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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>double check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>checkmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!!</td>
<td>brilliant move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>good move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!?</td>
<td>interesting move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>dubious move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>bad move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>blunder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+-</td>
<td>White is winning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±</td>
<td>White is much better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±±</td>
<td>White is slightly better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>equal position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≠</td>
<td>unclear position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡</td>
<td>Black is slightly better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡‡</td>
<td>Black is much better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−‡</td>
<td>Black is winning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>championship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cht</td>
<td>team championship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wch</td>
<td>world championship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>candidates event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IZ</td>
<td>interzonal event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>zonal event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wcht</td>
<td>world team championship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ech</td>
<td>European championship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echt</td>
<td>European team championship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>European Clubs Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL</td>
<td>olympiad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jr</td>
<td>junior event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wom</td>
<td>women's event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mem</td>
<td>memorial event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rpd</td>
<td>rapidplay game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sim</td>
<td>game from simultaneous display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corr.</td>
<td>correspondence game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-0</td>
<td>the game ends in a win for White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½-½</td>
<td>the game ends in a draw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>the game ends in a win for Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>nth match game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>see next diagram</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The Aim of this Book

Our main objective is to give Black a complete repertoire with the opening move 1...d6. The other aim is to provide a more detailed theoretical survey of the opening lines 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5, 1 d4 d6 2 Qf3 g4 and all the other 2nd moves for White (except 2 e4). These lines have been generally neglected by the opening theory industry until now and the theory in ECO is not of the highest possible level, with some important lines missing entirely. We are therefore about to jump into rather unexplored territory. Our main objective (providing Black with a complete repertoire) demands that we also provide playable lines against the moves 1 e4 and 2 e4, and also against White’s other first moves. This is why Chapters 20-29 are necessary but they are treated in a more selective manner than the earlier core parts of the book.

History

There doesn’t seem to be much early history in the lines 1...d6 against 1 d4, as some of the main systems only started to appear in the period 1950-1970, and some have only acquired any real popularity in the last two decades. In The Oxford Companion to Chess the opening 1 d4 d6 (D) is attributed to Pillsbury for some reason but who really has heard of the Pillsbury Opening? Most players seem to think 1...d6 is not a specific opening at all but rather a move to transpose to some well-known openings such as the Pirc, Modern, King’s Indian or Dutch, and over the years many players have used it for precisely this purpose.

The line 2 Qf3 g4 was popularized by Julian Hodgson during the 1980s (although, e.g., Miles used to play it earlier). This is why we call it the Hodgson line. The line 2 c4 e5 often leads to territory generally classified as part of the English Opening (ECO code A21). However, it has little in common with other English Opening lines. This line also became more
popular towards the end of the 1980s. In this case, there is no single player with whom we can closely identify this variation, but it is popular with

Ian-Minasian, Protvino 1993.
Summary of Lines Available
Against 1 e4 and 1 d4 d6 2 e4

1) Our main recommendation is the Pirc Defence, meaning the well-known variations arising after the moves 1 e4 d6 2 d4 \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 3 \( \mathcal{Q}c3 \) g6. The Pirc is a completely valid opening, as proved by many games at grandmaster level – this is a major benefit, as you can be sure that your time spent learning it will not be wasted. For an amateur player wishing to learn and play the 1...d6 repertoire, the main problem with the Pirc is that it demands a significant amount of theoretical knowledge. We do not discuss the Modern move-order 2...g6 because we don’t want to allow White to head for King’s Indian-type positions with 3 e4.

2) There is also the Endgame System, where Black plays either 1 e4 d6 2 d4 e5 or 1 e4 d6 2 d4 \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 3 \( \mathcal{Q}c3 \) (or 3 f3) 3...e5. We must emphasize that to some players the quick liquidation to an endgame with a slightly weakened pawn-structure might seem a nightmare. However, if you want to have something against 1 c4 with a minimal need for learning theory, or if you want to test your opponent in a long endgame, then this may be a good choice. However, you have to be prepared to play the line of the Philidor Defence which arises after 4 \( \mathcal{Q}f3 \).

3) Also worth noting is the Czech Variation, which is characterized by the moves 1 e4 d6 2 d4 \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 3 \( \mathcal{Q}c3 \) c6. This system is much easier to learn, but Black has some theoretical problems at the moment in the sharpest lines. However, the chance of White having a detailed knowledge of the theory of this rare line is not very high, which might make it a worthy surprise weapon. However, we decided against providing detailed coverage of a line that we cannot really recommend.

With 1 d4 the choice of system is harder, as White controls the course of the game with his second move. But we have included a minor choice, anyway.

Against 1 d4 d6 2 \( \mathcal{Q}f3 \)
INTRODUCTION

1) The main line with 2...\( \text{g4} \) is reminiscent of some Old Indian or Modern lines if White plays 3 \( \text{c4} \), though many independent positions are available to both players, especially those where Black exchanges on \( \text{f3} \), creating an unbalanced position. After 3 \( \text{e4} \) we have a completely independent position, which is regarded as a peaceful one, though slightly passive for Black.

2) The line of the Old Indian which arises after 2...\( \text{f6} \) 3 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{f5} \) offers Black some active counterplay close to the ideas of the King’s Indian in the main lines. However, there are many quite dangerous options for White, which Black should know, so if the reader wants to play this variation, then additional preparation is necessary.

3) The Portuguese Gambit 2...\( \text{g4} \) 3 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e5} \) is worth a closer look if Black is looking for a surprise weapon.

Against 1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 2 \( \text{c4} \)

![Chess Board Diagram]

1) The main line with 2...\( \text{e5} \) is a fully acceptable choice, with no theoretical problems. However, the amount of material is quite large there, so there is a clear need for preparations. Theoretically, the most critical line is 3 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e4} \) 4 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f5} \).

2) The line of the Old Indian which runs 2...\( \text{e5} \) 3 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e4} \) 4 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 5 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f5} \) is possible here. It has occasionally been chosen by strong players, but some problems have cropped up recently. However, the whole line is quite positional, offering good chances for active counterplay in the main lines.

3) The line of the Old Indian which runs 2...\( \text{f6} \) 3 \( \text{c3} \) (or 3 \( \text{f3} \)) 3...\( \text{f5} \) is also an option here.

4) The Portuguese Gambit, 2...\( \text{e5} \) 3 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g4} \), is another possibility at this point.

Practical Results

The line 1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 2 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e5} \) has been a real gold-mine for Black. Especially the extremely bad statistics of the exchange of queens after 3 \( \text{dxe5} \) is one of the most astonishing phenomena in chess. Perhaps this can be partly explained by the persistent delusion of many weaker players that it is a good idea to exchange the queens at the first opportunity when facing a higher-rated opponent. But even the other lines 3 \( \text{f3} \) and 3 \( \text{c3} \) are scoring relatively poorly for White. This is why most 1...\( \text{d6} \) players are happy to see 2 \( \text{c4} \) on the board and the need to use the transpositional possibilities to other openings explained earlier is significantly smaller than after 2 \( \text{f3} \).
The Hodgson variation, 2 \( \text{Qf}3 \text{Ag}4 \), is scoring perfectly well for Black, whose practical results are no worse than with other second moves like 2...g6 or 2...\( \text{Qf}6 \). However, for a serious tournament player it is not a bad idea to use some of the transpositional possibilities every now and then because predictability is usually a weakness in chess.

White has gained the best practical results with 2 e4, and they are slightly above the average. This may be a psychological problem for some players. For players who like to play the Pirc, Modern or the endgame system regularly against 1 e4 this should not be a problem but the other players should consider whether the opponent feels comfortable in these openings. Many 1 d4 players don’t.

**For Whom is this Repertoire?**

These lines have always attracted original fighting players such as Hodgson, Miles, Speelman, Adams, Gulko, Hickl, Agrest, etc., and there is a lot of flexibility to transpose to different kinds of systems. Most of the lines are more positional than tactical in nature but they leave a lot of space for creativity and aggressive play by Black. Players who like sharp theoretical and concrete tactical battles where home preparation plays a key role should prefer systems like the Dragon, Najdorf or Grünfeld. For players who don’t like endings, our repertoire is hardly optimal although the many endings discussed usually take rather a queenless middlegame nature. The only ending Black is obliged to accept in this repertoire arises after 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 dxe5 dxe5 4 \( \text{Wxd}8+ \text{Qxd}8 \) (D).

```
          w
```

This ending is very easy and systematic for Black and by no means a dead draw – indeed, Black can often create winning chances surprisingly quickly.
1 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5: Introduction

In this part of the book (Chapters 1-10) we study what to play as Black after 1 d4 d6 2 c4. Black’s most direct approach is to play 2...e5 to attack the strong centre that White has formed in his first two moves. This direct plan is related to the endgame system 1 e4 d6 2 d4 e5, but there is one major distinction. Here the endgame after 3 dxe5 is not dangerous for Black, so White must seek other plans. These other plans, focusing on the battle for the centre, are 3 d5, closing the centre, and 3 e3 and 3 Qf3 to support the centre, either with a pawn or with a knight. White’s last main option, 3 Qe3, gives Black the chance to open the centre, and White usually loses some time because he has to take back on d4 with his queen.

Specialists
There are some specialists who have played the variations presented in this part of the book very often. These specialists include the British grandmasters Jonathan Speelman, Michael Adams, Colin McNab and Julian Hodgson, together with other strong players such as Jörg Hickl, Zurab Azmaiparashvili, Evgeny Agrest and Viktor Komliakov. The most notable detail is that some of these players have scored really well with this opening, as a clear plus result as Black is always a good achievement. It seems that some of these players use 1...d6 in a flexible manner. Either they try to play for a win against weaker players, or they wish to transpose to some known openings, but without allowing some variations they want to avoid.

Statistics
The general trend is that Black scores very well: in my database Black has made an incredible 56% result after 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5. The table on the following page is how White has scored with his various possibilities on the third move. It shows the number of games together with White’s percentage score, overall rating and performance.
Introduction to 3 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \)

In Chapters 2-6 we study the positions after 1 \( d4 \) \( d6 \) 2 \( c4 \) \( e5 \) 3 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( e4 \), with Black continuing \( ...f5 \) to form a pawn-chain in the centre. In the *Encyclopaedia of Chess Openings* the main lines of this variation can be found under the code A21, since they can also be reached via the move-order 1 \( c4 \) \( e5 \) 2 \( \mathcal{D}c3 \) \( d6 \) 3 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( f5 \) 4 \( d4 \) \( e4 \). The main feature of this variation is the rapid advance of Black's pawns in the centre, and the white counter-attack against them before Black gets a chance to support them too well.

Plans for White

White has a few general positional plans to counter the black centre. He can try a pawn-break, either with the usual \( f3 \), or with the rare \( g4 \). He can try to get an outpost for his knight, either on the usual square \( f4 \), or on \( g5 \). Or he can try to stop Black's central expansion \( ...d5 \) by playing \( d5 \) to restrict Black's pieces and stop Black supporting the centre with \( ...d5 \).

In the diagram on the following page, we see White adopting the plan of occupying central outposts with his knights. This is a basic position in the variation with \( e3 \) and \( \mathcal{D}e2 \). The \( f4 \)-knight controls the centre well, and Black has no plans to undermine the knight with a pawn.

Plans for Black

Black's set of tools contains plans to support the central \( e4 \)-pawn, and plans...
White has played d5, but Black’s bishop is well positioned on the long diagonal, and Black’s knights are ready to become active with usual plans such as ...\textit{e}e5 or ...\textit{a}e5 and ...\textit{f}6. The d5-pawn can become a target, while White’s bishops are ineffective for now.

If Black has a chance to play ...d5 without the pawn becoming a target for immediate attack by White, it is generally useful for him to fix the centre. The pawns on d5 and e4 give Black space to manoeuvre his pieces, and White’s pawn-breaks are not so effective any more. White should probably advance on the queenside and open lines there, but Black can expect good counterplay by an advance on the kingside.
In this chapter we study variations where White plays the logical g3, \( \textbf{\text{g2}} \) and 0-0 before starting any action in the centre. After these moves, White has two general plans: the central break (by playing f3) or the central build-up (with the d5 advance).

Black has various possible counters to these plans. In Line B1, we see the standard plan for Black, namely ...\text{e6}, ...\text{\text{d}}6-c7 and ...d5, with play usually gravitating to the queenside. The new plans with Komlajik's ...\text{\text{\text{d}}7} (Line A) and the flexible ...\text{\text{h}}8 (Line B2) are interesting although less-played options for Black.

\[1 \text{d4 e5 \text{f3 e4 }4 \text{g5 f5 5 d3 e7 6 h3 c6 7 g3 f6 (D)}}\]

Or:

a) The immediate 8 \text{\text{f4} f4} seems to be premature:

\text{a1) The sharp 8...g5!? is possible; for example, 9 \text{g2 h6 10 h4 g8 11 d2 b6 12 e3 e6 13 b4 d7 14 a4 d8 15 a5 \text{f8} 16 e2 g7 17 a4 a6 18 b1 d8 19 c1 d5 20 c5 f7 21 d1 e6 22 c2 and the position is unclear, Delemarre-Christian, Antwerp 1995.}

\text{a2) Black can continue normally with 8...0-0 9 h4 a6 10 e3 c7 11 d2 h8 (11...c6!? looks good) 12 c2 d7 13 b4 d5 14 c5 b5 15 cxb6 axb6 16 b1 c6 17 c2 d5 18 dxf4 h5 = Pachman-Matanović, Portoroz 1Z 1958.}

b) 8 \text{g5} is a rare way to develop the dark-squared bishop, but it is possible:

\text{b1) 8...a6 9 e3 0-0 10 f4 c7 11 h4 e6 12 e2 d4 13 dxf4 e6 14 f1 h6 15 h5 h4 16 d7 17 g2 \pm Schlosser-Heinatz, Dresden 1995, though Black's position is quite solid.}

\text{b2) 8...g4?! 9 a7 c7 e7 10 e3 g5 (10...0-0!? is possible) 11 d2 a6 12 b4 d7 (12...h6!? seems to be a useful move) 13 c5 dxc5 14 d6 a6 15 a4 e6 16 c5 d5 17 b1 b8 18 c1 0-0 19 g1 \pm Lputian-Minasian, Protvino 1993.}
We now return to 8 GNUC2 (D):

Now:
A: 8...Gbd7!?  15
B: 8...0-0  17

Placing the bishop differently with 8...De6!? is perhaps playable; for example, 9 d5 De7 10 0-0 Gbd7, and now:

a) 11 f3 exf3 12 exf3 De5 13 f4 Gxe4 14 dxec6 2b6+ 15 Wh1 bxc6 16 b3 De5 17 He1 Ad8 18 De3 Wc7 19 De2 is equal, Haba-Votava, Czech Ch 1997/8.

b) 11 De5 Gg8 12 f3 h6 13 Gxe6 Axe6 14 dxec6 2c5 15 fxe4 fxe4 16 h3 2b6 17 Gg2 Wb4 2d Czerwon-ski-Mikhaletz, Swindica 1999.

c) 11 b3 De4 12 Wd2 0-0 13 f3 exf3 14 exf3 Dege5 15 Ab2 c5 16 Aael Af6 17 Gf4 2d Fuhrmann-U. Helbig, Bundesliga 1997/8.

A)

8...Gbd7!?

This move is the latest idea invented by one of the specialists of this variation, Komliakov. Black’s knight goes either to e6 (via f8) or to b6.

9 0-0

Or:

a) 9 Df4 is not good, as Black can start advancing on the kingside with 9...Df8 10 d5 g5 11 Df3 h6 12 dxec6 bxc6 13 f3 d5 14 De3 De6 15 cxd5 cxd5 2E Lomineishvili-Komliakov, Moscow 1997.

b) 9 f3, aiming to play in the centre, is not especially dangerous; for example, 9...Gb6!? (9...exf3 10 exf3 0-0 is also a thematic position: 11 Df4 Ae8 12 0-0 Df8 13 De1 Gg6 14 De6 Axe6 15 Axe6 Wd7 16 d5 Ad8! = Sorin-Slipak, Salta Clarin 1995) 10 b3 d5 11 c5 Gbd7 12 b4 Df8 13 0-0 h6 (13...De6!? leads to equality) 14 Df2 De6 with a basic position-type with a closed centre, in which both sides have their trumps. However, White tried an interesting idea to sharpen the game on the kingside in Delemarre-Bologan, Wijk aan Zee 1996: 15 g4!? exf3 16 exf3 0-0 with a chaotic pawn-formation.

c) 9 d5 and now:

c1) 9...De5 (the basic central plan is possible here) 10 b3 0-0 11 0-0 Ac7 12 Ab2 Dfg4 13 Wd2 a5 14 Wh1 a4 15 f3 Dh6 16 Ab1 axb3 1/2-1/2 Caff-ferty-McNab, British League (4NCL) 1999/00.

c2) 9...Gb6! and then:

c21) After 10 b3? exd5 11 exd5 Gbd5 12 Gxd5 Wc5+ 13 Ab2 Gxd5 Black wins a pawn, for which White doesn’t get enough compensation: 14 Df4 Wf7 15 Ae3 Ad7 16 Ae1 Ae8 17 Ad4 (Lazarev-Gofshtein, Oberwart...
1993) 17...a6!? 18 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 19 \textit{d5} \textit{e5} \\
\textit{c22) 10 \textit{dxc6} bxc6 11 b3 d5 = Gofshtein.} \\
\textit{c23) 10 \textit{b3}} \textit{d7?!} (10...a5 11 \textit{e3} c5 12 \textit{wc2} a4 13 \textit{bl} \textit{bd7} 14 \textit{a3} \textit{e5} 15 f3 \textit{d7} 16 \textit{d1} 0-0 17 0-0 \textit{w8} is OK for Black, Mastrovasilis-Salmensuu, Rimavska Sobota 1996; 10...\textit{cxd5} 11 \textit{cxd5} 0-0 12 0-0 \textit{w7} 13 \textit{d1} \textit{we4} 14 \textit{e3} \textit{d7} = Dao-Anka, Budapest 1994) 11 0-0 \textit{e5} (11...c5!?) 12 \textit{dxc6} bxc6 13 c5 dxc5 14 \textit{f4} (14 \textit{d1!? might be the most critical try for counterplay) 14...c4 15 \textit{we2} \textit{f6} 16 \textit{d1} \textit{we7} 17 f3 \textit{exf3} 18 \textit{xf3} \textit{bd3} \textit{f} Michaelken-Agrast, Furth 1999. \\
We now return to 9 0-0 (D): \\

\textbf{9...\textit{b6}} \\
After 9...0-0!? 10 \textit{f3} \textit{b6} 11 b3 d5 12 c5 \textit{bd7} 13 \textit{d4}, which seems to be a playable alternative, there has been a game with a curious knight manoeuvre: 13...\textit{b8} 14 h4 \textit{a6} 15 \textit{b4} (15 \textit{bl!?) 15...\textit{xb4} 16 \textit{b3} \textit{a6} 17 \textit{f6} \textit{f4} \textit{f4} 18 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 19 \textit{xe4} \textit{f6} 20 \textit{b2} \textit{xc5} 21 \textit{dxc5} \textit{xb2} 22 \textit{wxb2} dxe4 \textit{f} Gloria-Komliakov, Manila OL 1992. \\
\textbf{10 \textit{b3} \textit{d5}} \\
10...0-0 11 d5 = and 10...\textit{e6} 11 d5 \textit{cxd5} 12 \textit{d4} \textit{f} allow White to fix the centre to his advantage. \\
\textbf{11 \textit{c5}} \\
Or: \\
\textbf{a) The tactical idea 11 a4 doesn't work because of 11...\textit{cxd4} 12 a5 \textit{bd5} 13 \textit{cxd5} \textit{xd5} 14 a6 0-0 15 \textit{f4} \textit{f7} 16 \textit{bxc4} \textit{xc4} 17 \textit{a4} \textit{f7} 18 axb7 \textit{xb7} 19 \textit{a5} \textit{xd5} \textit{f} Arsovic-Simic, Belgrade 1994.} \\
\textbf{b) 11 \textit{cxd5} \textit{fxd5} (11...\textit{bxd5} 12 \textit{a4}! 0-0 13 \textit{b2} h6 14 \textit{c1} g5 15 f3 e3 16 \textit{c5} f4 \textit{f} D'Israel-Oratovsky, Netanya 1993) 12 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} and now:} \\
\textbf{b1) 13 a4! g5! (13...\textit{c3}!?) 14 f3 e3 15 \textit{w3} \textit{f4} 16 \textit{we4} 0-0 \textit{f} Permiakov-Komliakov, Kemerovo 1995.} \\
\textbf{b2) 13 \textit{d4} and here:} \\
\textbf{b21) 13...g5?! 14 \textit{xd5} \textit{cxd5} 15 f3 0-0 16 \textit{f4} \textit{f4} 17 \textit{xf8+} \textit{xf8} 18 \textit{e3} \textit{e6} 19 \textit{ec1} \textit{c8} 20 \textit{wd2} \textit{xc1} + 21 \textit{xc1} \textit{d8} = Radovic-Komliakov, Romania 1993.} \\
\textbf{b22) 13...\textit{f6}?! 14 \textit{d5} 0-0 15 \textit{xf6}+ \textit{xf6} 16 e3 \textit{e6} is also possible, Grechikhin-Komliakov, Cherepovets 1997.} \\
\textbf{b23) 13...0-0} seems pretty safe for Black: 14 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} 15 \textit{f4} \textit{f6} 16 \textit{e3} g5 17 \textit{c7} \textit{e6} with a slight advantage for Black, Raebor-Oratovsky, Switzerland 1994. \\
\textbf{11...\textit{bd7}} \\
Now the knight has the strong post e6 available. \\
\textbf{12 \textit{b4} (D)
12...\textcolor{red}{Qf8}

This position is quite easy for Black to play: \textcolor{red}{Qf8-e6} improves the knight's position, and White's advance on the queenside is easy to counter.

a) 12...h6?! 13 f3 g5 results in a slightly more complicated version of the same position-type: 14 fxе4 fxе4 15 \textcolor{red}{Bb3 Qf8} 16 b5 \textcolor{red}{Qe6} 17 c3 h5 18 \textcolor{red}{Qf2} h4 19 bxc6 bxc6 20 \textcolor{red}{Qxe4} with enough compensation since the black king is still in the centre, Volke-Greenfeld, Munich 1992.

b) 12...a6?! 13 \textcolor{red}{Qf4} \textcolor{red}{Qf8} 14 \textcolor{red}{Da4} ± and White can use the thematic weak point on b6.

13 b5 \textcolor{red}{Qe6}

13...h6?! is a risky attempt to complicate: 14 bxc6 bxc6 15 \textcolor{red}{Wa4} \textcolor{red}{d7} 16 \textcolor{red}{Bl} g5 17 f3 \textcolor{red}{Gg6} (17...\textcolor{red}{exf3} 18 \textcolor{red}{exf3} \textcolor{red}{Gg6} 19 f4 g4 20 \textcolor{red}{Qf2} 0-0 21 \textcolor{red}{Dd3} ±) 18 \textcolor{red}{fxe4} \textcolor{red}{fxe4} 19 \textcolor{red}{Qd1} 0-0 20 \textcolor{red}{Qe3} \textcolor{red}{hx8} 21 \textcolor{red}{Qf2} \textcolor{red}{Qc7} (Savchenko-Komliakov, Russian Army Ch 1995) 22 \textcolor{red}{Qxe4}! \textcolor{red}{Qxf1}+ 23 \textcolor{red}{Qxf1} ±.

14 bxc6 bxc6 15 \textcolor{red}{wa4} \textcolor{red}{d7} 16 \textcolor{red}{Qf4} 0-0

16...\textcolor{red}{Qc7} 17 f3 g5 18 \textcolor{red}{Oh3} h6 19 \textcolor{red}{Qf2} 0-0 ½-½ Roobol-Hartoch, Dutch Chl 1995.

17 \textcolor{red}{Qb1} \textcolor{red}{Qc7}!

The final opening plan: Black aims to finish his development with ...\textcolor{red}{a6} and ...\textcolor{red}{b8}, at the same time keeping an eye on White's queenside activity.

18 h4 \textcolor{red}{a6} 19 \textcolor{red}{Qh3} g6 20 \textcolor{red}{Qe3} \textcolor{red}{Qb8} 21 \textcolor{red}{Qxb8}+ \textcolor{red}{Qxb8} 22 \textcolor{red}{Qb1} \textcolor{red}{Qb1}+ 23 \textcolor{red}{Qxb1} \textcolor{red}{Qc8} 24 \textcolor{red}{Qbd}

½-½ Zakharevich-Komliakov, Moscow 1996.

**Conclusion:** The Komliakov plan appears to be completely sound for Black.

**B)**

8...0-0 9 0-0

Now:

B1: 9...\textcolor{red}{Qa6} 17

B2: 9...\textcolor{red}{Qh8}!?! 20

B1)

9...\textcolor{red}{Qa6} (D)

This is the older starting position of the g3 variation. Black's easiest development is ...0-0 together with ...\textcolor{red}{Qa6}, aiming to support the centre through ...\textcolor{red}{Qc7}. White's sharpest try is probably to play f3 at once, as the older main line seems to pose no difficulties for Black.

10 f3

After 10 f3?! Black must make a major decision:
a) 10...d5!? (this move is rare but playably) 11 cxd5 exd5 12 \( \text{Wb}3 \text{h}8 \)
\( \text{12...Wb}6 \text{13 Wxb}6 \text{axb}6 \text{14 g}5 \text{e}6 \text{15 f}4 \text{f}7 \text{16 a}3 \text{± Illescas-Lautier, Linares 1994}) \text{13 f}4 \text{g}5 \text{!?} \text{13...b}4 \text{14 e}5 \text{c}6 \text{15 x}f6 \text{xf}6 \text{16 e}3 \text{g}5 \text{17 f}4 \text{f}4 \text{17 fxe}4 \text{g}4 \text{18 f}2 \text{e}7 \text{Vigus-Summerscale, London 1999. Black has maintained d5 by tactical means, and now he has a clear space advantage.}

b) 10...c7!? (Black uses the hanging white knight on h3 to centralize his knight before starting any action in the centre) 11 fxe4 (11 \text{Wb}3 \text{exe}3 12 \text{exe}3 \text{b}8 13 a4 \text{h}8 14 d5 cxd5 15 exd5 b5 16 axb5 \text{cxb}5 17 f4 \text{e}8 18 ce2 a6 19 \text{d}3 _{ce}c7 = \text{Franic-Biti, Zagreb 1999}) 11...fxe4 (11...\text{exe}4 12 \text{exe}4 fxe4 13 \text{xf}8+ \pm 12 d5 b5! (this sharp move is Black's main idea; 12...cxd5 13 cxd5 \pm) 13 dxc6 (13 xeb5 _{ce}c5!? becomes quite messy) 13...bxc4 and now:

b1) 14 g5!? \text{xh}3 (14...d5 is not so good in view of 15 f4) 15 xh3 d5 16 e3 \text{w}d6 17 \text{wa}4 \text{wc}5 18 f4 \text{d}6 19 \text{xd}6 \text{xd}6 20 \text{d}7 \text{c}5 21

\( \text{f}6 \text{f}8 \text{a}6 \text{b}6 \text{c}6 \text{c}5 \text{d}4 \text{e}6 \text{f}4 \text{g}4 \text{h}4 \text{b}4 \text{d}3 \text{c}3 \text{b}5 \text{f}4 \text{f}4 \pm \text{is definitely not to Black's liking, Hoang Thanh Trang-Werner, Budapest 1993.}

\( \text{f}6 \text{f}8 \text{a}6 \text{b}6 \text{c}6 \text{c}5 \text{d}4 \text{e}6 \text{f}4 \text{g}4 \text{h}4 \text{b}4 \text{d}3 \text{c}3 \text{b}5 \text{f}4 \text{f}4 \pm \text{is definitely not to Black's liking, Hoang Thanh Trang-Werner, Budapest 1993.}

\( \text{f}6 \text{f}8 \text{a}6 \text{b}6 \text{c}6 \text{c}5 \text{d}4 \text{e}6 \text{f}4 \text{g}4 \text{h}4 \text{b}4 \text{d}3 \text{c}3 \text{b}5 \text{f}4 \text{f}4 \pm \text{is definitely not to Black's liking, Hoang Thanh Trang-Werner, Budapest 1993.}
c22) 14...\(\text{d}e8!\)?, with the point 15 
\(\text{d}3 \text{e}6\), looks pretty good.

c3) 12 d5. White is going to fix the centre and exploit his space advantage, so Black must react quickly:

c31) 12...b5!? 13 dxc6 bxc4 14 
\(\text{c}3 \text{d}5\) 15 \(\text{w}a4 \text{h}8\) 16 \(\text{ad}1 \text{e}6\) 17 
\(\text{h}1 \text{w}b8\) 18 \(\text{f}4 \text{g}8\) 19 \(\text{df}1 \text{c}5\) 20 
\(\text{e}5 \text{b}6\) leads to sharp play, but Black seems to be fine, Matamoros-Perez, Cienfuegos 1996.

c32) 12...cxd5 13 cxd5 (13 \(\text{xd}5 \text{fxd}5\) 14 cxd5 \(\text{f}6\) 15 \(\text{w}b3 \text{e}8\) 16 
\(\text{d}2 \text{a}6\) 17 \(\text{ael} \text{c}5\) 18 \(\text{xe}8+\) 
\(\text{x}e8\) 19 \(\text{w}c2 \text{a}4=\) Urban-Chekhover, Lubniewice 1995) 13...b5! and now 
Black's activity on the queenside gives him good chances:

c321) 14 b4?! \(\text{d}7\) (14...a5 15 \(\text{b}1\) 
axb4 16 \(\text{xb}4 \text{d}7\) is good for Black, 
Gulko-Short, Burgas 1995) 15 \(\text{e}3\) 
\(\text{f}6\) 16 \(\text{d}4 \text{e}8\) 17 \(\text{f}4\) a5 18 \(\text{b}1\) axb4 
19 \(\text{xb}4 \text{a}3=\) Rogozenko-Hickl, 
Bundesliga 1996/7.

c322) 14 a3 a5 15 \(\text{xf}4 \text{b}7\) 16 
\(\text{e}6\) (16 \(\text{ael} \text{e}8\) 17 \(\text{w}b3\) b4 18 \(\text{a}4\) 
g5 19 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{xd}5\) 20 \(\text{d}3=\) Wiedenkeller-Mokry, 
Hilversum 1993; 16 \(\text{w}b3\) 
b4 17 axb4 axb4 18 \(\text{xa}8\) \(\text{x}a8\) 19 
\(\text{xb}4 \text{fxd}5\) 20 \(\text{b}3 \text{h}8\) 21 \(\text{fxd}5\) 
\(\text{xd}5\) 22 \(\text{f}4 \text{b}4=\) Lomineishvili-Kuporosov, 
Smolensk 1997) 16...\(\text{exe}6\) 17 \(\text{dx}6\) 
\(\text{h}6+\) 18 \(\text{h}1\) b4 and now the 
position is unclear according to Short, 
but Black seems to be doing fine in 
view of his activity. Generally this 
position is quite dynamic, and Black's 
active position gives him good prospects.

We now return to 10 d5 (D):

10...\(\text{c}7\)
b) The flexible 10...\(\text{h}8\) is possible, but White gets some pressure after 11 \(\text{h}1\) (11 f3 \(\text{cxd5} \text{d5} \text{b6} + 13 \text{h}1 \text{d}7 14 \text{f}4 \text{exf3} 15 \text{exf3} \text{ae}8 16 \text{e}1 \text{d}8 17 \text{e}6 \text{xe}6 18 \text{dxe}6 \text{d}7 19 \text{f}4 \text{xe}6 20 \text{xe}6 \text{xe}6 21 \text{d}x\text{e}6 \text{e}8 22 \text{a}4 \text{f}2 + \text{f}2 \text{Overeem-}
\text{Piket, Antwerp 1996} 11...\text{d}7 12 \text{f3}
\text{cxd5} 13 \text{cxd5} \text{w}6 14 \text{f}4 \text{ae}8 15 \text{b}3
\text{d}8 16 \text{b}2 \text{c}5 17 \text{b}1 + \text{Pinter-}
\text{Speelman, Debrecen Echt 1992.}

11 f3 (D)

11 \text{f}4 is not played much at the moment, even though ECO gives it as ±; e.g., 11...\text{g}5?! 12 \text{h}3 \text{h}6 13 \text{f3} \text{exf3}
14 \text{exf3} \text{cxd5} 15 \text{b}5 \text{a}3 \text{b}7 17
\text{f}4 \text{g}4 18 \text{f}2 \text{a}5 19 \text{w}3 + \text{Razuvaev-}
\text{Gorbatov, Moscow 1991. Maybe one of the}
following logical alternatives on his 11th move is the reason for the lack
of popularity: 11...\text{g}4?! 11...\text{d}7?! and 11...\text{cxd5}?! (with the point 12 \text{cxd5}
b5).

\includegraphics{B}

11...\text{exf3}

Or:

a) 11...\text{cxd5}?! 12 \text{cxd5} b5 is similar to note ‘c32’ to White’s 10th move.

11...\text{b5}?! is a sharper option for
Black, when the activity on the queenside seems to give him good chances:

b1) 12 \text{dxc6} \text{bxc6} 13 \text{f}4 \text{d}4 (13...\text{f}4 \text{transposes to note ‘b’ to}
White’s 10th move) 14 \text{f}4 is messy.

b2) 12 \text{cxb5} \text{cxb5} (12...\text{cxd5}?!)
13 \text{cxd5} \text{cxd5} 14 \text{e}3 \text{e}6 15 \text{d}2
\text{d}7 16 \text{a}4 \text{e}8 17 \text{d}4 \text{d}8 18 \text{c}1
\text{e}4 19 \text{e}3 + \text{Van Doeland-Riemens,}
\text{Dutch Cht 1994} 13 \text{cxb5} (13 \text{dxe}6
\text{w}6 + 14 \text{h}1 \text{xc}3 15 \text{bxc}3 \text{w}6 is
OK for Black) 13...\text{exb5} 14 \text{e}3 \text{w}5
(14...\text{d}7 15 \text{f}4! ±) 15 \text{f}4 \text{d}8! =
\text{Ct.Hansen-Vaganian, Ter Apel 1993.}

12 \text{xf3}

12 \text{xf3} transposes to note ‘c3’ to
White’s 10th move.

12...\text{cxd5} 13 \text{cxd5} \text{g}4

13...\text{d}7?! 14 \text{e}3 \text{e}5 15 \text{d}4
\text{f}6 16 \text{f}4 \text{w}e8 17 \text{c}1 \text{g}5 18 \text{e}6
\text{f}3 19 \text{exf3} \text{c6} 20 \text{dxe6} \text{cxe6}
12 \text{A}6 \text{B}4 \text{Neurohr-Lau, Bundesliga 1989/90.}

Black has many good squares available for his minor pieces, and the
slightly weakened white pawn-structure gives him good targets.

14 \text{f}4 \text{e}5 15 \text{g}2 \text{d}7 16 \text{a}4
\text{f}6

Black has equalized, Avshalumov-
Dorfman, Cannes 1990.

Conclusion: Theoretically, there
seem to be no special problems for
Black in the main line with ...\text{a}6.
However, some players might not like
the sharp positions arising in the lines
where Black plays the active ...b5.

B2)

9...\text{h}8?! (D)
This flexible move, played mostly by IM Georg Seul, is an interesting idea. It has also been tested by Vladimir Kramnik. Black invests time to move his king to a safer square, which allows him a wide choice of ways to start countering White's plans.

10 d5

The thematic central break has also been played here: 10 f3 d5 (10...a6!? 11 g5 e6 12 fxe4 dxe4 13 dx e4 fxe4 14 fxe8+ fxe8 15 w.d2 x.g5 16 f.g5 e4 17 dxe4 w.e7 18 c3 c7 19 e4 f8 20 eel h6 21 d5 w.c5 22 dxc6 bxc6 with an equal position, Nenasev-Seul, Agios Nikolaos 1995) 11 cxd5 cxd5 12 g5 c6 13 f4 g8 14 x e7 dxe7 15 w.b3 f6 16 fxe4 fxe4 is equal, as 17 a.c1 g5 18 fxd5 e6 19 fxf6 fxf6 20 x.e4 e8 21 f1 f1+ 22 f1 x.c3 23 bxc3 x.d5 24 w.c2 f8+ 25 g1 w.f7 was good for Black in S.Ivanov-Agrast, Leningrad 1990.

10...bd7

10...a6!? is another option, which transposes to note 'b' to Black's 10th move in Line B1.

11 b3

As Black has many good alternatives in the main line, White should maybe try some of the less-played options either here or on the next move.

a) 11 f4!? cxd5 (11...dxe5!? looks pretty normal) 12 cxd5 dxe5 13 w.b3 w.b6 14 a3 a5 15 a4 a7 16 f.g5 h6 17 dxe6 xxe6 18 dx e6 d.d8 19 d.fdl ± Kveinys-Seul, Bonn 1995.

b) 11 f3!? dxe5 12 w.b3 d.f7 (12...exf3!? is a safe option) 13 fxe4 d.c5 14 wc2 w.b6 15 d.h1 d.e4 16 dxe4 fxe4 17 d.f8+ d.f8 18 d.f4 cxd5 19 cxd5 d.f5 20 d.xe5 dxe5 21 d.f1 g6 22 d.g5 ± Gonzalez Garcia-Seul, Budapest 1995.

11...d.e5 12 b2 (D)

12 d.h1!? d.d7 13 f.f4 (13 b2 d.g6! 14 w.d2 cxd5 15 cxd5 w.b6 is equal, Gretarsson-Zaichik, Moscow 1994) 13...g5 14 d.h3 h6 15 f3 exf3 16 exf3 d.g6 and Black's position seems fine, though White got a small advantage after 17 dx e6 bxe6 18 b2 d.h7 19 w.d2 w.c7 20 b.ad1 b.ad8 21 b.f1 c8 22 f4 g4 23 f.f2 ± in Lazarev-Seul, Biel 1997.
12...\( \text{We8} \)!

Or:

a) 12...\( \text{Aad7} \) is a sensible developing move, though White may get some advantage with 13 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 14 \( \text{Qxd5} \) (14 \( \text{cxd5} \) b5 with activity) 14...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 15 \( \text{Wxd5} \) \( \text{Ac6} \) 16 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) ! (16...\( \text{We8} \) 17 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \pm \)) 17 \( \text{Bd1} \) \( \text{We8} \) 18 f3 \( \text{exf3} \) 19 \( \text{Axf3} \) \( \text{Axd8} \) 20 \( \text{Aad5} \) \( \pm \) Nikolić-Cu.Hansen, Wijk aan Zee 1994.

b) 12...\( \text{Eb8} \) is regarded as a totally sound alternative. Black threatens to start counterplay on the queenside, and when White opens the centre, Black is well prepared for that: 13 \( \text{dxe6} \) \( \text{bx6} \) 14 c5 \( \text{Qeg4} \) 15 \( \text{cxd6} \) \( \text{Axd6} \) 16 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{We7} \) 17 \( \text{Bd1} \) \( \text{Aa6} \) 18 \( \text{Ae1} \) \( \text{Bc8} \) 19 \( \text{Af1} \) \( \text{Ae5} \) 20 \( \text{Da4} \) \( \text{Aad5} \) 21 \( \text{Ag5} \) \( \text{Af6} \) 22 \( \text{Axf6} \) \( \text{Qgf6} \) has been evaluated as unclear, Schwartzman-Agrest, Malmö 1993. Generally Black seems to be OK.

13 \( \text{Wd2} \)

13 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qh5} \) is unclear, but 13 f3?! (with the point 13...\( \text{Wh5} \) 14 \( \text{Wd2} \)) gives White a slight advantage according to Kramnik, but this has never been tested. However, Black seems to be ready for White's actions in the centre.

13...\( \text{Aad7} \)

This move is viable, but there are two interesting alternatives:

a) Aiming some extra force towards White's king with 13...\( \text{Wh5} \) 14 f3 \( \text{cxd5} \) 15 cxd5 \( \text{exf3} \) 16 \( \text{exf3} \) \( \text{Aad7} \) 17 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Wh6} \) 18 \( \text{Bd1} \) \( \text{Aad8} \)! seems to be playable, based on 19 \( \text{Bce2} \) \( \text{Ab5} \) 20 \( \text{Af1} \) \( \text{We8} \) 21 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Ab6} \) 22 a4 \( \text{Aad7} \) 23 a5 \( \text{Ac5} \) 24 \( \text{Wh1} \) \( \text{Qh5} \) 25 \( \text{Qxh5} \) \( \text{Wh5} \) 26 b4 \( \text{Qc4} \) 27 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qxd4} \) 28 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qxb2} \) 29 \( \text{Qxb2} \) f4 \( \mp \) Bixquert Jimenez-Diaz Benitez, 1992.

b) 13...h5 (playing sharply on the queenside and trying to gain some space there) 14 \( \text{cxb5} \) \( \text{cxb5} \) 15 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Ab8} \) might be Black's best, with the basic idea...\( \text{Aad8-b6} \).

14 f3

The positional 14 \( \text{Bd1} \) is a sensible move. 14...a5 and now:

a) 15 f3 \( \text{Aad8} \) gives Black dark-square counterplay.

b) 15 \( \text{dxe6} \) bxc6 16 c5 d5 17 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) (17...\( \text{cxd5} \)?) 18 \( \text{Axe5} \) \( \text{Axe5} \) 19 \( \text{Bb2} \) \( \text{Wf7} \) 20 g4 \( \pm \).

c) 15 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 16 f3 \( \text{Qxf4} \) 17 \( \text{Qxf4} \) was played in Lauter-Kramnik, Khalkidiki 1992. Now 17...\( \text{Qh5} \) leaves the fight for the centre totally unclear.

14...\( \text{Aad8} \)

This standard bishop manœuvre to the excellent a7-g1 diagonal works especially well here.

15 \( \text{dxc6} \) \( \text{Axe6} \) 16 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Ab6}+ \) 17 \( \text{Qh1} \) \( \text{Qh5} \)


Conclusion: The flexible...\( \text{Qh8} \) gives Black good chances to use various thematic plans depending on White's actions. The play can become quite sharp, so Black also has good chances to play for a win.
3.3 f3: Main Line with e3

In this chapter we study positions in which White develops with e3 and Ke2; usually this is connected with the knight manoeuvre Qh3-f4. White tries either to break up Black's centre with f3, or to develop more calmly with d5.

Black has usually continued with the general plan ...c6, ...Qa6-c7 and ...d5 which seems to work well against all of White's various set-ups.

In the main line with e3 there have not been so many new games, so the critical positions have not changed for about ten years.

1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 f3 e4 4 Qg5 f5 5 Ke3 Ke7 6 Qh3 (D)

\[\text{Diagram 3.3.1} \]

A6

6...c6

6...Qf6 7 f4 c6 8 h4 0-0 9 e3 Qa6 transposes to Line A, and there are many other move-orders which arrive at the same position.

7 e3

Or:

a) 7 f3 Qf6 transposes to the note to Black's 7th move in Line B of Chapter 4.

b) 7 Qf4 is provocative:

b1) 7...Qf6 8 e3 0-0 9 Ke2 h6 10 Kb3 (Christensen-Smejkal, Novi Sad OL 1990) 10...Wb6 11 Qc2 (11 Wa3!? 11...g5 12 Kg3 is unclear.

b2) 7...g5 8 Qd2 h6 9 e3 Qf6 and Black's activity should give him good chances: 10 f3 exf3 (10...a6 11 fxe4 fxe4 12 Qf2 d5 13 Wb3 h5 14 cxd5 cxd5 15 Ke1 Kc7 16 Ke2 Qc6 17 Qxe4! Qxe4 18 Qxe4, Gulkov-Rivas, Dos Hermanas 1994, 18...Qxe4! 19 Qh5+ Qd7 20 Wd5+ Qd6 21 Qg4+ Qe8 22 Wc6 c7 23 d5 Qd8 24 Wc6 Qe6 25 Qe5 is unclear) 11 gxg3 d5 12 Kb3 Wb6 is unclear according to Gulkov.

7...Qf6

Now:

A: 8 Qf4 24

B: 8 Ke2 25

White can fix the centre immediately, but Black is OK: 8 f3 0-0 9 fxe4 fxe4 10 Qf4 Qa6 11 Qe2 Qc7 12 d5 g5 13 Qh5 Qf5 14 0-0 Qg6, Ree-Quinteros, Amsterdam 1977.
A)

8  

\[ \text{A6 (D)} \]

9  

\[ h4 \]

9  is a logical alternative, although Black can just develop normally: 9...0-0 10 h4  c7 11 d5  g4 12 g3  f6 (12...c5 13 e2 e5 14 d2 2 Nikolaevev-Samarin, Moscow 1992) 13 d2 e5 14 b3 f6 15 e2 w7 with equality, Janjgava-Oratovsky, Jurmala 1983.

9...0-0

9...c7 10 d5  g4 is premature because of 11 e2 (11 g3  f6 12 d2 0-0 13 e2 w8 14 bl e5 15 b4 b5! allows Black too much activity, Schwartzman-Rotshtein, Cannes 1992) 11...e5 12 g3 ±.

10 d5!?

Playing this thematic move at such an early point leads to quite peaceful positions, where both players start manoeuvring their pieces towards the most active squares in the centre. Alternatives:

a) 10 d2 c7 11 b3 (11 d5  g4 12 g3 e5 13 e2 c5 14 a3 a5 15 bl

\[ d7 \] 16 fl g6 \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) Babula-Jansa, Czech Ch 1994) 11...b8 12 d5 (12 e2 e6 13 h3 d5 14 0-0-0 b5 15 cxd5 cxd5 16 a3 b4 17 axb4 xb4 + De Kok-Wockenfuss, Amsterdam 1985) 12...c5 13 e2 a6 14 a4 b6 15 a3 d7 16 h5 + Sideif-Zade – Lukin, Pavlodar 1987. However, Black's position is quite dynamic, and as White's king doesn't find a safe square too easily Black has counterplay.

b) 10 b3 c7 11 b2 (11 d5 c5 12 h2 g4 13 g3 a6 14 e2 e5 15 fl is unclear) 11...e6 12 e2 g4 13 xex6 xex6 14 g3 f7 15 w2 d5 16 f4 d7 17 e2 f6 18 c1 \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) Fischdick-Polihroniade, Thessaloniki wom OL 1984.

c) 10 a3 c7 11 b4 gives Black a chance to follow the normal central plans with 11...e6 12 h3 d5 13 g3 h6 14 b3 g5 15 hxg5 hxg5 16 d2 g7 17 cxd5 cxd5 18 0-0-0 h8 19 e2 w6 20 b2 d7 + Povah-Summerscale, British League (4NCL) 1996/7.

d) 10 e2 transposes to Line B2.

10...g4 (D)
11 g3
11...hxg5?!?
11...e5?!!

The other main move is 11...xf6, when White enjoys a small plus after 12 d2 (12 e2?! xcx3+ 13 bxc3 e5 ±) 12...g6 (12...xb8?!) 13 e2 e5 14 a3 c7:

a) 15 wb3!? c5 16 wc2 d7 17
bbl (17 b4 cxb4 18 axb4 b5?! gives
Black counterplay) 17...we7 (Terri

b) 15 c2? has also been pro-
poped.

c) 15 b4 c5 16 bbl b6 17 f1 ±

12 e2 g6 13 f1 f6 14 g2 c5
15 bbl c7 16 d2 b6 17 a3 w7 18
b4 a6 19 b5 c8 20 a4 a5 21 wc2
d7 22 bg1 e8

1/2-1/2 Lindenmaier-Espig, German Ch (Bremen) 1998.

Conclusion: This type of closed po-

tion leads to manoeuvring and is not
especially dangerous for Black, though
there are not many chances of active
play for him either.

B)

8 e2 0-0 (D)

Now:

B1: 9 0-0 26

B2: 9 df4 27

9 c2 is an independent try, seek-
ing queenside play. 9...a6 and then:

a) 10 e1 c7 11 wb3 bh8 12
0-0 b8 13 f3 exf3 14 xfx3 e6 15
d5 f7 16 wa4 cxd5 1/2-1/2 Kaufman-
Benjamin, Parsippany 2000.

b) After 10 0-0 wh8 it is probably
best for White to return to the central
strategy by 11 f3, when 11...c7 trans-
poses to the note to White's 10th move
in Line B1, while 11...d5 12 cxd5 cxd5
13 wb3 c7 allows White the instruc-
tive additional plan 14 e1 c6 15
h4! ± Farago-Havelko, Warsaw Z
1987.

C) 10 wb2 c7 11 a3 d5 12 c5 c7
13 b4 leads to the closed position-
type, and Black gets counterplay with
13...d7 14 a4 w8 15 g3 f4! 16 xfx4
g5 17 g2 h3 18 g1 (18 0-0 xg2
19 xg2 g4 20 h1 e6 21 h3 w6
gives Black an attack) 18...d4 19
0-0-0 (19 xg4 xg4 20 h4 w5 21
h4 22 c2 c6 with an attack for
Black) 19...xf2 20 Rober-Hen-
nings, Binz 1995.

d) 10 b1 c7 11 b4 d5 12 0-0 and
again Black can choose the open posi-
tion-type with a lot of dynamic play:
12...dxc4!? 13 xc4+ xh8 (13...e6?!) 14 b5 dc6 15 bc6 bc6 16 a4 d7
17 a5 d4 18 g3 h6 19 g5 xh2
20 xh2 xh6+ 21 g2 xg5 22 xe4
xg4 23 xd6 w3+ 24 f3 g4+...
\[ \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \] Wang Yaoyao-Tong Yuanming, Beijing 1996.

**B1)**

9 0-0 (D)

![Diagram](image)

9...\( \triangleleft a6 \)

9...\( \triangleleft b8 \) is worth a closer look, with a flexible choice of plan according to White's actions: 10 f3 (10 d5 \( \triangleleft bd7 \) 11 b3 \( \triangleleft e5 \) 12 \( \triangleleft b2 \) c5 13 \( \triangleleft f4 \) 14 \( \triangleleft b5 \) \( \triangleleft d7 \) 15 b4 a6 16 \( \triangleleft c3 \) \( \triangleleft c7 \) 17 \( \uparrow b3 \) \( \triangleleft d7 \) and Black is fine, Braun-Agrest, Passau 1994) 10...d5 11 \( \uparrow b3 \) \( \triangleleft a6 \) (11...\( \uparrow d6 \) 12 \( \triangleleft d2 \) \( \triangleleft x c4 \) b5 14 \( \triangleleft e2 \) \( \triangleleft e6 \) 15 \( \triangleleft c2 \) \( \triangleleft x f3 \) 16 \( \triangleleft x f3 \) \( \triangleleft a6 \) 17 \( \triangleleft c1 \) \( \triangleleft b4 \) 18 \( \triangleleft d2 \) \( \triangleleft x d8 \) 19 \( \triangleleft g3 \) \( \triangleleft d7 \) 20 \( \uparrow f1 \) \( \triangleleft b5 \) 21 \( \triangleleft f4 \) \( \triangleleft x f4 \) 22 \( \uparrow x f4 \) \( \triangleleft x d5 \) 23 \( \triangleleft x d5 \) \( \triangleleft x d5 \) 24 \( \triangleleft x d5 \) \( \uparrow x d5 \) = Uhlmann-Lein, Bad Liebenzell 1996) 12 \( \triangleleft d2 \) \( \triangleleft c7 \) 13 \( \triangleleft x d5 \) (13 \( \triangleleft x e4 \) \( \triangleleft x e4 \) 14 \( \triangleleft f4 \) \( \triangleleft x c4 \) 15 \( \triangleleft x c4 \) \( \triangleleft d6 \) 16 \( \triangleleft e2 \) \( \triangleleft e8 \) 17 \( \triangleleft d1 \) \( \triangleleft f5 \) 18 \( \uparrow h1 \) \( \triangleleft d8 \) 19 \( \uparrow c1 \) g5 20 \( \triangleleft h3 \) \( \triangleleft g6 \) = Petursson-Hawelko, Dubai OL 1986) 13...\( \triangleleft x d5 \) and then:

a) 14 f4 h6 15 \( \triangleleft a1 \) \( \triangleleft g8 \) (15...b6?!) 16 \( \triangleleft c2 \) g5 17 g3 \( \triangleleft c e 8 \) 18 \( \uparrow f1 \) g4 19 \( \triangleleft f 2 \) h5 20 \( \triangleleft b 5 \) \( \triangleleft d 7 \) 21 \( \triangleleft b 4 \) = Herraiz-Garza Marco, Torrevieja 1997.

b) 14 \( \triangleleft a c 1 \) \( \triangleleft d 6 \) 15 a4 (15 f4 h6 16 \( \triangleleft a 4 \) b6 17 \( \triangleleft b 4 \) \( \triangleleft a 6 \) 18 \( \triangleleft x d 6 \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) Uhlmann-Watson, Bundesliga 1997/8) 15...\( \uparrow e 7 \) (Pinter-Mokry, Dubai OL 1986) 16 fxe4 fxe4 17 \( \triangleleft f 4 \) \( \triangleleft e 6 \) with an unclear position, in which Black seems to have everything well under control.

10 f3 (D)

White follows a central strategy, hoping that the e4-pawn will be weak if Black allows the exchange, or that if Black exchanges on f3, then White will have chances to build a strong centre by playing e4 himself.

10 \( \triangleleft d 2 \) \( \uparrow h 8 \) 11 f3 \( \triangleleft c 7 \) 12 fxe4 fxe4 13 \( \triangleleft f 4 \) d5 14 \( \triangleleft c 1 \) (14 \( \triangleleft x d 5 \) ?!) 14...dxc4! (an instructive case where Black gets a good position by relieving the central tension) 15 \( \triangleleft x c 4 \) b5 16 \( \triangleleft e 2 \) b4 17 \( \triangleleft a 4 \) \( \triangleleft f d 5 \) 18 \( \triangleleft x d 5 \) \( \uparrow x f 1 \) + 19 \( \triangleleft x f 1 \) \( \triangleleft x d 5 \) 20 \( \triangleleft f 2 \) \( \triangleleft g 5 \) = Zakhchik-Mokry, Moscow OL 1994. Black's outpost on d5 is very useful.

![Diagram](image)

10...\( \triangleleft c 7 \)
10...d5!? is a very logical move that covers the centre, and brings Black close to equality: 11 cxd5 cxd5 12 fxe4 fxe4 13 Qf4 Qc7 14 Ad2 Afd7 (14...Qe6!? is a possible improvement), and now:

a) 15 Ael Ac6 16 Ag3 Ad7 17 Ab3 Ad6 (17...Ah8 18 a4 a6 19 a5 Ac6 = Uhlmann-Tseshkovsky, Leipzig 1975) 18 Ah5 Axa5 19 Axh5 Axc3 20 hxg3 Ac7 with a slight advantage for Black, Polgar-Hort, Biel 1987.

b) 15 b4 Ae8 16 Ab3 Af7 17 b5 Ce8 (17...b6!?) 18 b6! a6 19 Aa4 Afd6 20 Aae1 = Uhlmann-Knoll, Linz 1997.

11 Ab3

11 d5 cxd5 12 cxd5 exf3 13 Axhxf3 leaves the white pawn-formation destroyed: 13...Ag4 14 Ad2 (14 Af4 Ag5 15 Axc4 fxe4 16 e5 b6 17 Ae3 Aa6 18 Af2 Ad7 is level, Ivanov-Zaichik, Leningrad 1989) 14...Af6 15 Ab3 Aa6 16 Af4 Ac5 17 Ac2 Ac7 18 Aae1 a5 = San Segundo-Popchev, Mondariz 1994.

11...Ah8 12 Ad2 Aa6 13 fxe4 Aexe4 14 Aexe4 fxe4 15 Axf8+ Axf8

White has not found a way to keep attacking e4, and Black equalizes.

16 Af4 Ag5 17 Af1 Ac7

The game is equal, Portisch-Torre, Manila IZ 1990.

Conclusion: Black seems to have many ways to counter the early f3 plan, though some caution is needed in order to avoid positions where White has managed to weaken the central e- and d5-pawns.

B2)

9 Qf4 Qa6 (D)

10 h4

Here White’s alternatives are not good:

a) 10 f3 g5 11 Ah3 h6 12 Axf2 d5! and Black’s strong centre gives him better chances; for example, 13 cxd5 cxd5 14 Ab3 Ag7 15 Ad2 Ab8 16 Ael Ac6 17 Aa4 Ad6 18 Ac5 Ac7 19 fxe4 fxe4 20 Ad1 b6 21 Aa6 Ad7 T Petkov-Komliakov, Yugoslav Cht 1994.

b) 10 Ab3 is a bit more unclear:

10...Ac7 11 0-0 Ah8 12 Ad2 Ab8 13 d5 c5 14 a4 Ae8 15 Ab5 Axb5 16 axb5 Ae8 17 Ac3 Afc7 18 h4 Aae8 19 g3 Axf6 20 Aa3 a6 with activity, Soppe-Benjamin, Oz.com 2000.

10...Ac7 11 d5 (D)

This brings about the critical position of this variation. Again, White’s alternatives are not as strong as the text-move:

a) 11 Ab3 Ab8 12 Ad2 Ae6 13 c5 d5 and White’s pieces, especially his queen, are not ideally posted in this
closed position: 14 əxe6 əxe6 15 əwa4 b6 16 b4 a5! 17 a3 b5 18 əwc2 a4
19 g3 əxf7 20 0-0-0 əh5 ə Kosyrev-Gelman, Moscow Ch 1996.

b) 11 b3 d5 12 g3 əxe6 13 əf1 əxf4 14 exf4 əe6 and Black is completely OK; for example, 15 əe3 əe8
16 əg2 əf7 17 c5 b5 = Skembris-Rukavina, Bor 1983.

c) 11 b4!? əe6 12 əxe6 əxe6 13
g3 əwe8 14 b5 əf7 15 bxc6 bxc6 with a more dynamic position, though Black is OK after 16 əwa4 e5 17 d5 əd7 18
əc2 əab8 = Uibilava-Zaichik, Telavi 1982.

11...cx d5

Or:

a) 11...c5 closes the centre, and leads to unbalanced play where both players try to achieve a pawn-break
against the opponent's pawn-chain: 12 a3 əd7 13 g3 əf6 (13...əe5 14 əd2 əd7 15 b4 b6 seems to be too slow,
and White gets positional pressure on the queenside: 16 əf1 a6 17 bxc5 bxc5 18 əg2 əb8 19 əc2 əa7 20 a4 a5 21
əb5 ± Magerramov-Popov, USSR 1979) 14 əd2 əe5 15 b4 and now
Black secures his fair share of the chances with an interesting idea: 15...b5!? 16 cx b5 c4 17 əb1 əe8 18
a4 əb7 19 əa2 əc8 (Dlugy-Bagirov, Palma de Mallorca 1989) 20 əc1 with a very unclear position.

b) 11...a5 has also been played, with the idea of gaining some space on the queenside: 12 a3 əa6 13 əb1 əd7
14 b4 axb4 15 axb4 c5 16 h5 əb4 and White enjoys positional pressure on the queenside; for example, 17 əb3 əe8
18 g3 (18 əa3? əxa3 -+) 18...əf6 19 əb2 əe5 20 əf1 əf6 21 əg2 ± Schwartzman-Levin, Groningen 1992,
though in the game Black got some attacking chances on the kingside.

c) 11...əd7 is the old move, which is playable. Black starts manoeuvring his knights immediately, not closing
the centre:

c1) 12 g4 əe5! is not something Black need fear.

c2) 12 b3 əe5 13 əb2 and now:
c21) 13...əxh4? 14 dxe6 əf6 (or
14...bxc6 15 əxh4 əxh4 16 əxd6
-+) 15 cx b7 əxb7 16 əc2 ±.

c22) 13...c5 14 h5 əf6 and then:
c221) 15 əc2 əe7 16 a3 əd7 17
b4 gives Black a chance to get counterplay with a normal idea in this position-type: 17...b5!? 18 cx b5 (18 əxb5
əxb5 19 cx b5 əc8 with enough compensation) 18...c4 19 a4? (19 0-0?)
19...əd3+ 20 əxd3 əxd3 21 əc1 əe5
22 g3 əe8! ə Illescas-Vladimirov,

c222) 15 əd2 əd7 16 əd1 əe7 17
əf1 əfd8 18 a4 a6 and White's idea of hindering Black's queenside play
seems quite logical: 19 a5!? ḥa8 20 ḥa1 b5 21 axb6 ḥxb6 22 ḥc2 ḥdb8 23 ḥa3 a5 24 ḥa1 ± Gausel-Bologan, Manila OL 1992.

c3) 12 g3 ḥe5 13 dxe6! (this move has not been the main option for White, though it seems to be quite logical: in an open position, White has more targets to work with) 13...hxce6 14 b3 a5 15 ḥb2 ḥa6 16 ḥa4 ḥc7 17 ḥf1 g6 18 ḥg2 ± Haag-Myers, Australia 1999.

12 cxd5 ḥd7 13 g3 ḥf6 14 ḥd2 (Ruban-Anand, Palma de Mallorca 1989) 25 ḥxe5 ḥxe5 ±.

15...ḡf6

Again, a lot of maneuvring. White has many weakened squares and this gives Black easy targets and counterplay.

16 ḥb3 ḥb8 16...ḡh8!? has also been suggested.

17 a4 ḥh8 18 ḥg2 ḥd7 19 ḥc1 ḥa6 20 ḥa3 ḥc5 21 b4 ḥa6! (D)

14...ḡe5

Direct kingside expansion is also interesting: 14...ḡe5 15 ḥf1 g6 16 ḥg2 h6 17 ḥc1 g5 18 hxg5 hxg5 19 ḥh5 ḥh2 20 ḥh8 ḥe7 with an unclear position, Murugan-Norwood, Calcutta 1992, though Black seems to have the initiative.

