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# Introduction in Proca Retractors Anticirce <br> by Andreas Thoma 


#### Abstract

Our friend and collaborator from Germany, Andreas Thoma, sent us a set of problems of the kind that made him famous: Proca Retractors Anticirce. All of them were welcome for Quartz (even though the magazine no longer has a regular tourney for retro problems), but I asked that they be accompanied by comments. This is how this little didactic article was born, which we present to you. Read by the same author When the black King gives check, in ChessProlems.ca Bulletin 17/2019, as well as Five Pendulum Retros in Proca Anticirce, ChessProlems.ca Bulletin 16/2019.


Defensive Retractor: In Defensive Retractors, White and Black retract (take back) a given number of moves (-n moves), in order to reach a position in which a forward stipulation (e.g. \#1, $\mathrm{s} \# 1$ ) is met. Given a choice, Black will retract those moves that avoid or delay White's goal. Unless otherwise stated, Black may defend by mating White through a forward move, if such an opportunity exists after one of Black's retractions.
The different kinds of Defensive Retractors only differ in the way uncaptures are handled, of course only legal uncaptures are allowed:

- In Proca Retractors the retracting side decides, if and what man was uncaptured;
- In Hoeg Retractors the opposite side decides, if and what man was uncaptured (see $\mathbf{A}$ );
- In Klan Retractors always White decides, if and what man was uncaptured (see B).
,,As to the genesis of the defensive retractor its year of birth can be fairly precisely defined as the last months of 1923 and the beginning 1924. About that time the pioneer problems of the Romanian composer Zeno Proca and the Danish composer Niels Höeg were published, included the denitions of those retro types as formulated by the inventors. The crucial dierence between the two types refers only to retro moves allowing the retraction of a capturing move. In the decades to follow both orthodox types of the defensive retractor were to win only a relatively small amount of popularity. It was only as late as in 2001 that (based on an article by Klaus Wenda in feenschach) the new combination of the Proca retractor and later on of the Höeg retractor with the condition AntiCirce brought about a revival of the defensive retractor culminating in a real change on the retro stage. A good 700 examples of both types (with a majority of Procas) have been published from 2001-2018, mostly by Wolfgang Dittmann, Vlaicu Crisan, Paul Rãican, Andreas Thoma, Gunther Weeth and Klaus Wenda." (from the article Welcome to the Klan - Canadian Chess Bulletin 2017) In this article, we are dealing with Proca retractors only.

1) A. Thoma

CPBulletin.ca, 10/2016

$-1 . \mathrm{Ke} 1 \times \mathrm{Pd} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 1 \mathrm{Pd} 3-\mathrm{d} 2+-2 . \mathrm{Ke} 2 \times \mathrm{Re} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 1 \operatorname{Re} 7-\mathrm{e} 3+$
$-3 . \mathrm{Pb} 6 \times \mathrm{Ba} 7 \rightarrow \mathrm{a} 2$ \& 1.Pb6-b7+ K~\#
After $-2 . \mathrm{Ke} 2 \times \mathrm{Re} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{e} 1$, white is in double check from pawns d3 and e3. Not from the Rook, which doesn't check because the a8 reborn field is occupied. On the 3rd move, White uncapture a Bishop on a7, needed to defend the f2 field. In direct play, we have a selfmate in one, possibly because the reborn field of the Rook is free. So we have a Rook/ King battery here.
2) A. Thoma

StrateGems 88/2019
1.Kf6×Rf7 $\rightarrow \mathbf{K e 1}$ Re7-f7+ 2.Ke5-f6 Rf7-e7+ 3.Kf4-e5 Re7-f7+ 4.Ke3-f4 Rf7-e7+ 5.Kf2-e3 Re7-f7+ 6.Ke1-f2 Rf7-e7+ 7.Kf6×Pe6 $\rightarrow$ Ke1 Re7-f7+ 8.Kf7-f6 Re8-e7+ 9.Kf6-f7 \& 1.Kg5\#

The pair of pawns indicates a white King's pendulum. Beautiful maneuver by which the de-captured black Rook is forced to occupy the e8 square, vital for the black King.

3) P. Rãican \&
A. Thoma - original


White's goal is to give mate at g1 with the king. Therefore e8 must be occupied. With $1 . \mathrm{Ke} 1 \times \mathrm{Pd} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{Ke} 1$ d3-d2+ $2 . \mathrm{Ke} 1 \times \mathrm{Rd} 1 \mathrm{Rd} 2-\mathrm{d} 1+3 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \times \mathrm{Ph} 4 \mathrm{Sg} 7-\mathrm{f} 5+$ white forces the bS to g7. Then with $4 . \mathrm{Kf} 2-\mathrm{g} 3$ Rd1-d2+ 5.Ke1-f2 Rd2-d1+ back to the wK's rebirth place. Then $6 . \mathrm{Kf} 5 \times$ Se6! (blocks e6 for the bS and plans for the next white move) Se8-g7+ 7.Kf4-f5 S~-e6+ 8.Ke3-f4 d5-d4+ 9.Kf2-e3 \& forward: 1.Kg1\#

