The tournament with a closing date 30\textsuperscript{th} March 2007 received 47 entries from 26 authors from 18 countries. Many thanks to all participants – congratulators. As all entries cannot appear in the award, below find a list of all them sorted alphabetically.


Our thanks to Michal Hlinka for boring work as Tournament Director and for opportunity to test an interesting solving experiment (see below).

Enormous thanks go also to official sponsors Československý šach magazine and Chess Association TJ Pankrác for his generous grant made into the tournament prize funds. In addition Československý šach printed the Award in 5 and 6/2007 issues.

35 years long experience in the field of endgame studies led us to conclusion, that the solver’s aspect of endgame studies is often underestimated. If a judge replays the author’s solution only or if he checks correctness using computer, then his evaluation isn’t fully adequate and the quality of testing may be not very high. Therefore we internally tested an unusual evaluation experiment, using in the first stage a diagram only, solving it “by head”. In the following stages computers are involved, then both judges confront their experience and finally with author’s documentation compared.

Such interesting method is probably applicable only informally, but surely it contributed to deeper understanding of some entries. Outwards we kept usual non-anonymous status for quick and flexible communication with authors – it appeared to be useful in some cases.

An originality of entries was tested by an innovative CQL tool in Harold van der Heijden’s database. More details about CQL see e.g. http://www.vlasak.biz/vcql.htm.

A high quality of entries was a very pleasant surprise for us. It appeared again an objective ranking of entries is practically impossible. Both judges had own „favorites“ and after final discussion different points of view have been taken into consideration. Distinguish prices are nondescript comparable entries of various genre. Finally we increased the prize fund a little and introduced a special Romantic Section, defined quite clearly by initial position.

The so-called “database compositions” create last years a considerable problem for judges. All won 6 men (and less) positions and even several 7 men ones were generated with a computer and saved in special databases (EGTB). Using chess software one can
get the correct evaluation of every such a position, the quickest way to win and its uniqueness.

Using EGTBs composing endgame studies is challenged for two reasons. First extracting data from a database doesn’t need skills of traditional composing such as the talent. In addition the data mining could be automated as in the “Wilhelm” software. So it’s unfair from a sport view. Secondly the originality of such a works is threatened – especially in case of popular zugzwangs, which are even listed in papers. More details see EG135 page10 and EG166 page 177, no offered solution seems to be satisfactory.

Even both judges of this tournament have not the same view. Unquestionably until the study community will find some agreement the possible abasement of database studies has to be announced before the tournament. We did not something like, conversely we have agreed to evaluate such studies as a normal one.

We used usual standards as a tout ensemble, an originality and strength of the idea, a purity of a style, a linkage of the introductory play with the theme and an adequate difficulty.

We are sure this method was correct – otherwise all nice Prizes should to be demoted.

Even the kernel of the 1st Prize of Matouš, working quintessentially without a computer, could be found in a database after removing the technical d5 pawn.

Judges and composers, pay attention to the Becker’s Prize. If the database studies should be penalized some way, first you have to decide if this study belongs to this category.

The Preliminary Award dated 15th June 2007 was published in Československý šach magazine 5 and 6/2007 and on the web www.vlasak.biz/pv50.htm. Here you can find several standard formats (PGN, CBV, PDF – Czech and English versions). You can here also directly replay all studies without any special software.

Protests was possible till 31th July 2007 to emil@vlasak.biz with CC to jaroslav.polasek@brouzdej.net or by mail to Emil Vlasák, Stavbařů 3, 400 11 Ústí nad Labem, Czech Republic. In the confirmation period we have got only one remark.

L. Gonzáles noticed out our wrong comment of one subline in his study, which is corrected now.

So the preliminary award is the final one.

Jaroslav Polášek a Emil Vlasák, 5th August 2007
The Main Section

Undoubtedly the best study in the tournament. An introductory play - spectacular and attractive for solvers – culminates in a RxQ duel, a typical Matouš theme. A rook has to execute several surprising quiet moves, based on mutual zugzwangs and line obstructing.


