer than eight chessmen. There seem to be no originals.

Chess Endgames, by László Polgár, Cologne, 1999. 1160 pages. '171 types in 4560 positions', we read, and it's just that. 'Theoretical positions', studies and game positions are mixed, but after the initial 462 it is the study that predominates. Sources are confined to family name and year, with a bibliography (EG included, but probably not as a source). Diagrams are six to the A4 page, with figurine algebraic solutions starting on p785. There is no name index.


The Chess Composers of Novosibirsk, by K.K.Sukharev, 2000. This must be the first studies-relevant book of the new 'millennium'. In Russian, there are 110 pages, and the edition size is 300. The study-composers covered are V.I.Vinichenko, A.I.Dikusarov (1 study), V.G.Chupin, D.F.Petrov, N.K.Grechishnikov, V.Sabinin (2), D.A.Yakimovich, V.A.Kazantsev, A.A.Aleksandrov. Photos.

Chess endgame material in Games of no chance review by John Beasley
The mathematical games book *Games of no chance* (ed. R. J. Nowakowski, Cambridge University Press, 1996, paperback edition 1998, ISBN 0-521-64652-9) contains chapters on chess endgames by Noam Elkies and Lewis Stiller, and John Roycroft has asked me to review them for EG.

Most of *Games of no chance* is concerned with "combinatorial

game theory" (CGT), a theory developed by J. H. Conway and others for the combination of games subject to the rule "if you can't move, you lose" (see J. H. Conway, *On numbers and games*, Academic Press, 1976, and E. R. Berlekamp, J. H. Conway, and R. K. Guy, *Winning ways for your mathematical plays*, Academic Press, 1981). It has been said by several writers, including myself, that this theory has little relevance to chess (essentially because it applies when a game consists of or splits into independent subgames, whereas a game of chess usually remains as a single coherent entity throughout its existence). Noam Elkies, having heard such a statement in a lecture, regarded it as a challenge, and sat down to demonstrate just such a relevance. Elkies observed that certain pawn configurations are equivalent to elementary games of CGT: "0", where nobody can move (consider blocked pawns on say h4/h5), "Star", where each player can move but only to 0 (consider pawns one square apart), "Up", where White can move to 0 but Black only to Star (consider wPh2 facing bPh5), "Down" (the equivalent for Black, say bPh7 facing wPh4), and so on. It follows that if the kings are in mutual zugzwang, so that the first side to move its king will lose, and the rest of the position consists of


separate and non-interacting pawn configurations of these kinds, we can use CGT to combine them, and this may tell us the result with much less analysis than would otherwise be necessary. He gives an example from actual play (Schweda-Sika, Brno 1929):



Analysing the two halves of this position separately, he shows that the set-up on the Q-side is equivalent to Up (to prove two positions equivalent, set up the first as it stands and the second with the sides reversed, and show that the resulting combination is a win for whoever does not have the move), while the h-file is equivalent to Down+Down+Star. Combining these gives Down+Star, which is a win for whoever is to move, and in the game White to move did indeed win.

There is a lot more, and on a larger board this would be a powerful technique for resolving certain classes of pawn endings. On the 8x8 board the gain is usually small (most of the work in the above lies in proving that the Q-side is equivalent to Up), and the matter may seem little more than a

theoretical curiosity of interest only to mathematicians. But now consider the following position, where we have added a third set of pawns:



Without CGT, we would have to reanalyze from scratch. With CGT, we observe that the file we have added is equivalent to Star, and adding Star to our previous Down+Star gives Down which is a win for Black whoever starts. So this time Black can win the pawn battle even without the move, and it is White's king which will have to give way; without further analysis, we can state the result that will follow best play by both sides. If you don't believe it, give this diagram to your computer program. The paper by Lewis Stiller is of quite a different nature, being a report of his computer analysis of six-man endings. A lot of the information has already appeared in print, starting with an article in *Scientific American* in November 1991, but here we have the authority of Stiller's own exposition. Much of the article discusses the mathematical techniques needed to make effective use of the

machine on which the work was done (essentially, 65,536 separate processors each capable of operating simultaneously on a different part of the problem), but the chess results can be appreciated without reference to this.

From our point of view, the heart of the paper lies in a table summarizing the results for 41 six-man endings: the number and percentage of positions that are wins for the stronger side, the length of the longest win, and the number of positions of reciprocal zugzwang.

