## EDITORIAL

The French tradition responds to the question "Is this exact?', while the German reacts rather to "Is this true?', and the English to '"Does this work?". In pursuit of their respective goals the French achieve miracles of precision, the Germans plumb the depts of veracity, and the English get things moving (or used to).

Issue No. 125 (i-xii.87) was the last of THÈMES-64 under the editorial hand of François Fargette. Couched in many a memorable, sculpted, eclectic phrase, it was an emotional farewell. 11 awards (one for studies published in 1986) leave no obvious loose ends, in itself an achievement in precision, and the human touch pervades with photographs of helpers and lists of the behind-the-scenes activities that support any well-run review.

To revert to precision. A letter in THÈMES-64 No. 125 examines the word 'economy' as used in a translated article by the late Czech GM Vladimir Pachman. The pseudonymous correspondent understands 'economy of force' and 'economy of time' well enough, namely in the sense of 'parsimony' (though one might prefer the standard definition maximum use of minimum means), but is foxed by the phrase 'economy of space'. In chess composition this is clearly not the same kind of economy, since the aim is now not to use less of it, but some other aim. However, the correspondent then defends this conflicting use by proffering a second, classic, definition of
economy, namely, 'organisation', or 'use of a resource' (since in chess the given irreducible 64 squares comprise just that), but chides THĖMES-64 in that event (ie if that meaning were the editorial intent) for causing difficulties of interpretation for the reader.

Well, we happen to find that second definition quite satifactory, and although we are grateful to have had the two contrasted meanings of 'economy' drawn to our attention, we intend to retain the phrase 'economy of space', for want of anything better. It works.

The THÈMES-64 correspondent's letter was, by the way, humorous.

THÈMES-64 was unquestionably a review dedicated first and foremost to high quality, defined (of course, a definition!) by the magazine as 'the expression of a living community in which the demands of professional expression will always be the servants of thought'.

The reader will by now have guessed that this is the moment to consider the kind of magazine that EG is. Your editor edits his last EG with EG102. The abdication is voluntary, the decision irrevocable. Your editor is physically fit enough - the pressures are internal, not external. Put simply, his instinct tells him that the time is right and that the classic advice to quit while you're ahead is sound.

So, will the end of 1990 also spell the end of the magazine? The answer depends on other people. Offers are invi-
ted, world-wide. It's as simple as that. THEMES-64 has continued, transformed by a new crew led by Denis Blondel.

What is EG's irreducible creed? In a word, openness: openness to all views, to all nations, to all sources without exception. Now this attribute, evident as we hope it is from the content of EG's pages, can be at the expense of quality whenever openness overrules selectivity. This has been known to occur. But there are no regrets about EG, since the editor has produced it the way he wanted to. The editor believes that EG has achieved something that the rest of the world of chess composition still lacks, namely, a credible, detailed picture of contemporary production and producers, as to both quality and quantity, on the scale of the real world.

To put it plainly, aside from financial support there are just two guarantees required from the take-over team in order to secure EG's future: the magazine's language to be English; and the magazine's loyalty to be to the endgame study, not to any national flag.

John Roycroft
Vice-President, British Chess Federation
F.I.D.E. Judge of Endgame Studies (from 1959).
Founder of EG and The Chess Endgame Study Circle.
Editor and Publisher of EG from 1965 till 1990.

London, xii. 1989.
P.S. A succinct Russian equivalent to complement the French, German and English theme-questions we began with is elusive, unless it is 'Does it hurt?''.
But openness and glasnost, surely there's a total equivalent. Your editor, by the way, is a Quaker, and his father was born in Killarney.)

1.Bg3 Sc4
2.Kd1 Se3 + .

The knowledge that we have a win here is a certainty for which we have to thank the computer. We could have this certainty in no other way. It allows us to say with a conviction that is based neither on guesswork, however inspired, nor on some fallible human authority, however eminent, but is knowledge, that B1 is under pressure. bK would like to emerge from the corner via the square f1, but wK bars the way. We can already see that with wKf 3 and bKf1 there would be the dire threat of wBf 2 and wS delivering mate. If bK remains on hl (or is forced back there), W has at least one other mate threat, by an eventual wSg3, with wB guarding gl from somewhere.
3.Ke2 Sf5
4.Bf2 Se7
5.Kf3 Sc6
6.Kg3 Sd4.

This is the first of many self-sacrificial offers by bS. Stalemate figures frequently in the maximum length optimal play of many 5 -man endgames.
7.Kg4 Sc6 (Sb3)
8.Kh3 Sb4 (Se5)
9.Bb6 Sd3
10.Sc2 Sf2 +

## $11 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Se} 4+$

12.Kf4 Sd2
13.Se3 Kh2.
bK's first move! He's squeezed, as bS has no good landing strip: bSb3; can be met by wSc4, followed by wKe3.

## 14.Kg4 Sb3

15.Ba7.

Here $15 . S c 4$ is less effective because the follow-up move wKe3, is not possible. Nevertheless W succeeds in improving his position with play to describe which the word profound is so inadequate that it itself can be described only as shallow.
15...Sc1
16.Bd4 Sd3
17.Kh4 Sf2.

We observe with a nod of the head that W has time to spare for reorganising his forces as bS cannot check for another three moves, but nod turns to shake after we have seen the actual W moves 18-21.
18. $\mathrm{Be} 5+(\mathrm{Bc} 5 \mathrm{Bb} 6) \mathrm{Kg} 1$
19. Bc 3 (Bg3) Se4 (Sh1)
20.Bel Sf6 (Sd6 Sc5 Sf2 Kh1 Kh2)
21. Kg 5 (Kg3 Kh3) Sd7 (Se4 + )
22.Kf4 (Kg4) Sc5
23.Kf3 Se6 (Kh2) 24. Bc3.

The control of bK's freedom is exquisite: now it is wK that guards f2. But bS, what about bS? Well, 40 moves of solution remain to unfold: don't expect crystal clarity!
24...Kh2
25.Kg4 Sd8 (Sc5)
26.Be5 + (Ba5) Kg1
27. Kg3 Se6.

One thing about Bl's defence can be said. The mate threat is to be countered by $\mathrm{bSg} 5+; \mathrm{Kg} 3, \mathrm{Se} 4+$. To avoid
move repetition wK would have to leave the third rank. If this is what W's manoeuvres are designed to overcome, how can they take so many moves?
28.Bf6 (Bh8 Bc3 Bb2 Bal) Sc5 29.Bd4 Sb3
30. Ва7.

The position when $w B$ was last on a7 (after W's move 15) is worth a comparison.
30...Sd2
31.Sc4+Kh1
32.Se5 (Sb2) Sc4
33.Sd3 (Sg4) Sd6 (Sd2)
34.Kh3 Sf7
35. Be3 Se5
36.Sf4 (Sf2 + ).

Now wSg3 mate looms.
36...Sc4
37.Bd4 (Bc5 Ba7 Bf2) Sd6 (Sd2)
38.Sh5 (Sd3) Se4.

One wonders how many genuine zugzwangs there are in the 0014 class.
39.Be3 Sf2+
$40 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Se} 4+(\mathrm{Sd} 3)$
41.Kf3 Sd6
42.Bf4.

Now that $W$ nas failed to deliver checkmate his grip on bK is surely loosened.
42...Sc4
43.Kf2 Sa5
44.Sf6 Sb7
45.Kf3 Sd8
46.Bd6 (Se4).

Whatever is going on? A standard symbol for the question would be over-used in this ending...
46...Kg1
47.Se4 Sc6 (Se6)
48.Sd2.
wS covers f1 from a new square, d2. Compared with wSe 3 there is the advantage that $w B$ can use the g1-a7 diagonal for checking. Also, with wKf3 wS is no longer needed to guard g2. Progress is perceptible - just. The sequence: wKg 3 , wBc $5+$, wKh3, for Sg 3 mate, looms.
48...Sd4 +
49.Ke4 Se2
$50 . \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Sc} 3$.
As if by white magic the square g1 is unavailable to bS.

## 51.Be5 Sa2.

bS is remote again (as it was after 28...Sd8). W has time, sure, but to do exactly what?
52.Kf3 Sb4
53.Kg3 Kh1
54.Bd4 Sc6
55.Bc5 Sd8
56.Se4 Sb7
57.Bb4 Sd8.

Perhaps if $\mathrm{bKg} 1 ; \mathrm{Sg} 5$, and bSb 7 is suddenly in peril, even if not immediately.
58.Ba5 Se6
59.Bb6 Sg5.

This is the defensive idea mentioned in connection with 27...Se6. W's clandestinely prepared response is wonderful to behold.
$60 . \mathrm{Sf} 2+\mathrm{Kg} 1$
61.Kf4 Sf7
$62 . \mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 2$
63.Se3 + Kh3
64.Sf5.

A positional move to crown a combination of the greatest delicacy. W has gained time with each of his last 5 moves. The domination of bS is now apparent. The remaining moves have
their own charm but they are at last devoid of mystery. bS offers himself as hostage in the drama to secure bK's release.
64...Kg2 (Kh2)
65.Bc5 Sh8 (Sd8 Kh2)
66.Sd4 Kh3
67.Kf5 Kh4
68.Se6 Kh5
69.Be3 Sf7
$70 . \mathrm{Sg} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 4$
71.Bf4 Sh8 (Kh3).

It all dove-tails in: bSd8; Bg5 + .
72.Se6 (Kf6) Sf7
73.Kg6 (Kf6) Sh8 +
74. Kg 7 Kg 4
75.Bh6 (Bd6 Bc7 Bb8 Bd2 Bc1 Bh2)

Kh5 (Kf5)
76.Sf4 + Kg4 (Kh4)
77.Kxh8 wins.

It is of some interest that, arising out of a 1970 First Prize (a joint composition with Bent, Hungarian Chess Federation) in 1971 Walter Veitch analysed two bishops (on the same colour) and knight to win in all cases against knight. See EG25, p290, where AJR commented that the longest win might exceed 50 moves.

## Tourney announcement

Sredba na Solidarnosta announces its 10th 'Solidarity' multiple-genre tourney, with Jan Rusinek judging the studies. Closing date: 1.vi.90. Address: N. Stolev, ul. Vukovic 3a, n. Lisice, Skoplje, YU-91000 Yugoslavia.

## A TRIO OF LITTLE KNOWN BELORUSSIAN STUDIES by Dmitri N. Noi

Vaclav Gebelt, who hails from the small Belorussian town of Lida, has the FIDE IM Composition title, but for problems.

Solution to N1: 1. Bd5 (for b7) Bf2 2.b7 Ba7 3.b8Q Bxb8 4.Bb7 and selfimmolation offers on the long diagonal. After Bfl + 5.Bg2 Bxg2 + 5.Kxg2 we have the familiar 'wrong bishop' draw.


Studies by Vasily Daineko appeared in the early 1950's. I knew him in 1949 in the Minsk House of Pioneers and Schoolchildren. He was born in or about the year 1934, brought up in a children's home when the war orphaned him, finished secondary school, and, in 1956, attended a polytechnic. All trace of him thereupon vanishes and his fate is unknown. In 1952 this happy-go-lucky and exceptionally good-natured young man showed his work to Master of Sport A. Sokolsky, who instructed him in the technique of analysing study positions. In contrast to his studies, V. Daineko's problems are well known.
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Solution to } & \text { N2: } & 1 . B e 8+K c 7 \\ \text { Kc8 3.Bg6 } & \text { Se3 } & \text { 4.Bf4 } \\ \text { Bb6 }\end{array}+$
$S d 5+6 . K c 5$ Sxf4 7.Bf5 + Be6 8.Kd6 Bxf5 9.Ke5, and the win of a B1 piece suffices, for example Bd7 10.Kxf4 and reaches g1, or Se2 10.Kxf5 Sxd4+ 11.Kg4 Kd7 12.Kxh4, drawn.


Solution to N3: $1 . f 4+/ \mathrm{i} K d 52 . R d 3+$ $K c 5 / \mathrm{ii} 3 . R x c 3+K d 54 . R d 3+K c 5$ $5 . R d 5+K x d 56 . c 4+$ wins.
i) 1 . $\mathrm{Re} 3+$ ? $\mathrm{Kd} 52 . \mathrm{Rd} 3+$, is a thematic try. Qxd3 3. cd Kc5! and 4. $\operatorname{Sg} 3$ $K d 4$ 5. Se2 + Kxd3 6. Sxc3 Kxc3 7. $K x f 5$ Kd4 8. Kxff Ke4, or 4. Sxe3 Kd4 5. Kff Kxd3 6. Kxf6 Ke2, drawn. ii) Qxd3 3.cd Kc5 4.Sg3 Kd4 5.Se2+ $K x d 3$ 6.Sxc 3 Kxc 3 7.Kf5 and W wins.

Minsk
9.v. 89

## SEEK AND YE SHALL FIND

by $A$. and S. Manyakhin
Two knights against the queen, can this be study material? Do not be too hasty with your answer to this categorical question: chess is an art, but its logic is a science. This rare and on the face of it simple 5 -man endgame conceals not a few motifs replete with inner beauty.

We should like to present for EG readers' attention some recent original work on this theme.


M1
$1 . S d 6+K d 82 . S b 7+K c 83 . S d 6+$ Kb8. No more checks. 4.Se7. Now it is Bl's move. Qe2 5.Sc6+ Ka8 6.Sb5 Qb2 7.Ka6 Qg7 8.Kb6 Qb7+ 9.Kc5 Qc8 10.Kb6, drawn.


M2
1.Se3 + Kgl 2.Se5. Giving the move to Bl. $Q f 2+$ 3.Ke4. Again, Bl has to play. $Q g 34 . S 5 g 4$, and the enemy K is blockaded. Draw.


## M3

1.Sd5 Qh4. wK cannot move, but play continues. 2.dSf4 Khl 3.Sg6. bQ is again under attack. Qf6+ 4.gSf4 Qh4 5.Sg6 Qh2 6.gSf4 Qh4 7.Sg6 Qh3 + 8.Kel Qh2 9.gSf4. No contrivance by Bl makes any difference, and the draw becomes self-evident.


M4
$1 . S b 2+K a 52 . S c 4+K a 63 . S b 4+K a 7$ 4.Sc6+ Ka8 5.S4a5 Qe6+ 6.Kd8/i $Q d 6+7 . K c 8$, and the board shows an unexpected position of reciprocal zugzwang [confirmed by EG93: 006 in KT's, 020 in DVH's, arrangements of the 229 zugzwangs], with Bl to move, and hence, a draw.
i) $6 . K f 8$ ? $Q d 77 . K g 8 Q f 5$ and Bl wins.


M5

1. $\mathrm{Sg} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 8$ (Kh7; gSe7) 2. $\mathrm{gSe} 7+$ $K f 8$ 3. Sg6 + Ke8. The return to g8 leads to perpetual check, so Bl has to try the alternative. 4. $\mathrm{Sg} 7+\mathrm{Kd8} 5$.
$\mathrm{Se} 6+K c 8$ 6. $\mathrm{Se} 7+K b 8$ 7. $\mathrm{Sc} 6+\mathrm{Ka} 8$ 8. eSd8 Qe4 9. $K f 7$ Qf5 + 10. Ke7. After the careless play $10 . \mathrm{Ke} 8$ ? W falls into a zugzwang and loses, for example Qh7 11. Kf8 Qc7 12. Kg8 Qd7 13. Kh8 Qg4. But now it is drawn. In the course of the solution bK travels from corner to corner.

There has to be a limit to the content of this endgame, but for the moment the possibilities are far from exhausted.

Lipetsk, 22vi89
(The authors of this article are father and son.)

## IOSIF KRIKHELI and EYGENY UMNOV

Photographed by Bedłich Formanek at Tbilisi in 1975.




From left to right: John Roycroft, Brian Stephenson, Theo van Spijk (Holl.), AGM David Bronstein (USSR), Jan Lerch (CSSR) and Timothy Whitworth.

## DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS



No.7638: V.Balanovsky (Kiev). 1.Be8 Rg7 2.Qb1 Ka5 3.Qb6+ Ka4 4.Qxb7, with: Rxb75.Bxc6+ Qxc6 stalemate. Rg8 5.Ka7 Rxe8 6.Qxc6 Qxc6 stalemate.

No. 7639
T.
$=1 / 2$ Prize New Statesman and Society ASSIAC Mem.Ty, 1988


No.7639:
T.G.Whitworth (England). 1.g7 Ra7+ 2.Kf6 Be5+ 3.Kxe5 Rxg7 4.Sf7/i Kg4/ii 5.Kf6
(h6? Rh7;) Rh7 6.Kg6 Rxh5 7.Be6+ Kh4 8.Bc4 wins - a position of (reciprocal) zugzwang. Had this zugzwang been incorporated WTM into a try the study would have leaped ahead in the ratings.
i) Bl threatened: $\mathrm{Rg} 5+$ or Rh 7 . 4.Bb3? Rg5+ 5.K- Rxh5 6.Bd1+ Ke3 7.Bxh5 c4 draws. 4.Sg6? Kg4 5.Kf6 (Sf4,Rg5+;) Rh7 6.Bxb3 Kxh5. 4.h6? Rh7 5.Sf7 Kg 4 6.Bb3 Kh5. 4.Bd5+? Kg 4 5.h6 Rh7 6.Sf7 Kh5.
ii) Rg4 5.h6 Rh4 6.h7 Rh5+ 7.Kd6 wins, Rxh7 8.Sg5+ Ke3 9.Sxh7 Kd4 10.Sf6 c4 11.Sd5, or Ke3 8.h8Q Rxh8 9.Sxh8 Kd4 10.Sf7 c4 11.Se5.. Ke3 5.h6 Rh7 6.Bc4 wins, for example, Kd2 (Kf2;Kf6) 7.Kd6 Ke3 8.Kxc5 Kf4 9.Kd6.
"Some straightforward introductory play leads to a battle to save whP. Surprisingly, this is sacrificed, and the Bl pieces are lured to a position of mutual zugzwang where bR is dominated. Precise, elegant, and enjoyable to solve."

As first published (c3f3 0341.21 a7a2e3h8.g6h5c7 5/4+) the entry was cooked by John Nunn: 1.g7 Bd4+ 2.Kxd4 c5+ 3.Kc3!! [as well as the intended 3.Ke5]: Rxg7 4.Bb1 Rg1 5.Bc2! Rh1 6.Sf7, for Rxh5 7.Bd1+, and so W wins, but not 5.Bg6? Rh1 6.Sf7 Kg4 7.h6 Rxh6 8.Sxh6 Kg 5 , drawn. The composer's correction was allowed by the colum-
nist-director, who writes "Tastes may differ... but I actually prefer the new setting..." The argument in favour of the original setting is that the thematically important bPc 5 moves into place (from c7) during the play.

It was good to see prominent chess diagrams in the serialised tourney report in NEW STATESMAN \& SOCIETY, the magazine that is the result of a happy amalgamation of two (relatively) highbrow British weeklies. The (fortnightly) chess column is written by George Botterill, who won the British Championship in 1977 and is lecturer in philosophy at Sheffield University. The judges (IGMs Jonathan Mestel and Jonathan Speelman) reported on the 37 entries, 9 of which were eliminated in the course of judging. "There are advantages in having two judges for competitions such as this. We began independently, and, reassuringly, came up with similar short lists of sound submissions. Those studies on the borderline of soundness we analysed together. As grandmasters, we hope to have analysed them correctly, but it would be rash to make such a claim too confidently! A number of promising entries were unfortunately flawed. As players, we naturally favour game-like positions and solutions which, though elegant, run counter to the intuition which strong players develop. We also tend to rate
highly those compositions which are pleasurable to the solver. Yet beauty to a large extent really is in the eye of the beholder - and we had four eyes between us! In particular, we each favoured a different study for first prize and, after some debate, we agreed to award first prize jointly." [ie, two studies share first and second prizes.] "The judges' comments will serve to combine aesthetic appraisal with helpful hints as to the composers' intention."