To avoid a forward defense always lifts a problem up, here only $1 . \mathrm{Kh} 2 \times \operatorname{Sg} 3$ ! is possible.
$\mathbf{1 . K h 2} 2 \times$ Sg3! S~-f1/f2-f1S+ 2.Sg7×Rh5 $\rightarrow$ b1! Kh4-g4+ 3.Se8g7 \& forward: 1.Kh2-h3\# 1.Kh2 $\times$ Pg2/Bh1/Sh1? Sd2-f1+ $2 . \operatorname{Sg} 7 \times$ Rh5 $\rightarrow$ b1! Kh4-g4+ \& forward defense: 1.Sd2-f3\#
4) A. Thoma original

5) A. Thoma- original


7+4 -9 \& \#1 Proca Anticirce Cheylan

Two elements are shown. I: First move prevents a black defense! (1.Pc2×Sd3? Rb8-b3+!)
II.: Out of seven moves, black chooses the best one $2 \ldots$..Sf2-d3! (Otherwise 3.Bf7-d5 \& forward: 1.Rd8\#)
1.b5×a5 e.p.! a7-a5 2.Pc2×Sd3! Sf2-d3! 3.Pb4×Rc5! Kh8g8+ 4.Bf7-d5 \& forward: 1.Rd1-d8\#

Here we have an unexpected mate aux epaulettes:
6) $\mathbf{1 . K e 1} \times \mathbf{B d} 2!\mathrm{Bc} 1-\mathrm{d} 2+2 . \mathrm{Ke} 1 \times \mathrm{Bd} 2$ Be3-d2+ 3.Kf2×Rg3 Bd2-e3+ 4.Ke1-f2 Be3-d2+5.Ke6×Bd7 Be8-d7+ 6.Ba8-c6 \& 1.Ke6-f5\#

7 has another selfmate in the end, not too difficult to understand:
$\mathbf{1 . R f 3} \times \mathbf{R f} \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{h 1}$ ! Rf2-f1+2.Kd2×Rc3! Rf1-f2+ 3.Ke1-d2 Rf2-f1+ 4.Kb3×Ra3! Ra8-a3 5.Sc8-b6 \& 1.Rf3-f5+ Ra8-a1\#
6) A. Thoma, Comm

Sachova skladba 2014

7) V. Crişan \&
P. Rãican - original
8) 7) P. Rãican 8
A. Thoma - original


Two well known elements are shown in 8: avoiding forward defense and the remis-pendulum!
1.Ke1×Rd1(Ke1)! Rd2-d1+ 2.Kf2×Bg2(Ke1) Rd1-d2+ 3.Ke2-f2 f4f3+ 4.Kf1-e2! Ba8-g2+ [4.Ke1-e2? Rd2-d1+ and forward defense Re3\#] 5.Ke1-f1 Rd2-d1+ 6.Kf5×Be6(Ke1)! Bf7-e6+ (position 1st time) 7.Ke6-f5 Be8-f7+ 8.Kf5-e6 Bf7-e8 (position 2nd time) 9.Ke6f5 Be8-f7 10.Kf5-e6 g7-g6+ (forced,
otherwise position third time) 11.Ke4-f5 Rd5-d3+ 12.Kf3-e4 \& 1.Kg2\#

I hope that the retro-fan-club has a few more members now!
In the end, I want to thank Vlaicu and Paul for their support and friendly help.

## Appendix

A) A. Thoma- original

B) $\mathbf{1 . K e 1 \times R d 1 ! ~ R d 2 - d 1 + 2 . K f 2 \times B g 2 ~ R d 1 - d 2 + ~ 3 . K f 1 - ~}$ f2 Ba8-g2+ 4.Ke1-f1 Rd2-d1+ 5.Ke6×Bf7 Be8-f7+ 6.Kd5-e6 b7×Ra6! (b7×Qa6?) 7.Sd4-b5 \& 1.Ra3\# In Klan retractor, it is White which unit is uncaptured. not work in Anticirce). because of: d2xc1/e1B[Bf8]!)
A) 1.Qg6-d3! d2-d1R+2.h6×Pg7(g2)! Though it's

Hoeg, black must choose a black Pawn, thats the only way to take back the check by the black Bishop! (h2-h1=B does

Now the 1 st white move is clear too, 1.Q~-d3? and black demands $2 \ldots$ h6xRg7! 2..f3×Rg2(g7)+! (White wishes a white Rook) 3.Qe4-g6 \& 1.Rg8\# (not 3.Re2-g2? \& fd 1.Re8+?


Cu ocazia Campionatului Mondial de Compozitie Sahista (WCCT11), l-am cunoscut pe
Mihail Croitor, un pasionat al finalurilor de şah. El ne-a selectat câteva studii pe tema "furculitei calului" (Knight fork in chess studies).

Iatã câteva date biografice primite chiar de la autor:
Sunt născut în 28 iulie 1981 la Vulcănești (Republica Moldova). Mai târziu ne-am mutat cu familia la Ungheni. În anul 1999 am intrat la Universitatea de Stat din Moldova, facultatea Matematica şi Informatică, pe care am absolvit-o în 2006 cu titlul Magistru în Informatica. Sunt programator si lector universitar la Universitatea de Stat din Moldova. Am doi bãieți si o soție frumoasă.