15 ḥf1

15 ḥc1 was played in another classic game in this variation: 15...ḡf6 16 ḥb3 ḥh8 17 a4 ḥa6 18 ḥa3 ḥd7 19 b4 ḥc8 20 a5?! ḥc7 21 ḥb3 a6! 22 ḥc4 ḥc8 23 ḥc4 ḥf6 24 ḥd3 ḥd5 25 h6 g5 26 ḥxe5 ḥxe5 27 ḥh3?! ḥg8 28 hxg5 hxg5 30 ḥe6 ḥxe6 31 ḥxe5 dxe5 32 dxe5 a6 33 ḥh5 33 ḥe1 ḥxcl 34 ḥxcl f4 35 ḥd2 ḥg4! 36 ḥd7 fxe3! 37 ḥh3 ḥf6 38 ḥd1 exf2 0-1.

Black has a lot of counterplay, Salov-Romero, Madrid 1992. The remainder of this classic battle was 22 ḥab1 ḥc7 23 ḥc4?! ḥc8 24 b5 ḥc8 25 ḥc6 ḥf7 26 ḥa2 h6 27 ḥc3 ḥe7 28 ḥb3?! g5 29 hxg5 hxg5 30 ḥe6 ḥxe6 31 ḥxe5 dxe5 32 dxe5 a6 33 ḥh5 33 ḥe1 ḥxcl 34 ḥxcl f4 35 ḥd2 ḥg4! 36 ḥd7 fxe3! 37 ḥh3 ḥf6 38 ḥd1 exf2 0-1.

Conclusion: Black seems to be fine in the main line where White plays ḥe2, ḥf4 and h4. The games by strong players have shown Black the right plans.
4 5th Move Alternatives for White

b) 5 h4 is a rare variation, by which White often plans e3, \textit{e}2 and \textit{d}h3-f4. There are plenty of transpositional possibilities. Black can choose between:

b1) 5...h6?! is not appropriate, as White gets very good compensation for the pawn: 6 \textit{d}h3 \textit{w}xh4 7 \textit{\texttt{\texttt{c}}}c3 e6 8 \textit{g}3 \textit{d}d8 (8...\textit{w}f6 9 \textit{\texttt{f}}f4 \textit{g}6 10 \textit{g}4 \textit{x}g4 11 \textit{\texttt{g}}g2 \textit{\texttt{f}}f5 12 \textit{\texttt{g}}xe4 \textit{e}7 13 \textit{\texttt{g}}g2 \textit{x}a6 14 \textit{e}4 with enough compensation in the form of good central pawns, Matveeva-Stanciu, Bled wom 1992) 9 \textit{\texttt{f}}f4 \textit{x}a6 (V.Basagic-Dekic, Manila wom OL 1992) and now the simple 10 \textit{g}6 \textit{h}h7 11 \textit{d}5 looks best, when Black's pieces are tied up.

b2) 5...\textit{e}7?! attacks the \textit{h}4-pawn, and so might narrow White's choices: 6 g3 \textit{\texttt{c}}c6 7 \textit{\texttt{h}}h3 \textit{\texttt{f}}f6 8 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}6 9 \textit{d}f4 \textit{d}h6 10 \textit{\texttt{c}}c3 0-0 11 \textit{\texttt{x}}e2 \textit{\texttt{x}}c7 12 \textit{d}d2 c5 = Llanos-Dolezal, Buenos Aires 1992.

b3) 5...\textit{x}f6 and now:

b31) 6 \textit{\texttt{x}}c3 c6 (6...\textit{\texttt{c}}c6 7 \textit{\texttt{e}}3 \textit{g}6 8 \textit{b}4 \textit{\texttt{g}}g7 9 \textit{b}5 \textit{\texttt{x}}e7 10 \textit{g}3 \textit{h}6 11 \textit{\texttt{h}}h3 \textit{\texttt{c}}c6 12 \textit{\texttt{a}}b1 \textit{\texttt{f}}7 13 \textit{\texttt{e}}2 \textit{\texttt{w}}d7 14 a4 0-0 15 \textit{\texttt{a}}a3 \textit{\texttt{e}}c8 16 c5 \textit{\texttt{x}}d8 is also possible, Cebalo-Cabrilo, Yugoslav Ch 1989) 7 g3 (7 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}6 looks quite OK, because after 8 \textit{\texttt{x}}e2 \textit{\texttt{h}}h6 9 \textit{\texttt{h}}h3 \textit{\texttt{c}}c6 10 \textit{a}3 \textit{\texttt{c}}c7 11 \textit{b}4 \textit{d}5 12 \textit{c}5 0-0 13 \textit{g}3

White's early alternatives 5 g3 and 5 f3 are usually quite harmless for Black. In the former line the outpost on g5 does not promise White's knight too many things to do. In general, if White plays f3 too early, his lack of development might be a major problem for him, as we shall see.

Now:
A: 5 g3  31
B: 5 f3  32

Or:
a) 5 g4?! just loses a pawn: 5...h6 6 \textit{\texttt{h}}h3 \textit{\texttt{x}}g4 7 \textit{\texttt{f}}f4 \textit{\texttt{f}}f5 8 \textit{h}3 \textit{\texttt{f}}f6 9 \textit{\texttt{c}}c3 \textit{\texttt{d}}bd7 10 \textit{\texttt{x}}g4 \textit{\texttt{x}}g4 11 \textit{\texttt{g}}g2 \textit{\texttt{x}}g6, Moran-Strikovic, Zaragoza 1993.
\( \text{\textcopyright{} Black's pieces are well placed, Tyni-Lehto, J"arvenp"aa 1996) 7... \text{\textcopyright{a}a6 8 \text{\textcopyright{g}g2 \text{\textcopyright{c}c7 9 \text{\textcopyright{f}f4 h6 10 \text{\textcopyright{h}h3 \text{\textcopyright{e}e6 11 \text{\textcopyright{e}e1 \text{\textcopyright{x}xc4 (11... \text{\textcopyright{e}e7!? looks natural) 12 \text{\textcopyright{x}xe4 \text{\textcopyright{x}xa2 13 \text{\textcopyright{x}xf6+ \text{\textcopyright{w}xf6 14 b3 \text{\textcopyright{w}f7 15 \text{\textcopyright{e}e4 \text{\textcopyright{d}d5 16 \text{\textcopyright{w}c2 \text{\textcopyright{x}xb3 17 \text{\textcopyright{x}xb3 \text{\textcopyright{g}g6 18 \text{\textcopyright{e}e3 \text{\textcopyright{x}xb3 19 \text{\textcopyright{x}xb3 \text{\textcopyright{d}d7 \pm J.Christiansen-J.Madsen, Danish Ch (Arhus) 1992.}

b32) 6 \text{\textcopyright{h}h3 c6 7 \text{\textcopyright{g}g5 (7 \text{\textcopyright{c}c3 \text{\textcopyright{e}e7 8 e3 \text{\textcopyright{a}a6 9 \text{\textcopyright{c}c3 \text{\textcopyright{c}c7 10 \text{\textcopyright{f}f4 \text{\textcopyright{e}e6 11 \text{\textcopyright{x}xe6 \text{\textcopyright{x}xe6 12 b4 0-0 13 \text{\textcopyright{b}b1 d5 14 c5 b6 is satisfactory for Black, Danner-Plachetka, Prague 1988.

A)

5 g3 (D)

B)

White has several different move-orders in the early phases of this variation, but they usually transpose to the main lines. The plan with h4, trying to keep the white knight on g5, is a natural set-up that White often adopts if he does not know any theory.

5... \text{\textcopyright{e}e7

5... \text{\textcopyright{e}e7!? is worth a try, and after 6 \text{\textcopyright{c}c3 (6 \text{\textcopyright{h}h3 \text{\textcopyright{a}a6 7 \text{\textcopyright{c}c3 transposes to Line C of Chapter 6) Black has a choice:

a) The original development plan 6... \text{\textcopyright{c}c7 7 \text{\textcopyright{h}h3 \text{\textcopyright{f}f6!? (7... \text{\textcopyright{f}f6 transposes to Chapter 2) 8 \text{\textcopyright{g}g2 \text{\textcopyright{e}e6 is possible, but White found the surprising 9 d5 \text{\textcopyright{f}f7 10 \text{\textcopyright{b}b3 \text{\textcopyright{d}d7 11 \text{\textcopyright{g}g5! and got a big advantage after 11... \text{\textcopyright{h}h6 12 0-0 0-0 13 \text{\textcopyright{h}h3! \text{\textcopyright{x}xc4 14 \text{\textcopyright{x}xc4 \text{\textcopyright{e}e5 15 \text{\textcopyright{e}e5 \text{\textcopyright{d}d5 16 \text{\textcopyright{b}b1 \text{\textcopyright{e}e6 17 \text{\textcopyright{f}f4 \text{\textcopyright{f}f6 18 \text{\textcopyright{b}b3+ \text{\textcopyright{h}h8 19 \text{\textcopyright{a}a3 ± in Krush-Kosteniuk, Cannes girls U-14 Wch 1997.

b) 6... d5! (justified because White has lost a move with the early \text{\textcopyright{g}3, and his knight is not yet attacking d5) 7 cxd5 \text{\textcopyright{e}e5 8 \text{\textcopyright{h}h3 \text{\textcopyright{c}c6 9 \text{\textcopyright{g}g2 \text{\textcopyright{e}e6 10 0-0 \text{\textcopyright{f}f6 11 \text{\textcopyright{g}g5 \text{\textcopyright{d}d7 12 e3 \text{\textcopyright{g}g4 13 \text{\textcopyright{f}f4 \text{\textcopyright{f}f7 14 \text{\textcopyright{x}xe7 \text{\textcopyright{x}xe7 15 \text{\textcopyright{a}a4+ \text{\textcopyright{d}d7 16 \text{\textcopyright{x}xd7+ }1/2-{1/2 Fahnen Schmidt-Woekenfuss, Bundesliga 1986/7.

6 h4!?

6 \text{\textcopyright{h}h3 \text{\textcopyright{f}f6 7 \text{\textcopyright{g}g2 c6 8 \text{\textcopyright{c}c3 transposes to Chapter 2.

6... \text{\textcopyright{f}f6

6... \text{\textcopyright{e}e7!? is again a flexible move, and now 7 \text{\textcopyright{c}c3 \text{\textcopyright{a}a6 8 \text{\textcopyright{g}g2 (8 \text{\textcopyright{b}b1 \text{\textcopyright{f}f6 9 \text{\textcopyright{g}g2 transposes to the main line, while after 8 d5 \text{\textcopyright{c}c7 9 \text{\textcopyright{g}g2 there is also no reason for Black to avoid 9... \text{\textcopyright{f}f6) 8... \text{\textcopyright{c}c7 9 \text{\textcopyright{b}b3 led to some original play in Praszak-McNab, Koszalin 1997: 9... \text{\textcopyright{f}f6 10 f3 h6 11 \text{\textcopyright{h}h3 \text{\textcopyright{h}5 12 \text{\textcopyright{f}f2 \text{\textcopyright{e}e6 13 d5 \text{\textcopyright{c}c5 14 \text{\textcopyright{e}e2 0-0 15 \text{\textcopyright{f}f4 \text{\textcopyright{xf4 16 \text{\textcopyright{xf4 \text{\textcopyright{xf4 17 exf3 \text{\textcopyright{b}b6 18 \text{\textcopyright{f}f1 \text{\textcopyright{d}d7 19 \text{\textcopyright{e}e1 \text{\textcopyright{e}e5 with a playable position for Black, whose knight is doing most of the work.

7 \text{\textcopyright{c}c3 c6 (D)

8 \text{\textcopyright{g}g2
Praszk-Markowski, Polish Ch 1998.

Conclusion: The plans with an early h4 are not dangerous for Black. However, there are some tricks based on the white knight on g5 that Black should avoid.

B)

5 f3 (D)

Or:
a) The odd alternative 8 f4 0-0 9 d2 a6 10 d5 b6 11 h3!? is a tricky plan. Only played once, it leads to complications: 11...e5 12 e3 b4 13 cxe4 wxc4 14 dxe5 dxe5 L5 d6 d8 16 b3 b5 17 f4 h6 18 e4 hxg5 19 ffl cxe4 20 dxe7 e8 21 xb5 xdx2 22 xdx2 cxb5 23 d6 ± Avshalumov-Titov, USSR 1983.
b) 8 d5 0-0 (8...a6 9 g2 0-0 10 0-0 g4 11 h3 d7 12 b1 e5 13 b3 c5 14 f4 c7 15 a4 f6 = Mastrovasilis-Nikolaidis, Greek Ch 1998) 9 e3 g4 10 h3 e5 seems to favour Black, whose pieces find good squares without delay: 11 c2 a5 12 f4 a6 13 b3 f6 14 b2 c5 15 b1 w7 16 f1 g6 17 a3 w7 18 w2 d7 19 g2 fc8 20 b4 axb4 21 axb4 c3!, Lindinger-Velička, Hamburg 1999.

8...a6 9 b1 0-0 10 0-0 c7

Black is well prepared to meet White's plans, and the knight doesn't have any special function on g5.

11 b4 h6 12 h3 e6 13 c5 cd5 14 xd5 xdx5 15 wc2 a5 16 a3 axb4 17 axb4 f6

White tries to attack Black's centre at once with the idea h3-f2 and c3. Black can either develop normally, or keep the e7-square for his queen, thus overprotecting the e4-pawn.

5...c7!

5...f6 is another important set-up, by which Black reserves e7 for his queen. 6 c3 and now:
a) 6...h6 7 h3 g5 8 f2 (8 fxe4 fxe4 9 g3 c6 10 d5 w7 11 g2 f5 12 0-0 g6 = Schmidt-Marchio, Bad Wildungen 1998) 8...w7 9 fxe4 fxe4 is the main position of the plan where White directly attacks the e4-pawn. He has the following options:
a1) 10 \( \text{a}e3 \text{A}g7 11 \text{w}c2 (11 \text{g}3 \text{c}6 \\
12 \text{w}b3 0-0 0-0 13 \text{a}g2 \text{d}f5 14 0-0-0 \text{w}a6 \\
15 \text{h}3 \text{A}g6 16 \text{g}4 \text{d}5 \text{w}as was unclear in \text{R}omanishin-Balashov, \text{O}dessa 1974) \\
11...\text{d}f5 12 \text{h}3 (12 \text{g}3 \text{c}6 13 \text{a}g2 \text{d}5 \\
14 0-0 0-0 =) 12...\text{c}6 13 \text{g}4 \text{A}g6 14 \\
d5!? (14 \text{g}2 \text{d}5 =) 14...\text{cxd}5 15 \text{cxd}5 \\
\text{d}bd7 16 \text{g}2 \text{w}e8 17 \text{w}a4 (17 \text{w}b3 \\
b6??; 17 \text{w}xa7 \text{c}xd5??) 17...\text{a}6 18 0-0 \\
0-0 19 \text{w}ad1 \text{w}e8 is unclear, \text{T}ouzane-Douven, \text{Sochi} 1990.

a2) 10 \text{w}c2? \text{g}7 (10...\text{h}5 11 \text{g}4! \\
\text{d}xg4 12 \text{d}xg4 \text{d}xg4 13 \text{d}d5 \text{w}f7 14 \\
\text{w}xe4+ \text{d}e6 15 \text{h}3, \text{S}utter-Werner, \\
\text{Switzerland} 1994) 11 \text{d}fxe4 \text{d}xe4 \\
(11...\text{c}6?? 12 \text{e}3 0-0 13 \text{d}d3 \text{d}xe4 14 \\
\text{d}xe4 \text{d}d7 with enough compensation) \\
12 \text{d}d5 \text{w}f7 13 \text{w}xe4+ \text{w}d8 14 \\
e3 (14 \text{d}d2 \text{c}e8 15 \text{w}d3 \text{d}f5 16 \text{w}c3 \\
c5) 14...\text{w}e8 (14...\text{h}8 15 \text{e}2) 15 \text{d}d3 \\
\text{d}f5 16 \text{w}d1!! (16 \text{w}d2 \text{e}6 is OK for \\
\text{B}lack, \text{Levin-Klimenok, USSR corr. \\
\text{Cht} 1991) 16...\text{c}6 (16...\text{h}8??) 17 \text{e}2 \\
\text{d}x\text{d}5 18 \text{h}5 \text{w}x\text{e}3+ 19 \text{w}x\text{e}3 \text{w}e6 \\
20 \text{cxd}5 \text{w}xe3+ 21 \text{w}e2 \pm.

a3) 10 \text{e}3 and then:

a31) 10...\text{c}6 11 \text{e}2 \text{h}5 12 0-0 \text{g}4 \\
13 \text{d}d2 \text{h}6 14 \text{w}c2 \text{d}f5 15 \text{h}3 \\
\text{A}gg6 (15...\text{gxh}3??) 16 \text{d}f4 with a slight \\
advantage for \text{W}hite, \text{Petran-Higats-} \\
\text{berger, Budapest} 1992.

a32) 10...\text{g}7 and now:

a321) 11 \text{d}e2 0-0 12 0-0 \text{c}6 13 \text{b}1 \\
(13 \text{b}4 \text{a}6 14 \text{a}4 \text{d}f5 15 \text{a}3 \text{bd}7 16 \\
\text{c}1 \text{w}h8 17 \text{d}h1 \text{A}g6 18 \text{g}3 \text{w}e6 \\
19 \text{h}5 \text{c}5 20 \text{d}d5! \text{d}d8 21 \text{d}x\text{d}5 \text{d}x\text{c}5 \\
22 \text{b}2 \pm \text{Ar}di\text{s}yan\text{sh}-\text{Y}rj\text{o}la, \text{T}hessa-

l\text{oniki OL} 1988) 13...\text{d}f5 14 \text{b}4 \text{bd}7 \\
15 \text{c}5 \text{w}h8 16 \text{d}d2 \text{d}x\text{c}5 17 \text{bxc}5 \text{b}6 18 \\
\text{cxb}6 \text{axb}6 19 \text{d}h1 \text{A}g6 \pm \text{Siegel-Soko-

lov, \text{V}iernheim 1995.

a322) 11 \text{g}4!? \text{h}5 12 \text{g}xh5 \text{d}f5 13 \\
\text{g}2 (13 \text{e}2?!) 13...\text{d}bd7 14 \text{w}a4 \\
0-0 15 0-0 \text{c}5 16 \text{d}x\text{c}5 \text{d}x\text{c}5 17 \text{d}d2 \\
\text{w}d8 18 \text{w}e2 \text{e}f8 19 \text{d}h1! \pm \text{Mei-

ster-Tischbierek, Bundesliga} 1991/2.

b) 6...\text{d}c6?? is maybe most to the 

point:

b1) 7 \text{f}xe4 and now:

b11) 7...\text{f}xe4 8 \text{d}5 (not 8 \text{g}xe4?! \\
\text{g}xe4 9 \text{d}xe4 \text{w}h4+ 10 \text{d}g3 \text{w}x\text{d}4 \mp) \\
8...\text{d}e5 9 \text{g}3 forces Black to try some 

unclear counterplay as the e4-pawn is 

hard to keep.

b12) 7...\text{h}6! 8 \text{d}5 (8 \text{g}h3 \text{f}xe4 9 \text{d}f2 \\
\text{f}5 is OK for Black) 8...\text{d}e5 9 \text{d}e6 \\
\text{w}x\text{e}6 10 \text{d}x\text{e}6 \text{x}e4 is good for Black.

b2) 7 \text{g}3 \text{h}6 8 \text{g}h3 \text{g}5 9 \text{d}f2 \text{e}f3 \\
10 \text{e}f3 \text{g}7 = \text{Matamoros-Klinger, \\
Gausdal jr \text{W}eh 1986.

6 \text{d}h3 \text{d}f6 7 \text{d}e3 (D)

B

7...0-0

7...\text{c}6?? is another option, and it is 

fully playable:

a) 8 \text{d}5 0-0 9 \text{d}f2 and now:

a1) 9...\text{d}bd7 and then:

a11) 10 \text{f}xe4 \text{g}4?! 11 \text{d}d3 (11 \\
\text{d}xg4 \text{fxg}4 with counterplay due to
the very good knight on e5) 11...fxe4 12 \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) cxd5 13 cxd5 \(\mathcal{W}a5+\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\) \(\mathcal{Q}de5\) with activity.

a2) 10 f4 \(\mathcal{W}b6\) 11 e3 \(\mathcal{Q}c5\) 12 \(\mathcal{A}e2\) a5, Nikolaevev-Titov, Budapest 1990, is another typical possibility.

b) 8 e3 0-0 9 \(\mathcal{A}e2\) (the alternative 9 \(\mathcal{F}xe4\) fxe4 10 \(\mathcal{G}f4\) \(\mathcal{A}a6\) 11 \(\mathcal{A}e2\) \(\mathcal{C}c7\) 12 d5 g5 13 \(\mathcal{A}h5\) \(\mathcal{A}f5\) 14 0-0 \(\mathcal{A}g6\) is good for Black. Ree-Quinteros, Amsterdam 1977) 9...\(\mathcal{A}a6\) 10 0-0 transposes to Line B1 of Chapter 3.

c) 8 \(\mathcal{F}xe4\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 9 \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) fxe4 (Bischoff-Sakaev. Brno 1992) 10 \(\mathcal{G}f4\) 0-0 11 e3 \(\mathcal{A}h4+\) 12 g3 \(\mathcal{A}g5\) 13 \(\mathcal{A}g2\) \(\mathcal{A}xf4\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}xg4\) \(\mathcal{A}d7\) 15 0-0 \(\mathcal{A}f6\) = Sakaev.

d) 8 \(\mathcal{G}f2\) d5 9 cxd5 cxd5 10 fxe4 \(\mathcal{F}xe4\) 11 \(\mathcal{A}g5\) \(\mathcal{C}c6\) 12 e3 \(\mathcal{A}e6\) 13 \(\mathcal{A}e2\) \(\mathcal{W}d7\) 14 0-0-0 15 \(\mathcal{A}f4\) \(\mathcal{A}ac8\) = Varga-Vaulin, Paks 1999.

e) 8 \(\mathcal{A}g5\) \(\mathcal{A}a6\) 9 e3 (9 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) 0-0 10 e3 \(\mathcal{C}c7\) 11 0-0-0 d5 12 cxd5 \(\mathcal{G}fxd5\) 13 \(\mathcal{A}xe7\) \(\mathcal{W}xe7\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}c4\) \(\mathcal{A}e6\) 15 \(\mathcal{G}f2\) \(\mathcal{G}xc3\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xc3\) \(\mathcal{G}xf3\) 17 gxf3 \(\mathcal{G}xc4\) 18 \(\mathcal{W}xc4+\) \(\mathcal{A}h8\) + Kelly-Spectman, British Ch (Torquay) 1998) 9...\(\mathcal{F}xe3\) 10 \(\mathcal{G}xf3\) (10 \(\mathcal{G}xf3!\)) 10...0-0 11 \(\mathcal{A}d3\) \(\mathcal{G}g4\) 12 \(\mathcal{A}f4\) \(\mathcal{A}h4+\) 13 \(\mathcal{D}d2\) \(\mathcal{E}e8\) is much better for Black. Danielsen-Davies. Danish Ch 1988.

\[8 \mathcal{G}f2\]

B) 8...\(\mathcal{A}h8\)

In some positions Black is ready to give up the e4-pawn, because White has not developed yet, and his king-side pawns are weakened.

8...\(\mathcal{A}c6?!\) is a very active alternative:

a) 9 fxe4 fxe4 10 d5 (10 \(\mathcal{G}fxe4\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 11 \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) d5! gives Black a very active position) 10...\(\mathcal{A}e5\) 11 \(\mathcal{B}b3\) \(\mathcal{A}f5\) with a mess.

b) 9 e3 \(\mathcal{F}xe3\) 10 gxf3 \(\mathcal{G}h5\) 11 f4 \(\mathcal{G}g6\) 12 \(\mathcal{G}g1\) \(\mathcal{G}g7\) 13 a3 \(\mathcal{A}h4\) with counterplay, Pieterse-Nogueiras, Tilburg 1992.

\[9 \mathcal{G}g5\]

B) 9...\(\mathcal{A}c6\)

10 \(\mathcal{A}b3\)

11...d5 10 0-0-0 dxc4 12 \(\mathcal{W}xc4\) \(\mathcal{A}d5\)

12...b5!? has also been suggested.

13 \(\mathcal{A}xe7\) \(\mathcal{W}xe7\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}xd5\) cxd5 15 \(\mathcal{A}b3\) \(\mathcal{A}c6\)

\(\mathcal{C}wie\) Schwanek-Cifuentes, Buenos Aires 1991.

**Conclusion:** Black has many plans to meet the very early f3. There is no need to be afraid of the loss of the e4-pawn, as Black gets a very active position by focusing on good development.
5 4th Move Alternatives for White

1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 Qf3 e4 (D)

White has tried also some totally different set-ups against the black advance in the centre.

The flexible 4 Qg1 tries to weaken the advanced black pawns further, while developing the knight via e2 to f4, for example. Generally Black copes well with these positional plans, and 4 Qg1 has never been a popular choice for White.

4 Qfd2 aims at pressurizing the centre more calmly behind the pawn-front. Against this plan we have chosen Khalifman’s 6...c5 as the main line, as this sharp move leads to some active play by both sides and Black hasn’t had too many problems so far.

Thus we discuss:
A: 4 Qg1!? 35
B: 4 Qfd2!? 37

A)

4 Qg1!?

This move has been played mainly by Smbat Lputian. As the route of the knight to f4 is as long through g1 as g5, this quite often transposes back to the 4 Qg5 main lines.

4...f5 (D)

Or:

a) 4...h6 5 Qc3 Qf6 is also possible, transposing to Line A of Chapter 32.

b) 4...g6!? is an interesting alternative which has only been played a few times. 5 Qc3 and now:

b1) 5...f5 is playable: 6 Qh3 (6 h4 Qg7 7 Qg5 Qd7 8 e3 Qc6 9 g4 fxg4 10 Qxe4 Qf7 11 Qd2 Qge7 12 Qd3 h6 13 Qxe7 Qxe7 14 Qe2 0-0 15 0-0-0 Qf5 T Ward-King, British Ch (Blackpool) 1988) 6...Qg7 7 g3 Qf6 8 Qg2 0-0 9 0-0 and now 9...c5 10 dxc5 dxc5 11 Qe3 Qa6 12 f3 Qe6 13 Qb3 exf3 14 Qxf3 Qg4 gave Black some unclear counterplay in Elbilia-Delchev, Bastia 1998.

b2) 5...Qg7 6 Qxe4 Qh4 7 Qd2 (7 Qg3 Qxd4 8 Qxd4 Qxd4 9 Qf3 Qg7
7...\(\text{Wxd4} 8 \text{Qf3} \text{Wb6} 9 \text{g3} \text{Qf6} 10 \text{g2} 0-0 11 0-0 \text{a5} 12 \text{b3} \text{c6} \) (or \(\text{d5?!?} 13 \text{cxd5} \text{Wxal} 14 \text{Qc4} \text{Wa6} \)) \(\text{a4} = \text{Gretarsson-Van der Wiel, Wijk aan Zee 1996.} \)

5 \text{c3}

Or:

a) After 5 h4 it is probably best for White to seek transpositions back to 4 \text{Qg5} variations, as the independent tries have not been too good: 5...\text{e7} (5...\text{Qf6} 6 g3 c6 7 \text{Qe7} 8 \text{c3} 0-0 9 \text{h5} \text{a6} 10 \text{c3} \text{dxc7} 11 \text{h3} \text{e6} 12 \text{h4} \text{Qg4} 13 \text{Qxc7} \text{Wxc7} = \text{Hoffman-Hartoch, Berlin 1988}) 6 g3 c6 7 \text{Qc3} \text{Qa6} 8 \text{Qh3} \text{Qf6} 9 \text{e3?!} 0-0 10 \text{b1} \text{c7} 11 \text{b4} \text{d6} 12 \text{Qd2} \text{Qd7} 13 \text{e2} \text{Wxe8} \not< \text{Hoffmeier-Schlemmermeyer, 2nd Bundesliga 1994/5.}

b) 5 g3 c6 d5 (6 \text{c3} \text{Qa6} 7 \text{g2} \text{Qe7} 8 \text{Qh3} transposes to note 'b' to Black's 5th move) 6...c5, fixing the central pawns, led immediately to an original position in Rogozenko-Nis- tiriuic, Kishinev 1993: 7 \text{Qc3} \text{Qf6} 8 \text{g2} g6 9 \text{h3} \text{g7} 10 \text{Qf4} \text{We7} 11 \text{h4} 0-0 12 0-0 \text{Qg4} 13 \text{e3} \text{Qe5} 14 \text{Qe2} \text{Qa6} 15 a3 \text{Qc7} with no problems for Black.

5...\text{Qf6}

Or:

a) 5...\text{Qd7} is an independent try: 6 \text{Qh3} \text{Qe7} 7 e3 \text{Qd6}?! (this original positioning of the knights might be quite playable, as they both have some good squares) 8 \text{b4} \text{Qh6} 9 \text{Qf4} 0-0 10 \text{h4} \text{Qd7} 11 \text{Wb3} \text{Qh8} 12 \text{Qe2} \text{Qg4} 13 \text{g3} \text{Qc8} 14 \text{Qb2} \text{Qe8} 15 \text{d5} \text{Qf7} 16 \text{Qb5} \text{Qe5} 17 \text{Qd4} \text{Qf6} and Black is OK, Lputian-Eingorn, Kharkov 1985.

b) 5...\text{e7} 6 \text{Qh3} c6 7 g3 (7 e3 \text{Qf6} 8 \text{Qe2} \text{Qa6} 9 \text{Qf4} 0-0 transposes to Line B2 of Chapter 3) 7...\text{Qa6} 8 \text{g2} \text{Qc7} 9 \text{f3} \text{exf3} 10 \text{exf3} \text{Qf6} was not a success in Lputian-Mokry, Manila 1992, where White obtained an advantage with active play: 11 \text{Qf4} 12 \text{d5} \text{Qxc3+} 13 \text{bxc3} \text{e5} 14 0-0 \text{Qf6} 15 \text{Qe1} + \text{Qf7} 16 \text{Qb1} \text{Qe8} 17 \text{Qe6}! with the initiative.

c) 5...c6?! is recommended by Ribli as the most precise move-order.

6 \text{Qg5}

6 \text{Qh3} \text{Qe7} transposes to Line A of Chapter 6. The text-move offers White some chances of an advantage.

6...\text{e7} 7 e3 0-0 8 \text{Qg2} (D)

White has developed his pieces a bit differently from the main lines.

8...\text{c6}

8...h6?! represents one improvement for Black, clearing the kingside at once: 9 \text{Qxf6} \text{Qxf6} 10 \text{Qf4} c6 (10...\text{Qc6}?! 11 h4 \text{Qe7} 12 \text{h5} c6 13 \text{Wb3} \text{Qa5} 14 0-0-0 \text{Qd8} 15 \text{Qe2} \text{Qg5} 16 \text{d5} \text{Qxf4} 17 \text{exf4} \text{cxd5} 18 \text{exd5} \text{Qd7} 19 \text{Qd4} \text{Qab8} 20 \text{f3} \text{exf3} 21 \text{Qxf3} \text{b5} \not< \text{Uusi-Akopian, USSR 1967}) 11 \text{h4} \text{Qa6} 12
h5 ²c7 13 g3 ²e6 14 ²e2 ²xf4 15
gxf4 ²e6 16 ²c2 c5 17 dxc5 dxc5 18
²d1 ²a5 ²Puc-Milić, Novi Sad 1955.
White has not found clear compensa-
tion for the loss of the bishop-pair.
9 ²f4 ²g4
The last alternative worth trying is
9...²a6!? 10 h4 (10 ²c2 ²c7 11 ²b3
h6 12 ²xf6 ²xf6 13 ²g6 ²e8 14 h4
²h7 15 h5 ²b8 is nothing for Black to
be afraid of. Shvedchikov-Lashvili,
Moscow 1991) 10...²c7 11 ²b3 ²b8
12 ²e2 ²e6? (12...h6!? is possible)
13 c5! d5 14 ²xe6 ²xe6 15 ²f4 ⊗
10 ²xe7 ²xe7 11 h4 ²d7 12 ²d2
a6 13 a4 b6 14 ²e2 ²df6 15 a5 b5 16
cxb5 cxb5 17 ²ed5 ²xd5 18 ²xd5
²d8 19 g3
White has a slight advantage. Lput-

**Conclusion:** White has had some
success with the surprising 4 ²g1.
However, there are not many players
who choose it as White, and it is also
difficult to believe that it should really
be a problem.

**B)**

4 ²fd2!?
This is an interesting alternative,
popularized by Rogers, to the much
more studied 4 ²g5. Black seems to
have no special problems, as the d2-
Knight does not usually have a good
future ahead of it. However, the most
critical positions have only been tested
a few times, so there might be room
for new ideas.

4...f5 5 e3 ²f6 6 ²c3 (D)

6...c5!
Otherwise:
a) 6...c6 7 ²e2 (7 b4 a6 8 ²b3 c5 9
bxc5 dxc5 10 d5 ²d6 11 ²b2 ²bd7
12 ²e2 0-0 13 g4 ²e5 14 gxf5 ²xf5
is a dynamic position with a lot to play
for. Alterman-Greenfeld, Beersheba
1991) 7...g6 8 0-0 ²h6 9 b4 0-0 10 b5
²e8 11 ²b3 ²bd7 12 ²c2 ²c7 13
²d2 c5 = Boleslavsky-Bronstein, Zu-
rich Ct 1953.

b) 6...g6 is a more traditional ap-
proach which is also viable. 7 ²e2 (7
b4 ²g7 8 c5? d5 ²Dlugy-Kavalek,
New York 1984) 7...²g7 8 b4 (8 f3
exf3 9 dxe6 0-0 10 0-0 d6 11 e1 h8 = Ribli-Poliugaevsky, Budapest (1975) 8...0-0 and now:

b1) 9 0-0 e6 10 f3 exf3 11 dxe6 d5! 12 b3 b6 13 a4 c6 14 b5 e7 15 a3 e8 16 c1 c8 gives Black comfortable play, Tozer-Speelman, London Lloyds Bank 1992.

b2) 9 b2 d6 (9...c6?! = ECO) 10 b5 e7 11 wb3 b5 12 a4 c5 13 dx5 dx5 14 0-0-0 d7 15 g4! ± Veingold-Adams, Manila OL 1992.

b3) 9 db3 d6 10 0-0 dbd7 11 e6 12 b6 0-0 13 f7 b5 14 e4 exd4 15 e6 xg4 16 e5 x4d4 17 x3f4 xg4 18 dxe5 x4e5 19 d6 dx5 20 dxc5 with enough play for the exchange, Alburt-Zaichik, Philadelphia 1993.

7 e2

Alternatively:

a) 7 f3?! has been played, though it seems quite risky: 7...cxd4 8 exd4 d6 (8...e5?! is the most critical approach) 9 fxe4 fxe4 9...dx4d4 10 dxe4 dxe4 11 e5 wb4+ 12 g3 wd4 13 xwd4 d4xd4 14 e3 d6 (14...e6 15 0-0-0 0-0-0 16 e5 e8 17 d4 exd5 18 wxe5 d6 19 f1 e7 21 a4 df6 22 c5! ± Blagoevich-Otikin, Prague 1988) 15 0-0 (15 e4 e6 16 b3 e7 =) 15...e5 16 e2 e6 with counterplay.

b) 7 d5?! gives Black the e5-square, and is not to be recommended. 7...g6 and now:

b1) 8 e2 g7 9 f4 exf3 10 dxf3 d6 0-0 11 d6 d4 12 e4 f6 13 h3 e5 14 dxe5 xex5 (14...dxe5?) 15 g4 d6 16 a3 e7 17 w3 b8 18 e2 b5 (18...g5??) 19 e8xc8 wxc8 20 wxf4 bxc4 21 w3 d3 b3 is OK for Black, Pastor-Berciuk, Frydek Misteck 1998.

b2) 8 0-0 (the sharp 8 h6? 9 b2 0-0, stopping f3 and aiming to play ...f4, is also possible) 9 b2 dbd7 and now:

b21) 10 wd2 a6 11 e2 w7 12 h3 d5 13 0-0-0 0-0-0 14 a4?! (14 f4 exf3 15 gxf3 d7 16 f1 d4!) 14...d7 15 d1 e8 16 b1 (16 f3 exf3 17 gxf3 d7 18 d3 d4!) 16...d3! 17 x3xd3 exd3 18 xd3 d4 19 d4 f1 (19 dxe4 fxe4 20 w2 w5 21 exb5 axb5 22 a5 x5b5 f7) 19..b5! 20 exb5 axb5 21 axb5 (21 bx5 bx5 22 axb5 bx2 23 bx2 g7! 24 c2 a8 wins for Black) 21...xc3! 22 dx3f3! xxb3 25 d4 d8 = Lautier-Rogers, Groningen 1988.

b22) 10 0-0-0 11 wd2 d5 12 h3 d7 13 0-0-0 w7 14 d1 a6 15 f4 is a better try for White: 15...exf3 16 gxf3 d7 17 d3 e8 (after 17...d4!?, 18 exf4 attacks the black queen; but 17...b5?! seems logical) 18 f4 d5 19 d1 d5 20 e2 e7 21 df1 w6 22 d3 xg3 23 dxg3 13..h2 Hausner-Mokry, Zlin 1995.

c) White can also play 7 db3 immediately, when Black has 7...e7? (7...d6 8 f4 exd4 leads to an original position: 9 dxd4 a7 10 e2 0-0 11 0-0 w8 12 h3 d5 13 cxd5 a5 14 xcd5 w8d5 15 db5 dc5 = Lewis-McNab, British Ch (Eastbourne) 1990)

8 dxc5 dc5 9 xcd8+ xcd8 10 d2 d6 11 b1 b6 12 a2 d7 13 a3 dbd7 14 d2 b6 15 d4 a5 16 b4 w7 with a nice queenless middlegame, Nikolic-Belotti, Mitropa Cup (Portorož) 1998.
7...\(\text{\&}e6\) (D)

8 \(\text{\&}h3\)

8 d5 is the better option, but Black has enough good squares in the centre: 8...\(\text{\&}c5\) 9 f4 (9 0-0 g6 10 f3 exf3 11 \(\text{\&}xf3\) \(\text{\&}xf3\)+ 12 \(\text{\&}xf3\) \(\text{\&}g7\) is equal, Vogel-Hodgson, Bundesliga 1993/4) 9...exf3 10 \(\text{\&}xf3\) \(\text{\&}fg4\)! 11 0-0 \(\text{\&}e7\), and then:

a) 12 \(\text{\&}xe5\) \(\text{\&}xe5\) 13 e4 0-0 14 \(\text{\&}f4?!\) (14 \(\text{\&}e3\) =) 14...\(\text{\&}g6\) 15 exf5 \(\text{\&}xf4\) 16 \(\text{\&}xf4\) \(\text{\&}xf5\) 17 \(\text{\&}g4\) (17 \(\text{\&}d3\) \(\text{\&}xd3\) 18 \(\text{\&}xf8\) + \(\text{\&}xf8\) 19 \(\text{\&}xd3\) \(\text{\&}f6\) \(\text{\&}f4\) 19...\(\text{\&}g6\) + Lputian-Lukin, Blagoveschensk 1988.

b) 12 h3 \(\text{\&}xf3+\) 13 gxf3 (13 \(\text{\&}xf3\) \(\text{\&}e5\) 14 \(\text{\&}h5+\) g6 15 \(\text{\&}e2\) 0-0 16 e4 \(\text{\&}g5\) =) 13...\(\text{\&}c5\) 14 f4 \(\text{\&}g6\) 15 \(\text{\&}d3\) 0-0 \(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\) Kakageldiev-Lukin, Frunze 1989.

8...\(\text{\&}e7\) 9 f3

The main alternative is 9 0-0 0-0 10 f4 b6 11 h3 (after 11 \(\text{\&}d2\) a5 12 d5 \(\text{\&}d4\) 13 a3 \(\text{\&}a6\) 14 \(\text{\&}bl\) \(\text{\&}d7\) 15 \(\text{\&}al\) \(\text{\&}c8\) 16 \(\text{\&}c2\) \(\text{\&}f6\) 17 g4 g6 18 g5 \(\text{\&}g7\) 19 \(\text{\&}e1\) \(\text{\&}e7\) 20 \(\text{\&}a2\) \(\text{\&}e7\) Black has no special problems, as there is always the possibility ...b5, Meszaros-Richtrova, Czech Chqt 1996/7) 11...\(\text{\&}h7\) (11...a5!? is also more logical here, as the bishop is better placed on c8 to meet the later g4 advance) 12 d5 \(\text{\&}b8\) 13 g4, when White is slightly better, which was confirmed in the instructive game Rogers-Hartoek, Wijk aan Zee 1985: 13...g6 14 \(\text{\&}f2\) \(\text{\&}f7\) 15 \(\text{\&}g2\) \(\text{\&}e8\) 16 \(\text{\&}d2\) \(\text{\&}f8\) 17 h3 \(\text{\&}g7\) 18 \(\text{\&}h2\) \(\text{\&}bd7\) 19 g5 \(\text{\&}e8\) 20 h4 \(\text{\&}e7\) 21 h5 \(\text{\&}e7\) 22 \(\text{\&}e2\) \(\text{\&}f8\) 23 h6 \(\text{\&}h8\) 24 \(\text{\&}xe4\) \(\text{\&}xe4\) 25 \(\text{\&}xe4\) \(\text{\&}d7\) 26 \(\text{\&}g4\) \(\text{\&}c7\) 27 \(\text{\&}b5\)+ \(\text{\&}b7\) 28 \(\text{\&}xc8\)+ \(\text{\&}xc8\) 29 \(\text{\&}xh8\) \(\text{\&}d7\) 30 \(\text{\&}f3\) a6 31 \(\text{\&}a3\) \(\text{\&}c7\) 32 e4 \(\text{\&}e7\) 33 \(\text{\&}e6\) \(\text{\&}e8\) 34 e5 \(\text{\&}d7\) 35 e6 \(\text{\&}xf6\) 36 \(\text{\&}xf6\) \(\text{\&}a8\) 37 \(\text{\&}e2\) \(\text{\&}f8\) 38 \(\text{\&}e7\)+ \(\text{\&}b8\) 39 \(\text{\&}a1\) \(\text{\&}d8\) 40 d7 1-0.

9...0-0 10 0-0 (D)

B

10...b6

Or:

a) 10...exf3?! 11 \(\text{\&}xf3\) \(\text{\&}d7\) 12 \(\text{\&}d2\) \(\text{\&}e8\) 13 \(\text{\&}d5\) exd4 14 exd4 \(\text{\&}xd5\) 15 \(\text{\&}xd5\)+ \(\text{\&}h8\) 16 \(\text{\&}d7\) \(\text{\&}f8\) 17 \(\text{\&}h5\) \(\text{\&}e8\) 18 \(\text{\&}xe8\) \(\text{\&}xe8\) 19 \(\text{\&}xf5\) is much better for White, Pachman-Hort, Hamburg 1980.
b) 10...a5!? at once is also an interesting possibility that has not been tested.

c) 10...\textit{\textit{We}}\textit{e}8 11 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}5 \textit{\textit{c}}xd4 12 \textit{\textit{f}}xe4 (12 \textit{\textit{C}}\textit{c}7 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}8 13 \textit{\textit{C}}\textit{xa}8 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}3 \textit{\textit{F}}; 12 \textit{\textit{C}}\textit{xd}4 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xd}5 13 \textit{\textit{c}}xd4 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xd}4 13) 12...\textit{d}3 is speculative. After 13 \textit{\textit{C}}\textit{xf}6+ \textit{\textit{C}}\textit{xf}6 14 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xd}3 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{xe}4 15 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{xd}6 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}8 16 \textit{\textit{F}}\textit{f}4 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{xf}4 17 \textit{\textit{ex}}f4 a5 Black’s initiative gave him sufficient compensation in Mishra-Norwood, Dhaka 1993, but 13 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xd}3 \textit{\textit{f}}xe4 14 \textit{\textit{C}}\textit{c}2!? is more critical.

d) 10...\textit{\textit{W}}\textit{h}8 is the main alternative:

d1) 11 a3 a5 12 a4 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{b}4 13 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}2 \textit{\textit{a}}\textit{e}6 is close to equal, and Black even achieved an advantage after 14 fxe4 \textit{\textit{f}}xe4 15 \textit{\textit{C}}\textit{e}1 b6 16 d5 \textit{\textit{f}}7 17 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}2 \textit{\textit{g}}6 in Klimm-Agrest, Berlin 1993.

d2) 11 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{c}2 \textit{\textit{c}}xd4 12 \textit{\textit{c}}xd4 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{b}6 (12...\textit{d}5!? Khalifman) 13 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{d}1 \textit{\textit{e}}xf3 14 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xf}3 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}7 15 \textit{\textit{a}}\textit{e}3 \textit{\textit{g}}4 16 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}5 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}8 17 \textit{\textit{f}}4 \pm Rossiter-McNab, Dublin Z 1993.

d3) 11 fxe4 fxe4 (11...\textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xe}4!? is a Khalifman recommendation that has never been tested) 12 dxc5 dxc5 13 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xd}8 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xd}8 14 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}2 \pm Crouch-McNab, Scottish Ch 1997.

11 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}2 (D)

This brings about a critical position. Alternatives:

a) 11 fxe4 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xe}4 12 \textit{\textit{f}}\textit{f}3 (12 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xe}4 fxe4 13 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xf}8+ \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xf}8 14 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{c}2 \textit{\textit{f}}5 13) 12...\textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xc}3 13 \textit{\textit{b}}\textit{c}3 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}7 (13...\textit{\textit{b}}\textit{b}7 14 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}5+ \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{h}8 15 \textit{\textit{b}}\textit{b}1 \pm with a pawn position closely reminiscent of a Nimzo-Indian) 14 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{d}5+ \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{h}8 is given by Khalifman as unclear. Both sides have their trumps, as White’s active bishop on d5 compensates for his pawn weaknesses.

b) After 11 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{c}2 \textit{\textit{b}}\textit{b}7 12 a3 Black played the thematic queenside counter 12...a5 in Dreckmann-Oopen, Bundesliga 1986/7, and this scared White into making a short draw: 13 \textit{\textit{b}}\textit{b}5 \textit{\textit{a}}\textit{a}7 14 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{c}3 \textit{\textit{c}}\textit{c}6 15 \textit{\textit{b}}\textit{b}5 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}.

11...\textit{a}5! 12 \textit{f}xe4

12 a4!? might be possible.

12...\textit{a}4! 13 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{c}1 \textit{\textit{f}}\textit{xe}4 14 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{a}4 \textit{\textit{c}}\textit{xd}4 15 \textit{\textit{c}}\textit{xd}4 \textit{\textit{d}}5!

15...\textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xd}4 16 \textit{\textit{a}}\textit{e}3 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xe}2+ 17 \textit{\textit{g}}\textit{xe}2 \pm.

16 \textit{\textit{a}}\textit{e}3 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{h}8

Now:

a) 17 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{c}3?! is fine for Black, Agdestein-Khalifman, Narva ECC 1998.

b) The critical try is 17 \textit{\textit{b}}3!? \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xe}4 18 \textit{\textit{b}}\textit{c}4 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xd}4 19 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xb}6 (19 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{xd}4 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{a}4 20 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{xb}6 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{xb}6 21 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xb}6 \textit{\textit{a}}\textit{a}6 =) 19...\textit{D}xe2+ 20 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{xe}2 (20 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{xe}2 \textit{\textit{D}}\textit{a}3 with enough compensation) 20...\textit{\textit{g}}\textit{4} 21 \textit{\textit{W}}\textit{el} \textit{\textit{a}}\textit{a}6, when Black’s active pieces compensate for the material deficit.

Conclusion: Although 6...\textit{c}5 has not been played much, it seems to offer Black a very active position.
6 What Else Can Black Play?

This section shows some alternative plans for Black, differing from the main repertoire introduced above. It is worth noting that there are many transpositions from these alternative variations back to the main lines, which means that the reader should be familiar with the main lines anyhow. However, the plans with an early ...c5 (Line A) as well as the plans with an early ...h6 (Line B) don’t have as much theory to be remembered as the main lines, which might make them a good choice for players wishing to build a repertoire with minimal effort.

A) 5...e7 6 h3 d6 (D)

6...c5!? has been tried here, and it is by no means refuted: 7 dxe5 dxe5 8 wxd8+ xd8 9 b5 (9 e3 is one suggested improvement) 9...a5+ 10 d2 xd2+ 11 xd2 a6 12 e3 d6 13 e2 d7 leads to an equal position. Portisch-Larsen, Rotterdam Ct (8) 1977.

B: 5...h6 43
C: 5...c6 45

In Line A (and to a lesser degree Line B) we are primarily interested in plans with ...c5.

Now:

A: 5...e7 41
b) 7 f3 transposes to Line B of Chapter 4.

c) 7...g5 is the most important of White's independent tries. The plan is to develop the bishop outside the pawn-chain. However, this move gives Black the choice of which minor pieces to exchange:

c1) 7...c6!? is also a good-looking plan, as 8 e3 g4 9 a3 xe7 a3xe7 10 a2 f6 leads to the basic position without dark-squared bishops. White obtained only a small advantage by 11 a4 c6 12 b3 b6 13 a3 a5 14 a4 c7 15 c5! d5 16 b6 in Okrajek-Dubois, Cappelle la Grande 1991.

c2) 7...c6!? is again an interesting idea based on switching the bishop to the kingside: 8 e3 (8 b3 a6b7!?) 8...a6 77 77 and now:

c21) 9 c2 0-0 10 b3 h6 11 a4f4! a7 12 h4? c5 13 f1 cxd4 14 exd4 hxg5 15 hxg5 g6 16 gxf6 a6xf6 f Hawelko-Lukin, Naleczow 1981.

c22) 9 b3 b8 10 d4 a7 11 a4 a6 12 a6xf6! a6xf6 13 g4 fxg4 14 h3 (14 a4xe4 a7 15 a6xf6+ a6xf6 16 a4 c5 17 0-0-0 cxd4 18 cxd4 b5 gives Black enough counterplay, Albur-Lukin, Tbilisi 1974.

c23) 9 d4 a7 10 a6+.

c3) 7...h6!? is a logical move, as Black forces the immediate exchange: 8 a6xf6 a6xf6 9 e3 0-0 10 a6d4 (10 a6e2 a6c6 11 a3 a6f7 12 f4 a6xf3 13 a6xf3 g5+ Bellon-Galego, Cienfuegos 1997) 10...a6c6+ a6xf6 is the basic position with two pairs of minor pieces missing, which makes the game equal: 12 a6c2 a5+ 13 a6d2 a6d2+ 14 a6xd2 g5 15 f4 a6xf3 16 a6xf3 a6f4+. Lazic-Botan, Biel 1990.

7...0-0

7...c6 transposes to Chapter 2.

8 a6c5?? (D)

This independent idea, made possible by Black's move-order 6...a6c7, has been used by some strong players. The main plan is to attack the centre in a different way from the normal ...a6c7 and ...d5 plans.

9 d5

9 a6c5?? leads to a type of endgame we have seen before, but the latest examples suggest that White might keep an edge: 9 a6c5 10 a6x8f (10 0-0 a6c6 11 a6f4 a6c7 12 a6xd8 a6xd8 13 a6f3 g5! 14 a6fd5 a6xd5 15 exd5 a6xd5 16 a6xe4 a6xc3 17 bxc3 a6x4 = Cebalo-Tkachev, Solin 1999) 10...a6d8 is close to equal, but it might be worth taking seriously as Tkachev had some problems in this latest game from this position: 11 a6f4 a6a6 12 a6fd5+ a6xd5 13 a6xd5 a6d6 14 a6g5 a6c8 15 0-0-0 ± Savchenko-Tkachev, Cannes 2000.

9...a6b7
9...\(\text{Na6} 10 \text{0-0 Nc7} 11 \text{f3 exf3} 12 \text{exf3} \) should be compared with note 'a' to Black's 10th move in Line B1 of Chapter 2.

10 \text{0-0 Ne5} 11 \text{b3 Ne8}

Or 11...a6!? 12 a4 Nh5 13 f3 \text{f6!} 14 \text{Wd2 e3} 15 \text{Wxe3 Nxc4} 16 \text{Wd3 Nc5} 17 \text{Wc2 \text{d7} with counterplay.}

Quinn-Mantovani, Bolzano 1999.

12 \text{f3 exf3} 13 \text{exf3 \text{Nf6} 14 \text{Wc2}}

14 \text{\text{b2} is not a problem for Black:} 14...\text{Nc7} 15 \text{Wf4} g6 16 \text{Wd2} a6 17 a4 b6 18 \text{Wd1 \text{b8} 19 \text{\text{d3} Nxd3} 20 \text{exd3 \text{d4+} 21 \text{Wh1 \text{Wf6} 22 \text{Wab1}}}} \text{Ne8} = \text{Wang-Stiazhkina, New Delhi}

FIDE wom 2000.

14...\text{Nc7} 15 \text{Wf2 \text{d7} 16 f4 \text{g7} 17 \text{\text{b2} a6} 18 a4 b6 19 \text{Wf1 Ne8} 20 \text{Wf1 \text{Axe1} 21 \text{Axe1 \text{Wf8} 22 \text{Wcd1}}} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \text{Lautier-Svidler, Tilburg 1996.}

**Conclusion:** The plans associated with an early ...c5 are an interesting option for Black.

---

**B)**

5...h6

This introduces an independent plan, namely ...h6 and ...g5. This set-up is logical but risky, as Black advances his pawns before developing.

6 \text{Wg3} (D)

6...g5

It is most logical to grab some space immediately, but 6...\text{\text{e6}!} also looks possible, with the idea of improving the bishop's position: 7 \text{Wf4 \text{g7} 8 \text{Wb3 \text{Wc6} 9 \text{h4}} (after 9 f3 g5 10 \text{Wg3} \text{xf6} 11 \text{f3 c4} 12 \text{\text{f2}} \text{Black managed activate his bishop with 12...\text{g6 =}} \text{in J.Richardson-R.Pert, London 1997}) 9...\text{\text{e7} 10 \text{Wcd5} (10 \text{h5}!?, fixing the black kingside, also looks possible) 10...c6 11 \text{\text{e3} g6} 12 \text{g4 (12 \text{h5}!?) 12...\text{xg4} 13 \text{\text{gxe4} b5} with a sharp fight, Billio-Karakas, Caorle 1981.}}}

7 \text{\text{g1}!}

White plans to weaken Black's advanced pawns. Alternatives:

a) 7 \text{f3 \text{g6} 7...exf3!} transposes to note 'a' to Black's 5th move in Line B of Chapter 4.

b) 7 \text{g3} is not dangerous, because after 7...\text{Wd6} 8 \text{f3 exf3 9 \text{xe2 \text{Wc6} + 10 \text{Wc2 \text{Wxe2} + 11 \text{\text{xe2}}}}} Black has the normal counter in the centre: 11...c5! 12 b3 \text{Nc6} 13 \text{\text{h2} \text{g7} = Schmidt-McNab, Thessaloniki OL 1984.}

c) 7 \text{e3} is sharp idea to fight for the centre, but 7...\text{Wd6} 8 \text{f3 (8 \text{\text{e2} \text{Nc6} 9 \text{b4 \text{g7} 10 \text{Wc2} 0-0 11 d5 \text{Wf7} 12 f3 \text{exf3} 13 \text{\text{gxf3} \text{w7} 14 \text{\text{d3}} \text{\text{g6} 15 \text{\text{fxe2}} c6 \vdash Sani-Berkmortel, Caorle 1988; 8 \text{b4 \text{g7} 9 \text{e2} 0-0 10 \text{Wb3 \text{Wc6} 11 \text{\text{g1} \text{\text{e7} 12 h4 g4} 13 c5+ \text{Wf8} 14 g3 a5 = Schön-Hickl, Bundesliga 1987/88}}}}}

8...\text{\text{xe3} 9 \text{\text{gxf3} \text{Wg7} 10 \text{\text{f3} \text{c6} 11 \text{d3 \text{Wc7} 12 \text{\text{e2 \text{d7} 13 f4 0-0-0 is}}}

7...\&g7

After 7...\&f6 8 h4 \&g8 9 hxg5 hxg5 White can force a weakening of Black’s kingside pawn-formation: 10 \&h3 g4 (10...f4 11 e3 \pm is no good for Black, but maybe 10...\&h6!? is worth a try) 11 \&f4 \pm Illescas-Hodgson, Spanish Chpt 1993. This is White’s most dangerous general plan, and Black must be aware of it.

8 h4 (D)

8...g4

Black fixes the kingside, because he can fight for the outpost f4.

a) 8...\&e6 is a flexible alternative: 9 hxg5 hxg5 10 \&xh8 \&xh8 11 e3 g4 (the calm 11...\&g7!? might be possible) 12 \&b3 b6 13 \&ge2 \&e7 14 \&f4 \&f7 15 \&d2 \&d7 16 \&a4 c6 17 \&e2 a6 18 \&a3 \&b8 19 \&d1 b5 20 \&b4 \pm Hübner-Böhm, Telex 1977.

b) 8...\&c6!? has not proved successful so far, but it might be possible to find improvements in the subsequent complications:

b1) 9 hxg5 \&xd4 (9...hxg5!??) 10 gxf6 \&c6 11 g4 \&xh6 12 \&xh6 \&xh6 (12...\&xh6!??) 13 \&xh6 \&xh6 14 gxf5 \pm Kalinichen-Vorotnikov, Würzburg 1992.

b2) 9 e3 \&f6 10 hxg5 hxg5 11 \&xh8+ \&xh8 12 \&h3 \&g4 13 \&e2 \&h6 14 \&d2 \&d7 15 \&b3 b6 16 0-0-0 \pm Farago-Ermenkov, Albena 1983.

9 e3 \&f6

The alternatives are slightly problematic for Black:

a) 9...\&d7 10 \&ge2 h5 11 \&f4 \&f8 12 \&a4+ \&d7 13 \&b3 \&e7 and Black has lost quite a lot of moves with his knights, so White gets an edge with 14 c5! dxc5 15 dxc5 \&fg6 (15...c6 16 \&c4 \&eg6 17 \&b5! \&xf4 18 \&d6+ \&d8 19 exf4 \pm Portisch-Seirawan, Mar del Plata 1982) 16 \&xg6 \&xg6 17 \&d2 \pm according to Portisch.

b) 9...\&e6 is another option, with better chances for White after 10 \&b3 \&c8 11 \&ge2 \&d7 12 \&f4 \&f7 13 \&d2 a6 14 a4 \&gf6 15 \&e2 0-0 16 a5 \&c8 17 \&cc2 \&h5 18 \&xh5 \&xh5 19 \&f4 \pm Engorn-Deev, Berlin 1992.

10 \&ge2 \&h5! 11 \&d5 \&e6??

11...c5 is not as good because of 12 \&d2 \&c6 13 \&c3 \&e6 14 dxc6 dxc5 15 \&b3 0-0 16 \&xg7 \&xg7 17 0-0-0 \pm Portisch-Quinteros, Nice OLY 1974.

b2) 12 \&e4 \&xf4 13 \&xf4 \&f7 14 \&b3 c5?? 15 dxc5

15 \&xb7 \&d7, intending ...0-0 and ...\&b8, gives Black enough compensation.
Conclusion: The plan ...h6 and ...g5 is quite sharp and dangerous, but there are not many games with it. It currently seems a viable option for Black.