There are two explicit qualifications, (i) the "wins" include positions where Black is in check with White to move (a useful programming simplification, however absurd it might be from a chess viewpoint) and (ii) the reciprocal zugzwangs are inflated by multiple counting when the material involves repeated men such as R+B v 2N (GBR class 0116); furthermore, John Roycroft points out that another qualification is implicit in the text, in that the method of calculation means that certain symmetrical positions have also been counted twice (so the number of "genuinely different" reciprocal zugzwangs cannot be obtained simply by dividing the raw total by the multiplication factor for repeated men).

I stress these points because the numbers were reproduced at two removes in the supplement to EG 124 (pp 114-5) and these qualifications were lost along the

way.
But one of the chief matters of interest is whether an ending is "generally won" or "generally drawn", and here the paper offers only bare counts of "wins". These are so heavily inflated by immediate and trivial wins, typically by forks to pick up unguarded men, that sadly little can be deduced from them. For example, consider Q+B v 2R (GBR class 1610). It may seem that the defender can hope to set up a fortress with his rooks defending themselves on squares inaccessible to the bishop, but in fact many such attempted fortresses can be broken down (Q+B constitutes a surprisingly powerful attacking force) and the general result is far from clear. All the table tells us is that 92% of positions with White to move are won, which might seem conclusive until we look at an ending such as 2Q v 2Q (GBR class 8000) and see that no fewer than 83% of positions are reported as being "won" even here. If only the report included the results for some specimen positions where the defender starts with his men well placed in the middle of the board; if only it gave some specimen positions of reciprocal zugzwang, so that we could see which side is under pressure; if only it gave not just the length of the longest win in each ending but also the relevant starting position... If all this information were available, a much more intelligent judgement could

be made as to which endings appear to be won from almost any position not involving immediate loss of material, and which can be won only if the defender starts at a disadvantage. In fact I understand that some of this information was and is in existence, but perhaps it was thought inappropriately detailed for a book written primarily for mathematicians and not for chess endgame specialists. Apart from the computing, there is an extensive historical review and bibliography (John Roycroft is credited with providing much of the information), and I am particularly impressed by the effort that has gone into assessing the contributions of Friedrich Amelung and Theodor Molien. This will ensure that the paper continues to be quoted with honour long after the computing has been surpassed by workers with more powerful equipment. Few computer practitioners - indeed, few chess writers of any kind - have been to as much trouble to seek out and pay proper tribute to the work of their predecessors.

On the whole, it has to be said that for all its pioneering grandeur the analysis as reported here is tantalizingly incomplete. However, the massive increase in computer power since 1991 has meant that the analysis of six-man endings is now within the reach of conventional machines, witness the report of resumed activity on page 3 of EG 135, and moreover it is now

possible to preserve the results in full for subsequent examination. (Stiller's machine had enough internal memory to perform the calculations, but it did not have enough external memory to store all the results and what was to be preserved had to be decided before the run started.) So we can soon expect to have all the data that we can handle, and perhaps some of the questions "general win or general draw?" will admit of a better answer.

Hiarcs 7.32 and endgame databases


by John Beasley

Brian Gosling, a British study enthusiast, recently alerted me to the fact that Hiarcs 7.32 comes with a set of five-man endgame databases including K+2P v K+P. This is perhaps the most important of all five-man endings, and its absence from the Thompson CD-ROMs has been widely regretted.

Hiarcs does come so equipped, and the package is impressive. Supplied are databases for all three-man and four-man endings (with the curious and unimportant exception of K+Q v K+B), together with a selection of five-man endings: K+R+B/N/P v K+R, K+B+P v K+B, K+2N v K+N (an odd choice), and K+2P v K+P. Space limitations on the CD-ROM prevented the inclusion of further databases, but a program is supplied which allows the user to generate them for himself. The

RAM requirements for the generation program are not light (128Mb for pawnless endings where both White men are the same, 192Mb for general pawnless endings, and no less than 640Mb for endings with pawns), but machines of this capacity will no doubt be commonplace within a decade. Even so, the requirement for endings with pawns appears excessive, and I cannot help feeling that a little reprogramming would have reduced it by 70 per cent; but doubtless the authors had a large machine themselves, and took advantage of it to make the program as simple as possible.