Cu șahul am luat contact de la 6 ani. Ca membru al clubului de şah din oraşul Ungheni, la 15 ani devin candidat de maestru. În perioada aceasta, am făcut cunoștința cu problema lui Dmitrii Clark 1876 (Alb: Re1, Da3, Ca2; Negru: Rb1, pb2, pb3, mat în 2 mutări). Cu aceasta problema a început călătoria mea în lumea compoziției de șah.

Gustul pentru compozitie l-am format în baza cărții «Leonid Kubbel» scrisă de Vladimirov și Fokin. După finalizarea licențiatului în 2004, am reprezentat Universitatea la competiții naționale (la prima tablă), dar interesul meu s-a canalizat mai apoi către compozitie.

În 2009 am făcut cunoștință cu amatorii compoziției de șah din Chișinău și am început să particip la concursuri de dezlegări. Am devenit de 5 ori la rând campionul Moldovei la dezlegări și am început să organizez și să arbitrez concursuri de dezlegări. Am compus cam 200 de probleme si studii si am obtinut 12 premii. Ca etudist prefer stilul popular: conținut simplu, soluție memorabilă, poziție naturală.


# Knight Forks in Chess Studies 

by Mihail Croitor

Knight fork is so popular in chess that it is often selected as a basic theme of the study. In this article I would like to analyze the development of the topic. Were selected positions in which the Knight catches the most "tasty" piece - the Queen.
A) Studies before 1950

The first study on the subject, according to the HHDBV basis, appeared almost 200 years ago.

KF1) W. Bone
Le Palamede, 1836


KF2) B. Horwitz
The Chess Player's
Chronicle, 1850


## KF1

A simple combination of catching the queen in 2 variants.

## 1.c7+

1...Qxc7 2.Ba5 Qxa5 3.Sc6+
1... Kxc7 2.Bf4 Qxf4 3.Sd5+

The following example
circulates in almost all tactic books.
KF2 1.Ra4+ Ke5 2.Ra5! c5
(2...Qxa5 3.Sc6+ fork)
3.Rxc5! Qxc5 4.d4+! pawn fork Qxd4 (or 4...Kxd4 5.Se6+ fork) 5.Sc6+ fork 5...Ke4 6.Sxd4 Kxd4 7.Kf3! win

In the following endgame, the theme is realized in 4 variants: KF3 1.Se5!
1...Qg3 2.hxg3 hxg3 3.Sg7+ Kg5 4.f4+ Kf6 5.Sh5+ Kf5 6.e4\#;
1...Qh8 2.Sf4+ Kg5 3.Sf7+;
1...Qg2 2.Sf4+ Kg5 3.Sxg2 hxg2 4.f4+ Kh5 5.Sf3;
1...Qg1 2.Sf4+ Kg5 3.Sxh3+;
1... Qh7 2.Sg6! Qxg6 (2...Kxg6 3.Sf8+) 3.Sf4+

KF3) O. Nemo
3HM Rigaer Tageblatt, 1895


KF4) J. Sehwers
Rigaer Tageblatt, 1899


In Sehwers study, the Knight catches the Queen also in 4 variants and in a light position:

## KF4 1.g4+!

1...Kxg4 2.Bd1+ Kxh4 3.Sf3+ Kg4 4.Se5+ (or 4.Sd2+);
1...Kxh4 2.Sf3+ Kxg4 3.Se5+
1...Kh6 2.Bg5+! [2.Sf5+? Kg6 3.Sd6+ Qxc2+] 2...Kxg5 3.Sf3+ Kf6 (3...Kh6 4.g5+ Kh5 5.Bg6+ Kxg6 6.Se5+ Kxg5 7.Sxc4) 4.g5+ Ke6 (4... Kf7 5.Se5+ fork) 5.Bb3! Qxb3 6.Sd4+ win

KF5 1.Rd5! Qxd5 2.c4+! Kxc4 (2...Qxc4 3.Be2 Qxe2 4.Sd4+) 3.Bf7 Qxf7 4.Se5+ Again a cascade of white pieces given for the fork.

KF6 1.Sd6+! Kf6
If 1...Ke6 then 2.Re1+ Kf6 (2...Kd7 3.Re7+ Kxe7 4.Sf5+; 2...Kd5 3.Re5+ Kxe5 4.Sf7+) 3.Re5! Qxd2 (3...Kxe5 4.Sf7+) 4.Se4+ Kxe5 5.Sxd2 win

The Rook comes under two pieces, but it cannot be taken because of the forks:

## 2.Rg5! Ke6

2...Kxg5 3.Sf7+ Kxh5 4.Sxh6 Kxh6 5.d4 Kg6 6.d5 Kf6 7.d6; 2...Qxg5 3.Se4+ Kf5 4.Sxg5 win
3.Re5+!

Another sacrifice!
3...Kf6
3...Kxe5 4.Sf7+; 3...Kd7 4.Re7+

Kxe7 5.Sf5+ Kf6 6.Sxh6
4.Ke2! smart move 4...Qf4
4...Qg7 5.Se8+ Kxe5 6.Sxg7
5.Rf5+ Qxf5 6.Sxf5 win

Here, the Rook reduced the space of the black pieces.