C)

5...c6 (D)

with 7...\( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b6} 8 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xh6 axb6} 9 \text{b3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h6} 10 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d7} 11 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f4} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f8} 12 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{g6} 13 \text{g3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xf4} 14 \text{gxf4} \text{d5} 15 \text{e3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c6} 16 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e2} \text{h5} 17 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a4} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d8} 18 \text{c5} \text{b5} = \text{Pugach-Rai,Garcia, Argentine Ch (Buenos Aires) 1965) 7...\text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a6} (the alternative 7...\text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f6}?! is still slightly premature, as White plays 8 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{g5} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a6} 9 \text{e3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c7} 10 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f4} with chances of getting some pressure) 8 \text{e3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f6} 9 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c7} 10 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d2, Timman-Gulko, Reykjavik 1991, and now 10...\text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d5} = is most logical, as Black's knight is already supporting this central move. It has, however, never been played.}

b) 6 \text{d5} expands in the centre, providing strong posts for both player's pieces: White gets the a1-h8 diagonal, especially the d4-square and sometimes also e6, while Black gets e5 and c5 for his knights. 6...\text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c7} (D) and now:


b1) 7 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h4} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f6} 8 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f4} \text{h6} 9 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h3} 0-0 10 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c5}!? is an original idea, but Black is quite OK after 10...\text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xd5} 11 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xd5} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xd5} 12 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xd5+} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h8} 13 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xh6} 14 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d2} (14 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{g5}?!?) 14...\text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b6} 15 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{bl
\[ \text{An Explosive Chess Opening Repertoire for Black} \]

\[ \text{\texttt{\textbackslash e}6 16 \texttt{\textbackslash e}3 \texttt{\textbackslash w}a6 17 \texttt{\textbackslash d}f4 \texttt{\textbackslash w}xa2 18 \texttt{\textbackslash c}1 \texttt{\textbackslash e}d8 with good compensation, Meyer-McNab, Notresundby 1992.} \]

\[ \text{b2) 7 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3 \texttt{\textbackslash d}a6 (7...\texttt{\textbackslash f}f6!? is also possible: 8 \texttt{\textbackslash e}3 \texttt{\textbackslash b}d7 9 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e2 0-0 10 b3 \texttt{\textbackslash d}e5 11 \texttt{\textbackslash b}2 \texttt{\textbackslash f}g4 12 \texttt{\textbackslash w}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash h}4!? 13 \texttt{\textbackslash g}3 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 14 \texttt{\textbackslash g}1 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 15 \texttt{\textbackslash d}1 \texttt{\textbackslash g}6 16 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3 \texttt{\textbackslash d}e5 17 \texttt{\textbackslash c}3 c5 18 0-0-0 a6 19 f4 \texttt{\textbackslash e}xf3 20 \texttt{\textbackslash d}xf3 \texttt{\textbackslash d}xf3 21 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f3 b5 and it is Black who is attacking, Cummings-Watson, British Ch (Norwich) 1994) and now:} \]

\[ \text{b21) 8 g3 is a thematic developing move: 8...\texttt{\textbackslash f}f6!? 9 \texttt{\textbackslash g}2 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 10 0-0 0-0 11 \texttt{\textbackslash e}3 \texttt{\textbackslash c}7 (11...\texttt{\textbackslash d}g6!? with the point 12 \texttt{\textbackslash d}d4 \texttt{\textbackslash e}5) 12 \texttt{\textbackslash d}d4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d4 13 \texttt{\textbackslash w}x d4 c5 14 \texttt{\textbackslash w}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash g}6 15 f3! \texttt{\textbackslash e}xf3 16 \texttt{\textbackslash e}xf3 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 17 f4 \texttt{\textbackslash e}5 Nikolić-Speelman, New York 1994.} \]

\[ \text{b22) 8 e3 \texttt{\textbackslash f}6! (Black's best idea is to develop his bishop on the long diagonal whenever possible) 9 \texttt{\textbackslash d}2 (9 \texttt{\textbackslash e}2!?) 9...\texttt{\textbackslash h}6 (9...\texttt{\textbackslash e}7!??) 10 \texttt{\textbackslash f}4 0-0 11 \texttt{\textbackslash e}2 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 12 0-0 (12 \texttt{\textbackslash g}3 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 13 \texttt{\textbackslash h}4 is playable for White) 12...\texttt{\textbackslash e}7 13 \texttt{\textbackslash c}1 \texttt{\textbackslash e}5 gives Black a comfortable position; e.g., 14 \texttt{\textbackslash f}3 g5 15 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3 \texttt{\textbackslash e}xf3 16 \texttt{\textbackslash g}xf3 f4 \texttt{\textbackslash e} Johansen-Gulko, Copenhagen 1996.} \]

\[ \text{6...\texttt{\textbackslash a}6 (D)} \]

\[ \text{6...\texttt{\textbackslash f}6 7 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 enables White to improve his bishop's position.} \]

\[ \text{7 g3} \]

\[ \text{Black has committed himself to ...\texttt{\textbackslash a}6 plans, so White tries to choose a line with g3. Other moves:} \]

\[ \text{a) 7 f3 \texttt{\textbackslash f}6 and then:} \]

\[ \text{a1) 8 fxe4 fxe4 9 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 10 e3 0-0 11 \texttt{\textbackslash f}2 allows the original idea 11...\texttt{\textbackslash d}5!? (11...d5 12 cxd5 cxd5 13 \texttt{\textbackslash w}b3 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 12 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e7 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e7 13 \texttt{\textbackslash d}fxe4, when Black gets quite a lot of activity with 13...\texttt{\textbackslash f}5 14 \texttt{\textbackslash w}d2 d5 15 cxd5 cxd5 16 \texttt{\textbackslash x}a6 bx a6 17 \texttt{\textbackslash g}3 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e3! 18 \texttt{\textbackslash w}x e3 \texttt{\textbackslash e}8 19 \texttt{\textbackslash g}e4 \texttt{\textbackslash f}5 20 0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e4 = Neverov-Foigel, Kherson 1989.} \]

\[ \text{a2) 8 \texttt{\textbackslash f}2 d5 9 cxd5 cxd5 10 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 11 e3 \texttt{\textbackslash c}7 12 \texttt{\textbackslash e}2 \texttt{\textbackslash e}6 13 0-0 0-0 is equal, though White developed serious pressure after 14 \texttt{\textbackslash c}1 \texttt{\textbackslash f}8!? (14...\texttt{\textbackslash e}xf3) 15 \texttt{\textbackslash f}4 \texttt{\textbackslash d}6?! (15...\texttt{\textbackslash e}8!?) 16 \texttt{\textbackslash e}5! \texttt{\textbackslash w}d7 17 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3 \texttt{\textbackslash b}c8 18 \texttt{\textbackslash f}4 \texttt{\textbackslash f}7 19 \texttt{\textbackslash w}e1 \texttt{\textbackslash d}e8 20 \texttt{\textbackslash g}3 \texttt{\textbackslash d}e8 in the game Sitanggang-Komliakov, Manila OL 1992.} \]

\[ \text{a3) 8 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 9 e3 0-0 (D).} \]
Here White has many options, but none of them seems really dangerous:

a31) 10 \( \texttt{\text{xf6?!}} \) \texttt{\text{xf6}} 11 \texttt{\text{fxe4 fxe4}} 12 \texttt{\text{exf4}} is bad due to 12...\texttt{\text{hx3}} 13 \texttt{\text{gxf3 \text{h4+}}, which favours Black.}

a32) 10 \texttt{\text{c2 exf3}} 11 \texttt{\text{gxf3}} (not 11 \texttt{\text{xf3? \text{g4}} 12 \texttt{\text{f4 g5 \text{+}}}) 11...\texttt{\text{h5}} 12 \texttt{\text{f4 (12 \texttt{\text{g1? f4 \text{+-}}}) 12...\texttt{\text{hxg5 13 \text{g5 \text{f6 \text{+}}}} leaves White's pawns seriously committed.}}

a33) 10 \texttt{\text{b3 exf3}} 11 \texttt{\text{gxf3}} allows Black to attack the centre quickly by 11...\texttt{\text{g4!}} 12 \texttt{\text{exe7 wxe7}} 13 \texttt{\text{fxg4 fxg4}} 14 \texttt{\text{g1 wxe3+ 15 \text{ge2 \text{e6}}, with an attack.}}

a34) 10 \texttt{\text{f2}} is a passive alternative: 10...\texttt{\text{exf3}} 11 \texttt{\text{xf6}} 12 \texttt{\text{xf6}} 13 0-0-0 \texttt{\text{a5}} 14 \texttt{\text{d3 \text{e6}} 15 \text{a3 \text{c7}} 16 \text{g4}} 17 \texttt{\text{g5}} 17 \texttt{\text{xf5 \text{xf5}} 18 \texttt{\text{g3 \text{xd3}} 19 \text{xd3 \text{ae8 \text{+ Uhlmann-S.Mohr, Bundesliga 1995/6.}}}}

a35) 10 \texttt{\text{d2 c7}} 11 0-0-0 d5 with equality, Gulko-Speelman, Thessaloniki OL 1988.

b) 7 e3 \texttt{\text{f6}} (D) and here:

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{diagram.png}
\end{center}

b1) 8 \texttt{\text{a2 g6 (8...\text{e7 9 0-0 0-0 transposes to Line B1 of Chapter 3))}} 0-0-0 \texttt{\text{g7 10 \text{d2}} (10 \texttt{\text{b1 \text{c7}} 11 \text{b4}} 0-0-0 \text{a4 h6 13 f3 \text{1/2-1/2 Sutter-Hort, Switzerland 1996}} 10...0-0 11 \texttt{\text{b3 \text{e7}} 12 \texttt{\text{a1 h8}} 13 \text{a3 \text{c7}} 14 \text{f1e1 \text{e6}} 15 \text{d5 \text{c5}} 16 \texttt{\text{w2 \text{c7}} 17 \text{dxc6 bxc6 18 \text{cd1 \text{e5}} 19 \text{c1 \text{c6 \text{+ Kummer-Brestian, Moersem 1997.}}}}}}}

b2) 8 \texttt{\text{f4}} and now:

b21) 8...\texttt{\text{e7}} 9 \texttt{\text{e2 0-0 transposes to Line B2 of Chapter 3.}}

b22) 8...\texttt{\text{g6?! 9 a3 (9 g3 \text{g7 10 h4}} 0-0 11 \texttt{\text{e2 c7}} 12 d5 e5 13 \texttt{\text{c2 d7}} 14 \texttt{\text{a4 \text{f7}} 15 \text{b3 \text{a6}} 16 \texttt{\text{b2 \text{b4 = Gaertner-Maiwald, Budapest 1994}}}} 9...\texttt{\text{c7}} 10 d5 \text{1/2-1/2 Hyness-McNab, Blackpool Z 1990.}}

b23) The active 8...\texttt{\text{g5?! is best. After 9 \texttt{\text{h5 \text{e6}} 10 h4 Black seems to be able to play the committal 10...\text{g4}} 11 \texttt{\text{g4 f7}} 12 d5 \texttt{\text{g7}} 13 \text{dxc6 bxc6 14 \texttt{\text{c2 as he gets counterplay with}} 14...\texttt{\text{c5}} 15 \text{b3 a5}} 16 \texttt{\text{a3 \text{d7}} 17 \texttt{\text{d1}} 18 \texttt{\text{e2 \text{f6}} 19 \texttt{\text{c1 0-0 20 g3 \text{f8}} = Ruban-Popchev, Sochi 1989.}}}}

c) 7 d5 is best met by 7...\texttt{\text{f6 8 e3 (8 f3 exf3 9 exf3 d7 10 \text{d3 \text{b6}} 11 \texttt{\text{c2}} 12 \text{cx} 5 0-0-0 13 0-0 \texttt{\text{d7}} 14 \texttt{\text{c2 ae8 is at least equal for Black, Uhlmann-Van der Wiel, Austrian Cht 1995}) 8...\text{g6}} 9 b3 (9 \texttt{\text{g4 \text{g7}} 10 h4 \texttt{\text{g4\text{!}} 11 \texttt{\text{d2 0-0 12 \text{e2 \text{c7}} 13 \text{b1 \text{c5}} 14 \text{b4 \text{d3+ 15 \text{xd3 cxd3}} 16 \texttt{\text{f1 a5 17 b5 \text{e5}} 18 \texttt{\text{b3 \text{d7 is a messy position, but Black is probably already better, Popov-Miles, Rome 1990}) 9...\text{g7}} 10 \texttt{\text{h2 0-0 11 \text{d2 \text{g4}} 12 \text{e2 \text{c5 and the classic battle Knaak-Speelman, Thessaloniki OL 1998 continued 13 \text{d1 \text{h4}} 14 \text{a4}} 15 \text{a4 f4 \text{c7 16 \texttt{\text{xg7 fxe3}} 17 \texttt{\text{h8 \text{xe2+ 18 \text{f1 \text{c5 0-1.}}}}}}}}}}}}}}
}
We now return to the position after 7 g3 (D).

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess-board.png}
\end{center}

7...g6!?

The plan of fianchettoing the dark-squared bishop is a fully playable option in this move-order.

The alternative is 7...\textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}7 8 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}6 9 0-0 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}7 (9...0-0 transposes to Line B1 of Chapter 2), and now:

a) 10 d5 0-0 11 f3 transposes to Line B1 of Chapter 2.

b) 10 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}4 g5 (10...0-0!??) 11 \textcolor{red}{\textit{h}}3 h6 12 f3 exf3 (12...d5!?) 13 exf3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}6 14 d5! cxd5 15 cxd5 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}xf5 (the alternative 15...\textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xd5 16 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}1 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}e3 17 bxc3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}7 18 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}e2 is good for White) 16 f4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xc3 17 bxc3 g4 18 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}6? (18...0-0!?) 19 \textcolor{red}{\textit{a}}3! d5 20 \textcolor{red}{\textit{b}}1 b6 21 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}1 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}7 22 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}xe6 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}xe6 (the alternative 22...\textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xe6 23 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}5 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}8 24 \textcolor{red}{\textit{b}}3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}7 25 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}1 is not to be recommended for Black) 23 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}7 24 c4! and White controls the game, Dao-Bezold, Budapest 1994.

8 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}2

8 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}4!? \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}6 9 h4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}7 10 d5 is another option, but Black develops his pieces to good squares: 10...\textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}7 11 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}2 c5! 12 f3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}7 (12...exf3!?) 13 fxe4 fxe4 14 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}5 (now the position becomes quite complicated) 15 h5 g5 (15...\textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}8!? 16 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}6! \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xe6 17 dxe6 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xe6 18 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}xe4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}xe4 19 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xe4 0-0-0 20 0-0 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}8 seems to be better for White, Lputian-Cu.Hansen, Wijk aan Zee 1993.

8...\textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}7 9 0-0 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}6 10 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}5

10 f3 0-0 11 fxe4 fxe4 12 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}5 \textcolor{red}{\textit{b}}6! shows one plan associated with ...\textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}7: the d4-pawn might be as weak as the e4-pawn. After 13 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}6 14 b3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}4 15 \textcolor{red}{\textit{a}}d1 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}f1+ 16 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}1 h6 17 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e}}8 18 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xe3 19 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xe3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}4 Black has enough activity: 20 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xe4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}c2 21 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d}}3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xd4+ 22 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xd4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xd4 23 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xd4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xd4 24 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}6+ \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}7 25 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xe8 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c}}xe8 26 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}7 27 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f}}2 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} Schöpper-Angermüller, German corr. Ch 1993.

10...h6 11 \textcolor{red}{\textit{xf}}6 \textcolor{red}{\textit{xf}}6 12 e3 0-0

\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} Yusupov-Cu.Hansen, Hamburg 1993.

\textbf{Conclusion:} 5...c6 is a sound alternative to the standard move-order. It is worth noting that there are many transpositions between these various options for Black.
In Chapters 8 and 9 we study the position after \(1 \, d4 \, d6 \, 2 \, c4 \, e5 \, 3 \, \text{c}c3\), when it is best for Black to break up the white centre immediately with \(3...\text{exd4} \, 4 \, \text{wxd4} \, (D)\).

Now Black has a major decision: he can either win a tempo for development with \(4...\text{c}c6\) or he can develop his kingside first, starting with \(4...\text{f}f6\), trying to use the central position of the white queen to his advantage later.

The variations presented in this chapter can also be reached via an English Opening move-order: \(1 \, c4 \, e5 \, 2 \, \text{c}c3 \, d6 \, 3 \, d4\). Because of this, the ECO code for these variations is A21.

### Positional Plans
Looking at the following diagram, the general plan for White is based on free development together with strong diagonals for his bishops. White has fianchettoed both bishops and he is going to continue with \(\text{df}4\) and 0-0. The bishops together with the d5-outpost for his knights usually give White his normal small opening advantage.

The general plan for Black is \(...g6, ...\text{g}g7\) and \(...0-0\). After securing his king, Black usually has both tactical and positional plans. The good thing is that the general positional plans usually give Black a playable position, and readers who wish to play only on general grounds will be completely OK here. In this example, the positional approach contains plans like \(...a5-a4xb3\) or sometimes even \(...a5-a4-a3\), together with \(...\text{e}e5\) and \(...\text{fd}7-c5\).
Here Black has implemented the standard plans, and can start activating the rest of pieces with moves like ...c6 and ...\textbf{W}b6. The b3-pawn can also easily become a clear target for Black.

**Tactical Plans**

Depending on what White plays, there might be some exceptional tactical plans for Black. In the following positions we see some of these ideas.

These plans are usually based on the fact that Black is a few tempi ahead in development because of the additional moves by White’s queen. In somelines White may also weaken his position by playing b3, which leaves the long diagonal open until White has time for \texttt{\textbf{A}}b2; yet another possibility is that an early \texttt{\textbf{Q}}d5 by White might weaken his central squares like e4.
1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 Qc3

This position can also be reached via 1 c4 e5 2 Qc3 d6 3 d4. White is well centralized, but loses some time with his queen.

3...exd4 4 Qxd4

Our main repertoire is connected with:

4...Qc6 (D)

Black's advantage in development soon gives him good chances: 8 Qc3 (8 b3 Qf6 9 Qb2 0-0 0-10 Qf3 d5 ‡) 8...Qf6 9 Qxf6? Qxf6 10 e3 Qb4 11 Qd1 Qe4 and Black wins, Corniere-Prochazka, Massy 1993.

A)

5 Qd1

The main idea of this move is to develop the bishop actively with Qg5.

5...g6 (D)

Or:

a) 5...f5?! (this seriously weakens Black's pawn-structure) 6 g3 Qf6 7 Qg2 Qe5 (Schmidt-Helbig, Berlin 1994) 8 b3 intending Qh3-f4, Qb2 and Qd2 ‡.

b) After 5...Qf6 the Qg5 plan is not so effective: 6 Qg5 (6 g3 is of course possible, as is 6 Qf3) 6...Qe6!? (6...Qe7 7 e3 0-0 8 Qf3 Qe6 9 Qc2 Qd7 10 a3 Qe8 11 Qd1 h6 12 Qh4 Qad8 13 b4 Qg4 14 Qxe7 Qxe7 15 Qe2 Qge5 16 Qd5 Qxd5 17 Qxd5 Qxf3+ 18 Qxf3 Qe5 19 Qe2 c6 20 Qd2 a5 21 0-0 axb4 22 axb4 Qa8 23 Qb3 Qed8 24 Qfd1 Qf6 25 h3 Qg6 26 Qd4 ‡ Roos-Werner, Leipzig 1995) 7 e3 Qe5 8 Qd5 (8 Qf3?! is an improvement) 8...c6 9 Qc3 Qxc4 10 Qxc4 Qxc4 11 Qc2 d5 is much better for Black, Pichel Jallas-Alcaraz, Alicante 1989.

5 Qe3+ is best answered by 5...Qe7, when Black doesn't have to worry about 6 Qd5 Qe6 7 Qxe7 Qxe7, since
c) 5...\textit{e}6!? is possible, and gave Black active play in the following example: 6 e3 \textit{g}6 7 \textit{f}3 d5 8 \textit{g}5 \textit{b}4 9 \textit{x}e6 fxe6 10 cxd5 exd5 11 \textit{e}2 d4 12 cxd4 \textit{xd}4 13 0-0 0-0-0 14 \textit{e}3 \textit{xc}d1 15 \textit{f}xd1 a6 16 \textit{xd}8+ \textit{xd}8 17 \textit{d}1 \textit{e}8 18 g3 \textit{e}5 19 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 20 \textit{xd}5 c6 21 \textit{d}1 \textit{c}7 22 \textit{g}2 b5 with counterplay. Babula-Freisler, Karvina 1989.

\textbf{6 \textit{g}7? \textit{g}5 \textit{f}6!}

It is best for Black to develop and count on active counterplay with ...h6, ...g5 and ...\textit{f}5. Otherwise:

a) 7...\textit{g}7?! is incorrect because of 8 \textit{d}d5 f5 8...\textit{x}b2? 9 \textit{e}6+ \textit{xf}6 10 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{h}8 10 \textit{e}4 h6 11 \textit{e}5 \textit{e}6 12 \textit{xe}6+ \textit{f}7 12 \textit{d}5 \textit{c}5 13 \textit{c}4 \textit{e}6 14 \textit{c}3 a6 15 \textit{e}2 c5 (15...\textit{b}5?) 16 \textit{cxb}5 \textit{axb}5 17 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}4 18 \textit{xc}4+ \textit{xc}4 19 \textit{xc}6! \textit{f}6! 20 \textit{e}6+ \textit{e}6 21 \textit{b}3 \textit{a}5 22 \textit{d}d2 \textit{d}d8 23 \textit{f}2 \textit{d}d8+ 24 \textit{b}4 25 \textit{f}4 (23...\textit{xb}4 24 \textit{d}2 is good for White due to Black's weak pawns) 24 \textit{b}1 \textit{d}d8 25 \textit{a}x\textit{b}5 \textit{a}7 26 \textit{e}2+ \textit{b}1. Soko-

b) 7...\textit{f}6 8 \textit{f}4 (8 \textit{h}4 \textit{g}7 9 \textit{e}3 0-0 10 \textit{e}2 \textit{f}5 11 \textit{g}3 \textit{g}3 12 \textit{h}xg3 \textit{e}5, intending ...\textit{c}6 and ...\textit{f}5, is OK for Black according to Sokolov) 8...\textit{e}5 9 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}7 10 \textit{e}2 0-0 11 \textit{d}d4 \textit{g}5 12 \textit{g}3 f5 13 \textit{f}4 \textit{xf}4 14 \textit{xf}4 \textit{d}4 15 \textit{d}2 \textit{f}6 16 \textit{c}6 bxc6 17 \textit{h}3 \textit{f}6 18 \textit{f}2 \textit{b}5 19 \textit{d}e1 \textit{a}a8 20 \textit{f}2 c5 21 \textit{h}3 \textit{a}5 22 \textit{b}1 \textit{f}6 23 \textit{b}2 \textit{c}7 24 \textit{d}e2+ \textit{b}6 (24...\textit{f}4 25 \textit{d}e2 is more peaceful) 10. \textit{f}5 11-0-0 \textit{g}5. 11...\textit{e}8? 12 \textit{d}2 \textit{c}4 13 \textit{e}1 \textit{e}8 14 \textit{f}4 \textit{e}3 15 \textit{c}x\textit{e}3 \textit{d}4 16 \textit{h}x\textit{g}5 \textit{h}x\textit{g}5 17 \textit{d}2 \textit{f}6 18 \textit{b}4 \textit{c}5 19 \textit{e}3 20 \textit{d}2 \textit{c}6 21 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}4! = Iosebiani-Espig, 2nd Bundesliga 1998/9.

\textbf{6 \textit{f}3}

\textbf{Or:}

a) 6 g3 \textit{g}7 7 \textit{g}2 \textit{g}7 8 e3 0-0 9 \textit{g}ge2 \textit{c}6 10 \textit{d}d5 \textit{c}5 11 \textit{c}c7+ \textit{xe}7 12 \textit{c}xe7? is refuted by a basic trick: 12...\textit{c}6! 13 \textit{d}x\textit{a}8 \textit{f}3+ 0-1 Dimitriadi-Zakharian, Khania 1995.

b) 6 h3 \textit{g}7 7 \textit{h}2 \textit{f}6 8 g3 0-0 9 \textit{g}2 \textit{d}7 10 \textit{d}d2 is illogical: why did the queen go to \textit{d}1 at all? A standard plan gives Black an active position: 10...\textit{a}6 11 \textit{h}3 \textit{b}8! 12 0-0 b5 13 \textit{c}x\textit{b}5 \textit{ax}b5 14 \textit{c}4 \textit{c}e5 15 \textit{f}1 \textit{c}8 16 \textit{c}d5 \textit{c}x\textit{d}5 17 \textit{c}x\textit{d}5 c6 = Heissen-

\textit{b}üttel-Reicher, Bad Wildbad 1993.

\textbf{c) 6 e4 \textit{g}7 7 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}7 8 f4 0-0 9 \textit{f}3 allows Black to play the thematic possibility 9...\textit{d}d4! 10 \textit{d}2 c6 11 0-0 d5 12 cxd5 exd5 13 e5 \textit{f}5 14 \textit{x}f5 \textit{d}xf5 15 \textit{f}3 d4 16 \textit{e}4 \textit{d}5 17 \textit{d}3 \textit{c}6 with counterplay. Lombardy-

Quinteros, Haifa OL 1976.

6...\textit{g}7 7 \textit{g}5 \textit{f}6!
8...h6 9 a4 h4 0-0 10 e2

Black now starts an active plan that works well here:

10...f5 11 0-0 g5! 12 a3 b3 13 b4 bxa4 14 a4 b3 15 a3 b5 16 c6 bxc5 17 d4 d3 18 gxf5 e5 19 dxe5 fxe5 20 h4 a5 21 a4 a4

Conclusion: 5 w4 is too passive to give Black any real problems.

B)

5 w4 d2 f6 (D)

5...e6?! is also possible; for example, 6 e4 g6 7 b3 h6 8 f4 f5 9 e5 f6 10 exf5 d6 11 e5 e5 12 e5 0-0 12 b2 w7 13 0-0 e5 14 c3 15 d3 16 w3 d3 17 w2 w5 and Black is fine, Christiansen-Blatny, Bremen 1996.

Now White has to choose which fianchettto to start first:

B1: 6 b3 53
B2: 6 g3 56

B1)

6 b3

White is aiming for the basic set-up with b2, g3, b2 followed by h2-f4. Black's best option is to act immediately on the queenside.

6...a5!

Black's general plan usually contains the move ...a4, and here it can be played immediately because of tactical motifs.

The standard plan of development, starting with 6...g6, is of course possible. Play usually continues 7 b2 g7 8 g3 0-0 (D):

w

a) 9 h3 a5 10 f4 is best met by the same general plan: ...c5 and a quick ...a4; for example, 10...e5 11 g2 a4, and now:

a1) 12 0-0 a3 (12...f7!?) 13 c1 c6 14 b1 w5 15 c2 e8 16 d2 w6 17 b1 d5 (17...f5!?) 18 exd5 cxd5 19 f5 xd5 20 xd5 wxe2 21 a1 w5 22 w1 d7 Martin-Mestel, British Ch (Hove) 1997.

a2) 12 d1 axb3 13 axb3 d7 (the alternative 13...f7!?) also appears
b) 9...g2 Qe5! (this move, implementing the plan ...a5-a4, has scored especially well for Black) and now:

b1) 10 Qh3 a5 11 0-0 a4! 12 Rad1 axb3 13 axb3 Qd7 14 Ba1 Qxa1 15 Ra1 Qe5 16 Wd1 c6! 17 Qf4 Qb6 = Czerwonski-Lukin, Miedzybrodzie 1991. Black has used the plan of attacking the b3 weakness very well.

b2) 10 f4 Qd7 11 Qh3 Qc5 12 Qf2 a5 13 0-0 a4 14 b4 a3! 15 Qc1 Qd7 16 Qb1 Qb6 17 Qd3 Qa6 18 Qd5 c6 19 Qxb6 Qxb6 20 Qb3 Qa4 21 Qxa3 Qxa3 = Telljohann-Smyslov, Münster 1993. Here the c4-pawn remains weak, and Black gets good prospects.

b3) 10 Qxf3 Qd7 11 0-0 a5 12 Rad1 Qc5 13 Qd4 Qe8 14 Qa1 h5 15 Qd5 Qxd5 16 cxd5 Wb6 17 Qd3 Qe6 18 Qc2 Qxa1 19 Qxal b5 20 Wh6 zf6 21 Wf4 Qg7 22 Qxf6+ Qxf6 with an equal position, Karpov-Anand, Roquebrune Amber rpd 1992.

We now return to 6...a5 (D): 7 Qh2

7 e4 leads to the same type of positions:

a) 7...a4 has been popular lately, but there are some problems for Black: 8 Qbl axb3 9 axb3 g6 (9...Qe7?! 10 A.d3 0-0 11 A.ge2 A.b4 12 0-0 A.e8 13 A.f4 A.f8 14 A.d1 c6 15 f3 Aa5 16 A.f1 d5? 17 A.h1 A.b6 18 A.a4 Axa4 19 bxa4 dxe4 20 A.a3 c5 21 Ael exf3 22 Axe8 Qxe8 23 gxf3 Wb6 24 Qd1 Qe6 25 Qb2 Qd6 26 Qd5 = Anapolsky-Nevednichy, Bucharest 1994) and then:

a1) 10 g3 Qg7 11 Qg2 0-0 12 Qge2 and here:

a11) 12...Qe6! 13 0-0 Qd7 14 Qd5 Qc5 15 b4 Qa4 16 Qc2 Qe5 17 Acf4 Qd7 18 Qel c6 19 A3 b5 20 cxb5 cxb5 21 Afd5 Qe8 22 Qe2 Qc6 23 Qb3 Qb6 24 Qd1 Qxd5 25 exd5 Qd7 26 Qb2 Qe8 = Bowyer-J.Wells, English corr. Ch 1986.

a12) 12...Qe5 13 f4 (13 0-0 Qh3 14 f3 Qxg2 15 Qxg2 Qf7 16 A.b2 A.c5 17 Qc1 c6 18 f4 Qg4 19 b4 Qa4 20 Qxa4 Qxa4 21 A.xg7 Qxg7 22 Qe2 Qb6 23 Qf3 Qf8 = Tabatadze-Vorotnikov, Belgorod 1989) 13...Qcd7 14 0-0 Qe8 15 b4 Qe7 16 Qd3 Qb6 = Korchnoi-Polugaevsky, Evian Ch (11) 1977.

a2) 10 A.d3 Qg7 11 Qge2 Qb4 12 0-0 0-0 13 Qf4 Qe8 14 Qd1 (14 Qh2?!) 14...Qxd3 15 Qxd3 Qe4! 16
\[ \text{\textit{The text continues with chess moves and analysis.}} \]
\[ \text{\textit{Conclusion:} The active plan on the queenside should give Black enough play in this line.} \]

6 g3 \( (D) \)

White’s general plan is usually to fianchetto both bishops and then to develop the g1-knight by, for example, \( g3-h3-f4 \).

6...\( \text{\textbf{Ae6}} \)!

Black constantly seeks tactical possibilities. It is best to start by attacking the c4-pawn at once.

6...a5!? is another option: 7 \( \text{g2} a4 \) 8 \( \text{xf3} \) (8 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{e5} \) 9 \( \text{c2} c6 \) 10 \( \text{xf4} \) \( g6 \) 11 \( \text{gh3} \) \( g7 \) 12 0-0 0-0 13 \( \text{d2} \) \( f5 \) 14 \( \text{c1} h6 \) 15 \( f3 \) \( b6+ \) 16 \( \text{f2} \) \( d4 \) + Khosanov-Vorotnikov, Alushta 1993) 8...\( g6 \) 9 \( \text{d4} \) \( e5 \) 10 \( \text{c2} a3 \) 11 \( b3 \) \( g7 \) 12 0-0 0-0 13 \( \text{db5} \) \( f5 \) 14 \( \text{e4} \) \( g4 \) 15 \( f3 \) \( c6 \) 16 \( \text{xa3} \) \( b6+ \) 17 \( \text{h1} \) \( e6 \) 18 \( \text{b2} \) \( b4 \) 19 \( \text{a1} a1 \) d5 is
total chaos with Black having the initiative, Hermel-Komliakov, Manila OL 1992.

Now (after 6...\(\text{\textit{\text{e}}6\)):

\begin{align*}
B21: & \quad 7 \text{\textit{\text{d}}5} \quad 57 \\
B22: & \quad 7 \text{\textit{\text{e}}4} \quad 59
\end{align*}

7 \text{\textit{\text{b}}3 \text{\textit{\text{d}}5}}! gives Black the initiative: 8 \text{\textit{\text{cxd}}5 \text{\textit{\text{cxd}}5}} 9 \text{\textit{\text{b}}2 \text{\textit{\text{dxb}}4}!? (9...\text{\textit{\text{b}}4 is also safe for Black}) 10 \text{\textit{\text{f}}3 \text{\textit{\text{xf}}d2}+ 11 \text{\textit{\text{d}}d2 \text{\textit{\text{d}}d8}+ 12 \text{\textit{\text{e}}1 \text{\textit{\text{e}}7} 13 \text{\textit{\text{a}}3 \text{\textit{\text{a}}5}} 14 \text{\textit{\text{axb}}4 \text{\textit{\text{xb}}3}+ 15 \text{\textit{\text{c}}2 \text{\textit{\text{xa}}1}+ 16 \text{\textit{\text{d}}1} \text{\textit{\text{dxb}}4} \mp \text{Schacher-Z.Lehmann, Siofoi jr Ech 1996.}

\begin{align*}
\text{B21)} \\
7 \text{\textit{\text{d}}5} (D)
\end{align*}

Black could try 10...\text{\textit{\text{e}}4}!? 11 \text{\textit{\text{f}}4 \text{f}5 with some active play.

b) 7...\text{\textit{\text{g}}6 8 \text{\textit{\text{b}}3 \text{\textit{\text{g}}7} 9 \text{\textit{\text{b}}2} \text{\textit{\text{0-0 leads}}}} to the same position-type as in Line B1. After 10 \text{\textit{\text{g}}2 White has slightly the better game, though Black’s position is quite stable:

\begin{align*}
b1) & \quad 10...\text{\textit{\text{e}}8 11 \text{\textit{\text{d}}d1}?! (11 \text{\textit{\text{e}}3 \text{\textit{\text{e}}5}} 12 \text{\textit{\text{e}}2 \text{\textit{\text{c}}6} = \text{\textit{\text{L}}e}v\text{\textit{\text{t}}t-\text{\textit{\text{S}}pe\text{\textit{\text{c}}lm\text{\textit{\text{n}}an}, \text{\textit{\text{D}}ublin Z 1993}) 11...\text{\textit{\text{a}}5 12 \text{\textit{\text{h}}3} \text{\textit{\text{a}}4} 13 \text{\textit{\text{h}}f4 \text{\textit{\text{e}}5} (13...\text{\textit{\text{axb}}3}?! ) 14 \text{\textit{\text{xe}}5 \text{\textit{\text{dxe}}5} 15 \text{\textit{\text{xe}}6 \text{\textit{\text{xe}}6} 16 \text{\textit{\text{xf}}6}+ \text{\textit{\text{xf}}6} 17 \text{\textit{\text{x}}b7 \text{\textit{\text{xe}}8} 18 \text{\textit{\text{d}}5 \text{\textit{\text{eb}}6} 19 \text{\textit{\text{c}}5 ± \text{Cv\text{\textit{\text{e}}t\text{\textit{\text{k}}o\text{\textit{\text{v}}}-\text{\textit{\text{J}}o\text{\textit{\text{n}}s\text{\textit{\text{n}}}}\text{\textit{\text{e}}, \text{\textit{\text{K}}o\text{\textit{\text{r}}i\text{\textit{\text{t}}o}} 1998).}

b2) & \quad 10...\text{\textit{\text{a}}5 11 \text{\textit{\text{h}}3} \text{\textit{\text{e}}8 12 \text{\textit{\text{h}}f4} \text{\textit{\text{cxd}}5} 13 \text{\textit{\text{cxd}}5 \text{\textit{\text{cxd}}5} 14 \text{\textit{\text{cxd}}5 \text{\textit{\text{a}}2} 15 \text{\textit{\text{xb}}2 \text{\textit{\text{b}}4} 16 \text{\textit{\text{e}}0} \text{\textit{\text{e}}7} 17 \text{\textit{\text{e}}1} \text{\textit{\text{c}}6} 18 \text{\textit{\text{e}}c1 \text{\textit{\text{e}}5} 19 \text{\textit{\text{d}}2 \text{f}5 20 \text{\textit{\text{c}}3} \text{\textit{\text{g}}7} 21 \text{\textit{\text{e}}c1 \text{\textit{\text{e}}7} 22 \text{\textit{\text{c}}2} \text{\textit{\text{h}}8} 23 \text{e}3 ± \text{N\text{\textit{\text{a}}u\text{\textit{\text{m}}}}\text{\textit{\text{n}}}\text{\textit{\text{a}}}-\text{\textit{\text{W}}e\text{\textit{\text{i}}l}, \text{\textit{\text{G}}i\text{\textit{\text{e}}s\text{\textit{\text{e}}n} 1991.}

\begin{align*}
8 \text{\textit{\text{b}}3 (D)
\end{align*}

8...\text{\textit{\text{e}}4}!

With this move, Black relies on tactical devices.

8...\text{\textit{\text{e}}7 is also playable. 9 \text{\textit{\text{g}}2 \text{\textit{\text{c}}6} 10 \text{\textit{\text{x}}e7 (10 \text{\textit{\text{xf}}6+ \text{\textit{\text{x}}f6} 11 \text{\textit{\text{b}}2} \text{\textit{\text{b}}6} 12 \text{\textit{\text{b}}1} \text{\textit{\text{0-0}} 13 \text{\textit{\text{f}}3 \text{\textit{\text{xf}}3+ 14}
\textit{xf3} \textit{xb2} 15 \textit{wb2} \textit{h3} 16 \textit{e3} \textit{fe8} 17 \textit{e2} d5 18 \textit{h1} dxc4 19 bxc4 \textit{c5} 20 \textit{b4} \textit{f5} ! Koutsis-Czerwonski, Frydek-Mistek 1994) 10...\textit{xe7} 11 \textit{a3} \textit{d8} 12 \textit{f4} \textit{g6} 13 0-0 0-0 c5 14 e4 \textit{c8} 15 \textit{e2} \textit{xe4} 16 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 17 \textit{c3} \textit{f5} 18 \textit{h1} e6 19 \textit{e4} 0-0 20 \textit{d6} \textit{h3} 21 \textit{f2} \textit{g4} 22 \textit{d2} b6 23 \textit{f5} \textit{h4}! was unclear in Lligterink- Timman, Wijk aan Zee 1985.

9 \textit{e3}

9 \textit{d4} is an improvement, but Black is OK after 9...
\textit{c5} 9...
\textit{f5}? 10 \textit{g2} \textit{g6}, Kristiansen-Reinert, Denmark 1985, is also possible, but 11 \textit{xf4} is hard to meet) 10 \textit{xf4} \textit{c6} 11 \textit{e3} \textit{e7} 12 \textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 13 \textit{b2} 0-0-0 and now:

a) 14 \textit{xe7}+ \textit{he8} 15 \textit{ab2} (15 \textit{c3} d5! 16 \textit{d1} dxc4 \textit{f}; 15 \textit{wc3} \textit{xe4} 16 \textit{wd3} d5 gives Black an attack) 15...\textit{db4} 16 \textit{wd2} \textit{f5} ?

b) 14 \textit{xf3} \textit{he8} 15 \textit{c4} \textit{xd4} 16 \textit{xd4} \textit{d7} 17 \textit{ec3} \textit{h3}! (17...\textit{he6} 18 \textit{d1} \textit{g4} 19 \textit{wc2}, Taimanov-Smyslov, USSR Ch (Tbilisi) 1966/7, 19...g6 \textit{f} 18 0-0 0-0 (18 \textit{xe7}? \textit{xf1} 19 \textit{xf1} f6! wins for Black) 18...\textit{xe7} 19 \textit{xe7} \textit{f5} 20 \textit{he1} \textit{he8} 21 \textit{dxh7} \textit{c8} 22 \textit{wxa7} \textit{f5} 23 \textit{gxa7} \textit{f5} 24 \textit{wxh7} \textit{xc2} 25 \textit{wd2} \textit{g5} 26 \textit{eb1} \textit{c3} 27 \textit{es5} \textit{c5} with an equal position, Janjgava-Lymar, Poli- cka 1993) 16 \textit{xc1} \textit{xe1}+ 17 \textit{xb1} \textit{b4}+ 18 \textit{ab2} \textit{xd2}+ 19 \textit{wd2} \textit{g4} 20 \textit{he3} \textit{b7} 21 \textit{f3} \textit{c8} 22 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 23 \textit{xf4} \textit{d6} 24 \textit{f3} \textit{g5} 25 \textit{es5} \textit{xc1} 26 \textit{xc1} g5 27 \textit{eg2} d4 \textit{f} Jakobsen-Laursen, corr. 1992.

9...\textit{c5} (D)

9...\textit{c6} also favours Black. 10 \textit{exe4} cxd5 11 cxd5 \textit{a5}+ 12 \textit{xe2} and now:

a) 12...\textit{xd5} 13 \textit{wd4} (or 13 \textit{xc5} \textit{xe4} 14 \textit{f3} \textit{c6} 15 \textit{g2} \textit{e7} with equality, Ftačník-Timman, Wijk aan Zee 1985) 13...\textit{wb6} 14 \textit{g3} \textit{g5}? 15 \textit{f5} \textit{g7} 16 \textit{c1} 0-0 17 \textit{g2} (17 \textit{g5} \textit{f8} gives Black sufficient compensation) 17...\textit{fe8} 18 \textit{xe7}+ \textit{f8} 19 \textit{xe7}+ 0-0

10 \textit{xb2}

10 \textit{g2}? is probably the last chance for White to bail out from the complications. Black should then play 10...\textit{c6} 11 \textit{cc3} \textit{a5} according to Kasparov.

10...\textit{c6} 11 \textit{g4}

It is too late for 11 \textit{c3} according to Kasparov; 11...\textit{g4} 12 \textit{d4} \textit{e7} ? 11...\textit{g4}!
11...\=e7!? 12 \=dxe6 \=dxe6 13 \=h3 \=f6 14 \=dxe6 \=xe6 15 \=h3?! (15 f4!? might be a better try) 15...0-0 16 0-0 \=b6 17 \=e4 d5 18 \=c2 \=ae8 19 \=ad1 \=g4 20 \=xf6 \=xf6 21 \=g5 h6 22 \=f3 \=e4 23 \=e2 \=f6 24 \=g2 \=ef8 25 \=d4 \=xd4 26 \=xd4 g5 \=f Smejkal-Rogoff, Amsterdam 1980.

12 \=d4

12 \=dxe6 \=dxe3 13 \=xd8 \=c2+ 14 \=d1 \=xa1 15 \=xf7 \=xf7 16 \=xa1 \=e7 \=f Kasparov.

12...\=e4! 13 \=h3

Or:
a) 13 \=e4 \=a5+ 14 \=d1 \=xf2+ -

b) 13 \=d3 d5 14 cxd5 \=xd5 15 \=f3 c5 16 \=a4+ \=c6 17 \=c4 \=a5+! (17...b5 is also good; 18 \=c2 c4 19 0-0-0, A.Schneider-Z.Lehmann, Budapest 1995, 19...\=ce8 \=f18b4 cxb4 -)

13...\=a5+ 14 \=f1 \=gxh2

Black is winning, Hübner-Kasparov, Hamburg (1) 1985. The game concluded 15 \=xe6 fxe6 16 \=xe6 \=d7 17 \=h3 \=xh3 18 \=xe4 \=e8 19 \=c5+ \=g4+ \=e7 20 \=xh3 \=c7 22 \=xg7 \=hf8+ 23 \=xf8 \=xf8+ 24 \=e1 \=f2+ 25 \=d1 \=d4+ 26 \=c2 \=e4+ 27 \=d2 \=g5+ 28 \=c3 \=e5+ 0-1.

**Conclusion:** This classic game is a good illustration of Black's tactical methods of solving his opening problems.

B22)

7 e4 (D)

Black also has many different tactical plans in this variation, and the most spectacular of them is the main line.
\[ \text{8 f3} \]

\[ \text{Otherwise:} \]

\[ \text{a) } 8 \text{ \#e2}! ? \text{ is a suggested improvement, to stop the tactics.} \]

\[ \text{b) } 8 \text{ b3 runs into the thematic } 8...\text{\#xe4! 9 \#xe4 d5 (D), when White has to try to survive:} \]

\[ \text{\#w} \]

\[ \text{b1) } 10 \text{ \#xd5? \#xd5 11 f3 \#b4 12 \#c3 \#xg2} \]

\[ \text{b2) } 10 \#c3? \text{ d4 11 \#ge2 dxc3 12 \#xc3 \#xd2+ 13 \#xd2 \#d4 14 \#b5} \]

\[ \text{b3) } 10 \#g2! \text{ is best, though Black is better after } 10...\#b4 \text{ (10...dxe4? 11 \#xe4 =)} 11 \#c3 \text{ d4:} \]

\[ \text{b31) } 12 \#ge2 dxc3 13 \#xc3 \#xd2+ 14 \#xd2 \#e5! 15 \#xb7 (15 0-0?? 0-0-0 16 \#e1? \#d3=) 15...\#d8 with more than enough compensation.} \]
b32) 12 \(\text{\textit{b}}\text{b}2 \text{f}6\) \(\text{\textit{c}}\text{e}2 0-0-0\) 14 \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{c}1 \text{dxc}3! \) 15 \(\text{\textit{x}}\text{xc}3 \text{\textit{e}}5! \) 16 \(\text{\textit{x}}\text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6 17 \text{\textit{x}}\text{xb}4 \) \(17 \text{\textit{w}}\text{e}3 \text{\textit{xe}}3 18 \text{\textit{fxe}}3 \text{\textit{xc}}3+ 19 \text{\textit{xc}}3 \text{\textit{hd}}3 20 \text{\textit{dd}}1 \text{\textit{hd}}8 =+) 17...\text{\textit{h}}3! \uparrow\) Franco-Romero, Leon 1990.

8...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}7?? \) \((D)\)

8...0-0 is a safe option; for example, 9 b3 a5 10 \(\text{\textit{g}}\text{e}2 \) a4 11 \(\text{\textit{b}}\text{b}1 \text{axb}3 12 \text{axb}3 \text{\textit{e}}5 (12...\text{\textit{d}}7?? 13 \text{\textit{g}}2 \text{f}5 \) is possible) 13 \(\text{\textit{g}}2 \text{\textit{h}}3 14 0-0 \text{\textit{xg}}2 15 \text{\textit{xg}}2 \text{\textit{e}}8 16 \text{\textit{b}}2 \text{f}8 17 \text{\textit{bd}}1 \text{c}6 18 \text{\textit{w}}\text{c}2 \text{\textit{c}}7 \) and White has only a minimal advantage, Bareev-Mokry, Trnava 1989.

W

9 \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}5\)

White forgets to develop. 9 b3!? is possible.

9...0-0 10 \(\text{\textit{g}}\text{g}2 \text{f}5 11 \text{\textit{exf}}5\)

Or: 11 \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e}2 \text{f}xe4 12 \text{\textit{fxe}}4 \text{\textit{de}}5 \uparrow; 11 \text{\textit{f}}4 \text{\textit{dc}}5 12 \text{\textit{exf}}5 \text{\textit{xf}}5 \uparrow; 11 \text{\textit{h}}3 \text{\textit{ce}}5 12 \text{\textit{xf}}5 \text{\textit{xf}}5 13 \text{\textit{xf}}5 \text{\textit{xf}}5\) with an attack.

11...\(\text{\textit{xf}}5 12 \text{\textit{de}}3 \text{\textit{e}}6 13 \text{\textit{f}}4\)

The following opening of lines is quite effective.

13...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}5! 14 \text{\textit{xd}}\text{xd}5 \text{\textit{e}}8 15 \text{\textit{f}}3\)

15 \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e}2 \text{\textit{g}}4 \) = .

15...\(\text{\textit{c}}\text{c}5 16 \text{\textit{f}}1\)

16 \(\text{\textit{wd}}1 \text{\textit{f}}6 17 \text{\textit{xf}}6+ \text{\textit{wx}}\text{xf}6 18 \text{\textit{wc}}2 \text{\textit{g}}4 19 \text{\textit{wd}}2 \text{\textit{dd}}4 20 \text{\textit{wd}}3 \text{\textit{ad}}8 \) = .

16...\(\text{\textit{b}}\text{b}6!\)

Black has a very strong attack, and won quickly in Psakhis-Gofshtein, Israel 1996: 17 \(\text{\textit{g}}5 \text{\textit{f}}5! 18 \text{\textit{b}}3 \text{\textit{b}}4 19 \text{\textit{f}}3 \text{\textit{xd}}\text{x}5 20 \text{\textit{xd}}\text{x}5+ \text{\textit{xd}}\text{x}5 21 \text{\textit{xd}}\text{x}5+ \text{\textit{xd}}\text{x}5 22 \text{\textit{ex}}\text{xd}5 \text{\textit{dd}}4 0-1.

Conclusion: The tactics in this line are even more spectacular, but generally it is Black who has the initiative.
9 3 ♕c3 exd4 4 ♕xd4 ♕f6

In this chapter we study the position after...

1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 ♕c3 exd4 4 ♕xd4 ♕f6 (D)

A: 5 ♕g5 62
B: 5 e4 63
C: 5 b3 64
D: 5 g3 65

5 ♕xf3 is a rather planless move, and Black easily secures good activity:

a) After 5...g6 various transpositions are possible, but note that 6 ♕g5 ♕g7 7 ♕e3+ is not dangerous: 7...♕f8 8 g3 h6 9 ♕xf6 ♖xf6 10 ♕g2 ♕c6 11 0-0 ♕g7 12 ♕ad1 ♕e8 13 ♕c1 ♕xc3 14 ♕xc3+ ♕f6 15 ♕xf6+ ♕xf6 16 ♕d2 a5 = Aleksandrov-Belikov, Voskresensk 1993.

b) 5...♕c6 6 ♕d2 ♕e6 7 e4 (7 c3 is met by an active break in the centre: 7...d5! 8 ♕g5 ♕b4 9 a3 ♕xc3 10 ♕xc3 0-0 11 ♕e2 ♕g4 12 ♕f3 ♕e8 13 0-0 ♕e5 14 ♕xe5 ♕xe5 15 ♕e1 ♕e4 16 ♕c2 ♕xe5 17 ♕xe2 dx4 18 ♕xc4 ♕h4 19 ♗g3 ♕f6 20 ♗f4 ♕e7 = Uhlmann-Klinger, Szirak 1985) 7...♕e5 8 b3 (8 ♕xe5 dx5 9 ♕c2 ♕c5 =) 8...♕xf3+ 9 gxf3 g6 10 ♕b2 ♕g7 11 ♕c2 0-0 12 ♕d1 ♕e8 13 ♕b5 a6 14 ♕d4 ♕d7 =. In Hirzel-Markowski, Berne 1996 the end was very quick: 15 ♕c1 ♕e7 16 ♕d3 ♕h3 17 ♕c2 ♕g2 0-1.

A)

5 ♕g5 (D)

The bishop gets to g5 without delay, pinning the knight, and a later ♕d2
has more point, as it will no longer shut in the bishop on c1.
5...\textit{Qe7}

5...\textit{Qc6} 6 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qe6} 7 e4 h6 8 \textit{Qe3}
\textit{Qe}5 9 b3 \textit{Qeg}4 10 \textit{Qd}4 e5 11 \textit{Qxf}6
\textit{Qxf}6 12 \textit{Qge}2 g6 13 g3 \textit{Qg}7 14 \textit{Qg}2
0-0 15 \textit{Qd}1! a6 (15...\textit{Qc}8?!?) 16 \textit{Qxd}6
\textit{Qa}5 17 \textit{Qd}2 b5 (17...\textit{Qfd}8 18 \textit{Qd}5 \pm)
18 \textit{Qd}5 \textit{Qxd}2+ 19 \textit{Qxd}2 \pm Lautier-

6 e3

6 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qc}6 7 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qg}4 disrupts
White a little, though after 8 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Qe}5
9 e4 h6 10 \textit{Qe}3 \textit{Qd}7 11 f4 \textit{Qc}6 12 h3
\textit{Qh}5 13 \textit{Qf}5 \textit{Qg}6 14 g4 0-0 0-0 15
0-0-0 h5 16 \textit{Qc}2 White had nothing
to complain about in Bosboom Lanco-

6...0-0

6...\textit{Qc}6?! 7 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qe}6 8 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qe}5!
is an alternative, as the central symmetry
that arises is welcome for Black: 9
\textit{Qxe}5 dxe5 10 \textit{Qc}2 c6 11 \textit{Qe}2 0-0
1/2-1/2 Flear-Davies, Tel-Aviv 1989.

7 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qc}6 8 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qf}5

8...h6 9 h4 \textit{Qg}4 (9...\textit{Qf}5 10 \textit{Qe}2
\textit{Qe}4 11 \textit{Qxe}7 1/2-1/2 Grivas-Jansa,
Gausdal 1993) 10 \textit{Qe}2 \textit{Qd}7 11 \textit{Qd}1

\textit{Qf}6 12 0-0 a6 13 \textit{Qre}1 \textit{Qad}8 14 b3
\textit{Qc}8 15 \textit{Qc}1 = Gasthofer-Obodchuk,
Pardubice 1993.

9 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qxd}3 10 \textit{Qx}d3 \textit{Qe}5
10...h6!?.

11 \textit{Qxe}5

11 \textit{Qc}2?!?

11...\textit{Qxe}5 12 \textit{Qf}5 \textit{Qe}8 13 \textit{Qxe}7
\textit{Qxe}7 14 \textit{Qd}5
14 0-0 \textit{Qd}6 15 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qfd}8 =.
14...\textit{Qd}6 15 0-0 \textit{c}6

White has a minimal advantage,
which he managed to exploit in Sei-
ra-Wan-Benjamin, USA Ch (Salt
Lake City) 1999. Generally, however, Black
should hold.

Conclusion: White's additional possi-
ibility with \textit{Qg}5 and \textit{Qd}2 is not
to extremely dangerous, but there is no clear
reason for Black to allow it.

B)

5 e4 (D)

5...\textit{Qc}6

5...g6?! 6 \textit{Qe}3 \textit{Qg}7 7 \textit{Qd}2 0-0 8 \textit{f}3
(this position can arise from a rare
sideline of the Sämisch King’s Indian)
8...e6 9 d1 bd7 10 b3 c6 11 gce2
wa5 12 d4 ad8 13 ae2 e5 14
0-0 c5 15 ec2 ec8 16 a4 wxd2 17
xd2 c5, Douven-Miles, Wijk aan
Zee 1989.

6 wd1!? 
White tries maintain a grip on the
centre and a slight space advantage.

6 wd2 gives Black time to pursue
his usual plans successfully. 6...ae7, and now:

a) 7 ad3 0-0 8 b3 we8 9 gce2 a5 10
b2 af8 11 f3 db4! 12 ed1 edx3+
13 wxd3 ed7! 14 0-0 ec5 15 wd4 c6
16 a3 we7 17 df4 wg5 18 edx3 ae4!
19 ecx5 dxe5 20 wd3 ah3 21 we2
xg2 22 wxg2 we3+ 23 wh1 wxc3 =

b) 7 df3 0-0 8 ae2 we8 9 0-0
df8 10 wc2 ag4 11 ae3 de5 12
dxe5 dxe5 13 ffd1 we8 14 f3 ae6 15
d5 ed7 16 a3 a5! = Zedek-Novak,
Bratislava 1991. Black's idea is 17 b3
c6 18 db6 db6 19 xb6 c5! =

6...ae6 
6...g6 7 ad3 ag7 8 gce2 0-0 9 ac2
± gives White a stable pawn-centre.

7 df3 g6 
7...de5 8 edx4 ±.

8 h3 ag7 9 ae3 0-0 10 ae2 d7
10...de5 11 edx2 ±.

11 0-0 
11 ec1 de5 12 h3 dxf3+ 13 af3
c6 is not a problem for Black.
11...db6 12 ad5!

White is forced to start tactical op-
ations, since the c4-pawn is weak.
However, it is hard to say who is closer
to getting an advantage in the forcing
lines.

12...xb2 13 g5 f6 14 ah6 xa1
15 xf8 xf8

The game is unclear, I.Sokolov-

Conclusion: 5 e4 leads to a sharp
fight in the centre, but Black has sur-

5 b3 (D)

5...g6 
Black can also develop his kingside
quickly, trying to use the exposed posi-
tion of the white queen to his advan-
tage.

6 ab2 
6 ed5 ag7 7 ah6 has been tried
once, leading to a short forced draw:
7...xh6 (7...0-0!? ) 8 dxg6+ wf8 9
d7+ ag8 10 df6+ wh8 11 ed7+
wh7 12 df6+ 1/2-1/2 Touzane-Bricard,
French Ch (Auxerre) 1996.

6...ag7 7 g3 
After 7 ed5?! db7 8 wc3+ Black
has to move his king, but it turns out
that White's loss of time is more
significant, and grants Black a strong initiative: 8...\$f8 9 \$c3 (9 \$f3?! \$xd5 10 \$xg7+ \$xg7 11 \$xd5 \$f6 12 \$c1 \$b6 \parallel 13 \$d2 \$f5 14 \$xc7 \$ae8 1.5 \$xc8 \$xc8 gave Black an attack in Grotnes-Jansa, Gausdal 1992) 9...\$c5 10 \$xf3?! \$f5 11 \$d4?!., Ornstein-Ree, Budapest 1977, and now Black has the surprising and strong 11...\$g4!.

7...0-0 8 \$g2 \$e8 9 \$d2 \$bd7

This is the starting point for Black’s positional plan, which consists of moves like ...\$c5, ...a5, ...c6 and later either ...a4 or ...\$e4.

10 \$h3

10 \$f3 transposes to note ‘d21’ to Black’s 2nd move in Line A of Chapter 18.

10...\$c5 11 0-0

Or:

a) 11 \$f4 a5 12 \$d1 a4 13 b4 \$cd7 14 \$cd5 \$xd5 15 \$xd5 \$e5 16 \$e3 a3 17 \$c3 \$g4 with counterplay, Odessky-Tregubov, St Petersburg 1996.

b) 11 f3 d5 12 0-0-0 c6 13 cxd5 cxd5 14 g4 \$d7 15 e3 \$e8 16 \$f2 \$h6 17 \$d1 \$c7 18 \$fd1 d4 19 \$xd4 \$g7 20 \$bl \$ed8 \parallel Quinteros-Ree, Amsterdam 1973.

11...a5 12 \$ad1 a4 13 b4 \$ce4 14 \$xe4 \$xe4 15 \$c2 \$xb2 16 \$xb2 a3!

Black makes full use of his far-advanced pawn. After 17 \$b3 \$xh3! 18 \$xh3 \$f6 19 \$d3 \$b2 20 \$el c5 21 f3 \$xb3 22 \$xb3 \$d2 23 \$d3 \$xc4 Black was winning in Wiedenkeller-Arnason, Helsinki 1986.

Conclusion: Black’s general plans seem to work well if White just develops with normal moves.

D)

5 g3 g6

5...\$c6 is more precise, and will transpose to lines of Chapter 8.

6 \$g2

6 \$e3+ \$e6 7 \$h3 (Zaichik-Ehlvest, Komotini 1992) 7...\$e7 8 \$g2 \$c8 9 \$f4 \$xc4 10 b3 gives White enough compensation according to Ehlvest.

6...\$g7 7 \$e3+!

This move seems to give Black some problems, as his development is disrupted.

7...\$f8

7...\$e7 8 \$xe7+ \$xe7 leads to an endgame, but one where White maintains an edge: 9 b3 a5 10 \$b2 c6 11 \$a4! \$e6 12 \$f3 \$bd7 13 \$d4 \$hc8 14 0-0 \parallel Kasparov-Short, Barcelona 1989.

8 \$f3 \$bd7 9 0-0 \$h6 10 b3 \$g8 11 \$b2 \$h7 12 \$ad1 \$e8 13 \$c1!

White is a little better. His positional plans in Ribli-Mokry, Vienna 1991 proved that Black has some problems.

Conclusion: Black has not found a clear way to counter the disruptive 7 \$e3+.
In this chapter we study the other 3rd moves for White after 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5. We focus our attention upon 3 dxe5, 3 d5 and 3 e3.

The endgame arising after 3 dxe5 dxe5 4 \texttt{wx}xd8+ \texttt{xd}xd8 favours Black. The fact that White has played c4 turns out to represent a significant weakness, as d4 and some dark squares on the queenside are controlled by Black. Black gets a good endgame with plans like ...c6 and ...\texttt{c}c7, ...f6 and ...\texttt{h}h6-f7, ...a5, ...\texttt{d}d7-c5 and ...\texttt{e}e6. The black king is useful in the centre, as long as White doesn’t have too many open lines against it.

With the move 3 d5, White is aiming for King’s Indian-type positions with a closed centre and some space advantage. This diagram shows a basic position from 3...\texttt{g}g6 where Black has simply developed, delaying the ...f5 pawn-break.

The other positional plan for White, typical of King’s Indian positions in which Black has played the thematic ...f5, is the use of the e4 outpost. In the following diagram, Black has left White in total control of the light squares, and in particular the e4-knight is very strong. Black has no active play and can only wait passively.
In our main line, 3 d5 f5, the play focuses on the e4-square (see diagram above). White can try to build a positional stronghold, but Black has some means of fighting back, as there are enough black pieces to support c4. If White tries to attack the g6-bishop with 9 h4, then this pawn may become weak. And if White takes on f6, then Black can take back with the pawn, keeping the centre fluid. This latter plan has been topical in grandmaster games recently.

After 3 e3 the plans are usually highly reminiscent of the plans against the English Opening, as the white set-up with g3 and e3 is quite passive. White may transform the game to some other position-types, but Black has no problems with them either. The endgame positions after, for example, 3...f5 4 dxe5 are also a thematic possibility here.

1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 (D)

Now:
A: 3 dxe5 67
B: 3 d5 70
C: 3 e3 74

A)

3 dxe5 dxe5 4 ♕xd8+

This queenless middlegame is not dangerous for Black, as his king will
be quite well placed on c7 and Black has the useful outpost d4 available because of White’s early pawn advance c4. It is worth comparing this variation to other relevant endings in this book, as here the move c4 proves to be clearly useless for White.

4 \[\mathcal{c}2\] offers White nothing special. Black can just develop: 4...\[\mathcal{c}6\] 5 e3 g6 (5...\[\mathcal{b}4\]? led to some fun in Rajić-Wockenfuss, Munich 1992: 6 \[\mathcal{e}3\] \[\mathcal{e}6\]! 7 a3 \[\mathcal{c}6\] 8 \[\mathcal{d}2\] a5 9 \[\mathcal{d}3\] \[\mathcal{c}5\] 10 \[\mathcal{c}2\] 0-0 11 \[\mathcal{g}3\] \[\mathcal{g}4\] 12 \[\mathcal{h}3\] \[\mathcal{xf}2\] 13 \[\mathcal{xf}2\] f5 14 \[\mathcal{gf}1\] f4 15 \[\mathcal{f}3\] fxe3+ 16 \[\mathcal{xe}3\] \[\mathcal{d}4\] with a messy position) 6 a3 \[\mathcal{g}7\] 7 \[\mathcal{c}3\] \[\mathcal{f}6\] 8 \[\mathcal{d}2\] 0-0 9 0-0-0 (now Black is ready to take the initiative) 9...\[\mathcal{f}5\] 10 e4 \[\mathcal{d}4\] 11 \[\mathcal{d}3\] \[\mathcal{e}6\] 12 \[\mathcal{b}1\] \[\mathcal{d}7\] 13 h4 \[\mathcal{b}6\] 14 \[\mathcal{d}5\] c6 15 \[\mathcal{xb}6\] axb6 16 h5 b5 17 cxb5 \[\mathcal{xb}5\] 18 \[\mathcal{g}3\] \[\mathcal{w}b6\] 19 \[\mathcal{xb}5\] \[\mathcal{xb}5\] 20 \[\mathcal{h}3\] \[\mathcal{f}8\] 21 \[\mathcal{c}1\] \[\mathcal{c}4\] = Medina-Bermejo Collado, Spanish Ch 1993.