No.7640:
A.Lewandowski (Poland). 1.gSe7/i Sxe7 2.h6 Ke4 (xc8;h7) 3.h7 Sg6 4.Kxg6/ii Bf5+ 5.Kf7/iii Bxh7 6.Se7 Kf4/iv 7.Sg6+/v Kf5(g5) 8.Sf8 drawn.
i) 1.h6? Sxh6 2.cSe7 Sf7+ 3.Kf6 (Kh4,Bf1;) $\quad$ Sd8 $\quad 4 . \mathrm{Se} 5$ Bd6 5.57 g 6 Bc 8 wins.
ii) 4.Se7? Sh8 5.Kf6/vi Bd4+ 6.Kg5 Bd7 7.Sd5 Ke5 8.Kh6 Kf5 9.Se7+ Kf6 wins.
iii) 5.Kg7? Bd4+ 6.Kg8 Be6+ 7.Kf8 Bxc8 wins.
iv) Bd4 7.c5 $\mathrm{Bxc} 58 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ drawn. Kd3 7.Sg6 Bd4 8.c5 Bxc5 9.Kg7 drawn.
v) 7.Ke6? Bd3 8.Sd5+ Ke4 9.Sf6+ Kd4 10.Sd7 Bxc4 wins. vi) $5 . \mathrm{Sd} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 56 . \mathrm{Sc} 7 \mathrm{Bf} 57 . \mathrm{Kh} 6$ Bf8 wins.
"The discovery that, in general, BB wins against $S$ has naturally led to new themes. An extra $S$ added to both sides does not help the defence. In this very gamelike study whP is once more lost after a struggle, but unexpectedly a tactically drawn position results. A very original composition." Hear, hear! AJR


No.7641: Noam Elkies (USA and Israel). 1.Bxf6/i, with: Qe7/ii 2.Bxe7 gfQ 3.Be8+/iii Kxe7 4.Qd7+ Kf8 5.Qd8 wins.Kxf6 2.Qh6+/iv Ke7/v 3.Qe6+ Kd8 4.Qe8+ Kc7 5.Qc8+ Kd6/vi 6.Sg3 g1Q/vii 7.Qc6+ Ke7 (Ke5;Qe6+) 8.Sf5+ Kd8 (Kf7;Qe6+) 9.Qc8 mate.
i) 1.Qxg2? Qd3+ and Qxd4, but not Bxd4? 2.Qg6+ Ke7 3.Qe8+.
ii) Bl is now threatening both Qe4+; and Kxf6+. gfQ 2.Qd5+ Kxf6 3.Qe6+ Kg5 4.Qh6 mate. g1Q 2.Qd5+ Kf8 3.Bg5.
iii) 3.Bb4? Qb1+. 3.Qb4? Qd3+. 3.Qg5? Qh1+ 4.Qh4 Qbl+ 5.Kh8 Qa1+. 3.Qd6? Qh1+. There is a thematic try in 3.Be6+? Kxe6 4.Qd6+ Kf7 5.Qd7 Qbl+ 6.Kh8 is OK except for: $\mathrm{Qh} 7+$.
iv) 2.Qxg2? Qxe7+ and Qxd7.
v) Ke5 3.Qe6+ Kd4 4.Qf6+ Kc5/viii 5.Qc6+ Kb4 (Kd4;Qxg2) 6.Qd6+ Kc4 (Kb3;Sd2+) 7.Qxa3 gfQ 8.Ba6+.
vi) Can W escape the carrousel? If instead $\mathrm{Kb} 66 . \mathrm{Qb} 8+\mathrm{Kc} 5 / \mathrm{ix}$ 7.Qc7+ Kd4/x 8.Qb6+ Qc5/xi 9.Qb2+ Kd3 10.Bb5+ Ke4 11.Qxg2+.
vii) Qxg3 7.Qb8+. Qd3+ 7.Bf5 g1Q 8.Qd7+ and 9.Qxd3.
viii) Kc4 5.Qc6+ Kb3 (Qc5;Sd2+) 6.Sd2+ Kb2 6.Qxg2 (also Sc4+) Q+ and W interposes with check, winning. Kd3 5.Qf3+, with Kd4 6.Qxg2 Qe7+ 7.Qg7+, or Kc4 6.Sd2+ (Qxg2? Qd3+;) Kb4 7.Qxa3+ Kxa3 8.Sf3. Kd5(e4) 5.Bc6+ and 6.Bxg2. ix) Ka6 7.Qa8+ Kb6 8.Qxg2 Qe7+ (Qd3+;Qg6+) 9.Qg7 Qh4+ 10.Qh6+.
x) Kb4 8.Qd6+. Kd5 8.Qc6+ Ke5 9.Qe6+ is a transposition.
xi) Kc3 9.Qc5+. Kd3 9.Qe3+ Kc2 (Kc4;Sd2+) 10.Bf5+ Kb2 11.Qf2+ and 12.Qxg2.
"A very difficult study to solve because the best defence is well hidden. In the main line there are two tries involving batteries on the 7th and 8th ranks, depending on which bB is sacrificed. But only one succeeds, because of a stalemate defence. Unfortunately,
the play after another defence (on move 1) is rather long and uninteresting."


No.7642: Jan Timman (Netherlands). 1.e6/i Bxe6+ $2 . f 5$ Bxf5+ 3.ef Sc6 (Sg6;Bc6) 4.Ba4 (Bxc6? Re3+;) Re2 5.Bd1 Sd4 6.Be3 Sf3 7.f6 Rh2+ (Rxe3; 77 ) 8.Kg3 Kg6 9.Bxf3 Rh8 10.Be4+ Kf7 11.Bd4/ii Ke6 (Rd8;Be5) 12.Kg4 wins.
i) 1.f5? Sxf5 2.Bxe8 Sd6 3.Bc6 Sc4 4.Bf4 Be6+ and Kg6.
ii) 11.Bd5+? Kg 6 12.Bc5 Rh 5 drawn.
"Some promising introductory play forces Bl to rely on stalemate ideas, involving a halfpin. Thereafter $w B B+w P$ battle against bR. Careful, but somewhat anticlimactic play assures the win."

No.7643: N.Elkies. 1.Sf7/i g3/ii 2.Kxg3/iii Kg6 3.Sh8+/iv Kg7/v 4.a4/vi Kxh8 5.Kf4 Kg7 6.Ke5 Kf7 7.Kd6 Ke8 8.Kc7 Ke7 9.Kxb6 Kd7 10.Kxb7 wins.
i) This is to stop Bl abandoning gP and speeding westwards to
swap off waP: 1.a4? g3 2.Kxg3 Kg5 3.Kf3 Kf5 4.Ke3 Ke5 5.Kd3 Kd5 6.Kc3 Kc5 7.Kb3 b5 8.a5 b4 9.Ka4 b3.
ii) Ke5 2.Se5+ and 3.Sxg4. Kh4 2.Sh6 g3 3.S55+.
iii) Forced. 2.Se5? g2 3.Sf3 b5 4. Kg3 (else wS too vulnerable) Kg6 5.Kxg2 Kf5 6.Kf2 Ke4 7.Ke2 b6 8.Se1 Kd4 9.Kd2 Kc4 $10 . \mathrm{Sc} 2 \mathrm{~Kb} 3$ 11.Kc1 Ka2 drawing. iv) $3 . \mathrm{Se} 5+$ ? Kf5 and Ke4, drawn. 3.Sd6? Kf6 4.Kf4 Ke6 and Kd5, drawn. 3.Sd8? Kf6 4.Kf4 Ke7 5.Sxb7 Kd7 6.Ke5 Kc6 7.Sd6 Kc5 drawn.
v) Now Bl would lose the race across the board, as wK would be established on b3 and wS would eventually enter the fray decisively.
vi) 4.Kf4? b5 5.Kf4 Kxh8 6.Ke5 Kg 7 , reaching c 8 in time.

"A very natural position illustrating on the one hand some important practical endgame principles (such as the difficulty of winning with an extra $S$ against an active K ), while completely flouting others with a paradoxical
switchback. A very pleasing study, especially to the practical player."


No.7644:
A.Sochniev
(Leningrad). 1.e7 c2 2.Rc1d3+/i 3.Kc6/ii b2 4.a8Q bcQ 5.Qh5+ Bh4/iii 6.Qxh4+ Kg1 7.Qg3+/iv Kf1 8. $\mathrm{Qg} 2+\mathrm{Kel} 9 . \mathrm{Qg} 1+\mathrm{Kd} 2$ $10 . \mathrm{Qg} 5+\mathrm{Se} 3$ 11.Qa5 mate.
i) b2 3.e8Q bcQ 4.Qh5+ Bh4 5.Qxh4+ Kg1 6.Qg3+ Kf1 7.Qg2+ Kel 8.Qe2 mate.
ii) 3.Kd6? $\mathrm{Bg} 3+$ and b2. 3.Kd5? b2 $4 . \mathrm{e} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ Se3+.
iii) $\mathrm{Kg} 3 \quad 6 . \mathrm{Qg} 4+\mathrm{Kh} 2 \quad 7 . \mathrm{Qg} 2$ mate.
iv) 7.Qh1+? Kf2 8.Qg2+ Ke3 9.Qg5+ Kf3 drawn. The composer says: pure mate with 4 active self-blocks.
"Some fairly natural initial play (with Bl transpositions) leads to a short K-hunt with a dramatic and unexpected conclusion. Elegant, but not subtle."

No.7645: C.M.Bent (Inkpen Common, Berkshire). 1.Be3/i Sf3+/ii
2.Kf4 (Ke4? Bg4;) Se1 (Sh4;Bf2) 3.Bb6 Sd3+ 4.Kg3 Bf5 5.Sb5+ and $6 . S d 6$ wins.
i) 1.Sxc8? Sf3+ 2.Kf5 Sxg5 3.Kxg5 b5.
ii) b5 2.Sxb5+ Kb4 3.Sd6 Sf3+ 4.Kf4 Sh4 (Se1;Bd2+) 5.Bf2 $\mathrm{Sg} 2+6 . \mathrm{Kg} 3$ wins.
"A clear theme, with the B1 pieces lured towards domination of bB . It is a pity that $\mathrm{bSf8}$ is such a spectator. Perhaps a little unlucky not to win a prize."


No.7646: C.M.Bent. 1.Sg4+ Qxg4/i 2.Qxg4 h1Q 3.Qg7+ Kd5 4.Qc3 wins.
i) $\mathrm{Kd} 5 \quad 2 . \mathrm{gSf} 6+\quad \mathrm{Kc} 5$ (Qxf6+;Sxf6+) 3.Sd7+ Kd5 4.Sf4 mate.
"A very neat and easily missed win with $\mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{S}$ vs. $\mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{B}$. Satisfying, but ... lightweight."


No.7647: Colin Crouch (Durham, England). 1.Bb5+/i Rxb5 2.f8Q Rh5 3.b8B/ii Rxh4+ 4.Bh2 g3/iii 5.Qxf2+Bxf2 stalemate.
i) $\quad 1 . \mathrm{Bg} 2+$ ? $\mathrm{Ke} 2 \quad 2 . \mathrm{Sf} 3$ (f8Q,Rbl+;) gf 3.f8Q Rb1+ 4.Kh2 Be5+ 5.Kh3 fg. 1.Bf3? Bc5. 1.Sf3? gf (also Bc5;) 2.f8Q Ke1 3.Qe8+ Re3 4.Qxe3+ Bxe3 $5 . \mathrm{Bb} 5 \mathrm{Bf} 4$, winning by means of bKxb7-e1, bBd4 and f1Q.
ii) 3.b8Q? Rxh4+ 4.Qh2 g3 5.Qxh4 g2+ 6.Kh2 g1Q+ 7.Kh3 Qg 2 mate. 3.Qd8? g3 4.Qxd4 g2+. 3.Qe7? g3 4.Qe4 Rxh4+ 5.Qxh4 g2+.
iii) $\mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{5} . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rxh} 2+6 . \mathrm{Kxh} 2$ f1Q 7.Qxf1+Kxfl 6.Kg3 draw.
"A surprising trap is avoided by underpromotion, enabling a stalemate defence."


No.7648: V.Kos (Czechoslovakia). 1.d4 Bxb4 2.de Sa6 3.Ba4 Kxe7 4.Kb7 Sc5+ 5.Kb6 Sxa4+ 6.Kb5 Bc5 7.Kxa4 Ke6 8.Kb3 Ke5 9.Kc4 B- $10 . \mathrm{Kd} 3$, 11.Kc2, 12.Kd1, drawn.
"Some forcing introductory play leads to a position where Bl, temporarily two pieces up, is unable to win, albeit due to a known kind of positional draw."


No.7649: Colin Crouch. 1.Kf6 Kg8/i 2.Sd5/ii g3/iii 3.Sd7 gh/iv 4.Kg6 h1Q 5.S5f6+ Kh8 6.Se5

Qb1+/v 7.Kh6 Qh7+ 8.Sxh7 Kg8 9.Kg6/vi h2 10.Sd7 (Sf6+? Kf8;) h1Q 11.hSf6+ Kh8 12.Se5 Qbl+ 13.Kh6 Qh7+ 14.Sxh7 Kg8 15.Kg6 b3 16.Sd7 b2 17.hSf6+ Kh8 18.Se5 b1Q+ 19.Kh6 Qh7+ 20.Sxh7 Kg8 21.Kg6 h3 22.Sd7 h2 23.hSf6+ Kh8 24.Se5 h1Q 25.Sf7 mate.
i) gf $2 . \mathrm{Kf} 7 \mathrm{~g} 33 . \mathrm{Bg} 1$ and 4.Bd4 mate. g3 $2 . \mathrm{Kf} 7 \mathrm{gh} 3 . \mathrm{S} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6$ mate.
ii) $2 . S 4 \mathrm{~g} 6$ ? g3. $2 . \mathrm{Sh} 5$ ? Kxf8. 2.Sd7? gf 3.Bxf4 h2 4.Bxh2 g3 5.Bg1 h3 6.Kg6 h2 7.Bd4 h1Q 8.Sf6+ Kh8 9.S- Kg8 drawn. 2.S4e6? g3 3.Kg6 gh 4.Sd7 h1Q 5.Sf6+ Kh8 6.Sd8 Qb1+ 7.Kh6 Qb3.
iii) Kxf8 3.Bd6+ Ke8 (Kg8;Kg6) 4.Ke6 Kd8 5.Bc7+ Kc8/vii 6.Kd6 b5 7.Kc6 and 8.Se7 mate.
iv) Kh7 4.Kf7 Kh6/viii $5 . \mathrm{Bg} 1 \mathrm{~h} 2$ 6.Bd4 h3 (h1Q;Bg7+) 7.Bg7+ Kh5 8.S7f6+ Kh4 9.Se3 g4 10.Bh6 g2 11.Sf5 mate.
v) Qe4+ 7.Sxe4 Kg8 8.Sd7 g2 9.eSf6+ Kh8 10.Se5.
vi) $9 . \mathrm{Sf6}+$ ? Kf8 9.fSd7+ Kf7.
vii) Ke8 6.Sf6+ wins, for instance, Kf8 7.Bd6+ Kg7 8.Sxg4 b3 9.Ba3 Kg6 10.Ke5 Kf7 11.Kf5 b5 12.Kxg5 Ke6 13.Kf4 Kd5 14.Ke3 Kc4 15.Bb2 Kd5 16.Kd3 Kc5 17.Kc3 Kd5 18.Kxb3 Ke4 19.Kb4 Kf4 20.Sh2 Kg3 21.Be5+.
viii) gh 5.S5f6+ Kh6 6.Sg4+, and Kh7 7.S7f6+, or Kh5 7.dSf6 mate.
"An old theme, with multiple promotions, which, regrettably, necessitates an ugly setting."


No.7650: C.M.Bent. bSf2+ (Bc2/f3+;Kg1) 2.Kg1/i Bxh5 3.Se5 Sd1 (Sg4;Sxg4) 4.Sg3 Be8 (Se3;B+) $5 . S c 4$ wins, threatening 6.Bc8+.
i) 2.Kg2? Bxh5 3.Se5 Sd1 4.Sg3 Se3+.
"Another illustration of domination."


No.7651: Marek Halski (Poland). From the published award (Thessaloniki, 1988: "Olympic Problem Tourneys 1984-88") we learn that the results were announced, presumably verbally only, on 5.xii. 84 at the end of the otb Olympiad. On the following page
we read 'at last we have the book', which incorporates also the results of a ' 2,300 years of Thessaloniki' tourney for problems. ... As is normal where chess composition is concerned there was a shortage of funds for printing. The booklet, distributed by hand at Bournemouth by Mr Moutecidis, is handsome. EG also thanks Dr Enrico Paoli, who participated in the tourney, for earlier photocopying of relevant pages. There were 35 entrants in the studies section. For the first six in the award, see EG91.66646669. Here are the remaining two. 1.Rb4/i a3/ii 2.Rxb6 Kal 3.Re6 Kb2/iii 4.Re1 a2 $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 3$ a1Q 6.Rxal Kxal 7.Kf2 Kb2 8.h4 gh 9.g5 h3 10.Kg1 Kc2 $11 . \mathrm{g} 6 \mathrm{Kd} 2 \quad 12 . \mathrm{g} 7 \mathrm{Ke}$ 13.g8Q drawn.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Rc} 1$ ? b5 $2 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{~b} 43 . \mathrm{h} 4 \mathrm{~b} 3$ 4.Kh2 b2 5.Rd1 (Rc2,a3;) b1Q 6.Rxb1 Kxb1 7.hg a3 8.g6 a2 9.g7 a1Q 10.g8Q Qe5+ 11.Kh3 g1Q 12.Qb3+ Qb2 13.Qd3+ Ka1 14.Qa6+ Qa2 15.Qf6+ Kb1 16.Qf5+ Qc2 17.Qb5+ Kc1 18.Qg5+ Qd2 wins. 1.Rxa4+? Kb2 2.Rb4+ Kc2 3.Rc4+ Kd2 4.Rd4+ Ke2 5.Re4+ Kf2 6.Re5 g1S mate.
ii) Ka1 2.Re4 Kb2 (g1R;Rxa4+) 3.Re1 a3 4.Kg3 a2 5.Kf2 alQ 6.Rxa1 Kxa1 7.h4 drawn. g1Q 2.Rb2+ Ka1 3.Ra2+.
iii) g1Q 4.Re1+. g1R 4.Ra6 Kb2 5.Rxa3 f2 6.Rb3+.

How successful are EG readers in identifying the tourney's set
theme by inference after playing through the solutions? If there were an accepted definition of 'set theme' should not readers all come close? See "Bournemouth Snippets" in EG98.
" ... 1.Rc1? is a good try."


No.7652: the late Rolf Richter (East Germany). 1.Rb4/i Rd3/ii 2.Rc4+/iii Kb7 3.Re4/iv c2 (Rf3;Kd7) 4.Rb4+ Ka6/v 5.Rc4 Rd2/vi 6.Kf7/vii Rf2+ (Re2;Rxc2) 7.Ke6 g3 8.Kd6(d7) Rd2+ (Re2;Rxc2) 9.Kc6 Re2 10.Ra4 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Rc} 2$ ? $\mathrm{Rd} 32 . \mathrm{Kf} 7 \mathrm{Rf} 3+3 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ Kd7. 1.Rb8+? Kc7 2.Rb4 Rd3 3.Rc4+ Kb6. 1.Rb5? Rd3 2.Rc5+ Kb 7 3.Re5 c2 4.Rb5+ Kc6 drawn.
ii) Rc7 2.Kf8. c2 2.Rc4+ Rc7 3.Kf8 Rxc4 4.e8Q+ Kc7 5.Qf7+ wins.
iii) 2.Re4? Rf3 3.Rc4+ Kb7
4.Re4 Kc7 drawn. 2.Rf4? g3 3.Kf7/viii Re3 4.Rc4+ Kd7. 2.Rxg4? Rf3 3.Rc4+ Kb7 4.Re4 Kc7 drawn.
iv) 3.Rf4? g3 4.Kf7(f8) Re3
5.e8Q Rxe8 6.Kxe8 g2 7.Rg4 c2.3.Kf7? Rf3+ 4.Kg7 Re3 5.Rxc3 Rxe7+ 6.Kh6 Rc7 drawn.
v) Kc6 5.Rc4+ Kb7/ix 6.Rxc2 Rf3/x-7.Rc4 g3/xi 8.Rg4 Kc7 9.Rg7 h5/xii 10.Rg5 Kc8 11.Rxh5 g2 12.Rg5 Rf2 13.h5 wins.
vi) g3 6.Rxc2 Kb5(b7) 7.Re2 Rf3 8.Kd7 Rf2 9.e8Q.
vii) $6 . \mathrm{Kf} 8$ ? $\mathrm{Rf} 2+7 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Re} 2$ 8.Kf7/xiii g3 9.Rxc2 Rf2+ $10 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{~g} 2$ drawn.
viii) 3.Kf8 Re 3 4.Rc4+ Kb 7 5.Rxc3 Rxc3 6.e8Q Rc8.
ix) Kd6 6.Rxc2, and Ra3 7.Re2, or Rf3 7.Kd8 Ra3 8.Rd2+, or Re3 7.Rd2+ Kc7 8.Rd7+ Kc8 9.Rd8+ Kc7 10.Kf7 Rf3+ 11.Kg8.
x) $\operatorname{Re} 3$ 7.Rd2, or g3 7.Re2.
xi) h5 8.Rc5 Rh3 9.Rxh5 g3 $10 . \mathrm{Rg} 5$ wins.
xii) g2 10.Rxg2 Rf4 11.Rg7 Rxh4 12.Rf7.
xiii) 8.Rxc2 Rxe7+ 9.Kh6 Kb7 10.Rg2 Kc7 11.Rxg4 Kd7 drawn.