## KF5) A. Olland

Tijdschrift v.d. KNSB, 1899


KF6) J. Sehwers
St.Petersburger Zeitung, 1900


KF7) L. Kubbel
Rigasche Rundschau, 1914


KF8) V. and M. Platov
1P, Rigaer Tageblatt, 1909


## KF7

Leonid Kubbel specifies about this study that it is based on Horwitz's position, but tended to make the Queen's play freer.
It will be wrong if White tries directly 1.Ra1? Qg2! 2.Rg1 Qxd5 3.Rg4+ Kc5! (4.Rg5?)
1.g6! hxg6
1...Qg2 2.gxh7 Qg4+ 3.Sf3+;
1...h6 2.g7
2.Ra1! with two variants
2...Qxd5 (2...Qxa1 3.Sxb3+)
3.Ra4+ Ke5 4.Ra5! Qxa5
5.Sc4+ fork
2...Qg2 3.Rg1! Qxd5 (3...Qxg1 4.Sf3+) 4.Rg4+ Kc5 5.Rg5! Qxg5 6.Se4+ fork

An enchanting study that goes into all the chess books.:

## KF8 1.Bf6 d4 2.Se2!

2.Sf3? a1Q 3.Bxd4+ Qxd4 4.Sxd4 Kxd4 5.Kf4 Kxd3 6.Kg5 Ke4 7.Kh6 Kf5 8.Kxh7 Kf6 9.h6 Kf7 = 2...a1Q 2...Kxe2 3.Bxd4 Kxd3 4.Ba1

## 3.Sc1!

3.Bxd4+? Qxd4 4.Sxd4 Kxd4 5.Kf4 Kxd3 =
3...Qa5! 4.Bxd4+ Kxd4 (4...Kd2 5.Sb3+) 5.Sb3+ fork Kxd3 6.Sxa5
3...h6 4.Be5 (4.Bg7? Qa6) 3...Kd2 (3...Qxc1 4.Bg5+) 4.Sb3+ fork

KF9) L. Kubbel
Listok Kruzhka
Petrogubkomunni, 1921


## KF9

The first example of the theme of checkers, in which with the help of the consecutive forks, White captures black pieces (as in the game of checkers). 1.Qe4+ Kb8!
1...Ka7 2.Ra6+

## 2.Rb6+! Bxb6

2...Kc8 3.Qb7+ Kd7 4.Se5+ Ke7 5.Qxc7+ Ke8 6.Qc6+ 3.Ka6! Rd7!
3...Rd5 4.Qxd5 Qc8+ 5.Kxb6 Qc7+ 6.Kb5; 3...Kc7 4.Qb7\# 4.Qa8+! After this sacrifice Black loses all the pieces.
4...Kxa8 5.Sxb6+ Kb8 6.Sxd7+ Kc7 7.Sxf8

KF10 White prepares a battery, which limits the possibilities of the black King. 1.Qa2+! Kb4 (1...Kb5 2.Sc3+) 2.Qb2+ Kc4 (2...Ka4 3.Sc3\#) 3.Qc2+ Kb4 4.Kb2 threat Qb3\# 4...Qd5 5.Qa4+! Kxa4 6.Sc3+ fork Kb4 7.Sxd5+ Kc4 (7...Kb5 8.Sc7+) 8.Sb6+ and wPh5 guarantees the gain.

KF10) L. Kubbel
Shakhmatny Listok, 1924


KF11) A. Herbstman
1P, Tyovaen Shakki, 1935


KF12) V. Simu
1P Bucharest ty, 1949


Eight consecutive sacrifices of the Queen for the Knight's fork:
KF11 1.Qe1+! (1.Qc1+? Ke2 2.Qe1+ Kf3 3.Qh1+ Kxf2) 1...Kc2! (1...Kxe1 2.Sxd3+) 2.Qc1+! Kb3 (2...Kxc1 3.Sxd3+) 3.Qb2+! Kc4 (3...Kxb2 4.Sxd3+) 4.Qb4+! Kd5 (4...Kxb4 5.Sxd3+) 5.Qd6+! Kc4 6.Qc5+ Kb3 7.Qb4+ Kc2 8.Qb2+ Kxb2 9.Sxd3+ Kc3 10.Sxf4 win

KF12 1.Se5+ Kg5 2.Bh4+! (first sacrifice) Kxh4 3.Sf3+ Kg4 4.Sh6+! (second sacrifice) Qxh6 5.Se5+ Kg5 6.Sf7+ Kg6 7.Sxh6 =

## B) Studies after 1950

Starting with the 50 's, the Knight fork theme appeared sporadically, but as a compensation it was shown in deeper compositions.
KF13 1.Sc6! Q×d5 2.Bc2+! Kc4 (Kxc2 3.Sb4+ fork) 3.Bd3+ Kc5 (Qxd3 4.Se5+ fork) 4.Be7+ Kb6 5.Bd8+ Kb7 6.Be4 Qd1+ 7.Kb2 Qd2+ 8.Ka1 Ka6 9.Bd3+ Kb7 10.Be4 Kc8 11.Bf5+ Kb7 12.Be4 Qc1+ 13.Ka2 Qd2+ 14.Ka1 Qc3+ 15.Ka2! Qc5 16.Ba5! Kc8 17.Bf5+ Q×f5 18.Se7+ =

KF13) G. Kasparian
1P, Revista de Şah, 1959


6+4

KF14) A. Wotawa
Schach-Echo, 1962(v)