4...\[\mathcal{xd}8\] (D)

5 \[\mathcal{d}f3\]

Or:

a) 5 f4?! aims to open the position, but leads to a chaotic pawn-formation for White after 5...\[\mathcal{b}4\]+ 6 \[\mathcal{c}3\] \[\mathcal{x}c3\]+ 7 bxc3 \[\mathcal{e}6\] 8 fxe5 \[\mathcal{e}7\] 9 \[\mathcal{f}3\] h6 10 e4(10 \[\mathcal{d}4\]?) 10...c5 ≈ Janakiev-Popchev, Podgorica 1991.

b) 5 g3 \[\mathcal{e}6\] 6 \[\mathcal{g}2\] c6 7 b3 \[\mathcal{a}6\] 8 a3 \[\mathcal{c}5\] 9 \[\mathcal{d}2\] a5! 10 \[\mathcal{b}2\] f6 11 \[\mathcal{gf}3\] \[\mathcal{h}6\] 12 0-0 \[\mathcal{f}7\] 13 \[\mathcal{e}1\] \[\mathcal{c}7\] and Black has everything under control, Kliewe-Hennings, Neubrandenburg 1998.

c) 5 c4 c6 6 \[\mathcal{f}3\] f6 7 \[\mathcal{e}3\] \[\mathcal{a}6\] 8 \[\mathcal{c}3\] \[\mathcal{c}7\] 0-0-0 \[\mathcal{e}6\] 10 \[\mathcal{e}2\] \[\mathcal{e}7\] 11 \[\mathcal{d}2\] \[\mathcal{g}6\] 12 g3 \[\mathcal{h}3\]? = is the basic queenless middlegame, with White’s bishop on e3 performing no special role, Belokon-Agrest, Ostlersk 1994.

d) 5 \[\mathcal{d}c3\] is the other main move, when transpositions to the main line are highly likely, but there are also some independent ideas: 5...\[\mathcal{e}6\] 6 b3 \[\mathcal{d}7\] 7 g3 c6 (7...\[\mathcal{b}4\] 8 \[\mathcal{d}2\] c6 9 \[\mathcal{h}3\] \[\mathcal{h}3\] 10 \[\mathcal{h}3\] h6 11 \[\mathcal{f}3\] \[\mathcal{gf}6\] 12 \[\mathcal{f}2\] \[\mathcal{a}3\] 13 \[\mathcal{d}1\] \[\mathcal{c}7\] 14 e3, Gheorghiu-Miles, Ostend 1988, 14...\[\mathcal{h}8\] =) 8 \[\mathcal{h}3\] \[\mathcal{h}3\] 9 \[\mathcal{h}3\] and then:

d1) 9...h6 10 \[\mathcal{b}2\] \[\mathcal{gf}6\] 11 f3 \[\mathcal{c}5\] 12 \[\mathcal{f}2\] \[\mathcal{e}8\] 13 \[\mathcal{e}4\] \[\mathcal{xe}4\] 14 \[\mathcal{xe}4\] \[\mathcal{b}4\] 15 \[\mathcal{c}3\] \[\mathcal{x}c3\] 16 \[\mathcal{xc}3\] \[\mathcal{c}7\]
17 0-0-0 Ʌc5 is a very drawish position, and Black was even playing for win after 18 Ʌd2 Ʌad8 19 Ʌxd8 Ʌxd8 20 Ʌd1 Ʌe8 21 Ʌc2 f5 22 h4 a5 in Michenka-Mokry, Czech Republic 1992. 

d2) 9...Ʌg6 10 f3 Ʌb4 11 Ʌd2 Ʌe7 is also a quiet position, in which White’s idea 12 g4?! proved to be wrong after 12...Ʌc5 13 g5 Ʌfd7 14 Ʌd5+ cxd5 15 Ʌxb4 Ʌxc4 16 Ʌc1 a5! 17 Ʌxc5+ (17 Ʌa3 b5 18 bxc4 b4 Ʌ) 17...Ʌxc5 18 Ʌxc4 Ʌac8 19 Ʌd2 b5! 20 Ʌc2 Ʌhd8+ 21 Ʌe3 Ʌa6 22 Ʌhc1 Ʌxc2 23 Ʌxc2 Ʌb4 24 Ʌc5 Ʌd5! 25 Ʌxd5 Ʌxd5+ 26 Ʌd2 b4 Ʌ in Meulders-Seret, Lyons 1990. 

5...f6 6 Ʌc3 (D)

6...Ʌe6

Black’s plan consists of moves like ...f6 and ...c6 to take control of the centre, ...Ʌe6 and ...Ʌd7 to develop, and ...Ʌc7 to place the king on a good square. 

6...Ʌa6 7 Ʌd2 Ʌe6 8 e3 Ʌc5 9 0-0-0 Ʌh6 allows White an active plan: 10 Ʌg1! a5 11 e4 Ʌf7 12 g4! (12 Ʌe3+ Ʌc8 13 g4 g5 14 h4 h6 15 Ʌe2 a4 is OK for Black, Meulders-Hort, Haifa Echt 1989) 12...h6 13 h4 Ʌ intending g5. 

7 e3

White opens a diagonal for the f1-bishop, and at the same time takes control of the weakened d4-square, but this move allows Black the new plan ...Ʌh6-f7-d6, bringing the knight nicely to the centre. 

7 b3 c6 is also possible:

a) 8 Ʌb2 Ʌd7 9 h3 (9 g3 Ʌc7 10 Ʌg2 Ʌh6 11 0-0 a5 12 Ʌac1 Ʌc5 13 Ʌd2 Ʌe7 = Tisdall-Hodgson, Reykjavik 1989) 9...h5! 10 0-0-0 Ʌc7 11 e3 h4 12 Ʌe2 a5 13 Ʌd2 Ʌh6 14 Ʌde4 Ʌf7 = Lehtivaara-Yrjölä, Finnish Ch 2000. 

b) 8 Ʌg1! Ʌd7 (8...h5!?) 9 g4 is one of the most critical tries. White’s goal is to open lines on the kingside in order to get some activity against Black’s king and centre. Black has tried many moves:

b1) 9...Ʌe7 10 Ʌb2 g6?! 11 Ʌe4 Ʌg8 12 0-0-0 h6 13 Ʌh4 Ʌf7 14 Ʌg3 Ʌc7 15 Ʌgd3 Ʌd8 16 Ʌg2 Ʌ Röschlau-Schirmer, 2nd Bundesliga 1994/5. 

b2) 9...Ʌc7 10 Ʌe3 Ʌa3?!, Mukić-Jacimović, Kladovo 1991.

b3) 9...Ʌb4 10 Ʌb2 a5 11 g5 a4 12 0-0-0 axb3 13 axb3 Ʌe7 14 gxf6 gxf6 15 Ʌe4 Ʌf8 16 Ʌg3 Ʌf5 17 Ʌh3 Ʌf7 18 Ʌh5 Ʌe7 19 Ʌh3 Ʌd6 (Röschlau-Brecht, Germany 1997/8) and now White has the interesting possibility 20 Ʌxc6 Ʌxc6 21 Ʌf5+ fxg5 22 Ʌxg5+ Ʌe7 23 Ʌxf7 Ʌxf7 24 Ʌxh7 Ʌ.

b4) 9...a5 10 Ʌb2 Ʌc5 11 g5 a4 12 gxf6 gxf6 13 Ʌd2 a3 14 Ʌc1 Ʌa6 15
\( \text{Déf4 D4b} 16 \text{Db1 Ff5 17 Ag2 and White has pressure, Pirttilahti-Yrjolä, Jyväskylä 1994.} \)

We now return to 7 e3 (D):

\[
\text{B}
\]

7...\( \text{Dd7} \) 8 \( \text{Ae2} \) c6 9 0-0 \( \text{Ah6} \) 10 \( \text{Dd1} \)

10 b3 \( \text{Ac7} \) 11 \( \text{Ab2} \) is maybe more precise, as it is not clear which are the most useful squares for the rooks.

10...\( \text{Af7} \) 11 b3 a5 12 \( \text{Ab2} \) \( \text{Ac7} \) 13 \( \text{Aa1} \) \( \text{Ac5} \)

Black is a little better. He has made all the basic moves, and his position is very safe. It is difficult to see a plan for White, but Black can start a queenside expansion without any risks. The following game is a model example: 14 \( \text{Dd2 Ac7} \) 15 \( \text{Dd4 Dxe4} \) 16 \( \text{Dxe4 a4} \) 17 \( \text{Ac3 axb3} \) 18 axb3 \( \text{Aa3} \) 19 \( \text{Axa3} \) \( \text{Ab8} \) 20 \( \text{Db1 Dd8} \) 21 \( \text{Dxd8 Axd8} \) 22 \( \text{Af5} \) 23 \( \text{Db2 Ac6} \) 24 \( \text{Dd1 At8} \) 25 \( \text{Ae2 Dxced2} \) 26 \( \text{Dxc2 Ac5} \) 27 b4 \( \text{Dd3} \) 28 b5 f5 29 \( \text{Dxe2 Dc5} \) 30 f3 \( \text{Aa3} \) 31 bxc6 bx\text{bxc6} 32 \( \text{Dd1 Aal} \) 33 \( \text{Dd2 g5} \) 34 \( \text{Dxe2 e4} \) 35 \( \text{Dd2 h5} \) 36 \( \text{Dxe2 exf3+} \) 37 \( \text{Dgf3} \) g4 38 \( \text{Df1 Dg1} \) 39 \( \text{Dxg4 fxg4} \) 40 \( \text{Dd2 Aa2} \) 41 \( \text{Df1 Dxa2} \) 42 \( \text{Dd2 Aa2} \) 43 \( \text{Dxg4 Dh1+} \) 44 \( \text{Dg2 Dh4} \) 45 \( \text{Dg3 Dxe4+} \) 46 \( \text{Dxe4 hxe4} \) 47 \( \text{Dxe4 Dd6} \) 48 \( \text{Df5 Dc5} \) 49 e4 \( \text{Dd7} \) 50 \( \text{Df4} \) 51 \( \text{Df5 Dxe4} \) 52 \( \text{Dxe6} \) 53 \( \text{Dd6 c5} \) 54 e5 \( \text{Dd4} \) 55 e6 \( \text{Dd5} \) 0-1 Aung Aung-Krasenkov, Shanghai 2000.

**Conclusion:** Black has no problems in this endgame.

\[
\text{B)}
\]

3 d5 (D)

\[
\text{B}
\]

This move fixes the centre at once, and White is going to develop with ideas that are familiar from the King's Indian. Black has many viable plans. The fight for the centre, focusing on the e4-pawn, is the most direct approach.

3...f5

Or:

a) 3...\( \text{Af5} \) with the idea ...e4 is a different possibility: 4 \( \text{Dc3 e4} \) 5 \( \text{Dd3} \) (5 g3!? 5...\( \text{b6} \) 6 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{Dd7} \) 7 \( \text{Dxe4} \) \( \text{Ae7} \) 8 \( \text{Dxe4} \) \( \text{Af6} \) 9 \( \text{Dg3} \) 10 \( \text{Dxh7} \) \( \text{Dxh7} \) 11 \( \text{Dxg6} \) 0-0-0 14 \( \text{Dxd7} \) 15 \( \text{Dxd7} \) \( \text{Dxd7} \) 16
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\[ \text{a3} \text{ d5} 17 \text{ axd6} \text{ d3} + 18 \text{ e2 a6d8} \, + \, \text{Puusa-Ylijoki, Finnish Cht 1996.} \]

b) 3...\text{e7?! is another typical move, intending to exchange the bad bishop with ...\text{g5}:}

b1) 4 \text{c3 g5 and now:}

b11) 5 e3! f5 6 g3 e4 7 f3 exf3?! (7...\text{cf6}?! is an improvement proposed by Mikhailevskii) 8 \text{xf3 f6 9 xe2!}

\[ \text{c5} + 10 \text{ dxc6 dxc6} + 11 \text{ d4 g6 12 d2 e7} + 13 0-0 0-0 14 \text{ wh1 w7} + 15 \text{ b1 a5 16 b3 a4 17 ab2} \, + \, \text{Mikhailevski-Kantsler, Rishon le Zion 2000.} \]

b12) 5 e4 a5 6 xg5 (6 g3 xcx1 7 xcx1 xec7 8 xg2 0-0 9 xf3 a6 10 0-0 a5 11 b3 h6 = Debnar-Novak, Slovakia 1997) 6...\text{w} xg7 (7 a6 c5 8 d2 xdx6 9 cxd6 10 b5+ xdx6 0-0 dxd7 11 b6 c6 12 0-0 xec8 13 xed2 c5 14 c4 c5 15 xdx7 xdx7 16 a4 \, + \, \text{Mikhailevski-Fioramonti, Biel 1992.} \]

b2) 4 e4 g5 5 d2 c6 7 (c5 6 g3 xgf6 7 xg3 xh6 8 h4 0-0 9 xed2 c4 10 xg5 a6 11 g4 c5 12 f3 a4 13 xed1 xed8 14 xed3 xdx2 15 xed2 xdx2 16 xdx2 f6 17 xed3 xdx3 18 xsc3 xec7 19 d2 xdx3 20 d3 xdx3 21 xdx3 c5 = Milov-Hickl, Pula Z 2000) 6 xgf3 xh6 7 xed3 (7 b4 a5 8 bxa5 xxa5 9 db3 xxc1! 10 xda5 xh2 =) 7...x5 8 0-0 xgf6 9 b3 xec5 10 xec2 (Avrukh-Kantsler, Israel 2000) 10...0-0 11 a3 c6 12 b1 cxd5 13 cxd5 (13 exd5 e4 14 d4 e3 15 d2f3 xec4 =) 13...b5 with equality.

We now return to 3...f5 (D):

4 e4?!?

or:

a) 4 e3?! is too passive, and standard play gives Black a good position; for example, 4...g6 5 xed2 xg7 6 xec3 c6 7 d4 xf3 xh6!? 8 h4 0-0 9 wc2 e4 10 d4 xed5 11 d2 c5 12 dxc6 bxc6 \, + \, Plass-Popchev, Val Thorens 1990.

b) 4 d3 is the older main line, but Black usually has very active centre pawns which secure him a good position; for example, 4...xf6 (4...g6 5 e4 xh6? 6 xef5 xed5 7 xec6 xed2 8 xdx7 g5 9 cxe2 xdx7 10 xed3 wc6 12 0-0 xec5 13 xec2 a5 = Pogosian-Stojanović, Rimavska Sobota 1992) and now:

b1) 5 g3 xbd7 6 xg2 a5 7 xwa4 xce7 8 b4?! 0-0-0 9 xdb6 10 xwb3 xab4 11 xwb4 xeb8 \, + \, Armas Wohlers-Marowski, Lyons 1995.

b2) 5 xec2 xg7 6 f3 0-0 7 xed2 xed8 8 a3 c6 9 c4 xec4 10 xec4 xcd5 11 xcd5 xed4 12 xh3 xh4+ 13 g3 xdxh2 14 0-0-0 xed1 15 gxh4 xh3 16 xh3 xf2 is much better for Black, Sleisz-Borsos, Eger 1993.

b3) 5 f4 c6 6 xg6 7 xh3 xg7 8 xef2 a5 9 xea2 xbd7 10 xwa2 xec5 11 xed2 0-0 12 xdb5 c6 13 d4 xed4 14 0-0 xh8 = Fayard-McNab, Hastings Challengers 1988/9.
b4) 5 e4 Qxe4 6 Qxe4 fxe4 7 Qe2 (7 h4 Qd7 8 Qg5 Qe7 9 Wh5+ g6 10 Wh6 Qxg5 11 hxg5 Qe7 12 Qe2 Qc5 13 Qg3 a5 14 Qh4 Qf5 = Carneiro-Pereira, Lisbon 1995) 7...Qe7 8 Qg3 0-0 9 Qxe4 Qf5 10 Qd3 Qd7 11 Qe3 Qxe4 12 Qxe4 Qg5 is equal, and similar to note 'c' to Black's 6th move.

b5) 5 Qg5 Qe7 6 Qxf6 (6 Qc2 Qxd5!; 6 g3 Qxd5)! 6...Qxf6 7 e4 0-0 8 Qd3 g6 and here:

b51) 9 Qge2 f4 10 f3 Qa6 11 Qd2 Qh4+ 12 g3 Qg5 13 Qxf4 Qxf4 14 Qxf4 Wh4+ 15 Qe2 Qxf4 16 Qag1 Qd7 17 Qg3 Qaf8 18 Qe3 Wh5 19 Qc2 Qxf3 = Tousif-McNab, Manila OL 1992.

b52) 9 Qf3 Qa6 10 Qc1 Qh8 11 h4 f4 12 Wh2 c6 13 Qe2 Qg4 14 dxc6 bxc6 15 Wh4+ Qb6 16 Wc3 Qe7 17 Qel Qc5 18 Qc2 a5 = Petrović-Medak, Djakovo 1994.

b53) 9 Whc2 Qg5 10 Qf3 Qh6 11 a3 a5 12 Qb1 c5 is unclear, Thorfinnsson-Bern, Hafnarfjördur 1995.

b6) 5 Qf3 Qc7 and now:

b61) 6 Qg5 0-0 7 e3 Qh8 8 Qe2 Qa6 9 Qxf6 (9 0-0 Qxd5 10 Qxd5 Qxg5 = Grobovsek-Kodrić, Portorož 1995) 9...Qxf6 10 0-0 e4 gives Black a slight advantage.

b62) 6 Whc2 Qa6 7 b4 0-0 8 a3 c5 9 b5 Qc7 10 a4 e4 11 Qgl Qg4 12 h3 Qe5 13 e3 g5 14 Qe2 We8 15 a5 Qg6 16 Qd2 Qd7 17 Whb1 1/2-1/2 Ferkingstad-F.Brunner, Zanka girls Ech 1995.

b63) 6 e4 Qxe4 7 Qxe4 fxe4 8 Qd2 Qf5 9 Wh2 Qa6 10 Qxe4 0-0 11 Qd3 Qb4 12 Wh3 Qxd3+ 13 Whx3 Qe8 14 Qg6 15 f3 h5 = Auehnberg-Voroitnikov, Copenhagen 1990.

We now return to 4 e4 (D):

4...f4e4

Or:

a) 4...Qf6?! is playable: 5 exf5 Qxf5 6 Qc3 (6 Qd3 Qxd3 7 Whxd3 Qc7 8 Qc3 0-0 9 f3 Qfd7 10 Qe3 Qh4+ 11 g3 Qg5 12 Qe4 Qxe3 13 Qxe3 Qa6 14 Qe2 Qdc5 15 0-0 Qxe4 16 fxe4 Qd7 = Sanz Navarro-Moran Rodriguez, Zaragoza 1998) 6...Qbd7 7 Qge2 Qg6 (7...Qe7!?, with the point 8 Qg3 Qg6 9 Qd3 c4, is playable) 8 Qg3 c6 (8...e4 9 Qe2 a5 10 h4 h6 11 Qh5 Qc5 12 Qf4 Qf7 13 Qe3 Qfd7 14 Qh5 Wh6 15 Qxf7+ Wh7 16 Qe2 Qf5 17 0-0 0-0 0-0 18 Qh5 ± Kelečević – Schmidt-Schäffer, Berne 1996) 9 Qd3 Qf7 10 0-0 Qe7 11 Qge4 cxd5 12 cxd5 Qxe4 13 Qxe4 0-0 14 Qe3 Qg5 15 Qc2 ± Mikhailovski-Van der Wiel, Leeuwarden 1995.

b) 4...f4 5 g3 and now:

b1) 5...fxg3 6 hxg3 g6 7 Qc3 Qg7 8 Qe2 Qf6 9 Qe3 Qd7 10 Qg4 Qc8 11 f3 ± Norevall-Ekström, Gotland 1997.

b2) 5...Qf6 might be possible, with the point 6 Qc3 (6 Qxf4 Qxe4) 6...g5 7
h4 (7 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \mathcal{A}g7 \)) 7...\( \mathcal{fx}g3 \) 8 \( \mathcal{hx}g5 \) \( \mathcal{gf}xf2+ \) 9 \( \mathcal{Af}xf2 \mathcal{A}g4+ \).

5 \( \mathcal{Ac}3 \mathcal{Af}6 \)

5...\( \mathcal{Af}5 \) 6 \( \mathcal{Dg}e2 \mathcal{A}g6 \) 7 \( \mathcal{Dg}3 \mathcal{Wh}4 \) 8 \( \mathcal{Gx}e4 \) \( \pm \) is a basic tactical trick.

6 \( \mathcal{D}ge2 \) \( \text{(D)} \)

6 \( \mathcal{Ag}5 \mathcal{Db}d7 \) (6...\( \mathcal{Af}5! \)?) 7 \( \mathcal{Gg}4 \mathcal{Ag}6 \) 8 \( \mathcal{Ag}2 \) h6 9 \( \mathcal{Ah}4 \mathcal{Db}d7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{Dxe}4 \mathcal{A}e7 \) 11 \( \mathcal{Dxf}6 \mathcal{Dxf}6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Dg}3 \mathcal{Dd}7 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Ae}4 \mathcal{Axe}4 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Dxe}4 \) 0-0 15 \( \mathcal{D}e2 \mathcal{Df}6 \) 16 \( \mathcal{D}e2 \mathcal{D}e4 \) 17 \( \mathcal{Dxe}4 \mathcal{Ff}4 \) 18 \( \mathcal{Ff}2 \mathcal{Dd}7 \) 19 \( \mathcal{H}h3 \mathcal{Af}8 \) 20 0-0 \( \mathcal{Df}3 \) gives Black counterplay, Kele\-c\-ević-Espig, Schellenberg 1991) 7 \( \mathcal{D}ge2 \) (7 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \mathcal{A}e7 \) 8 \( \mathcal{Dxf}6 \)?) 7...\( \mathcal{Ae}7 \) 8 \( \mathcal{D}g3 \) allows Black a tactical trick with 8...\( \mathcal{D}xd5 \) 9 \( \mathcal{D}xd5 \mathcal{D}xg5 \) 10 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \mathcal{A}e7 \) \( \mp \) Soln-Tratar, Slovenian Ch (Bled) 1999.

6...\( \mathcal{Af}5! \)\?

Or:

a) 6...\( \mathcal{D}bd7 \) 7 \( \mathcal{D}g3 \mathcal{D}c5 \) 8 \( \mathcal{Ag}5 \) (8 \( \mathcal{Ae}3 \) b6 9 \( \mathcal{Ae}2 \) a5 10 0-0 \( g6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{D}xc5 \) \( bx \) c5 12 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{A}h6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{D}xf6+ \) \( \mathcal{Wxf}6 \) 14 \( \mathcal{D}b5 \) \( \mathcal{We}7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}g4 \) 0-0 16 a4 \( \mathcal{Af}5 \) is slightly better for Black, Gerber-Okh-otnik, Prague 1988) 8...\( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{Dxf}6 \) \( \mathcal{Dxf}6 \) 10 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \mathcal{D}xe4 \) 11 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \) 0-0 12 \( \mathcal{D}d3 \) \( \mp \) Mikhailevski-Finkel, Beersheba 1996.

b) 6...\( g6 \) 7 \( \mathcal{D}g3 \mathcal{Af}5 \) 8 \( \mathcal{Ag}5 \mathcal{Db}d7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{Gx}e4 \mathcal{A}e7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{D}xf6 \mathcal{Dxf}6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{D}d3 \) 0-0 12 0-0 \( \mathcal{Dh}5 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Gg}3 \mathcal{Wd}7 \) 14 \( \mathcal{D}e2 \) \( \mathcal{D}g7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{Gg}4 \) \( \mathcal{Dxe}4 \) 16 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \mathcal{Ff}4 \) 17 \( \mathcal{Ff}3 \) gives White a slight advantage, Kele-čević-Mohr, Switzerland 1996.

c) 6...\( \mathcal{Ae}7 \) is a safe continuation, if Black just aims to draw: 7 \( \mathcal{D}g3 \) 0-0 8 \( \mathcal{Gx}e4 \mathcal{Af}5 \) 9 \( \mathcal{D}d3 \) \( \mathcal{Db}d7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{D}e3 \) \( \mathcal{Dxe}4 \) 11 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \mathcal{A}g5 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Wh}5 \mathcal{D}f6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Wx}g5 \mathcal{D}xe4 = \) Albutt-Miles, USA Ch (Cambridge Springs) 1988.

7 \( \mathcal{D}g3 \mathcal{Ag}6 \) 8 \( \mathcal{A}g5 \) \( \mathcal{Ae}7 \)

8...\( \mathcal{Db}d7 \)? is not correct:

a) 9 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \mathcal{A}e7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{D}xf6 \mathcal{D}xf6 \) (10...\( \mathcal{D}xf6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( \pm \); White controls the f5-square) 11 \( \mathcal{D}d3 \) 0-0 12 0-0 \( \mathcal{Ah}4 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Ae}2 \mathcal{We}7 \) (13...\( \mathcal{D}f6 \) 14 \( \mathcal{D}e2 \mathcal{D}xe4 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}e4 \) \( \pm \)) 14 \( \mathcal{Wc}2 \mathcal{Ff}7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{D}e2 \) (15 \( \mathcal{D}e4 \) \( \mathcal{D}xd3 \) 16 \( \mathcal{Wxd}3 \mathcal{D}c5 \) 17 \( \mathcal{Fc}2 \) e4 \( \mp \)) 15...\( \mathcal{A}f8 \) 16 b4 \( \pm \) Avrukh-Bologan, Biel 1999.

b) 9 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \mathcal{A}e4 \) 10 \( \mathcal{D}xe4 \mathcal{A}e7 \) 11 \( \mathcal{D}xf6 \mathcal{D}xf6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) 0-0 13 \( \mathcal{D}g4 \mathcal{D}e5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{D}xe5 \mathcal{D}xe5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{D}xe5 \) \( \pm \) Rapoport-Vigus, Witley 1998. White’s bishop is clearly more active than its black counterpart.

9 \( \mathcal{H}h4 \)

9 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \mathcal{Gxf6} \) gives Black good centre pawns, and indeed he is already slightly better unless sharp ideas to fight for the light squares work:

a) 10 \( \mathcal{G}xe4 \mathcal{F}f5 \) 11 \( \mathcal{D}g3 \mathcal{D}d7 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) (12 \( \mathcal{Dh}5 \) 0-0 13 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \mathcal{D}f6 \) 14 \( \mathcal{D}xf6+ \) \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) is slightly better for Black, Müller-Albrecht, Crailsheim 1995) 12...\( \mathcal{A}g5 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Ah}5 \mathcal{D}f6 \) 14 0-0 0-0 15 \( \mathcal{D}xg6 \mathcal{Hxg6} \) 16 \( \mathcal{D}ge2 \mathcal{Hh}6 \) 17
f4 \( \text{e7} \) 18 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{ae8} \) 19 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{f7} \) Kolev-Errnennkov, Bankia 1992.

b) 10 \text{h4?!} \( \text{d7} \) (10...\text{h6} 11 \( \text{f5} \)!! fights for the light squares; 10...\text{h5} 11 \( \text{e2} \) attacks the weakened h5-pawn; 10...\text{e3} 11 \text{fxe3} \text{f5} 12 \text{h5} \( \text{h4} \) 13 \text{hxg6} \( \text{hxg6} \) 14 \( \text{d2} \) \( \pm \) 11 \text{f3}! (11 \text{h5} \text{e7} 12 \text{f3} \( \text{g8} \) \( \mp \)) and now:

bl) 11...\text{exf3}?! and then:

bl1) 12 \( \text{gxf3} \) \text{f5} 13 \text{h5} \( \text{f7} \) 14 \( \text{d3} \) (14 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{h4} \) \( \pm \)) 14...\text{e4} 15 \text{fxe4} \text{f4} 16 \text{g}5 \( \text{e}6 \) is unclear.

bl2) 12 \( \text{xf3} \) \text{h5} 13 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xd3} \) 14 \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 15 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{xe} \) 16 0-0-0 with enough compensation.

b2) 11...\text{f5} 12 \text{h5} \( \text{f7} \) 13 \text{fxe4} (13 \text{b3}!!?) 13...\text{fxe4} 14 \( \text{gxe4} \) \( \pm \) Mikhailovsky-Milos, Cappellela Grande 2000.

9...\text{h5} 10 \( \text{xf6} \)

10 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{a6} \) 11 \( \text{dxe4} \) \( \text{dxe4} \) 12 \( \text{dxe4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 13 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 14 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d3} \) + 15 \( \text{wd3} \) 0-0-0 16 \text{f3} \( \text{d8} \) \( \text{=} \) Dive-Rogers, Wellington 1988.

10...\text{xf6} 11 \( \text{e2} \) \text{c3} 12 \( \text{exh5} \) \text{exf2}+ 13 \( \text{df1} \) \( \text{exh5} \) 14 \( \text{exh5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 15 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e7} \)

\( \mp \) Danner-Yrjölä, Batumi Echt 1999.

**Conclusion:** 3 d5 is an interesting option, which has been played a few times by some strong grandmasters quite recently. Black should get a good position in the main line.

C)

3 \text{c3} (D)

3...\text{f5}!!

This aggressive move is closest to the spirit of the book, but there are also many safe moves.

---

---

---

a) 3...\text{d7} aims for an Old Indian-type position, with a very stable structure for Black:

a1) 4 \( \text{gxf3} \) \text{g6} 5 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 6 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 7 0-0 0-0 0-0 \text{b3} \text{h6} 9 \( \text{b2} \) \text{f5} 10 \text{dxe5} \text{dxe5} 11 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{c6} \) 12 \( \text{d5} \) \text{e4} 13 \( \text{e4} \) \text{dxe4} 14 \( \text{dxe4} \) \( \text{exd4} \) 15 \text{exd4} \text{c6} 16 \text{d4} \text{e8} 17 \text{d5} \text{g6} 18 \text{dxc6} \text{bxc6} 19 \text{g3} \text{g5} 20 \text{g2} \text{f4}! gave Black an attack in Alonso-Vescovi, São Paulo 1999.

a2) 4 \text{f4} \text{g6} 5 \text{fxe5} \text{dxe5} 6 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{gf6} \) 8 \( \text{e2} \) 0-0 0-0 \text{c7} 10 \text{b4} \text{c6} 11 \text{b5} \( \text{g4} \) is a complicated position, Bach-Berg. Hamburg 1996.

a3) 4 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{gf6} \) 5 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{g7} \) 0-0 0-0 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e8} \) 9 \( \text{g3} \), Paasikangas-Lehto, Finnish Ch 1996, might be possible for White, intending 10 \( \text{f5} \)!!) 5...\text{c6} 6 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e7} \) 7 0-0 0-0 \text{b1} is a basic position from the Old Indian Defence, where Black has no problems.

b) 3...\text{c6} 4 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{c7} \) is a Modern-type position, where White’s \text{c3} might be close to a loss of tempo; for example, 5 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 6 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 7 \( \text{c2} \) \text{g6} 8 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{h6} \) \text{9 b4} 0-0 10 \( \text{b3} \)
a5 11 bxa5 \aha5 12 a4 \fh8, Paasikangas-Lindqvist, Finnish Cht 1996, and White’s position looks a bit odd, but maybe it is possible to continue with normal plans like 13 \aha3 b6 14 \ab4 \ba8 15 a5) 4...g6 5 \af3 \ag7 6 \ae2 \ah6 is a line of the Modern Defence.

4 \ae3

Here too White can get an endgame, but the most he can hope for is slight pressure. 4 dxe5 dxe5 5 \wx8d8+ \wx8d8 6 \af3 \ac6 7 \ac3 \ah6 8 \ad2 e4 9 \ad4 \ae5 (9...\ad4?!?) 10 0-0-0 c6 11 \ac2 \ac7 12 \af8 \af7 13 g4 \ag14 \ah1 ± Akhelov-Shukan, Alushta 1997.

4...c66 (D)

4...c61? 5 dxe5 dxe5 6 \wx8d8+ \wx8d8 leads to a new version of this queenless middlegame, but Black is again OK: 7 b3 \ah6 8 \ab2 \ac6 9 \af3 \af7 10 0-0-0+ \ad7 11 h4 \af7 12 g3 \ac8 13 \ah3 \ac5 14 \af1 \ac8 15 b4 e4, Psaras-Makropoulos, Serres 1990.

5 g3

Or:

a) 5 \af3 e4 6 \ad2 is an important transposition to Line B of Chapter 6.

b) 5 dxe5 dxe5 6 \wx8d8+ \wx8d8, and now:

b1) 7 \ad2 and then:

b11) 7...\cx8d6 8 \af3 \bd7 9 0-0-0 \af7 (9...\af7?) 10 \ac e2 g6 11 \ae1 a5 12 \af3 \af7 13 \ac4 f4 14 \ad3 \ah8 15 \af3 g5 16 \gxf4 \gxf4 17 \ah1 \ag8 18 \af1 \ac6 19 b3 \ah8 20 \ac3 ± Nedeljkovic-Puc, Belgrade 1952.

b12) 7...\af6 8 \af3 \bd7 9 0-0-0 c6 10 \ac4 \af7 11 \ac e2 \af4 12 \ah1 \af7 13 \ac3 \ad2 14 \axd2 g5 = Pina Sierra-Antipova, Litho 1999.

b2) 7 b3 c6 8 \ab2 \af6 (8...\af7 9 0-0-0 \bd7 10 \ac3 e4!? 11 \ac2 a5 12 \ah3 \ad6 13 \ac2 \ae8 14 \af4 \ac5 15 \ad2 \ab4 16 \ac4 h6 17 \ah1 \ad7 18 a3 \ac5 19 \ad2 \ah8 20 \afg1 \af5 = Miles-Larsen, Las Palmas 1977) 9 \af3 \bd7 10 \ac2 \ac6 11 0-0 \af7 12 \afd1 \ah8 13 h3 h6 14 \ac4 \ah2 \af1/2 Illescas-Magem, Barcelona 1990.

b3) 7 \af3 \ac6 8 \ac2 \ac6 9 0-0-0 \ac8 10 h3 a6 (10...e4!?!) 11 e4 \ac4 12 \ac4 fxe4 13 \ac5 \af5 14 \ag4 \ag6 15 \ag2 \ad8 16 \ac3 \axd1+ 17 \axd1 \ab4 and Black seems to be fine, Rubinstein-Sämisch, Baden-Baden 1925.

5...g6 6 \ag2 \ag7 7 \af2 e2 0-0 8 0-0 c6

Because White has no pressure against e5, Black has a free hand to develop, more in the style of the English Opening.

9 b4 \ac6 10 d5 \af7 11 \ah1 \bd7 12 a4 e4 13 a5 \ad5 14 \ad5 \ac6


Conclusion: 3 e3 is too passive to give Black any real problems.
11 The Hodgson Variation
(2 \( \text{\textit{f3 g4}} \)): Introduction

The variation 1 d4 d6 2 \( \text{\textit{f3 g4}} \) (D) was played in 1938 by Rudolf Spielmann and used in the 1960s by Stein and Kavalek among others.

For those who think that 2...\( \text{\textit{g4}} \) might be somewhat unsound, we would like to mention that Mr Solid, Tigran Petrosian, employed the move a few times. But the towering figure of the line is Julian Hodgson, who popularised it with many dynamic performances. Among the other practitioners, the contributions of Miles, Adams, Hickl and Jansa to the theoretical development of the line are worth mentioning.

The line 3 c4 \( \text{\textit{d7}} \) brings to mind the Torre Attack (1 d4 \( \text{\textit{f6}} \) 2 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) and 3 \( \text{\textit{g5}} \)). Here too the idea is to develop the queenside first so that the queen’s bishop doesn’t remain blocked behind the pawn-chain. The system is also reminiscent of some Old Indian lines where Black brings the bishop out at an early stage. However, in the Old Indian Black has played ...\( \text{\textit{f6}} \), which is not our only option here.

Black can also opt for very uncompromising play with the early exchange 3...\( \text{\textit{x}} \)\( \text{\textit{xf3}} \), which has some similarity with certain Nimzo-Indian Defence lines. Black makes White’s pawn-formation clumsy and will then concentrates on limiting the power of White’s bishop-pair with suitable pawn-chain strategy.

The other important line is 3 e4, with positions more akin to Semi-Open games after 3...\( \text{\textit{f6}} \) 4 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \).

The statistics (see table) suggest that the third move alternatives to 3 c4 and 3 e4 are not very dangerous. It appears that the 1 d4 player’s standard choice 3 c4 scores best but things are not so clear. After 3 e4 \( \text{\textit{f6}} \) 4 \( \text{\textit{c3 e6}} \) the aggressive main line 5 h3 \( \text{\textit{h5}} \) 6 \( \text{\textit{g4 g6}} \) 7 \( \text{\textit{We2 c6}} \) 8 h4 has scored well, while with the more routine alternatives like 5 \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) or 4 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) White usually doesn’t get anything at all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Games</th>
<th>W's score</th>
<th>W's rating</th>
<th>W's Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 e4</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>2474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 e4</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>2443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 e3</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>2338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 c4bd2</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>2325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 g3</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>2393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 3 c4 \textit{d}d7

After 1 d4 d6 2 \textit{f}f3 \textit{g}g4 3 c4, 3...\textit{d}d7 \textit{(D)} has been more popular than the immediate exchange, 3...\textit{x}f3.

However, some of the main practitioners, such as Hodgson, tend to play ...\textit{x}f3 after certain choices by White. Especially after the move 4 g3 there is no better reply than 4...\textit{xf}3, which is considered in Line \textit{B} of Chapter 13.

The table below gives the statistics for White's most important moves.

The rather rare 4 d5 (Line \textit{A}) has scored surprisingly well in practice although it doesn't look theoretically dangerous. The idea of the move (i.e. to try to interfere with Black's general plans) is basically good. 4 \textit{b}b3 has also done well, and was White's most popular choice in the mid-1990s. After 4...\textit{b}b8, White can continue 5 h3 or 5 g3 without allowing a doubling of his f-pawns. However, the placing of the queen on f3 looks a bit artificial. Black tends to get active play to compensate for the bishop-pair by playing ...c5.

The move 4 e4 is very logical, as it occupies the centre immediately. The drawback is the slight weakness of White's d4-pawn, which the new idea 4...\textit{xf}3!? 5 \textit{xf}3 g6 seeks to exploit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Games</th>
<th>W's score</th>
<th>W's rating</th>
<th>W's Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 \textit{c}c3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2432</td>
<td>2457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 \textit{b}b3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2429</td>
<td>2508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 e4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2445</td>
<td>2475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 g3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2417</td>
<td>2451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 d5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>2520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This may be the reason why 4 e4 has been much less in popular recent years than it was at the beginning of the 1990s. However, there are still too few examples of 4...\&xf3?! to claim that it is really better than the traditional 4...e5.

During the last few years, White’s most popular choice has been 4 \&xc3 e5 (4...\&xf3?!?) 5 g3!, which is a very solid option that scores quite well in practice. The point is that after 5...\&xf3 Black has already played the move ...e5, which doesn’t seem to fit in very well with the exchange on f3. Black has tried several systems after this but none of them looks good enough to equalize fully or even give unclear counterchances. It is quite difficult to play for a win with Black except perhaps with 4...\&xf3. At the moment the ball is in Black’s court to find something inspiring. The more innocent option 5 e3 leads to slow play typical of the Old Indian, and this weakens White’s statistics with 4 \&xc3.

**Black’s plans and some important position-types**

Depending on White’s choice, Black generally has three standard plans.

1) Black fianchettoes his king’s bishop, pressing against the d4-pawn, and strikes with ...c5. Usually Black gets some sort of counterplay on the queenside later on. Black may achieve the ...b5 advance in a Benoni type of position or sometimes the c4-pawn becomes weak if White hasn’t answered with d5.

In this position, which arises after 4 \&b3 \&b8 5 h3 \&xf3 6 \&xf3 g6 7 \&xc3 \&g7 8 e3, the first reaction at top level was 8...e5 but after Naumkin got very good play on the light squares against Hodgson (Cappelle la Grande 1992) with 9 d5 f5 10 e4 \&e7 11 g4!, the move 8...e5! became accepted. After the obvious 9 d5 the controversial question is whether Black should play 9...\&xc3+!? - Sometimes this exchange is the best idea in positions of this type, but here it is not necessary as Black gets a comfortable position with normal moves like ...\&g6, ...a6 and ...e6 (see Line C2). Nevertheless, the idea of saddling White with doubled pawns at the cost of the strong bishop is important in this line. After the exchange White has an inflexible structure and two passive bishops. However, White might later achieve a central breakthrough to activate the bishops, get pressure on the b-file or manage to eliminate all Black’s chances.

2) Black develops in a natural way with ...e5 and ...\&e7. After that, Black
strives for the exchange of the dark-squared bishops.

This position can arise from more than one line. White has probably given up the central tension prematurely by playing d5 and now Black happily continues 6...\textit{Q}xf3! 7 \textit{Q}g5, which looks positionally nice. Often Black has to do much more work to get rid of the passive dark-squared bishop. In Line D12 Black often attempts to exchange the bishops with the manoeuvre \textit{Q}d8-b6 (see Khalifman-Gofshtein in note ‘d2’ to White’s 8th move).

There is an important line 4 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}5 (Line B1) 5 \textit{\&}e2 \textit{\&}e7 6 \textit{\&}c3 \textit{Q}xf3 7 \textit{Q}xf3 and now instead of the logical 7...\textit{Q}g5, which leads to trouble here, Black has 7...\textit{e}xd4? 8 \textit{\&}xd4 \textit{\&}f6 9 \textit{\&}d2 \textit{\&}e7 10 0-0 0-0 11 \textit{b}3 \textit{\&}c6 (D).

Now it is obvious that in spite of White’s slight space advantage Black has managed to stifle White’s bishop-pair and even gets some counterplay with the plan ...\textit{Q}c5 and ...\textit{a}5-a4: 12 \textit{\&}b2 \textit{\&}c5 13 \textit{\&}d1 \textit{\&}a5 14 \textit{\&}b1 \textit{\&}a4 15 \textit{\&}e1 axb3 16 axb3 \textit{\&}b4 and now White doesn’t have anything better than 17 \textit{Q}d5 \textit{\&}xd5 (17...\textit{Q}xb2!? 18 exd5 \textit{\&}xb2 19 \textit{\&}xb2 \textit{\&}f6 with a comfortable position for Black, Jackelen-Hickl, Bundesliga 1992/3. This example shows another important idea: it is not always necessary to develop routinely with ...\textit{Q}f6 and ...\textit{\&}e7. Often the knight finds better options via \textit{c}7. The counterplay with ...\textit{a}5-a4 is also an important weapon to remember, as in many lines throughout the book.

3) Black exchanges on f3 and tries to stifle White’s bishop-pair. Those position-types are introduced in the next chapter but there are some instances in this chapter in Line D2.

\begin{align*}
1 & d4 \textit{d}6 2 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{\&}g4 3 \textit{c}4 \textit{\&}d7 \\
\text{Now:} \\
\text{A:} & 4 \textit{d}5 \quad 80 \\
\text{B:} & 4 \textit{e}4 \quad 83 \\
\text{C:} & 4 \textit{\&}b3 \quad 89 \\
\text{D:} & 4 \textit{\&}c3 \quad 95 \\
\text{A):} & 4 \textit{d}5 (D)
\end{align*}
This move is often part of White’s plans in this line, but here it doesn’t stop Black playing ...e5.

4...e5

Or:

a) After 4...g6 5 Qd4 Qd6 the black knights look a bit clumsy, but in Kaunas-Fridman, Riga Z 1995 Black managed to equalize after 6 g3 Qg7 7 Qg2 Qc8 8 Qc3 (8 h3!? 8...h6 9 Wa4+ Aa7 10 Wa5 c5 11 dxe6 bxe6 12 0-0 Aa6 13 e4 Ag4 14 Ag3 Ae6 15 e5 Axe5 16 Axe5 dxe5 17 Axe5 Axh4 18 Ael 0-0 19 Ac5 Qd5.

b) Hodgson has played the interesting alternative 4...a5!? a couple of times:

b1) 5 Qc3 g6 6 Qd4 Qc5 7 f3 Ad7 8 e4 e5 9 dxe6 fxe6 10 Axe3 Aa6 11 Af2 e5 12 Ad5 Aa6 13 Ad5 Qxd5 14 exd5 0-0 15 Qc3 a4 16 Axe2 Ag5 with counterplay, Baburin-Hodgson, Biel 1992.

b2) 5 Qd4 Qc5 (the knight likes to be here) 6 Qc3 g6 7 g3 Qg7 8 Aa2 Qf6 9 Qe3 Qc8!? 10 h3 Ad7 11 g4 0-0 12 Wc2 c6 (12...e5!? looks better) 13 Ad1 e5 14 dxe6 Axe6 15 Qxe6 Qxe6 16 b3 ± Bates-Hodgson, British League (4NCL) 1997/8.

c) 4...Axh3!? 5 exf3 g6 is a viable alternative: 6 Qd3 (6 Qc3 should be compared with the note to White’s 5th move in Line C of Chapter 13) 6...Qg7 7 0-0 Qg6 8 Qe1 0-0 9 Qc3 Qc8 9...c6 10 Af1 Qc5 11 Qe3 Qfd7 12 Wd2 a5 13 h4! gave White a kingside attack in I.Sokolov-Van der Wiel, Dutch Ch (Rotterdam) 1998 10 Qc2 a5 11 f4 e6! 12 Wf3 Qfd7 13 Qd2 Ab6 14 b3 cxd5 15 cxd5 f5 16 Aal Wd7 17 Qd3 ½-½ Baburin-AI.Panchenko, Germany 1992/3.

5 dxe6

5 Qc3 Ae7 6 e4 transposes to note ‘b3’ to White’s 5th move in Line B1.

5...Axh6

5...fxe6!? leads to a more difficult position-type; for example, 6 Qd4 (Wojtikiewicz considers 6 g3! to be better) 6...Wb7 7 h3 (7 Qc3 Qg6 8 f3 QAh5 9 h4 Qf7 10 g4 g6 is unclear, Edzgveradze-Jaracz, Mlada Boleslav 1994) 7 Qh5 8 Qc3 c6 9 g4 Qf7 10 Qg2 Qd8 11 Qc4! h6 12 g5 d5 13 g6 dxe4 14 gfx7+ Qxf7 15 Qxe4 Qg6 16 Qc2 Oe5 ± Radzievicz-Minasian, Cappelle la Grande 1999.

6 e4 (D)

6...Ag4

It seems exchanging the bishop is a good idea in this type of position where Black has less space. Otherwise:

a) Black tends to drift into a passive position after 6...Qc5?! 7 Qc3 Qf6 8 Wc2 g6 (8...a5 9 Qd4 ±; 8...Qe7 9 Qd4 0-0 10 Qe2 c6 11 0-0 a5 12 Qe3 Qc7 13 Aac1 Aed8 14 h3 Ae8 15 a3 g6 16 b4 axb4 17 axb4 Qe6 18 Qb3 ±
Shabalov-Sokolovs, Cappelle la Grande 1995) 9  \( \text{\&c2} \) \( \text{\&g7} \) 10 0-0 0-0 11  \( \text{\&d4} \) \\
\( \text{\&d7} \) 12  \( \text{\&d1} \) \( \text{\&e8} \) 13  \( \text{\&f3} \) \( \text{\&h5} \) 14  \( \text{\&f1} \) c6 15 \( \text{\&f2} \) \( \text{\&c7} \) 16 g4 \( \text{\&f6} \) 17 \( \text{\&f4} \) b6 18 \\
b4 \( \text{\&b7} \) 19 b5 \pm Wojtkiewicz-Adams, New York Open 1995.

\( \text{\&e2} \) \( \text{\&xf6} \) 7 \( \text{\&c3} \) \( \text{\&g4} \) White has tried 8 \\
\( \text{\&e3} \) (8 \( \text{\&e2} \) transposes to the main line) 8...\( \text{\&g6} \) 9 \( \text{\&b3} \) \( \text{\&c8} \) 10  \( \text{\&d4} \) \( \text{\&g7} \) 11  \( \text{\&f3} \) \( \text{\&c5} \) 12 \( \text{\&c2} \) \( \text{\&d7} \) with equality. \\

7  \( \text{\&e2} \) \( \text{\&gf6} \) 8  \( \text{\&c3} \) \( \text{\&g6} \)

Black was suffering in a passive position after 8...\( \text{\&xf3} ?? \) 9 \( \text{\&xf3} \) c6 10 \\
0-0 \( \text{\&c7} \) 11 \( \text{\&e2} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{\&e3} \) \( \text{\&e8} \) 13 \\
f3 a5 14 \( \text{\&h1} \) \( \text{\&f8} \) 15 \( \text{\&d2} \) \( \text{\&c7} \) 16 \\
\( \text{\&fd1} \) \( \text{\&c5} \) 17 \( \text{\&a1} \) \( \text{\&e6} \) 18 b3 \pm in D.Gurevich-Bezold, Bermuda 1998.

9 0-0 \( (D) \)

Or:

a) The most natural line is 9 h3 \\
\( \text{\&xf3} \) 10 \( \text{\&xf3} \) \( \text{\&g7} \) 11 0-0 0-0 12 \( \text{\&e1} \) \\
\( \text{\&e8} \) 13 \( \text{\&d2} \) (13 \( \text{\&g5} \) transposes to the main line) 13...c6 14 \( \text{\&c2} \) a6 15 \( \text{\&ad1} \) \\
b5 16 \( \text{\&f4} \) \( \text{\&e5} \) 17 \( \text{\&e2} \) \( \text{\&b8} \) 18 a3 \\
\( \text{\&a7} \) = Schmidt-Jansa, 2nd Bundesliga 1993/4. White’s bishop-pair is not too active.

b) 9 \( \text{\&d4} \) \( \text{\&xe2} \) 10 \( \text{\&xe2} \) \( \text{\&g7} \) 11 \\
\( \text{\&e3} \) 0-0 12 0-0 c6 13 \( \text{\&d2} \) \( \text{\&f}2-1/2 \) Wojtkiewicz-Benjamin, Philadelphia 1995. \\
Here Black could soon play ...d5 (for example, 13...\( \text{\&e8} \) 14 f3 \( \text{\&e5} \) 15 b3 \\
d5), or opt for ...\( \text{\&a6} \) followed by ...\( \text{\&b5} \).

9...\( \text{\&g7} \) 10 \( \text{\&g5} \)

After 10 \( \text{\&e3} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{\&d4} \)(11 h3) \\
11...\( \text{\&xe2} \) 12 \( \text{\&xe2} \) \( \text{\&e8} \) 13 f3 Black \\
can obtain good chances with a plan \\
familiar from the King’s Indian: 13...c6 \\
14 \( \text{\&d1} \) a6 15 \( \text{\&d2} \) \( \text{\&c5} \) 16 b3 b5 \( \text{\&h7} \) \\
14...\( \text{\&e5} ?? \) 15 \( \text{\&e2} \) \( \text{\&fd7} \) 16 \( \text{\&d2} \) \\
17 f4 \( \text{\&h7} \) 17 f4 was very good for White in \\
Lalic-Fernando, Dos Hermanas 1998.

15 g3 \( \text{\&e5} \) 16 \( \text{\&e2} \) \( \text{\&d7} \) 17 f4 \( \text{\&e6} \) \\
18 \( \text{\&g4} \) \( \text{\&d8} \) 19 \( \text{\&f3} \) \( \text{\&g5} \)!

Black gets some counterplay thanks 

to White’s somewhat vulnerable kingside.

20 \( \text{\&f2} \) \( \text{\&h8} \) 21 \( \text{\&h1} \) \( \text{\&xf4} \) 22 \( \text{\&xf4} \) \\
\( \text{\&f6} \) 23 \( \text{\&e2} ?? \) \( \text{\&g5} \) ! 24 \( \text{\&h4} \) \( \text{\&e6} \)
3 c4 d6

† Christiansen-Benjamin, USA Ch (Parsippany) 1996.

**Conclusion:** Although this line has been quite good for White in practice, it seems theoretically quite innocent. Even the 4th move alternatives look perfectly playable.

**B) 4 e4 (D)**

An active and quite important move. Black has allowed White to occupy the centre, so why not do so?

Now:

**B1: 4...e5  83**

**B2: 4...fxe3!?  87**

**B1) 4...e5 5 a4**

This is the most natural move but White has two primary alternatives:

a) 5 ...c6 5 (our suggestion is 5...exd4!? 6 exd4 c5 7 a4 7 7 a2 c6 =) 6 dxc3 dxe4 7 a4 a5 8 g3 dxe4 9 gxe4 10 h5 a4 11 h4 12 f3 a5 13 h3 f4 14 gxf4? (White should not give Black the e5-square: 14 ...f2! 15 dxe5 16 dxe6+ h8 17 h4 c5 18 h5 c6 5 is unclear, Zilberman-Agrest, USSR Ch (Azov) 1991.

b) Closing the centre immediately with 5 d5 is an important line but probably not so dangerous for Black:

b1) The appealing 5...f5?! is a bit risky: 6 e5 c5 6 fxe4 7 c5 7 g5?! (Gershon gives 7 exf5 8 a4 d3 9 d4 f1 10 exf5 h8 11 e3 12 g4 9 xg5 10 xg5 10 exf5 d6 11 c6 12 e4 13 g3 f5 14 g3 15 g3 f7 with a complicated position, Gershon-Azmaiparashvili, Saint Vincent Ech 2000.

b2) 5...d5 6 c5 dxc5 7 c2 or 7 h3 a5 8 h3 a5 (8...a5 d7 is possible) 9 g3 e7 10 g2 c6 11 0-0 and then:

b21) 11...0-0 12 g4! g6 13 h4 a4 14 f1 c5?! (14...d7 =) 15 d2 a6 16 c4 e8 17 f5 d5 18 a3 gave White more than sufficient compensation in Lukacs-Hodgson, Lisbon 1988.

b22) 11...cxd5! is more accurate, as Hodgson later showed: 12 cxd5 0-0 13 c1 a4 14 f1 a5?! (14...f7 =) 15 d2 a6 16 c1 f8 17 f5 f5 18 Illescas-Hodgson, Wijk aan Zee 1993.

b3) 5 ...e7 (the most logical) 6 c3 c6 7 f3 g5 (D). Black achieves the desired exchange of his bad dark-squared bishop. In this seemingly level position White has tried:

b31) 8 a4 d3 f6?! (8...xc1 9 xc1 c6 brings the knight to a more
natural square) 9 0-0-0-0 10 w3 xc1
11 axc1 a5 12 da4 we7 13 df1
fh8 14 c3 b6 15 c2 c5 16 xc5
bcx5 17 da3 dfb8 18 xc3 db4 19
d4 ± Lobron-Hickl, Nussloch 1996.

b32) 8 wg3 9 xc1 9 xc1 g6 10
e2 ogf6 11 0-0 0-0 12 f4 exf4 13
xf4 c6 14 b3 we7 = brought White
nothing in Douven-Lalic, Groningen

b33) 8 g3 9 xc1 9 xc1 c7 10
h3 a5 = 11 0-0 0-0 12 we3 og6 13
c2 b6 14 f3 wc7 15 df2, Sorokin-
Torre, Elista OL 1998. White has
more space but there are no weak-
nesses in Black's camp.

b34) 8 axg5 wg5 and now:

b341) 9 db5 wd8 seems to achieve
nothing for White.

b342) The peaceful 9 g3 wc7 10
g2 ogf6 11 0-0 c6 12 3a1 0-0 13
h3 a5 14 wc2 c5 is level, Jack-
ellen-Maiwald, Bundesliga 1994/5.

b343) 9 c5?! dgxc5 10 b5+ we7
(10...wh8!? 11 b4 da6) 11 b4 a6 12
bcx5 axb5 13 dbx5 df6 14-0-0 dxc5
(14...hec8!? is unclear) 15 xc7 de8
16 db5 ± was a very interesting piece

of activity in d’Amore-Albano, Peru-

We now return to 5 de2 (D):

5...dc7

For some reason the following sys-
tem has not been repeated even though
it doesn’t look very illogical: 5...xf3
6 xf3 exd4 7 wxd4 dc7 8 dc3 dc6
9 wd2 g6 10 dc3 dg7 11 0-0 0-0 12
d2 dc5 13 f3 de6 14 3a1 dh8 (it
is hard to say if this is useful; at this
point the position looks quite level)
15
d3 de4 16 f4 f5 17 exf5 gxf5 18
we2 wf6 ± Wl.Schmidt-Yrjolä, Thess-
aloniki OL 1988.

6 dc3

6 dg1!? is an interesting idea of
Gleizerov’s. 6...xe2 7 xe2 ogf6
7...exd4 8 dg4 df6 9 dc3 de7 10
0-0, Tjomsland-Salmensuu, Rimavska
Sobota 1995, 10...0-0 11 dc3 ce8 ap-
pers pretty solid) 8 dbc3 0-0 9 0-0
d8 10 dg3 dg8 11 de3 c6 12 d5 g6
13 f3 h5 14 wd2 dh7 15 dxc6 bxc6 16
b4 db6 17 wd3 gave White a tiny
space advantage in Gleizerov-Vezzosi,
6...\textbf{xf}3

6...\textbf{Qf}6 7 0-0 0-0 8 \textbf{Qe}3 \textbf{\pm} leads to a well-known Old Indian line where White is a move ahead compared with the note to White's 8th move in Line D12.

7 \textbf{xf}3 (D)

\[ B \]

7...\textbf{Qg}5

After Hickl's interesting continuation 7...exd4!? 8 \textbf{Qxd}4 \textbf{Qf}6 there is no evidence that White really gets anything concrete, in spite of his bishop-pair.

\begin{itemize}
  \item a) 9 \textbf{Qe}3 \textbf{Qe}7 10 \textbf{Qd}5 \textbf{Qxd}5 11 cxd5 (11 exd5+??) 11...0-0 12 0-0 a5 13 \textbf{Qb}1 \textbf{Qe}8 14 g3 c6 15 dxc6 bxc6 16 \textbf{Qa}3 \textbf{Qc}7 17 \textbf{Qf}4 \textbf{Qc}5 = Ružele-Hickl, Berlin 1997.

  \item b) 9 \textbf{Qd}2 \textbf{Qe}7 10 0-0 0-0 11 b3 \textbf{Qc}6 (11...\textbf{Qc}5 12 \textbf{Qb}2 a5 13 \textbf{Qf}el \textbf{Qe}8 14 \textbf{Qe}2 \textbf{Qc}6 15 f3 \textbf{Qg}5?? 16 f4 \textbf{Qf}6 17 \textbf{Qd}1 a4 18 \textbf{Qb}1 axb3 19 axb3 \textbf{Qb}4 = Rey-Hodgson, San Francisco 1998) 12 \textbf{Qb}2 \textbf{Qc}5 13 \textbf{Qd}1 a5 14 \textbf{Qb}1 a4 15 \textbf{Qe}1 axb3 16 axb3 \textbf{Qb}4 17 c5 \textbf{Qxd}5 (17...\textbf{Qxb}2??) 18 exd5 \textbf{Qxb}2 19 \textbf{Qxb}2 \textbf{Wf}6 = Jackelen-Hickl, Bundesliga 1992/3. The bishop-pair tends to remain inactive or else it is devalued by the exchange of dark-squared bishops. From these examples this idea looks more attractive for Black than the main line, but further tests are needed.

7...\textbf{Qxg}5

Less ambitious is 8 0-0 \textbf{Qxc}1 9 \textbf{Qxc}1 \textbf{Qf}6 (9...\textbf{Qe}7??):

  \begin{itemize}
    \item a) 10 d5 0-0 11 b4 \textbf{Qe}7 (11...a5?! =) 12 \textbf{Qd}2 g6 13 a3 \textbf{Qxe}8 14 \textbf{Qf}d1 \textbf{Qg}7 15 \textbf{Qd}3 h5 16 \textbf{Qd}2 \textbf{Qe}8 17 \textbf{Qd}1 \textbf{Qb}6 18 \textbf{Qb}3 \textbf{Qf}6 19 \textbf{Qd}1 \textbf{Qbd}7 20 \textbf{Qdc}2 c5 21 dxc6 bxc6 22 \textbf{Qd}2 \textbf{Qb}1/2 Ionov-Belikov, Orel 1992.

    \item b) 10 g3 0-0 11 \textbf{Qg}2 \textbf{Qc}8 12 \textbf{Qd}2 c6 13 \textbf{Qcd}1 a6 14 d5 \textbf{Qc}8 15 b3 cxd5 16 \textbf{Qxd}5 \textbf{Qxd}5 17 cxd5 a5 \textbf{Qb}1/2-\textbf{Qb}6 Vukić-Mokry, Graz 1991.

    \item c) 10 \textbf{Qd}2 0-0 11 \textbf{Qc}2 \textbf{Qc}8 12 d5 \textbf{Qc}5 13 \textbf{Qe}3 a5 14 b3 c6! 15 \textbf{Qb}1 \textbf{Qb}6 16 a3 \textbf{Qec}8 17 \textbf{Qfc}1 \textbf{Qcd}7! = Vyzhmanavin-Miles, Beijing 1991.

8...\textbf{Wg}5 9 0-0 (D)

\[ B \]

White has more space and better development. Practice has shown Black cannot completely equalize.
9...\texttt{\textbf{d}}8

Or:

a) Black has suffered even more in the line 9...c6?! 10 d5! c5 11 \texttt{\textbf{b}}3 \texttt{\textbf{b}}6 12 a4 \texttt{\textbf{e}}7 13 a5 \texttt{\textbf{c}}8 14 a6 \texttt{\textbf{b}}8:

a1) 15 \texttt{\textbf{b}}5+!? \texttt{\textbf{f}}8 (15...\texttt{\textbf{d}}7?? 16 \texttt{\textbf{xd}}7+ \texttt{\textbf{xd}}7 17 \texttt{\textbf{g}}4+ \texttt{\textbf{d}}8 18 \texttt{\textbf{xc}}8 \texttt{\textbf{xc}}8 19 \texttt{\textbf{b}}5 +) 16 axb7 \texttt{\textbf{xb}}7 17 \texttt{\textbf{c}}6 ±.

a2) 15 \texttt{\textbf{g}}4 \texttt{\textbf{b}}6 16 axb7 \texttt{\textbf{xb}}7 17 \texttt{\textbf{xa}}7! \texttt{\textbf{xf}}6 (17...\texttt{\textbf{xa}}7 18 \texttt{\textbf{xb}}6 \texttt{\textbf{c}}7 19 \texttt{\textbf{xc}}7 \texttt{\textbf{xc}}7 20 \texttt{\textbf{b}}5 \texttt{\textbf{e}}7 21 \texttt{\textbf{a}}1! +) 18 \texttt{\textbf{b}}5+ \texttt{\textbf{f}}8 19 \texttt{\textbf{xb}}7 \texttt{\textbf{xb}}7 (\texttt{J.Horvath-Ruck, Budapest 1995}) 20 \texttt{\textbf{b}}4! +! \texttt{\textbf{Ribli}}.

b) 9...\texttt{\textbf{h}}6 10 b4! 0-0 11 dxe5 \texttt{\textbf{dxe}}5 12 \texttt{\textbf{e}}2 \texttt{\textbf{d}}g4 13 \texttt{\textbf{d}}5 \texttt{\textbf{f}}6 14 \texttt{\textbf{d}}2 ± a5?! 15 \texttt{\textbf{d}}5 \texttt{\textbf{d}}8 16 \texttt{\textbf{xa}}5 \texttt{\textbf{a}}7 17 \texttt{\textbf{a}}b1 c6 18 \texttt{\textbf{b}}6 ± \texttt{Stohl-Miles, Manila 1992}.