3.Ke3!! A logical supplement to the previous move. The weak 3.Kg3? Qg6+ costs a rook c2. 3...cxd4+ 4.Kf2! Qf4 Now is very bad 5.Re2? Qe3+ and other attacking rook-moves lead to a perpetual: 5.Ra2? Qe1 6.Kg3!? (6.Ra8 Qc2+ 7.Kg3 Qg6+ 8.Kf2 Qc2+) 6.Qc7+ 7.Kf2 Qc1 or 5.Re8? Qe3+ 6.Kg3 Qh6 7.Kf2 Qe3+ 8.Kg3 Qh6. 5.Rc6!! Mutual zugzwang, the queen has surprisingly no good moves. So a pawn has to move obstructed the important diagonal b1-h7 in two echo lines:

A) 5...d3 6.Rc8!! Qh6 7.Rb8! wins.
B) 5...Qe3+ 6.Kg3 Another mutual zugzwang. 6...d3 7.Ra6! Qc1 8.Ra7! wins.
An incredibly rich study with an excellent finish, probably mined from databases, but not being a database position. The author is known through a very complicated introductions, but in this case he keeps a respectable bound. The introduction here is logically connected with a finish and so it deepens it. You can fully understand the content without a computer, but it takes some days.

What about to drive back the rook with a tempo? A “study” move 1.g7? Re8! 2.b6 (2.Bd6 Rg8 3.bxa6 Kc8 4.Be5 Rxb7=) slows for 2...c4 3.Be5 c3 4.Bxc3 Kc8 5.Bb4 (5.Kc6 Re6+) 5...Rg8 6.Bf8 Kb7 7.Kc5 a3! and white is in zugzwang. Positions with queens give also nothing – 3.Bd6 c3 4.Bf8 c2 5.g8Q c1Q 6.Qf7+ Kd8 or 3.Bf4 c3 4.b7 c2 5.b8Q Rxb8 6.Bxb8 c1Q. The first mystery of the study – the rook has to stay in his “active” position! 1.b6! Suddenly Black is in troubles. A simple bishop retreat is an important threat, for example 1...Re8 2.Bf4 c4 3.b7 c3 4.b8Q Rxb8 5.Bxb8 c2 6.Bf4. The 7th rank defense also fails for a typical motive 1...Re7 2.Be5 Kc8 3.g7 Re8 4.Kc6 Re6+ 5.Bd6. 1...Rd3+! 2.Kxc5 Rc3+! Interesting is 2...Rh3 3.g7 Rh5+ 4.Kd4! Rg5 5.Bf4 Rg8 6.Kc5 Rg5+ 7.Kb6. 3.Kd5! White king starts a transfer to help his g-pawn. The whole way has to be made precisely – 3.Kd4? Rc6! 4.g7 Rg6=. 3...Rd3+ Of course not 3...Rc6? 4.b7 Kc7 5.b8Q+!. Insufficient is also 3...Re2 4.Bg3 Rg2+ 5.Kc5 Rc2+ 6.Kd4 Kc6 7.g7 Rd2+ 8.Ke5 Rd8 9.Bf2 Rg8 10.Kf6. 4.Ke5! To understand the whole mechanism we have to demonstrate an important line with a seemingly insignificant tempo loss 4.Kc4?. Rd1 5.Kf3 (5.g7 Rg1 =) 5...Rf1+ 6.Kg4 Rf8 7.Kg5 Rg8 8.Kf6 Rf8+ 9.Kg7 Rf1 10.Kg8. Now after 10...Kc6!! white cannot succeed, as in the line11.g7 Ve(d)! he can never play the key move Bd8. For example 12.Kf7 Rf1+. 4.Rd1! 5.g7! After 5.Kf5? Kc6! the defense is similar as in 4.Ke4? line. 5.Rg1 6.Kf6! The culmination of this difficult phase. Yes, Black has also an extra tempo here, but he cannot take advantage from it: 6...Kc6? 7.Bd8! Kb7 8.Kf7 Kc8 9.Bf6 Kb7 10.Bd4. 6.Rf1+ 7.Kg6 Rg1+ 8.Kf7 Rf1+ 9.Kg8 The final phase is beginning. As we will see later Black has problem to move. But first he can push his pawns to delay the matter. 9...a5 10.Kh7! Too hasty is 10.a3? Kc6 11.Bd8 Rd1 12.Bg5 Rg1 13.Be3 Rg3 14.Bd4 Rxa3. 10...Rh1+ 11.Kg6 Rg1+ 12.Kf7 Rf1+ 13.Kg8 Using this encirclement maneuver White can reach this position again and again. 13...a3 14.Kh7 Rh1+ 15.Kg6 Rg1+