KF15) V. Nestorescu
2P Themes-64, 1969


An interesting combination is found in the study of Alois Wotawa (corrected by M. Garcia): KF14 1.g7! Purpose: closing the diagonal a1-h8. 1...Sxg7 2.Sxa3! Sxa3 (2...a1Q 3.Sxc2+)

## 3.Rh1 Sb1 4.Rh4! a1Q 5.Ra4!

The black Queen has no space, because all the fields are observed or defended with a fork.
5...Sa3 (5...Qxa4 6.Sxa4 Se6 7.Sb6!=) 6.Rxa3+! Qxa3 7.Sc4+ Kf2 8.Sxa3 =

KF15 1.Sc6+ Kf6 2.Be5+ K $\times$ f5 3.Sd4+! Ke4 (3...Kxe5 4.Sf3+) 4.Sc3+ Ke3 5.Bf4+! K $\times$ f4 6.e7! Qg1+ 7.Kd2! Q×d4+ 8.Kc1! Qe3+ 9.Kd1! (9.Kb2? Qb6+ 10.Kc1 Bh6! 11.e8=Q Kg3+ 12.Kd1 Qd4+ 13.Ke2 Qd2+ 14.Kf1 Qf2\#) 9...Qg1+ 10.Kd2 Qd4+ 11.Kc1 Qe3+ 12.Kd1 =
6. ... Qxe7 7.Sd5+ fork
6. ... Bxe7 7.Se6+ fork
6. ... Qxh5+ 7. Sce2+! Ke3 8.Sf5+! =

A valuable study of the Romanian composer.

KF16 1.Be6+ Kb7 (1...Kd8 2.Bc7+) 2.Bd5+ K×b6 3.Bc5+! $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{c} 5$ (4...K×c5 5.Se4+ fork) 4.Sd7+ fork $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{b} \mathbf{5}$ 5.S×c5 f2 6.Se4 (6.Be4? Kxc5 7.Bd3 Bb5) 7...f1=Q 8.Bc4+! Q×c4 (8...Kxc4 9.Sd2+ fork) 9.Sd6+ fork Kb4 10.S $\times \mathbf{c} 4 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{c} 4$ 11.Kf5 =

The new Queen will traverse the same way as the previous one, but on the other colour squares: echochameleon (J. Reek, Endspielstudies zwischen Theorie und Artistik, 1993)

A phenomenal achievement of the Romanian master Em. Dobrescu.

KF16) B) Em. Dobrescu
1P L'Italia Scacchistica, 1970(v)


In the 21 st century, composers are driven in its creation by 3 factors:

- they got a very powerful tool - computer with chess engines;
- the bases of the finals in 6 and 7 units appeared;
- the bases of the studies have become accessible (HHDBV, endgame.md, yacpdb.org, WinChloe).

These three factors have raised the quality and complexity of studies. A strong example of modern studies is shown below.

## KF17) V. Tarasyuk

Ural Problemist, 2003


KF18) A. Beliavsky
1P Korolkov MT, 2008


KF19) A. Zhukov
HM Kirillov 65JT, 2017


KF17 1.Rc3+ Kd5 2.Rc5+ K×c5 3.B×d4+ Q×d4 (3... Kxd4 4.Sf3+ fork) 4.Se6+ fork Kc4 5.b3+! (5.S $\times \mathrm{d} 4$ ? $\mathrm{Bc} 7+6 . \mathrm{Ka} 4 \mathrm{Kxd} 4$ 7.Kb5 Kd5 black wins) $5 . . . \mathrm{Kd5} \mathbf{6 . S} \times \mathbf{d 4} \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{d 4} 7 . \mathbf{7}$ ! B×a7 8.Ka6 Bc5 9.Kb7 Sb6 10.b4 =

KF18 1.Rf8+! Kd7 1...Kxf8 2.Qg7+ Ke8 3.Qg8+ Kd7 4.Se5\# 2.Sxb6+
2.Rxc8? Sf7+ 3.Kg7 Sxc8

## 2...Ke6 3.Kg6!

3.Rxc8? Sxc8 4.Sa8 Rxc1 5.Sxc7+ Rxc7 =
3...Qxf8 3...Rxc1 4.Rf6+ exf6 5.Qxf6\# 4.Qe5+! Kxe5 5.Sd7+! Rxd7

The black pieces are nicely arranged, then White "eat" heavy pieces using forks. The theme of checkers, known from Kubbel's studies!

## 6.Sd3+ Ke6 7.Sxc5+ Ke5 8.Sxd7+ Ke6 9.Sxf8+ Ke5 10.Sd7+ Ke6 11.Sc5+ Ke5 12.f4\#

KF19 1.d7! fxg2+ 2.Kxg2 d4+ 2...Qa8 3.Rxh6+ 3.Kf2! 3.Kg1? Qd5! 4.Rxh6+ Kxa7 5.Rd6 Qg5+ 3...Qd5! 4.Rxh6+ Kxa7 5.Sb5+! Kb7 5...Qxb5 6.d8Q Qf5+ 7.Kg3! 6.Sd6+! Kc7 7.d8Q+! Kxd8 8.c4! Now the black Queen has a place which seems safe, but even there white find her.
8...Qg8! 9.Rh8! Qxh8 10.Sf7+ fork 10...Kd7 11.Sxh8 Kc6 12.Ke2!
12.Nf7? Kc5 13.Ne5 d3! 14.Ke3 d2! 15.Kxd2 Kd4!