10 dxe5!

10 \texttt{\textbf{c}}1 transposes to the note to White's 8th move.

10...\texttt{\textbf{d}}xe5

Kramnik's suggestion 10...\texttt{\textbf{d}}xe5 11 \texttt{\textbf{c}}2 \texttt{\textbf{c}}7 12 f4 doesn't look very attractive for Black either. Where are the counterchances?

11 \texttt{\textbf{b}}3 \texttt{\textbf{b}}8

11...\texttt{\textbf{c}}8 is about the same: 12 \texttt{\textbf{g}}4!

(12 \texttt{\textbf{c}}d1 \texttt{\textbf{g}}6 13 \texttt{\textbf{a}}3 \texttt{\textbf{c}}6 14 \texttt{\textbf{d}}2 \texttt{\textbf{c}}7 15 \texttt{\textbf{f}}d1 \texttt{\textbf{f}}8 16 \texttt{\textbf{a}}4 \texttt{\textbf{d}}8 17 \texttt{\textbf{a}}3 \texttt{\textbf{f}}8 \texttt{1/2-1/2 Piket-Adams, Groningen 1990}) 12...\texttt{\textbf{g}}6 13 \texttt{\textbf{d}}7+ (13 \texttt{\textbf{f}}5?!) 13...\texttt{\textbf{xd}}7 14 \texttt{\textbf{a}}3 \texttt{\textbf{c}}6 15 \texttt{\textbf{c}}d1 \texttt{\textbf{c}}7 16 \texttt{\textbf{a}}6 0-0 17 \texttt{\textbf{f}}d1 \texttt{\textbf{f}}6 18 \texttt{\textbf{c}}5 \texttt{\textbf{b}}6 19 \texttt{\textbf{xb}}6 axb6 20 f3 and White is much better, \texttt{Kuzman-Dunnington, Cannes 1992}.

12 \texttt{\textbf{a}}3 \texttt{\textbf{c}}6 (D)

13 \texttt{\textbf{g}}4!

An important move. Less convincing is 13 \texttt{\textbf{c}}ad1 \texttt{\textbf{g}}6 14 \texttt{\textbf{d}}2 \texttt{\textbf{f}}8 with counterplay.

13...\texttt{\textbf{g}}6

After 13...\texttt{\textbf{d}}f6 14 \texttt{\textbf{h}}3 \texttt{\textbf{e}}7 15 \texttt{\textbf{c}}ad1 \texttt{\textbf{c}}7 16 \texttt{\textbf{d}}d6 (another idea is 16 \texttt{\textbf{c}}5!?, threatening both 17 \texttt{\textbf{b}}5 and 17 \texttt{\textbf{d}}5) 16...0-0 17 \texttt{\textbf{f}}d1 ± White dominates the d-file.

14 \texttt{\textbf{h}}3

Black's position is not quite as difficult after 14 \texttt{\textbf{xd}}7+?! \texttt{\textbf{xd}}7 15 \texttt{\textbf{c}}ad1 \texttt{\textbf{c}}7 ± but 14 \texttt{\textbf{f}}5!? should not be worse than the text-move.

14...\texttt{\textbf{d}}8

14...\texttt{\textbf{c}}7 15 \texttt{\textbf{c}}ad1 \texttt{\textbf{f}}8 16 \texttt{\textbf{c}}5! \texttt{\textbf{w}}e7 17 \texttt{\textbf{d}}6 ± offers Black no relief.

15 \texttt{\textbf{c}}ad1 \texttt{\textbf{c}}7 16 \texttt{\textbf{d}}d6 \texttt{\textbf{f}}8

In the variation 16...0-0 17 \texttt{\textbf{xd}}7 \texttt{\textbf{xa}}3 18 \texttt{\textbf{xa}}3 \texttt{\textbf{cxd}}7 19 \texttt{\textbf{cxd}}7 \texttt{\textbf{f}}d8 20 \texttt{\textbf{d}}d1 ± White gains material and after 16...\texttt{\textbf{c}}b6 17 \texttt{\textbf{c}}5! \texttt{\textbf{c}}4 18 \texttt{\textbf{b}}4 \texttt{\textbf{cxd}}6 19 \texttt{\textbf{cxd}}6 \texttt{a}5 (19...\texttt{\textbf{d}}8 20 \texttt{\textbf{d}}7+! \texttt{\textbf{xd}}7 21 \texttt{\textbf{d}}d1 ++) 20 \texttt{\textbf{a}}3!? (20 \texttt{\textbf{c}}5 \texttt{\textbf{cxd}}7 21 \texttt{\textbf{cxd}}7+ \texttt{\textbf{xd}}7 22 \texttt{\textbf{c}}4! with good compensation) 20...\texttt{\textbf{f}}8 21 \texttt{\textbf{d}}d1 ± White has superb compensation, and should probably win.
17 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}8d7} \\
17...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}6} 18 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}4c6} +--.

18 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}8\text{f8} 19 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}6d1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}6} 20 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}3} \\
White makes the g6-knight an unhappy piece and secures a big plus. In Kramnik-Mokry, Bundesliga 1994/5, White realized his advantage convincingly: 20...0-0 21 c5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}e8} 22 b4 a5!? 23 b5! exb5 24 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xb5}! (there is no need to allow counterplay by 24 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d5} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xd5} 25 exd5 c4!) 24...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xe4} 25 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c3} \\
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}6f6} 26 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}b6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}ed8}?! (after 26...e4 27 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}eb8} 28 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}2} 29 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}xe4} \\
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}xe4} 30 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}xe4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}xe4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{t}}x} White dominates the board) 27 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e8} 28 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}b3}! -- \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}7}?! \\
29 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}c8} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}xc8} 30 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}xc8} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}xc5} 31 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d8} \\
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}e7} 32 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}d7} 1-0.

Conclusion: The main line is unpleasant for Black, who has to opt for either the less tested alternative on the 7th move or choose Line B2.

B2)
4...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xf3}?! (D)


This is a slightly surprising and comparatively new idea. Black wants to benefit from the weakness of the d4-pawn and plans to play ...c5 later instead of ...e5.

5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xf3} \\
5 gxf3 e5 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xc3} is untested but maybe not as stupid as it looks.

5...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}6} 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xc3} \\
Or:

a) 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d1} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7} 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}f3} c5 8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d3} transposes to the note to White’s 8th move.

b) 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{b}}3} can hardly be any good if White has no time to take on b7: 6...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7} 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}e3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}h6}?! 8 h3! (8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{b}}xb7} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}4} looks risky for White) 8...f5 9 \\
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c3} 0-0 10 g3 c5 11 d5 fx e4 12 g4 \\
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}5} 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}g2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d4} 14 0-0 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}xe3} 15 \\
fx e4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}6} 16 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}xe4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}f7} 17 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}de5} \\
18 b3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}5} 19 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}5} = Kozul-Adams, Pula Echt 1997.

6...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7} 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d1} \\
Or 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}c3} c5.

7...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}5}! (D)

8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}5} \\
This should be critical since White can hardly hope for anything with 8 \\
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}e3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{b}}6} (8...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}xd4} 9 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4} 10
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\[ \text{Conclusion: This new but not so original idea has frightened White away from } 4 \text{ e4 even though it is not absolutely clear that Black can equalize. In fact it seems that in these complicated positions White has somewhat better chances. Still, more tests are needed.} \]

\[ \text{C) } \]

\[ 4 \text{ \texttt{Wb3} } \texttt{Ab8} \ (D) \]

\[ \text{Now:} \]

\[ \text{C1: } 5 \text{ g3} \quad 89 \]

\[ \text{C2: } 5 \text{ h3} \quad 92 \]

\[ \text{White also has the following less popular possibilities:} \]

\[ \text{a) } 5 \text{ c3 is a serious move (and has something in common with } 4 \text{ c3):} \]

\[ \text{a1) } 5...a6!? 6 \text{ e4 } \texttt{xf3} 7 \texttt{xf3} \text{ e6} \]

\[ \text{ (7...e5! deserves attention) } 8 \texttt{xe3 c5} \ 9 \texttt{dxc5 } \texttt{xc5} 10 \texttt{wc2 } \texttt{f6} 11 \texttt{g1 } \texttt{a5} \]

\[ 12 \text{ 0-0-0 } \texttt{g6} 13 \texttt{xb1 } \texttt{e7} 14 \texttt{wd2} \text{ is slightly better for White. Epishin-Bezold, Bad Wiessee 1997.} \]

\[ \text{a2) } 5...g6 \text{ (very logical if Black doesn't have to worry about the position of the g4-bishop) } 6 \texttt{g5}?! (6 \texttt{d2} e5) 6...\texttt{g7} 7 \texttt{e3 } \texttt{xf3} 8 \texttt{xf3} \texttt{c6} 9 \]

\[ \texttt{c2 } \texttt{a5} 10 \texttt{f4 } \texttt{gf6} (10...\texttt{e5}!) 11 \]

\[ 0-0-0 \texttt{c5} 12 \texttt{dxc5 } \texttt{xc5} 13 \texttt{b5 } \texttt{xb5} 14 \texttt{xb5 } \texttt{fe4} 15 \texttt{h4} \texttt{a6} 16 \texttt{d4} \]

\[ \texttt{d7} = \text{Ortiz-Torre, Manila 1997.} \]

\[ \text{a3) After } 5...\texttt{xf3} 6 \texttt{exf3 } \texttt{g6} 7 \texttt{c3} \]

\[ \texttt{g7} 8 \texttt{d1} \text{ Black can hardly be happy with } 8...\texttt{e6}?! 9 \texttt{d5}, \text{ so he has continued } \]

\[ 8...\texttt{c6} 9 \texttt{c2 } \texttt{gf6} 10 \texttt{0-0-0-0} 11 \texttt{f4} \texttt{a6} \]

\[ 12 \texttt{d5 } \texttt{a5} 13 \texttt{f5} (13 \texttt{dxc6! bxc6} 14 \texttt{wxc2} \text{ is slightly better for White according to Benjamin, though it would be very hard to prove any meaningful plus) } 13...\texttt{c5} \]

\[ 14 \texttt{wc2 } \texttt{xd5} 15 \texttt{cxd5 } \texttt{fc8} 16 \texttt{bl } \texttt{a4} 17 \texttt{xa4 } \texttt{wa4} \text{ with an equal position, Miles-Benjamin, Horgen 1994.} \]

\[ \text{b) Less natural is } 5 \texttt{e3 } \texttt{c6}: \]

\[ \text{b1) } 6 \texttt{c3 } \texttt{gf6} \text{ (here is an unusual way to lose: } 6...\texttt{b5}?! 7 \texttt{cxb5 } \texttt{cxb5} 8 \texttt{g5}! \texttt{h5} 9 \texttt{g4 } \texttt{g6} 10 \texttt{h4 } \texttt{h6}?! 11 \texttt{h5} \]

\[ 1-0 \text{ Matveeva-Guseinov, Russia Cup 1999}) 7 \texttt{d2 } \texttt{a5} 8 \texttt{d5} (8 \texttt{f3 } \texttt{e6} 9 \texttt{f2} \texttt{b5} \text{ is unclear) } 8...\texttt{e5} (8...\texttt{eb6}?!?) \]

\[ 9 \texttt{f3 } \texttt{f5} 10 \texttt{f2 } \texttt{e4} 11 \texttt{g4 } \texttt{g6} 12 \texttt{g5} \]

\[ \texttt{h5} 13 \texttt{h3} \text{ (Barcev-Adams, Biel 1991) and now } 13...\texttt{e5}! \text{ is unclear according to Barcev.} \]

\[ \text{b2) } 6 \texttt{bd2 } \texttt{a5}! 7 \texttt{h3 } \texttt{xf3} 8 \texttt{xf3} \texttt{gf6} 9 \texttt{e2 } \texttt{e6} = 10 \texttt{0-0-0 } \texttt{e7} 11 \texttt{fd1} \]

\[ 0-0 \texttt{12 } \texttt{ac1 } \texttt{c7} 13 \texttt{e4}?! \texttt{d5} 14 \texttt{xf6+ } \texttt{xf6} 15 \texttt{c5 } \texttt{h5} \text{ and now Black has a slight advantage, M.Gurevich-}

\[ \text{Seul, Bonn 1996.} \]

\[ \text{C1) } \]

\[ 5 \texttt{g3} \ (D) \]

\[ 5...\texttt{g6} \]
This is the most natural plan, striving for the ...c5 thrust, but there are other moves Black has tried:

a) 5...c5?! 6 axg2 and then:

a1) 6...exf3 7 wxf3 dgf6 (7...exd4 8 wxe4+ a7 9 wxd4 ±) 8 e3 d5? (8...e4 9 wfd1 c6 10 dxc3 d5 11 exd5 cxd5 12 wa4 a6 13 f3 ± Dokhoian) 9 exd5 a6+ 10 wxe4 (10...exd4 11 exd4 0-0 12 0-0 wxb6 13 g5 ±) 11 wxe2 0-0 (Dokhoian-Hodgson, Wijk aan Zee 1989) 12 0-0 ± intending to meet 12...axc3 with 13 bxc3 axd5 14 axc4 wxc3 15 axh7+.

a2) 6...d7 7 a3 exd4 8 wxe4 c5 9 dxc3 a6 10 a4 b5 11 axb5 axb5 12 cxb5 e6 13 d3 0-0 14 0-0 w6h6 15 wfd1 a6 16 wcd5 17 g5 wxc3 18 bxc3 axb5 = Ružele-Kveinys, Bonn 1996.

b) 5...d7 6 wxe4 c6 7 dxc3 e5 8 dxe5 w5 9 0-0 w7 10 a3 (alternatively, 10 wfd1 ± Salov-Adams, Manila 1990) 10...w6a6 11 w6a2 0-0 12 w4 wfe8 13 wfc1 ± Antunes-Urdaj, Matanzas Capablanca mem 1994.

c) An interesting Benko-style continuation is 5...c5!? 6 d5 b5!? (6...g6)

7 cxb5 a6 8 a4 axb5 9 axb5 d6 10 dxg6 11 hxg6 (11 h3!? wxf3 12 gxf3) 12 w7 0-0-0 0-0 13 d2 d6 14 h3 d7 15 dbd1!? (15 da4 dxh4 16 wxc4 exh4 with good compensation) 15...dxe4 16 dxh4 d7 17 da3 w6c8 18 w6h2 w6b7 19 d4 d8c8 20 e5 axb5 = A. Marić-Cherniaev, Biel 1994.

6 d3

Some sources recommend 6...bd2 but Black gets similar counterplay as in the main line after 6...c5!. White then has three options:

a) Black activates his pieces after 7 dxc5?! dx5 8 w5c3 d6f6 9 b4 w7g7! 10 waa3 dx4 (10...d7?! is unclear) 11 bxc5 dxf3! 12 dxf3 0-0 13 g2

wxc7 (13...a5!? 14 bxa5 d8 offers Black a slight advantage) 14 w5c1 d6

(14...a5!? 15 e5 w5d4 16 h3!? 16 0-0 wxf2 17 dxe2? dxe2 15) 16...w7g2 (16...dxe2 17 w7xg4 h7xh4 18 wxc5

followed by dxe4 ±) 17 0-0 0-0 18

dx7 19 w5e3 20 w7c4 21...d8 and w7c2 with a very complicated position, Lauder-Adams, Manila 1990.

b) 7 c3 w5a5?! (7...w7g7 8 h3 dxf3 9 dxf3 transposes to "c2") 8 d7 w7g7 9 w7d4 w7g7 10 w7d4 w7e7 (the alternative 8...exd4! 9 w5d4 w7g7 is also worth considering) and now:

c1) After 9 dxc5 dxc5 10 w7a3 w7b5!? (10...a5) 11 bxc5 dxc5 Black once again becomes active.

c2) 9 e3 allows two promising options:
c21) 9...a6!? 10 \(\text{\textit{g2}}\) (another approach for White is 10 a4 \(\text{\textit{g6}}\) 11 e2) 10...\(\text{\textit{g6}}\) 11 0-0 0-0 12 \(\text{\textit{c2}}\) \(\text{\textit{c7}}\) 13 b3 \(\text{\textit{rfe8}}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{we2}}\) b5 15 \(\text{\textit{exb5}}\) axb5 16 \(\text{\textit{b2}}\) c4 17 \(\text{\textit{rfe1}}\) d5 \(\text{\textit{\varnothing Brückner-Bezold, Bundesliga 1989/90}}\).

c22) 9...\(\text{\textit{g6}}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{e2}}\)!? (here the bishop protects c4 and stops ...b5) 10...0-0 11 0-0 e5 12 \(\text{\textit{d1}}\) \(\text{\textit{c7}}\) 13 \(\text{\textit{f1}}\) a6 14 a4 \(\text{\textit{rfe8}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{d2}}\) \(\text{\textit{e4}}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{e1}}\) \(\text{\textit{exd4}}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{exd4}}\) h5 18 \(\text{\textit{g2}}\) h4 19 g4 \(\text{\textit{rfe6}}\) 20 \(\text{\textit{c2}}\), Vyzhmanavin-Gofshtein, Debrecen Echt 1992. This complex example has usually been considered slightly better for White but the activity and harmony of Black’s pieces should be respected in practical play.

6...\(\text{\textit{g7}}\) (D)

7 \(\text{\textit{bd2}}\)

Or:

a) 7 \(\text{\textit{e3}}\) c5 8 \(\text{\textit{bd2}}\) is unconvincing: 8...\(\text{\textit{h6}}\) 9 dxc5 \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) dxc5 11 0-0 (11 \(\text{\textit{wa4}}\) \(\text{\textit{d7}}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{xa7}}\) b6 with good compensation) 11...0-0 12 \(\text{\textit{e4?!}}\) \(\text{\textit{wa5}}\) 13 \(\text{\textit{fd1}}\) b5 and Black is much better, Scarella-Bezold, Buenos Aires 1992.

b) Interesting though not the most natural is 7 d5?! c6 8 \(\text{\textit{c3}}\) \(\text{\textit{gf6}}\) (those who like action can try 8...\(\text{\textit{eh5?!}}\) 9 \(\text{\textit{wa3}}\) b5 with complications) 9 \(\text{\textit{e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{wa5}}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{d4}}\) c5?! (those who don’t like action should play 10...\(\text{\textit{c5}}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{c2}}\) exd5 12 cxd5 \(\text{\textit{d7}}\) =) 11 \(\text{\textit{c1}}\) a6 12 \(\text{\textit{d2}}\) b5 13 cxb5 axb5 14 f3 (14 h3?! 14...b4 15 \(\text{\textit{d1}}\) \(\text{\textit{f5}}\) 16 e4 \(\text{\textit{e5}}\) 17 exf5 c4 18 \(\text{\textit{e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) 19 \(\text{\textit{e2}}\) \(\text{\textit{d3+}}\) 20 \(\text{\textit{h1}}\) \(\text{\textit{xb2}}\) 21 \(\text{\textit{xb2}}\) \(\text{\textit{xb2}}\) 22 \(\text{\textit{e1}}\) 0-0 23 \(\text{\textit{xc4}}\) \(\text{\textit{rs8}}\) 24 \(\text{\textit{wd3}}\) \(\text{\textit{xa2}}\) with good compensation, Pfleger-Jansa, 2nd Bundesliga 1994/5.

7...c5 8 e3

Again, 8 dxc5 \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) offers Black quite active piece-play. 9 \(\text{\textit{wa3}}\) \(\text{\textit{d7}}\)! (the ‘!’ was given by Lautier and Polugaevsky though 9...a5! looks logical too) 10 \(\text{\textit{b3}}\) \(\text{\textit{a4}}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{bd4}}\) \(\text{\textit{wb6}}\)! (this is better than allowing compensation after 11...\(\text{\textit{wa5}}\) ?! 12 b4! \(\text{\textit{wc7}}\) 13 0-0 \(\text{\textit{xc4}}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{rfe6}}\) 13 0-0 0-0 14 b3 \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{d1}}\) a5 16 \(\text{\textit{d2}}\) \(\text{\textit{a8}}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{e1}}\) \(\text{\textit{rfe8}}\) 18 \(\text{\textit{bab1}}\) e5! 19 \(\text{\textit{c2}}\) \(\text{\textit{f5}}\) 20 \(\text{\textit{al1}}\) a4! (20...\(\text{\textit{d3}}\) ?! 21 \(\text{\textit{h4}}\) ?) 21 b4 \(\text{\textit{c4}}\) 22 \(\text{\textit{d1c1}}\) \(\text{\textit{e6}}\) ? and c4 was weak in Anić-Hodgson, Metz 1994.

8...\(\text{\textit{gf6}}\) (D)

9 0-0

9 a4 0-0 10 0-0 \(\text{\textit{c6}}\) (10...\(\text{\textit{wa5}}\) 11 h3 \(\text{\textit{xf3}}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{xf3}}\) \(\text{\textit{e4}}\) 13 \(\text{\textit{wd3}}\) f5 14 \(\text{\textit{xd2}}\) \(\text{\textit{ef6}}\) 15 d5 a6 16 \(\text{\textit{wa3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\varnothing Razuvaev-Jansa, Prague 1992}}\) 11 h3 \(\text{\textit{xf3}}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{xf3}}\) d5 13 \(\text{\textit{d1}}\) dxc4 14 \(\text{\textit{wxc4}}\) \(\text{\textit{e8}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{b5}}\) \(\text{\textit{c7}}\) = Polak-Jansa, Olomouc 1995.

9...0-0

Ribli likes this move more than the Benko-style possibility 9...b5?! 10 exb5 a6 11 \(\text{\textit{g5?!}}\) (11 \(\text{\textit{a4?!}}\) 0-0 gives
Black compensation) 11...0-0 12 f3
\[ \text{W} \]
\[ \text{B} \]
\[ \text{W} \]
\[ \text{B} \]
\[ \text{W} \]
\[ \text{B} \]
\[ \text{W} \]
\[ \text{B} \]
13 \text{\textit{f3 x3 cxd4! f 14 \textit{xf7 xf7}}}
15 \text{\textit{xxg4 dxe3 16 \textit{xxe3 \textit{gg4 e7 \textit{g61 18 \textit{xf7 d4+ 19 \textit{h1 xf7}}}}}}}
10 h3 \textit{xf3 11 \textit{gf3 c7}}
White's queenside is weak, and this compensates for the bishop-pair.
12 g2 h6 13 a4 e4 14 f6 c8 15 d8 c5 16 f1 c5 17 d2 b4 18 xd1 a5
Though it was not obligatory for Black to relieve the tension, he has a solid position and space on the queenside, Vaganian-Speelman, Bundesliga 1997/8. The game is roughly level.

Conclusion: Black gets sufficient counterplay, with the key move being ...c5. This line should also be OK in a practical sense because the side with an active position tends to score well.

C2)
5 h3 (D)
5...gxf3
Better than 5...h5?! 6 g4! (White also has good play after 6 xf4! xf3 7 xf3 e5 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 d2 gf4 10 c3 c5 11 g4! h6 12 h4! intending g5 and h3, Miles-Kavansky, Los Angeles 1988) 6...g6, and then:

a) 7 f4 h5?! 8 g5 e5! 9 e3 f6 10 c5 h6?! (10...f7! is unclear) 11 e6 xg6 12 xg6 13 c3 e6 14 xg1 c7 15 0-0-0 is slightly better for White, Scherbakov-Khomeriki, Mlada Boleslav 1994.
b) 7 g2 e5 8 e3! c6 9 0-0 a6 10 e3 w7 11 e1 w7 12 \textit{xd7?} \textit{xf4 14 xg5 gives White good compensation} 12 \textit{h4 e7 13 f4 xf4 14 xf4 0-0 15 e4 16 xg7} ±

6 xf3
Now White has problems with his clumsy queen.
6...g6 (D)

Or:

a) 6...e5 doesn't look very logical in view of 7 e3 ±.
b) 6...c5 7 dxc5 Qxc5 should be playable. White has tried the somewhat risky 8 b4!? Qd7 9 Ab2 Qg6 10 Qd2 g6 11 Qe4 Qb6 (after 11...Qg7! White might suffer due to his poor development) 12 Qxf6+ Qxf6 13 Qxf6 exf6 and now 14 a3 = is better than 14 Ab1 d5!, Schwalbenberg-Sokolovs, 2nd Bundesliga 1995/6.

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
W
\end{array} 
\]

7 Qc3

Or:

a) The rather inactive 7 e3 Qg7 8 Qd1 allows Black to equalize easily with 8...c5 (or 8...e5 9 Qe2 exd4 10 exd4 d5!? 11 0-0 Qxc4 12 Qxc4 Qc7 = Zitnik-Vaulin, Zadar 2000) 9 dxc5 (9 d5) 9...Qxc5 10 Qe2 Qf6 11 Qc3 0-0 12 0-0 a6 13 Qc2 Qd7 14 Qd2 (14 b4 Qce4 15 Qb2 Qxc3 16 Qxc3 Qxc8 =) 14...Qfc8 15 b4 Qe6 16 Qb3 Qg5! 17 Qd1 b5 18 Qxb5 Qxb5 19 Qe1 Qfe4 = Timoshchenko-Jansa, Czech Republic 1999.

b) Interesting is 7 Wa3 Qg7 8 c3 (8 Qxa7!? is not a ‘human’ move but is not easy to refute immediately) 8...a6?! (8...c5 9 dxc5 Qxc5 looks more active)

9 Qc2 Qg6 10 0-0 0-0 11 Qd1 c6 12 Qd2 Qc7 13 Qe1 b5 14 Qa5 Qb7 15 Qd2 c5 16 Qf3 Qa7 17 dxc5 Qxc5 18 Qac1 ± Karpov-Hickl, Baden-Baden 1995, though the placing of the white queen on a3 is somewhat odd. However, it is very unusual if Karpov plays positionally unjustified moves.

c) After 7 e4 Qg7 8 Qd1 c6 (8...c5 9 d5 Qg6 10 Qc3 ±) 9 Qc3 Black can force a draw with 9...Qb6 10 Qe3 Qxb2 11 Qa4 Qb4+ 12 Qd2 Qa3 13 Qc1 Qb4+ 14 Qd2 Qa3 15 Qc1 a3 Qh2 Votruba-M.S.Hansen, Tåstrup 1992.

7...Qg7 8 e3

The clumsy 8 Qd3?! c5 9 d5 invites complications: 9...Qe5 10 Qc2 Qxc4 11 Qa4+ b5 12 Qxb5 Qxb6 13 Qc7+ (13 Qxa7?!) 13...Qf8 14 Qxa7 Qc8 15 Qb5 Qxd5 16 Qa4 Qb4 (16...Qc6! is much better for Black) 17 e4 Qf6 18 f3 and now 18...d5! (instead of 18...Qh5 19 Qf2, Wl.Schmidt-Jansa, 2nd Bundesliga 1992/3) is good.

8...c5!

When this line became popular at the beginning of the 1990s, 8...c5 was considered obvious but practice has shown it to be slightly suspicious as it exposes the light squares:

a) 9 Qd1 Qe7 (9...exd4?! 10 exd4 Qe7) 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 Qe2 0-0 12 0-0 c6 (12...f5?!) 13 e4 Qc8 14 Qe3 Qe7 15 Qa4 ± Sitnik-Maslak, Pardubice 1999.

b) 9 dxe5 dxe5 10 Qd1 f5 11 g4!? (11 e4 appears safer, with a slight advantage for White) 11...Qe7 12 Qxf5 Qxf5 13 Qe4 0-0 14 c5 Qh8 15 h4 led to very complicated play in K.Arkell-Hodgson, Dublin 1991.
9...a6

It is tempting but somewhat unnecessary to play 9...\textit{a}xc3+?! 10 bxc3:

a) 10...\textit{W}a5 11 \textit{A}d2 \textit{G}gf6 and now:
   a1) 12 \textit{A}e2?! leaves White's queen in trouble: 12...\textit{G}e5 13 \textit{W}f4 \textit{W}a4! (a standard idea in this position-type, blockading and pressing against c4 at the same time; it is better than the unclear 13...b5 14 cxb5 \textit{G}xd5 15 \textit{W}h6) 14 0-0 \textit{W}d8 15 \textit{G}fc1 \textit{G}c7 16 \textit{A}e1 h6 17 \textit{G}ab1 g5 18 \textit{W}f5 \textit{G}xc4 19 \textit{W}d3 b5 \textit{G}Mcbedlishvili-Gelman, Russia Cup (Krasnodar) 1998.

   a2) Better is the humble 12 \textit{W}d1! \textit{G}e4 13 \textit{A}d3 f5 14 0-0 \textit{G}e5 15 \textit{A}e1 0-0 16 f3 \textit{G}f6 (16...\textit{G}xd3 17 \textit{W}xd3 \textit{G}f6 18 a4 \textit{G}e2 19 Flear-Adams, London WFW 1990).

b) 10...\textit{G}gf6!?! 11 g4?! (11 \textit{W}d1 is Ribli's recommendation; then 11...\textit{W}a5 12 \textit{A}d2 transposes to variation 'a2')
   11...\textit{W}a5 12 \textit{W}d1 h5! 13 gxh5 (13 \textit{G}g1 \textit{H}xg4 14 \textit{H}xg4 \textit{G}e4 15 \textit{W}c2 \textit{G}e5 \textit{G}+) 13...\textit{A}xh5 14 \textit{W}b3 \textit{G}e4 is much better for Black, Miles-Adams, Tilburg 1993.

10 \textit{A}d2 \textit{G}gf6 11 a4 18 \textit{G}f6 18 a4 \textit{G}e2 19 Flear-Adams, London WFW 1990.

Or:

a) 11 e4 is a natural continuation leading to a typical Old Benoni position. 11...0-0 12 \textit{A}e2 e6 13 0-0 \textit{G}e5 14 \textit{W}f4 exd5 15 exd5 \textit{G}e8 16 \textit{G}g3 f5 17 f4 \textit{G}d7 18 a4 \textit{A}d4+ 19 \textit{G}h1 \textit{G}g7 is equal, Ki.Georgiev-Hickl, Altensteig 1995.

b) 11 \textit{A}e2 0-0 12 g4?! (12 e4 e6) 12...\textit{G}e5 13 \textit{G}g2 b5! 14 cxb5 axb5 15 \textit{G}xb5 c4 16 a4 \textit{G}fd7 17 0-0 \textit{G}c5 allowed Black to gain too much Benko-style compensation in Bagirov-Jacobs, Gausdal 1991.

11...0-0 12 \textit{W}d1 e6

Black leads the position to a rather standard type of Modern Benoni where the white pieces are not very actively placed. In the Benoni Black is usually quite happy to get rid of his light-squared bishop.

13 \textit{A}e2 exd5 14 exd5 \textit{G}e8

Ribli suggests playing 14...b5?! 15 axb5 axb5 16 \textit{G}xb5 (16 \textit{G}xb5 \textit{G}b6 17 \textit{G}a7?! \textit{G}a8 18 \textit{G}c6 \textit{G}xal 19 \textit{W}xal \textit{W}d7 \textit{G}) 16...\textit{G}xd5 and after 17 \textit{G}xd5 \textit{G}xb5 18 \textit{A}c3 \textit{A}xc3+ 19 bxc3 \textit{G}b6 the position simplifies into equality.

15 0-0 \textit{G}e4

Black's control over the central squares is strong enough for equality
in spite of White’s bishop-pair. Il’i- 

nov-Benjamin, USA Ch (Parsippany) 1996 continued 16...ex4 e5 17...c2 

xe8 18 a5 g5 19...c4 b5! (more active than 19...wh4 20...e1...e5 21 

xe2 ±) 20 axb6 exb6 21...xa6...xc4 

22...xc4...xb2 23...c3 (this move 

leads to a drawish ending but White must exchange Black’s strong bishop) 

23...xc3 24...xc3...e5 25...xe5 

xe5 26...d6...d2 27...d8+...g7 28 

d6 h5 29 d7...f6 30...c1...f5 31 f4 

fd5 32...c8...d7 33...xc5...e2 34 

...g5...e3 35...e6+...e6 36...e6+ 

½-½.

Or:

a) 4...xf3 is discussed in Line C of Chapter 13. If Black wants to play 

for a win this may well be the most attractive option. This is what Hodgson 

usually does.

b) 4...g6 is a slightly tame version of the Modern Defence. 5 e3! (5...e3 6 ...f3 transposes to note ‘a’ to 

White’s 6th move in Line B of Chapter 

13, while 5...xf3 6...xf3 transposes 

to Line B2 of this chapter) 5...g7 6 

...e2...g6 7 0-0 0-0 8...d3...xf3 9 

...f3 c6 10...d1 ± Schilstra-Hodgson, 


Now (after 4...e5):

D1: 5 e3 95
D2: 5...g3! ± 101

Or:

a) 5 d5?!...e7 6 e4 transposes to 

note ‘b3’ to White’s 5th move in Line 

B1.

b) 5 e4?! is rather risky. 5...xf3 

(Black can also play safe with 5...exd4 

6...d4...e7 7...e2...c6 8...d1...e7 9 

0-0 0-0 10...d4...xe2 11 dxex2...e8 

= Moran-Perez, Matanzas Capablanca 

mem 1995) 6...f3 g6 7...c3...g7 8...f4 

exd4 9...xd4...gf6 10...d2 0-0 11 

0-0-0...e8 12...g2?! (12 f3 is unclear) 

12...b6 13...d3...h5 ± Twardon- 

Kuczynski, Lubniewice 1993.

D1)

5 e3 (D)

Now:

D11: 5...c6 96
D12: 5...gf6 97

The former generally signifies that 

Black intends...f5.
Alternatives:

a) 5...f5?! may be premature because of 6 h3 \( \text{Nh5} \) 7 dxex5 (stronger than the unclear 7 \( \text{Ne}2 \) \( \text{Ne}7 \) 8 \( \text{Nb}3 \) c4 9 \( \text{Qd}2 \) \( \text{Nxe}2 \) 10 \( \text{Qxe}2 \) \( \text{Wc}8 \) 11 g4 g6 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 \( \text{Qf}4 \) c6 14 f3 \( \text{Qg}6 \) (Pähtz-Miles, Bad Wörishofen 1990) 7...dxex5 8 \( \text{Wd}5 \) ! (8 \( \text{Qe}2 \) \( \text{Ab}4 \) 9 \( \text{Wb}3 \) \( \text{We}7 \) 10 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Nxe}2 \) 11 \( \text{Qxd}7 \) \( \text{Nxc}4 \) 12 \( \text{Wxc}4 \) \( \text{Nxc}3+ \) 13 \( \text{Wxc}3 \) \( \text{Wxd}7 \) 14 b3 \( \text{Qf}6 \) 15 0-0 0-0 16 \( \text{Na}3 \) ± (A.Petrosian-Minnullin, St Petersburg 1993)) 8...c6 9 \( \text{Wc}6+ \) \( \text{We}7 \) 10 \( \text{Wxf}5 \) ± (Flačnik).

b) 5...g6!? 6 \( \text{Ne}2 \) \( \text{Ng}7 \) 7 0-0-0 (7 h3!? \( \text{Nh}3 \) 8 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) 8 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) should be better) 7...dxex5 8 b3 0-0-9 \( \text{Nh}2 \) \( \text{Qxf}3 \) 10 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) \( \text{Qxd}4 \) 11 \( \text{Qxd}4 \) c6 12 \( \text{Nh}4 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \) 13 \( \text{Nh}3 \) d5 14 \( \text{Ne}1 \) \( \text{Ne}8 \) = Prakash-Speelman, Calcutta 1999.

D11)

5...c6 6 h3

White can include this move or play straight away 6 \( \text{Ne}2 \) \( \text{Ng}7 \) 7 0-0 f5 8 e4! f4 9 c5! \( \text{Qxf}3 \) 10 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) \( \text{Qgf}6 \) 11 cxd6 \( \text{Nh}6 \). Then:

a) 12 d5 c5 (12...cxex5) 13 \( \text{Qb}5 \) \( \text{We}7 \) 14 b4 cxb4 15 a3 0-0 16 axb4 a6 17 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Wxd}6 \) 18 \( \text{Nd}2 \) b5 ± (Dautov-Mokry, Brno 1991).

b) Stronger looks 12 \( \text{Nxf}4! \) exf4 13 e5 0-0 (13...\( \text{Qxe}5 \)? 14 dxex5 \( \text{Nh}5 \) 15 \( \text{Wf}1 \) \( \text{Wf}7 \) 16 \( \text{Wf}2 \) +\( \) 14 exex6 \( \text{Qb}6 \) 15 \( \text{Wb}3+ \) \( \text{Nh}8 \) 16 a4 \( \text{Qb}8 \) ? (16...\( \text{Wxd}6 \) 17 a5 \( \text{Qb}5 \) ±) 17 a5 \( \text{Qc}8 \) 18 \( \text{Qxe}6 \) ± (Chuchelov-Bezdov, Dresden 1994).

6...\( \text{Nh}5 \) 7 \( \text{Ne}2 \) \( \text{Ne}7 \)

This is also a bad moment to play 7...f5 for a couple of reasons: 8 dxex5 (also 8 g4!? fxg4 9 \( \text{Qh}2 \) \( \text{Qgf}6 \) 10 hgx4 \( \text{Nh}6 \) 11 \( \text{Qf}1 \) ± followed by \( \text{Qg}3 \) looks positionally nice for White) 8...dxex5 9 e4! f4? 10 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Qxe}2 \) 11 \( \text{Wxd}7+ \) \( \text{Wxd}7 \) 12 \( \text{Qxd}7 \) \( \text{Qxc}4 \) 13 \( \text{Qxf}8 \) \( \text{Qxf}8 \) 14 \( \text{Qxf}4 \) ±.

8 0-0 f5!? (D)

This move is risky but interesting, and demands active play from White. 8...\( \text{Qgf}6 \) is still possible, leading to solid Old Indian-style play.

9 e4!

White should avoid 9 c5? e4! 10 cxex6 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) (10...\( \text{Qxf}3 \)?? 11 dxex7 \( \text{Qxe}7 \) 12 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) ±) 11 \( \text{Qd}2 \) \( \text{Qxe}2 \) 12 \( \text{Wxe}2 \) \( \text{Qgf}6 \) 13 \( \text{Qc}4 \) (after 13 f3 Black can
continue 13...\textit{We}7 or even 13...\textit{Gh}5!? 13...\textit{Ac}7, and now:

a) 14 b3?! b5! 15 \textit{Gd}2 \textit{We}7 16 \textit{Ad}1 0-0 17 \textit{Gf}1 \textit{Gb}6 leaves Black better. Vera-Gulko, Lucerne Wch 1993 continued nicely: 18 \textit{Ab}2 \textit{Gfd}5 19 a4 \textit{f}4! 20 exf4 \textit{Gxf}4 21 \textit{Gxe}4 \textit{Wg}5 22 \textit{Wf}3 (both 22 \textit{Wxc}6? \textit{Gxh}3+ and 22 \textit{Gg}3? \textit{Aae}8 23 \textit{Wxc}6 \textit{Gxh}3+ are winning for Black) 22...\textit{Gae}8 23 \textit{Wg}4? (23 \textit{Ff}1) 23...\textit{Wg}4 24 \textit{hxg}4 \textit{b}4 25 \textit{Gaa}2 \textit{Gc}2+ 26 \textit{Gh}1 \textit{Gd}5 27 \textit{f}3 \textit{Gd}6 28 \textit{Gc}1 \textit{Gff}6 29 g5 \textit{Gf}5 30 \textit{Gh}2 \textit{Gh}2 0-1.

b) 14 \textit{f}4! 0-0 (14...\textit{exf}3?! 15 \textit{Wxf}3 \textit{Gg}6 16 \textit{e}4 is worse) 15 \textit{Gd}5 \textit{Gb}6 \textit{E} minimizes the damage, but is positionally nice for Black.

9...\textit{f}4
9...\textit{fxe}4 10 \textit{Gxe}4 d5 (10...\textit{Ag}6 11 \textit{Gcg}5; 10...\textit{Gxf}3?! 11 \textit{Gxf}3 d5 12 \textit{cx}d5 \textit{cx}d5 13 \textit{Gc}3 e4 14 \textit{Gh}5+ \textit{Gg}6 15 \textit{Gx}d5 \textit{gx}h5 16 \textit{Gf}4) 11 \textit{cx}d5 \textit{cx}d5 12 \textit{Gcg}5 \textit{Gxf}3 13 \textit{Gxf}3 \textit{e}4 14 \textit{Gxe}5 \textit{Ggf}6 15 \textit{Gh}3 \textit{Gb}6 (15...\textit{Gb}6 16 \textit{Gxd}7? \pm) 16 \textit{a}4 \pm.

10 \textit{c}5! \textit{Gxf}3 11 \textit{Gxf}3

Now:

a) 11...\textit{cx}d4 12 \textit{Wxd}4 \textit{Gce}5 13 \textit{Gxf}4 \textit{Gxf}3+ 14 \textit{Gxf}3 \pm.

b) 11...\textit{dx}e5?! 12 \textit{dx}e5 \textit{Gxe}5 13 \textit{Gxf}4 (13 \textit{Gh}5+ \textit{Gg}6 14 \textit{Gxf}4 \textit{Gd}3! 15 \textit{Gc}3 \textit{gx}h5 16 \textit{Gxh}5+ \textit{Gf}8 17 \textit{Gf}5+ \textit{Gg}8 18 \textit{e}5 is unclear) 13...\textit{Wxd}1 14 \textit{Gxd}1 \textit{Gxd}3 15 \textit{Gg}3 \textit{Gxb}6 16 \textit{Gf}4 \textit{Gd}8 is precarious for Black but he may well survive.

c) 11...\textit{Ggf}6 12 \textit{cx}d6 \textit{Gxd}6 13 \textit{dx}e5 (Fta\v{c}nik gives this but 13 \textit{Gxf}4! exf4 14 \textit{e}5 should be possible; compare note 'b' to White's 6th move) 13...\textit{Gxe}5 14 \textit{Gb}3 \textit{Gc}5 15 \textit{Gc}4 \textit{Gf}7 with an unclear position.

\textbf{Conclusion:} It is risky for Black to opt for an early ...\textit{f}5 even if it is not completely refuted. No wonder most players these days are content with the Old Indian-style play in Line D12.

\begin{center}
\textbf{D12)}
\end{center}

5...\textit{Ggf}6 (D)

This is Black's safest option. He will get a well-known Old Indian position with an extra tempo if White plays \textit{e}3-e4 later on.

6 \textit{Gxe}2 \textit{Gd}7

After 6...\textit{c}6 7 0-0 \textit{Gd}7 White has also tried the idea 8 \textit{b}4?! (8 \textit{b}3 and 8 \textit{c}4 lead to similar positions to those in the main line) 8...0-0 9 \textit{Ab}1 \textit{Gf}5 10 \textit{Ab}2 \textit{Gc}7 11 \textit{Gb}3 \textit{h}6 12 \textit{a}4 \textit{Gfe}8 13 \textit{Gd}2 \textit{Gxe}4 (13...\textit{e}4?!) 14 \textit{Gxe}4 \textit{Gxe}4 15 \textit{Gc}3 \textit{Gf}6 with equality, Krasenkow-Miles, London Lloyds Bank 1993.

7 0-0

Including the moves 7 \textit{h}3 \textit{Gh}5 at this moment doesn't help White much. 8 0-0 0-0, and then:

a) 9 \textit{e}4?! has not been tried here, probably because of 9...\textit{Gg}6.
b) 9 b3 \( \texttt{Ke8} \) 10 \( \texttt{Ke1!?} \) (after 10 \( \texttt{Kb2} \), 10...\texttt{exd4}!? looks like a good equalizing attempt because after 11 \texttt{exd4} Black has the good-looking move 11...\texttt{d5}!) 10...\texttt{Kf8} 11 \texttt{e4} \texttt{c6} (putting pressure on \texttt{e4} with 11...\texttt{g6}!? looks good) 12 \texttt{Kb2} \texttt{a5} 13 \texttt{d5} \texttt{Qc5} 14 \texttt{Kf1} \texttt{Wb6} 15 \texttt{Kb1} \texttt{a4} 16 \texttt{Kc1} \texttt{axb3} 17 \texttt{axb3} \texttt{Wb4} 18 \texttt{Kd2} \pm Van Wely-Jansa, Gausdal 1992. Complicated King’s Indian-type play has developed.

c) 9 \texttt{Kb4}!? \texttt{Ke8} 10 \texttt{a4} \texttt{exd4} (10...\texttt{e4} 11 \texttt{Qxd2} \texttt{Kxe2} 12 \texttt{Wxe2} \texttt{Kf8} 15 \texttt{b5} gave White more play in Guliev-Mokry, Ceske Budejovice 1992) 11 \texttt{Qxd4} \texttt{Kxe2} 12 \texttt{Wxe2} \texttt{Kf8} 13 \texttt{Kd1} \texttt{g6} 14 \texttt{Ka3} \texttt{c6} 15 \texttt{b5} \texttt{Wc7} 16 \texttt{Kac1} \texttt{Ke5} 17 \texttt{O5} \texttt{Kad8} = I.Van- 

7...0-0 (D)

\[\]

8 \texttt{b3}

After 8 \texttt{e4}!? White is a tempo down compared with a similar Old Indian line but it is hard to say if the tempo is valuable enough for Black to equalize. After 8...\texttt{c6} 9 \texttt{Ke3} Black has a wide choice:

\[\]

a) 9...\texttt{Ah5}!? 10 \texttt{Wc2} (White can consider playing 10 \texttt{h3} \texttt{Kg6} 11 \texttt{Kd2}) 10...\texttt{Qg4} 11 \texttt{Kc1} \texttt{Gg6} 12 \texttt{h3} \texttt{Qf6} 13 \texttt{Ke3} \texttt{exd4} 14 \texttt{Qxd4} \texttt{Kxe8} 15 \texttt{Qfe1} \texttt{Qc5} 16 \texttt{Kxc5} \texttt{dxc5} 17 \texttt{Kad1} \texttt{Wc7} 18 \texttt{Wd4} \texttt{Kd6} 19 \texttt{Kxg6} \texttt{hxg6} 20 \texttt{Kf1} \texttt{Kb5} = and Black was fine with the bishop on \texttt{d4} in Azmaiparashvili-Romanishin, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1983.

b) 9...\texttt{xf3} 10 \texttt{xf3} \texttt{h6} 11 \texttt{d5} \texttt{Wb8} 12 \texttt{b4} \texttt{Kc8} 13 \texttt{Wb3} \texttt{Kd8} 14 \texttt{a3} \texttt{b6} 15 \texttt{Kxb6} \texttt{Wxb6} 16 \texttt{Kac1} is very slightly better for White because of his space advantage, Vadasz-Bezold, Gyula Perenyi mem 1997.

c) 9...\texttt{Ke8} 10 \texttt{d5} \texttt{Wf5} 11 \texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Kxe2} 12 \texttt{Wxe2} \texttt{Qb6}! (exchanging a pair of knights as White has the space advantage) 13 \texttt{Kfc1} \texttt{Qa4} 14 \texttt{Kxa4} \texttt{Wxa4} 15 \texttt{f3} \texttt{Wc8} 16 \texttt{dxc6} \texttt{bxc6} 17 \texttt{Qb1} \texttt{Qd7} 18 \texttt{Qc3} \texttt{Wb4} 19 \texttt{Kc2} \texttt{Qc5} 20 \texttt{Kd1} \texttt{Qd8} 21 \texttt{h1} \texttt{a5} 22 \texttt{b3} \texttt{h6} 23 \texttt{g3} \texttt{Qg5} 24 \texttt{Qf2} \texttt{h5} = Andersson-Khalifman, Reykjavik 1991.

d) 9...\texttt{a6} looks like a useful move:

\[\]

1) 10 \texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Qxc2} 11 \texttt{Wxc2} \texttt{h5} 12 \texttt{a3} \texttt{exd4} 13 \texttt{Kxd4} \texttt{Ke8} 14 \texttt{f4} \texttt{Qf8} 15 \texttt{Wf3} \texttt{Qc6} 16 \texttt{Kc3} \texttt{Qd7} 17 \texttt{Kad1} \texttt{Wc7} 18 \texttt{Wb3} \texttt{f6} gave Black good counterplay in Gavrilov-Timoshchenko, Moscow 1988 since 19 \texttt{e5}? embroils White in unfavourable complications: 19...\texttt{dxe5} 20 \texttt{Qxe4} \texttt{exf4} 21 \texttt{Qxf4} \texttt{Wxf4} 22 \texttt{Wxd7} \texttt{Qxc3} +. 

\[\]

d2) 10 \texttt{d5} \texttt{exd5} 11 \texttt{cxd5} \texttt{Kxf3} 12 \texttt{Qxf3} \texttt{Wc5} 13 \texttt{a3} \texttt{Kfc8} 14 \texttt{Wd2} \texttt{Kd8} 15 \texttt{b4} \texttt{Wc7} 16 \texttt{Kfc1} \texttt{Kb5} Khalifman-Gofshteyn, Ischia 1996. Black could continue with 16...\texttt{Wb8} 17 \texttt{Kc2} \texttt{Qb6} =.

d3) 10 \texttt{a3}!? \texttt{Ke8} (maybe 10...\texttt{b5}!? is a better idea; for example, 11 \texttt{d5}}
cxd5 12 cxd5 \( \mathcal{A}xf3 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}xf3 \) \( \mathcal{W}h8 \) followed by \( \ldots \mathcal{Ac}8 \) and \( \ldots \mathcal{Nd}8 \) 11 d5 cxd5 12 cxd5 \( \mathcal{Ac}8 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Q}xd2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xe2 \) 14 \( \mathcal{W}xe2 \) \( \mathcal{E}c7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{E}fc1 \) \( \mathcal{W}b8 \) 16 a4 \( \mathcal{Ac}7 \) 17 a5 h6 18 g3! \( \mathcal{G}h7 \) 19 h4 \( \mathcal{G}hf6 \) 20 \( \mathcal{Q}g2 \) \( \mathcal{E}c8 \) 21 \( \mathcal{Aa}4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \) 22 \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}ed7 \) 23 \( \mathcal{E}b4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) 24 \( \mathcal{Aa}1 \) \( \mathcal{A}f8 \) 25 \( \mathcal{Ae}4 \) \( \mathcal{E}fc8 \) 26 \( \mathcal{A}a3 \) h5 27 f3 g6 28 b4 \( \mathcal{Q}cd7 \) 29 b5 \( \pm \) Korchnoi-Gi.Hernandez, Groningen FIDE 1997. This is a good example of how routine play can lead to trouble.

8...\( \mathcal{A}e8 \) 9 \( \mathcal{A}b2 \) (D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9...c6

Or:

a) 9...\( \mathcal{Q}xd4 \)?? 10 \( \mathcal{Q}xd4 \) \( \mathcal{A}xc2 \) 11 \( \mathcal{W}xe2 \) \( \mathcal{A}f8 \) has not been tried but looks rather solid.

b) 9...\( \mathcal{A}f8 \) may be slightly preferable, with the following possibilities:

b1) 10 \( \mathcal{Ac}1 \) c6 11 b4 e4 12 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f5 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Q}b3 \) d5 14 c5 g6 15 b5 h5 16 a4 \( \mathcal{A}h6 \) 17 a5 a6 18 bxc6 bxc6 19 \( \mathcal{Q}a4 \) \( \mathcal{Aa}7 \) 20 \( \mathcal{Q}b6 \) \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) leads to a closed position that is quite comfortable for Black, who can create pressure on the kingside: 21 h3 \( \mathcal{G}g7 \) 22 \( \mathcal{A}c3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}h7 \) 23 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \) \( \mathcal{G}g5 \) 24 \( \mathcal{W}h1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 25 \( \mathcal{A}a1 \) \( \mathcal{A}h8 \) 26 f4? \( \mathcal{Q}xf3 \) 27 \( \mathcal{A}xf3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}fe4 \) 0-1 Frois-Hauchard, Linares 2000.

b2) 10 \( \mathcal{W}c2 \) c6 (or 10...e4!? 11 \( \mathcal{Q}xd2 \) \( \mathcal{A}f5 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}fe1 \) c6 13 \( \mathcal{Q}f1 \) d5 14 f4 \( \mathcal{Exf3} \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}xf5 \) \( \mathcal{Rx}e2 \) 16 \( \mathcal{A}xe2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}b6 \) = Vivaldo-Milos, Sao Paulo 1997) and now White has not found anything convincing:

b21) 11 \( \mathcal{Q}ad1 \) c4! 12 \( \mathcal{Q}h4 \)?? d5 13 h3 \( \mathcal{A}xe2 \) 14 \( \mathcal{W}xe2 \) g6 15 f4 \( \mathcal{Exf3} \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}xf3 \) \( \mathcal{A}b4 \) 17 cxd5 \( \mathcal{A}xc3 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}xc3 \) cxd5 19 g4 \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 20 \( \mathcal{Q}g2 \) \( \mathcal{W}e4 \) \( \pm \) Hoi-Jansa, Copenhagen 1991.

b22) 11 \( \mathcal{Q}a1 \) \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe2 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}xe2 \) \( \mathcal{W}xe2 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Exd}4 \) \( \mathcal{W}d2 \) 15 \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e1 \) + 19 \( \mathcal{W}xe1 \) \( \mathcal{W}xd4 \) \( \pm \) Kosyrev-Chekhov, Moscow 1992.

b23) 11 dxe5 dxe5 12 \( \mathcal{Q}ad1 \) \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) (12...e4 13 \( \mathcal{Q}d4 \) \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 14 h3 \( \mathcal{A}xe2 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}xe2 \) g6 16 \( \mathcal{A}c3 \) \( \mathcal{A}g7 \) = Pfleger-Lobron, Bundesliga 1993/4) 13 h3 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \) \( \mathcal{G}g6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) \( \mathcal{A}xd3 \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}xd3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xc5 \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}f5 \) \( \mathcal{W}c8 \) 18 \( \mathcal{W}xc8 \) \( \mathcal{A}xc8 \) 19 b4 \( \mathcal{Q}cd7 \) 1/2-1/2 Uhlmann-Jansa, Leipzig 1973.

b3) Rather unambitious is 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 \( \mathcal{W}c2 \) e4 12 \( \mathcal{Q}d4 \) c5 13 \( \mathcal{Q}db5 \) a6 14 \( \mathcal{Q}a3 \) \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{Q}ad1 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe2 \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}xe2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}xd5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}h6 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}xd8 \) 1/2-1/2 Uhlmann-Tal, Leningrad 1/2 1973.

b4) The most critical looks 10 h3 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) 11 g4 \( \mathcal{G}g6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}h4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Q}xg6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xh3 \) 14 \( \mathcal{A}xh3 \) hxg6, when in spite of White's bishop-pair this position was regarded as equal by Guklo, maybe because of some weakness on White's kingside. The game Pomes-Pansa, Andorra 1996 continued 15 \( \mathcal{A}f3 \) c6 (15...e4 16 \( \mathcal{A}g2 \) d5 17 \( \mathcal{f}3 \) \( \pm \) ) 16 \( \mathcal{A}g2 \)
\( \text{\#h4 17 b4 (however, it may be possible that White has a small edge after 17 f4!?) 17...\text{\#f6 18 \#c2 e4 19 f4 exf3 20 \text{\#xf3 \#c4 =.} } \)

10 h3 (D)

This is better than 10 b4 e4 11 \#d2 \#xe2 12 \#xe2 d5 13 b5 \#c8 14 a4 \#b4 15 \#fc1 dxc4 16 \#xc4 \#d5 17 bxc6 bxc6 18 \#a2 \#f8 = K"apel-Tukmakov, Biel 1999.

Instead, 10 \#c2 \#f8 transposes to note ‘b2’ to Black’s 9th move.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
& & & & \\
\hline
& & & & \\
\hline
& & & & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

10...\#h5?!

Black should continue 10...\#xf3 11 \#xf3 \#f8 12 dxe5 (after 12 \#c2 \#e7 Black is ready to play 13...e4) 12...dxe5 13 \#c2 \#c7 14 \#ad1 a5 15 g4 h6 16 \#d2 \#c5 17 \#f1 \#ad8 18 \#f5 1/2-1/2 Fta"nik-Smejkal, Prague 1986. Black's position is very solid. However, maybe White could insert the moves h3 and ...\#h5 at an earlier point so as to avoid this possibility.

11 g4!

This is certainly more critical than:

a) 11 \#h4 \#xe2 12 \#xe2 \#f8 13 \#f5 g6 14 \#fg3 a5 15 \#c3 \#b6 16 \#c2 exd4 17 \#a4 \#c7 18 \#xd4 d5 19 cxd5 \#xd5 = Tibensky-Jansa, Stary Smokovec 1991.

b) 11 d5 c4! 12 dxc6 bxc6 13 \#d4 \#xe2 14 \#xe2 \#e5 15 f3! exf3 16 \#xf3 \#c8 17 \#ad1 \#c7 18 \#d4 \#c8 19 \#f5 \#f8 20 \#h6+?! \#h8 21 \#xf6!? gxf6 22 \#h5 \#xh6 23 \#xh6 \#e6 24 \#e4 with compensation for the exchange, Larsen-Spassky, Malm"o Ct (6) 1968.

11...\#g6 12 \#h4 \#f8 13 \#xg6!

13 dxe5 dxe5 (not 13...\#xe5? 14 f4 \#xf4 15 \#xg4 +-) 14 \#xg6 hxg6 15 g5?! \#h7 16 h4 is less dangerous due to the drawing sacrifice 16...\#xg5! 17 hxg5 \#xg5+.

13...hxg6 14 \#f3 e4

After 14...g5!? 15 d5 c5 the black set-up is harder to break, though White still enjoys a solid plus.

15 \#g2 d5

Now:

a) After 16 f3?! White suffered from the lack of kingside defence in Tisdall-Gulko, San Francisco 1995: 16...\#b4 17 g5 \#h5 18 h4 \#g3 19 fxе4 \#xe3 20 \#xc3 \#xe4! (20...\#xf1 21 \#xf1 dxe4 22 \#f4 gives White nice positional compensation) 21 \#h4?! (the bishop is more effectively placed on e1) 21...a5 22 \#a3 a4! 23 \#f4 axb3 24 axb3 \#c7 25 exd5 exd5 26 \#c1 \#a5 27 \#xe4\#? \#xe4! 28 \#xe4 dxe4 29 \#d6 \#f5! 30 \#f4 \#b6 31 \#c2 \#d5 32 \#a3 \#h3 33 \#f2 \#a3 34 \#c4 \#g4+ 35 \#f1 \#xe3+! 36 \#xe3 \#f3+ 37 \#f2 \#a2 0-1.

b) A stronger continuation is 16 g5! \#h7 17 h4 \#b6 18 c5 \#d7 19 f3±.
Conclusion: It is not easy to give a
definite verdict on this positional line.
Although there are many move-orders
and the moves h3 and ...\&h5 can be
included almost at any time, White has
basically two main approaches. He can
go for an Old Indian a tempo down
with e3-e4 but it is not clear how important
this tempo is. If White instead
flanchettoes his queen’s bishop, the
strongest idea seems to be exchanging
Black’s intrusive light-squared bishop
with g4 and \&h4. However, this creates
some weaknesses in White’s own
camp. This line is important in prac-
tice because White has various move-
orders which reach the same line and
therefore no 2...\&g4 practitioner can
expect to avoid it.

D2)

5 g3!

After Black has played ...e5, White
doesn’t usually have to be concerned
about the doubled-pawn formation.
Black cannot strive for the e6-d5-c6
formation any more and he has more
light-square weaknesses.

5...\&xf3

A characteristic move for our de-
defence. 5...\&gf6 6 \&g2 c6 7 0-0 \& leads
to a line of the Old Indian that gives
White a solid plus.