Unlike the Thompson CD-ROMs, the Hiarcs databases (the authors call them "tablebases", and indeed they are better regarded as look-up tables rather than as conventional databases) count moves to eventual mate rather than to promotion or capture. This is just what is wanted by a playing program, though the Thompson approach is more helpful to an analyst who is trying to understand what is going on; the interest in a K+R+P v K+R ending stops with promotion or capture of the rook, and whether the resulting elementary mate takes two moves or twenty is irrelevant. But a choice had to be made, and "moves to mate" is clear and unambiguous; it will have avoided many complaints of inconsistency. Even so, the user needs to be aware of one quirk. Consider the position below:



A beginner might well play Qxf4+ here, winning yet more material; an expert would certainly play wK to f6 with mate next move. But Hiarc is neither a beginner nor an expert, it is a computer program with access to a definitive K+2P v K+P look-up table, and it announces mate in 25 by Qf7+! The point is that after Black's forced ...Kxf7 the position is in the table, so no more analysis is needed and the computer can go off and have a beer (or whatever it is that computers do when they feel they have done enough work for one day). The result may seem absurd in this rather artificial position, but in fact it is merely an extreme example of the fact that a computer doesn't look for the shortest win, it looks for the one it can find most quickly - and what could be quicker than looking up the answer in a table? All the tables supplied with Hiarc ignore the 50-move rule, and it occurs to me that it would be relatively simple to extend the generation program to produce tables which take account of it - or indeed of any other "n-move rule" selected by the user. The RAM

requirement during generation would probably double and the runs would take somewhat longer, but there would appear to be no difficulty in principle. I am aware that this is a controversial issue, but an option of this kind might do something to reduce the controversy. The package for release appears to have been put together in a slight hurry; apart from the absence of a table for K+Q v K+B, which the user can supply using the generation program, the introductory booklet with my copy is largely in German (though there is an English version on the CD-ROM), there is no printed manual, and the English-language manual on the CD-ROM appears to be a Fritz manual which has not yet been badge-engineered to refer to Hiarc (the programs have a similar operational interface). But all these can be lived with, and for £37.99 one doesn't expect the earth. I do have one genuine gripe: once the program has found a table look-up win, it gives just this line even when the user has specifically requested n lines of analysis. This is most unfortunate - if the user wants n lines of analysis, this is what he wants, even if some of them can be done by table look-up - and I hope it will be put right in the next release. But on balance, this is a major step forward, and it does not detract from what the Thompson CD-ROMs have done for us to say that they are now on their way to becoming museum

pieces.

Technical details. Hiarc 7.32 is marketed by ChessBase, Mexikoring 35, D-22297 Hamburg, Germany. The DM price is not known to me, but it is available in the UK at £37.99 plus postage from the BCM and doubtless from other UK ChessBase outlets.


System requirements are specified as "Pentium with Windows 95/98/NT4.0". No minimum RAM is specified, but the requirements noted in the body of the review are needed only for table generation; once a table has been generated, it can be copied to another machine and used with only the minimum system requirements.

Footnote by AJR. Guy Haworth confirms that the term 'tablebase' is due to Microsoft programmer Eugene Nalimov. A common abbreviation is EGT, for EndGameTablebase. The 'mate' metric seems always to be used. The behaviour of Hiarc reported by John Beasley, whereby the depth of the first 'win' encountered in a tablebase search is adopted, irrespective of the existence of a lower figure, is a function of the program that invokes the tablebase, and is not inherent. Tablebases are used by many programs, for instance: FRITZ6, NIMZO7.32, JUNIOR, DEEP JUNIOR.

SNIPPETS

The bulky, rich-in-content German monthly ROCHADE EUROPA has recently been devoting space to study-relevant matters. An article contributed by Amatzia Avni (Israel) is in the 2/2000 issue. AA asks where composers get their ideas from, and suggests answers. The same issue reports the publication of the first issue (March 2000) of PROBLEM-FORUM, a fresh magazine for composition, with a studies section run by our good friend Rainer Staudte of Chemnitz. We read that there is no intention either to compete with DIE SCHWALBE or copy the Swiss IDEE & FORM. Then the 3/2000 issue reports the publication as a private initiative of an updated catalogue of the chess collections of the late Wilhelm Massmann and Gerd Meyer, held in the Schleswig-Holstein public library. The section on composition occupies 80 pages. A 5-page interview in issue No.15 (3/1998) of URALSKY PROBLEMIST makes fascinating reading. The interviewer puts the same questions - many of which are based on famous quotations from writers or philosophers - independently to UP's editor, Vladimir Zheltonozhko, and to its director, Andrei Selivanov, with their answers (or reactions) printed together. The technique succeeds. Here, apropos of nothing in particular, is the full source of a classic:

No 11569 R.Skuja
5th Latvian SSR otb ch, 1948
dedicated to the participants




g7d4 0140.01 3/3 Draw

No 11569 R.Skuja (Aluksne, Latvia) 1.Kh8!! Bxg8 2.Bd8 Kc5 3.Bc7 g1Q(g1R) 4.Bb6+ Kxb6 stalemate.