No.7653: Yochanan Afek (Israel). Judge: Yehuda Hoch, who considered the standard sufficiently
high to honour 11 from among the 17 entries passed to him. EG96.7229 was awarded First Prize. 1.Kb2 h3 2.Se6+/i Ke3/ii 3.f6 ef 4.Sxg7 h2 5.Sf5+ Kf2 6.Sg3 Kxg3 7.g7 a1Q+ 8.Kxa1 h1Q+ 9.Bb1 Qa8+ 10.Ba2 Qh1+ 11.Bb1 (Kb2? Qb7+;) Qd5 12.Ba2 Qd4+ 13.Kb1 Qb6+/iii 14.Ka1 $\mathrm{Qg} 1+$ 15.Kb2 $\mathrm{Qg} 2+$ 16.Kal Qh1+ 17.Bb1, positional draw.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Sc} 6+$ ? Ke4 3.Bg8 h2 4.Sxe7 a1Q+. 2.f6? a1Q+ 3.Kxa1 h2 4.fg Kc 3 wins.
ii) Kc4 3.Bg8 h2 4.Sf4+ for Bd5. Ke5 3.Sg5.
iii) Qe4+ 14.Kal Qe5+ 15.Kbl Qel+ 16.Kb2 Qd2+ 17.Kb1, but not 17.Kal? Qc1+ 18.Bb1. Qc3+ 19.Ka2 Qa5+ and Qg5, winning.
"The positional draw position is fascinating and seems to be original. The introductory play is nice, accurate, and full of pitfalls."


No.7654: Amatzia Avni (Israel). 1.Qh5+ Kxh5 2.e8Q+ Kh4 3.Qxe4+ Rxe4 4.Ba5 Rf4
5.Be1+/i Kh3 6.Be6+/ii g4 7.Bxg4+ Rxg4 8.c8R/iii Rd4 (Rc4(g8);d7) 9.Rg8/iv Rd1 $10 . \mathrm{Rg} 1$ wins, but not $10 . \mathrm{Rg} 3+$ ? Kh4 11.Rg1+ Kh5 12.Bg3 Kg6 13.Re1 Kf7 14.Kg2 Rxe1 15.Bxe1 Ke6, with elQ to follow, drawing.
i) $5 . \mathrm{Bd} 5$ ? $\mathrm{Rf} 1+6 . \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{~g} 47 . \mathrm{Be} 1+$ Rxe1 6.c8Q Rh1+ 9.Bxh1 elQ, when $W$ is unable to win.
ii) $6 . \mathrm{c} 8 \mathrm{Q}+? \mathrm{~g} 4$ 7.Qxg4+ Kxg 4 8.d7 Rf1+, drawn.
iii) 8.c8Q? B-, stalemate. 8.d7? Rf4.
iv) $9 . \mathrm{Rh} 8+$ ? Kg 4 10.Rh4+ Kf3 11.Rxd4 stalemate. Bl was threatening bRd1.
"Sparkling and eventful play, in the best style of this composer. A breathtaking duel from beginning to end."


No.7655: Emilian Dobrescu (Romania). 1.Ba6 (Ba8? Rd4;) a3 2.Qc5/i Rb2+ 3.Kc3 dRd2 4.Qxa3 bRc2+ 5.Kb4 Ra2 6.Qc1/ii dRc2 7.Qd1 Rd2 8.Qe1 Re2 9.Qf1 Rf2/iii 10.Qg1 fRb2+/iv 11.Kc3 Rc2+ 12.Kd4/v Rd2+/vi 13.Ke3

Rg2 14.Qf1/vii Ra3+ 15.Kf4 aRa2 16.Kf3, wins.
i) 2.Bb5? $\mathrm{Rb} 2+3 . \mathrm{Kc} 3 \quad(\mathrm{Kc} 1$ ? Rd1+;) Rd1 4.Qe8+ Kb7 5.Bc6+ Kb6 6.Qa8 Rcl+ 7.Kd4 Rd1+ 8.Ke4 Re1+ 9.Kf4 a2 draws.
ii) $6 . \mathrm{Qe} 3$ ? $\mathrm{dRb} 2+$ and Rxa6.
iii) eRb2+ $10 . \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 2+11 . \mathrm{Kd} 4$ Rf2 12.Qe1 Rf4+ 13.Ke3, wins.
iv) Rg 2 11.Qh1 $\mathrm{gRb} 2+12 . \mathrm{Kc} 3$ Rc2+ 13.Kd3 Rd2+ 14.Ke3 Re2+ 15.Kf3 Rh2 16.Qg1 Rh3+ 17.Kg4 hRh2 18.Kg3 wins.
v) $12 . \mathrm{Kd} 3$ ? $\mathrm{Rg} 213 . \mathrm{Qb} 1+\mathrm{gRb} 2$ 14.Qc1 Rb3+, and Rxa6.
vi) $\mathrm{Rg} 213 . \mathrm{Qb} 1+\mathrm{gRb} 215 . \mathrm{Qc} 1$ Rc2 15.Qe1 wins.
vii) 14.Qh1? Ra3+ 15.Kf4 Rf2+, and Rxa6. 14.Qb1+? gRb2 15.Qc1 Rb3+.
"The composer shows an excellent grasp of the secrets of composition, and the technical execution is excellent, but the theme seems less interesting than those of the previous endings."


No.7656: A.Avni. 1.Bh3+ Kg5 2.Bxe6 Be5 3.Rc5 Kf6 4.Bg8/i Rf5+/ii $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Rg} 5+6 . \mathrm{Kh} 1$

Rxg8 7.Rc6+ Kg5 8.Rxh6 Kxh6 stalemate.
i) 4.Bb3? Rb4+. 4.Bf7? Rf5+ 5.Kg4 Rg5+, and bKxf7.
ii) Rc4+? 5.Rxe5 Rc3+ 6.Kf4, drawn.
iii) $5 . \mathrm{Kh} 4 ? \mathrm{Bg} 3+$. $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Rg} 5+$. 5.Kh3? Rh5+.
"The ending is based on a reallife endgame, and just by comparing it to the source one can appreciate the composer's creative imagination. He has succeeded in adding something of his own to produce a rich and enjoyable composition."


No.7657: Y.Afek. 1.g7+ Kh7 2.g6+ Kh6 3.a8Q Rxa8 4.Kf7 Ra7+ 5.Kg8 Rxg7+ (Kxg6;Kh8) 6.Kh8 Ra7 7.g7 Rxg7 stalemate.
"A fresh and amusing variation on an old theme."

No.7658: Hillel Aloni (Israel). 1.Rg6/i Rxd6 (Rxg6;Rxg6) 2.Rxd6 e2 3.Rf3+ Kxg2 4.Re3/ii a3+ 5.Kxa3/iii Bb4+ 6.Kxb4 (Kb2? Bxd6;) b2 7.Rxe2+ (Rg6+? Kf2;) Bxe2 8.Rd1 Bxd1
9.Ka3 $\mathrm{blQ}(\mathrm{R})$ stalemate, while promotion to bB is a draw and $\mathrm{b} 1 \mathrm{~S}+10 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Sd} 211 . \mathrm{Kc} 1$ is likewise a draw.
i) 1.Rd4? e 2 (for $\mathrm{Bc} 3+$;). 1.Bc5? a3+ 2.Bxa3 (K xa13? Ra6+;) Bxg4 3.Rxg4 e2 4.Bc5+ Kf1 5.Rf4+ $\mathrm{Kxg} 26 . \mathrm{Kxb} 3 \mathrm{Bg} .3$ wins.
ii) $4 . f \mathrm{fR} 3$ ? a3+/iv 5.Kxa3/v Bb4+ $6 . \mathrm{Kxb4} \mathrm{elQ}+\quad$ 7.Rd2+ Be 2 8. Kxb 3 Kf 3 wins.
iii) 5.Ka1? Bc3+ 6.Kbl Bc2+ 7.Kc1 ba, wins. 5.Kb1? Bc2+ $6 . \mathrm{Kc1}$ ba 7.Rxa3 Bb4, wins. 5.Kc1? ba 6.Rxa3 Bb3 7.Rd8 $\mathrm{Bb4}$, winns.
iv) Bc3+? 5.Rxc3 elQ 6.Rg6+ wins.
v) 5.Kc1? Bc3 6.Rxd1 edQ+ 7.Rxdl ba, and alQ.
"W and Bl exchange heavy blows with mutual sacrifices, culminating in the consecutive sacrifice of wRR. On the other hand the construction is very heavy, and the final position has been presented before."


No. $7659 \quad$ Y. Afek and G. Costeff Shahmat


No.7659: Y.Afek and Gad Costeff (Israel). 1.f6+ Kg6 $2 . f 7$ Rh7 3.Sh6 Kxh6 4.Ke8 Rh8+/i 5.f8R (f8Q+? Kg6;) Rh7/ii 6.Rf6+ Kg7 7.Rf7+ and Rxh7, winning.
i) Kg6 5.f8S+ wins, but not 5.f8Q? Rh8 6.Qxh8 stalemate.
ii) Rxf8+? 6.Kxf8 Kg6 7.Ke7, wins.
"The composers present two minor promotions in a variation on a well-known ending by Peckover."


No.7660: I.Krikheli (USSR). 1.Bf4 ef+ 2.Kh5/i Qb6/ii 3.Bg5 (c7? Kxh7;) Ba5 4.c7 Qxc7/iii 5.d8Q+/iv Qxd8 6.Bf6+ Kxh7 7.Bxd8 Bxd8 stalemate.
i) 2.Kxf5? Qb6 3.c7 Qb1+ 4.Ke6 Qg6+ 5.Kd5 Qg2+ 6.Ke6 Qg4+ 7.Ke7 Bh4+.
ii) $\mathrm{Qd} 83 . \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Ba} 5$ 4.Bxd8 Bxd 8 5.c7 Bxc7 6.Kg5 f4 7.d8Q+, drawn.
iii) Kxh7 5.d8Q Qg6+ 6.Kh4 Bel+ 7.Kh3 Qh5+ 8.Bh4, drawn.
iv) 5.Bf6+? Kxh7 6.d8Q Qh2+ 7.Bh4 Qe2+.


No.7661: A.Avni. 1.Sb5 Bxb5/i 2.Be4+ Bc6 3.d5 Re7+ 4.Kd4/ii Rd7 5.Kc4 Bxa4 6.b3 Re7(c7)+ 7.Kd4 draws.
i) Rxh7 2.Sd6+. $\operatorname{Re} 7+2 . \mathrm{Kf6}$ Rf7+3.Kg6 Rd7 4.Kh6 drawn. ii) 4.Kf4? Rf7+. 4.Kf5? Bd7+.


No.7662: A.Avni. 1.f4+ Kxf4/i 2.c7 Bb3+ 3.Ke1/ii Be6 4.Sxe6+ Ke3 5.c8R (c8Q? Rc4;) and wins.
i) Rxf4 2.Sh3+ Kf6 3.Sxf4 Ke7 4.c7 Kd7 5.fSe6 wins.
ii) 3.Kc1? Rh2. 3.Kd2? Rh2+ 4.Se2+ Rxe2+ and $\mathrm{Bc} 4+$ for Ba 6 , drawing.


No.7663: Helmut Ossadnik (Dortmund, West Germany). Judge: Hemmo Axt, who tells us that this was his first study tourney award, though he is experienced in judging other genres. His fresh comments are therefore of especial interest and value. 1.Kb1/i Bb4 2.f3 a3/ii 3.Ka2 Ka4 4.f4 Ba5 5.f5 Bb4 6.f6 Ba5 7.f7 Bb4 8.f8S Ba5 9.Sd7 Kb4 10.Sf6 Ka4 11.Sd5 blQ+ 12.Kxbl a2+ 13.Kxa2 Bb4 14.Sxb6+ Ka5 15.Sd5 Ba3 $16 . \mathrm{b} 6$ wins.
i) $1 . \mathrm{f} 4$ ? b1Q+, followed by bBb 2 and $\mathrm{a} 4-\mathrm{a} 3-\mathrm{a} 2+$ and bB holds fP .
ii) Bl tries to rid himself of aP. His aim is to construct a fortress with bBa 5 and an oscillation by bKab4, meeting S-promotion with
bKa 5 and this time bB oscillating. Great stuff!
"It soon became clear that this was the one study worthy of a prize. There is more to the position than one suspects. Bl is outwitted by 'Sting' methods. The content is buttressed by the try 2.f4? in which $W$ is eventually caught on the wrong foot, and 3.f4? is also pretty."


No.7664: Alexandr P. Maksimovskikh (Zagainovo, USSR) and Pauli Perkonoja (Turku, Finland). 1.Rd8 Kc7 2.Ra8/i Kb7 3.Rh8 Bg7 4.Rh4 g5 5.Rd4 Bf8+ 6.Kb5 a6+ 7.Ka4/ii Bc5 8.Rd8 Be7 9.Rh8 wins.
i) 2. Rh 8 ? $\mathrm{Bg} 73 . \mathrm{Rh} 4 \mathrm{~g} 54 . \mathrm{Rd} 4$ Sd7+, explaining the prefatory decoy of bK to b7.
ii) 7.Ka5? would fail (main line) to 8.Rd8?? Bb6+.
"This too has wit. Similar piece chases are familiar, but here it is a pleasure to see $w R$ going one-and-a-half times round the houses, embellished with the logi-
cal hesitation 2.Rh8? 2.Ra8! that lends the piece a light neudeutsch touch."


No.7665: St.Eisert (Salach, West Germany) and H.P.Rehm (Pfinztal, West Germany). 1.Se8/i Kc6/ii 2.Sd6 Rb4 3.Sf5 Kc7 4.e4 Rxe4 5.Se7 Re5 6.Sd5+ Kc6 7.Sf6 Rb5 8.Sg8 Re5 9.Sf6 Kc7 10.Sd5+ Kc6 11.Sf6 Rb5 12.Sg8 draws.
i) 1.Se6? Rb4 2.Sf8+ Kc6 3.e4 Rxe4 4.Sd7 Re6 5.Sb8+ Kc7 6.Sd7 Re8+ 7.Sb8 Re7 8.Sd7 Rf7 9.Sb8 Kb6. 1.Sd5? Kc6. 1.Sb5? is refuted by Re5 2.Sd6 Kc7 3.e4 Re6 4.e5 Rxe5 5.Sb5+ Kb6 6.Sd6 Rd5 7.Sc8+ Kc7 8.Sd6 Re5, but not by Rb4? 2.Sc3 c6 3.e4 Rd4 4.Sd5.
ii) Rb4 2.Sf6+ Kc6 3.e4 Rd4 4.Sd5 drawn.
"A product of intellectual Sprödigkeit but the material employed is of interest, and the run of the play is gripping. It is an extension of an earlier work." The dictionary gives 'brittleness, hardness, coyness...' for Sprödigkeit.


No.7666: Mario Matous (Prague). 1.f6 d3+ 2.Kxd3/i Kf2 3.f7, with: g2 4.f8B/ii Kxf3 5.Bc5 Kg3 $6 . \mathrm{Bg} 1 \mathrm{f} 37 . \mathrm{Ke} 3$, winning, or Kxf3 4.f8R g2 5.Rg8 Kf2 6.e5 f3 7.Ke4 wins.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Kd} 2$ ? g2 3.f7 Kf1 4.f8Q glQ 5.Qxf4 Qh2+, a stalemate trap.
ii) 4.f8Q? Kxf3 (g1Q? Qxf4) draws.
"A pretty piece of underpromotion, not to be suspected from the innocent setting. The placing would have been higher had the introduction been of better quality."


No.7667: Marek Halski (Warsaw). 1.Bg6/i Kb3/ii 2.Se3

Be5+/iii 3.Kb7 Kc3 4.Sd5+ Kd4/iv 5.Bb2+ Kxd5 6.Bf7+ Kc5 7.d4+ Bxd4 8.Ba3 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Be} 2$ ? $\mathrm{Kb} 1 / \mathrm{v} \mathrm{Bh} 6 \mathrm{Kc} 23 . \mathrm{Se} 3+$ Kd2 4.Bf1 Bd4 5.Sc4+ Kel 6.Sa3 Ba6 drawn.
ii) $\mathrm{Kb} 12 . \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{Kc} 23 . \mathrm{Se} 3+\mathrm{Kb} 3$ 4.Sd5.
iii) Bg 5 3.Bd2 d5 4.d4.
iv) Kc2 5.Bf4, and Bxd3 6.Sb4+, or Bd4 6.Kc7, or Bc6+ 6.Ka6.
v) Kb 3 ? 2. $\mathrm{Se} 3 \mathrm{Be} 5+3 . \mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Kc} 3$ 4.Sc4 wins.
"A surprising midboard mate, delighting the beholder. The content suffers somewhat from the byplay, and the try $1 . \mathrm{Be} 2$ ? has no connection with the solution proper."


No.7668: Gregor Werner (Worms, West Germany). 1.a4+ Kb4 2.Qb7+ Kxa4 3.Qb3+/i Ka5 4.Qa3+ Kb6 5.Qa7+, and Kb5 $6 . \mathrm{Bc} 4+$, or Kc6 6.Bd5+, winning. i) $3 . \mathrm{Bb} 3+? \mathrm{Ka} 3 \quad 4 . \mathrm{Qa} 7+\mathrm{Kb} 2$ $5 . \mathrm{Qg} 7+\mathrm{Kb} 16 . \mathrm{Qh} 7+\mathrm{Kb} 27 . \mathrm{Qh} 8+$ wins bB but the game is drawn.
"A logical study should not go
away empty-handed, even if it could have done with some merchandising."


No.7669: Gerd Rinder (Haar, West Germany). 1.Bb7/i Ral/ii 2.Kxg1 Be3+ 3.Kf1 Rxd1+ 4.Ke2, and Rd7 5.Bc8, or Rb1 5.Be4+, drawn.
i) The main line demonstrates the inadequacy of $1 . \mathrm{Bg} 2$ ? or $1 . \mathrm{Bc} 6$ ?
ii) Re 5 2.Sf2, with $\mathrm{Se} 23 . \mathrm{Be} 4+$, or Re2 3.Sh3, or Be3 3.Bc8+/iii (followed by $4 . \mathrm{Sg} 4$ ).
iii) 3.Kxg1? Rb5 4.Bc8+ Kf4.
"A good choice of key, and the material makes it interesting - a bR ahead is usually more than enough."


No.7670: Gerd Rinder. This study was singled out as being of interest though not in the award. 1.Sxa6/i Kb5 (Bd2;Sb4) 2.Sc5 Bf4+ (Kc5;Kb7) 3.Kb7 Kxa5 4.Kc6, and Kb4 5.Sd3+, or Bd2 $5 . \mathrm{Sb} 3+$, winning.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Sc} 6$ ? $\mathrm{Kb} 52 . \mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Bd} 23 . \mathrm{Sd} 4+$ Ka4 draws, but the 'correction' 1.Bc3!? also fails, despite Kxc3? 2.Sa2+ Kb3 3.Sxc1+ Ka4 4.Sb3 (wins), because of the preliminary interpolation Bf4+ 2.Kb7 Kxc3 3.Sd5 (Sxa6 is no better) Kc4 4.Sxf4 Kb5, when wS cannot hoof it in time to c 4 .