6 exf3 (D)

6...exd4

Black has the following alterna-
tives, none of which can equalize con-
vincingly, although with some of them
Black comes very close:

a) 6...\&c7 7 dxe5 \&xe5 (Ribli’s
suggestion 7...dxe5 8 \&g2 \&gf6 9 0-0
0-0 10 f4 c6 looks slightly better but
White still enjoys a small and endur-
ing plus) 8 f4 \&d7 9 \&g2 c6 10 g4!
(using his pawn-majority) 10...\&b6 11
\&f6 12 g5 \&e7 13 \&e3 \& Sokolov-Hickl, Jakarta 1996.

b) 6...g6 and then:

b1) In the closed position-type af-
ter 7 d5 \&g7 8 \&g2 \&gf6 (8...\&e7) 9
0-0 0-0 10 f4 \& the white bishops don’t
work so well.

b2) 7 f4 is a more critical con-
 tinuation.

b21) After 7...\&g7?! 8 dxe5 dxe5
9 \&g2 \& the position is the same as in
Hegde-Miles, Calcutta 1994 in which
Black came very close to equality after
9...\&e7 10 0-0 (10 \&h3!??) 10...c6 11
fxe5 \&xe5 12 \&b3 \&c7 13 \&f4 0-0
14 \&fe1 \&f5.

b22) 7...exf4 8 \&xf4 \&h6 (8...\&g7
9 \&g2 \&e7+ 10 \&f1 \& 9 \&xh6 \&xh6
10 \&d2 \&f5 11 \&h3 \&g7 12 \&e3+
\&f8?! (12...\&e7 13 0-0 \& 13 0-0 \&f6
14 \&f3 \&b8 15 \&fe1 \& Dizdar-Hickl,
Erevan OL 1996.

b23) 7...\&gf6 7 \&g2 \&c7 8 0-0 0-0 0-9
f4 c6 10 \&fe1 (both 10 d5 and 10 \&e3
are worth considering although the text-move is more forcing) 10...exd4 11
\(\text{Bxd4}\) \(\text{\text{e}8}\) is very similar to the main line. Wells-Hickl, Austrian Cht 1997
continued 12 \(\text{\text{d}2}!\)? (12 b3) 12...\(\text{\text{b}6}\) 13 \(\text{\text{b}6}\) \(\text{\text{b}6}\) 14 b3 \(\text{\text{d}7}\) 15 \(\text{\text{e}3}\)
\(\text{\text{f}6}\) 16 \(\text{\text{d}1}\) \(\text{\text{c}5}\) =.

d) 6...\(\text{\text{e}7}!\)? is a notable idea:

d1) 7 \(\text{\text{g}2}\) exd4 8 \(\text{\text{b}4}\) transposes
to note ‘a’ to Black’s 7th move.

d2) 7 f4 exd4 8 \(\text{\text{b}4}\) transposes to
note ‘b’ to Black’s 7th move.

d3) 7 dxe5!? dxe5 8 f4 \(\text{\text{c}6}\) leads
to equality.

d4) After 7 \(\text{\text{b}3}\) exd4 8 \(\text{\text{b}4}\) \(\text{\text{c}6}\) 9 \(\text{\text{e}3}+\) \(\text{\text{e}7}\) 10 \(\text{\text{d}5}\) 0-0 11 \(\text{\text{e}7}+\)
\(\text{\text{e}8}\) 12 0-0 \(\text{\text{e}8}\) (12...\(\text{\text{c}6}!\)? may be
slightly more accurate; why force
the white queen to a good square?) 13 \(\text{\text{e}3}\)
a5 14 b3 \(\text{\text{c}6}\) 15 \(\text{\text{b}2}\) \(\text{\text{f}6}\) 16 \(\text{\text{a}1} =\)
\(\text{\text{e}1}\) (16...a4??) 17 \(\text{\text{e}1}\) d5 18 exd5
\(\text{\text{b}4}\) 19 a3 \(\text{\text{b}3}\) 5 20 \(\text{\text{c}5}\) c6 Black is
passive but solid. In the game
San Segundo-Adams, Madrid 1998, he
defended without a problem.

7 \(\text{\text{b}4}\) (D)

Black has to consider whether the
knight is well placed here. The serious
alternative is 7...\(\text{\text{c}7}!\):

a) 8 \(\text{\text{g}2}\) \(\text{\text{c}6}\) 9 \(\text{\text{e}3}+\) \(\text{\text{e}7}\) 10
0-0?! (White should play 10 \(\text{\text{d}5}\) 0-0
11 \(\text{\text{e}7}+\); compare with note ‘d4’
to Black’s 6th move) 10...0-0 11 \(\text{\text{d}5}\)
safer is 11 b3 \(\text{\text{f}6}\) 12 \(\text{\text{b}2}\) a5 13 \(\text{\text{d}2}\)
\(\text{\text{c}5}\) 14 \(\text{\text{d}5}\) \(\text{\text{b}2}\) 15 \(\text{\text{b}2}\) \(\text{\text{e}7}\)
\(\frac{1}{2}\) Salo-Yrjölä, Finnish Cht 2001)
11...\(\text{\text{f}6}!\) 12 \(\text{\text{f}6}+\) \(\text{\text{f}6}\) 13 \(\text{\text{g}5}\) (13
\(\text{\text{f}4}\) 13...\(\text{\text{d}4}\) 14 \(\text{\text{e}3}\) \(\text{\text{c}4}\) 15 \(\text{\text{f}1}\)
\(\text{\text{e}6}\) 16 f4 \(\text{\text{f}6}\) 17 \(\text{\text{b}5}\) \(\text{\text{a}8}\) =
Clavijo-R.Perez, Cienfuegos 1996.

b) 8 f4 \(\text{\text{c}6}\) 9 \(\text{\text{d}2}\) \(\text{\text{e}7}\) 10 \(\text{\text{g}2}\)
0-0 11 0-0 \(\text{\text{f}6}\) 12 b3 a5 13 \(\text{\text{b}2}\) \(\text{\text{c}5}\)
14 \(\text{\text{d}5}\) \(\text{\text{b}2}\) 15 \(\text{\text{b}2}\) \(\text{\text{e}8}\) 16 \(\text{\text{a}1}\)
\(\text{\text{e}7}\) = Anič-Hickl, Montpellier 1993.

c) 8 \(\text{\text{b}3}\) transposes to note ‘d4’
to Black’s 6th move, and may well be
best.

8 \(\text{\text{g}2}\) \(\text{\text{e}7}\) 9 0-0 0-0 (D)

10 f4

Even the alternatives may be un-
pleasant for Black:

a) 10 b3 \(\text{\text{e}8}\) 11 \(\text{\text{b}2}\) \(\text{\text{f}8}\) 12 \(\text{\text{e}4}\)
a5 13 \(\text{\text{c}3}\) \(\text{\text{b}8}\)?? (13...a4) 14 \(\text{\text{f}1}\) a4
15 b4 0xe4 16 fxe4 w7 17 wxa7 Bxa7 18 f4 ± Portisch-Foldi, Hungarian Ch (Budapest) 1966.

b) 10 0xe3?! looks slightly strange, because the bishop generally wants to go to the long diagonal. However, it has been very successful in practice: 10...Bxe8 11 f4 c6 12 h3 a5 (12...d5?! 13 cxd5 0xc5 14 w2 0xe3 15 fxe3 cxd5 16 Bxd5 0xb6 17 Bxf6+ Wxf6 18 Bc1 ± Einigort-Jansa, Hamburg 1999, was an unconvincing attempt but maybe Black can try 12...Bb6 13 Ad1 Wc7, intending...Ad8 and...d5)

13 b3 0xc5 14 Bb1 (14 Bb1 Bc8 15 g4 g6 16 Bd1 ± Vyzhmanavin-Mokry, Tilburg 1994) 14...Wb6 15 Wd2 Wc7 16 Wc2 ±.

10...c6 11 b3 Bxe8 12 0xb2 (D)

White has the bishop-pair and active pieces. Only the g2-bishop is not so active because of the b7-c6 wall. Black has a structural weakness on d6 and it doesn’t seem easy for him to create counterplay except with the plan...a5-a4. Even though White’s kingside pawn-structure is somewhat inflexible.

White has the plan of advancing his kingside pawns. This should add up to a small advantage for White.

12...Bf8 13 Bf3

Black’s one hope is a well-timed breakthrough with...d5: 13 Wfd1 Wb6 14 Wxb6 Wxb6 15 Aa3 Aa8 16 Ad3 d5! 17 Axg8 Bxf8 18 Bb1 Ad7 19 cxd5 Ed8 20 Bc1 Ed6 21 g4 Bfxd5 22 Bg2 Ed7 and Black has a slight advantage, Stoeck-Jansa, Czech Republic 1998.

13...Wb6

13...h5 doesn’t stop the pawns: 14 h3 ±.

14 Bc2!

It seems to be difficult for White to advance after 14 Wxb6 Wxb6 =. Black has the plan...a5-a4. Also, he may soon be able to play...d5, as in the note to White’s 13th move.

14...Bc7

14...Bc8 15 Bf1 a5 seems more active. With...a4 Black can hope to create some weaknesses in White’s camp.

15 g4! Bc5 (D)
16 g5?! ∆f6e4 17 ∆xe4 ∆xe4 18 ∆c2 d5! 19 ∆e5 ∆xe5 20 fxe5 ∆xg5
allows Black counterplay.
16...a5
Black secures the knight on c5 and
is ready to strike with ...a4 at a suitable
moment. After 16...∆xel+!? 17 ∆xel
∆e8 18 ∆xe8 ∆xe8 White has a slight
advantage: Black's position is solid
but passive.
17 g5 ∆fd7 18 h4 (D)

B

18...∆wb6
Black doesn't seem able to achieve
...a4. For instance, 18...a4 19 ∆xe8
∆xe8 20 b4 ± or 18...∆xel+ 19 ∆xel
a4 20 b4 a3 21 ∆a1 ±.

19 ∆a3!

This move stops the only chance
for counterplay (19...a4 20 h4) which
could come after 19 ∆g2?! a4.
White now has a solid plus. The rest
of Van Wely-Timman, Breda playoff
(3) 1998 is a nice example of effective
realization but not very interesting
from our point of view: 19...∆e6 20
∆ad1 ∆d4 21 ∆g4! ∆xd2 22 ∆xd2
∆dc5 23 f5 ∆f4?! (the seemingly ac-
tive knight gets into trouble: the pas-
sive continuation 23...∆c7 24 ∆ed1
(∆7a6 ± is better) 24 ∆xe8 ∆xe8 25
∆xe5 dxe5 26 ∆h2 ± (the knight is
trapped!) 26...g6 27 f6 h5 28 ∆g3 ∆e6
29 ∆xe6 ∆xe6 30 ∆d8 ∆d6 31 ∆xd6
∆xd6+ 32 f4 b6 33 ∆f3 ∆f8 34 ∆e4
∆e8 35 ∆e2 ∆d7 36 f5 b5 1-0.

Conclusion: This line is probably
the biggest challenge for Black after
3...∆d7. Because Black's position is
so awfully passive in the main line, he
should seriously consider some of the
alternatives on move 6 or 7, especially
6...∆c7 or 7...∆c7. If Black wants to
play for a win he can try 4...∆xf3, but
in that case he might consider making
this exchange on the third move, when
there is considerably less theory to
study.
In this chapter we study lines after 1 d4 d6 2 Qf3 Qg4 3 c4 where Black plays ...Qxf3, either immediately or after 3...Qd7 and then making the capture after certain 4th moves by White. With this move Black gives up the bishop-pair, but in return weakens White’s pawn-structure by giving him doubled pawns.

The general evaluation of the positions in this variation is probably close to ±, as White has the bishop-pair, and the position might become quite stable, with White activating his bishops and controlling the position with them.

However, there are some motivations for Black to play an early ...Qxf3. Firstly, the pawn-structure becomes nicely unbalanced. Secondly, the pawn weaknesses require White to play actively, testing his understanding of the position. And finally, Black usually has more targets and plans, and his play is more concrete than White’s.

Based on these characteristics, some strong players have used an early ...Qxf3 as a weapon to play for a win. Again, these players include British grandmasters like Michael Adams and especially Julian Hodgson, though there are others too. Hodgson, for example, has the habit of starting with 3...Qd7 and in certain cases exchanging on f3 (see Lines B and C).

Typical positions and plans for White

![Diagram of chess positions]

Lobron – Van der Wiel
Gran Canaria 1996

Usually it is useful for the player with the bishop-pair to open the position. However, sometimes it is far more important first to stabilize the position. In this position White has played d5, which stops Black’s most active counterplay with ...exd4 followed by ...Ne5!...Dc5.

The following diagram shows the normal position after 4 exf3, where White has again played the d5 advance. White’s bishops control the queenside effectively, and his plan is to exert increasing pressure on Black’s position.
with moves like £fd1, £a4 and f4. White hopes that Black will not find any targets in the strong white position.

Typical positions and plans for Black

Sometimes it is useful to create pressure by means of ...£h6-f5 instead of ...£c6. Black may wish to play ...c6 and ...d5, or he might need additional pieces in the centre: ...£c6 can always be played later. White usually has no clear way of stopping the ...£f5 plan, as g4 weakens his king too much, and £d3xf5 only improves Black’s pawn-structure by bringing his pawns closer to the centre.

In the following diagram, Black can also continue in a flexible manner, awaiting White’s actions. In this position White has an impressive centre, but Black still has more targets than White. Both of the breaks ...e5 and
A logical option for Black is to take on f3 at once, thus weakening White’s pawn-structure. There is an additional motivation when White has played c4, because it leaves the d4-pawn weak, as White can no longer support it with his c-pawn.

Now:
A1: 4 gxf3
A2: 4 exf3

A1)
4 gxf3 (D)

...c5 are possible, as is the attack on White’s centre with moves like ...\h4 and ...\f6-h5.

1 d4 d6 2 \f3 \g4 3 c4

We now discuss the following continuations:
A: 3...\xf3 107
B: 3...\d7 4 g3 \xf3 114
C: 3...\d7 4 \c3 \xf3 116

A)
3...\xf3 (D)

Now:
A11: 4...c6 107
A12: 4...g6 110

A11)
4...c6

White has doubled pawns, so Black takes control of the centre and develops in a flexible manner. He is aiming to create a solid structure with pawns on c6, d5 and e6, which makes it difficult for White to improve his pawn-structure.

5 h4!
White wants to activate his pieces and improve his pawn-formation with the plan h5 and possibly hXg6.

The alternative is 5 0-0-0.

a) 5...0-0-0 is too committal at this stage, and White can open some lines for his bishops: 6 f4! (6 e4 g6 7 0-0-0 0-0-0 8 0-0-0 g7 8 0-0-0 bd7 9 e2 0-0-0 10 h6 e5 11 xg7 xg7 12 0-0-0 wb6 13 f4 wxd4 14 wxd4 exd4 15 wxd4 xc5 16 e5 dxe5 17 fxe5 xec8 18 b4 xec6 19 xd7 a5 with good dark-square counterplay, Ali-Leski, Saint Afrique 1997)

6...0-0-0 7 d5! cxd5 8 0-0-0 e6 9 xfx6+ xfx6 10 xg2 (10 wa4+ wbd7 11 wxd7+ wxd7 12 xg2 wb8 13 e3 b6 14 0-0-0 xc7 15 xd1 xhc8 16 b3 g6 17 xd4, Draško-Petronić, Yugoslavia 1994, 17...0-0-0 = intending ...xd7) 10...wxd7 11 w3 xb8 12 xe3 with a slight advantage for White.

b) 5...g6 (D) is correct:

\[Diagram\]

b1) 6 f4 xg7 and then:

b11) 7 0-0-0 0-0-0 0-0-0 6 xg7 e8 13 dxc6 bxc6 14 f5 gxf5 15 exd5 16 xg5 xc5 17 gl wd6 18 e4 fxe4 19 xxe4 g6 1 Szilagy-Boros, Hungary 1997.

b2) 6 h4 is too late, and Black can stabilize the position with 6...0-0-0 7 xg5 xd7 8 h3 xg7 9 xd2 wb6 10 b3 xbd7 11 wc7+ xd7 12 xd7 d5 13 xfx6 xfx6 14 0-0-0 0-0-0 15 xd4 0-0-0 17 gl d5 17 xg5 wh2 1 Gruskovnjak-Medak, Blid 1999.

b3) 6 e4 e5 7 dxe5 dxe5 8 xbd8+ xbd8 9 a3 0-0-0 10 b4 a5 11 e4 fxe4 12 xxe4 xad7 13 xeb2 xe8 14 b1 ± Draško-Popchev, Čačak 1991) 11 xbd4 xbd4 12 axb4 f5 13 e4 xh6 14 xh2 xh2 15 e5 is unclear according to Draško.

b4) 6 xg5 xg7 7 c3 0-0-0 0-0-0 1 wdd2 xaxa5 9 xd1 c5 gives Black counterplay on the long diagonal, though the game gets quite unclear after 10 d5 h6 11 xh4 g5 12 xg3 xec3+ 13 bxc3 xxc3+ 14 xgf1 xgf6 15 xbl h6 16 xag4 xhe8 17 xg2 xbd2 18 0-0-0 xg6 19 xgd1 xaxa5 20 xde8 xde8 21 xfd5, as in the game Picket-Ki.Georgiev, Wijk aan Zee 1988.

We now return to 5 h4 (D):

5...0-0-0

Or:

a) 5...g6?! 6 h5 ± is what White wants.
b) 5...h5 is possible: 6  
\[ \text{B} \]

\[ \text{e}3 \text{ d}7 7 \text{ g}5 \text{ g}f6 8 \text{ d}2 e6 9 d5 exd5 10 cxd5 e5 11 0-0 0  e7 12  b1 a6 13  h3 b5 14  xd7+  xd7 1/2-1/2 Schmidt-Chekhov, Lubniewice 1994.

6 h5 \text{ bd}7

It is a bit surprising that the logical 6...h6!? has not been played more often, as Black seems to be OK after 7  
\[ \text{c}3 \text{ e}5 8  d5  e7 9  e4  h7. \] White then has to complicate with 10 f4 0-0 (10...exf4??) 11 c5!? exf4 12  xf4 dxc5 13 d6  f6 14  g4  d7 15  xh6  x3 16 bxc3  f6 17  d2  e5 18  g3  f3+ 19  e2  x2 20  x2  e8 with a messy position in which Black appears to be fine, Chatalbashov-Popchev, Bulgaria 1994.

7  c3 e5 8  d5!

By closing the centre White stops Black's counterplay and gains time to put his bishops on efficient squares to control the position.

8 e3  e7 9  d3 exd4 10 exd4 allows Black to fix the centre by means of 10...d5! 11 cxd5  xd5 12  xd5 cxd5, when the position is balanced: 13  b3 0-0! (13...b6 14  b5+ ± Lobron-Rivas, Debrecen Echt 1992) 14  x5 (14  x7 with good compensation) 14...c5 15  x7+ (15  x8  xd3+ 16  d2  x8 17  xd3  f6 18  e3  d5 =) 15...x7 16  f5+  g8 17 dxc5  a5+ 18  f1  xc5 with equality.

8...e7 9 e4  b8! (D)

The thematic plan ...bxb6 seems to make this position playable for Black.

10  e3  d8 11  d2  a5

If Black wants to play for a win then 11...cxd5!? might be an option: 12  x5 (12 cxd5 h6 intending ...  b6) 12...xd5 13  xd5  b6 14  h3 (14  d1  xe3 15 fxe3  c7! ?) 14...c7 with a lot to play for.

12 0-0-0 cxd5 13 exd5  c7 14  b1 a6 15  c1 0-0 16  d3  h8 17  c2  b6

Both sides have chances, Lobron-Van der Wiel, Gran Canaria 1996.

Conclusion: The variation 4 gxf3 c6 should not give Black too many problems. White's thematic active plans
seem to lead to equal positions, with a lot of play still left.

A12)

4...g6 (D)

Black's plans are similar to those in Line A2: quick development and counterplay in the centre.

5 ąc3

Or:

a) 5 ąg2 c6 6 ąc3 ąg7 7 0-0 ąd7 8 ąc1 ągf6 9 e4 5 0-0 ąc3 0-0 11 ąd2 ąh5 (a thematic example of Black's plans to slow down the play in the centre) 12 ąad1 exd4! 13 ąxd4 ąxd4 14 ąxd4 ąg5 15 ąe2 ąe5 16 ąh1 ąad8 ą Belamarić-Puljek Salai, Poreč 1994.

b) 5 e3 ąg7 6 ąb3 ąc8 7 ąc3 ąd7 8 ąg2 c6 9 ąd2 ągf6 10 f4 0-0 11 0-0 ąe8 12 ąe4 ąb8 13 ąac1 c5 14 ąd3 ąc7 15 b4 b6 = Ros-Craig, corr. 1992.

c) 5 ąb3 attacks the weakened b7, but Black has no special problems:

cl) 5...b6!? is possible; 6 f4 ąg7 7 ąg2 c6 8 e3 ąe6 9 a4 (9 d5!!?) 9...ąe7 10 a5 ąd7 11 ąa3 d5 12 axb6 ąxb6 13 cxd5 cxd5 14 ąc3 0-0 = Koskinen-Tella, Finnish Ch 2000.

c2) 5...ęc8 is the main move: 6 ąh3 (6 h4 ąf6 7 ąh3 ąbd7 8 ąc3 ąg7 9 f4 c6 10 e4 ąh5 11 ąe3 ąc7 12 f5 a6 13 ąg4 ąhf6 14 ąf3 e5 is good for Black, Clavijo-Spangenberg, Paranana 1993) 6...ąd7 7 ąxd7+ ąxd7 8 c5 ąe8 9 cxd6 cxd6 10 ąc3 ąd7 11 ąf4 ąh6 (11...ąg7!?) 12 ąxh6 ąxh6 13 ąd5 (Liogky-Popchev, Val Thorens 1990) 13...ąc8! ą with the point that 14 ąe3 ąf5 15 ąf6+ ąd8 16 ąxd7 ąxe3 17 fxe3 ąxd7 is good for Black.

d) The thematic 5 f4 might give White some advantage; for example, 5...ąf6 6 ąb3 ąc6!? 7 e3 ąc8 8 ąg2 (8 ąc3 ąg7 9 h4 e6 10 ąh3 ąe7 11 e4 ąh5 12 ąe3 f5 leaves the battle for the centre still open, Schöne-Lorenz, Karl Marx Stadl 1990) 8...ąg7 9 ąc3 0-0 10 ąd2 ąb8 and now the play seems to become quite slow and positional: 11 0-0 a6 12 ąac1 ąg4 13 ąd1 ąh4 14 ąf3 c5 15 d5 ąa5 16 ąe2 b6 17 ąg3 ąh5 18 f3 ąb7 19 fxe5 dxe5 20 ąh3 ± Matlak-Woda, Slupska 1989.

e) 5 h4 ąf6 6 ąb3 ąc8 7 ąh3 ąbd7 8 ąc3 c6 9 ąg5 ąg7 10 0-0-0 ąc7 11 ąb1 ąb6 = 12 ąc2 and now Black should avoid 12...0-0? 13 h5!, Pushkov-Savon, Orel 1995.

5...ąg7 6 f4 (D)

6 c4?! ąc6 7 ąe3 e5 is again a misguided plan, as White closes the centre himself, and Black is better after 8 d5 ąd4 9 ąb5 ąxb5 10 cxb5 ąf6 11 ąd2 ąh5 12 h4 ąf6 13 0-0-0 ąxh4 ą Leiber-Hartoeh, Ostend 1987.

6...ąc6!?
This active move gives Black good counterplay.

A more positional approach is also possible with 6...c6:

a) 7 \texttt{Wd3} e6 8 e3 \texttt{Qe7} 9 \texttt{Qe2} \texttt{Qd7} 10 \texttt{Axd2} d5 11 \texttt{Ac1} \texttt{Qf5} 12 cxd5 exd5 13 \texttt{Qa4} 0-0-0 14 \texttt{Qg4} \texttt{Qd6} 15 \texttt{Qb4} \texttt{Qf6} 16 \texttt{Qf3} \texttt{Qe8} 17 \texttt{Axd6} \texttt{Wxd6} 18 \texttt{Qf1} \texttt{Qe7} \texttt{Vokač-Okhotnik, Marianske Lazne 1989.}

b) 7 h4!? \texttt{Wb6} (7...h5!? 8 e3 \texttt{Qd7} 9 h5 0-0-0 10 \texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Qf6} 11 h6 \texttt{Qf8} 12 b4 e5 13 c5! \texttt{Gerber-Ireneusz, Geneva 1994.}

c) 7 e3 \texttt{Qd7} 8 \texttt{Qd3} e6 9 \texttt{Qe4} \texttt{Qdf6} 10 \texttt{Qg5} \texttt{Qc7} is sound for Black. \texttt{Ander-Christiansen, Reggio Emilia 1987/8.}

7 e3
7 d5!? Agrest.
7...e5 8 fxe5 dxe5 9 d5 \texttt{Qce7} 10 c5 \texttt{Qf6} 11 e4
11 \texttt{Qc4}? Agrest.
11...0-0 12 \texttt{Qe2} b6 13 \texttt{Qe3}
13 b4 a5 14 \texttt{Qa3} axb4 15 \texttt{Qxb4} bxc5 16 \texttt{Qxc5} c6! gives Black good counterplay.

13...\texttt{Qd7} 14 b4
14 c6 \texttt{Qf6} is also good for Black.

14...a5
White has quite an impressive centre, but Black’s lead in development gives him good chances of active counterplay. The game Schissler-Agrest, Malmö 1993 continued sharply: 15 cxb6 cxb6 16 \texttt{Wb3} \texttt{Qc8} 17 h4 \texttt{Qd6} 18 h5 \texttt{Qf6} 19 \texttt{Qf3} \texttt{Qc8} 20 bxa5 bxa5 21 \texttt{Ac1} \texttt{Wd7} 22 \texttt{Qe2} \texttt{Qb8} 23 \texttt{Wd1} \texttt{Qfc8} and Black was OK.

Conclusion: Black gets sufficient counterplay after 4 gxf3 g6 though the positions can become quite sharp.

A2)

4 exf3 (D)

As White’s strong centre might just be an obstacle for his bishops, 4 exf3, immediately opening the f1-a6 diagonal for his bishop, is more logical.

4...g6
Black’s most natural plan is to place his bishop on the long diagonal, and develop. Sometimes the moves ...\texttt{Qh6-f5} and ...\texttt{Qc6} offer some chances to attack the d4-pawn.
4...e6 is less flexible: 5 \( \Box c3 \) (5 \( \Box b3 \) \( \Box c8 \) 6 d5 e5 7 f4 \( \Box d7 \) 8 \( \Box e2 \) \( \Box gf6 \) 9 0-0 \( \Box e7 \) 10 \( \Box c3 \) 0-0 11 \( \Box e3 \) a5 12 \( \Box d1 \) exf4 13 \( \Box x f4 \) \( \Box c5 \) 14 \( \Box c2 \) \( \Box d f7 \) 15 \( \Box e f1 \) \( \Box d 8 \) 16 \( \Box b 5 \) \( \Box f 6 \) 17 b3 \( \Box e 8 = \) Gavrikov-Miles, Horgen 1994) 5...\( \Box d 7 \) 6 \( \Box d 3 \) g6 7 h4! \( \Box g 7 \) 8 \( \Box e 3 \) \( \Box e 7 \) 9 h5 \( \Box f 5 \) 10 \( \Box x f 5 \) gxf5 11 g4! fxg4 12 fxg4 \( \Box e 7 \) 13 h6 \( \Box f 6 \) 14 \( \Box f 3 \) ± Sokolov-Miles, Groningen 1994.

5 \( \Box c3 \) \( \Box g 7 \) 6 \( \Box e 3 \)

6 \( \Box e 2 \) allows Black to become active:

a) 6...\( \Box c6 \) 7 d5 \( \Box d 4 \) 0-0 0-0 \( \Box x e 2 + \) 9 \( \Box x e 2 \) \( \Box x c 3 \) 10 bxc3 \( \Box d 7 \) 11 \( \Box e 1 \) \( \Box f 8 \) with an unusual position in which the chances should be about equal, Grabarczyk-Tella, Stockholm 2000.

b) 6...\( \Box e 7 \) 7 f4 c5 8 dxc5 \( \Box x c 5 \) 9 \( \Box e 3 \) \( \Box x c 3 + \) 10 bxc3 \( \Box f 6 \) 11 \( \Box d 4 \) 0-0 12 \( \Box x f 6 \) \( \Box a 2 = \) Sosonko-Van der Wiel, Rotterdam 1997.

c) 6...\( \Box x h 6 ! \) 7 0-0 \( \Box f 5 \) 8 d5 0-0 9 \( \Box d 2 \) c6 10 \( \Box x d 3 \) \( \Box d 7 \) 11 \( \Box e 1 \) \( \Box e 8 \) 12 \( \Box b 1 \) \( \Box a 6 \) 13 b4 \( \Box c 7 \) 14 \( \Box e 4 \) cxd5 15 cxd5 \( \Box a c 8 \) 16 \( \Box c 1 \) \( \Box a 8 \) 17 a4 \( \Box b 6 \) 18 a5 \( \Box c 4 \) ± L.Spassov-Solozhenkin, Berga 1993.

6...\( \Box f 6 \)

Alternatives:

a) Standard development by means of 6...\( \Box d 7 \) 7 \( \Box d 2 \) \( \Box f 6 \) is somewhat careless. White gets the better chances by 8 d5! c6 9 \( \Box e 2 \) \( \Box c 8 \) 10 0-0 cxd5 11 cxd5 0-0 12 a4 \( \Box a 5 \) 13 \( \Box a 3 \) a6 (Van der Sterren-Plaskett, London Lloyds Bank 1993) 14 \( \Box b 3 \) with some pressure.

b) 6...\( \Box h 6 ! \)?, with the very concrete plan of attacking d4, is also worth considering here: 7 \( \Box b 3 \) \( \Box c 8 \) 8 d5 \( \Box f 5 \) 9 \( \Box e 2 \) c5 10 0-0 0-0 11 \( \Box c 2 \) \( \Box d 7 \) 12 \( \Box a e 1 \) \( \Box e 8 \) 13 \( \Box d 3 \) \( \Box e 5 \) 14 f4 \( \Box x d 3 \) 15 \( \Box x d 3 \) a6 16 \( \Box e 2 \) \( \Box d 7 \) 17 \( \Box f 1 \) b5 = Vaillant-Frick, Avoine 2000.

7 \( \Box e 2 \) (D)

7...c6

7...0-0?! is premature, as White can start a kingside attack with 8 f4 (8 0-0 \( \Box b d 7 \) 9 \( \Box e 1 \) e5 10 dxe5 \( \Box x e 5 \) 11 f4 \( \Box c 6 \) 12 \( \Box f 3 \) \( \Box d 7 \) 13 c5 \( \Box b d 8 \) 14 cxd6 cxd6 15 \( \Box b 5 \) \( \Box f 8 \) 16 h3 d5 17 a4 \( \Box c 4 \) 18 \( \Box a 7 \) \( \Box x b 2 \) 19 \( \Box c 2 \) \( \Box g 7 \) 20 \( \Box x c 6 \) bxc6 21 \( \Box b 6 \) \( \Box b 8 \) 22 a5 ± Petrursson-Hodgson, London 1979) 8...c6 9 h4 \( \Box a 5 \) 10 \( \Box f 1 \) e5 11 h5 \( \Box b d 7 \) 12 hxg6 fxg6 13 fxe5 dxe5 14 d5 e4 15 \( \Box w d 2 \) cxd5 16 cxd5 \( \Box b 4 \) 17 \( \Box h 4 \) \( \Box d 8 \) 18 \( \Box d 1 \) \( \Box b 6 \) 19 \( \Box x e 4 \) \( \Box w d 2 \) 20 \( \Box x d 2 \) \( \Box x d 5 \) 21 \( \Box c 5 \) \( \Box c 8 \) 22 b4 \( \Box x d 2 \) 23 \( \Box x d 2 \) \( \Box b d 5 \) 24 \( \Box c 4 \) ± Vaganian-Milos, Moscow OL 1994.

8 0-0 0-0 9 d5 \( \Box b d 7 \) 10 \( \Box w 3 \)

Other moves:

a) 10 \( \Box a 5 \) 11 \( \Box b 1 \)! \( \Box f c 8 \) 12 b4 \( \Box c 7 \) 13 \( \Box c 1 \) a5 14 dxc6 bxc6 15 b5 c5
16 \( \text{xf3} \) is much better for White. Van der Sterren-Jansa, Prague 1992.

a2) 10...a6!? 11 \( \text{Ee}1 \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 12 \( \text{cxd5} \) b5 13 a4 b4 14 \( \text{dxa2} \) a5 15 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{e6} \) 16 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 17 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 18 \( \text{e1} \) b6 19 f5! and despite Shariyazdanov-Spengenberg, Roque Saenz Pena 1997 being agreed drawn immediately, the position is very unclear.

a3) 10...\( \text{cxd5} \) 11 \( \text{cxd5} \) (11 \( \text{fxd5} \) \( \text{c5} \) 12 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{fe4} \) 13 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 14 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 15 \( \text{b1} \) a5 16 b3 \( \text{c7} \) 17 h4 e6 18 h5 \( \text{f8} = \) Sorokin-Spengenberg, Villa Gesell 1996) 11...\( \text{wa5} \) 12 a3 \( \text{bxc8} \) 13 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{e8} \) 14 g4 f5 15 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 16 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 17 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 18 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{g8} \) 19 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g8} \) 20 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c5} \) 21 b4 \( \text{d7} \) 22 \( \text{d4} \) \( \pm \) Farago-Davies, Silkeborg 1988) 14...\( \text{fxg7} \) 15 \( \text{g4} \) f5 16 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 17 bxc3 \( \text{xc3} \) 18 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{f6} \) 19 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 20 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{c8} \) 21 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{c7} \) 22 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 23 g4? \( \text{fxg4} \) 24 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{f5} \) 25 \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{gxf5} \) (Naumkin-Jansa, Namas- tovo 1987) 26 f3 gives White some advantage.

b) 10 \( \text{b1} \)? is also a logical move: 10...\( \text{b6} \) (10...a5!? is an improvement) 11 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 12 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{d6} \) 13 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 14 \( \text{fd1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 15 \( \text{xb6} \) axb6 16 \( \text{e3} \) \( \pm \) Benkovic-Jovic, Kragujevac 2000.

c) 10 \( \text{c1} \)? is possible; for example, 10...\( \text{wa5} \) 11 \( \text{dxc6} \) (11 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 12 \( \text{fxd5} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 13 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{b4} \) 14 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{c8} \) 15 b3 a6 16 a4 \( \text{a3} \) 17 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{a7} \) 18 f4 \( \text{d8} \) 19 g3 \( \text{a5} \) 20 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{c7} \) 21 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 22 \( \text{d2} \) a5 23 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{e5} \) 24 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{e4} \) 25 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d4} \) 26 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c3} \) \( \mp \) Stern-Slobodjan, Heringsdorf 2000) 11...\( \text{bxc6} \) 12 f4 \( \text{ab8} \) 13 b3 \( \text{c5} \) 14 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{bc8} \) 15 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e6} \) 16 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{fd8} \) 17 \( \text{d7} \) 18 \( \text{g8} \) \( \text{ff8} \) 19 \( \text{a4} \) \( \frac{1}{2} \) (1/2) Bukal-Medak, Pula 2000.

We now return to the position after 10 \( \text{b3} \) (D):

![Diagram]

10...\( \text{b8} \)?

This is the latest try from a top-level grandmaster game, and Black managed to hold, though he faced some difficulties. The game, however, is a model example of the positions arising in this variation. Older moves:

a) 10...\( \text{cxd5} \)! is not good, opening the queenside to White's advantage: 11 \( \text{b8} \) (11...\( \text{wa5} \) 12 a3 a6 13 \( \text{ac1} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 14 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{b8} \) 15 \( \text{xa6} \) \( \text{xa6} \) 16 \( \text{xa6} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 17 a4 \( \text{c5} \) 18 \( \text{b5} \) \( \pm \) Bacrot-Marković, Nice 1994) 12 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{d8} \) 13 f4 a6 14 a4 b6 15 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 16 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{a7} \) 17 b4 \( \text{d7} \) 18 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{f4} \) 19 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{b7} \) 20 \( \text{d6} \) \( \pm \) Stohl-Přibyl, Bundesliga 1993/4.

b) 10...\( \text{c7} \) is also quite slow, and White has a normal advantage after 11 \( \text{d1} \) (11 \( \text{ac1} \) e6 12 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 13 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{b8} \) 14 f4 d5 \( \frac{1}{2} \) (1/2) Gagarin-Rashkovsky, Zadar 2000) 11...a6 12
5...g6
With the knight on d7, Black’s main plan is to challenge White’s centre with a pawn-push, either ...e5 or ...c5.

5...e6 is another move:

a) 6 f4  gxb6 7  d3  f6 8 a4 a5 9  g2  b8 10  e2  e7 11 0-0 0-0 12 b3
d5 13 c5  c8 14 f5 exf5 15  e5 b6! leaves the result totally open, though
D.Gurevich-Benjamin, Chicago 1991
ended after 16  xf5  bxc5 17  xd5
cxd5 18  xd5  f6 19  c4  xd4 20
g5 ½-½.

b) 6 d5 e5 7  d3  g6 8 f4  g7 9
fxe5  dxe5 10  h3  f6 11 0-0-0 0-12
b3  f7 13  d2  c5 14  b1 a5 15
h3  e8 16  b5  c3 17  c3  d7
d2  b6 19  d1  ½-½ Pienezak-
Maiwald, Bundesliga 1996/7.

c) 6  and now:

c1) After 6...c6 White gets activity
in the centre with 7 d5!  exd5 8  g6
 9  f4  e5 (9...c5!? Greenfeld)
10  g2  e7 11  xe5  dxe5 12 dx6
bxc6 13  f4  c7 14 0-0! exf4 15  b5
  b6 16  d6+ Greenfeld-Sokolovs,

c2) 6...g6 7 d5 e5 and now White
can always attack the centre with f4,
though Black also has a safe position:
8  g2  g6 9 0-0  g7 10 f4 0-0 11 fxe5
dxe5 12 b3  f7 13  c2  f6 14  b2
g3 15  h1  f6 16  d1  e5 17
d5  e7 18  f3  f3 + 19  xf3
gxf3 20  xg7  xg7 21  g2  e5 22
f1 a6 23  c3  e8 with an equal
  position, Gunawan-Hodgson, Jakarta
  1996.

6  g2
Or:

a) 6  g7 and now:
a1) 7 h4 Qgf6 8 Ae3 c6 9 g4 h6 10 Ae2 d5! 11 cxd5 Qxd5 12 Qxd5 cxd5 13 Qb3 (the alternative 13 f4 Qb6 14 h5 gxh5 15 Axb5 Qf6 16 Qh3 has been suggested as an improvement by Dautov) 13...Qb6 14 Qxb6 Qxb6 = Dautov-Adams, Ter Apel 1995.

a2) 7 Ae3 c6 8 Ae2 Qgf6 allows White to get some space in the centre with 9 d5! 0-0 10 0-0 Qa5 11 Qb3 Qfc8 12 Qfd1 Qab8 13 a3 a6 14 Qa1 cxd5 15 Qxd5 Qxd5 16 Qxd5 Qc7 17 Qa2 ± Pieniazek-Hennings, 2nd Bundesliga 1998/9.

b) 6 Qh3 is an interesting idea, to maximize the effect of the bishop: 6...Qg7 7 0-0 Qgf6 8 d5 0-0 9 Qc3 c6 10 Aa3 Qa5 11 Qb3 Qab8 12 Qfd1!? (12 Qad1 Qb6 13 Qe1 ±) 12...Qb6 13 Qf1 Qfc8 14 Qd2 Qbd7 15 f4 Qh6 16 Qe1 Qf8 17 Qd1?! cxd5 18 cxd5 Qxb2 19 Qb1 Qa3 20 Aa3 with good compensation, Skomorokhin-Sakaev, St Petersburg 1996.

6...Qg7 (D)

7 0-0

White has many alternatives:

a) 7 Qc3 e6 8 f4 c6 9 d5 exd5 10 cxd5 c5 with a complicated position: 11 f5 Qc7 12 fxg6 hxg6 13 0-0 a6 14 Qe1 Qf8 15 Qe4 Qb6 16 h4 Qe5 17 Qg5 Qf5 18 Qf6 Qxb2 19 Qb1 Qd4 (Tager-Miles, Bad Wörishofen 1989) 20 Qxd4 Qxd4 21 Qxe5! dxe5 22 Qxb7 with good compensation.

b) 7 d5 h5 8 0-0 Qh6 9 Qd2 (9 f4!? Gleizerov) 9...c5 10 Qh3 Qf5 11 Axf5 gxf5 12 f4 (12 Qc2 e6 13 Qe1 Qf6 ±) 12...h4 13 Qe1 hxg3 14 hxg3 Qf6 15 Qb1 Qf8 16 Qf3 Qd7 17 Qd3 e6 is OK for Black, Gleizerov-Tunik, Voskresensk 1993.

c) 7 f4 c6 8 0-0 Qgf6 9 Qc3 0-0 10 d5 (10 Qe1!?) and now:

c1) 10...Qc8 11 Qe1 (11 Qe3 Qa5! provides Black with counterplay, Sokolov-Hickl, Nussloch 1996) 11...Qc8 12 Qc3 ±.

c2) 10...Qb6 11 Qe2 cxd5 12 cxd5 Qc8 13 Qe3 Qfd7 14 Qad1 Axc3 15 bxc3 Qxc3 16 Qd4 Qc7 17 Qfe1 Qf6 18 Qxb6 axb6 19 Qd3 Qd7 20 Qe3 Qc8 21 Qb3 Aec8 22 Qf1 Qa4 23 Qb2 Qd4 ± Schöne-Maiwald, Bundesliga 1997/8.

7...Qh6! (D)

Black is going to bring his knight to f5, generating counterplay against the white centre.

7...c6 is another option, aiming to build a safe central set-up with ...c6 and ...d5: 8 Qc3 Qgf6 9 Aa3 0-0 10 Qd2 d5 11 Qe2 dxc4 12 Qxc4 e6 13 Qe4 Qd5 14 Qad1 Qb6 15 Qc1 a5 16 Qe1 Qb4 17 Qf1 Qf8 18 Qg5 Qd8 19 b3 a4 ± Born-Bagirov, Deizisau 1999.

8 Axf6
8...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textbf{x}h6}}}} 9 f4

Here is a thematic example of how Black can gain the advantage: 9 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}e3}}} 0-0 10 f4 c6 11 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}e}1}}} g5 12 d5 cxd5 13 cxd5 e6 14 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}3}}} \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{x}c}3}}}! 15 bxc3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}7}}} 16 h4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}d}8}}} 17 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}d}4}} b6 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{x}b}7}}} Brenninkmeijer-Hodgson, Dutch Ch (Breda) 1998.

9...c6 10 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}3}}} \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}7}}} 11 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{w}d}2}} 0-0 12 d5

12 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{x}f}7}}} e6 13 d5 cxd5 14 cxd5 c5 is OK for Black: 15 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}e}4}}} exf4 16 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}x}d}6} e5 17 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}x}f}7} \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}7}}} 18 gxf4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}g}4}} 19 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}d}1}}} Heim-Hodgson, Slough ECC 1997.

12...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}8}}} 13 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{a}a}c}1}} \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{a}a}5}} 14 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{f}f}d}1}
\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{f}f}e}8}} 15 b3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}7}}} 16 h4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}x}c}3} 17 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{w}w}c}3}} \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}x}c}3}} 18 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}x}c}3} \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}x}d}5} 19 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}x}d}5} \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}f}6}} 20 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{b}b}b}5}} b6

= Temirbaev-Adams, Elista OL 1998. The position is balanced, since White's bishop is a plus, but the doubled pawns are a clear minus in an endgame.

\textbf{Conclusion}: 3 c4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}d}7}} 4 g3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{x}f}3}}} 5 exf3 g6 seems to be completely sound for Black. Again, the plans with ...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{h}h}6}}} work well.

C)

3...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}d}7}} 4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}c}3}}} \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{x}f}3}}} (D)

5 gxf3

5 exf3 leads to somewhat different positions after 5...g6:

a) 6 e2 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}g}7}}} 7 0-0 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{h}h}6}}}! looks sound for Black, though complications are possible:

al) 8 d5 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{x}f}5}} 9 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}c}d}4}} 10 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}e}1}} 0-0 11 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}g}5}} \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}e}8}} 12 f4 c5 13 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}e}2}} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} Lautier-Hodgson, Harplinge 1998.
a2) 8 \( \text{d}3 \text{e}6 \) 9 \( \text{e}3 \text{0-0} \) 10 \( \text{w}d2 \text{g}f5 \) 11 \( \text{xf}5 \text{exf}5 \) 12 \( \text{g}5 \text{f}6 \) 13 \( \text{h}4 \text{c}6 \) 14 \( \text{fe}1 \text{e}8 \) is equal, Vyzhmanavin-Hodgson, London ECC 1996.

a3) 8 \( \text{g}4! ? \text{e}6 \) (8...\( \text{e}5?! ) 9 \( \text{e}3 \text{f}5 \) 10 \( \text{e}1 \text{0-0} \) 11 \( \text{g}5 \text{f}7 \) 12 \( \text{f}4 \text{c}6 \) 13 \( \text{w}d2 \text{w}c7 \) 14 \( \text{ad}1 \text{ad}8 \) 15 \( \text{h}4 \text{fe}8 = \) Eperjesi-Bree, Budapest 2000.

b) 6 \( \text{f}4 \text{g}7 \) and then:

b1) 7 \( \text{e}3 \text{e}6 \) 8 \( \text{w}b3 \text{e}7 \) 9 \( \text{0-0-0} \) \( \text{b}6 \) 10 \( \text{g}4 \text{xf}6 \) 11 \( \text{eg}1 \text{d}5 \) 12 \( \text{cx}d5 \text{fx}d5 \) 13 \( \text{xd}5 \text{w}d5 \) 14 \( \text{c}4 \text{w}c6 \) 15 \( \text{wb}1 \) 0-0 = Samarim-Belikov, Smolensk 1992.

b2) 7 \( \text{e}2 \text{wh}6 \) 8 \( \text{g}4 \text{e}5 \) 9 \( \text{dx}e5 \text{dxe}5 \) 10 \( \text{fxe}5 \text{xc}5 \) 11 \( \text{wd}8+ \text{xd}8 \) 12 \( \text{wh}6 \text{wh}6 \) 13 \( \text{d}1 \text{c}6 \) = Gleizerov-Epishin, Podolsk 1992.

b3) 7 \( \text{g}4! ? \) is an interesting sharp idea, which made Black react wrongly with 7...\( \text{e}5?! \) (7...\( \text{c}5?! \) and 7...\( \text{h}5?! \) look like natural improvements) 8 \( \text{dxe}5 \text{g}2 \text{e}7 \) 10 \( \text{0-0-0} \) 11 \( \text{xb}7 \text{ab}8 \) 12 \( \text{g}2 \text{ex}f4 \) 13 \( \text{xf}4 \text{xb}2 \) 14 \( \text{b}5 \text{d}5 \) 15 \( \text{e}1 \text{xc}4 \) 16 \( \text{xd}8 \text{d}8 \) 17 \( \text{xc}7 \) = in Garcia Lundain-Mellado, Spanish Cht 1992.

c) 6 \( \text{e}3 \text{g}7 \) (D) and now:

c1) 7 \( \text{wd}2 \) is best met by the standard set-up 7...\( \text{e}6! \) 8 \( \text{d}3 \text{e}7 \), when Black is doing fine; for example, 90-0 (9 \( \text{h}4 \text{h}5 \) 10 \( \text{d}5 \text{e}5 \) 11 \( \text{f}4 \text{g}f5 \) 13 \( \text{d}e2 \text{ex}f4 \) 14 \( \text{xf}4 \text{c}5 \) with counterplay, Itkis-Nevednichy, Kishinev 1993) 9...\( \text{0-0} \) 10 \( \text{h}6 \text{wh}6 \) 11 \( \text{wh}6 \text{g}f5 \) 12 \( \text{xf}5 \text{ex}f5 \) 13 \( \text{wd}2 \text{e}8 \) = Ovsieiev-Borsos, Simferopol 1991.

c2) After 7 \( \text{h}4 \text{h}5 \) the position may become quite complicated, although Black's plan with \( \ldots \text{wh}6 \) appears very natural:

c21) 8 \( \text{g}3 \text{wh}6 \) 9 \( \text{h}3 \text{c}6 \) 10 \( \text{0-0} \) \( \text{g}f5 \) 11 \( \text{xf}5 \text{gxf}5 \) 12 \( \text{g}5 \text{f}8 \) 13 \( \text{e}1 \text{g}6 \) 14 \( \text{e}2 \text{wh}7 \) 15 \( \text{f}4 \text{e}6 \) 16 \( \text{xb}6 \text{fx}b6 \) 17 \( \text{d}5 \text{e}5 = \) Engorn-Agren, Berlin 1993.

c22) 8 \( \text{wd}2 \text{wh}6 \) 9 \( \text{d}3 \text{c}5 \) 10 \( \text{dx}c5 \) \( \text{xc}5 \) 11 \( \text{dc}2 \text{f}5 \) 12 \( \text{xf}5 \text{xf}5 \) 13 \( \text{d}4 \text{d}4 \) 14 \( \text{wd}4 \text{g}8 \) 15 \( \text{0-0-0} \) \( \text{e}6 \) 16 \( \text{wd}5 \text{wh}6 \) with good activity, Pogorelov-Izeta, Linares open 1995.

c23) 8 \( \text{e}1 \text{wh}6 \) 9 \( \text{g}4 \text{hx}g4 \) 10 \( \text{fx}g4 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 11 \( \text{e}2 \text{xf}4 \) 12 \( \text{xf}4 \text{fx}g4 \) 13 \( \text{w}xg4 \text{f}8 \) 14 \( \text{we}4 \text{c}6 \) 15 \( \text{d}2 \text{h}2 \) Komarov-Hodgson, French Cht 1999.

5...\( \text{g}6 \) 6 \( \text{f}4 \)
The alternatives are not dangerous for Black:

a) 6 b3 g7 7 b2 g6 8 e3 0-0 9 f4 e5 10 fxe5 dxe5 11 g2 exd4 12 xd4 c6 13 d2 a5 14 e4 xd2+ 15 xd2 d8 16 d1 c5 17 e2 dfe8 = Vladimirov-Rivas, Salamanca 1991.

b) 6 h4 g6 7 b3 b8 8 e3 c6 9 h3 g7 10 0-0 and now 10...a6 allows 11 c5!? 0-0 12 f4 e5 13 dxe5 dxc5 14 e4 h5 (Kirov-Delchev, Bulgarian Ch (Sofia) 1996) 15 exd6 ±. Probably Black should continue with 10...d6!?; e.g., 11 wa4 w6.

6...g7 (D)

7 g2

White has some alternatives:

a) 7 w2 d8 7...c6 8 b3 b6 9 e3 h6 10 h4 e5 11 fxe5 dxe5 12 d5 d6 13 g2 d5 14 b2 0-0 15 0-0-0 d8, San Segundo-Epishin, Madrid 1992. 16 h5!? xh5 17 xh5 g6 ± with good compensation – Epishin) 8 b3 (8 e4 c5 9 d5 f5 =) 8...f5 9 e5 10 fxe5 dxe5 11 d5 0-0 is unclear according to Epishin.

b) 7 e3 c6 8 d2 e9 b3 c7 10 e4 d6? (10...b6??) 11 xh7! d7 12 xc7+ xc7 13 g5 is much better for White, Gomez Esteban-Romero, Elgoibar 1997.

7...c6!? This logical move, blocking the long diagonal, seems to give Black excellent counterplay.

7...b8 is another option: 8 0-0 (8 d3 g6 9 b3 0-0 10 h2 a6 11 c5 12 exd4 13 xd4 b5 14 cxb5 axb5 15 f1 b4 16 a4 a5 is OK for Black, Panno-Miles, Buenos Aires 1994) 8...e6 9 d5 g6 10 c3 a6 11 b3 e5 12 fxe5 dxe5 13 f7 a8 14 d4 h5 15 e3 0-0 16 xh7 x7 17 b3 xb8 18 c2 e4 19 e2 e5 20 f5 f1 21 c1 a4 22 h3 /2–1/2 Sakaev-Svidler, St Petersburg 1997.

8 0-0 h6 9 e4 0-0 10 a3 e6 11 c1 h4

Black’s pieces nicely attack the white position, and the strong-looking centre is not effective.

12 f3 e5 13 fxe5 dxe5 14 d5 g4 15 h3 xh3 16 xh3 e3 17 fxe3 e5


Conclusion: Black should not be too worried about the strong white centre in the variation 4 d3 xf3 5 gxf3 g6 6 f4 as this centre might easily become a target for active counterplay by Black.
14 The Portuguese Gambit

1 d4 d6 2 ♜f3 ♜g4 3 c4 e5 4 dxe5 ♜e6 (D)

This gambit has mostly been tried by some Portuguese players, and it is reminiscent of the notorious Hennig-Schara Gambit (1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 ♜c3 c5 4 cxd5 cxd4). Black sacrifices a pawn, but White will be behind in development for some time. This gambit is probably not completely correct, but it might be a good choice as a surprise weapon for a must-win situation. The gambit can also be applied in the move-order 2 c4 e5 3 ♜f3 ♜g4.

5 ♜g5!?  
This zwischenzug, developing the bishop with tempo, seems to be the strongest, but there have only been a few examples. The alternatives for White are:

a) 5 h3?! ♜xf3 6 efx3 is not good, because Black plays for activity with 6...dxe5! (6...dxe5 7 ♜e2 ± allows White to stabilize his advantage in the form of the bishop-pair) 7 ♛a4 ♛b4+ 8 ♛d2 ♛xd2+ 9 ♛xd2 ♛d4 with advantage to Black.

b) 5 e6?! just gives away the pawn: 5...dxe5 6 fxe5 ♛d7 7 e4 ♛c6 8 ♜e2 0-0-0 9 ♜e3 h6 10 a3 ♜xf3 11 ♜xf3 ♜g5 12 ♛d2 ♜xe3 13 ♛xe3 e5 is also possible, Guerra-Charneira, Honra 1998) 6 e3 g6 7 ♜d2 ♜g7 8 ♜c3 ♛f6 9 ♛bd2 0-0 10 e4 ♛c7 11 ♛e2 ♛d7 12 ♛c2 ♛ae8 + Silva-Leonardo, Portugal 1993.

c) 5 ♜c3 also gives the pawn back too easily. 5...dxe5 6 ♛a4 and then:

c1) 6...♛c5 7 ♜g5 (7 ♜xe5!? is another idea) 7...dxe5 8 ♛d1 ♛d7 9 ♛c2 0-0 10 e3 ± Pfaff-Blum, Baunatal 1999.

c2) 6...♛b4! 7 ♜d2 ♜xf3 8 exf3 ♛d4 with counterplay.

d) 5 exd6 is the most natural move. After 5...♕xd6 Black can expect some compensation in an unclear position:

d1) 6 c3 ♛c7 7 ♛c2 ♛f6 8 0-0 0-0-0 9 ♛a4 ♛e4 10 ♛bd2 f5 11 ♛xe4 fxe4 12 ♛d4 ♛xe2 13 ♛xe2 ♛e5 14 ♛g3 ♛he8 15 ♛b5 ♛e7 16 b3 ♛e5 17 ♛bl a6 18 ♛a4 h5 19 b4 h4 20 ♛b5 hxg3 21 hxg3 22 ♛hx2 ♛xh2+! ♛xh2+! ♛xh2+! Durão-Charneira, Honra 1998.
d2) 6...\(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 7 e3 \(\text{Q}f6\) 8 \(\text{Q}e2\) 0-0-0 9 \(\text{Q}d4\) \(\text{Q}xd4\) 10 \(\text{Q}xg4+\) \(\text{Q}h8\) 11 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}f5\) 12 \(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{Q}xe3\) 13 \(\text{fxe3}\) \(\text{Q}xe3\) 14 \(\text{Q}f3\)? (14 \(\text{Q}b3!?\) and 14 \(\text{Q}b1!?\) are better) 14...\(\text{Q}b4+\) 15 \(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{Q}g4!\) \(\text{Q}d\text{amasceno-Charmeira, Lisbon 1996.}\)

\(d3)\) 6 \(\text{Q}c3\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 7 e3 \(\text{Q}e7\) 8 \(\text{Q}e2\) 0-0-0 (8...\(\text{Q}d8\) 9 \(\text{Q}d2\) 0-0 10 0-0 \(\text{Q}e5\) 11 \(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 12 f4 \(\text{Q}e6\) 13 \(\text{Q}xg4\) \(\text{Q}xg4\) 14 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}c5\) 15 \(\text{Q}d5\) f5 16 \(\text{h}3\) c6 17 hxg4 \(\text{cxd5}\) 18 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{e}7\) 19 gxf5 \(\text{xf}5\) 20 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{h}6\) 21 g4 \(\text{g}6\) 22 \(\text{g}2\) \+ Van Wely-Damaso, Strasbourg 1994) 9 \(\text{Q}b3\) (9 \(\text{Q}w4\) \(\text{Q}b8\) 10 a3 \(\text{h}5\) 11 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}h8\) 12 \(\text{Q}b5\) \(\text{Q}e4\) 13 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}c5\) 14 \(\text{Q}f1\)? \(\text{Q}d2\) 15 \(\text{Q}xd2\) \(\text{Q}xe2\) 0-1 Quaresma-Vitor, Odivelas 1995) 9...\(\text{Q}e4\) 10 0-0 with a basic position-type of this variation. Black gets compensation by playing very aggressively: 10...\(\text{h}5\) 11 \(\text{Q}b5\) \(\text{Q}c5\) 12 a3 \(\text{a}6\) 13 \(\text{Q}c3\) \(\text{Q}d6\) 14 \(\text{Q}xe4\) \(\text{Q}xe4\) 15 c5 \(\text{Q}xc5\) 16 \(\text{Q}xf7\) \(\text{Q}d6\) 17 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 18 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{Q}xf3\) 19 \(\text{Q}xf3\) \(\text{Q}e5\) 20 \(\text{Q}w4\) \(\text{Q}xf3\) 21 \(\text{Q}xf3\) g5 and despite the simplifications Black had activity in Kaabi-Rocha, Algarve 1995.

5...\(\text{Q}d7\) 6 \(\text{Q}d6\)
6 \(\text{Q}c3\) \(\text{Q}xf3\) 7 \(\text{cxf3}\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 8 \(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 9 \(\text{Q}xe7\) \(\text{Q}xe7\) \(\text{Q}d6\) \(\text{h}2-h2\) Tella-Ribeiro, Athens 1997.
6...\(\text{Q}xd6\) 7 \(\text{Q}c3\) (D)
7...\(\text{Q}g7\)
Or:

a) 7...\(\text{h}6?!\) doesn't seem to have much of an idea behind it: 8 \(\text{Q}h4\) f5 9 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{Q}xh6\) 10 \(\text{Q}xd7+\) \(\text{Q}xd7\) 11 0-0-0+ \(\text{Q}c8\) 12 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}g7\) 13 \(\text{Q}c4\) a6 14 \(\text{Q}g3\) b5 15 \(\text{Q}e6+\) \(\text{Q}b7\) 16 \(\text{Q}d7\) \(\text{Q}ac8\) 17 \(\text{Q}e5\) \(\text{Q}h5\) 18 \(\text{Q}d5\) \(\text{Q}he8\) (Santos-Rocha, Portuguese Chl (Evora) 1995/6) and now 19 \(\text{Q}xc6\) wins.

b) The unnatural 7...\(\text{f}5?!\) is not good: 8 \(\text{Q}d5\) \(\text{Q}g6\) (8...\(\text{Q}d7\) 9 \(\text{Q}d4\) \(\text{Q}g7\) 10 \(\text{Q}xe7\) \(\text{Q}xe7\) 11 \(\text{Q}w4\) 0-0-0 12 0-0-0 a6 13 g3 c5 14 \(\text{Q}b3\) f5 15 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 16 \(\text{Q}g2\) \+ Perez-Ribeiro, Matanzas 1995) 9 \(\text{Q}e4+\) \(\text{Q}w4\) 10 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}b4+\) 11 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}xd2\)+ 12 \(\text{Q}xd2\) 0-0-0+ 13 \(\text{Q}d3\) f5 14 \(\text{Q}g5\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 15 h3 \(\text{h}5\) 16 g4 h6 17 gxh6 hxg6 18 \(\text{Q}xg5\) \(\text{Q}xh6\) 19 \(\text{Q}e6\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 20 \(\text{Q}g2\) \+ Arlandi-Rocha, Pula Echt 1997. Black should keep more pieces on the board.

c) The so far untested move 7...\(\text{f6}?!\) might be worth a try, as there seem to be some problems in the main line.
8 \(\text{e}3\) (D)
8 \(\text{Q}a4?!\).

Now (after 8 \(\text{e}3\)):

a) 8...\(\text{Q}g6\) (the tactical operation started by this move does not work) 9 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{Q}xh3\) (9...\(\text{Q}e6\) 10 e4 \(\text{Q}f1\) 10 \(\text{Q}xh3\) \(\text{h}6\) 11 0-0-0! \(\text{Q}xg5\) 12 e5 \(\text{Q}g5\) 13 \(\text{Q}e2\) (13 \(\text{Q}e4\) \(\text{h}4!\) gives Black counterplay) 13...0-0-0 14 \(\text{Q}xh3\) \(\text{Q}d6\) 15 f4 \+ Tella-Conquest, Stockholm Hilton Cup 1998/9.

b) 8...0-0-0 deserves a closer look. Black's activity has led to some success
in practice, though objectively it looks quite speculative. 9 əh3 f6 10 əh4 əb8 (10...h5 11 əg3 əe6 12 əxd6 əxd6 13 əa4 əxf3 14 əxf3 əe5 15 əe2 əg4 16 c5 ədd8 17 əxa7 c6 18 əa8+ əc7 19 əa4 əd5 20 əe4 əf7

21 əxd5+ əxd5 22 əxd5 əxd5 23 b4 ± Arlandi-Ribeiro, Athens rpd 1997)
and now:

b1) 11 əa4 g5 12 əg3? (12 0-0-0! is an improvement, with White claiming an advantage after 12...gxh4 13 c5 h3 14 cxd6 cxd6 15 g3) 12...əxf3 13 əxf3 əxg3 14 əd1 əxh2+ 15 əxf2 əf5 16 g4 əe5 17 əb5 əxd1 18 əxd1 əd8 19 əxe5 əxe5 = Pereira-Dam-ason, Lisbon 1995.

b2) 11 əg3!? is best, although Black might still have some chances of complicating the position.

**Conclusion:** The gambit is probably not completely sound, but as a surprise weapon it might be a reasonable choice.
15 3 e4

1 d4 d6 2 Qf3 g4 3 e4 (D)

This move leads to rather different position-types from 3 c4. It is more like a semi-open system because generally White leaves the c-pawn on c2 and plays Qc3 early on. Lines B1 and B21 are rather positional and don’t cause any major danger to Black’s life. Typically Black aims for a well-timed ...d5 after which the position either simplifies or after White plays e5 there arises a French-type position where Black has put his bad bishop outside the pawn-chain, which, in itself at least, is highly beneficial for him. In Line B212 White manages first to push d5, which is slightly more dangerous for Black. The real test for the black system is the complicated Line B22, where White attempts to put the bishop in trouble with the plan of h3, g4 and h4, and sometimes aims to castle queenside.

Here we discuss:
A: 3...Qd7!? 122
B: 3...Qf6 123
The latter is very much the main line.

A)
3...Qd7?!

This is a rare move with some practical value. It will be some kind of Philidor where Black has got the bishop out. One may think that this fact is in Black’s favour, but sometimes the bishop gets in trouble or has to be exchanged for the knight.