The diagram is in Bulletin No.2 (15x1948) and the solution is in Bulletin No.4 (6xi1948) of the five slim bulletins of the Riga Central Chess and Draughts Club covering that championship. The series apparently, or incidentally, marked the 30th anniversary of the Latvian Komsomol. Latvian: "Padomju Jaunatnes" izdevums.

No 11570 V.Smyslov
New in Chess, 1/2000




a2b5 0013.45 6/7 Win

No 11570 V.Smyslov 1.a4+ Ka5 2.Bd2+ Sb4+ 3.Ka3 c5 4.Bf4 Sd5/i 5.Bg5 h3 6.Bd8 (for dxc5) c4 (cxd4;Be7) 7.Bg5 c3/ii 8.Be7 and mate follows.

i) cxd4 5.Bd2 b5 6.Bxb4+ Kb6 7.axb5 axb5 8.f3 wins.
ii) Sb4 8.Bd2 b5 9.Bxb4+ Kb6 10.Bd6 Kc6 11.Be5 cxb3 12.Kxb3 bxa4+ 13.Kxa4 Kd5 14.Ka5 h5 15.Kxa6 h4 16.Kb5 h2 17.Bxh2 Kxd4 18.f4 Ke4 19.Kc5 Kf5 20.Kd4 Kg4 21.Ke3 Kh3 22.f5 Kxh2 23.f6 h3 24.f7 Kg2 25.f8Q wins.

This set of six studies are recent output of the ex-World Champion. We learn from our contemporary *New in Chess* that Smyslov's eyesight is failing - we can add, sadly, that GM Averbakh is similarly afflicted - but that, though no longer playing competitively, he derives great satisfaction from composing studies. The whole process, including testing, takes place in his head, with no outside assistance.


No 11571 V.Smyslov
New in Chess, 1/2000



f8h8 0001.27 4/8 Win

No 11571 V.Smyslov 1.Se3 c3
 2.h6 gxh6 3.g4 c2/i 4.Sc4 h5 5.g5
 c1Q 6.Se5 wins.
 i) fxg4 4.Sxg4 h5 5.Sxh6 wins.


No 11572 V.Smyslov
New in Chess, 1/2000



h6h8 3110.31 6/3 Draw

No 11572 V.Smyslov 1.g7+/i Kg8
 2.Rd1/ii b1Q/iii 3.Rxb1 Qa7
 4.Rb8+ Qxb8 5.g6 Qe5 6.Bf6 Qc7
 7.Be7, with a draw based on
 stalemate if bQ captures wB.
 i) 1.Rf1? Kg8 2.g7 Qa6+ wins.
 ii) 2.Re1? Qd8 3.Bg3 Qd7 4.Be5
 Qd3.
 iii) Qc6 3.g6 Qc1+ 4.Rxc1 bxc1Q+
 5.Bg5, draw.

No 11573 V.Smyslov
New in Chess, 1/2000




b4h3 0002.24 5/5 Win

No 11573 V.Smyslov 1.eSc1 b1Q
 2.Kc3 Kg4 3.g6 h3 4.g7 Kh4
 5.g8B Kg4 6.Bh7 Kf3/i 7.Sd2+
 wins, not 7.Bxc2? Qxc2+ 8.Kxc2
 Kg2 draw.

i) Kf4 7.Bxc2 Qxc2+ 8.Kxc2 Ke3
 9.Sd2 Kf2 10.Kd3 Kg2 11.Ke2
 h4/ii 12.Ke1 Kg1 13.Sf3+ Kg2
 14.Sxh4+ Kxh2 15.Kf2 Kh1 16.Se2
 Kh2 17.Sf3+ Kh1 18.Sg3 mate.
 ii) 11...Kxh2 12.Kf2 h4 13.Sf1+
 Kh1 14.Se2 h2 15.fSg3+ hxg3
 16.Sxg3 mate.


No 11574 V.Smyslov
New in Chess, 1/2000



f4h5 3011.43 7/5 Win

No 11574 V.Smyslov 1.Kg3/i d5/ii
 2.Be3 dxe3/iii 3.h4 wins, but not
 3.Sf4+? Kxg5.
 i) 1.Kf3? Kh4 2.Kf2 Qb3, this pin
 of wS being the defence that
 2.Be3! precludes.
 ii) Qh1 2.h3 d5 3.Kf2 Qd1 4.Bf4/iv
 Qc2 5.Se1 Qe4 6.Sf3 Qxf4 7.g4+
 Qxg4 8.hxg4 Kxg4 9.Sxd4 wins.
 iii) Qh1 3.Bg1 Qxg1 4.Sf4 Kg5
 5.Sh3+ wins.
 iv) 4.Kg3? Qc2 5.h4 Qxd3 draw.