## $12 . . . \mathrm{Kc5} 13 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \pm$

Another contemporary example of using a fork. As you have noticed, in modern studies the Knight fork is a final tactical element of the whole fight between the pieces. In the initial position the mechanism is not yet created, as it was in most artistic endings composed 100 years ago.


## KF21 1.a6 c3

1...Qh3+ 2.Kf2 Qh2+ 3.Kf3 d2 4.B×d2 Q×d2 5.a7

## 2.R×c3!

2.a7? Qh3+ 3.Kf2 Qh2+ 4.Kf3 d2 5.Ra5+ Ke6! 6.Sc1 d1=Q+= 2.d7? Qf8+ 3.Ke1 Qf3 4.R×c3 Q×e3+= 2.S×c3? Qh3+ 3.Kf2 Qh2+ 4.Kf3 d2 5.B×d2 Q×d2=
2...Q×a6
2...Qh3+ 3.Kf2 Qh2+ 4.Kf3 d2 5.B×d2 Q×d2 6.Re3+ K×d6 7.Se4+ fork
3.Sb4! Qa1+ 4.Kg2! Q×c3 5.d7 c1=Q!
5...Qc7 6.d8=Q Q×d8 7.Sc6+ fork
6.B×c1 d2 7.d8=Q $\mathbf{d \times c} 1=\mathbf{Q}$ 8.Qe7+! Kd4 (8...Kf4 9.Sd5+ fork), 9.Se2+ fork Kc4 10.Sa2! $\pm$

A very complex study which desterves his first prize. =

## KF20

1.e7! Qa8 2.Sd3! 2.Se2? Ke6! 3.Re4+ Kxd7! 2...Bg3 3.Rd4!
3.Ra6? Qe8 3...Ke6 3...Qe8 4.Rd5+! Kg6 5.S3e5+!
4.S7c5+! Kxe7 5.Rd7+ Kf8 5...Ke8 6.g6! 6.Sb7! Bd6+ 7.Sxd6!

Qc6! 8.Rf7+! 8.Rd8+? Ke7! 9.Sf7! Qa6+! 10.Kb2 Kxf7 8...Kg8
9.Sc4! Qa6+ 10.Kb2! Kxf7 11.Sc5!

Now 2 Knights dominate the Queen.
11...Qb5 12.Sd6+; 11...Qc8 12.Sd6+;
11...Qc6 12.Se5+; 11...Qg6 12.Se5+

Four variants of Knight fork.

KF21) D.Keith \& S.Nielsen MT Halberstadt-50, 2016 $1^{\circ}$ Prize


KF22) M. Minski
2P, FIDE World Cup, 2019


KF22 In the initial position, White has some chances to be saved in view of the black King's being slightly separated from his forces The dramatic position promises double edged play and these expectations are met 1.Qc4! Be3+ 2.Kg3 Bf2+ 3.Kf4 Qc6 4.Qa2! The purpose of this unexpected maneuver will not be clear until the finale. The try 4.Qxd3? Kxd3 5 Rxd6 Qxd6 6 Rd8 $\mathrm{Bg} 3+7 \mathrm{Kxg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 58 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Qxd} 8$ leads to defeat, while the capture of the Queen is again punished by a mating attack 4 Qxc6 Rd4
4... Rd2 5.Qxd2 Kxd2 6.Rxd6 Qxd6 7.Rd8 Bg3+ 8.Kxg3

Rg5 ++! Hoping for a miracle 9.Kh3? Rg3+ 10.Bxg3 Qxd8 or 9.Kf3? Qxd8 10.Bxg5 Qxg5 and the fork Sf3+ is unavailable. However, White plays accurately until the very end 9.Kf2! with the final denouement 9... Qxd8 10.Bxg5 Qxg5 11.Sf3+ (S fork) (judge: V. Tarasiuk)

KF23 Black's passed Pawns are a powerful force, while the White's passer is easy to hold. How can White save itself?
$\mathbf{1 . S b 5}+$ ! The play begins with a battery salvo. Bringing the Bishop into play would be premature $1 . \mathrm{Bg} 5+$ ? Kc 7 2.Sb5 Kb6
3.c7 a1=Q 4.c8=Q Qf1+ 1...Ke8 Weaker is $1 \ldots \mathrm{Kc} 82 . \mathrm{Bf} 4 \mathrm{a} 1=\mathrm{Q}$ 3.Sa7+ $\mathbf{2 . c 7}$ with two thematic lines of play:
A) 2.Bxc7 3.Sxc7+ Kf7 4.Rd7+ (4.Rf4+ Kg8 5.Rf8+ Kh7) 4.Kg8 5.Rd8+ Kh7 6.Rd7+ Bf7 7.Rxf7+ Kg6 (the key position) 8.Rg7+!