David Gurgenidze, GEO

2nd – 4th Prize ex aequo
Polášek and Vlasák 50 JT 2007
black to move, white wins

It’s known from several endgame studies, a queen with a pawn can in a center of board beat a connected rook pair. The Gurgenidze’s work exceeds all them dramatically. A rich game, pure side-lines, quiet hard to find moves, shifted pawn forks and the final mate with active blocks. With an excellent introduction this study is a remarkable piece. 1...Rb8+ 2.Bb4+ 2.Rb7? Rxb7+ 3.Kc1 Rxe7 4.f8Q Re1 mate. 2...Rxb4+ 3.Kc1 Rf3 3...Rxd7 4.f8Q Rd5 leads to a main. 4.Rd3+! Rxd3 5.f8Q Rd5! The only good defense, for example 5...Rdd4 6.Qf3+ Kc4 7.Qc6 mate. The next quiet moves are a fine delicacy for solvers. Bad is 6.Qf3+? Kc4 or 6.Qc8+? Rc4. 6.Qf6+! Kc4 6...Rbd4 7.Qc6+ Kb4 8.c3+. 7.c3! A point of the attack! 7...Rbb5 8.Kc2! The last difficult move crowns a matter. 8...Kc5 8...Re5 9.Qf4+ Kd5 10.c4+, 8...Ra5 9.Qc6+ Rdc5 10.Qe4+ Kb5 11.Qb7+ Kc4 12.Qb3 mate. 9.c4 Kxc4 10.Qc3 mate or 9...Rb6 10.Qf2+ Rd4 11.Kc3 Rbd6 12.Qf5+ Kc6 13.Qe8+ Kb6 14.c5+ wins.
Enclosed studies are not direct anticipators; they could illustrate the theme development in a wider continuity.

D. Gurgenidze
The Problemist, 2000
white wins

The previous author’s work.

V. Tarasjuk
Magadan Kudesnik 1991
white wins

The similar mate as in the honored study, but on the board egde.
To fully enjoy this miniature delicacy, we warmly recommend an individual solving. You have to crack two mixed problems. First how to find a missing tempo and secondly how to dispose of a superfluous knight.


Mario Matouš, CZE

2nd – 4th Prize ex aequo
Polášek and Vlasák 50 JT 2007
draw
The study is based on an unexpected king’s move – White doesn’t take a piece and conversely he sacrifices his knight to draw back rook in a fatal square.

This dense database mined study is interesting for an endgame theory. The authors highlight parallel stalemates in both lines, we also like the geometrical motives in RxB battle in line A. As usually for Becker, you need a good armed computer to fully understand all that.