No 11575 V.Smyslov
New in Chess, 1/2000
dedicated to NiC readers



g2d3 0410.21 5/3 Draw

No 11575 V.Smyslov 1.Bh5 a1Q
2.Bg6+ Kc4 3.Rf4+ Kb3 4.Rf3+,
with:

- Ka2 5.Rf1 Qxb2+ 6.Rf2 draw,
or
- Kxb2 5.Rf2+ Kc3 6.Rf3+,
perpetual check.

FIDE ALBUM 1995-1997 (studies)

supplementary report by section
director (SD=AJR)

As a postscript to the list of the
first 87 batches of entries received
- see EG/35 pp55-56 - further
batches were received subsequently
and accepted as follows:

Batch No.87a SerRad [1]
Batch No.88 NiKr [19]
Batch No.89 DPlet [2]
Batch No.90 AnKuz [8]
Batch No.91 GeNek [3]
Batch No.92 NiMic [1]
Batch No.93 MeGo [5]
Batch No.94 EvFom [15]
Batch No.95 DaGu [14]
Batch No.96 DaGu [25]
Batch No.97 ViKal [22]

The date of receipt of Batch no.97
was 14i2000.

A fortnight later SD took the
unilateral decision to disallow,
irrespective of the date of despatch,
all batches delivered after 31i2000,
a cut-off two whole 31-day months
after the announced 'closing date'
of 30xi1999. The following 4
batches are, regretfully, affected:
Batch No.98 VSam [3] (postmark
22jan2000, Kharkov) received date:
1ii2000

Batch No.99 AlManv [7] (airmail,
postmark 28nov99, Erevan)
received date: 10ii2000

Batch No.100 GaAmi [26]
(postmark 22nov99, Erevan, not
airmail; in poor state) received
date: 11ii2000

Batch No.101 LIKa [16] (22nov99,
not airmail, St Petersburg) received
date: 23ii2000

In taking this decision SD con-
sidered not only his own sorting,
numbering, listing, checking and
distribution labours and expenses
but also fairness to the three judges
- and implications of any further
delay.

The sets of 586 valid entries were
distributed to the judges during
Feb/Mar 2000.

AJR
London, 2iii2000

Euwe Centennial

On the occasion of the 100th birthday of former World Champion (1935-37) Machgielis (Max) Euwe (1901-1981), the Max Euwe-Centrum (MEC), in co-operation with the Nederlandse Bond van Schaakprobleemvrienden (NBvS) and the Alexander Rueb Vereniging voor Schaakeindspelstudies (ARVES) organises a formal international tourney for endgame studies (free theme).

Judge: IGM Jan Timman

Prizes:

1st prize: 750 NLG
2nd prize: 500 NLG
3rd prize: 250 NLG

Composers are invited to submit their original endgame studies (maximum: two per composer) before January 1st, 2001 to the tourney director:

Harold van der Heijden
Michel de Klerkstraat 28
7425 DG Deventer
The Netherlands
harold_van_der_heijden@wxs.nl
(submissions by E-mail are allowed)

The provisional award will be officially announced during the PCCC-meeting in Wageningen (2001).

Contents:

Drawing by Neiko Neidze	57
Editorial Board/Subscription	58
Originals by Noam Elkies	59-60
Spotlight by Jürgen Fleck	60-62
Diagrams and Solutions:	
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1992	62-68
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1996	68-73
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1997	73-80
Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 1998	80-87
Shakhmatnaya poezia 1993	87-90
Shakhmatnaya poezia 1998	91-92
Articles:	
Four knights beat the Queen by I. Bondar	92-94
In defence of a young study composer by V. Korolkov	94-95
Three picture studies by A. Khait	95-96
Rare material - or eyeopeners by A. Manyakin	96-100
Computer Section:	
The 8 GBR 8000 recizugs	100-102
A Kopnin study commented on by computer - by Noam Elkies	103-104
Longest win in GBR 3102 a "found" endgame study - by Noam Elkies	104-107
The Kasparov-World game by G. Haworth and P. Karrer	107-111
Six-man oracle survey 1 by G. Haworth	111-112
Reviews	112-114
Chess endgame material in "Games of no change" by J. Beasley	114-118
Hiarcs 7.32 and endgame databases by J. Beasley	118-120
Snippets	120-123
FIDE ALBUM 1995-1997	123
Announcement "Euwe-100"	124
Contents	124
Computer supplement:	
Neiko Neidze drawing	125
Zugzwangs in GBR 0013.10	126-148