Die Schwalbe, organ of the West German national problem organisation of the same name, is an interesting magazine as regards studies. Contributions by Hilmar Ebert (examples: on pawnless minimals and one-pawn minimals) are typical article fare, while studies are mixed with other genres in the originals on offer to solvers. At the rate of no more than two originals per issue it makes sense that the tourney is over a 3 -year period. Gerd Rinder is the columnist. Significant space is devoted to solving, book reviews, items on individual composers, and FIDE matters. We translate Hemmo Axt's commentary prefacing the above award in Die Schwalbe 115.
"... it was my duty to ponder on the artistic evaluation of this composition genre. ... A large part of the entries exhibited quite
pretty ideas, though in too simple a shape. Now in order for a study thought to become a valid composition in artistic dress it must somehow be exalted above naked origin and mere superficiality: there must be added value with regard to content or (better, and) form.

With respect to content this entails: introductory play that is not trivial, that brings out the concealed play while setting off its pregnancy; try play that logically sustains the idea; temptations or variations that bring about the desired pregnant effect by analogy. The formal criteria are: elegance of setting; good use of the material present; the aesthetic effect of the moves in action. I have deliberately omitted mentioning endgame theory (for example, a surprising and unusual distribution of force) because these remarks are restricted to consideration to the central idea. Studies frequently exhibit an emphasis on the formal. Profundity is in such cases manifested only through tries or by-play that run on into tedious variations that may well lack even a value for endgame theory, and these have a merely cumulative deadening effect without relevance to the study's central thought. Alternatively, the central thought exhausts itself in the mere addition of effects. A painting is not a high class work of art by virtue of the heaping up of detail,
however painstaking the artist's technique. From the standpoint of art a composition should be more than a puzzle - and this is why I have not discussed the question of difficulty. In my view there is, and not just among solvers, the mistaken idea that where there is difficulty there is also beauty. It is the artistic thought that is irreducible, and by 'artistic' I do not mean 'artificial'. Chess compositions that exaggerate the conundrum have beyond question the taste of long ago - which is not to say that they cannot amuse! There is a final remark that I should like to make. For me studies are chess problems (Schachprobleme) just like directmates, helpmates and so on. It makes me uncomfortable when someone says 'chess problems and studies'. At the least it should be 'chess problems including studies', in which the addendum is really superfluous. This uncomfortable feeling is heightened for me when one encounters, for example, the valuation of studies (one-and-two-thirds points as against just one for other genres. AJR ), and the setting up by the FIDE PCCC of a special subcommittee for studies." This was in 1988, when the West Germany delegate, as was his right, voted against the formation of the Sub-Committee.

No.7671: Vasily Smyslov, 21 years before he won the World Championship from Botvinnik.
1.Sg6+ hg 2.g5 a3 3.0-0-0 and wins, castling being 'legal because W gave the odds of QR' one of those hoary jokes rediscovered by the youthful Smyslov. In 1988 three articles appeared in (issues $26,27,29$ of) the now thrice-monthly Bulletin of the Central Chess Club of the USSR reproducing compositions by soviet World Champions. Smyslov thereupon disclosed nearly a dozen more of his own that had eluded journalist E.Gik. (Issue 7/89, iii.89).


No.7672: V.Smyslov. 1.Bb1 $\mathrm{a} 1 \mathrm{Q}+2 . \mathrm{Kb} 5 \mathrm{Bg} 33 . \mathrm{g} 7 \mathrm{Bb} 84 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{~B}$ Bf4 5.B8a2 Bxd2 6.f6 Bf4 7.7 Bd6 8.Kc6 Bf8 9.Kc7 with the winning threat of Bd 5 mate.


No.7673: V.Smyslov. 1.Sd6+ Kb8 2.Rb1+ Ka8 3.Se8 Qg3+ 4.Ka4 Bd4 5.e5, with Bxe5 6.Sc7+ Bxc7 7.h8Q+, or Qxe5 6.h8Q Qxh8 7.Sc7 mate. DVH: "Plachutta theme."


No.7674: V.Smyslov. 1.Sh8+ Kg8/i 2.f7+ Kf8 3.Kg6 a2 4.Kh7 alQ $5 . \mathrm{g} 6$ (for Bh6) Qh1 6.Bh6 Bf4 7.b8Q+ Bxb8 stalemate.
i) Kf8 2.Sg6+ and bKf7 is best, repeating moves as Ke8? 3.fg Kf7 4.Kh6 actually allows W to win, and Kg 8 3.Se7+ Kf7 4.fg Kxg7 5.Sf5+ is also a bad choice.

No.7675: V.Smyslov. 1.Bd8+ Kb4 2.a3+ (Bb6? e5;) Kc5/i
3.Rxf6 gf 4.Kc3 d5 5.e5 fe 6.Bc7 Qxc7 (ed+;ed+) 7.Sxe6+ Kd6 8.Sxc7 Kxc7 9.h5, winning.
i) Kxa3 3.Rf1 (for Ral+), and if Kb4 4.Ra1 Sxe4 (d5;Bb6) 5.Ra4+ Kc5 6.Ra5+ Kb4 7.Kb2, or if $\mathrm{Ka} 24 . \mathrm{Se} 2 \mathrm{Sxe} 4 / \mathrm{ii} 5 . \mathrm{Sc} 1+\mathrm{Ka} 3$ 6.Sd3 Ka2 7.Sb4+ Ка3 8.Ba5, mating.
ii) Qxd8 5.Sc1+ Ka3 6.Sd3 Ka2 7.Sb4+ Ka3 8.Sxc6.


No.7676: V.Smyslov. 1.Rg1+ Kb2 2.f4 gf 3.a7 Rd4+ 4.Kb5 Rd8 5.Rg2+ Kb3 6.Rg1 f3 7.Rf1 f2 8.Kb6 Kc3 9.Kb7 Kd3 10.Ral Kc3 11.Rf1 Kd3 12.Ra1, positional draw.


No.7677: V.Smyslov. 1.f5 gf 2.Bh3 Re8 (Rc8;ef) 3.ef/i Bc8 4.f6 Bxh3 5.c7 a5 6.Rd8/ii a4 7.Kb2 Be6 8.Kc2 Bf5+ 9.Kc3 Be6 10.a3, and after bB quits e6 11.Kxc4 and W wins.
i) 3.c7? Bc8, and 4.Bxf5 Ke7, or $4 . e f f 6$.
ii) 6.a4? Kg8 7.Rd8 Rf8 8.Kc2 Bg4 9.Kc3 Be6 and W gets nowhere.


No.7678: V.Smyslov. This was composed at the Dubai Olympiad, where for the first time Smyslov was present neither as participant nor trainer. He helped Bob Wade produce the daily bulletin - and had time to compose. $1 . g 6 \mathrm{hg} / \mathrm{i}$
2.h7 Bf6 3.Bb8 (Kxf6? 0-0-0;) Rxb8 4.Kxf6 Kd8 5.h8Q+ Kc7 $6 . \mathrm{Qh} 2+$ wins.
i) Bb6 2.Bb8, as once more $2 . \mathrm{g} 7$ ? fails: $0-0-0 \quad 3 . \mathrm{Bd} 6 \mathrm{Rg} 84 . \mathrm{Kf7}$ Be 3 , for Bl will be able to give up bB for wgPhP, to push bPa4 to divert $w B$ from control of $c 7$, and to mop up the last wP.


No.7679: V.Smyslov. 1.b7 Sc6+ 2.Kc7 Sb4 (for Sa6+;) 3.Kb8 f3 4.Bd4/i a3 5.Kxa7 f2 6.Bxf2 Kxf2 7.Kb6 Sa6 8.Kxa6 a2 9.b8Q $\mathrm{a} 1 \mathrm{Q}+\quad 10 . \mathrm{Kb} 7 \quad \mathrm{Qb} 2+11 . \mathrm{Ka} 8$ Qxb8+ 12.Kxb8 Ke3 13.Kc7 f5 14.c4 Kd4 15.Kd6 Kxc4 16.Ke5 f4 17.Kxf4, and there's not much left to fight with!
i) 4.Kxa7? f2 5.Kb6 Sa6.


No.7680: V.Smyslov. 1.g8S+ (g8Q? f6+;) Bxg8 2.Kf6 Kh7 3.g5 d3 4.Bf4/i Kh8 5.Be5 Kh7 6.Bc3 d2 7.Bxd2 Kh8 8.Bc3 Kh7 9.Bb2 Kh8 10.g6 fg 11.Kxg6 mate.
i) 4.Ba5? Kh8 5.Bc3 Kh7 and it's WTM.


No.7681: L.Tamkov. We do not know where, when, or even if, this Belorussian III Individual Championship (1977-80) award has been 'published', but the particulars supplied by the veteran Mr Dvizov are convincingly circumstantial. 1st, Dvizov (Minsk, 79 points); 2nd, Slepyan (Minsk, 54); 3rd, Tamkov (Gomel, 42); 4th, G.Novikov (Minsk, 9); 5th, Shablinski (Minsk, 8); 6th, Bondar (Brest, 6); 7th, Frigin (Mogilev, 4); 8th, Gebelt (Lida, 2); 9th, Tzirulik (Grodnensk region), who were the competing composers. The following were the 'top 20 ' studies placings: EGxx.4173, 4950, 3647, 4146, 5004, 3800, 3031 (after move 2), 4190, (9th), 5267, (11th), (12th),
(EG38.2235 a major anticipation of 13th), (14th), 4948, 4962, 4946, 4947, (19th), (20th). 1.Kb6 Qc1 2.Rg8+ Qc8 3.a5 d5 4.Rf8 d6 5.Re8 Qxe8 stalemate.


No.7682:L.Tamkov. 1.Qh2 Bd5 2.Qb8 Kc5+ 3.Qb7 Bc6 4.d4+ Kd5 5.Qxc6+ Kxc6 6.d5+ Kb6 7.d6 Se7 8.de Kc7 9.e8S+ drawn.


No.7683: Gennadi Novikov. 1.c7 Kb7 2.c8Q+ Kxc8 3.Se7+ Kb7 4.a6+ Kxa6 5.Bc8+ Kb5 6.Bd7+ Kc4 7.Be6+ Kd3 8.Bf5+, drawn.

No.7684: G.Slepyan. 1.Bd1+ Sg4 (g4;a8Q) 2.a8S Bf5 3.Sc7

Bd7 4.Se6 Bxe6 5.de c2 6.e7 c1Q 7.e8S Qc7+ 8.Sxc7 b4 9.Bf3 d1Q 10.Se6 Qxd4 11.Bxg4+, and if you were playing Bl how would you recapture? You'd resign, yes?


No.7685: L.Tamkov. 1.Bfl+ dRg2 2.Be7! Rh1 3.Bxg2+ Kh2 4.Bd6+ Kg1 5.Bc5+ Kh2 6.Kf2 Rd1 7.Be3 wins.

No.7686: S.Tsirulik. 1.Qh1 Qd1 2.Rh2 cb 3.Sg3 fg 4.Rc2+ bc 5.Qh6+ Kb1 6.b8Q+ Sxb8 7.Qb6+ mates.

DVH: "No advance on Stamma, 1737."


No.7687: Amatzia Avni (Israel). The 3-section tourney celebrated 25 years of the Guanabara Chess Club. It was formal, and organised in principle very correctly (though the award was greatly delayed - see EG65, p433), with Claude Fisch as the 'neutralising judge', or director. The award is in English. The studies section judge was the eminent Brazilian composer Sebastiao A. da Silva, who writes "I am not fond of judging study competitions, but, being the least unknown study composer in Brazil, I was forced to accept the task. It was difficult to examine the correctness of the entries without assistance. Even
so I 'succeeded' in demolishing $25 \%$. No information on anticipations was obtained, so I can only hope not to have been a victim of blindness." There were 40 studies entered by composers from 14 countries. The president of the Guanabara Chess Club (C.X.G) is, or was, Marcio Barbosa de Oliviera.1.Be3 Be 7 2.Bbl/i Kxbl 3.Bc5 Sc1+ 4.Ka3 Bxc5+ 5.b4 drawn.
i) 2.Bh6? Sd4+/ii 3.Kc3 Kxa2/iii 4.Kxd4 b4 5.b3 Kxb3 6.Bd2 $\mathrm{Bf} 6+7 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \quad 8 . \mathrm{Bg} 5 \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 9.Be7 b3. 2.Bd2? Bc5 3.Bc3 $\mathrm{Sc} 1+4 . \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Sxa} 2$ 5.b4+ Sxc3 6.bc Sd5.
ii) Bc 5 ? $3 . \mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{Sc} 1+4 . \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Sxa} 2$ 5.b4 draws.
iii) Sf5 4.Be6 (for b4 and Bd7) b4+ 5.Kb3 Sxh6 6.Kc2 Bd6 7.Kc1 Be5 8.Kc2 Bxb2 9.Kb3 $\mathrm{Ba} 310 . \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 2$ 11.Kb3 Bc3 12.Kc2 Be5 13.Kc1, drawn.
"With 2 pieces ahead Bl can only draw! There is a plus in the try 2.Bh6? to guarantee a fine positional draw if Bl accepts the piece."


No.7688: Gad Costeff (Israel). 1.h7/i Rh1+ 2.Bh3 Rxh3+ 3.Kg4 Rxh7 4.b8Q+ Ke6/ii 5.Qxe8 Rg7+ 6.Kf4 (Kf3? Rd6;) Rf7+/iii 7.Ke4 Rd7 8.a6, with: dRxe7 9.Qc6 mate, or Rxe7 9.Qg6 mate, or Rd6 9.Qf8 Rxe7 10.Qf5 mate, or Rf6 9.Qd8 Rxe7 10.Qd5 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Kg} 5$ ? $\mathrm{dRd} 12 . \mathrm{Bh} 3 \mathrm{Rgl}+$ 3.Bg4 Rh1 drawn.
ii) Rd6 5.Qb5+ Rd5 6.Qxe8 Rg7+ 7.Kf3 Ke6 8.Qc6+.
iii) Rd6 7.Qf8 Rf7+ 8.Ke4 Rxe7 9.Qf5 mate. Rd7 7.Qg6+ Rxg6 8.e8Q+. Rc3 7.Qg6+ Rxg6 8.e8Q+ Kf6 9.Qe5+.
"Active play ends in zugzwang leading to two pairs of echoed mates."


No.7689: the late Jos Mugnos and Oscar J.Carlsson (Argentina). 1.Qe2+/i Kf5 2.Qd3+ Kf6 3.Qxa6+ Kf5 4.Qd3+ Kf6 5.Qg6+/ii Ke5 6.Qg5+ Ke4 7.Qg2+ Kf5 8.Qh3+ Kf6 9.Qe6+ Kg5/iii 10.Qe5+ Kg4 11.a5 Qa8/iv 12.Sd5 Qa6/v 13.Qg7+ Kh3 14.Sf4+ Kh4 15.Qe7+ Kg3 16.Qe3+ Kh4 17.Qh3+ Kg5 18.Qg3+ Kf5 19.Qg6+ Qxg6 20.Sxg6 Ke4 21.Se5 Kd4 22.a6

Kc3 23.Sc4, wins. The annotations are "some lines from the authors' extensive analysis".
i) $1 . \mathrm{Qg} 2+$ ? $\mathrm{Kf5} 2 . \mathrm{Qh} 3+\mathrm{Kf6}$ 3.Qe6+ Kg5 4.Qe5+ Qf5 5.Se6+ Kg4 6.Qxf5+ Kxf5 7.Sc7 Ke4 8.Sxa6 Kd4, drawn.
ii) 5.a5? Qb8 6.Qe4 b2+ 7.Kxa2 b1Q+ 8.Qxb1 Qxf4, drawn, or, in this, 6.Sd5+ Ke6 7.Qe4+ Kd7 8.Qe7+ Kc6 9.Sb4+ Kb5 10.Qf6 Qa7, drawn.
iii) Kg7 10.Sh5+ Kh7 11.Sf6+ Kg7 12.Qg8+ Qxg8 13.Sxg8 Kxg8 $14 . \mathrm{a}^{5}$ wins.
iv) b2+ 12.Kxa2 Qc8 13.Se3+ Kf3 14.Qf5+. Bb1 12.Kxb1 a2+ 13.Ka1 Qa3 14.Sd3+. Qd8 12.Sd5 Qc8 13.Se3+ Kh4 14.Qf4+ Kh3 15.Qf5+ Qxf5 16.Sxf5 Kg4 17.a6.
v) Qb7 13.Se3+ Kh3 14.Qf5+ Kg3 15.Sf1+ Kg2 16.Qd5+ Qxd5 17.Se3+ Kf3 18.Sxd5 Ke4 19.Sc7 Kd3 20.Sb5 Kc4 21.a6, or, in this, Kf3 14.Qd5+ Qxd5 15.Sxd5 Ke4 16.a6 Kd3 17.a7 Kc2 18.Sc3 wins. Qc6 13.Se3+ Kh3 14.Qf5+ Kh2 15.Qf4+ Kh3 16.Qg4+ Kh2 $17 . \mathrm{Qg} 2+$, wins. Bb1 13.Sf6+ Kh4 14.Qh5+ Kg3 15.Kxb1 Qc6 16.Qe5+ Kh3 17.Qe3+ Kh2 18.Qd2+ Kg1 19.Qc1+, wins. Kf3 13.Qe3+ Kg4 14.Qe6+ Kg3 15.Qd6+ Kf2 16.a6 Qg8 17.Qc5+ Ke1 18 a7 Qa 8 19.Sc3 Kd 2 20.Qd5+ Qxd5 21.Sxd5 Kc2 $22 . \mathrm{Sc} 3$, wins.
"By means of a long $\mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{S}$ vs. Q struggle $W$ transforms his apparently innocent $P$ into a real threat, while the immediate
danger to wK is eliminated. The conclusion is rather prosaic."


No.7690: Attila Koranyi (Budapest). 1.Kg2 alQ/i 2.Sf3+ Kg4 3.Rg6+ Kf4 4.Rf6+ Ke3 5.Re6+ Kf4 6.Rd4+ Kf5 7.Re5+ Kg6 8.Rg4+ Kh6 9.Re6+ Kh7 10.Sg5+ Kg8/ii 11.Re8+/iii Kg7 12.Se4+ Kf7 13.Sd6+ Kf6 14.Rf4+ Kg5 15.Rf5+ Kg6 16.Re6+ Kg7 17.Rf7+ Kg8 18.Re8 mate.
i) e1S+ 2.Kf2 alQ 3.Rh6+ Kg5 4.Sf7+ Kg4 5.Rg5+ Kf4 6.Rh4 mate, or, in this, Sd3+ 3.Sxd3a1Q 4.Rh6+ Kg4 5.Rg6+ Rh4 6.Rd7 $\mathrm{Qa} 2+7 . \mathrm{Kf} 3$ wins.
ii) Kg 7 11.Rf4 Qf1+ 12.Rxf1 efQ+ 13.Kxf1 c2 14.Re1 b3 15.Se6+ and $16 . \mathrm{Sd} 4+$, or, in this, b3 14.Re1 b2 15.Se6+ and 16.Sd4.
iii) 11.Rg6+? Kf8 12.Rf4+ Ke8 13.Rf7 Qf1+ 14.Rxf1 efQ+ 15.Kxf1 c2 16.Re6+ K?? 17.Re1 b3.
"W has the upper hand with his heavy material, but precision is required to prevent the newborn bQ from coming into play."

No. 7691 Y. Hoch
2 Hon.Mention, Guanabara Club
2 Hon.Mention, Guan


No.7691: Yehuda Hoch (Israel). 1.Qd5+/i Ka3/ii 2.Qc5+/iii Ka2/iv 3.Qc4+ Ka3 4.Qc2 d3 5.Qb1 Kb3 $6 . \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{a} 3 / \mathrm{v} 7 . \mathrm{Kxd} 3 \mathrm{a} 28 . \mathrm{Qc} 2+$ Ka3 9.Qc5+ Kb3 10.Qb6(b5)+ Ka3 11.Kc4 b1Q 12.Qa5(e3)+ Kb 2 13.Qc3 mate.
i) 1.Qb7+? Ka2 2.Qd5+ Kal 3. Qxd4 a3 4.Kd2 elQ+ 5.Kxel Ka2, drawn.
ii) Kc3 2.Qa2 d3 3.Qa3+ Kc2 4.Qxa4+ Kc3 5.Qa2 Kc2 6.Qc4+ wins.
iii) 2.Qb5? d3, and the draw might go, 3.Kd2 e1Q+ 4.Kxe1 $\mathrm{d} 2+5 . \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{~d} 1 \mathrm{Q}+6 . \mathrm{Kxd1} \mathrm{blQ}+$ 7.Qxb1 stalemate, or 3.Qxd3+ Ka2 4.Qc4+ Ka3 5.Qc3+ Ka2 6.Qc4+ Ka3 7.Qc2 b1Q+, or 3.Qc5+ Ka2 4.Qc4+ Ka3 5.Qb5 $\mathrm{d} 2+6 . \mathrm{Kxd} 2 \mathrm{e} 1 \mathrm{Q}+$, and so on.
iv) Kb 3 3.Qb5+ Kc3 4.Kxe2 a3 5.Kd1 a2 6.Qa5+ Kb3 7.Qd5+ Ka3 8.Qc5+ Kb3 9.Qc2+ Ka3 10.Qd3+ Kb4 11.Qxd4+ Kb3 12.Qd3+ Kb4 13.Qd2+ Kb3 14.Qc2+ Ka3 15.Qc3+, or, in this, Ka3 4.Kxe2 d3+ 5.Kd1 d2 6.Qd3 Ka2 7.Qd5+ Ka1 8.Qd4 a3 9.Kc2 Ka2 $10 . \mathrm{Qg} 1$ wins.
v) e1Q+ 7.Kxe1 a3 8.Kd2 a2 9.Qxd3+ Ka4 10.Qd4+ Kb3 11.Qc3+.
"A wQ vs. bPP endgame leads to a fine mate after running the gauntlet of stalemate and positional draw. The minor duals on moves 10 and 12 are of no significance."