A) 2...Rxd7 3.Rxd7 Ng5! The second possibility 3...Ne5 is not good in this line. After 4.Rd6 Bxf6 5.Ra6 Black cannot free from the 6th rank pin, for example. 5...Nf3 6.Rb6 Ng5 7.Kg8! Kf5 8.Rb7 Ke6 9.Rb6+. 4.Kg8! White has to play very precisely here, for 4.Ra7? Bxf6 5.Ra6 Ne6+ see the line 2.Rxd7?. Premature is 4.Rd5?! Nh7+! 5.Kg8 Nxf6+. 4...Bxf6 5.Rd5! The only move again – 5.Rd1? Be5 6.Rd5 if or 5.Rd6? Kf5 6.Rd7 Ke6 7.Ra7 Be5. After the main move we are facing to the complex positional draw. Black will test the opponent’s alertness first: 5...Ne6 6.Rd7?! Nd8 7.Rd6! Ne6 8.Rd7 Ng5 9.Rd5! No result, so there is next chance to unfreeze. 9...Be7?! 10.Rd7 Kf6 He doesn’t hurry with 10...Bc5? 11.Rxf7! Nxf7 stalemate. 11.Rd1! Now the fine geometric motives in RxB battle come in useful. 11...Bc5 After 11...Ba3 12.Rg1! Black hasn’t 12...Bc1. After 11...Bb4 12.Rd5! Black hasn’t 12...Bd2, for example 12...Nf3 13.Rb5 Bd6 14.Rb6. 12.Rf1!+! Demonstrating the hidden defect of 11...Bc5, when 12...Ke7? so 13.Rf5!. 12...Kf6 13.Re1+ Kd6 14.Rf1 Ke6 15.Re1+ Kf6 16.Rf1+ Kg6 The last try. 17.Rxf7 Nxf7 stalemate.

B) The defense in line A is based on the key move 4.Kg8. So Black can try 2...Rb8+? 3.Re8 Rxe8+ 4.Kxe8 getting the same position, but with white king on e8 instead of f8. The matters are curiously swapped here. Weak is now 4...Ng5? 5.Rd4(1) Bxf6 6.Rg4! Kg7 7.Rg1 and Black cannot free from the g-file pin. Not enough is also the more aggressive 5...Kxf6 6.Rg4 Ne6 7.Rg1 Ng7+ (7...Nc7+ 8.Kf8 Bg7+ 9.Kg8 Ne6 10.Rf1+) 8.Kf8 Nf5 (8...Ne6+ 9.Kg8) 9.Kg8 Bg7 10.Rf1. Vice versa, the second knight’s move is here a serious try 4...Ne5! 5.Rd1(2) Bxf6 6.Re1! Preventing a king’s release, bad was 6.Kf8? Bg5. 6...Bg7 7.Rg1+ Kf6 Nothing gives 7...Kh7 8.Rf1. 8.Rf1+ Ke6 9.Rxf7 Nxf7 stalemate.
Mario Matouš, CZE

3rd honorable mention
Polášek and Vlasák 50 JT 2007

white wins, black to move

The surprising finish with a win of alone knight plus pawn against a queen through a quiet move hasn’t had a satisfactory setting. For the two known studies see below. Matouš, working completely without a computer, succeeded to expand this difficult theme. In his introductory play he composed a very fine difference between Kc4/Kb4 with a nice refutation of the second one through a stalemate. But the introductory play is too complicated and some side-lines have dual solutions.

1...b2+ 2.Ke2


2...Qe7+ 3.Be3, 2...Qxa4 3.b7+ Kxb8 4.Qe5+.


6.Kd3 Qxc3+ 7.Kxc3 a1Q+

8.Kc4! The only move! After the seemingly better 8.Kb4? Qd4+ 9.Kb5 Black can save the game through a stalemate 9...Qe5+!! 10.Kc6 (10.Ka6 Qa1+! 11.Qa5 Qf1+) 10...Qc7+!! 11.Kd5 Qxb4 draw.


G. Sonntag
Schach 1968
white wins

L. Mitrofanov and A. Bor
Sacharov JT 1989, 5th Prize
white wins

Unfortunately also 1.Qc4!, for example 1...Qh2
A pleasant position with an unexpected pawn sac should be also very attractive for solution contests. At the first look it seems to be a typesetter’s mistake.