4 Qc3

Both 4 h3 Qh5 5 Qc3 e5 6 Qe3 Qc7 7 Qc2 Qg6 8 0-0 0-9 a4 c6 10 a5 Qc7 11 Qe1 Qf8 12 Qd2 Qxe2 13 Qxe2 h5 14 axb6 axb6 15 Qh3 h5 = Demina-Ionov, Moscow 1991 and 4 Qc2 e5 lead to a similar sort of position.

4...e5 (D)

5 Qc4

White obtained a slight initiative in R.Schulz-Belkov, Berlin 1994 with the apparently tamer 5 Qe2 Qg6 6 0-0 Qc7 7 Qc3 0-0 8 Qd2 Qxc2 9 Qxc2 c6 10 a4 Qe8 11 Qad1 Qf8 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 Qe4 Qe6 14 Qd3 Qc7 15
\( \mathcal{L} \text{g5} \mathcal{L} \text{c5} 16 \mathcal{L} \text{e3} \text{g6} 17 \mathcal{L} \text{g4} \mathcal{L} \text{xg4} \\
18 \mathcal{L} \text{xf4} \mathcal{L} \text{e7 \pm}.
5...\text{c6} 6 \mathcal{L} \text{e3}

With 6 \text{a4} \text{exd4} 7 \mathcal{L} \text{xd4} \mathcal{L} \text{xf3} 8 \\
gxf3 White takes a big risk.
6...\text{b5} 7 \mathcal{L} \text{e2} \mathcal{L} \text{gf6} 8 \mathcal{L} \text{d2} \mathcal{L} \text{xe2} 9
\mathcal{L} \text{xe2} \text{a6} 10 \text{f4} \mathcal{L} \text{e7} 11 \text{dxe5} \text{dxe5} 12
\text{f5} \mathcal{L} \text{c5} 13 \text{0-0} \mathcal{L} \text{xe3+} 14 \mathcal{L} \text{xe3} \mathcal{L} \text{b6 =}
15 \mathcal{L} \text{xb6} \mathcal{L} \text{xb6} 16 \mathcal{L} \text{f3} \mathcal{L} \text{fd7} 17 \text{b3}
\text{f6}

There is no reason why Black should lose this ending, although he in fact
did so in Khalifman-Belikov, Russian Ch (Podolsk) 1992.

**Conclusion:** If Black dislikes the complexities of Line B, he may con-
sider this cautious possibility but White is likely to get some spatial advantage.

**B)**
3...\text{f6} (D)

Now:

**B1:** 4 \mathcal{L} \text{d3} 123

**B2:** 4 \mathcal{L} \text{c3} 125

4 \mathcal{L} \text{bd2} \text{e6} usually transposes to
Line B1 by 5 \mathcal{L} \text{d3} or 5 \text{c3} \mathcal{L} \text{e7} 6 \mathcal{L} \text{d3}.

**B1)**

4 \mathcal{L} \text{d3} \text{e6} 5 \mathcal{L} \text{bd2}

Or:

a) 5 0-0 is a natural move, but it is not very dangerous:

a1) After 5...\text{d5}! 6 \mathcal{L} \text{bd2} \mathcal{L} \text{c7} it is
better to play 7 \text{c3 =} than to go for a
closed position with 7 \text{c5?!} \mathcal{L} \text{fd7} 8
\mathcal{L} \text{e1} \text{c5} since the attempt to complicate
with 9 \text{c4?!} (9 \text{c3} \mathcal{L} \text{c6} is positionally
fine for Black) 9...\text{dxex4} 10 \mathcal{L} \text{xc4 exd4}
11 \mathcal{L} \text{e4} \mathcal{L} \text{h5} 12 \mathcal{L} \text{e2?!} \text{d3} 13 \mathcal{L} \text{xd3}
\mathcal{L} \text{g6 \pm} led to the loss of an exchange in
Åkesson-Karpachev, Jyväskylä 1996.

a2) After 5...\mathcal{L} \text{e7} White has:

a21) 6 \mathcal{L} \text{e1} \text{c6} 7 \mathcal{L} \text{bd2} \text{d5} 8 \text{e5}
(White should play 8 \text{c3 =} or 8 \text{exd5}
\text{exd5 =} ) 8...\mathcal{L} \text{fd7} 9 \text{c3} \text{c5} (this may
already be slightly unpleasant for
White) 10 \mathcal{L} \text{a4} (10 \mathcal{L} \text{fl} \text{exd4} 11 \text{exd4}
\mathcal{L} \text{c6 \pm} 12 \mathcal{L} \text{e3} \mathcal{L} \text{b4}) 10...\mathcal{L} \text{h5} 11 \text{c4}
\mathcal{L} \text{c6} 12 \text{exd5} \mathcal{L} \text{b6} 13 \mathcal{L} \text{b5} \text{a6} 14 \mathcal{L} \text{b3}
\text{xd5} 15 \text{dxc5} \mathcal{L} \text{xc5 \pm} 16 \mathcal{L} \text{e4?!} \mathcal{L} \text{b4}
\pm 17 \mathcal{L} \text{g5} \mathcal{L} \text{d7} 18 \mathcal{L} \text{ed1?!} \mathcal{L} \text{xf3} 19
\text{gxf3} \mathcal{L} \text{d4} 20 \mathcal{L} \text{ec4} \mathcal{L} \text{xf3+} 0-1 Bagaturov-Ki.Georgiev, Biel IZ 1993.

a22) 6 \text{c3} \text{c6} 7 \mathcal{L} \text{bd2} \mathcal{L} \text{h5} (7...\text{d5}
here or next move looks slightly more
accurate; there is no hurry to castle) 8 a1 e1 0-0 9 a1 f1 d5 10 exd5 cxd5 11 g3 g6 12 a3 exg6 hxg6 13 e2 d6 (13...c6 with the logical plan...h5-b4 should be close to equality) 14 a4 f4 c6 15 d3 with a slight advantage for White. B. Schmidt-Bezold, Bundesliga 1994/5.

b) 5 a1 g5!? a7 e7 6 a1 bd2 (D) is another approach:

```
B
```

b12) More accurate is 10 w b3! d6 h6 11 a4 a5 12 0-0 cxd7 13 w c2 a3 x f3 (13...h6 14 w e1! ± takes the g4-bishop in trouble) 14 a3 x f3 h6 15 e2 c5 16 a1 b5 a6 c8 17 dxc5 a x c5 18 a1 d4 ± Dautov.

b2) It is the right time for 6...d5! 7 e5 (7 exd5 = ) 7...cxd5 8 a1 e5?! (8 a3 x e7 w x e7 9 0-0 c5 10 c3 c6 = ) 8...c5 9 c3 d6 10 0-0 c4 11 a1 c2 b5 12 a1 b4 13 cxb4 a x b4 14 h3 a x h5 15 g4 a1 g6, which gave Black a nice position in Yuferov-Blumberg, Minsk 1993.

5...a1 e7 6 c3 (D)

White has also tried:

a) 6 a1 f1 0-0 (6...c5 7 dxc5 w a5+ 8 c3 a1 xc5 9 h3 a3 x f3 10 a x f3 a1 bd7 11 w e2 0-0-0 12 a1 d2 w e5 13 a1 c2 a1 fc8 14 f4 a1 c4 15 a x c4 w x c4 16 a1 d3 w x c6 17 0-0 ± Polugaevsky-Short, Reykjavik 1987) 7 a1 g3 c5! (White’s slow approach invites this) 8 dxc5 dxc5 9 h3 a x f3 10 a x f3 a x c6 = 11 a1 d1? w c7 12 c3 a f8 13 a1 e2 a3 d6! 14 a1 f1 a1 e5 15 a1 c2 c4 gives Black a slight advantage, Dizdarević-Groszpeter, Zenica 1987.

b) 6 0-0 a1 bd7?! (6...c6 7 c3 transposes to note ‘a22’ to White’s 5th move and may be preferable; 6...d5 7 c3 transposes to note ‘b3’ to Black’s 6th move) 7 a1 e1 0-0 8 h3 a1 h5 9 a1 f1 a1 g6 10 a1 g3 a1 h5 11 a x h5 (11 a x f5? gains the bishop-pair) 11...a x h5 12 c3 a8 e1 13 a1 e3 c6 14 a1 e2 ½-½ Andersson-Miles, Benasque 1995.

6...a1 h5

This is a standard manoeuvre with the idea of exchanging light-squared bishops with...a1 g6. Other options:
a) The dangers of the tempting but premature 6...0-0?! were demonstrated by 7...\texttt{bc}2 h6?! (7...\texttt{vh}8?!; 7...\texttt{bc}bd7) 8 h3 \texttt{xf}3 9 \texttt{ex}f3 c5 10 dxc5 dxc5 11 e5 \texttt{bd}5 12 \texttt{we}2 \texttt{ed}7 13 \texttt{we}4 f5 14 exf6 \texttt{xf}6 15 \texttt{g}6 ± in W.Richter-Bezold, Bundesliga 1991/2.

b) The immediate 6...d5!? is thematic, but it allows White to complicate:

\begin{itemize}
  \item b1) 7 \texttt{a}4+ c6 8 \texttt{ce}5 \texttt{h}5 9 0-0 \texttt{bd}7 10 \texttt{xd}7 \texttt{xd}7 11 f4 dxe4 12 \texttt{xe}4 0-0 13 \texttt{c}2 \texttt{g}6 = Nemet-Belotti, Elista OL 1998.
  
  \item b2) 7 \texttt{b}3?! \texttt{xf}3 8 \texttt{xb}7?! (8 gxf3?! leads to a position that is difficult to assess) 8...\texttt{gx}g2 9 \texttt{g}1 \texttt{xe}4 10 \texttt{xe}4 \texttt{bd}7 11 \texttt{f}3 0-0 12 \texttt{b}3 \texttt{b}8 13 \texttt{xb}8 \texttt{axb}8 14 \texttt{h}6 \texttt{e}8 ± Sarosy-Liebowitz, corr. 1990-2.

\end{itemize}

b3) 7 0-0 dxe4 8 \texttt{xe}4 is safest:

\begin{itemize}
  \item b31) 8...\texttt{xe}4 9 \texttt{xe}4 c6 10 \texttt{b}3 \texttt{c}7 (10...\texttt{wb}6?! 11 \texttt{e}5! \texttt{h}5 12 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{d}7 13 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{e}8 14 \texttt{c}4 \texttt{f}6 15 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{e}2 16 \texttt{f}e1 \texttt{xc}4 17 \texttt{xc}4 0-0 18 \texttt{b}3 \texttt{d}8 19 \texttt{ad}1 ± Dzidar-Miljanic, Yugoslav Ch (Kladovo) 1990.

\end{itemize}

White has a useful bishop-pair.

b32) 8...\texttt{bd}7 looks better: 9 \texttt{g}3 0-0 (9...c5! =) 10 h3 \texttt{xf}3 11 \texttt{xf}3 c6 ± 12 \texttt{d}1 \texttt{h}2-\texttt{h}2 Lengyel-Sulskis, Budapest 1995.

7 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{g}6

Even here 7...d5!? seems to be quite OK: 8 e5 \texttt{fd}7 9 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{g}6 10 \texttt{ax}g6 hxg6 11 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{b}6 12 a4 a5 13 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{bd}7 14 0-0 0-0 15 \texttt{d}2 c5 16 dxc5 \texttt{xc}5 1/2-1/2 Dautov-Bezold, Altensteig 1994.

8 \texttt{g}3 d5 9 exd5 \texttt{xd}3 10 \texttt{wd}3 \texttt{xd}5 11 c4

11 0-0 c5 12 c4 \texttt{d}7 looks OK for Black.

11...\texttt{a}5+ 12 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{a}6 13 0-0 0-0
14 \texttt{f}e1 \texttt{d}8 15 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{e}6 16 \texttt{c}3

White enjoys a small space advantage. However, the next move offers some relief and Black doesn't suffer from any structural weaknesses.

16...\texttt{b}4! 17 \texttt{xb}4 \texttt{xb}4 18 a3 \texttt{c}6 19 \texttt{ad}1 \texttt{h}6

= Miles-Van der Wiel, Wijk aan Zee 1996. The game was drawn after 103 moves.

**Conclusion:** This system is not dangerous for Black, who can most likely equalize with a well-timed ...d5. However, Black should usually avoid castling prematurely.

**B2)**

4 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{e}6 (D)

Now:

**B21:** 5 \texttt{e}2 126

**B22:** 5 \texttt{h}3 131

5 \texttt{e}3 tends to reach similar positions to Line B21; e.g., 5...\texttt{e}7 6 \texttt{h}3
\[ \text{B211)} \]

5  \text{\$e2 \$e7 (D)}

It is too early for 5...d5?! 6 exd5  
\text{\$xd5 (6...exd5 7 \text{\$e5 \text{\$xe2 8 \text{\$xe2 \text{\$e7 9 0-0 c6 10 \text{\$e1 \text{\$e6 11 \text{\$g5 \text{\$e7 12 \text{\$xf6 gxf6 13 \text{\$h5 fxe5 14 \text{\$xe5 \text{\$f6 15 \text{\$a1 + is even worse, Filipppov-Kovaliov, Gistrup 1996}})} 7 \text{\$xd5 exd5 8 \text{\$e5! \text{\$e6 9 0-0 \text{\$e7 10 f4 0-0 11 \text{\$d3 f5 12 \text{\$e2 + Filipppov-Arkhangelsky, Moscow 1994}}). Now (after 5...\$e7): B211: 6 0-0 126 B212: 6 d5 129}}\]

Or 6 \text{\$c3, and now:} 

a) 6...0-0 7 \text{\$d2 (7 0-0 transposes to Line B211)} 7...d5 8 exd5 exd5 9 a3  
\text{\$bd7 10 0-0 c6 11 \text{\$d1 \text{\$e8 12 h3 \text{\$h5 13 \text{\$f1 \text{\$b6 14 \text{\$c1 \text{\$d6 with an equal position, Lang-Přibyl, Nuremberg 1989.}}) 6...d5!? 7 e5 (7 \text{\$e5 \text{\$xe2 8 \text{\$xe2 c6 leads to equality) 7...\text{\$fd7 8 \text{\$d2 \text{\$xe2 9 \text{\$xe2 c5 10 c3 \text{\$e6 11 0-0 exd4 (11...b5 is another plan) 12 exd4 \text{\$b6 13 \text{\$b1 0-0 14 b4!? \text{\$c7 15 a3 b5! 16 \text{\$g3 a5 resulted in a typical kingside vs queenside fight, where Black's counterplay was strong, in the game Zsu.Polgar-Yrjölä, Kecskemét 1988.}}}}\]}

\[ \text{B211)} \]

6 0-0 (D)
6...0-0
Or:

a) Possibly the thematic 6...d5?! is still premature in view of 7 便可5 便可xe2 8 可可xe2 0-0-0! (though 8...c6 may be solid enough) 9 可可b5!, and now:

a1) 9...dxe4?! 10 可可xe7 可可xd4 11 可可f4! (after 11 可可xa8 可可xe5 Black gets a strong attack with moves like ...可可g4 and ...可可d6 according to Ribli) 11...可可d6 12 可可xa8 可可xe5 13 可可xe5 可可xe5 14 可可h3 c5 15 可可b7! ± Lesiège-Norwood, Bermuda 1995.

a2) 9...b6 is a better chance according to Ribli: 10 exd5 exd5 11 可可c6 (Donev’s recommendation 11 可可f4 ± is also good) 11...可可xe6 12 可可xc6 可可d6 13 可可xd6 可可xd6 14 可可b5 ±.

b) If Black wants to play for a win, 6...c6!? might be a good choice, with the idea of taking back with the c-pawn if White exchanges on d5, for example. Then:

b1) 7 可可e5! dxe5 8 dxe5 可可d1 (another idea is 8...可可d5!?) 9 可可xd1 可可d5 =.

b2) 7 可可e3 d5 and now:

b21) 8 exd5 可可f3?! 9 可可f3 cxd5 is at least equal for Black: 10 可可e2 可可e6 11 c3 0-0 12 可可f4 b5 with counterplay, Seybold-Pribyl, Schellenberg 1991.

b22) 8 可可d2 可可xe2 9 可可xe2 = 0-0 10 e5 可可f7 11 f4 c5 12 可可f3 可可e6 13 可可d1 cxd4 14 可可xd4 可可c8 15 c3 可可xd4 16 cxd4 可可c7 17 可可c3 可可c4 18 可可a1 可可b6 19 b3?! 可可xe2 20 可可xe2 可可a3 ? E.Berg-Blatny, Gausdal 1992.

b23) After 8 e5 可可fd7 Black is ready to break with ...c5:

b231) 9 可可d2 可可xe2 10 可可xe2 c5 11 c4!? (11 c3 = is a less ambitious move) 11...cxd4 12 可可d4 可可b6 13 c5?! (13 可可xb6 axb6 is unclear) 13...可可d7 14 b4 可可c6 15 可可a4 a5! 16 可可b5 axb4 ? Reis-Lalić, Seville 1993.

b232) 9 可可e1 可可xe2 10 可可xe2 c5 11 c3 可可b6! 12 b3 可可c6 13 可可f4 g6 14 可可f3 cxd4 15 cxd4 a5 16 可可h4 h5 = Čapral-Novoselski, Royan 1989. In this type of ‘improved French’ White is usually the one who has to play more accurately. The absence of light-squared bishops compared to the true French is highly favourable for Black.

b3) 7 d5! cxd5 8 exd5 e5 (alternatively, 8...可可f3!?? 9 可可f3 e5 10 可可e3 0-0 11 a4 可可e8, intending ...f5 and ...可可f6, is not a bad idea, Somogyi-Ruck, Oberwart 1996) 9 可可d2! 可可xe2 10 可可xe2 0-0-0! (10...可可bd7 11 可可c4 可可b6 is more accurate) 11 可可c4 可可bd7 12 可可a3 a6 13 a4 可可c8 14 a5 ± Oll-Yrjolä, Helsinki 1989.

We now return to 6...0-0 (D):
transposes to the note to White’s 9th move, which is about the only trap for Black in this line) 10 \( \text{Qxd5 exd5 11 g4} \) 11 \( \text{Qe5} \ \text{Axe2 12 Wxe2} \ 1/2-1/2 \text{Chekhov-Epishin, Moscow 1992) 11...A_g6} \) 12 \( \text{Qe5} \ \text{Qd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qxg6} \) (13 \( \text{f4?! A_e4} \) 13...hxg6 14 \( \text{Qf4} \ \text{Ae8} \) 15 \( \text{Wd2} \) 16 \( \text{A_g3} \) 17 \( \text{c3} \) 18 \( \text{A_d3} \) 19 \( \text{Ae1} \) 20 \( \text{Wd1} \) = Callergård-Mokry, Gausdal 1988.

7...d5

This is another opportunity to play the more testing 7...c6 8 \( \text{Qd2} \) (8 d5?!?) 8...\( \text{Axe2} \) 9 \( \text{Wxe2} \) d5, with similar position-types as after 6...c6.

8 \( \text{exd5} \) (D)

8 e5?! \( \text{Qfd7} \) 9 \( \text{Ae1} \) \( \text{Axe2} \) 10 \( \text{Axe2} \) c5 11 c3 \( \text{Ae6} \) is not very logical since White has lost a tempo compared with the lines with 6...c6. Kiviaho-Hermelin, Tampere 1992 continued 12 \( \text{f4} \) b5 13 g4 \( \text{Ab6} \) 14 \( \text{Qf3} \) (14 f5? is premature owing to 14...\( \text{exd4} \) 14...f6! 15 \( \text{Wh1} \) exd4 16 exf6? (16 \( \text{Qexd4} \) is unclear) 16...\( \text{Axf6} \) 17 \( \text{Qfxd4} \) \( \text{Axe4} \) 18 \( \text{A_g1} \) \( \text{Qxd4} \) 19 \( \text{Qxd4} \) 20 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{Ae4} \) ?.

Black has two other moves, both of which seem to equalize without trouble:

a) 8...\( \text{Axe2} \) (the simplest way to make a draw) 9 \( \text{Qxe2} \) exd5 10 \( \text{Ae5} \) \( \text{Axe2} \) 11 \( \text{Wxe2} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 12 \( \text{Qxd7} \) (12 \( \text{f4?} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) ?) 12...\( \text{Wxd7} \) 13 \( \text{Wd2} \) (13 \( \text{Axe4} \) \( 1/2-1/2 \)) Goldin-Khalifman, Sochi 1989) 13...\( \text{Wb5} \) = Hulak-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 1987.

b) Because of the solid nature of the black position, even 8...\( \text{Axf3}?! \) 9 \( \text{Axf3} \) exd5 is possible, depriving White of the chance to occupy e5:

b1) 10 \( \text{Wd3} \) c6 11 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) 12 c3 \( \text{Qe8} \) 13 \( \text{Qg3} \) g6 14 \( \text{Axe4} \) \( \text{Wg8} \) 15 \( \text{Axe1} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 16 \( \text{Axd2} \) \( \text{Axd6} \) 17 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Wb6} \) 18 \( \text{Wc2} \) c5?! (18...\( \text{Wxe7} \) =) 19 \( \text{dxc5} \) \( \text{Axc5} \) 20 \( \text{Ah6} \) d4 21 \( \text{Qad1} \) \( \text{Wac8} \) with an active position, Lechtynsky-Bezold, Brno 1993.

b2) 10 \( \text{Ae1} \) c6 11 \( \text{Wd3} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) 12 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 13 \( \text{Qg3} \) g6 14 \( \text{Axe4} \) c5! (9...\( \text{Wxf3} \) 10 \( \text{Axe4} \) c6?) (11...\( \text{Wb4} \)?! fights for the c4-square) 12 \( \text{f4} \) 13 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 14 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{dxe4} \) 15 \( \text{Axe1} \) 16 \( \text{Axe1} \) 17 \( \text{Wh5} \) \( \text{Qxe3} \) 18 \( \text{Axf7} \) \( \text{Axe4} \) 19 \( \text{Wxe4} \) 20 \( \text{Wxe4} \) 1-0 Mäkinen, Tampere 1997.

9...\( \text{Axe2} \) 10 \( \text{Axe2} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) 11 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Axe3} \) 12 \( \text{f4} \)
12...\textit{e}e8 13 \textit{d}d3

This leads to inevitable simplifications, but White cannot maintain the e5 strongpoint: 13 \textit{e}e1 \textit{e}e4! 14 \textit{d}d3 (after 14 \textit{x}xe4 \textit{d}xe4 Black threatens ...\textit{f}6) 14...\textit{x}xf4 15 \textit{xf}xf4 \textit{g}g5 16 \textit{d}d3 \textit{g}6 17 \textit{c}c1 \textit{w}f6 18 \textit{c}c3 \textit{c}6 19 \textit{w}f4 \textit{w}xf4 20 \textit{x}xf4 \textit{x}d6 21 \textit{d}d3 \textit{h}5 = \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}

13...\textit{x}xf4 14 \textit{xf}4 \textit{f}8 15 \textit{e}e1 \textit{xe}1+ 16 \textit{xe}1 \textit{w}d6 17 \textit{d}d3 \textit{e}e8 18 \textit{w}a5 \textit{w}b6

\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} Andersson-Speelman, Volmac-Lyon ECC 1991.

**Conclusion:** This is rather a routine approach by White, and Black has several ways to equalize. The line is not an absolute draw if Black carries out the standard ...d5 with the help of ...c6 first.

B212)

6 d5 (D)

With this move White gains some space advantage but Black’s formation remains solid enough.

6...\textit{ex}d5

6...\textit{e}5?! 7 \textit{e}e3 c6 (7...\textit{xf}3 8 \textit{xf}3 \textit{c}6 9 \textit{w}d3 0-0 10 h4 \textit{a}a6 11 dxc6 \textit{b}b4 12 \textit{w}e2 \textit{xc}6 13 \textit{d}d1 \textit{w}a5 14 0-0 \textit{w}d4 15 \textit{w}b5 \pm Loginov-Maiwald, Budapest 1993) 8 \textit{dd}2 cxd5 9 \textit{ex}d5 \textit{xe}e2 10 \textit{xe}e2 \textit{a}6 11 a4 \textit{bd}7 12 a5 0-0 13 \textit{e}e4 gave White a positional grip on the queenside in Neverovsky-Vaulin, Kstovo 1994.

7 \textit{ex}d5 0-0

In Filippov-Jacimović, Elista OL 1998 Black gave up his bishop too easily: 7...\textit{xf}3?? 8 \textit{xf}3 0-0 9 0-0 \textit{b}bd7 10 g3 \textit{e}e8 11 a4 a5 12 \textit{b}b5 \textit{c}c5 13 c3 \textit{xf}d7 14 \textit{e}e1 \textit{d}e5 15 \textit{e}e2 \textit{xf}6 16 \textit{e}e3 \textit{d}ed7 17 \textit{f}f1 \textit{e}e7 18 \textit{g}g2 \pm and Black was doomed to passivity.

8 0-0

White has also aimed to castle queenside but that naturally involves some risk:

a) 8 \textit{e}e3 \textit{bd}7 9 \textit{w}d2 a6 10 0-0-0?! \textit{xf}3 11 \textit{x}f3 \textit{b}6 12 \textit{e}e2 c6 13 dxc6 bxc6 14 \textit{d}d4 d5 15 \textit{w}c3 \textit{b}8!? 16 \textit{xa}6 \textit{e}e8 17 \textit{h}e1 \textit{bd}7 18 \textit{g}g3 c5 19 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 with practical chances and some compensation, Miralles-Seret, French Ch 1991.

b) 8 \textit{d}d4 \textit{xe}2 9 \textit{w}xe2 \textit{e}e8 10 \textit{e}e3 \textit{bd}7 11 0-0-0 \textit{f}8 12 g4 \textit{e}e4 13 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 14 f3 \textit{e}e8 15 \textit{d}e1 a6 16 \textit{b}b1 \textit{e}e5 17 \textit{f}5 \textit{wd}7 = Petkov-Zakhariev, Bankia 1991.

8...\textit{e}e8

8...\textit{bd}7 9 \textit{e}e3 \textit{e}e8 10 a4 \textit{xf}8 11 a5 a6 12 \textit{e}a4?! \textit{c}c5 13 \textit{d}d4 \textit{w}e8 (13...\textit{b}b8) 14 h3 \textit{h}5 15 \textit{f}4 \textit{g}6?!
(it is not easy to see what White is going to do after 15...\(\text{Whd8}\), for instance) 16 \(\text{Qh4}\) c6 17 \(\text{Qxg6}\) hxg6 18 \(\text{Qf3}\) ± Boidman-Krivoshei, Priekvidza 1998. Here we saw a very interesting rook manoeuvre by White.

9 h3?! (D)

White asks what Black is going to do with his bishop. Instead, he achieves nothing by 9 \(\text{Qel}\) \(\text{Qbd7}\) 10 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Qxf3}\) 11 \(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Qe5}\) 12 \(\text{Qd1}\) \(\text{Qfd7}\) 13 \(\text{Qc2}\) \(\text{Qg5}\)! 14 \(\text{Qd4}\) \(\text{Qg6}\) 15 \(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Qxe1}\) 16 \(\text{Qxe1}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 17 \(\text{Ed1}\) a6 18 \(\text{Qe4}\) \(\text{Qe5}\)
\(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\) Korchnoi-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 1987.

\[
\begin{center}
B
\end{center}
\]

9...\(\text{Qxf3}\) ?!

According to Ribli, Black has better chances to equalize after 9...\(\text{Qh5}\). Perhaps Black feared the bishop would be in trouble but after 10 g4 \(\text{Qg6}\) 11 \(\text{Qd4}\) (to play f4) there is 11...\(\text{Qe4}\) =.

10 \(\text{Qxf3}\)

Now White has a small but solid positional advantage. Even if the bishops don't work well just now, they can prove powerful later on after some manoeuvring and they can eliminate Black's counterplay. White enjoys an enduring spatial plus because of the d5-pawn.

10...\(\text{Qbd7}\) 11 g3?! \(\text{Qce5}\) 12 a4

By provoking...a5, White secures a firm base for his knight. If Black avoids...a5, White gains space.

12...\(a5\) 13 \(\text{Qg2}\) \(\text{Qfd7}\) 14 \(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 15 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Qe5}\) ?!

The activity of the knight is only temporary and it will be pushed back. More sensible is 15...\(\text{Qb6}\) 16 b3 ±.

16 b3 \(\text{Qd7}\) 17 \(\text{Qbs5}\)! b6 ?!

This is too passive and weakens the c6-square. 17...c6 is essential, when White should choose 18 \(\text{Qc3}\) ± (and not 18 dx6 bxc6 19 \(\text{Qd4}\) d5 =).

18 \(\text{Qc3}\) !

Now the advance f4 is threatened, emphasizing Black’s problems. Black cannot avoid structural weaknesses and gets no counterplay, Malaniuk-V.Ivanov, St Petersburg Chigorin mem 1999. This positional dominance was possible only after many inaccuracies from the black side. The rest was easy for White: 18...\(\text{Qe7}\) 19 f4 \(\text{Qg6}\) 20 \(\text{Qxf6}\) gxf6 21 \(\text{Qxc7}\) \(\text{Qxc7}\) 22 \(\text{Qel}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 23 \(\text{Qxe7}\) \(\text{Qxe7}\) 24 \(\text{Qf2}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 25 h4! \(\text{Qe8}\) 26 h5 \(\text{Qf8}\) 27 \(\text{Qd1}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) 28 \(\text{Qa7}\) ± \(\text{Qe8}\)

29 \(\text{Qh3}\) \(\text{Qfd7}\) 30 h6 \(\text{Qb8}\) 31 \(\text{Qf5}\) \(\text{Qca6}\) 32 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qb4}\) 33 \(\text{Qb5}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 34 c3 \(\text{Qa6}\) 35 \(\text{Qd4}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 36 \(\text{Qh1}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 37 \(\text{Qel}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 38 \(\text{Qc2}\) \(\text{Qc5}\) 39 \(\text{Qg4}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 40 \(\text{Qh4}\) \(\text{Qcd7}\) 41 \(\text{Qh3}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 42 b4 axb4 43 cxb4 \(\text{Qg6}\) 44 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 45 \(\text{Qxe8}\)\(+\) \(\text{Qxe8}\) 46 a5 bxa5 47 bxa5 \(\text{Qd7}\) 1-0.

**Conclusion:** There is more spirit in 6 d5 than in the previous line. Still, in the static position-type arising, Black
shouldn’t have much trouble with accurate play. White has only a small space advantage and there are no weaknesses in the black camp.

**B22)**

5 h3 h5 6 We2!? (D)

This aggressive method is the one many players are afraid of when considering 2...g4. However, this line also gives Black more play than some of the more solid ones.

**6...c6**

White was threatening Wh5+, and 6...Qbd7?! 7 g4 Qg6 8 h4 h5 9 g5 ± is hardly a viable option.

However, the not so obvious plan starting with 6...a6!? has scored well in practice. After 7 g4 Qg6 8 h4 (8 Qg5? Qe7 9 h4 h5 10 Qxf6 Qxf6 {10...gx6!?} 11 g5 Qe7 12 0-0-0 b5 13 We3 Qd7 = Hennig-Hickl, Hamburg 1995) 8...h5 9 g5 Qy7d7 White has tried the following moves:

a) 10 h3 and then:

a1) 10...Qe7 11 Qe3 b5 12 Qd2 b4 13 Qa4 d5!? 14 exd5 Qxc2 15 b3 (15 dxe6 Qxa4 16 exd7+ Qxd7) 15...exd5 16 Qc1 Qg6 is unclear. Pogorelov-Miles, Andorra 1994.

a2) 10...b5 11 a3 Qc7 12 Qf4 Qb6 13 Qg3 c6 14 0-0-0-0-0 15 Qd2 d5 led to a complicated position in Zsu.Polgar-Anand, Amsterdam OHRA 1990.

b) A natural way to develop is 10 Qe3 b5 11 Qd2 Qb6, and now:

b1) 12 f4 is well met by 12...d5!.

b2) 12 h6 h4 13 Qd1 d5 14 f3 Qc6 15 c3 Qe7 was unclear in K.Berg-Jansa, Heming 1991.

b3) 12 d5!? is a very notable idea. 12...e5 (since this looks positionally bad, maybe Black should play 12...b4 13 Qd1 exd5 14 Qxh6 exb6 15 exd5+ ±) 13 a4 b4 14 Qd1 c6 15 a5 Qd6 16 Whc4 c5 17 c3 bxc3 18 Qxc3 Qe7 19 b4! ± 1.Farago-Mokry, Austria 1992. White has a big positional plus.

We now return to 6...c6 (D):

7 g4

White can develop the bishop first:

a) 7 Qf4 Qc7 (Stohl’s suggestion 7...d5!? looks better) 8 g4 Qg6 9 Qg2 d5 10 exd5 Qxd5 (10...exd5??) 11
8...\(\text{e}d7!!\) is a very notable alternative even though rare in practice.

a) Maybe it is rare because not everyone knows the tactical point 9 e5 dxe5 10 dxe5 \(\text{w}b6\) and after 11 0-0-0 \(\text{e}d5\) Black is fine.

b) 9 \(\text{h}g2\) \(\text{e}7\) 10 \(\text{d}d2\) e5! 11 \(\text{d}b3\) \(\text{g}f8\) 12 \(\text{e}3\) (12 0-0-0!? and 12 \(d5\)! are both interesting alternatives) 12 \(\text{e}d6\) 13 0-0-0 \(\text{d}d7\) 14 h4 h6 15 \(\text{d}d2\) \(\text{f}4\)! 16 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{x}g2\) 17 \(\text{w}xg2\) f6 18 \(\text{h}d1\) 0-0 19 dxe5 \(\text{e}x\) e5 20 \(\text{d}d4\) \(\text{c}e4\) 21 \(\text{c}e2\) b5 gives Black counterplay, Lutz-Epishin, Tilburg 1992.

c) Most natural is 9 0-0-0!? \(\text{w}a5\) (9...\(\text{c}e7\) is more solid) 10 \(\text{g}2\) (10 \(\text{d}d2\) may be more troublesome for Black, but 10 \(d5\) \(\text{c}xd5\) 11 exd5 \(e5\) is perfectly comfortable for him: 12 \(\text{d}d4\) \(\text{c}e7\) 13 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{d}8\) 14 f4 \(\text{exf}4\) 15 \(\text{x}f4\) 0-0 16 h4 h5 17 g5 \(\text{g}4\) 18 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{d}e5\) = Plaskett-Benjamin, Bermuda 1998) 10...d5 11 \(\text{x}f6\) \(\text{x}f6\) 12 exd5 \(\text{c}xd5\) 13 \(\text{x}d5\) \(\text{c}xd5\) 14 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{d}6\) 15 \(\text{c}xg6\) hxg6 16 \(\text{b}1\) 0-0-0 17 c4 dxc4 18 \(\text{w}x\) c4+ \(\text{b}8\) = Summerscale-Benjamin, Internet ICC 2000.

In summary, the rather untested move 8...\(\text{e}d7!!\) is well worth considering.

9 \(\text{x}f6\) is an important alternative:

a) 9...\(\text{d}b7\) 10 \(\text{x}f6\) (10 \(\text{d}3\) or 10 0-0-0 might be worth trying) 10...\(\text{x}f6\) 11 0-0-0 d5 12 exd5 (12 e5 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{e}4\)) 12...\(\text{c}xd5\) 13 \(\text{c}xd5\) \(\text{w}xd5\) 14 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{e}4\) 15 \(\text{e}2\) 0-0 16 \(\text{b}h1\) \(\text{x}f3\) 17 \(\text{x}f3\) \(\text{g}5\) 18 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{x}e3\) ½-½ Tondyar-Dunnington, Ostend 1993.

b) 9...d5 10 \(\text{x}f6\) \(\text{x}f6\) 11 \(\text{d}3\) and then:
b1) 11...\(\text{Qa}6 \text{12 a3 Qc5?!} 13 \text{dxc5 d4 14 Wf4 dxc3 15 h4 Wb8 16 We3 (16 e5 \(=\)) 16...b6 17 0-0 0-0 18 \text{Qd}1 bxc5 19 bxc5 c5 20 \text{Qab1 Qc7 21 Qb3} \pm \text{Tunik-Vorotnikov, Krasnodar 1991.}

b2) 11...\(\text{Wxa}5 \text{12 0-0-0 Qd7} 13 \text{Wb1 (13 Qd2? c5! \(=\)) 13...Qe7 14 Qd2 dxe4 15 Qxe4! Qf6 16 Qc4 Qc7 17 Qe5 Qxe4 18 Qxe4 Qxe4 19 Wxe4 is slightly better for White, Tunik-Meshkov, Russia 1992.}

9...Qxf6 10 h4 (D)

![Diagram]

Now:

B2211: 10...h6?! 133
B2212: 10...h5 134

The evidence so far strongly suggests that the latter is superior.

B2211)

10...h6?! 11 0-0-0 Qd7

11...\(\text{Wa5} \text{12 c5 dxc5 13 dxc5 Qc7 14 Qd4!? (intending f4-f5 and Qh3; 14 Qd2 Qd7 15 f4 0-0-0 16 Qc4 is a little better for White, Porrasmaa-Puranen, Finnish Chlt 1997) gives White a strong initiative: 14...Qb4 15 h5 Qh7 16 Qh3! Qxd7 17 f4 0-0-0 18 a3 Qe7 19 Qg2 Qc5 20 Wc4! Qd7 21 Qxc6 Wxd4 22 Qxd4 Qc6 23 b4 Wxa3+ 24 Qd2?! (24 Qd1) 24...Qb7? (24...Qc4+ is equal) 25 Wxc6+ Qb8 26 Qd7 Wxb4 27 Qc7+ Qa8 28 Qxe7 Wxf4+ 29 Qc1 Wb4 30 Qf3 Qb8 31 Qfx7 Qxg4 32 Wxb8+ 1-0 Norri-Puranen, Jyväskylä 1993.

12 Wb1

Better than 12 Wc3 Qb6 13 Qe2 e5 = Stangl-Bezdol, Bad Homburg 1996.

The brutal continuation 12 e5?! Qe7 13 exd6 Qxd6 14 Qe5 Qh7 15 f4 f6?! (15...Qe7) 16 f5! Qe7 17 Qc4 Qf4+ 18 Qb1 Qg8 19 fxg6 Qxe6 20 Qe1 Qg3 21 d5 Qxel 22 dxe6 \(=\) was successful in the game Halkias-Bitti, Aviles 2000.

12...Qc7 13 Qg1?! Qh5

On 13...0-0-0, 14 h5 Qh7 15 g5 hxg5 16 Qxg5 Qg8 17 f4 \(=\) is strong. However, Black’s bishops are now shut out of play.

14 g5 Qe7 15 d5! e5 16 Qh3 0-0-0 17 Qd2 Qb8 18 Qc4 Qb6 19 Qxb6 Qxb6 20 Qd3 Qa8 21 a3 Qdf8 22 Qf5 Qh7 23 Qgd1 Qg6

The bishop on h7 looks awful, but Black is hoping to break out with ...f6. The end of the classic game Rogers-Milos, Manila OL 1992 is enjoyable: 24 dxc6! bxc6 (24...Qxf5 allows a rapid mating attack with 25 Qd5 Qd8 26 Qb3) 25 Qd7 Qc7? (Black is hoping for 26 Qh3 f6 with a good game but 25...Qb8 26 b3 Qc7 was necessary, although after 27 Qh3 White keeps the edge because 27...f6 is not playable) 26 Qxc6+!! Qxc6 27 Qd5 Qd8 28 Qc3 Qb7 29 Qb3 Qc6 30 Qdd3 Qa5 31 Qdc3! Qxc3 32 Qa6!! 1-0.
Conclusion: This line is difficult for Black, and 10...h5 is therefore recommended...

B2212

10...h5 11 g5 e7 12 0-0-0 d7 (D)

13 h3

The idea is to play 14 d5. Otherwise:

a) A solid idea is 13 e3 0-0 14 d3 wa5 (14...b6 15 d2 c5 looks better) 15 d2 e5 16 f4 exf4 17 xf4 b5 18 b1 ae8 19 wg3 with a slight advantage for White, Grivas-Christian, Erevan OL 1996.

b) 13 d5!? with similar ideas to Line B2211, is untested. In comparison, b1 is probably more useful for White than...c7 is for Black. Black could then consider 13...exd5 14 exd5 0-0.

13...d5

After 13...0-0?! 14 d2 d5 15 f1!? dxe4 16 g3 White can exploit the weakness of h5.

14 e5

14 exd5 cxd5 15 he1 e8 affords Black counterplay while 14 he1 dxc4 15 exf5 a5 16 b1 0-0-0 is equal.

14...xe5 15 dxe5 wa5 16 exd5 cxd5

Black seems to be doing well in this position:

a) 17 b4 18 b5 c8 gives Black serious counterplay.

b) 17 f4 and then:

b1) 17...b4!? is critical: 18 b5+ (18 f5!? xf5 19 xf5 xc3 20 d3 b4 is rather complicated, though 21 g6? wxa2 22 c3 c8 is too risky for White) 18...xb5 19 xb5 c8 20 f5? with unclear play.

b2) 17...0-0 18 f5 exf5 19 xd5 (according to Stohl, 19 xd5 is better, though after 19...xe8 Black is threatening to play both...xa2 and...d6) 19...b4 20 g2 xe8 (e5 and h4 are now weak) 21 b1 (21 d7 wae+ 22 b1 e5 gives Black the initiative) 21...f8 = Epishin-Mokry, Vienna 1991.

Conclusion: Black’s defences seem to be holding up in this line, though there is still plenty of unexplored territory.

B2222

8 h4 (D)

This is the main line of the whole 3 c4 system. It seems most players consider this more natural than 8 g5. Black is immediately forced to decide between 8...h5 and 8...h6 and, as in other similar situations, the former appears to be better.

8...h5
8...h6 tends to lead to a passive position: 9 h5 h7 10 g5 hxg5, and now:

a) 11 ∆xg5 ♗b6! (11...♕a5 12 ♞d2) 12 0-0-0 ♞bd7 leads to unclear play according to Goldin.

b) 11 ♞xg5! d5 12 e5 ♗g8 13 ♞h3 ♗h6 14 ♞hx7 ♗xh7 15 ♞d3 ♞h8 16 ♞e3 ♗a5 17 0-0-0 ♗a6 18 ♗d2 ♞d7 19 ♞g5 h5 20 ♗d3 ♗b6 21 ♗b1 ♗b7 (after Ribli’s suggestion 21...♕c4?! things are maybe not so clear) 22 ♗e2 ♗d7 23 f4 ± Farago-Nevednicny, Bled 1992.

9 g5 ♗fd7 10 ♞h3

10 ♞e3 allows Black to play 10...d5 immediately. After 11 ♞d2 we have:

a) In reply to Malaniuk’s suggestion 11...♕a6, White can choose between 12 ♞g2?!., 12 f4 and 12 a3 ♗c7 13 ♞g2.

b) 11...♗b4!? 12 ♞g2 ♗a5 (safer is 12...♗b6 13 0-0 ♗a6 or 12...♕a6) 13 0-0 ♐xc3 14 bxc3 ♗xc3 15 f4! with compensation according to Goldin.

10...♕e7 (D)

11 ♞e3

The most natural developing move but White has other important options:

a) 11 d5!? cxd5 12 exd5 e5 13 ♗e3 0-0 14 ♗d2 (14 ♗g1 ♗a6 15 0-0-0 ♗c8?! 16 ♗b5 ♘xc3 17 bxc3 ♘xc5 gives Black fair compensation. Tregubov-Nogueiras, Linares 1996) 14...♕a6 15 ♗b3?! (both 15 ♗f1!? ♗b4 16 ♗c1 ♘c8 17 ♗g3 ♘xc3 18 bxc3 ♘xd5, with compensation for the exchange, and 15 ♗de4!? are better according to Chekhov) 15...♗b4 16 ♗c1 ♗b6 17 ♗g2 ♘c8 18 a3 ♗a6 19 ♗a5 ♘xc3! 20 bxc3 ♗c7 21 0-0 (21 ♗d2 ♗a4 22 ♗b3 b6 23 0-0 ♗xc3 also offers Black good compensation, but Chekhov’s suggestion 21 ♗d2!? looks better) 21...♕xc3 with strong compensation, Damjanović-Hodgson, Čačak 1996.

b) With 11 ♗d2!? White hurries to push the f-pawn, and this may well be the most critical line:

b1) Goldin gives 11...e5 12 dxe5 dxe5 (12...♕xe5 13 f4 ±) 13 ♗f1!, with ♗g3 to follow, as unpleasant for Black.

b2) 11...d5 12 f4 dxe4 13 ♗dxe4 (13 ♗xe4!? ♗b6 14 c3 is unclear) 13...♗b6 (13...♕a5?! 14 ♗d2 ♗a6 15 0-0-0 0-0-0 16 ♗g3! ± allows White
b21) 15 0-0-0!?! is somewhat risky:
b211) 15...\textit{a5}!? 16 \textit{d}2 \textit{a}6?! 17 \textit{f}3! \textit{xe}4 18 \textit{xe}4 g6 (18...\textit{xc}3 19 \textit{xc}3 \textit{xa}2 20 f5 \pm) 19 \textit{xe}6! fx6 20 \textit{xe}6 \pm Scherbakov-Hasangatin, Dežin 1996. White has a strong attack.

b212) 15...\textit{a}6! 16 \textit{h}f1 \textit{d}7 17 \textit{g}1 0-0 18 a3 \textit{e}8 19 \textit{f}3 \textit{ad}8 (19...b5!? is interesting) 20 \textit{g}3 b5 21 f5 exf5 22 \textit{xf}5 \textit{b}7 23 \textit{e}4 b4 24 a4 \textit{f}8 = Pogorelov-Urday, Cordoba 1994.

b22) 15 0-0 \textit{xe}3 (15...\textit{a}6 16 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 17 \textit{g}3 \pm intending f5; 15...\textit{xc}3 16 \textit{xc}3 \textit{a}5 17 f5 \textit{xf}5 18 \textit{xf}5 exf5 19 \textit{f}4 \pm) 16 \textit{xe}3 \textit{a}6! (considerably stronger than both 16...\textit{d}7 17 f5! \textit{xf}5 18 \textit{xf}5 exf5 19 \textit{d}6+ \textit{f}8 20 \textit{xf}5 \pm and 16...0-0 17 \textit{ad}1! as h5 is in trouble after \textit{c}2 and \textit{g}3). Now White has two options:

b221) 17 f5!? exf5 18 \textit{xf}5 0-0! 19 \textit{xf}6 (19 \textit{ad}1 transposes to "b222")

b222) 17...\textit{xe}4 18 \textit{xe}4 g6 19 c4 is also unpleasant for Black – Goldin.

b2223) 17...\textit{b}4 18 \textit{xd}2 \textit{d}5 19 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 (19...\textit{xd}5 20 \textit{g}3 \pm) 20 \textit{g}3 \pm and White is about to achieve f5.

b2224) 17...0-0! 18 f5 exf5 (1/2-1/2 Lukacs-Jansa, Austrian Ch 1994) 19 \textit{xf}5 \textit{xf}5 20 \textit{xf}5 \textit{d}7 might look positionally good for White because of his pawn-majority and active pieces, but he also has some problems with his vulnerable king.

11...\textit{d}5 12 \textit{d}2 (D)

12...\textit{a}6!

Another logical idea is 12...b5?! 13 a3 \textit{b}6 14 0-0 (14 f4!?) 14...\textit{d}7 15 f4 dxe4 16 f5!! exf5 17 \textit{xf}5 \textit{xf}5 18 \textit{xf}5 g6 19 \textit{f}4 (after 19 \textit{f}2 f5?! 20 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 21 \textit{c}xe4 \textit{g}4 Black gets

a strong knight) 19...0-0 20 \( \text{Qdxe4} \text{Qc4} 21 \text{Aa1} \text{Qxe3} \) (more unclear is 21...\( \text{Qxb2?!} \) 22 d5 \( \text{Ge5} \) 22 \( \text{Qxe3} \pm \) Lagunow-Gausel, Berlin 1991.

13 a3

This cautious move is maybe not the best. White has two more aggressive options:

a) 13 0-0 (D) and then:

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{B} \\
\end{array}
\]

a1) 13...\( \text{Qc7} \) 14 f4 dxe4 and now instead of the unclear 15 f5 exf5 16 \( \text{Qxf5} \text{Qd5} \) Yermolinsky-Blocker, USA 1995, Black cannot fully equalize after 15 \( \text{Qxc6} \text{f5} \) (15...\( \text{Qxf5} \) 16 \( \text{Qxf5} \) exf5 17 \( \text{Qxf2} \pm \) 16 \( \text{Qf2} \pm \) according to Yermolinsky.

a2) After the more active 13...\( \text{Qb4} \) White has:

a21) 14 f4!? dxe4 (14...\( \text{Qxc2} \) 15 f5 looks wild) 15 \( \text{Qdxe4} \text{wa5} \) places the vital f5-square under control.

a22) 14 \( \text{Ra1} \text{dxe4} \) 15 a3 \( \text{Qd5} \) 16 \( \text{Qdxe4} \text{Qxc3} \) 17 \( \text{Qxc3} \text{Qb6} \) 18 f4 \( \text{Qc7} \) 19 \( \text{Qh1} \) 0-0-0 20 \( \text{Rce1} \text{Qhe8} \) 21 \( \text{Qg1} \text{Qd6?!} \) (21...\( \text{Qd7} \) = again places f5 under control) 22 f5 exf5 23 \( \text{Qxe8} \text{Qxe8} \) 24 \( \text{Qxe8+} \text{Qd7} \) 25 \( \text{Qg8} \pm \) 1/2-1/2


b) 13 f4 dxe4 14 \( \text{Qdxe4} \) and now:

b1) 14...\( \text{Qf5} \) 15 \( \text{Qxf5} \text{exf5} \) 16 \( \text{Qg3} \text{g6} \) 17 0-0-0 is catastrophic for Black as there is no move to stop d5: 17...0-0?! 18 d5! exd5 19 \( \text{Qxd5} \text{Qc7} \) 20 \( \text{Qxf5} \text{gxf5} \) 21 \( \text{Qhx5} \text{Qe6} \) 22 \( \text{Qd4} \text{Qxd4} \) 23 \( \text{Qh1} \text{Qe5} \) 24 \( \text{Qf6+} \) 1-0 Damljanović-D. Fernando, La Coruña 1998.

b2) 14...\( \text{wa5} \) is the right move, to stop f5 and to play ...\( \text{Qf5} \) if necessary. Yermolinsky-Benjamin, Chicago 1995 continued 15 0-0 \( \text{Qf5} \) 16 \( \text{Qxf5} \text{Qxf5} \) 17 a3 \( \text{Qc7} \) 18 \( \text{Qf2} \) 1/2-1/2.

We now return to 13 a3 (D):

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{B} \\
\end{array}
\]

13...\( \text{Qc7} \) 14 f4 dxe4 15 \( \text{Qdxe4} \)

15 \( \text{Qxe4} \text{Qd5} \) 16 0-0 \( \text{Qf5} \) 17 \( \text{Qxf5} \text{exf5} \) 18 \( \text{Qf2} \) 0-0 19 c4 \( \text{Qxe3} \) 20 \( \text{Qxe8} \text{Qe8} \) 21 \( \text{Qae1} \text{Qf8} \) 22 \( \text{Qd3} \text{g6} \) 23 d5 exd5 24 cxd5 \( \text{Qc7} \) 25 \( \text{Qc4} \text{Qb6} \) 26 b4 \( \text{Qd6} \) ½= Babu-Hodgson, Novi Sad OL 1990 is an instructive example where White’s weaknesses turned the game in Black’s favour.

15...\( \text{Qd5} \) 16 0-0 \( \text{Qxe3} \)
16...\texttt{Qxe}3 17 \texttt{Wxe}3 0-0 18 f5 exf5 19 \texttt{Qxf}5 \texttt{Eh}6! 20 \texttt{Qxg}6 fxg6 21 \texttt{Qc}5 \texttt{Qxc}5 22 dxc5 \texttt{Qd}5 = Agamaliev-Malaniuk, Swidnica 1997.

17 \texttt{Qxc}3 \texttt{Qb}6 18 f5 \texttt{Qxf}5 19 \texttt{Qxf}5 exf5 20 \texttt{Qxf}5 g6 21 \texttt{Qf}2 0-0 22 \texttt{Qaf}1 \texttt{Qd}7

Once again the typical position-type of this line. White cannot benefit from his positional pluses because of his vulnerable king.

23 \texttt{Qe}4 \texttt{Qae}8 24 \texttt{Qf}3 \texttt{Qd}5 25 \texttt{Qd}2 h5 = Szekely-Baburin, Cappelle la Grande 1996. Black has managed to fix the queenside majority.

**Conclusion:** This line (8 h4) is more important in practice than Line B221. The play is extremely complicated, but many lines lead to positions where Black can expect some counterplay. For most players it will probably be impossible to memorize all the precise sequences and often it is impossible to pinpoint the best move, but here are some general rules for Black:

1) \texttt{...h}5 is usually the best answer to h4.

2) \texttt{a}6 is often a good route to develop the queen’s knight.

3) In many cases it is important to stop White playing \texttt{f}4-\texttt{f}5.
16 3rd Move Alternatives for White

1 d4 d6 2 Qf3 Qg4

In this chapter we look at the following moves:

A: 3 Bd2 139
B: 3 Qd3 140
C: 3 h3 141
D: 3 g3 143
E: 3 c3 144
F: 3 e3 145
G: 3 Qg5 146
H: 3 Qf4 147
I: 3 b3 148

It must be noted that some methods may transpose to Chapter 12 or 15; for example, 3 Qc3 Qf6 4 e4 transposes to Line B of Chapter 15.

The rather odd-looking 3 Bd2 avoids ...Qxf3 and the doubling of pawns, and it has some logical ideas; for example, f3 and e4. However, it is too slow, as Black just continues 3...d5 4 c4 e6 5 Qc3 e6 6 Qh3 Qb6 with a stable position, which is quite equal, though White can easily try too hard; for example, 7 f3 Qh5 8 e4 dxe4 9 fxe4 Qd7 10 Qxh6 axb6 11 Qf3 Qd6 12 e5 Qb8 13 Qe2 Qe7 14 Qe3 e5 15 Qb5 Qf5 16 Qf2 cxd4 17 Qxd4 Qxd4 18 Qxd4 Qxe2 19 Qxe2 Qe7 and Black is much better, Belotelov-Dovzhik, Paks 2000.

A) 3 Bd2 Qf6 (D)

4 h3

Or:

a) 4 e4 is considered in Line B of Chapter 15, and is probably White's best option.

b) 4 c3 Bd7 and now:

b1) 5 e4 e5 6 Qc4 exd4 7 cxd4 d5! 8 exd5 Qb6 9 Qb5+ Qd7 10 Qe2+ Qe7 11 d6 cxd6 12 0-0 Qxb5 13 Qxb5+ Qd7 14 Qd3 0-0 15 Qe1 Qfd5 = Ulak-Rogovski, Pardubice 1996.

b2) 5 h3 Qh5 6 e4 e6 7 Qd3 Qe7 8 0-0 0-0 9 Qe1 c5 ½-½ Kindl-Dietz, Giengen 1987.

b3) 5 g3 e6 6 Qg2 Qe7 7 0-0 0-0 8 Qe1?! d5 = 9 h3?! Qf5 10 g4 Qg6
11 f4?! c5 ∆(due to the weak point e4)
c) After 4 g3 the best plan for
Black is 4....bd7 5.g2 e5 (D), when
White has tried various plans but with
no great success:

```
W
```

```
B
```

c1) 6 0-0 ∆e7 and here:
c11) 7 c3 e6 8.b3 wc7 9.g5 0-0
  10 f3 ∆h5 11 e4 b5 12 a4 a6 13.d1
d5! and Black is OK. Ruffenach-
  Benoit, France 1994.
c12) 7 h3 ∆h5 8 dx5 dxe5 9.g4
  c6 10.f5 0-0 11.dxe4 ∆g6 12.g4?!
  ∆xf5 13.gxf5 wc7 14.e3 e4! and Black
  is better, Giffard – Schmidt-Schäffer,
  Cannes 1995.
c13) 7 b3 0-0 8.b2 e4! 9.del d5
  10.c4 c6 11.d2 e8 12.b1 dxc4? 
  13.bxc4 wc6 14.d3 Ad8 15.d2 
  A.f8 16.del wa6 17.d3 ∆h5 with
  chances for both players, O.Knudsen-
  Hirtsgaard, Danish League 1989/90.
c2) 6.h3 ∆h5 7 c3 c4! 8.dh4 d5 9
  f5 ∆g6 10.de3 c6 11.b3 d6 12
  b2 ∆h5 13.del f5 14.e3 0-0 is
  much better for Black, Nguyen-Vadasz, 
  Budapest 1998.

c3) 6 c4 c6 7wc2 ∆e7 8 0-0 0-0 9
  b3 is an Old Indian-type position, with
  Black getting a comfortable position
  with the useful plan 9...∆h5! 10.∆b2
  ∆g6 11 e4 exd4 12.∆xd4 d5! 13.∆h4
  ∆xe4 14.∆xe4 ∆xe4 15.∆xe4 dx4
  16.∆f5 ∆f6 17.∆ad1 ∆xd4 18.∆xd4
  wc6 = in Ormos-E.Lendvai, Hungary
  1993.

4...∆h5 5 g4
5 e4 e6 is similar to Line B1 of
Chapter 15, but White’s h3 is
premature.

5...∆g6 6.∆h4 ∆e4! 7.∆xe4 ∆xe4
8.g2 d5
Black controls the light squares
in the centre, and the position is equal.
After 9.∆f3 e6 10.∆d2 ∆xd2 11.∆xd2
  c6 12.c3 ∆d7 13.∆f4 ∆e7 14.e3
  0-0 15.∆e2 ∆e8 16.∆h2?! ∆f6 17.0-0-0?!
  (Ravikumar-Hodgson, British Ch (East-
  bourne) 1990), 17...b5 is better for
Black.

B)

3 wd3 (D)

3...c6
Or:

a) 3...Qd7?! 4 Qg5 c6 5 Qc3 Qgf6 6 e4 e5 7 Qe2 Qe7 8 0-0 0-0 is a Philidor-type position, but White has placed his queen quite ineffectively, and Black soon got the upper hand after 9 a4 Qe8 10 Qf1 Qg7 11 h3 Qh5 12 d5!? Qxd5 13 exd5 e4! 14 Qxe4 Qxe4 15 Qxe4 Qxg5 16 Qf5 Qxf3 17 Qd3 g6 — in B.Hansen-Höiberg, Åhus 1993.

b) 3...Qc6!? is interesting; for example, 4 d5 Qb8 5 h3 Qd7 6 e4 e5 (6...g6!? 7 dxe6 fxe6 8 Qg5 Qe7 9 Qxe7 Qxe7 10 Qh3 Qc6 11 Qbd2 Qg6 (11...0-0!? 12 h4 Qf6 13 g4!) 0-0 14 0-0-0 Qh8 15 h5 Qge5 16 Qxe5 Qxe5 17 f4 ± Ciglč-Novacan, Slovenian Cht 1994.

4 Qg5

Alternatives:

a) 4 Qf4 Qd7 5 Qbd2 Qc7 6 h3 Qh5 7 e3 Qgf6 8 Qe2 Qg6 9 Qb3 Qd5 10 Qg3 a5 11 c3 c4 12 Qa3 Qa5 13 0-0 b5 = Malek-Ruf, Cappelle la Grande 1990.

b) 4 e4 Qf6 5 Qbd2 (5 Qc3 e6 6 h3 Qh5 7 Qg5 Qe7 8 Qe2 Qbd7 is approximately equal; then 9 g4 Qg6 10 Qh4? allows 10...Qxe4 11 Qxe4 Qxe4 12 Qxe4 Qxg5 13 Qf6 Qf6 [13...d5!]) 14 Qxg7+ Qf8 15 Qf3 Qxg7 16 h4 Qa5+ 17 c3 h6 = Bugajski-Czerwon- ski, Warsaw 1997) 5...e6 6 c3 Qe7 is a safe way to play, and after 7 g3 0-0 8 Qg2 the thematic central push 8...d5 is even more effective than usual, and gives Black a very good position: 9 0-0 Qh5 10 Qe5 Qbd7 11 f4 Qxe5 12 fxe5 Qd7 13 exd5 cxd5 14 Qf3 Qb8 15 h4 b5 16 Qg5 b4 = Lagrotteria-Miles, Toscolano 1996.

c) 4 Qc3 d5 (4...Qd7!? 5 e4 e5) 5 Qe5 Qh5 allows White the trick 6 Wh3 Qf6 7 g4 Qg6 8 Qxg6, when Black has to take back with the f-pawn, and White gets a clear advantage after 8...fxg6 9 g5 Qh5 10 Qf4 Qxe4 11 Qc4, Hubert-Lütke, Germany 1997/8.

d) 4 c4!? has been tried in some recent games. 4...Cd7 5 g3 and now:

d1) 5...Qg6 6 Qg2 e5 7 Qbd2 Qc7 8 0-0 0-0 9 e4 Qxd4 10 Qxd4 Qc5 11 Qe3 Qb6 12 h3 Qd7 13 Qb1 Qe8 (13...a5!?) 14 b4 Qe6 15 Qf3 Qg5 16 Qd3 ± Krupp-Jossien, Cappelle la Grande 2000.

d2) 5...Qxf3!? 6 Qxf3 e6 7 Qg2 Qgf6 8 0-0 Qc7 (8...d5!? 9 e4 0-0 10 Qc3 e5 11 Qe3 Qe8 12 Qad1 Qc7 (Pataki-Dovzhik, Paks 2000)) 13 d5! gives White some advantage.

4...e6 5 f3 Qh5

5...f5 6 e4 Qg6 7 Qb3 Qb6 8 Qe3 Qf6 9 Qd2 d5 10 Qd3 Qa6 11 Whxb6 axb6 12 c3 Qe7 13 Qh3 Qxe4 14 Qxe4 Qg4 15 Qe2 e5 16 a3 0-0 17 Qf3 Qxe3 18 Qxe3 Qxd4+ 19 exd4 Qfe8 20 Qf4 Qad8 21 Qxg6 hxg6 = Zurck-Jansa, Czech Cht 1998/9.