No.7692: Yochanan Afek (Israel). 1.Rb6+ Kxb6 2.d8B Ba7 3.c8B+ Kb5 4.Ba6+ Kxa6 drawn.
"The double stalemate with promoted BB of different colours pinned is quite a feat, but unfortunately the play is poor, the initial position being set for the outcome."

No.7693: Alexander Hildebrand (Sweden). 1.Rf4+ Kxg3/i 2.g8Q+ Kxf4 3.Qb8+ Kxf5 4.Qxh2 f1S+ 5.Kxd3 Sxh2 6.b6 Sf3 7.b7 Se5+ 8.Kd4 Ke6 9.b8S, drawn.
i) Kh5 2.Rh4+ Qxh4 3.gh f1Q 4.g8Q Qe2+ 5.Kc3 Qc2+ 6.Qd4 Qc4+ 7.Ke5 Qe4+ 8.Kd6 Qf4+ 9.Kc5 Qc7+, drawn.
"The first Q falls victim to a Sfork, but an underpromotion avoids the second fork."


No.7694: the late Eduard A.Asaba (Moscow). 1.c4+ Kc5 2.Bd6+ Qxd6 3.b4+, with: Rxb4 4.d4+ Kc6 5.Qc8+ Qc7 6.d5+ Kd6 7.e5+ fe 8.Qf8 mate, or, Kc6 4.Qc8+ Qc7 5.b5+ Rxb5 6.cb+ Kd6 7.Qf8+ Ke5 8.Qxf6 mate. "Two Q-mates after a fine Bsacrifice. The play has a rather forced character."

No.7695: A.Dzhalilov (Kokand, Uzbek SSR). The international
tourney was in honour of the Chelyabinsk composer-analyst A.G.Kopnin's 70th birthday. Judge: Aleksei Grigoryevich Kopnin, who sadly reported on the 82 studies that only 40 remained after screening had eliminated the rest, some with very interesting ideas. The results EG reports are as in the provisional award. 1...Sd4 2. $\mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Kf} 5$ 3.Bd1 Rd2 4.Se3+ Ke4 5.Sg4 Kf5 6.Se3+ Kg5 7.Bg4 Rd3 8.Sd1 Rd2 9.Se3 Rb2 10.Bd1 Rd2 11.Bg4 Rd3 12.Sd1, a positional draw. "The mechanism for direct and indirect defence of both W pieces shows versatility."


No.7696: Pavel Arestov (Rostov region). 1.Se6+ Rxe6+ 2.de Bb8+ 3.Qxa8 Qxd3+ 4.Kb6 Qxe3+ 5.Kb7 Bd5+ 6.Kc8 Qb6 7.cbS Bxe6+ 8.Sd7+ Ke8 9.Qa7 Qxa7, with a pure stalemate, the promoted wS being pinned and a blockaded pawn - hardly to be imagined from a glance at the diagram.


No.7697: A.Zinchuk (Kiev). 1.Qh8+ Kb1 2.Qc3 Bf3+ 3.Rxf3 $\mathrm{Qg} 1+$ 4.Qe1 Rxel+ 5.Bxe1 Qg4 6.Kd2 Qxf3, a pure stalemate with wB walled in and wP blocked. That is not all. There's a positional draw after $\mathrm{Qg} 4+3 . \mathrm{f} 3$ Bxf3+ 4.Rxf3 Qg1+ 5.Qe1 Qd4+ 6.Qd2 Qg1+ 7.Qe1.


No.7698: D.Gurgenidze (Georgian SSR). 1.Sb5+ Kxc2 2.Sa3+ Kd3 3.Rd7+ Ke4 4.Re7+ Kd4 5.Rd7+ Kc5 6.Rc7+ Kb4 7.g8Q Bb3+ 8.Rcl Qxcl+ 9.Sb1 Bxg8, a pure stalemate with wS pinned.


No.7699: A.P.Grin (Moscow). 1.Sh6+ Rxh6 2.g8Q+ Qxg8 3.Qh5+ Rxh5 4.e8Q+ Kxe8 5.f7+ Qxf7+ 6.Rxe6+ K- and it's stalemate with four W men pinned.


No.7700: R.Ganiev (Kazan). 1.Ra6 g2 2.Kd5 Kf3 3.Ra3+ Kf4 4.Ra4+ Kf5 5.Ra8 Kf6 6.Ra6+ Kf7 7.Ra7+ Kg8 8.Ra8+ Kh7
9.Ra7+ Kh6 10.Ra6+ Kh5 11.Ra8 Kh4 12.Ra4+ Kg3 13.Ra3+ Kf4 14.Ra4+ Kf5 15.Ra8 Kf6 16.Ke6 Kf7 17.Ra7+ Ke8 18.Ke6 Kf8 19.Kf6 Kg8 20.Ra8+ Kh7 21.Ra7+ Kh8 22.Ra8+ Kh7 23.Ra7+, and the possibilities of the positional draw have by now been exhausted. Based on an idea of the late US composer Edmund Peckover.


No.7701:
V.Kondratev (Chelyabinsk). Awarded for a rook ending with significance for theory. 1.Re4+ Kf6 2.Rd4 Rb2 3.Kd5 Rc2 4.Rd3/i Kf5 5.Rf3+ Kg 4 6.Rd3 Kf4/ii 7.Kd4 and draws, the zugzwang having been manipulated in W's favour.
i) $4 . \mathrm{Rf} 4+$ ? Kg 5 5.Rd4 Kf5 6.Kd6 (Rd3,Rc8;) Rb2 7.Kd5 Ra2 8.Rd3 Kf4 9.Kd4 Rc2, when W is on the zugzwang rack - and loses.
ii) Rc8 7.Ke6 Re8+ 8.Kd7 Re2 9.Kc6, drawing.

No.7702: G.Amiryan (Erevan). 1.Ba7+ f2 2.Bg4 Kf1 3.Bh3 Qg1 4.Bf5 Qh1 5.Bxd3+ Kg1 6.Bf5 Kf1 7.Bh3 Qg1 8.Bc8 Qh1
9.Ba6+ Kg1 10.b5 Kf1 11.b6+ Kg1 12.Kc3 flR 13.b7+ Rf2 14.Kd4 Rf3 15.Ke4+ Rf2 16.Ke3, winning.


No.7703:
E.Kotenko
(Chelyabinsk). 1.b6+ Kb7 2.f8Q Rxf8 3.Kxf8 Sf3 4.Kxe7/i Sxd2 5.Bxd3 Sb3 6.Kd6 Sd2 7.Ba6+/ii Kxa6 8.Kc7 wins.
i) 4.Bxd3? Se5 5.Bf5 e6 6.d4 Sd7+ 7.Ke7 Sxc5 8.Bc2 Kxb6, drawn.
ii) 7.K- Sb3 8.Kd6 Sd2 7.Be2? Se4+, or 7.Bc2? Sc4+ and Sxb6.

No.7704:
S.Osintsev
(Sverdlovsk). 1.Bf3+ Kh6 2.g4
Rh5 3.g5 + Rxg5 4.Bf4 Bh4 5.Sd8 Se5 6.Bxe5 Rf5 7.Bxg7+ Kg5 8.Se6 mate.


No.7705: N.Ryabinin (Tambov region). 1.a5 g3 2.Ba4, with: f5 3.Bc6+ Bd5 4.d3+ Kd4(e5) 5.Bxd5 Kxd5 $6 . a 6$ g2 7.a7 g1Q 8.a8Q+ Ke5 (Kd4;Qa7+) 9.Qb8+ Kf6 10.Qf8+ Ke5 (Kg6;Qg8+) 11.Qd6 mate, or f6 3.Bc6+ Bd5 4.d3+ Kd4(e5) 5.Bxd5 Kxd5 6.96 g2 7.a7 g1Q 8.a8Q+ Ke5 9.Qe4 mate.


No.7706: O.Forkosh (Transcarpathian region - the proximity to Hungary suggesting the original name Farkas. The conjectures of name trans-literation are limitless!). 1.a6 Kf5 2.Kb3 Rd4 3.g4+ Kxg4 4.a7 Rd3+ 5.Kb4 Rd4+ 6.Kb5 Rd5+ 7.Ka6 Rd6+ 8.Sb6 Rd1 9.Kb5 Rd8 10.Kc6 Se7+ 11.Kc7 Kf5 12.Sf6 Kxf6 13.Sd7+ Ke6 14.Sb8 Sd5+ 15.Kb7 wins.


No.7707: A.Kubryak (Maritime province). 1.c7 Rh7+ 2.e7 Ba3 3.c8Q Rxe7+ 4.Kxe7 b3+ 5.Ke6 ba 6.Qh8 Kc2 7.Qal Kb3 8.Kd5 Bb2 9.Qd1+, and now either: Kc3 10.Qd4+ Kc2 11.Qa4+ Kb1 12.Qdl+ Bcl 13.Kc4 alQ 14.Qd3+ Kb2 15.Qb3, a familiar mate, or Kb4 10.Qg4+ Ka5 11.Kc5 $\mathrm{Ba}+\mathrm{B}$ 12.Kc6 alQ 13.Qf5+ Kb4 14.Qb5+ Kc3 15.Qe5+, winning.

No.7708: D.Makhatadze (Zestafoni, Georgian SSR). 1.Se3+, with: Kcl 2.Rxb4 b1Q 3.Sxc2 Qxc2 4.Rc4 Qxc4 stalemate, or Kd2 2.Sxc2 b1Q 3.Rxb4 Qc1+ 4.Ka2 Kc3 5.Rb3+ Kxc2 6.Rc3+ Kxc3 stalemate.


No.7709: A.Krochek (Khmelnitsky, Ukraine) and N.Mansarliisky (Odessa, Ukraine). 1.d5/i cd 2.Kd6, with: Ba2 3.Rb7 Ka3 4.Kxd5 b2+ 5.Kc5 Bb3 6.Ra7+ Ba4 7.Rb7, positional draw, or Be4 3.Kc5 b2 4.Rb7 Ka3 5.Kd4 Ka 2 6.Ra7+ Kb3 7.Rb7+ Kc2 8.Rc7+ Kd2 9.Rb7 Kc1 10.Rc7+ Bc 2 11.Rb7 Be4 12.Rc7+, and another positional draw. i) 1.Kd6? Be4 2.Kc5 b2 3.Rb7 Ka3 4.d5 Bxd5 5.Kd4 Bb3 6.Ra7+ Ba4 7.Rb7 Bb5, or, in this, 4.Kc4 b1Q 5.Rxb1 Bxbl 6.d5 $\mathrm{Ba} 2+$, and Bl wins.

No.7710: S.Migunov (Voronezh). 1...h2+ 2.Kxh2 Rf2+ 3.Kh3 Rf3+
4.Kh4 Rf4+ 5.Kh5 Rxf5 $+6 . \mathrm{Kh} 4$ Rf4+ 7.Kh3 Rf3+ 8.Kh2 Rf2+ 9.Bg2 Rxg2+ 10.Kh3 $\mathrm{Rg} 3+$ 11.Kh4 Rg4+ ... 15.Kh8 Rh7+ 16.Kg8 Rg7+ ... 19.Kd8 Rxd7+ 20.Ke8 Re7+ ... 23.Kh8 Rg8+ 24.Kh7 Rg7+ 25.Kh6 Rg6+ 26.Qxg6 wins.


No.7711: N.Ryabinin. 1.Bc7+ Ka6 2.Rb1 Bg4+ 3.Kd8 h1Q 4.Bd3+ Ka7 5.Ral+ Kb7 6.Ba6+ Kc6 7.Rc1+ Bc3 8.Rxc3+ Kd5 9.Bb7+ Kd4 10.Be5+ Kxe5 11.Bxh1 wins.

No.7712: Michael Schlosser (Karl-Marx-Stadt, East Germany). 1.g5 Kh4 2.g6 Kg5 3.g7

Kh6 4.g8R Kh7 5.Bb3 Kh6 6.Bc2
Kh5 7.Rg6 Kh4 8.Bd1 Kh3 9.Rh6 mate.


No.7713: N.Grechishnikov (Novosibirsk). The judge was G.A.Umnov, from a safe distance of several thousand miles. [The Pacific Ocean port of Magadan has infamous human transportation connotations for readers of Solzhenitsyn's Gulag Archipelago or Shalomov's Kolyma Tales. Here we see it in an innocent light.] There were 43 entries for the studies section. The full page award incorporates a rarity - the photographed head of the chess column's editor, Vladimir Koz-
hakin. We learn that he also masquerades as 'V.Zeitnotkin' and 'V.Third' - as a non-chess hobby he draws caricatures. 1.ef $\mathrm{Ra} 2+2 . \mathrm{Kxa} 2 / \mathrm{i} \quad \mathrm{Bc} 4+3 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 / \mathrm{ii}$ Bxf7 4.Rh8+ Kxg7 5.Bd4+ Rf6 6.Rh1/iii Bc4 7.Rc1 Bb5/iv 8.Rc5 Bd7/v 9.Rc7 wins.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Kbl}$ ? $\mathrm{Bd} 3+3 . \mathrm{Kc1} \mathrm{Rc6+}$ 4.Rxc6 Kxg7 5.Rf6 Ra8 6.Bd4 Rf8, drawn.
ii) 3.Rxc4? Kxg 7 4.Rc7 $\operatorname{Rg} 2$ draw.
iii) 6.Rh2? e3. Had $W$ played 3.Kb1? now e3 7.Rf1 e2, promoting on e1 with check after, for instance, 8.Rxf6.
iv) Covers both f 1 and c6. v) Covers both c6 and f5. But there's a 'but'.
"Bright, lively, inventive play by both sides culminates in a rare final picture with two Bl pieces pinned. Superb."


No.7714: P.Arestov (Krasnogorsk). 1.b6 Sc4 2.Sxd7 Ba4 3.b7/i Sd6 4.Ke6 Sxb7 5.Sb6 Bc6 6.Rg8+ Kc7 (Be8;Sd7) 7.Sa8, a beautiful model mate with a pair of active self-blocks. i) 3.Ke6? Bd7+4. $\mathrm{Rxd7}+\mathrm{Kc8}$.


No.7715: V.Lovtsov (Maundzha). 1.Sd3+ Kd1 2.Kc7 g1Q 3.Rxh1 Qxh1 4.Sf2+ Ke2 5.Sxh1 Kf3 6.Kd6 h4 7.Ke5 h3 8.Kd4 Kg2 9.Ke3 Kxh1 10.Kf2 drawn.


No.7716: V.Lovtsov. 1.Ba5 Sd3 2.Sxa7 Kb7 3.Kc4 Sb2+ 4.Kc3 $\mathrm{Sa4+} / \mathrm{i}$ 5.Kb3 Sb6 6.Sb5 Ka6 7.Sc7+ Kxa5 8.Se5 c4 9.Ka3 wins. Not a new conclusion, but it is led up to by play that is interesting.
i) $\mathrm{Sd} 1+5 . \mathrm{Kd} 2$, and $\mathrm{Sf} 26 . \mathrm{Ke} 3$, or Sb2 6.Se5.

No.7717: B.Sidorov. 1.c7 Kb7 2.Bd7 Kxc7 3.Bg4 Kd6 4.Kc2/i Ke5 5.Kxc3 Ke4 6.Kd2 Kd4 7.Ke2 Ke4 8.Kd2 Kf4 9.Kd3 Kg4
$10 . \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6$ 11.Ke5, and Bl is tragicomically stalemated.
i) 4.Bxh5? $\mathrm{Ke} 55 . \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Kd} 4$.

DVH: "Too many dead men."


No.7718: A.Grin (Moscow). 1.f7 Qxf7 2.Sc6+ Ka8 3.b7+ Qxb7 4.Bxe4 a5 5.h4, winning a decisive tempo, a4 6.Bf3 Qb6 7.Se5+ Kb8 8.Sd7+ Kc7 9.Sxb6 ab 10.Be4 Kd6 11.Bxh7 wins.

No.7719: V.S.Kovalenko. 1.h6 h2 2.h7 h1Q 3.f4, with: Qh2 4.h8Q Qxh8 stalemate, or $\mathrm{Ke} 84 . \mathrm{Kg} 6$ Kf8 5.g5 Qh2 6.f7 Qb2 7.f6 Qb1+ 8.f5 Qh1 9.h8Q Qxh8 stalemate. A pair of echo stalemates in a P-study.


No.7720: David Gurgenidze (Tbilisi). Judge: Velimir Kalandadze, IM of Composition. The award was prefaced as follows. "The study art has many devotees throughout the world. For this reason the announcement the Tbilisi Chess Pavilion of the 2nd international tourney [GOLDEN FLEECE, 1988] resounded far and wide.
Over a hundred entries were received from many parts of the USSR and from other countries.
"The tourney underlined once more the high standard of Georgian composers. We consider
that this competition will continue its tradition for the future and make a positive contribution to the popularity and development of the art of the chess endgame study."
1.Rg8 b2 2.gRxg2 Rb3+ 3.Ka4 Rb4+ 4.Ka5 Rb5+ 5.Ka6 Rb6+ 6.Ka7 Rb7+ 7.Ka8 Rb8+8.Kxb8 blQ+ 9.Rb2 Qe4 10.Rh1+ Qxh1 11.Rb1+ Kf2 12.Rxh1 Kg2 13.Ra1 Kxh3 14.Rg1 Kh2 15.Rg8 h3 16.Kc7 Kh1 17.Kd6 h2 18.Ke5 h4 19.Kf4 h3 20.Kg3 and wins.
"A masterly production. The idea of a systematic movement of pieces is realised across the whole board and is finely executed."


No.7721: G.Slepyan (Minsk). 1.c8Q+ Kxc8 2.Ra8+ Kb7 3.Rxal Rc7+ 4.Kf6 Se4+ 5.Ke6 Sc5+ (Rxh7;Ra7+) 6.Kf6 e4+ 7.Ke6 Rg6+ 8.Kf5 Rf6+ 9.Kg4 Sf2+ (Rxh7;Ra7+) 10.Kg5 Se4+ $11 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \quad \mathrm{Rg} 6+$ 12.Kf5 Rg5+ 13.Ke6, positional draw.
"The author has realised a synthesis of two mirror stalemates. .... It is a unique composition, but somewhat schematic." For the position and solution awarded 3rd Prize, see EG97.7367. "The Argentinian author has composed an outstanding work displaying, by the use of zugzwang motifs, a number of interesting positional draws." The composer clearly sent his study to two places.


No.7722: Revaz Tavariani (Tbilisi). 1.Bd3+ Kb2 2.Rb4+ Kc 3 3.Ra4 Kb3 4.Bc2+ Kb2 5.Bb1 d4 6.Rb4+ Kc3 7.Rb5 (also Rb8) d3 8.Rf5 d2 9.Rf1 wins.
"In this study a sharp struggle by $w R$ and wB against passed pawns is superbly presented, although the conclusion weakens the dramatic effect. The conclusion is tame, but the economical setting is remarkable."