An unexpected and accurate Rook sacrifice! The similar 8.Rf6+ Kxf6 9.Bd2 a1=Q 10.Bc3 Qxc3+ is no good, since the King is in check
8... Kxg7 9.Be3 a1=Q 10.Bd4+ Qxd4 11.Se6+ fork Kf6 12.Sxd4 $=$
B) 2.Bh5+ 3.Kf4! This is the right square to move to: $3 . \mathrm{Kg} 2$ ? Bxc7 4.Sxc7+ Kf7 5.Rd7+ Kg6 6.Rd6+ Kf5 7.Rd5+ Ke4 8.Rd4 Kxd4 9.Bh6 Ke4 10.Bg7 Bf3+ 3.Bxc7 4.Sxc7+ Kf7 5.Rd7+ Kg8 (5...Kf6 6.Be3 a1=Q 7.Bd4+) 6.Rd8+ Kh7 7.Rd7+ Bf7 8.Rxf7+ Kg6 9.Rf6+!

This move ensures a draw, while the previously saving move 9.Rg7+ now leads to defeat: 9...Kxg7 10.Be3 a1=Q 11.Bd4+ Qxd4 and again with check!) 9...Kxf6 (9... Kh7 10.Rf7+ Kg8 11.Rf8+) 10.Bd2 a1=Q 11.Bc3+ Qxc3 12.Sd5+ once again with the saving fork 12...Ke6 13.Sxc3 An excellent example of development of the classical J. Fritz, Norodni Listy 1933(*). The core of this endgame study consists in sacrificial combinations performed in a simple position these are mirror reflected in the homogeneity of play in the two thematic, skillfully intertwined variants (judge: V. Tarasiuk)

The last two studies are from $7^{\text {th }}$ FIDE Cup 2019 and both are by chance in the topic of this article.
(*)White: Kc8 Sd5 Bh6 Pb3; Black: Ka6 Pg2 Pg5, = 1.Sc7+

# Rescuing Failed Ships (II) 

13) G. Kasparyan

2-3 Pr.ex.aequo Uralsky rabochy 1946 version P. Rãican


Under this name, we continue a section that consists of searching for versions of demolished or unsound old works.

Kasparyan's study demonstrates the dominance of the Knight by the Rook: 1.Re4 Bf3 2.Rf4 Bc6 3.Rf6 Be8 4.Kg3 Bg6 5.Bxg6 hxg6 6.Rb6 Sd8 7.Rd6 Sf7 8.Rd7 Sg5 9.Re7! Zz win But also wins 1.Rc7! Sd6 2.Rc6 Sb5! 3.Kg3 Kg5 4.Kf2 Kh4 5.Bxh7! The study can be saved as follows:
013:
Sol: 1... Bxc6 (1... Bxf3 2.Kxf3 Sd6 3.Kf4 Sb5 4.Ba2! Kg6 5.Ke5 h5 6.Bc4! Sa7 7.c7 win) 2.Rf6 win, as in 012 .

KF23) S. Didukh
1P, FIDE World Cup, 2019

012) G. Kasparyan

2-3 Pr.ex.aequo Uralsky rabochy 1946


In 014, the author shows the Knight fork theme (see the article): 1.Sb5+ Ka4 2.Sc3+ Ka5 3.Sb3+ Ka6 4.Sc5+ Ka7 5.Bf6! Qxf6 6.Sb5+ Ka8 7.Sc7+ Ka7 8.Sb5+ =
"b" line is not available to the black King due to multiple forks.
Broken by a dual: 3.Bd8+ Ka6 4.S1e2! Qd6 5.Bg5= (4...Qc8 5.Bf6) M. Croitor made a correction, see 015:
1.Se7+ Kd8 2.Sc6+ Ke8 3.Sc7+ (3.Bh5+? Kf8!) Kf8 4.Se6+ Kg8 5.Bf3! Qxf3 6.Se7+ Kh8 7.Sg6+ Kh7 8.Sg5+=

This unsound study from 1969 (016) was very easy to correct. Author solution: 1.e8=S+ (Black threatening h1=Q\#) Kc8 2.Sd6+ Kc7 3.Sb5+ Kb6 4.Kb8 h1 $=\mathrm{Q} 5 . \mathrm{a} 8=\mathrm{S}+$ (5.Sd6 Qd5=) Kxb5 $6 . \mathrm{g} 8=\mathrm{Q}$. In the vision of that time, white was declared winner here, but Black has 6... Qc6! with draw.

017:
Sol: 1.e8=S+! Kc8 2.Sd6+ Kc7 3.Sb5+
Kb6 4.Kb8 h1=Q 5.a8=S+! Kxb5 6.f8=Q Qc6 7.Sc7+ win So, for the correction, a pawn was removed from the board.

016) G.Nadareishvili Komunisty 1969


## 015) G.Nadareishvili

Themes64 1958 correction by M. Croitor


## 017) G.Nadareishvili

Komunisty 1969
correction by P. Rãican


A special case is this superb study of the Russians T. Gorghiev and V. Rudenko. They won the Special Prize in the 1961 tournament of Revista de Sah.