The second part is known from Jan Ševčík: 1.d7! Nb6+ 2.Kd4 Nxd7 3.g7 Bf7! 4.Bg6 Bg8 5.Be8. But it’s cooked 1.g7! Nxd6+ 2.Kc5 Nb7+ 3.Kb6 Bf7 4.Kxb7 and there isn’t a nice pawn sac.
Michal Hlinka, SVK

5th honorable mention
Polášek and Vlasák 50 JT 2007

draw, black to move

Hlinka’s typical work is very close related by o.t.b. game and has an accent to all run. The finish prepared by unexpected king’s move is interesting. Unfortunately such a concepts bring a difficult side-lines, lowering impression.

The main line runs 1...Ra6+ 2.Kxa6 cxb3+ 3.c4 Bxc4+ 4.Ka7! Point. 4...b2 5.Rh3+ Kg6 6.Rg3+ Kf7 7.Rg7+ Ke8 8.Bb4 b1Q 9.Re7+ with a double threat Rxb1 and Ba5+!

However a careful solver has to examine a lot of a rubbish.


We like the solvers’ attractive A position with a fine choice between Kf6/Kg7 and Ne2-f3/Nc3-d5. The B position is rather analysis and the evaluation should be unchanged without it.

1. \textit{h7 Ne5+ 2. Kg7!} After 2.\textit{Kf6?}! Ng6 3.\textit{Nd2} there is a nice win 3...\textit{Bd3? 4.Nf3!} but Black has 3...\textit{Be2?! 4.Ne4 Nh8!} (4...\textit{Bd3? 5.d7 Kc7 6.Nc5}) 5.\textit{Ke7 Ng6+ 6.Kf7 Nh8+ 7.Kg7 Bd3 8.d7 Kc7! 9.Nc5 Bxh7 10.Kxh7 Nh8+}. In both lines the defense is based on Nh8! and this is key to the correct solution. 2.\textit{Ng6 3.Nc3! Bd3} 3...\textit{Nh8} is bad here for the simple 4.Kxh8 Bd3 5.Nb5!.

4.\textit{Nd5! Kxd6} The threat was Nb4+. 5.\textit{Nf4!} A point of the knight’s maneuver! 5...\textit{Nh8 6.Nxd3 wins}. There is an interesting addendum – after 6...\textit{Ke7?!} White cannot play 7.Kxh8?? Kf7!, the quickest way to win is 7.Ne5! Ke8 8.Ng6 Nf7 9.Kf6.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Position B with wNh7}
\end{center}


\textbf{János Mikitovics, HUN}

6th honorable mention
Polášek and Vlasák 50 JT 2007

white wins
twin B: Nb1 → h7
Juri Akobija, GEO

1st – 2nd commendation
Polášek and Vlasák 50 JT 2007

white wins

A jewel mined from databases with an unexpected king’s move! Unfortunately the author didn’t find a way to highlight the mutual zugzwang 7.Kh1, for example in a try with the reverse move order.

A well constructed perpetual attack of two rooks with alone bishop. Author gives the Simkhovitch 1940 as his inspiration source.


1...Rf1! The best move, 1...Rf6?! gives White besides main 2.Ra8+ an extra possibility 2.Bc2! Rxe3 3.Ra8+ Rf8 4.Rxf8+ Nxf8 5.Bf5. 2.Ra8+! Not 2.Ra5? Rh2+ 3.Rh5 Rxe5+ 4.Kh5 Nf6+ 5.Kh6 Rxa4. 2...Nf8! After 2...Rf8 3.Ra7 or even 3.Rxf8+ Nxf8 4.c7. 3.Rxf8+! Another moves lose easily. 3...Rxg2 4.c7 Rg8! Or 4...Rxc3 5.Bd7. After the text move White position is critical. 5.c8Q!! A surprise! 5.Bd7? R4xg6+ 6.Kh5 R6g7 ends with mate. 5...Rxc8 6.Bd7! Rcc4 7.Be6! Rce4 8.Bf5! Ra4 After 8...Kg8 9.Kh5!, but unfortunately also 9.g7! Kf7 10.Kh5!. 9.Bd7! Kg8!? The only chance to avoid the white-square perpetual attack. 10.c4! Raxc4 11.Be6+ Kf8 12.g7+ draw.