No.7723: Julien Vandiest (Belgium). 1.Bd5+ Kb8 2.Kb4 Qf8+
3.Kb5 Kc7 4.Qb6+ Kd7 5.Qa7+ Kd8 6.Qb8+ Ke7 7.Qe5+ Kd8 8.Bc6 Kc8 9.Be8, with: Qg8 $10 . \mathrm{Kb6}$ Qg1+ 11.Ka6 Qd1 12.Bb5 h4 13.Qe8+ Kc7 14.Qe7+ Kc8 15.Qe5 h3 16.Qxf5+ Kd8 17.Qf8+ Kc7 18.Qc5+ Kb8 19.Qe5+ Kc8 20.Bc4 Kd8 21.Kb6 Qg1+ 22.Kb7 Qh1+ 23.Kb8 Qc6 24.Qg5+ K- $25 . \mathrm{Bb} 5$ wins, or Qh6 10.Bf7 Qd2 11.Be6+ Kd8 12.Qf6+ Kc7 13.Qe7+ Kb8 14.Qf8+ Kb7 15.Qc8+ Ka7 16.Qc5+ Kb8 17.Ka6 Qd3+ 18.Bc4 Qd7 19.Qb6+ wins.
"This study shows two identical variations with significant wit."


No.7724: V.Kondratev (Ivanovo). 1.Rg7+ Kb8 2.Rg8+ Kc7 3.Rg7+ Kd8 4.Rxg6 b2 5.Rd6+ Kc7 6.Rd1 Sc3 7.Rf1 Se2+ 8.Kh1 Sc1 9.Rf7+ Kc6 10.Rf6+ Kc5 11.Rf5+ Kc4 12.Rf4+ Kc3 13.Rf3+Kd2 14.Rf2+Se2 15.Rf1 Kc2 16.Re1 Sc1 17.Re2+ Sxe2 stalemate.


No.7725: P.Arestov (Rostov-onDon). 1.Ra8 Rc5+ 2.Rc7 Rb5 3.Rxd7 Rc1+ 4.Kd8 Re5 5.Rxe7 Rd5+ 6.Ke8 Rf1 7.Re1 Ra5 8.Rd8 wins.



No.7726: A.Gorsky (Altai province). 1.c7 Rc6 2.Bd6 Bc5
3.Re8+ Kf3 4.Be5 Bd4 5.Rf8+ Kg 2 6.Rg8+ Kh1 7.Rg6 Rc1 8.Bf4 Be3 9.Rg1+ Kxg1 10.Bxe3+ wins.


No.7727: V.S.Kovalenko (Pacific Maritime Province).1.Kc1 alQ+ 2.Bb1 Kc7 3.h4 Kb6 4.h5 Ka5 5.h6 Ka4 6.h7 a5 7.h8B (h8Q? Qxb2+;) Kb3 (Qxb2+;Bxb2) 8.Bc3 a4 9.d4, and cd 10.Bxd4 (ed?) Kxc4 11.b3+, or Kxc4 10.dc Kxc5/i 11.b4+ wins.
i) Otherwise the dark wB can shepherd a P through to promote. This study is seriously anticipated by No. 7728.


No.7728: A.Maksimovskikh (USSR). 1.Kf1 h1Q+ 2.Bg1 Kg7
3.a4 Kg6 4.a5 Kh5 5.a6 Kh4 6.a7 h5 7.a8B (a8Q? Qxg2+;) Kg3 8.h4 Kxh4, with: Kxh4 9.g3+ and 10.Bxh1, or Kg 4 9.Bb7 Kg3 (Qxh4;Bf3+) 10.Bf3 Kxh4 $11 . g 3+$ wins. This study did not figure in the Swedish magazine's annual informal tourney award because studies editor Hildebrand did not consider it original: the composer had submitted only the latest setting of one of his earlier ideas. A case of 'self-anticipation'.


No.7729: P.Vashakidze (Tbilisi). 1.Sf6 Rh4+ 2.Sh7+ Rxh7+ 3.gh g4 $4 . \mathrm{g} 3 \mathrm{gh} 5 . \mathrm{g} 4 \mathrm{~h} 26 . \mathrm{g} 5 \mathrm{~h} 1 \mathrm{~S}$ 7.g6 Sg3 8.fg f2 9.g4 f1S 10.g5 Se3 11.de d2 12.e4 d1S 13.e5 Sc3 14.bc b2 15.c4 b1Q 16.c5 Qxg6 16.c6 Qxe6 18.g6 Qxg6 19.c7 Qe6 20.c8Q+ Qxc8 21.e6 and stalemate is unavoidable.

No.7730: A.Davranyan and M.Zinar (Odessa region). 1.f8R (f8Q? Kh2;) f1Q 2.Qxf1+ Kxf1 3.g5 Kxg2 4.g6 Kxh3 5.g7 g2
6.g8R Kh2 7.Kxh4 g1Q 8.Rxg1 Kxg1 9.Kg5 Kf2 10.Kf6 Kf3 11.Kf5 Ke2 12.Ke6 Ke3 13.Ke5 Kd2 14.Kd6 Kd3 15.Kd5 drawn.


No.7731: E. Chumburidze (Terdzholsky district, Georgian SSR). 1.Bc2 a2 2.Re1 a1Q 3.Bb1 a5+ 4.Kb3 a4+ 5.Kb4 a3 6.f7 Qxb1 7.Rxb1 a2 8.f8Q abQ 9.Qg7+ e5 10.Qg3 Qd3 11.Qg1+ Ke4 12.Qg4 mate.

No.7732: V.Tarasiuk (Kharkov region). 1.Bb1 Kxb1 2.Kxa6 Kc1 3.Se2+ Kd2 4.Sc3 Kxc3 5.Sb5+ Kb4 6.Sa3 Kxa3 7.Kb5 mate.

No. $7732 \quad$ V. Tarasyuk 3 Comm., 2nd Golden Fleece ty,


No. 7733
4 Comm., 2nd Golden Fleece ty,


No.7733: Enrico Paoli (Italy). $1 . c 7$ a1Q 2.c8Q Qxb2 3.Bf3+ Kd6 4.Qf8+ Ke6 5.Bg4+ Kd5 6.Qf7+ Ke4 7.Qf5+ Ke3 8.Qf3+ Kd2 9.Qe2+ Kc3 10.Qe3+ Kc2 11.Bf5+ Kd1 12.Qg1+ Kd2 13.Qf2+ Kc3 14.Qe3 mate.


No.7734: Ernest Pogosyants (Moscow). 1.Rg1+ Kh2 2.Rg2+ Kh1 3.Rxa2, with: g3 4.Rg2 h3 5.Rg1+ Kh2 6.Rxg3 Kxg3 7.Kg1 Kf4 8.Kf5 wins, or h3 4.Kf2 Kh2 5.Ral g3+6.Kf3 g2 7.Kg4 wins.


No.7735:
G.A.Nadareishvili (Tbilisi). The international judge, Vazha Neidze, reported that over 150 composers from 11 countries sent in 206 entries. Strictly speaking, for a fully international tourney the judge should come from outside the host country, especially if the latter is rich in composing talent. The award, in a bilingual (Georgian and Russian) brochure with photographs, is provisional. Figurines, an innovation in soviet awards, help the solver, but a number of diagram misprints have the opposite effect. Piece counts might have been supplied. Ilya Chavchavadze (1837-1907) was a Georgian writer and 'activist'. 1.Se4/i d1Q/ii 2.Sf2+Kg1/iii 3.Sxd1 c2 4.Sc3 Sxc3/iv 5.Bg5 Sf7+ 6.Kg8

Sxg5 7.Sxd4 c1Q 8.Rxc3 Qb2 9.Rc1+ Kf2 10.Rc2+.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Rb} 1+? \mathrm{Scl} 2 . \mathrm{Se} 4 \mathrm{Sd} 3$.
ii) c2 2.Sxd2 c1Q 3.Rb1, draw.
iii) Otherwise 3.Sxd1 c2 4.Rb2.
iv) dc 5.Sd4 Sg6+ 6.Kh7 Sxe7 7.Sxc2.
"A study on the grand scale [but with no published variations or annotations!? AJR] witty and hard to solve. A new and exceptional work by the Georgian Grandmaster." The annotations to No. 7735 are Beat Neuenschwander's, taken from the Swiss IDEE \& FORM (x.89).


No.7736:
A.Sochniev
(Leningrad). 1.h4 Ra8 2.g6+ Kf6 3.g7 Kf7 4.Rg1 Rf6+ 5.Kh5/i Rf5+ 6.Kg4 Rf4+ 7.Kh3 Rxf3+ 8.Kg4/ii Rf4+ 9.Kh5 Rf5+ 10.Kh6 Rf6+ 11.Kh7 Rf5/iii 12.Rf1 Rxf1 13.d7 Rf5 14.d8S+ Rxd8 15.cdS+ Kf6 16.g8S mate.
i) 5.Kg5? Rg8. 5.Kh7? Rf5.
ii) 8.Rg3? e2 9.Rxf3+ Kxg7 10.Re3 Ra3 11.Rxa3 e1Q 12.c8Q Qf1+ 13.Kg3 Qg1+ drawn.
iii) This would be a drawn position with wPf3.
"A pure checkmate with a pair of promoted wS and active self-block by bR forms a piece in the logical school of problems, and the play is witty. A highly artistic production."


No.7737: Mario Matous (Prague). 1.Se5+ Ke4/i 2.g6 (Sf7? Bxg5+;) Bh6 3.Sf7, with: Bg7 4.Bd1 Kf5 5.Bc2+ Kf6 6.Sb6 Sxg6 7.Sd7+ Kxf7 8.Bb3 mate, or Bf8 4.Bd1 Kf5 5.Bc2+ Kf6 6.Sc7 Sxg6 7.Se8+ Kxf7 8.Bb3 mate.
i) Kd 4 2.g6 Bh6 3.Sf7 Bg7 4.Bh5 Ke4 5.Sc7 Kf5 6.Se8 Sxg6 7.Sxg7+ Kf6 8.Se8+ Kxf7 9.Kd7 wins.
"The parallel synthesis of a pair of pure mates brilliantly realised in a light setting. A masterly study."

No.7738: An.G.Kuznetsov and O.Pervakov (Moscow). 1.e7+ Kxe7 2.Sf5+ Ke6 3.Sxh4 Se2 4.Ba1/i Bd3+ 5.Kb2 c5 (Be4;Sf5) 6.Sf3 c4 7.Sg5+ Kd5 8.Se4 Kd4 9.Sc3 Sxc3 10.Kc1 drawn.
i) $4 . \mathrm{Bg} 7 ? \mathrm{Bd} 3+5 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Be} 4$.
4.Sf3? Bd5 5.Sg5+ Kf5 6.Be3 Sf4 7.Bxf4 Kxf4 8.Sh3+ Kg3 $9 . \mathrm{Sgl} \mathrm{Bc} 4$ wins.
"With respect to content and originality this is of high class with sharp play by both sides at GM level, finally ending peacefully."


No.7739:
L.Mitrofanov and V.Razumenko (Leningrad). $\quad 1 . \mathrm{Bb} 3 / \mathrm{i}$ e4 $2 . \mathrm{b} 5 \mathrm{e} 3$ 3.Ba4/ii a2 $4 . \mathrm{b6}$ cb 5.cb a1Q 6.b7+ Kd8 7.b8Q+ Ke7 8.Qe8+ Kd6 9.Qd7+ Kc5 10.Qc6+ Kb4 11.Qb5+ wins.
i) 1.b5? a2 $2 . \mathrm{b6} \mathrm{cb} 3 . \mathrm{cb} \mathrm{a} 1 \mathrm{Q}$ 4.b7+ Kd8 5.b8Q+ Ke7 6.Qe8+ Kf6 drawn.
ii) 3.b6? cb 4.cb Kd7 5.Ba4+ Ke6 drawn.
"The manoeuvres by wB, with their interesting logical motivation, are striking. An outstanding amalgam of the classic and contemporary study."


No.7740: Yu.Bazlov (Vladivostok). 1.Sd5 (Kxd3? Bg2;) Bf1 2.Kc3/i Ka3 3.Se3 d2 4.Sc2+ Ka2 5.Sb4+ Ka1 6.Sc2+ Ka2 7.Sb4+ Kb1 8.Kxd2 b2 9.Se6 Ka1 10.Sc5 b1Q 11.Sc2+ Kb2 12.Sa4+ Kb3 13.Sc5+ Ka2 14.Sa4 Qb3 15.Sc3+ Kb2 16.Sd1+ Kb1 17.Sc3+ drawn.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Sc} 3+$ ? Ka3 $3 . \mathrm{Sf5}$ b2 $4 . \mathrm{Se} 3$ Be2 5.Kd4 Kb3 6.Sc4 b6 7.Sd2+ Kc2 8.cSb1 b5 9.Kc5 Bh5 $10 . \mathrm{Kxb5} \mathrm{Bf} 7$ and bBa 2 .
"The synthesis of perpetual check and capture of promoted bQ are combined in a masterful way."

No.7741: V.Kalandadze (Tbilisi). 1.Rf2 Bc6+ 2.Kg3/i Bc7+ 3.Rf4 $\mathrm{Ra} 3+4 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Bd} 7+5 . \mathrm{Rf} 5 \mathrm{Ra} 4+$ 6.Kg5 Bd8+ 7.Rf6 Ra6 8.Rf1

Bb5 9.Rf3 Rxf6 10.Rxf6 Bd3 11.h4 Bc2 12.h5 Bbl 13.Kh6 (h6? Bh7;) Bxf6 stalemate.
i) 2.Kf1? Ra1+ 3.Ke2 Bb5+.
"On a backdrop of clear-cut play on the grand scale the study successfully embodies the serial [as distinct from parallel. AJR] synthesis of a systematic movement and the confection of a stalemate refuge."


No.7742: A.Belyavsky and L.Mitrofanov. 1.Rh8+ Ka7 2.Bxb3 Rg7+ 3.Kh5 Rf7 4.Bxf7 f2 5.Rh7 Kb8 6.Rh8+ Kc7 7.Rh7 Kd8/i 8.Rh8+ Ke7 9.Re8+ Kxf7
10.Re4 f1R 11.Rxb4 Rf5+ 12.Kg4 Ke6 13.Re4+ Re5 14.Kf4 drawn.
i) Kd6 8.Rh6+ Ke5 9.Re6+ Kf5 10.Re8 f1Q 11.Be5+ draws.
"Double-edged play with a complex of ideas: battery, stalemate, underpromotion."


No.7743: Yu.Akobiya (Tbilisi) and N.Pandzhakidze (Tsagveri, Georgian SSR). 1.Kf7 (Bxf6? Kg6;) Rd8 2.Bg7+ Kh7 3.Sd7 Bxd7 4.Bxf6 Be8+ 5.Kf8 Ra8 6.Bd8, with: Bh5 7.e7 Ral e8S/i Rf1+ 9.Sf6+ draws, or Rxd8 7.e7, and Ra8 stalemate, or Rd1 8. Kxe8 Kg7 stalemate.
"Plenty of content, sparking off a micro-study at the end."

No.7744: Virgil Nestorescu (Bucarest). 1.Bal/i Kc2 2.h7 Kb1 3.h8Q c2 4.Qxd4/ii c1Q+5.Bc3, with: Qxa3 6.Qd3+ Kc1 7.Bd2+ $\mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{8} . \mathrm{Bc} 1+$ wins, or Ka 2 6.Qc4+ Kxa3 7.Bb4+ Kb2 8.Ba3+ wins.
"A brilliant study with two variations showing the win of bQ in echo."


No.7745: V.Vlasenko (Kharkov region). 1.Rf8+ Ke7/i 2.Ra8 c2/ii 3.Ra7+ Kd8 4.e7+ Kc8 5.Ra8+ Kc7 6.Ra7+ Kb8/iii 7.Rb7+ Kc8 8.Rb5 c1R 9.Rd5 Ra1+ 10.Ra5/iv Rc1 11.Rd5 Rc6+ 12.Ka5 (Ka7? Sc3;) Se3 13.Rxd6 Sc4+ 14.Kb5 drawn.
i) Kc7 2.Rf7+ Kc6 3.e7 Se8 4.Rf8 Kd7 5.Rf4 Sd6 6.Rd4 drawn.
ii) Kxe6 3.Kb6 Sc4+ 4.Kc7.
iii) Kc6 7.Ra8 c1Q 8.Rc8+ Sxc8 9.e8Q+ drawn.
iv) 10.Kc6? Se3 11.Rxd6 Sc4+ wins.
"Masterfully packed to the brim with drama and study-like points."


No.7746: D.Gurgenidze. 1.Kc4 Rd4+ 2.Kc3/i Qc7+ 3.Kb2 (Kb3? Rxb4+;) Rxb4+ 4.Ka1 Qa5+/ii 5.Qa2 Ra4 6.Re2 Qc3+ 7.Kb1, with: Rxa2 8.Rxa2+ Kb6 9.Rb2+ Ka5 10.Ra2+ Kb4 11.Rb2+ Ka3 12.Ra2+ Kb3 13.Ra3+ drawn, or $\quad$ Qd3+ 8.Kc1/iii $\quad$ Rxa2 (Qc3+;Kb1) 9.Rxa2+ Kb6 $10 . \mathrm{Rb} 2+\mathrm{Ka} 5$ 11.Ra2+ Kb4 12.Rb2+ Kc3 (Ka3;Ra2+) 13.Rb3+ draw.
i) 2.Kb3? Qd5+ 3.Ka4 Qd7+ 4.Kb3 Rd3+ wins.
ii) Qxc2 5.Ra8+ Kb6 6.Rb8+ Ka5 7.Rb5+ draw.
iii) 8.Qc2? Qb5+ 9.Qb2 Rb4 wins.
"The play is forced, but the duel of heavy pieces and K's is lively, culminating in chameleon echo stalemates. An outstanding miniature constructed with a rare distribution of material."


No.7747: V.Kalandadze. 1.Qc8+ Kh2 2.Qc7+/i Kh1 3.Qc1+ Qxcl 4.h8Q+ Kg1 5.Qg7+ Kf1 6.Qg2+ Ke1 7.Qxf2+ Kd1 8.Qe2 mate. i) 2.Qb8+? Kh1 2.Kxf2 Qf4+ draws.
"An amazing mix of the classic with the romantic!"


No.7748: V.Kozirev (Rostov region). 1.Qa1 Be2+ 2.Kg5 Qh5+ 3.Kf4 $\mathrm{Qg4} 4+4 . \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Qf} 3+5 . \mathrm{Kd} 2$ Qd3+ 6.Kxe1 Qe3 7.Qd4 (Qa3? Bd3+;) Qxd4 8.b8Q, with: Qe3 9.Kf2 Qd2 10.Qh2+/i Kxh2 stalemate, or $\mathrm{Bf} 39 . \mathrm{Qb} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 4$ 10.Qb7+ Kg1 11.Qg2+ Kxg2 stalemate.
i) $10 . \mathrm{Qb} 7+$ ? $\mathrm{Bf} 3+$. $10 . \mathrm{Kg} 3$ ? $\mathrm{Qe} 3+$ 11.Kh4 Qh6+ wins.
"Three stalemates of a high class."


No.7749: the late Iosif Krikheli (Gori, Georgian SSR). 1.a6/i Kf7 2.Bd5+ $\mathrm{Ke} 7 \quad 3 . \mathrm{Kb5} \mathrm{Kd7}$ (Ba7;Kc6) 4.Be4 Ke6/ii 5.Bf5+/iii Kxf5 6.Kc6 Ba7 7.Kd5/iv Bb8 8.e6 Kf6 9.Kc6 Ba7 10.Kd7 wins.
i) 1.e6? $\mathrm{Kf6} 2 . \mathrm{Bd} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 73 . \mathrm{Kb} 5$ Ba 7 4. Ka 6 Bg 1 draws.
ii) Ba7 5.Bf5 + Kc7 6.Bxh7. h5 5.Bf5+ Kc7 6.e6 Kd6 7.Kb6 wins.
iii) 5.Bxh7? Ba7 draws. 5.Kb6? Be5 draws.
iv) $7 . \mathrm{Kd} 6 ? \mathrm{Bb} 8+8 . \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{~h} 5$ draws.
"An excellent artistic working-out of an endgame with B's on opposite colours."

No.7750: A.Sochniev and L.Mitrofanov. 1.Se3 Rb1 2.Kf8 Re1 3.Sf5+/i Sxf5 4.b7 Rb1 5.a6 Sd6 6.a7/ii Rxb7 7.a8Q Rf7+ 8.Kg8 Rg7+ 9.Kf8 Kh7 10.Qa7 Rxa7 stalemate.
i) 3.Ke7? Sb7 4.a6 Rxe3+ 5.Kf6 Rb3 wins.
ii) 6.Ke7? Sxb7 7.ab Rxb7+ 8.Ke8 Kg7 9.d6 Rb1 10.d7 Re1+ wins.
"A good composition with pointed theme."