## 018) T. Gorghiev \& V. 019) T. Gorghiev \& V.

## Rudenko

Special Prize
Rev. de Sah 1961


## Rudenko

Special Prize
Rev. de Sah 1961(v)


## Sol 018:

1.e8=Q Sf3+2.Qxh5 e2 [2... Sxh5 3.Rb8+!] 3.Rb7+! Rxb7 4.Qh8+ Kb3 5.Qg8+ Kb4 6.Qf8+ Kb5 7.Qe8+ Kb6 8.Qd8+ Kb5 9.Qa5+! Kxa5 10.axb7+ Kb5 11.b8=Q+ win

Neither the judge nor the authors saw a clear demolition: $1 \ldots$ Rxg7! = Surprisingly, the study is very simple to correct: the Knight from f4 moves to f 3 and the one from h2 to h3, unchanged solution (see 019)
Solution: 1.e8=Q Sf4+ 2.Qxh5 etc.

In the book Chess Study Composition, Amsterdam 1999, by Em. Dobrescu, I discovered this sensational study, see 020:
1.Sd4+ Kb2 2.Rdb8+ Kc1 3.Rc8 Rxf4+ 4.Ke5 Rxd4 5.d3! Rd5+ 6.Ke6 Qc5 7.d4! [7.Be7? Bb3 8.Bxc5 Rxc5 9.Kd6 Rxc8 10.Rxc8+ Kd2=] 7...Rd6+ 8.Ke7 Qc6 9.d5! Rd7+ 10.Ke8 Qc7 11.d6! win But Stockfish shows us an alternative: 2.f5! Rf3 3.Kg6! Ra3 4.Rdb8 + Bb3 5.Rxa3 Kxa3 6.Rxb3 + Ka2 7.Bf2 Qf1 8.Bg3 Qc4 9.Be5 Qg8 + 10.Kf6 Qd8 + 11.Ke6 win. A version appears 2 days later, see 021.
020) Em. Dobrescu
$3^{\text {rd }}$ Prize - Stella Polaris 1969
version 1999

021) Em. Dobrescu
$3^{\text {rd }}$ Prize - Stella Polaris 1969
version P. Rãican


Sol 021:
1.Sc4+ Ka2 2.Ra8+ Kb1 3.Rgb8! [3.Rab8?] Rxe4+ (a) 4.Kd5 Rxc4 5.c3! Rc5+ 6.Kd6 Qb5 7.c4! Rc6+ 8.Kd7 Qb6 9.c5! Rc7+ 10.Kd8 Qb7 11.c6! Rc8+ 12.Rxc8 Qb6+ 13.c7! Kc2 14.Rcb8 Qd6+ 15.Ke8 Qc6+ 16.Kf8 Qxc7 17.Rc8 win
(a) 3... Qxb8 4.Rxb8+ Kxc2 5.Sd6! Ba3 [5... Bb2 6.Se7 Be5 7.S7f5] 6.Sb5 Rxe4+ 7.Kxf6 Bb2+ 8.Kxg5 wins

Readers are invited to contribute their own discoveries of failed ships. An workshop is open at https://forums.chessproblems.ca $\rightarrow$ Ideas Sandbox $\rightarrow$ Studii


Ivan Aivazovski - Gunboat off Crete, 1897

## Murfatlar Thematic Tourney for Proof Games - $4^{\text {th }}$ edition WCCC Rhodos 2021

At RIFACE 2016 (the annual meeting of French composers) a retro tourney was launched, the required theme being the Vertical cylinder. At Murfatlar TT4, a vertical cylinder is also required, but it is mandatory with an additional fairy condition, no fairy units (see example 2).
Theme: Proof Games in which Vertical Cylinder condition must be presented. The authors should add another fairy condition, but not fairy pieces.
Definition Vertical Cylinder: Chessboard on which columns a and $h$ are adjacent.
Examples:

Sol 1: 1.d4 Sf6 2.Bh6 Rg8 3.e3 Rah8 4.Ba6 Sxa6 5.Sf3 Rb8 6.O-O Rba8 7.Se1 Sb8 8.Qa6 Rgh8 9.f3 Sg8 10.Kf2

With this condition, it is possible to waste time while keeping the pieces in the original position. Not thematic for TT4 because it has not an added condition.
2) P. Rãican

Phenix 306-307/2020


Vertical Cylindre
Anti take\&make

1) A. Buchanan

Phenix 310-311/2020


Sol 2: 1.g4 Sc6 2.Bxc6 [+bSb4] Sxa2 [+wPa4] 3.Rxa2 [+bSg3] bxc6 [+wBd5] 4.hxg3 [+bSh5] cxd5 [+wBe4] 5.axh5 [+bSf4] dxe4 [+wBf3] 6.gxf4 [+bSg6] exf3 [+wBg2] 7.hxg6 [+bSe5] fxg2 [+wBb7] 8.fxe5 [+bSc6] gxh1=B [+wRh6] 9.Rxc6 [+bSb8]
bS circuit, Pion Volet b7, Jacobi+ ( $\sim 34$ h); here, the added condition is Anti take\&make.

Deadline: November 15, 2021.
Judge: P. Rãican, quarpaz1@yahoo.fr
Prize: Bottles of Murfatlar (delivered at the next WCCC)

Murfatlar 3 revisited (Quartz 51): Andrey FROLKIN \& Igor VERESHCHAGIN - 6th Prize: The solution has inversions of moves.
Andrey FROLKIN \& Igor VERESHCHAGIN - 5th Prize: The problem is Jacobi+ in about 5 hours.