F. Simkhovitch
Turkmenskaja Iskra, 1940
draw

An interesting game culminates with a remarkable move Qxd8! refuted by a perpetual check.

1.c7! \(1...\text{Nc}2?\) Qc1+ 2.Kh2 Bxd6+ 3.g3 Qd2+, \(1...\text{Bg}5?\) Qf2. 1...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1!

A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1!

A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1!

A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1!

A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1!

A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1!

A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1!

A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1! A well-known motive – white queen has to be decoyed out of black squares: 2.Kh2? Qe5+ 3.Kh1 Qe1+ or 3.g3 Qe2+ 4.Kg1 Ba7+. 2...Qxb1+ 3.Bxd6+ 4.Kf2 Qe2+. 2...Qa1+! 2.Nb1!
After a pleasant lively introduction we are facing a NNxP position with Pf4 blocked by the king. It’s necessary for a win to swap blockers allowing the pawn’s advance. A resulting position type with knight-blocked Pf5 is well-known to the theory – White holds only if he can occupy squares close to the h8 corner. A spirit of this rule affects also the starting Pf4 position.

We are familiar with this fineness because of Polášek+Vlasák study, Magyar Sakkélet 1989. Rossi’s king is more distant from a saving corner, but his finish is uncertain and it’s hard to determine author’s main line.

1.Bc8+ Kxe7 2.Bxf5
2...Nf8 3.Ng6+!

We have tested an “promising” move 3.Bb1 Kf6 4.Ba2, but there are several ways to win. For example

J. Polášek and E. Vlasák
Magyar Sakkélet 1989
draw

Jan Lerch, CZE

5th commendation
Polášek and Vlasák 50 JT 2007

A well-known motive of fork-knight’s domination. Pogosianc has a very nice setting. But Jan Lerch has discovered a new interesting aspect of this theme where the known method 3.Kb1?! fails because of a positional draw.


C. Dorasil
Deutsche Schachzeitung 1921
white wins

A classic work, but cooked. It’s known after 2...Bg7! or 2...Bd4! Black draws as in Lerch’s study.
E. Pogosjants
Shakhmaty 1976
white wins

One of the best treatment.
The Romantic Section

Gregori Slepian, BLR

Special Prize for Romantic
Polášek and Vlasák 50 JT 2007

white wins

The position is saturated by discovered checks, mates, stalemates and underpromotions. Finally White saves the game against a same-color-bishops pair using an original sacrifice combination.

The Black’s try 1..Rg7!! is probably a most paradoxical move in the tournament. But a next play is a little schematic. We don’t also like a strange balance of this study: Black is very active the whole run and as “repayment” he is finally almost lost.

A nice adventure with a self imprisonment of king, a tempo lose, an unexpected positional draw and underpromotions. Unfortunately the intended second thematic line is only technical because of dual and it costs a Prize.