No.7751: A.Sochniev. 1.Rb6+ Kc1/i 2.Ra6 Rd5 (Re5;Sc3) 3.Bc6/ii Re5 4.Sc3 a1Q 5.Rxal+ Kc 2 (Kb2;Kf6) 6.Se2/iii Kb2/iv 7.Sd4 Kxal 8.Kf6 wins.
i) Kc2 2.Ra6 Rd5 3.Rxa2+.
ii) 3.Be6? . Re5 4.Sg5 Rxe6+ drawn.
iii) 6.Sb5? Re6+ 7.Kf6 Rxc6 8.Sd4+ Kb2 drawn.
iv) Re6+ 7.Kf6 Rxc6 8.Rc1+.
"A bright and gripping example of domination."


No.7752: A.Motor (Odessa). 1.c5 Kc4 2.c6 Sd5 3.c7 Se7 (Sxc7 stalemate) 4.Ka6 Kc5 5.a5 Kd6 (Kc6;c8Q+) 6.Kb7 Kd7 7.a6 Sc8 8.Ka8 Kc6 (Kxc7 stalemate) 9.Kb8 Sb6 (Kd7;Kb7) 10.Kxa7 Kxc7 stalemate.
"Stalemate cascade."


No.7753: A.Foguelman (Buenos

Aires). 1.Rg3 (Rh1? c3;) b1Q 2.Rg6 Qc1 3.h5 Qe3 4.Kf1 c3/i 5.h6 Qa7 6.Rg5 Qa1+ 7.Kg2 Qa7 8.Kh3 (hg+? Qxg7;) c2 9.hg+ Qxg7 10.Rh5+ wins. i) Qc1+ 5.Kf2 Qf4 6.h6 Qh2+ 7.Ke1 Qh4+ 8.Kd1 Qd4+ 9.Kc2 wins.
"The play is both sharp and original."


No.7754: D.Gurgenidze. 1.Sb3+/i Kb5/ii 2.baQ/iii $\mathrm{Qg} 8+3 . \mathrm{Kb7}$ Qd5+ 4.Kb8 Qd8+ 5.Kb7 Qd7+ 6.Kb8 Kb6 7.Qc6+ Qxc6 8.a8S+ Ka6 9.Sc7+ Kb6 0.Sa8+ drawn. i) 1.baQ? Qg8+ 2.Kb7 Qd5+ 3.Kb8 Qd8+ 4.Kb7 Qd7+ 5.Kb8 Kb6 wins.
ii) Kb6 2.baS+ draws. Ka6 2.Sc5+ Kb6 3.Sd7+ draws.
iii) 2.baS? Qg8+ 3.Kb7 Qd5+ 4.Kb8 Kc6 wins.
"A witty study on the theme of perpetual check."


No.7755: E.Kvezereli (Tbilisi). 1.b7 Bd2+/i 2.Kc2 aRc4+ 3.Kd1 Bf4 4.Rxf4 cRd4+ 5.Kc1 Rc4+ 6.Kbl Rb4+ 7.Ka1 Rxb7/ii 8.Rf3+ Rb3 9.Ra7+ Ra4 10.Be7 mate.
i) aRc4+ $2 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{cRd} 4+3 . \mathrm{Ke} 2$ Bf4+ 4.Kf2 Bb8 5.Bg3 Rd8 6.Rf8 eRd4 7.Rxd8 Rxd8 8.Ra5+ and 9.Ra8 wins. ii) $\operatorname{Rxf} 4$ 8.Be7 Rxf7 9.Bxb4+ Kb3 10.b8Q wins.
"A beautiful checkmate with pinned bRR."

No.7756: V.Vlasenko. 1.Bf3 Kf2 2.Bh1 (Ba8? Sd4;) Kg1 3.Ba8/i h2 4.Ke7/ii Sc3 5.Kf6/iii Sa2 6.b5 Sc3 7.b6 Sa4 8.b7 Sc5 9.b8S/iv Sd3 10.Sd7 Sf4 11.Se5 Sg2 12.Sf3+ drawn.
i) 3.Bd5? Sd4 4.Ke7 h2 5.Kf6 Sc2 6.b5 Se3 7.Ba8 Sg2 wins.
ii) 4.Kd7? h5 5.Ke6 Sc7+.
iii) 5.Kf7? Sd1 6.b5 Se3 7.b6 Sc4 8.b7 Se5+.
iv) 9.b8Q? Sd7+ $10 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Sxb8}$ 11.Kxh7 Sd7 12.Kh6 Sb6 13.Bb7 Sc4 14.Kh5 Se3 wins.
"Outwardly simple, but there are hidden depths to this difficult study."


No.7757: V.Israelov (Baku). 1.d7 Bf8+ 2.Ka4 Be7 3.Sd5 Bd8 4.Sf4 Se7/i 5.Se6 Sc6 6.Sc5/ii Sb8 7.Se6 Sc6 8.Sc5 drawn.
i) $\mathrm{Bb} 75 . \mathrm{Kb} 5 \mathrm{Se} 7$ 6.Se6 Sc 6 7.Sxd8 Sxd8 8.Kb6 Bf3 9.Kc7 drawn. ii) 6.Sxd8? Sxd8 7.Ka5 Bxd3 8.Kb6 Se6 wins.
"A piquant positional draw."


No.7758: L.Topko (Krivoi Rog). 1.e7 Bb5/i 2.e8Q Bxe8 3.Kxd3 $\mathrm{Bg} 6+$ 4.Ke2 Bh4 (Ba5;Sc6) 5.Sf8 Bh5+ 6.Kd3 Bxd8 7.Se6 $\mathrm{Bg} 6+8 . \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Bh} 5+9 . \mathrm{Kd} 3$ drawn. i) $\mathrm{Bf} 2+2 . \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 53 . \mathrm{Sf} 6$ drawn.
"An interesting find in the BB vs. S endgame."


No.7759: Yu.Bazlov. 1.Be3+/i Kc3/ii 2.Rxg5 (Bxg5? Bd4+;) Sf7+ 3.Kg8 Sf6+ 4.Kf8 Sxg5/iii 5.h8B/iv Sh7+ 6.Kg7 Bh2 (Bxe3 stalemate) 7.Bf4 Bg1 8.Be3, positional draw based on a pair of monochrome wBB.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Bc} 3+? \mathrm{Kc} 2 \quad 2 . \mathrm{Rxg} 5 \mathrm{Sf} 7+$ 3.Kg8 Sxg5 4.h8Q Bf7+ 5.Kf8 Bc5 mate.
ii) Kxe 3 2.Re5+ Kf3 3.Re3+ draw.
iii) Bxe3 5.Rg3 Kd2 6.Rxe3 Kxe3 7.Ke7, and a short examination shows that it's no mre than a draw.
iv) 5.h8Q? Sh7+ and Bxe3, and it should be a win for the pieces! But who has encountered the ending 1066 and all that?


No.7760: Enrico Paoli (Reggio Emilia, Italy). 1.d6/i Kb4 2.Ra5 Kxa5 3.d7 alQ 4.d8Q+ Kb4 5.Qb6+ Ka3 6.Qa5+ Kb2 7.Qb4+ Ka2 8.Kc2 Qc3+ 9.Qxc3 dc $10 . \mathrm{d} 4 \mathrm{~h} 511 . \mathrm{d} 5$ wins.
i) 1.dc? Ka4/ii 2.c7 alQ 3.c8Q Qc3+ 4.Ke2 Qc2+ 5.Kf3 Qd1+ 6.Kf4 Qd2+ 7.Kg4 Qg2+ draws. 1.de? Kb4/iii 2.e7 alQ 3.e8Q Qb2+ 4.Kdl/iv Kc3 5.Kel Qd2+ 6.Kf1 Qf4+ draws.
ii) Kb4? 2.Rb5+ and 3.Rb8 wins.
iii) Ka4? 2.e7 a1Q 3.e8Q Qb2+ 4.Kdl Qb1+ 5.Ke2 wins. iv) 4.Ke1 Qc1+ 5.Kf2 Qf4+ draws.
"A deeply and originally developed idea of choice of promotion square for wP."

$$
\text { No. } 7761
$$

V.N. Dolgov 12 Hon. Men Chavchavadze MT, 1987


No.7761: V.N.Dolgov (Krasnodarsk province). 1.Sf7 Kh4 2.Se5 Kh5/i 3.Sg4 Kh4 4.Se3 b2 5.Rh6+ Rh5 6.Sf5+ Kh3 7.Rxh5+ Kg 2 8.Rg5+/ii Kh2 9.Sd4 b1Q $10 . \mathrm{Sf} 3+\mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{11.Rh} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 12.Rh2+ Kf1 13.Rh1+ wins. i) Kh3 3.Kf3 Kh4 4.Rh6+ Kg5 5.Sf7+ Kf5 6.Rh5+ wins. ii) $8 . \mathrm{Se} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 19 . \mathrm{Rg} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 1$ drawn.
"Brilliant miniature."


No.7762: A.Davranyan (Shakhtersk, USSR). 1.Bc6+, and: Kxh2 2.Bxd6 Kh3 3.Bd7+ Kg 3 4.Bg4 wins, or Kh3 2.Bd7+ (Sf3? Rc4;) Kg2 3.Sg4/i Rf7 4.Bc6+ Kh3 5.Bxd6 Rf5+ 6.Kxh6 Kxg4/ii 7.Bd7 Kh4 8.Be7+ Kg4 $9 . \operatorname{Bg} 5$ wins.
i) 3.Bxd6? Rd4 4.Bc6+ Kh3 drawn.
ii) Kh4 7.Se3 Rf6+ 8.Kxh7 Rxd6 $9 . \mathrm{Sf5}+$ wins.
"Echo! Stalemates in the tries embellish wins of bR."


No.7763: M.Matous. 1.Sf6/i Qa8 2.Re2 Qb8 (Qh1;Rd2) 3.Re3 Qc8 4.Re4 Qh3 5.Rb4 Qg3 6.Rb1 Qh2 7.Ra1 Qg2 8.Ra4 Qh1 9.Rd4 gf 10.Rd8+ Kh7 11.g6+ wins. i) 1.Sf4? $\mathrm{Qg} 8+2 . \mathrm{Kxe} 7 \mathrm{Qc} 4$.
"Duel between wR and bQ."
DVH: "Worth a higher place."


No.7764: V.Kalyagin (Sverdlovsk), V.Kirillov (Serov, USSR), and Jan Rusinek (Warsaw). 1.Rh3+/i Kxc4 2.b8Q ab+ 3.Ka3 g1Q 4.Qc8+/ii Rc5 5.Qe6+ Rd5 6.Qc6+ Rc5 7.Rc3+ dc 8.Qxe4+ Qd4 9.d3 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Rg} 1$ ? ab+ $2 . \mathrm{Ka} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 8$ draws. ii) 4.Qc7+? Rc5 5.Qf7+ Rd5 draws.
"A pure mate with a trio of active self-blocks and pin of bQ."


No.7765: I.Bondar (Brest region). 1.Rg8 (Rf8? Sh6;) Sg5 2.Bf5 Kh6 3.Rg6+ Kh5 4.Rg8 Kh4 5.Rc8/i g1Q 6.Rc4+ Kh5 7.Bg4+ Kg6 (Kh4;Bf5+) 8.Rc6+ Kf7/ii 9.Rc7+ Ke8 10.Rc8+ drawn.
i) $5 . \mathrm{Rh} 8+$ ? $\mathrm{Kg} 36 . \mathrm{Rg} 8 \mathrm{Kf4}$ wins.
ii) Kg 7 9.Rc7+ Sf7 10.Be6 $\mathrm{Qg} 2+$ 11.Kc5 draws.


No.7766: A.Grin and N.Kralin (Moscow). 1.Rf8/i Rg7+ 2.Kxg7 Bh6+ 3.Kg6 Bxf8 4.d8Q+/ii Kxd8 5.Kxh5/iii Sf6+ 6.Kg6 Ke7 7.Se6 Kxe6 stalemate.
i) 1.Sc6+? Kd6 2.Kxh7 Kxc6 3.Kg6 Sf4+ 4.Kf5 Sh6+ wins.
ii) 4.Se6? Kxe6 5.d8Q Sf4+ 6.Kh7 Sf6+. 4.Kxh5? Sf6+ 5.Kh4 Sf4 6.Kg5 S6d5 wins. iii) 5.Se6+? Ke7 6.Sxf8 Sf4+ wins.


No.7767: V.Anufriev (Tula). 1.bSd5 Bxd4 2.Sb4+ Ka3 3.Sc2+ Ka4 4.Sxd4 b1Q 5.Rxb1 (Ra7+?

Qa5;) Qc7+ 6.Kh8 Qxh2 7.Sd7/i Qd6 8.Ral+ Kb4 9.Rb1+ Kc4 10.Rc1+ Kd3 11.Rd1+ Ke4 12.Re1+ Kf4 13.Rf1+ Kg5/ii 14.Rg1+ Kf4 15.Rf1+ Ke4 16.Re1+ Kd5 17.Rd1 Kc4/iii 18.Rc1+, drawn.
i) 7.Ra1+? Kb4 8.Rxa8 Qd6 wins.
ii) Kg4 14.Sf6+ Kh3 15.Rf3+ Kg2 16.Rf2+ draw.
iii) Qg6 18.Se6+ Ke4 19.Re1+ Kf5 20.Rf1+.


No.7768: V.Israelov and I.Garayazli (Sumgait, Azerbaidzhan). 1.Bd7+ Ka5 2.Bd8+ Ka6 3.Ra2+ Kb7 4.Rb2+ Ka7 5.Ra2+ Kb8 6.Rb2+ Ka8 7.Ra2+ Ba7 8.Rxc2 Bxc2 9.Bc7 Bb8 10.Bb6 Ba7 11.Bc7 Bb3+ 12.Kh7 Bc2+ 13.Kg8 drawn.

No.7769: A.Oleinik (Pacific Maritime province). 1.Sc7 Ka3 2.Kc8
(Sb5+? Kb4;) Sd6+ 3.Kb8 Sc6+ 4.Ka8 Kb2 5.Sd5 b5 6.Sc3 b4 7.Sa2 b3 8.Sc1 Kxc1 stalemate.


No.7770: L.Mitrofanov. 1.Sf2+/i Kxd4 2.e7 fRe5 3.c7 fRe5 3.c7 Rc5 4.Sd3, and Rxe7 5.Sxc5, or Rxc7 5.Sxe5 wins.
i) 1.e7? Rxd4+ 2.Ke1 $\mathrm{Re5} 3 . \mathrm{c} 7$ Rc4 drawn.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } 7771 \quad 7 \text { A. Hildebrand } \\
& \text { Chavchavadze MT, } 1987
\end{aligned}
$$



No.7771: Alexander Hildebrand (Uppsala). 1.Bg7 Bxg7 2.fg, with: Sg6 3.h8Q Sxh8/i 4.Kh7/ii $0-0-0$ 5.c7 Kxc7 6.ghQ Rxh8+ 7.Kxh8 c4 8.h5 c3 9.h6 c2 10.h7 c1Q $11 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ drawn, or Sxh7 3.Kxh7 Kf7 4.h5 c4 5.h6 c3 $6 . \mathrm{c} 7 \mathrm{c} 2$ 7.c8Q Rxc8 8.g8Q Rxg8 stalemate.
i) $0-0-0+4 . \mathrm{Kh} 7 \mathrm{Rxh} 8+5 . \mathrm{Kxg} 6$ drawn.
ii) 4.ghQ? 0-0-0+ 5.Kg7 Rxh8 6.Kxh8 c4 7.h5 c3 8.h6 c2 9.h7 c1Q $10 . c 7 \mathrm{Kd} 7$ wins.

$$
\text { No. } 7772 \quad \text { D. Makhatadze }
$$

Chavchavadze MT, 1987


No.7772: D.Makhatadze (Zestafoni, Georgian SSR). 1.a5 h4 $2 . a 6 \mathrm{~h} 3$ 3.Sxh3 Bf3 4.d5/i, with: Bxd5 5.Sf4 Be4 6.Sd3+ and 7.Sc5 wins, or cd 5.Sg1 Bh1 $6 . \mathrm{Se} 2+$ and $7 . \mathrm{Sd} 4$ wins.
i) 4.Sf4? c5 $5 . \mathrm{d} 5$ ed, and if 6.Sd3+ Kd2 7.Se5 Bg2 8.Sc6 d4, or if $6 . \mathrm{Se} 2+\mathrm{Kc} 27 . \mathrm{Sd} 4+\mathrm{cd} 8 . \mathrm{a} 7$ d3 9.a8Q d2 draw.

No.7773: Ernest Pogosyants (Moscow). 1.Se6/i Sd6+ 2.Kf6 Sxe8+ 3.Ke7 Sg7 4.Sg5/ii Kh8 5.Se4/iii Kh7 6.Kf7 Kh6 7.Sf6 wins.
i) 1.Bc6? Sd8 2.Bd5+ Kxf8 3.Kf6 Sf7 4.Bxf7 stalemate.
ii) 4.Sd4? Kh7 5.Sf5 Kg6 drawn. iii) 5.Kf8? Sf5 6.Sf7+ Kh7 7.gf stalemate.


No. 7774 A. Malyshev and A. Toropov 10 Comm
Chavchavadze MT, 1987


No.7774: A.Malyshev and A.Toropov (Yaroslavl region). 1.c8Q+ Kxc8 2.Sf6 Rh5 (Rh2;Rf8) 3.Sxh5 Ra2+ 4.Ba5+ Kd7 5.Rh7+ Kc6 6.Ra7 Rh2 7.Ra6+ Kb5 8.Bc7 Rxh5 9.Ra5+ wins.

No.7775: Viktor Kichigin (Perm). 1.d7 Rh1+/i 2.Kxh1 (Kg3? Rh8;) b1Q+ 3.Kh2 Qxb4 (Qxd3;Rd6) 4.Rf6+/ii Ke5 5.f4+/iii Kxf6 6.d8Q+ wins.
i) b1Q 2.d8Q Rh1+3.Kg3 wins. ii) 4.d8Q? Qf4+ 5.Kh3 Qg4+ 6.Kh2 Qh5+ 7.Kg1 Qd1+ drawn. iii) 5.d8Q? Qh4+ 6.Kg1 Qxh1+ 7.Kxh1 stalemate.

## No. 7775

11 Comm.,
V. Kichigin


No.7776: Anders Gillberg (Vesteras, Sweden). 1.g7 (Sd4+? Kd6;) Sh7 2.Ke7 Bb3 3.Sd4+ Kc7 4.Se6+/i Bxe6 5.Kxe6 d1B/ii $6 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{iii} \quad \mathrm{Bb} 3+$ 7.Kf5 Bxg 8 7.Kg6 drawn.
i) 4.Sxb3? c1Q 5.g8Q Qd7 mate.
ii) d1Q 6.g8Q Qb3+ 7.Ke7 Qxg8 stalemate.
iii) 6.Kf5? Bc2+ 7.Ke6 Bb3+ wins.

No.7777: L.Abramov (Moscow). 1.Qh3 Qh5/i 2.a6 ba/ii 3.Qc8 d4
4.ed ed 5.Qc3+ (Qc4? Qg4;) dc+ $6 . \mathrm{Kc1}$, and W will be stalemated.
i) Kb 2 2.Qf1 alS 3.Qb5+ Ka3 $4 . a 6$ draws.
ii) Kb2 3.Qf1 a1Q 4.Qb5+ draws.

No. 7777
L. Abramov

13 Comm.,
Chavchavadze MT, 1987


No.7778: A.Oleinik. 1.Se5, with: e6 2.Rf1+ Ke7/i 3.Rf7+ Kd6/ii 4.Sc4+ Kc6 (Kd5;Bf3 mate) 5.Bf3+ Kb5 6.a4+ Kxa4 7.Bc6 mate, or Ra8/iii 2.Rf1+ Ke8 3.Bh5+ Kd8 4.Rd1+ Kc8 5.Bg4+ Kb7 6.Rb1+ Ka7 7.Sc6 mate.
i) Kg 8 3.Sd7 Rd 8 4.Rg1+ $\mathrm{Kf7}$ 5.Rg7+ Ke8 6.Bh5 mate.
ii) Kd8 4.Sc6+ Kc8 5.Ba6 mate.
iii) Kg8 2.Rg1+ Kf8 3.Sd7+ Kf7 4.Bc4+ e6 5.Rg7 mate.

DVH: "Mansuba style, a few centuries too late."

B.N. Sidorov

15 Comm.,
Chavchavadze MT, 1987


No.7779: B.N.Sidorov (Apsheronsk). 1.Ke7 (c7? Kf7;) g6 2.c7 Kg7 3.c8Q Kh6 4.Qf8+ Kh5 5.Qf7/i h6 (Kh6;Kf6) 6.Qf1 g2 7.Qxg2 Kh4 8.Qh2 mate.
i) 5.Qg7? h6 6.Qa1 g2 7.Qg1 g3.


No.7780: D.Gurgenidze. 1.R4b5/i Kg6 2.Kg8 Kf6 3.Kf8 Ke6 4.Ke8 Kd6 5.Kd8 Ke6 6.R8b6+ Kf7 7.Rf5+ Kg7 8.Rg5+ Kf7 (Kh7;Rxb2) 9.gRg6 b1Q 10.bRf6 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{~b} 6+$ ? $\mathrm{Kg} 5 \quad 2 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Kf} 5$ 3.Kf7 Ke5 4.Ke7 Kd5 5.Kd7 Ke5
6.R6b5+ Kf6 7.Rf4+ Kg6 8.Rg4+ Kf6 9.gRg5 blQ drawn. 1.Rg8? Kh5 2.Rb3 Kh4 3.Rb6 Kh5 drawn.
"Awarded for a witty creative enrichment of a 1953 Wotawa study: b8b6 0200.02 a8h5.a2b2 3/3+. 1.hRa5 Kc6 2.Kc8 Kd6 3.Kd8 Ke6 4.R8a6+."


No.7781: V.N.Dolgov. 1.Rc8+ Kd7 2.Rh8 g4 3.Rxh2 Rf3+ 4.Kd2 Rh3 5.Se3 (Rxh3? gh;) Rxh2+ 6.Ke1, with: g3 7.Kf1 (Sf1? Rh1;) Ke6 8.Kg1 Rf2 9.Sf1 Rf3 $10 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Rf} 2+11 . \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Rf} 3$ $12 . \mathrm{Kg} 2$ drawn, or Rh 4 7.Kf2 Ke6 8.Kg3 Rh3+ 9.Kf4/ii Rf3+ 10.Ke4 Rg3 11.Kf4 Rf3+ 12.Ke4 drawn.
i) $10 . \mathrm{Sd} 2$ ? Ra3 11.Sf1 Kf5 wins.
ii) 9.Kf2? Rf3+10.Ke2 Rf4 wins.
"Awarded for a brilliant version of a known classic positional draw, shown here in echo form."


No.7782: Julien Vandiest (Borgerhout, Belgium). 1.Qe7+ Ka4 2.Qd7+ Ka3 3.Qd6+ Kb3 (Ka4;Qd4+) 4.Qe6+ Kc3 5.Qc4+ Kd2 6.Qd4, with: Qa3 7.Bb5+ Ke1 8.Qg1+ Kd2 9.Qf2+ Kc3 10.Qxf6+ Kd2 11.Qf2+ Kc3 12.Qg3+ Kb4 13.Qd6+ Kb3 14.Qd2 g3 15.Qd3+ Kb4 16.Qd6+ Kb3 17.Qxg3+ Kb4 18.Qd6+ Kb3 19.Qd2 wins, or Qh1+ 7.Ka2 (Kb2? Qh2;) Qc1/i 8.Qf4+ Kd1 9.Qxg4+ Kd2 10.Qf4+ Kd1 11.Be2+ Kc2 12.Qb4 f5 13.Qc4+ Kd2 14.Qf4+ $\mathrm{Kc} 215 . \mathrm{Qb} 4 \mathrm{f} 4$ 16.Qc4+ Kd2 17.Qxf4+ Kc2 18.Qb4 wins.
i) Qe1 8.Bc4+ Kc1 9.Qb2+ Kd1 10.Bb3 mate. Qd1 8.Bc4+ Kc1 9.Qb2 mate. Qh6 8.Bc4+ Ke1 9. Qg1+ Kd2 10.Kb2 wins.
"Awarded for a masterly doubling of an idea by Bron ( $=1 / 2$ Prizes, Thèmes-64, 1962)."

No.7783: N.Kralin. 1.Kg3/i Kc3 2. Sc6 Kxc2 3.Sxd4+ Kb2 (Kc3;Sc6) $4 . \mathrm{a} 4 \mathrm{Kc} 35 . \mathrm{Sb} 3 / \mathrm{ii} \mathrm{Kxb} 36 . \mathrm{a} 5$ Kc4 7.a6 h2/iii 8.Kxh2 Kd3 9.a7 f2 10.a8Q f1Q 11.Qa6+ wins.
i) 1.Kg1? d3 2.cd+ Kxd3 3.Sc6 Kc4 draws.
ii) 5.a5? Kxd4 6.a6 Ke3 7.a7 f2 8.a8Q f1Q. 5.Sc6? Kc4 draw. iii) 1.Kxh3? would allow Kd3 $8 . \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{f} 2$ 9.a8Q f1Q+, drawing, at this point.
"Awarded for a beautiful synthesis of ideas of the Sarychev brothers, Réti and Rinck."

DVH: "Yes."


No.7784: Revaz Tavariani (Tbilisi). 1.Bxe3+/i, with: Kxf1 2.Kxd6 Kxg2 3.Bf4 Kf3 4.Ke5 Kg4 5.Kf6 g5 (Kh5;Be5) 6.Ke5 gf 7.gf+ wins, or Kxe3 2.Bc4 Kf2 (Kd4;Bf7) 3.Bd5 Kxg3
4.Kxd6 g5 5.Ke5 f4 6.Bf3 g4 7.Ke4 gf 8.gf wins.
i) 1.Bc1? Kxf1 2.Bxe3 Kxg 2 $3 . \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{~g} 5$ draws.
"Awarded for an original chameleon realisation of a known P-ending."


No.7785: A.Sochniev. 1.a8S+/i Bxa8 2.f7/ii Bb7/iii 3.feS Bf4 4.Sd6 Bxd6 5.e8S Bg3 6.e7 Bf4 7.Sd6 Bxd6 8.e8S Bh2 9.Sd6 Bf3 10.c8S+ Kc6 11.Ka7 drawn, presumably with the continuation $\mathrm{Bf} 2+12 . \mathrm{Kb} 8 \mathrm{Ba} 613 . \mathrm{Se} 4$, and 14.cSd6 when the cavalry is re-uknighted - but with wK so confined it still looks precarious for W.
i) 1.a8Q? Bxc7+ 2.Kc8 Bxa8 wins.
ii) 2.Kxa8? Sxc7+ 3.Kb8 Se8+ 4.Kc8 Sxf6 wins.
iii) Bc6 3.feQ Bxe8 4.Kc8 Bxc7 stalemate.
"5-fold S-promotion!"
No.7786: the late Rolf Richter (Oederan, East Germany). $1 . \mathrm{Kg} 3$ $\mathrm{Kc} 2 / \mathrm{i}$ 2.Kf4 Kc3 3.Ke5 (g5?

Kd4; $\quad \mathrm{Rg} 1 / \mathrm{ii}$ 4.e4/iii $\mathrm{Kc} 4 / \mathrm{iv}$ 5.Kd6 Rd1+ 6.Ke7/v Rg1/vi 7.Kd6/vii Rd1+ 8.Ke7 Kc5 9.e5 Kd5 (Kc6;e6) 10.g5 Rg1 11.e6 Ke5 12.Kf7/viii Kd6 13.e7 Rf1+ 14.Ke8 Re1 15.g6 Rxe7+ 16.Kf8 Ke6 17.g7 Rf7+ 18.Kg8 Rf1 (Kf6;Kh8) 19.Kh8 Rh1+ 20.Kg8 Kf6 21.Kf8 Ral 22.h8S+ wins.
i) Ra4 2.Kf3 Kc2 3.e4 Kd3 4.Kf4 Rxe4+ 5.Kf5 draw.
ii) Ra5+ 4.Kf6 Kd4 5.g5 Ra6+ 6.Kf5 draws.
iii) 4.Kd5? Kd2 5.e4 Ke3 6.e5 Kf4 7.e6 Kg5 wins. 4.Kf5? Kd4 5.g5 Kd5 6.Kf6 Kd6 7.g6 Rf1+ wins.
iv) $\mathrm{Rxg} 45 . \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{~Kb} 46 . \mathrm{e} 5$ draw.
v) $6 . \mathrm{Ke} 6$ ? Kc5 7.g5 Rg1 8.Kf6 Kd6 wins.
vi) Kd4 7.g5 Rg1 8.Kf6. Re1 7.g5 Rxe4+ 8.Kf6 Kd5 9.g6, and Kd6 $10 . \mathrm{g} 7$, or $\mathrm{Rf} 4+10 . \mathrm{Ke} 7$, drawing.
vii) 7.e5? Kd5 8.e6 Ke5 wins. viii) $12 . \mathrm{Kd} 7$ ? Rdl+ 13.Ke7 Rd6 wins.
"Awarded for rework of a Mandler study (1950)."

ENTRIES RECEIVED
I: HARMAN MEMORIAL FORMALINTERNATIONAL TOURNEY ofEG
Acknowledgement list of 57 entries received by closing date (30.vi.88). EG's editor deeply regrets that the tourney announcement's undertaking to publish the award in 1989 (see EG89 p 231 ) has not been honoured.
$\qquad$
ARGENTINA: OCar A1F
BELGIUM: JuV
CZECHOSLOVAKIA:PCin
JSvar
ENGLAND: CMB CoCr
West GERMANY: WSchü
IRELAND: RPy
ISRAEL: HAlo GCos NElk YeHo AYo
ITALY: EPao
NETHERLANDS: WMe
New ZEALAND: EmMel
USSR: YuAk EAA APGr DGur VI-
Kal VAKalya VKich VAKir OPer ASochniev
YUGOSLAIA: MiDu
II: BENT JUBILEE FORMAL INTERNATIONAL TOURNEY of EG Acknowledgement list of 158 entries received (including some jointly composed) by 14.xi. 89 (closing date postmark 31.x.89), with one late entry.

FINLAND: $\mathrm{PeMa}(2) \mathrm{KaVa}$
FRANCE: GBa MaLa J-CLe(3)
GERMANY (East/West): GuJo
WISo(2) RaSt SvTr
ITALY: MaCu EnPa
MONGOLIA: VBu
[12]
NETHERLANDS: HEn (2) JHM
NEW ZEALAND: EmMe(2)
NORWAY: KjYn
POLAND: ALe StWo(3)
PORTUGAL: GaMa(2) Nob(2) [8]

ROMANIA: FiIu(4) IoMu TiTa SOUTH AFRICA: AvT
SWEDEN: AnGi AHi [5]
U.S.S.R.: YuAko GGAm VVAnu(2) PavAr V/DAt YaTBad(2) ACherk(2) BoDan VND EdEil AiGas(2) MGn DRGo DAGu(2) VaNiII(2) VDIs AVKali(2) YuVKal(2) VIKal(2) APKarg(2) GMKas SeKas LIKa ArKh(2) GAKhuts(2) VIKich(2) VIKlyu(2) EVKol VIKond AEKons AGKop VSKov(2) VAKri AlDaKr(2) AVKu(2) KALe AFLi VBMali(2) PAMa1 (8) A/SMany (3) EVN(2) GVNov(2) OAPa OVPe Lpesh ELPo(2) SVRad JüRa(2) NGRya RaiSen(3) MMShk ALShn AnShu AlSo BKSm(2) AllvSta AnIvSte IVel(2) SNTk(2) RTav LFT(2) NFVlas APVor MaSYaAIZin [67]

WALES: DBlu(2)
YUGOSLAVIA: MiDu(2)
[2]


[^0]
## ARGENTINA: ZRC A1F

BELGIUM: JuV(2)
BULGARIA: NiAs
CZECHOSLOVAKIA: LaLa JLe Ma$\mathrm{Ma}(2) \mathrm{EvPa}(2) \mathrm{EmVl} \mathrm{MiHl} \mathrm{BoSi}(2)$ ENGLAND: JDB AJR AJW TGW [15]

## SNIPPETS

1. The PROBLEMIST for November 1989 carries a superb account by Paul Valois of the August 1989 Bournemouth happenings.
2. What are the 'best 5 studies' of all time? A 'Super-Ring-Tourney' (other genres also) is the idea of Hilmar Ebert, Alexianergraben 8, D-51 Aachen, West Germany. Send your choice direct to him.
3. Operation Rescue! (see EG95) resulted in 5 entries, all having in common the correction wKh7 (not g7). Competition report in EG100.
4. Can anyone find a genuine fortress in the GBR class 0023.01? AJR is very interested. The best draw so far using a single pawn with this force is undoubtedly the wonderful No. 7640 by Lewandowski.
5.1 With academic assistance the 0023 database is online in London. AJR is working on a consistent description of the intangible second of the five phases of the win.
5.2 Both IGM David Bronstein and the Polgár sisters were invited (while they were in London in xi.89) to face the data base, but both (for different reasons) declined. Other publicity ideas are welcomed!
6.1 We have tentatively begun to send solution and article text to our printer on diskette. This has resulted in such improved accuracy (though accents and italics etc., remain problematic) that the few proof corrections to the page text of EG98 were sent by fax (ie page images with the handwritten corrections were transmitted by phone line from London to Venlo), but this did not prevent obiter dicta being printed as obher dictator on p 647 !
6.2 For computer-literate eyes only! AJR's system is a PC/AT-compatible (actually an EFI-286) with a megabyte of RAM, 40 megabytes of hard disk and two diskette drives, running under MS-DOS. His software is NOTA BE-

NE, designed for authors writing in more than one natural language. To overcome incompatibilities with the Venlo system, Prof. Dr. Jaap van den Herik of the University of Limburg (Maastricht) offered departmental expertise to render AJR's diskettes readable to nearly Venlo. Both London and Venlo gratefully accepted this generous and wilingly volunteered assistance.
$\stackrel{\text { sistance. }}{=}===========$

Magazines, bulletins and newspapers (with the studies' editor's name between parentheses) that reliably hold annual (or biennial) international informal tourneys for the composition of original endgame studies are listed below. Always send in diagram form, in duplicate. In the addresses a comma generally indicates the end of a line.

BULETIN PROBLEMISTIC (Nicolae Chivu) Soseaua Pantelunon 245, bloc 51, sc. B, ap.88, 73542 Bucuresti/Bucharest, Romania.
CESKOSLOVENSKY̌ SACH (Michal Hlinka) Muskátová 38, 04011 Kosice, Czechoslovakia.
CHESS LIFE (Pal Benko) 'Benko's Bafflers', United States Chess Federation, 186 Route 9W, New Windsor, NY 12550, U.S.A
DIAGRAMMES (Guy Bacqué) 65240 Arreau, France.
EUROPA-ROCHADE (Manfred Rittirsch) Weisenauer Strasse 27, 6090 Rüsselsheim, BRD/West Germany.
GAZETA CZESTOCHOWSKA (Mariusz Limbach) srytka pocztowa 349, 42-407 Czestochowa 7, Poland.
MAT-PAT (Ladislav Salai) Bellova 8, 03601 Martin, Czechoslovakia.
PROBLEMIST (Adam Sobey) 15 Kingswood Firs, Grayshott, Hindhead, Surrey, GU26 6EU, England.
PROBLEMISTA (Eugeniusz Iwanow) Kilinskiego 57 n. 53, 42-200 Czestochowa, Poland.
REVISTA ROMANA DE SAH (Iosif Grosu) str. Batistei 11, sect. 2, Bucuresti / Bucharest, Romania.
SACHOVÁ SKLADBA (J. Brada) Na strži 61, 14000 Praha/Prague, Czechoslovakia.
SAKKELET (Attila Korányi) 'Tanulmányrovat', P.O.Box 52, H-1363 Budapest, Magyarország/Hungary. SCHACH (Manfred Zucker) Postfach 29, Karl-Marx-Stadt, 9061 DDR/East Germany.
SCHACH-ECHO (Hemmo Axt) Ferdinand-Miller-Platz 12a, D-8000 Munich 2, BRD/West Germany.
SCHAKEND NEDERLAND (Jan van Reek) Eijkerstraat 44, 6269 BN Margraten, Netherlands.
SCHWALBE (Michael Pfannkuche) Schweringsheide 6, D-4400 Münster, BRD/West Germany.
SCHWEIZERISCHE SCHACHZEITUNG (Beat Neuenschwander) Sieberweg 2, CH-3063 Ittigen, Switzerland.
SHAHMAT (Hillel Aloni, for 'ring' tourney) 6/5 Rishon-le-Zion street, 42-274 Netanya, Israel.
SHAKHMATNA MISAL (Petko A. Petkov) ul. Rakitin 2, Sofia, Bulgaria.
SHAKHMATY/SAHS (Vazha Neidze) bulvar Padom'yu 16, et. III, Riga, Latvian SSR, U.S.S.R.
SHAKHMATY v SSSR (Anatoly Kuznetsov) abonementny yaschik 10, 121019 Moscow G-19, U.S.S.R.
SUOMEN SHAKKI (Pauli Perkonoja) Parolanpolku 12 B 20, SF-20350 TURKU, Suomi / Finland.
SZACHY (Jan Rusinek) ul. Wspolna 61, 00-687 Warsaw, Poland.
VECHERNY LENINGRAD (?) nad.r. Fontanki 59, 191023 Leningrad, U.S.S.R.
64-SHAKHMATNOYE OBOZRENIYE (Ya.G. Vladimirov) ul. Arkhipova 8, Moscow K-62, 101913 GSP, IJ.S.S.R.
There are other informal international tourneys of uncertain periodicity (for instance, the Yugoslav Solidarity series). Chervony Girnik is soviet All-Union.
Formal tourneys are considered 'one-off'. Tourneys of L'Italia Scacchistica and Tidskrift för Schack's appear to be in abeyance. Would composers please note that EG itself does not require originals (unless a tourney is announced).

## The Chess Endgame Study Circle

1. Annual (January-December) 4 issues) subscription: $£ 8 .-$ or $\$ 15 .-$. (Airmail: $£ 3$ or $\$ 5$ supplement.) 1990: EG99-102. 2. National Giro Account: 511525907 (Chess Endgame Consultants \& Publishers).
2. Bank: National Westminster ( 21 Lombard Street, London EC3P 3AR -- A.J. Roycroft Chess Account).
3. All analytical comments to: 'EG Analytical Notes', David Friedgood, 47 Grove House, Waverley Grove, London N3 3PU, England.
4. Composers may have their unpublished studies confidentially tested for originality by the HARMAN INDEX: Brian Stephenson, 9 Roydfield Drive, Waterthorpe, Sheffield, S19 6ND.
5. All other correspondence to: A.J. Roycroft, 17 New Way Road, London, NW9 6PL, England.
6. Unless clearly pre-empted by the context (such as a tourney judge's comments between inverted commas), all statements and reviews are by AJR.
${ }^{*} \mathbf{C}^{*}$ denotes a computer-related article or diagram.
BTM - Black to Move
WTM - White to Move
otb - over-the-board
ICCA - International Computer Chess Association (Prof. Dr. H.J. v.d. Herik) P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, Netherlands
PCCC - Permanent Commission of the FIDE for Chess Composition
GBR code (after Guy/Blandford/Roycroft) concisely denotes chessboard force in at most six digits. Examples: two white knights and one black pawn codes into 0002.01; wQ bQ wR codes as 4100 ; wBB vs. bS codes as 0023; the full complement of $\mathbf{3 2}$ chessmen codes as $\mathbf{4 8 8 8 . 8 8}$. The key to encoding is to compute the sum ' 1 -for-W-and-3-for-Bl' for each piece-type in QRBS sequence, with wPP and bPP uncoded following the 'decimal point'; the key for decoding is to divide each QRBS digit by 3, when the quotient and remainder are in each of the 4 cases the numbers of BI and $\mathbf{W}$ pieces respectively.

Next meeting of The Chess Endgame Study Circle (in London) on Friday 12th January, 1990 (and probably 6th April). Phone John Roycroft on 01-2059876.


[^0]:    Total: 107 composers