1.g4! White has to free his rook despite a life imprisonment of king. It gives a study a romantic nature. Bad is 1.c4 Rxd2 2.g4 Rxhr2 3.gxf5 Rd4 4.f6 Rd4 5.f7 Rxh4+ 6.Kxh4 stalemate. 1...Bxc2! 1...Bd7 is a clearly technical win, for example 2.Rf2 Ra8 3.Rf7 Rd8 (3...Be6 4.Re7Bg8 5.Rf7 Rd8 6.d7) 4.c4 Be6 5.c5. But 1...Be6!? is more interesting being originally considered by author as a second thematic line. The play is surely nice: 2.Re2 Bg8 3.d7 Ra8 4.Re7! Bd5 (4...Rd8 5.Rf7! Rf8 6.c4!) 5.Re8+ Bg8 6.Re8! Rxec8 7.dxc8N!, but not 7.dxc8B?!. Bd5 8.Bb7 Be6 9.Ba6 Bc4 with a positional draw. An inviting move 4.Re8? actually loses an important tempo: 4...Rd8! 5.Re7 Bd5! 6.d4 Bc4 7.c4 Bxd7. Unfortunately the white’s position is too strong and the technical 3.d3!! wins too, for example 3...Ra8 4.c4 Rd8 5.c5 Bd5 6.Re5 Ba8 7.d4 Kg8 8.d5 Kf8 9.Rf5+ Kg8 (9...Ke8 10.Rf7 Rd7 11.c6 Rxd6 12.Rxg7) 10.c6 Rxd6 11.c7 Bb7 12.Rf4 Rxd5 13.Rb4. 2.d3!! A goal of this move is a pure time los – compare to the 2.d4?. But this correct move could be find also using wrong speculation about a threat Bxg6+; this is a little flaw. Because of a pin Black has to trade now. 2...Bb3 3.Rxa2 Bxa2 4.d7 Bg8! 5.d4! Mutual zugzwang. 5...Be6 This extraordinary position was proposed to several strong o.tb. players to solve. The first surprise, after the queening an extra pawn, spared by a smart move 2.d3, cannot help White to win. It cannot simply cross a d5. And every try to prepare Qf7 ends with a stalemate Bxf7 and g6+!. According Gady this idea is taken from Lazard 1905. A long time the solvers try to win with a promoted knight, but without any success. The solution is hidden, but simple. 6.d8R+!! Bg8 7.Rd6(7) Bc4 8.d5 wins.

F. Lazard
De Barbieri MT 1946, 2nd Prize
draw

1.Ne4+! Kh4 2.Ng3!! Qf8 3.Be1! fxg3 4.Bf2!!
gxf2 9.g3+ Kxg3
Sergej Didukh, RUS

1st Special commendation
Polášek and Vlasák 50JT 2007

draw

One stalemate to each celebrating judge. 1.Na6+ Ka7 The first one after 1...Bxa6
2.Qe8+! Rxe8 stalemate. 2.b8Q+! Else Black has a decisive attack. 2.Nxc7? Ne4+ 3.Ke3
Author corrected his cooked study from Šachová skladba 1990. The nice key is now perfectly sound and there is a new pawn ending with a precise White’s move. A hidden stalemate defense is refuted by underpromotion. The stalemate is just uneconomical and the pawns’ interlacement on a-file is a little unnatural.


G. Nadareishvili
Kommunist 1962
white wins

A very economical version from classic.
1.d7 Nf7 2.g6 a2 3.gxf7 a1Q 4.d8Q Qxa4+ 5.Qb7 Qb3+ 6.Qb6 Ka1 7.f8R.
But Kekely’s stalemate defense is more tricky – it comes only after a bad promotion in a queen.
A logical study with a romantic setting. But the similar constructions are known.

1. **Rh8! Be3+!** Black is very close to a perpetual check, but White can break this defense throwing away his h6 pawn. 2. **Ke5** 2.**Kxd3? Bf5+ 3.**Ke2 Bg4+ with another system of perpetual. 2... **Bf4+ 3.**Kf6 Bg5+ 4.**Kg7 Bxh6+ 5.**Kf6 Bg5+ 6.**Ke5 Bf4+ 7.**Kd4!

Premature is 7.**Ke4? Bb8!.

2... **Bf4+ 3.**Kf6 Bg5+ 4.**Kg7 Bxh6+ 5.**Kf6 Bg5+ 6.**Ke5 Bf4+ 7.**Kd4!


**A. Vysokosov**

Josten 65 JT 2002, 2**nd** Prize

white wins


**J. Roslov**

USSR - World 1989, 11**th** Place

white wins


Luis Miguel Gonzáles, ESP

3**rd** Special commendation

Polášek and Vlasák 50 JT 2007

white wins