6 Qh3 d5 7 Qf4 Qg6

Black has a safe structure.

8 Qb3 Qb6 9 Qxg6 hxg6 10 Qd4 Qd7 11 e3 Qe7 12 c3 Qc8 13 Qd2 Qd6 14 Qxd6 Qxd6 15 Whxb6 axb6 16 Qd3 b5


C)

3 h3

White forces Black to define the pawn-formation at once, but it is hard.
to see any compensation for the doubled pawns, as White lacks targets in Black’s camp.

3...\textit{xf}3 (D)

4 \textit{exf}3

4 \textit{gxf}3 doesn’t work in conjunction with \textit{h}3: 4...\textit{d}2 5 \textit{g}2 \textit{gf}6 6 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}5 7 \textit{c}4 \textit{c}6 8 \textit{c}3 \textit{b}6 9 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 10 \textit{b}3 \textit{e}6 11 \textit{a}4 \textit{a}5 12 \textit{f}5 \textit{b}4! 13 \textit{fxe}6 \textit{fxe}6 14 0-0 0-0 and Black has good activity, Fuller-Keene, Coventry 1970.

4...\textit{g}6

Black is going to develop flexibly with ...\textit{g}7, ...\textit{e}6, ...\textit{e}7 and ...\textit{d}7, and later start playing against White’s weakened pawns.

4...\textit{e}6 5 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}6 (5...\textit{d}5 6 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}6 7 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}6 8 \textit{c}3 \textit{c}6 9 \textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6 10 \textit{e}2 0-0 11 0-0 \textit{e}8 12 \textit{c}3 \textit{a}6 is equal, Ehrke-Gustafsson, 2nd Bundesliga 1996/7) 6 \textit{c}3 \textit{g}7 7 \textit{c}3 \textit{c}7 8 \textit{d}2 \textit{bc}6 9 \textit{e}2 \textit{d}7 10 \textit{c}3 \textit{e}5 11 \textit{h}4 \textit{exd}4 12 \textit{xd}4 \textit{f}5 13 \textit{b}5 \textit{a}6 14 \textit{a}4 \textit{d}5 again with equality, Fancsy – Har-Zvi, Trier 1989.

5 \textit{c}3

White has many alternatives:

a) 5 \textit{f}4 \textit{g}7 6 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}6 7 \textit{c}3 \textit{d}7 8 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}7 9 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}5 10 \textit{d}5 \textit{d}5 11 0-0 0-0 12 \textit{e}2 \textit{c}7 13 \textit{e}1 \textit{d}8 14 \textit{c}4 \textit{c}6 15 \textit{e}3 \textit{a}6 = Obsivac-Okhontnik, Stare Mesto 1992.

b) 5 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}7 6 0-0 \textit{e}6 7 \textit{c}3 \textit{d}7 8 \textit{e}1 \textit{e}7 9 \textit{f}4 0-0 10 \textit{d}2 \textit{c}5 11 \textit{d}5 \textit{c}5 12 \textit{f}1 \textit{c}7 13 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}8 14 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}5 15 \textit{e}2 \textit{e}4 16 \textit{e}3 \textit{f}5 = Obsivac-Jansa, Olomouc 1995.

c) 5 \textit{c}4 \textit{g}7 6 \textit{e}3 \textit{d}5 7 \textit{b}3 \textit{f}6 (7...\textit{e}6?!?) 8 0-0 0-0 9 \textit{e}1 \textit{e}6 10 \textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 11 \textit{f}4 \textit{e}7 12 \textit{d}2 \textit{h}7 13 \textit{e}3 \textit{c}8 14 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}7 15 \textit{c}2 \textit{c}5 16 \textit{d}5 \textit{e}5 17 \textit{b}3 is slightly better for White, Fraser-Spraggett, Quebec 1989.

d) 5 \textit{c}3 \textit{g}7 6 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}7 7 \textit{c}3 \textit{e}5 (7...\textit{e}6?!?) 8 \textit{d}5 \textit{d}5 9 0-0-0 \textit{d}7 10 \textit{d}4 \textit{f}8 11 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}6 12 \textit{x}g7+ \textit{x}g7 13 \textit{d}5 \textit{f}6 14 \textit{c}3 \textit{f}8 15 \textit{g}4 = Vokroj-Werner, Vienna 1996.

e) 5 \textit{d}5 \textit{f}6 6 \textit{b}5+ \textit{c}6 7 \textit{d}xc6 \textit{bxc}6 8 \textit{a}4 \textit{a}7 9 \textit{c}3 0-0 10 0-0 \textit{e}7 11 \textit{f}4 \textit{e}5 12 \textit{h}2 \textit{bd}7 13 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}5 was unclear in David-Fon- dain, Saint Quentin 1998.

5...\textit{g}7 6 \textit{b}3 \textit{e}8 7 \textit{d}2
d) 5 \textit{c}4 \textit{c}5 8 0-0 \textit{d}5 9 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}7 10 \textit{f}4 0-0 11 \textit{e}1 \textit{d}7 12 \textit{f}1 \textit{c}5 13 \textit{d}6 \textit{e}8 14 \textit{d}5 \textit{f}5 15 \textit{b}4 \textit{a}5 16 \textit{b}5 \textit{c}6 17 \textit{d}3 \textit{d}6 18 \textit{e}5 \textit{d}6 19 \textit{d}1 \textit{c}6 = Silva-Damaso, Lisbon 1995.

7...\textit{e}6 8 \textit{c}4 \textit{e}7

Black develops flexibly, offering White no targets.

9 \textit{d}3 \textit{d}7 10 \textit{f}4 0-0 11 0-0 \textit{d}5 12 \textit{e}5 \textit{xe}5 13 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 14 \textit{dxe}5 \textit{c}5

In this basic position White has tried almost every possible move.

5 ąg2

The following should also be taken seriously:

a) 5 c4 ąd7 transposes to the note to Black’s 5th move in Line B of Chapter 13.

b) 5 c3?! d5 6 ąb3 ąc8 7 ąa3 ąf6 8 ąf4 c6 9 ąd3 ąe7 10 ąc2 b5!
11 g4 ąbd7 12 ąbl ąb7 13 ąd2 c5 14 h4 ąc8 15 ąd1 ąb6 is slightly better for Black, Casadel-Bezold, Catolica 1992.

c) 5 h4?! d5 6 f4 c5 7 f5?! exf5 8 ąb5+ ąc6 9 0-0 ąf6 10 ąg5 ąc7 11 dxc5 0-0 12 ąc3 d4 13 ąxc6 bxc6 14 ąe2 (14 ąa4 h6=+) 14...ąxc5 15 ąd3 h6 16 ąxf5 hgx5 17 ąxc5 ąe8 18 ąc4 (18 ąxd4 ąe4 19 ąc4 ąd2=+; 18 hxg5 ąd7 19 ąc4 ąe5=+) 18...gxh4 19 ąxd4 ąe4=+ Gutman-Miles, Bundesliga 1985/6.

d) 5 d5! exd5 6 ąxd5 c6 7 ąb3 ąb6 8 ąc3 ąxb3 9 axb3 a6 and now:

d1) 10 ąd2 d5 11 c3 ąd7 12 b4 ąd6 13 f4 ąc7 14 ąh3 ąd8 15 ąd4 ąe8 16 0-0 ąf6 17 ąb3 ąc7 18 ąe3 g6 19 ąd4 f5 20 ąe6+ ąc8 21 ąd4 ąg8 22 ąfe1 ądf6 23 ąg5 ąd7 24 ąf1 ąxe1 25 ąxe1 ąe8 26 ąd1 ąe7 = Magerramov-Lukin, Pavlodar 1987.

d2) 10 b4 ąf6 11 b5 d5 12 bxc6 ąxc6 13 c3 ąe7 14 ąd2 0-0 15 ąh3 ąad8 16 ąb6 ąde8 17 0-0 ąd6 18 ąfe1 ąe5 19 ąf5 g6 20 ąc2 ąed7 21 ąe3 ąe7 is OK for Black, Garcia Paolicchi-Ribeiro, Linares Z. 1995.

e) 5 f4! c6 6 ąg2 (6 ąd3 g6 7-0 ąg7 8 c3 ąe7 9 ąd2 ąd7 10 ąf3 0-0 11 ąe3 ąe8 12 c4 ąf5 = Zsu.Polgar-Torre, New York 1989) 6...g6 7 ąd2 (7 0-0 ąg7 8 a4 ąe7 9 ąd2 ąd7 10 ąc4 ąc7 11 c3 0-0 12 h4 ąad8 13 ąe2 h5 14 ąh3 ąfe8 15 ąel ąf6 16 ąd2 ąf5 17 ąwd3 b6 18 ąg2 c5 19 dxc5 bxc5 = Bischoff-Hickl, Baden-Baden 1992) 7...ąg7 8 c3 ąd7 9 a4 ąe7 10 0-0 (10 a5 0-0 11 ąa6? b5=) 10...0-0 11 ąel ąc7 12 ąf3 ąac8 13 ąd2 ąfd8 14 ąc2 c5 = Polugaevsky-Miles, Biel 1990.

We now return to 5 ąg2 (D):
5...c6

5...Qf6 6 f4 d5 7 wD3 cBd7 8 0-0 
A.d6 is also safe; for example, 9 b3 0-0 
10 Ab2 a5 11 c4 c6 12 a4 Ab4 13 
Dd2 Dxc4 14 Axc4 Dd5 15 f5 exf5 16 
Wxf5 Qf6 17 A.e3 Ae8 18 A.xd5 

6 0-0 Qe7

Black has a very safe position, with plans such as ...g6, ...A.g7, ...A.d7 and 
...Ac7, developing nicely.

6...g6 7 Dd2 (7 c4 Qe6 8 A.c3 d5 9 
c5?! A.g7 10 g4 b6 11 b4 a5 12 A.a4 
Dd7 13 Abl b5 14 A.c3 Axb4 15 Axb4 
Dxc5 16 Dxc5 Dxc3 = Csulits-Hümmer, Bundesliga 1991/2) 7...
Qd7 8 
Bd1 d5 9 f4 Qe7 10 Ae3 A.g7 11 c3 
Dc7 12 Dc5 0-0 13 Dc2 (13 h4 Dac8 
14 b3 Dfe8 15 h5 Df6 16 hxg6 hxg6 
17 g4 c5 18 A.a3 Dxe4 19 cxd4 Dc6 20 
Dc3 Dd7 21 Dh2 Dxe5 22 Dxe5 Dc5 
Bale-Ruck, Harkany 1991.4) 13...
Df5 
14 Dd2 Dfe8 15 A.h3 Df8 16 Dc3 Dc6 

7 Dc1 g6 8 c3 A.g7 9 A.g5 0-0 10 
Wb3 h6 11 A.e7 Wxe7 12 f4 Wc7 13 
Dd2 Dd7 14 Df3 c5 15 Abd1

1/2-1/2 Salo-Yrjölä, Finnish Chl 
1995/6.

E)

3 c3 (D)

3...A.d7

Or:

a) 3...Axf3?? might not be very 
useful here, as White's pawn being on 
c3 improves his central pawn-structure, 
taking away Black’s possible counter-play 
based on, for example, ...g6, ...A.g7 
and ...Ac6: 4 exf3 A.d7 (4...c6 5 A.d3 
e6 6 A.f4 Qe7 7 Wb3 Qd5 8 A.g3 Wb6 
9 Ac2 Qd7 10 Qd2 Qf6 11 A.d4 
Wc7 12 A.e3 = Ledger-Barton, London 1995) 5 Ac3 g6 6 A.g5 h6 7 A.e3 
A.g7 8 Ac2 Qf6 9 Qd2 0-0 10 Wb3 
c5 11 Wxb7 cxd4 12 cxd4 Ab8 13 
Wxa7 Aa8 14 Ab7 Ab8 15 Wb6 Axb2 
16 Ab1 Wb8 17 Ab2 A.d5 is unclear, 

b) 3...c6 4 Qbd2 Qd7 5 e4 e6 
(5...e5?! 6 A.c4 A.g6 7 Wb3) 6 A.e2 
d5 is simple and good – compare Line 
B1 of Chapter 15.

4 e4

Alternatively:

a) 4 Wb3 Ab8 5 Qbd2 A.g6 6 h3 
A.h5 7 g4 A.g6 8 Ab4 e5 9 A.xg6 hxg6 
10 A.g2 c6 11 Df3 A.e7 12 Dxe5 Dxe5 
13 A.e3 A.a5 14 Ad1 Dd5 15 Ae5 
A.xg5 16 A.xd5 cxd5 17 A.xg5 A.d6 
18 Wf1 0-0 = Radosević-Vaulin, Belgrade 1993.

b) 4 Qbd2 e6 5 e4 d5 6 A.d3 Dxe4 7 
A.xe4 A.g6 8 h3 A.h5 9 A.g5 A.e7 10 
Axf6+ A.xf6 11 A.xf6 Wxf6 12 A.e4 
c6 13 Wb3 Wf4 14 Qd2 Ab8 15 g3 
Wd6 16 0-0 0-0 17 Afel Afd8 = Kurr- 
Black can continue in a flexible manner, sometimes reaching positions similar to Queen's Gambit Slav by playing d5.

3... d5

Black is well developed. 4... e5 5 dxe5 dxe5 6 dxex5

Black has alternatives for White.
5...\e2! is a recommendation of Curt Hansen, with a very stable though slightly passive position for Black.)

13...\b7 14...\b3 \c8 15...e5 = Uhlendorf-Sautter, Bundesliga wom 1992/3.

4.c6 5...c3 (5...b3 \b6 6...e2 \b7 7...c3 \c5 8...g6 9...d2 \e7 10...f1 \e4 = Bochev-Andonov, Bankia 1992) 5...f6 6...e2 \e7 7...d5!! 0-0 8...b6 9...c6 \c6 10...d4 \d7 11...c2 \c8 12...d1 \f8 13...g6 14...b4 \c7 15...b2 \c7 16...b3 \d8 17...c8 = Karlsson-Gausel, Oslo 1988.

5...e2 \g6 6...c3 \e7 0-0 0-0 8...e4 e5 (play has transposed to an Old Indian) 9...c6 10...d5 \c5 11...c4 \f3 12...f3 \f8 13...e4 \c8 14...b5 \d8! 15...c1 \b6 16...a6 \c8 17...d6 18...b5 a6 19...d6+ \c6 20...e2 in Keitlinghaus-Klarić, Prague 1990.

6...d3 6...d6 7...d5!? (7...f6 8...b4 9...c6 \c6 10...d4 \d7 11...c2 \c8 12...d1 \f8 13...g6 14...b4 \c7 15...b2 \c7 16...b3 \d8 17...c8 = Karlsson-Gausel, Oslo 1988.

5...e2 \g6 6...c3 \e7 0-0 0-0 8...e4 e5 (play has transposed to an Old Indian) 9...c6 10...d5 \c5 11...c4 \f3 12...f3 \f8 13...e4 \c8 14...b5 \d8! 15...c1 \b6 16...a6 \c8 17...d6 18...b5 a6 19...d6+ \c6 20...e2 in Keitlinghaus-Klarić, Prague 1990.

6...d3 6...d6 7...d5!? (7...f6 8...b4 9...c6 \c6 10...d4 \d7 11...c2 \c8 12...d1 \f8 13...g6 14...b4 \c7 15...b2 \c7 16...b3 \d8 17...c8 = Karlsson-Gausel, Oslo 1988.

5...e2 \g6 6...c3 \e7 0-0 0-0 8...e4 e5 (play has transposed to an Old Indian) 9...c6 10...d5 \c5 11...c4 \f3 12...f3 \f8 13...e4 \c8 14...b5 \d8! 15...c1 \b6 16...a6 \c8 17...d6 18...b5 a6 19...d6+ \c6 20...e2 in Keitlinghaus-Klarić, Prague 1990.

6...d3 6...d6 7...d5!? (7...f6 8...b4 9...c6 \c6 10...d4 \d7 11...c2 \c8 12...d1 \f8 13...g6 14...b4 \c7 15...b2 \c7 16...b3 \d8 17...c8 = Karlsson-Gausel, Oslo 1988.

G)

This move is not very logical here, as Black has not played ...\f6 yet.
3...\textit{d}7

Or:

a) 3...e6 4 \textit{d}bd2 (4 e3?? \textit{xf}3 5 \textit{xf}3 \textit{wa}5+ 0-1 Frosch-Peisser, Leiner 1996, is too good to be true) 4...h6 5 \textit{h}h4 g5 6 \textit{g}3 \textit{xf}6 7 h4 \textit{h}5 8 \textit{e}c4 f5 9 \textit{h}2 fxe4 10 \textit{x}g4 \textit{x}g3 11 fxg3 \textit{g}7 12 c3 \textit{d}7 is a typical Torre-type mess, Patuzzo-Brunner, Silvaplana 1993.

b) 3...h6!!? 4 \textit{h}4 \textit{d}d7 5 \textit{bd}2 \textit{gf}6 6 h3 \textit{f}5 7 e3 makes it possible to develop the bishop to h7, where it functions well together with the plan of ...e6 and ...d5. 7...\textit{h}7 8 \textit{e}4 c6 9 c3 \textit{e}7 10 \textit{e}2 d5 11 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}4 12 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xc}7 13 \textit{e}5 \textit{xe}5 14 dxe5 \textit{xd}2 15 \textit{xf}7 \textit{xc}4 16 \textit{c}2 \textit{xe}5 17 \textit{xe}5 + Springer-Wockenfuss, Passau 1998.

4 \textit{bd}2

4 e4 c6 5 \textit{wd}2 \textit{wb}6 6 c4 g6 7 \textit{c}3 \textit{g}7 8 \textit{e}3 \textit{xf}3 9 \textit{xf}3 \textit{gf}6 (another idea is 9...c5??!) 10 \textit{e}2 \textit{w}7 11 f4 c5 12 d5 = Kekki-Couso, Helsinki 1997.

4...h6!

It is already possible for Black to try active plans. He can also play it safe: 4...\textit{gf}6 5 e4 h6 6 f4 e5 7 dxe5 dxe5 8 \textit{c}3 \textit{c}5 9 \textit{xc}5 \textit{xc}5 10 h3 \textit{xf}3 11 \textit{xf}3 \textit{d}4 12 c3 \textit{a}4 13 b4 \textit{c}6 = Marszalek-Vorotnikov, Moscow 1991.

5 \textit{h}4 g5 6 \textit{g}3 \textit{g}7

Black has an active position.

7 c3 f5!? 8 e3 e5 9 h3 \textit{h}5 10 \textit{h}3 f4 11 h2 \textit{gf}6 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 \textit{xf}4 \textit{xf}4 14 0-0-0 \textit{f}7 15 \textit{e}1+ \textit{f}8

† Piankov-Vorotnikov, Moscow 1996.

H)

3 \textit{f}4 (D)

3...\textit{xf}3

3...\textit{gf}6 4 \textit{bd}2 \textit{h}5!? (4...e6 is also a safe move, intending to meet 5 e4 with 5...d5) 5 \textit{g}5 (5 \textit{e}3 \textit{d}7 6 h3 \textit{xf}3 7 \textit{xf}3 e5 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 \textit{wd}5 c6 10 \textit{wb}3 \textit{wc}7 11 g3 \textit{hf}6 12 \textit{g}2 \textit{xd}5 13 0-0, Cibulka-Dolezal, Czech Republic 1992, 13...\textit{xe}3 =) 5...h6 6 \textit{h}4 g5 7 \textit{g}3 \textit{g}7 8 c3 \textit{c}6 9 c3 e5 10 \textit{b}5 0-0 11 0-0 \textit{c}7 12 h3 \textit{xf}3 13 fxg3 \textit{d}7 = Teichmann-Chigorin, Karlsbad 1907.
4 exf3
4 gxf3 g6!? 5 e4 g7 6 c3 d7 7 b3 b8 8 d2 g6 9 d1 0-0 10 
 e2 a6 11 c4 d5 12 d2 e6 13 c4 

4...d7
Black has many other playable moves and plans:

a) 4...e5 5 d3 c6 6 d3 c5 7 c2 d6 8 dxd6 
xd6 9 d2 f6 10 0-0 11 b4 a6 12 b3 b6 13 e1 e8 14 e3 e5 = Kagan-West, Melbourne
1990.

b) 4...c6 5 c3 d7 6 d3 c6 7 0-0 
 d5 8 g3 g6 9 e1 g7 10 f4 e7 11 
 h4 f6 12 d2 0-0 gives Black a

5 Ac4
5...c3 c6 6 Ac4 is not natural, as
after 6...d5 7 b3 c6 8 0-0 Black has a
safe structure, though the following
variation is anything but quiet: 8...g5!?
9 Ac3 d6 10 e2 h6 11 c4 dxc4 12 
xc4 c7 13 h3 e7 14 c1 b6 15 
b3 0-0 0-0 16 d5 Exd5 17 bxd5 
xd5 18 a7 f4 19 xf4 xf4 =
Vasilev-Delchev, Dupsica 1998.

5...c6
5...e6 6 0-0 d5 is equivalent.

6 0-0 d5 7 b3 e6 8 d2 f6 9 
 e3 d6 10 c4 e7 11 e1 0-0 12 
xd5 exd5 13 f1 f5 14 d3 e8 15 
c2 g6 16 g3 g7

† Galka-Kiedrowicz, Augustow
1996.

D)

3 b3 (D)
3...f6

3...xf3 is the most testing move,
though it has only been played a cou-
pel of times: 4 exf3 (4 gxf3 g6 5 c3?!
 g7 6 c4 d5 7 c5 b6 8 a4 e6 9 
f4 e7 10 h4 d5 11 g5 d6 12 
c3 h6 13 c1 c5 = Kapp-Spiess, Chem-
nitz 1998) 4...g6 5 b2 g7 6 d2 d5
(6...c5??) 7 Ac3 c6 8 b5 f6 9 0-0
0-0 10 Ac6 bxc6 11 e1 e8 12 
a4 d6 13 Ad1 e6 14 Ac5 e8 15 
d3 = Sobik-Ksieszek, 2nd Bundes-
liga 1995/6.

4 bd2
4 b2 e6 5 bd2 Ac7 6 g3 c5 7 
g2 Ac6 8 0-0 cxd4 9 d4 Ac8 10 
c4 0-0 11 d2 d5 12 Ac6 bxc6 13 
c5 Ac5 = Sorri-Kankko, Helsinki
1989.

4...e5?! 5 Ac4
5 dxe5 dxe5 6 b2 (not 6 b5??
 d4 =+) is a better option for White,
but Black gets activity and good com-
pensation after 6...e4 7 xf6 xf6 8 
xc4 b4+ 9 d2 10 xd2+ 10 e2 c6.

5...e4 6 Ac2 d5 7 c3 Ae6 8 b2 
d6 9 c4 c6 10 g3 h5

† Heuser-Chekhov, Dresden 1997.
17 Other 2nd Moves for White: Introduction

In the next two chapters we study White's other options on the 2nd move (apart from 2 e4) after 1 d4 d6 (D).

There are 'odd' moves that are seen only occasionally. Another way to divide up the moves is to consider those that aim for a concrete opening plan, and those that are of a more flexible nature.

The move 1...d6 is also flexible, introducing no direct contact between the armies of White and Black, and because of this flexibility there are still many transpositions available in these rare variations. Especially against the move 2 g3 Black has many transpositional possibilities.

Statistics
Below we have collected some statistics for White's 2nd moves. We have used these statistics to partition the material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Games</th>
<th>W's Score</th>
<th>W's Rating</th>
<th>W’s Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 g3</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2391</td>
<td>2422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 dxe5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>2446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 dxc3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2339</td>
<td>2357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 c3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2375</td>
<td>2397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 dxf4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>2244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 c3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>2078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>2145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into two chapters, the first of which covers the ‘serious’ alternatives with the second covering the odds and ends.

**Position-types**

Black usually has many different plans available in these variations, since the theory goes far less deep than in the main lines, where the play might focus on some variations that have been proved to be critical. This means that Black can choose the position-type quite freely. Below we summarize these various plans to give the reader an overview of which plan to choose and when.

1) Black plays an immediate...e5 – endgame positions: 2 g3 with a slight advantage to White; 2 c3, 2 b3 or 2 e3 with equality.

2) Black plays a later...e5 – Old Indian / advanced centre positions: 2 f4 with an unclear position; 2 c3 or 2 e3 with normal positions; 2 f4 with an advantage to Black.

3) Black plays...c5 – Benoni positions: 2 g5 or 2 f4 with equality.

4) Black plays...f5 – Dutch positions: 2 g3 with likely transpositions to main lines of the Dutch.

5) Black plays...h6 and...g5 – flank positions: 2 g5 with an active position for Black.
18 Serious Alternatives for White

1 d4 d6

We regard the 2nd move alternatives for White presented in this chapter as serious tries for an opening advantage. Especially the flexible 2 g3 offers some chances of an advantage against the thematic endgame system, and against other plans by Black there exist many different transpositions. The Torre/Trompowsky-type move 2 \( \text{\textit{ag5}} \) might be a valuable tool for a Torre specialist. 2 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \) can also lead to the endgame system, if Black wishes, but otherwise there are many transpositions, for example to a pure Pirc, available.

We discuss these moves as follows:

A: 2 g3 \( \text{\textit{151}} \)
B: 2 \( \text{\textit{ag5}} \) \( \text{\textit{156}} \)
C: 2 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \) \( \text{\textit{157}} \)

A)

2 g3 \( \text{(D)} \)

This developing move is a very natural and flexible choice for White. Black has two basic ideas: either he transposes to another opening, hoping to get a variation White doesn't usually play, or he tests the ending presented in the main line.

2...e5

Alternatively:

a) 2...g6 is likely to reach Modern or King's Indian positions, with White committed to a king's fianchetto.

b) 2...f5 is a form of Dutch, but Black has avoided the Staunton Gambit, and a number of other sharp possibilities.

c) 2...\( \text{\textit{df6}} \) aims for King's Indian or Old Indian positions.

d) 2...\( \text{\textit{ad7?}} \) 3 \( \text{\textit{ag2}} \) e5 is a way to play the thematic ...e5 without allowing White the ending. Then:

D1) 4 e4 g6 5 \( \text{\textit{de2}} \) \( \text{\textit{ag7}} \) 6 \( \text{\textit{bc3}} \) \( \text{\textit{gf6}} \) 7 h3 0-0 transposes to a line of the g3 Pirc, but not the one we recommend for Black in Line C3 of Chapter 25. However, Black's position is solid here; for example, 8 \( \text{\textit{ae3}} \) c6 9 a4 b6 10 0-0 \( \text{\textit{b7}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{d2}} \) \( \text{\textit{c7}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{ad1}} \) \( \text{\textit{ad8}} \)
13 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f6} = \), J. Müller-Helbig, 2nd Bundesliga 1996/7.

d2) 4 \( c4 \) \( \text{exd4} \) 5 \( \text{Wxd4} \) \( \text{g6} = \) \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 7 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{g7} \) leads to positions that can arise via 1 \( d4 \) \( d6 \) 2 \( c4 \) \( e5 \) 3 \( c3 \), though the move-order is a bit rare. Play can continue:

d21) 8 \( b3 \) 0-0 9 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{e8} \) 10 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 11 0-0 \( a5 \) 12 \( \text{d4} \) \( c6 \) (12...a4 13 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{axb3} \) 14 \( \text{axb3} \) \( c6 = \) Rumpf-Beikert, Austria 1998) 13 \( \text{ab1} \) \( a4 \) 14 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{axb3} \) 15 \( \text{axb3} \) \( \text{fe4} \) 16 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 17 \( \text{c2} \) f5 18 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{a1} \) 19 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d7} = \)

Adorjan-Smejkal, Szirak 1986.

d22) 8 \( \text{Wc3}+ \) \( \text{we7} \) and then:

d221) 9 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{we3} \) 10 \( \text{xe3} \) d8 11 h3 a6 12 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{e8} \) 13 \( \text{Ec1} \) \( \text{Ec5} \) 14 \( 0-0 \) \( \text{fe4} \) 15 \( \text{exd4} \) \( \text{e4} \) 16 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{g5} \) 17 \( \text{xf5} \) 18 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 19 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{c6} \) 20 \( \text{a1} \) d5 21 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f7} \) 22 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f7} = \)


d222) 9 \( \text{we7}+ \) \( \text{xe7} \) 10 \( \text{e3} \) c6 11 \( \text{Ec1} \) \( \text{G4} \) 12 \( \text{g5}+ \) \( \text{f6} \) 13 \( \text{xf6}+ \) \( \text{xf6} \) 14 \( \text{dxd4} \) h5 15 h3 \( \text{b6} \) 16 b3 a5 17 0-0 \( a4 \) is equal although Black enjoys the initiative, Toth-Tischbierek, Bundesliga 1998/9.

We now return to 2...\( \text{e5} \) (\( D \)):

3 \( \text{dx e5} \)

Or:

a) 3 \( \text{xf3} \) is best answered by 3...\( \text{e4} \), which leads to the position-type studied after 1 \( \text{d4} \) \( d6 \) 2 \( c4 \) \( e5 \) 3 \( \text{xf3} \), although here Black has even better prospects due to the fact that his d-pawn can move to d5 without loss of time. White has two moves:

a1) 4 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{xf6} \)! (4...\( \text{f5} \) 5 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 6 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f6} \) is also possible; for example, 7 \( \text{g2} \) \( g6 \) 8 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{exf3} \) 9 \( \text{x f3} \) \( \text{g7} \)

10 0-0 1/2-1/2 Stecker-Meyer, Hamburg 1992) 5 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{d5} \) 6 \( c4 \) \( c6 \) 7 \( c3 \) \( c6 \) 8 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 9 0-0 \( \text{c7} \) 10 \( f3 \) \( \text{e f3} \) 11 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{c7} \) 12 \( \text{g5} \) 0-0 13 \( \text{be3} \) \( \text{c4} \) 14 \( \text{ad} \) \( h6 \) 15 h3 \( \text{f6} \) 16 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 17 \( \text{d6} \) 18 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{eb5} \) 19 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{b6} \) 20 \( \text{af1} \) \( \text{c4} \) 21 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{dxe4} \) 22 \( \text{a2} \) \( \text{c8} \) + Pfleger-Miltner, 2nd Bundesliga 1994/5.

a2) 4 \( \text{g5} \) and then:

a21) 4...\( \text{f5} \) 5 \( \text{f3} \) ? (5 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c7} \) 6 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 7 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 8 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c7} \) 9 0-0 \( \text{g7} \) 10 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 11 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 11...\( \text{xf3} \) !? 12 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{dxe4} \) 13 \( \text{c3} \) 0-0 14 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{h7} \) is at least equal for Black, Bonnafous-Hari, Murcek jr Ech 1998.

a22) 5 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c7} \) 6 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{dxc4} \) !? 7 \( \text{a4}+ \) \( \text{c6} \) 8 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 9 \( \text{d2} \) 0-0 10 \( \text{xc4} \) a5 (10...\( \text{g4} \) looks good) 11
g2 e6 12 wc2 db4 13 xb4 axb4 14 dd2 d5 15 xc4 with a slight advantage for White, Pichler-Spreng, Tirschenreuth 1982.

b) 3 g2 allows Black to take control of the centre with 3...cxd4. Then:

b1) 4 df3 offers Black a gambit pawn. He can choose a reply according to taste:

b11) 4...Cc6 5 Cxd4 ad7 6 b3 de6 7 c4 is a safe continuation for Black: 7...wc8!? (this active plan works well here) 8 0-0 de3 9 xc3 dxg2 10 xg2 e7 11 ab2 0-0 (11...h5!? 12 e4 Cxd4 13 Wxd4 c6 14 Cfe1 wc7 is equal, Teske-Perez, Cienfuegos 1997.

b12) 4...c5 5 c3 dxex3 6 Cxc3 Cxf6 7 0-0 e7 8 e4 Cc6 9 Cf4 0-0 10 Cc1 Cg4 11 h3 Cxf3 12 Wxf3 Ce8 13 Wd1 Cg5 14 Cc3 Cae8 15 f4 h5 16 Wc2 Cc8 17 Cc2 Cb6 18 Cwd3 with some positional compensation, Epishin-Chatalbashev, Cuto 1999.

b2) 4 Cxd4 places the white queen in the centre, and Black can win a tempo with 4...Cdx6 (D) (4...Cf6!? is also possible: 5 Cg5 Ce7 6 c3 0-0 7 Cc3 Ce8 8 0-0 Cc6 9 Cwd3 h6 10 Cc4 and now Black implemented a standard plan to attack the e4-pawn with 10...Cd7 11 e4 Cf6 12 Cxb2 Cf5 13 Cc2 Ce7 14 Cc1 Cg4 15 f3 Cd7 16 Cd1 a5 17 Ce4 Ce5 18 Cxe5 dxe5 19 Ce3 Cb5 20 Cc2 Cc6 21 Cbc5 Cc5 × in Schouten-Borm, Leeuwarden 1975) and here:

b21) 5 Cwd2 Cf6 and now:

b211) 6 c4 Cc6 is problematic for White.

b212) 6 b3 d5! gives Black better chances in the centre; for example, 7 Cc3 Ce6 8 Cb2 Cb4 9 a3 Cc5 10 b4 Cb6 11 Cc4 0-0 12 Cxb6 axb6 13 Cc3 Cxc3 14 Cxc3 Cc8 15 Cg2 Ce5 16 Cc4 Cc4 17 Cc3 Cc6 18 Cc6 Cc6 19 Ccd3 Cg4 20 0-0 Cc5 21 Cc2 b5 C Galliamova-Vaulin, Koszalin 1997.

b213) 6 Cc3 g6 7 Cc4 Cc4 8 0-0 0-0 0-0 9 Cc3 Ce8 10 Cc1 Cc5 11 b3 Cc6 12 Cb2 d5 = Donchenko-Chekhov, Moscow 1996.

b214) 6 Cc3 Cc6 7 0-0 0-0 8 Cc3 Cc5 9 Cc6 10 Cd2 Cdx3+ 11 Cxf3 Cc5 12 Cc3 Cc5 = Iglesias-Szmetan, San Luis 1995.

b22) 5 Ccd1 g6 6 Cc2 (6 Cd3 Cc7 7 c3 Cg7 8 Cd2 Cc7 9 Cc3 Cc8 10 e4 0-0 11 Cc4 12 Cc2 Cc7 13 Ccd4 Cae8 = Tennstedt-Lorenz, 2nd Bundesliga 1994/5) 6...Cg7 7 Cc3 Cd6 8 Cd3 Cc5 gives Black a very active position. He had no problems after 9 Cxc4 Cdx4 10 Cxc4 Cc6 11 C4 Cc6 12 Cc4 0-0 13 Cc4 14 Cc4 15 Cc4 16 Cc4 a4 = in Kornushin-Vorotnikov, Vladivostok 1994.

b23) 5 Cc3+ Cc7 6 Cc3 Cc6 7 0-0 0-0 8 Cc4 Cc6 is also OK for Black, as White's pieces are poorly coordinated:
9 \( \text{Qa3} \text{ Qg4} \) 10 \( \text{Qd2} \text{ Qge5} \) 11 b3 \( \text{Qxf3}+ \) 12 \( \text{Qxf3} \text{ Qf6} \) 13 \( \text{Qb2} \text{ Qb8} \) 14 \( \text{Qxf6} \text{ Qxf6} \) 15 \( \text{Qb5} \text{ Qe7} \) 16 \( \text{Qg2} \text{ Qd7} \) 17 \( \text{Qf1} \) a6 18 \( \text{Qc3} \) b5 with active play for Black, Romanishin-Tomczak, 2nd Bundesliga 1991/2.

3...\( \text{dxe5} \) 4 \( \text{Qxd8+} \text{ Qxd8} \) (D)

Now Black has many options. His basic plan is to develop, put the king in a safe place (usually c7), and fight to maintain control over the vital e5-square.

5 \( \text{Qc3} \)

Or:

a) 5 \( \text{Qd2}?! \) is illogical, as it blocks in the c1-bishop. 5...c6 and now:

a1) 6 \( \text{Qc4} \) f6 7 f4 \( \text{Qe6} \) 8 e4 \( \text{Qd7} \) 9 \( \text{Qf3} \) b5 10 \( \text{Qa5} \) (this plan might be too aggressive, as the knight remains out of play on a5 for a long time) 10...\( \text{Qc7} \) 11 c3 \( \text{Qe5} \) 12 fxe5 \( \text{Qxe5} \) 13 \( \text{Qf4} \) d6 14 0-0-0 \( \text{Qg5} \) 15 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 16 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qh6} \) 17 \( \text{Qxe5} \) fxe5 18 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) \( \text{Kistella-Matthaei}, 2nd Bundesliga 1994/5.\)

a2) 6 f4 \( \text{Qd6} \) (6...\( \text{exf4}!?! \) 7 \( \text{Qgf3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 8 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 9 \( \text{Qd2} \) f5 10 \( \text{Qeg5} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 11 fxe5 h6 12 e6 \( \text{Qc5} \) 13 \( \text{Qb4} \) hgx5 14 \( \text{Qxc5} \) + \( \text{Qxf6} \) 15 \( \text{Qd4} \) + \( \text{Qg6} \) 16 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 17 \( \text{Qxe5} \) + \( \text{Qf6} \) 18 \( \text{Qf7} \) \( \text{Qh7} \) 19 \( \text{Qd6} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 20 \( \text{Qg2} \) g6 21 0-0-0 \( \text{Qe5} \) = Lerner-Sulskis, Koszalin 1999.

b) 5 \( \text{Qg2} \) c6 6 f4!? has the thematic idea of taking the safe c7-square away from the black king, but it is not so effective because of 6...\( \text{exf4} \) (6...\( \text{Qd7} \) 7 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 8 \( \text{Qbd2} \) \( \text{exf4} \) 9 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 10 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) 11 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Qgf6} \) 12 0-0-0 \( \text{Qe7} \) 13 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) ± Draško-Jacimović, Yugoslav Ch (Cetinje) 1992) 7 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 8 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 9 0-0-0+ \( \text{Qd7} \) 10 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) 11 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Qb4} \) 12 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 13 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qa5} \) 14 \( \text{Qd6} \) \( \text{Qb6} \) with a slight advantage for Black, Shneider-Bagirov, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1991.

c) 5 f4!? is the most direct approach, and it also seems to test Black most: 5...\( \text{exf4} \) 6 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 7 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{cxd6} \) leads to an instructive position, which Black should be able to hold; for example, 8 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 9 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 10 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 11 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 12 \( \text{Qh3} \) a6 13 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) (13...\( \text{Qxh3}!?! \) 14 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 15 b3 \( \text{Qb8} \) 16 0-0 \( \text{Qd7} \) 17 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qhc8} \) 18 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 19 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 20 c4 \( \text{Qxd4} \) 21 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 22 \( \text{Qb4} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) 23 \( \text{Qxg2} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) ± Reschke-Lorenz, Bundesliga 1997/8.

We now return to 5 \( \text{Qc3} \) (D):

5...\( \text{Qd7} \)

Or:

a) 5...\( \text{Qd6} \) 6 \( \text{Qg2} \) c6 7 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 8 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{Qxd6} \) is too risky, as White can either open the centre or activate his pieces too quickly; 9 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 10 \( \text{Qf3} \) e4 11 \( \text{Qg5} \) f5 12 b3 h6 13 \( \text{Qa3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 14 0-0-0+ \( \text{Qd5} \) 15 \( \text{Qf7} \) \( \text{Qh7} \) 16 c4 +– Rausis-Cruz, Lisbon 1999.
b) 5...f6, with the principled plan of holding on to the strong point e5, is possible, though 6 f4!  @d6 7 @f3 @c6 8 @d2 @ge7 9 0-0-0 h6 10 @g2 @e6 11 @e3 @e8 12 fxe5 fxe5 13 @e4 ± K.Arkell-Dunnington, London 1992, is slightly problematic for Black.

c) 5...@e6!? is probably the best try for Black, when there is a new game that changes the old evaluation: 6 f4 @d7 7 @f3 f6! 8 fxe5 @xe5 9 @f4 @g6! (this move, renouncing the e5-square but attacking the bishop, is best) 10 0-0-0+ @c8 11 @e3 @e8 12 @d4 @d7 13 @db5 @e5! (13...@c6? 14 @xd7! ± Romanishin-Kindermann, Munich 1992, is a good example of the tactical possibilities Black must be aware of) 14 @g2 c6 15 @xa7+!? (15 @d6+ @c7=) 15...@b8 and now White must seek complications, as his direct approach has not succeeded: 16 @xd7 @xd7 17 @d1 @f5 18 @g1 @e5 19 @xc6+ bxc6 20 @h3 @xg1 21 @xg1 @d4 22 @xd7 @xa2 23 @xa2 @xc2+ 24 @d1 @xg1 25 @xc6 @h3 ²1/2-½ Romanishin-Sokolovs, Cappelle la Grande 1995.

d) 5...c6 6 f4 and again Black has many options:

d1) 6...@b4!? 7 fxe5 (7 @d2 exf4 8 0-0-0 @f6 9 @xf4 ½²-½ Godes-Oratovsky, Tel-Aviv 1993) 7...@f5 8 @g5+ @c7 9 @f4 @e6 10 @f3 @e7 11 @g5 @d5 12 @xe6+ @xe6 13 @d2 @xc3 14 bxc3 @d7 15 @h3 @ae8 = Skomorokhin-Helbig, Mlada Boleslav 1992.

d2) 6...@e6!? 7 fxe5 @d7 8 @f3 h6 9 @d2 @g5 10 0-0-0 @g7 11 @d4 @xe5 12 @xe6+ @xe6 13 @h3 @e7 with an unclear position; Vandreyy-Dudas, Budapest 1997. Black has managed to bring his king to a safe place, but White's bishops might still offer him some advantage.

e) 5...@f5!? is an interesting idea, as after 6 c4 @e6 the long diagonal is blocked, and following 7 f4 @b4 8 @f3 @f6! 9 @g5 @e8 10 @c3 exf4 11 @xf4 @xc3+ 12 bxc3 @d5! Black suddenly has threats of his own; for example, 13 0-0-0 @bd7 14 @h3 @xe4 15 @h1 @g6 16 @d4 @e7 17 @e5 @xe5 18 @xc6, ½²-½ Bczold-Dutschak, Würzburg 1997, and now 18...@d5 seems to be good for Black.

6 f4 @c6f6

6...@b4!? 7 @f3 f6 8 fxe5 @xe5 9 @f4 gives White some initiative.

7 @f3

7 fxe5!? has also been suggested.

7...@d6 8 @b5 @e7 9 @xd6 cxd6 10 b3

White has some advantage due to his bishop-pair, but the unconventional pawn-structure gives Black some prospects for counterplay. After 10...@xd5?! 11 fxe5 @xe5 12 @xe5 dxe5, 13 @a3+ @f6 14 e4 @e3! 15 @d3 @h3! gave
Black good counterplay in Yusupov-Rivas, Las Palmas 1993, but 13 e4!? and 13 \( \text{g}2 \)!? have been suggested as improvements.

**Conclusion:** 2 g3 is a very flexible move, with many transpositional possibilities. Black may have some problems in the endgame, so one of these transpositions might be the best choice.

**B)**

\[ 2 \text{g}5 \] (D)

This move, in the spirit of the Trompowsky, is quite common. Again, Black has many possible transpositions, but our main game shows an independent alternative.

2...h6

Or:

a) 2...g6 3 \( \text{f}3 \) is similar to Torre positions.

b) 2...d7 3 e4 \( \text{g}f6 \) 4 \( \text{c}3 \) might transpose to a Pirc or Philidor.

c) 2...f5!? transposes to a line of the Dutch Defence, but this particular position is not very common.

d) 2...c5!? is another option worth noting. After 3 \( \text{dxc}5 \) (3 \( \text{d}5 \) !?) 3...\( \text{a}5+4 \) \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{xc}5 \) Black should be quite OK, though 5 \( \text{d}2 \) h6 6 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 7 e4 a6 8 0-0-0 e5? 9 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 10 f4 \( \text{bd}7 \) 11 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 12 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 13 e5d5 e4! 14 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 15 \( \text{h}b5 \) (15...0-0?) 16 c4 \( \text{xc}4 \) 17 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 18 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 19 \( \text{f}5 \) was unclear in Koma-rov-Sakaev, Kherson 1991, as White has some activity for his pawn.

3 \( \text{h}4 \) g5?!

Black has scored well using this active move. Other, more positional moves:

a) 3...c6 4 c3 (4 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 5 \( \text{bd}2 \) \( \text{xb}2 \) is the normal poisoned pawn line of the Torre Attack, but with the black d-pawn more flexibly placed on d6 than on d5: 6 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{a}2 \) 7 e4 \( \text{a}5 \) 8 \( \text{d}3 \) \( g6 \) 9 0-0 \( \text{g}7 \) 10 c4 \( \text{d}7 \) 11 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 12 \( \text{g}3 \) \( e5 \) 13 \( \text{c}2 \) c5 14 \( \text{dxe}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 15 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 16 \( \text{e}3 \) 0-0-0 \( \text{Zwick-Werner, Lenk 1994} \) ) 4...\( \text{b}6 \) (4...\( \text{d}7 \) 5 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{gf}6 \) 6 \( \text{g}3 \) e5 7 e3 \( \text{e}7 \) 8 a4 is a safe Torre position, although 8...e4 9 \( \text{g}1 \) g5 10 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 11 a5 \( \text{g}6 \) 12 h3 d5 13 \( \text{a}4 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 15 \( \text{h}2 \) f5 \( \text{Kovačević-Benoit, Cannes 1993 illustrates some dangers for White} \) ) 5 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 6 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{gf}6 \) 7 \( \text{gf}3 \) g5? 8 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 9 e4 \( \text{g}7 \) 10 a4 \( \text{f}8 \) 11 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 12 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 13 a5 \( \text{d}7 \) is unclear, Kovačević-Belikov, Alcobendas 1993.

b) 3...f5?! is a sound possibility for Black; for example, 4 \( \text{c}3 \) d5 5 e3 c6 6 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{xd}3 \) 7 \( \text{xd}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 8 e4 dxe4 9 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{a}5 \) + 10 \( \text{d}2 \) e6 11 \( \text{gf}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 12 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{gf}6 \) 13 0-0-0 0-0 14 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 15 \( \text{fd}1 \) c5 with an equal

4...g3 g7\(D\)

5 c3

5 c3 also leads to quiet play; for example, 5...c5 6 c3 w6 7 w3 wxb3 8 axb3 \(\Box\)d7 9 \(\Box\)a3 a6 10 \(\Box\)b5? wB8 11 wA7 wgf6 12 w\(\Box\)d3 \(\Box\)h5 13 w\(\Box\)e2 w\(\Box\)xg3 14 w\(\Box\)xg3 \(\Box\)f6 15 w\(\Box\)xc8 wxc8 16 w\(\Box\)f5 w\(\Box\)f8 = Boissonnet-Nogueiras, Buenos Aires 1991.

5...\(\Box\)c6

5...\(\Box\)f5!!? should probably be recommended only to adventurous players, though there is nothing clearly wrong with it: 6 e3 wgf6 7 w\(\Box\)d2 w\(\Box\)c6 8 h4 e5! 9 h\(\Box\)x5 h\(\Box\)x5 10 w\(\Box\)xh8+ w\(\Box\)xh8 11 w\(\Box\)b3 f4 12 ef4 ef4 13 w\(\Box\)d2 w\(\Box\)c7+ 14 w\(\Box\)e2 w\(\Box\)d7 15 d5 w\(\Box\)a5 16 w\(\Box\)a3 b6 17 0-0-0 w\(\Box\)h7! 18 w\(\Box\)f1 we4 and Black is active, Wells-Urban, Budapest 1993.

6 w\(\Box\)d2 \(\Box\)h5 7 e4 w\(\Box\)xg3\(D\)

8 wxfg3

8 h\(\Box\)xg3 c6 9 w\(\Box\)c2 \(\Box\)d7 gives rise to a Torre-type position, leading to some manoeuvring after 10 f4 w\(\Box\)f8 11 w\(\Box\)e2 w\(\Box\)c7 12 w\(\Box\)h5 c5 13 d5 \(\Box\)h7 14 \(\Box\)e2 w\(\Box\)d7 15 a4 0-0-0 16 \(\Box\)b5 e6 17 0-0-0 exd5 18 exd5 w\(\Box\)f6 19 w\(\Box\)xd7 w\(\Box\)xd7 20 w\(\Box\)c4 \(\Box\)he8 21 fxg5 h\(\Box\)xg5 22 w\(\Box\)f3 w\(\Box\)g4 23 w\(\Box\)d3 w\(\Box\)c7 \(\Box\) Czernicki-Slapikas, Polanica Zdroj 1996.

8...c5 9 d5 \(\Box\)d7 10 \(\Box\)e2 h5?? 11 w\(\Box\)b5 wB8 12 a4 a6 13 w\(\Box\)xd7+ w\(\Box\)xd7 14 w\(\Box\)c4 w\(\Box\)xb2 15 w\(\Box\)xb2 w\(\Box\)xc3+ 16 w\(\Box\)f1 w\(\Box\)xh2 17 w\(\Box\)b1 w\(\Box\)g7 18 h4 g4 19 w\(\Box\)d3 0-0

Black has good compensation because of his active pieces, Patuzzo-Klauser, Swiss Cht 1996.

Conclusion: Black has at least two good ideas against 2 w\(\Box\)g5, namely 2...h6 intending ...g5, and 2...c5.

C)

2 w\(\Box\)c3 c5?!

Black can choose a transposition if he so wishes, but this thematic push seems to be enough to equalize.

2...g6 3 c4 w\(\Box\)f6 transposes to a Pirc, as does 2...w\(\Box\)f6 after 3 e4, although Black should be careful about 3 w\(\Box\)g5, which has similarities to the Trompowsky.
3 dxe5 dxe5 4 \( \text{xd} \text{xd} \text{8} + \text{xd} \text{xd} \text{8} \) (D)

5 e4

Or:

a) 5 \( \text{Qf} \text{f} \text{3} \) f6 6 e4 (6 \( \text{Qd} \text{d} \text{2} \) c5 7 0-0-0 \( \text{Qe} \text{e} \text{d} \text{7} \) 8 e3 Qh6 9 Qc4 Qc6 10 a3 Qe8 11 Qe4 Qb6 12 h3 Qd8 13 a2 Qe7 14 Qe1 Qf5 15 Qc3 Qe6 with equality, Cuevas Rodriguez-Sanchez, Cienfuegos 1991) 6...Qe6 allows Black to use the standard plans and achieve easy equality: 7 Qe3 Qd7 8 \( \text{Qd} \text{d} \text{2} \) c6 9 a4 Qc7! 10 Qc4 Qxc4 11 Qxc4 Qb6 12 Qxb6 axb6 13 Qe2 Qb4 \( \frac{1}{2} \)-\( \frac{1}{2} \) Rakic-Rukavina, Berlin 1988.

b) 5 f4! is the most active approach, and Black should be careful because the opening of lines may give White some attacking chances: 5...exf4 (5...Qc6 6 \( \text{Qd} \text{d} \text{2} \) Qg7 7 Qf3 f6 8 0-0-0 gives Black some problems: 8...exf4 9 Qxf4+ \( \text{Qd} \text{d} \text{7} \) 10 g3 Qe8 11 Qb5 Qd6 12 Qxd6 Qxd6 13 Qd6 cxd6 14 Qxd6 Qc7 15 Qd2 Qae8 \pm Arencibia-Ermenkov, Calcutta 1988) 6 Qxf4 c6 7 0-0-0+ Qe8! 8 Qf3 Qf6 9 e4 Qb4 10 e5 Qxc3 11 exf6 Qxf6 12 Qc4 Qe6 13 Qhe1 Qd7 14 Qxe6 fxe6 15 Qxe6+ Qf7 16 Qed6 Qb6 17 Qe5+ Qxe5 18 Qxe5 Qhe8 = Khenkin-Appel, Leningrad 1991.

5...Qe6 (D)

5...Qf6 transposes to Line B of Chapter 33.

6 Qc4 f6 7 Qe3 Qc7

Another queenless middlegame has arisen. Black has a stable position.

8 a4 Qb4 9 Qge2 Qd7 10 f3 a5 11 Qf2 Qe7 12 Qa2 Qc5 13 Qac1 Qxe3+ 14 Qxe3 Qb6 15 Qd3 Qe6 


Conclusion: Black can choose between the endgame or a transposition to a Pirc.
In this chapter we study White’s miscellaneous alternatives on the 2nd move. The best White can hope for with these moves is to transpose to other well-known systems. Black should have no theoretical problems against these moves, and they are presented here just so as to provide a full repertoire.

1 d4 d6

Now:
A: 2 f4?! 159
B: 2 a4f4 160
C: 2 c3 161
D: 2 b3 162
E: 2 e3 162

A)
2 f4?! (D)

This move is simply bad, as Black’s first move is a good preparation for a quick ...e5, which leaves White’s centre destroyed after the premature f4.

2...Ng4!?

First Black prevents e4. There are other moves:
a) The paradoxical 2...d5 is possible, as White’s f4 has its drawbacks in this type of position: 3 Qdf3 g6 4 e3 Qg7 5 Qd3 Qf6 6 0-0 Qf5! 7 c4 e6 8 Qc3 Qxb1 9 Qxb1 e6 10 b4 a6 11 a4 0-0 12 Qb3 Qbd7 13 Qd2 Qg4 14 Qxc1 Qe8 15 Qd3 f5 16 b5 with a slight advantage for White, T.Georgadze-Kudrin, Salamanca 1989.

b) 2...Qf6 stops e4, and by continuing this plan with 3 c4 e6 4 Qf3 g6 5 Qc3 Qf5! 6 e3 Qg7 7 Qd3 Qxd3 8 Qxd3 d5! 9 0-0 0-0 10 b4 Qbd7 11 c5 b6 12 Qe5 Qc7 = Black is OK, Bach-Davies, Gausdal 2000.

c) 2...e5!? is a logical move.
d) 2...c5 (when White is playing the Stonewall, one of the best ways to hit it is the plan of ...d6 with a quick ...e5 or ...c5) 3 e3 g6 4 Qd3 Qg7 5 c3 Qf6 6 Qf3 0-0 7 0-0 Qc6 8 Qbd2 e5! ?. In Pinto-Galego, Lisbon 1999, Black’s strategy soon prevailed: 9 fxc5 dxe5 10 Qe4 cx4 11 exd4 Qxe4 12 Qxe4 Qxe4 13 Qg5 Qb6 14 Qc1 dxc3 15 Qe3 Qxb2 0-1.

3 Qd2 e5!?
4 fxe5 dxe5 5 ♗f3 e4 6 ♗e5 ♗f5 7 ♗f4 ♘d6 8 ♕d2 f6 9 ♗c4 ♘xf4 10 ♕xf4 ♗e7

Fakkel-De Hoop, Hengelo jr 1999. Black has better central pawns, and his development is OK.

Conclusion: 2 f4 is not a real move, and Black can easily get some advantage. This variation is just to illustrate some standard plans for Black.

B)

2 ♗f4 (D)

White is going to continue with the set-up ♗f3, e3, h3 and ♗h2.

2...g6

2...c5!? is possible, and scored a quick victory in the following example: 3 c3 exd4 4 cxd4 ♕b6 5 ♕d2 ♗c6 6 d5 ♘c5 7 e4 ♖f6 8 ♘c3 ♘d7 9 ♘c3 ♘d8 10 f4 ♗eg4 11 ♘d4 e5 12 fxe5? (12 dxe6!) 12...dxe5 13 ♘f2 ♘xf2 14 ♕xf2 ♘g4 15 ♕d2 ♘c5 16 ♘d1 ♕b6 17 a3? ♘xg1 0-1 Crea-Rossi, Bozen 1998.

3 ♗f3 ♘g7 4 e3

It should be mentioned, at least as a curious detail, that in a game Tella-Yrjölä, Tampere rpd 2001, just days before the deadline for this book, White tested this odd variation and the game soon developed an independent character: 4 h3 f5 5 ♘c3 ♗f6 6 e3 0-0 7 ♘d3 ♘c6 8 ♘h2 ♘h5 9 e4 f4 (9...fxe4!? 10 e5 dxe5 11 dxe5 ♘xe5 12 ♘xe5 ♘xe5 13 ♕e2 ♘g7 (Black could consider 13...�xc3+!?)) 14 0-0-0 and White had excellent compensation.

4...♗d7

Planning a quick ...e5, which gives Black a good game.

5 h3

5 c4 e5 6 ♘g3 ♗e7 7 h3 ♘f5 allows Black's pieces to get to very active squares; he might even be better: 8 ♘h2 0-0 (8...exd4!? 9 exd4 ♕f6 suggests itself, attacking the d4-pawn) 9 ♘c3 exd4 10 exd4 ♘h4 11 ♘xh4 ♕xh4 12 ♘b5 ♕e7+ 13 ♘e2 ♕f6 14 0-0 a6 = Alburt-Kavalek, USA Ch (Estes Park) 1986.

5...e5 6 ♘h2 (D)

6...♕e7
6...e4 7 Qf2 f5 is an active option; e.g., 8 c4 Qg6 9 Qc3 0-0 10 b4 We7 11 c5 d5 (11...dxc5!? 12 Qb3 c6 13 Qd6 Qd8 14 Qxf8 Qxf8 15 b5 Qe6 16 g3 Qd7 17 Bc1 Qd8 18 Wa4 Qd7 2 2 Sapis-Pribil, Marianske Lazne 1989. Black should, however, be careful about White's dark-squared bishop, as it is placed actively outside the pawn-chain.

7 e2 f5

7...Qg6 8 c4 0-0 9 Qc3 b6 10 0-0 Qb7 is a safe option; for example, 11 b4 Qe4 12 Qxe4 Qxe4 13 Qd2 Qb7 14 Qf3 e4! 15 Qe2 c5! 16 bxc5 dxc5 17 Qb3 Qad8 18 Qb1 exd4 19 exd4 f5 20 Qd2 g5 gave Black an attack in Ragnarsson-Hickl, Reykjavik 1997.

8 0-0 Qh6 9 c4 0-0 10 Qc3 c6 11 b4 g5! 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 c5 Qf7 14 Qb3 Qh8 15 Qad1 h5 16 Qc4 g4

Black is already better, Lenz-Szenetra, Baden-Baden 1990.

Conclusion: It is very hard to see the point of 2 Qf4, as it invites Black to play a quick and effective ...e5 advance, when it is often White who is fighting for equality.

C) 2 c3 (D)

This move is played quite often, usually transposing to other openings such as the Torre or Pirc. In the Pirc, lines with an early c3 are usually not very sharp, so Black should seriously consider transposing.

2...Qd7

Or:

a) 2...g6 3 Qg5 (3 e4 Qf6 4 Qd3 Qg7 5 Qf3 0-0 6 0-0 transposes to Line A of Chapter 25) 3...f5!? (3...Qg7 4 Qd2 Qf6 5 Qg3 Qbd7 6 e4 0-0, Bogza-Grigorieva, Bucharest 1999, transposes to a line of the Torre vs K1) 4 e3 (4 e4 Qxe4 5 Qd2 Qf6 6 Qf3 exf3 7 Qgxf3 Qg7 8 Qd3 0-0 9 0-0 c6 10 We1 Qa6 11 Wh4 Qc7 12 Qae1 Qf5 13 Qxf5 Qxf5 14 Qe2 Qd7 15 Qe1 Qae8 is unclear, Zurek-Jansa, Czech Ch 1993) 4...Qh6 5 Qc4 c6 6 Qd2 d5 reaches a sort of Stonewall Dutch position that is OK for Black; e.g., 7 Qb3 Qf7 8 Qh4 Qd7 9 c4 Qb6 10 cxd5 Qxd5 11 Qg3 Qg7 12 0-0-0 13 Qc4 Qc6 14 Qc1 a5 15 a4 Qa6 16 a3 Qb6 17 Qce5 1/2-1/2 Hraček-Jansa, Rimavska Sobota 1991.

b) 2...Qf6 3 Qf3 (3 Qg5 Qbd7 4 Qd2 e5 5 e4 Qc7 6 Qd3 gives Black the opportunity to play 6...d5! 7 Qxf6 Qxf6 8 exd5 exd4 9 We2+ We7 10 cxd4 Qxh4 11 Qxe7+ Qxe7 12 0-0-0 Qxf2 2 Hodgson-McNab, London WFW 1989) 3...Qbd7 4 Qg5 is best met by 4...e5, when a thematic set-up gave Black a safe position after 5 We2 Qc7 6 Qbd2 0-0 7 dxe5 dxe5 8 e4 Qg4! 9 Qxe7 Qxe7 10 Qc4 Qb6 11
\( \text{d3 a5 12 0-0 } \text{Qf6 = in Costa-Hodgson, San Bernardino 1989.} \)

3 \( \text{Af4} \)

3 \( \text{g5 h6} \) is OK for Black, but White should play 3 \( \text{e4!?} \), with a Pirc-type position.

3...e5 4 \( \text{Ag3 Qgf6} \) 5 e3 \( \text{Qe4} \) 6 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qxg3} \) 7 \( \text{hxg3} \)

Black has a bishop-pair and a stable position; he has solved his opening problems.

7...\( \text{g6} \) 8 \( \text{Qgf3} \) \( \text{Ag7} \) 9 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{We7} \) 10 0-0 0-0 11 a4 \( \text{Qe8} \) 12 a5 a6 13 \( \text{Qc2} \) c4 14 \( \text{Qh2} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 15 \( \text{Qfb1} \) h5!

Black has a slight advantage, Pöthig-Bialas, Bundesliga 1981/2.

**Conclusion:** 2 c3 gives White at best a quiet variation of the Pirc, where he has no real chances of an opening advantage.

D)

2 b3 \( (D) \)

\( \begin{array}{c}
\text{Diagram 1}
\end{array} \)

2...\( \text{e5!} \)

This is in keeping with the spirit of our repertoire.

2...\( \text{g6} \) 3 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{g7} \) leads to quiet positional play, with Black easily obtaining a normal playable position; for example, 4 \( \text{Qd2} \) (4 \( \text{Qf3} \) f5 5 e3 \( \text{Qf6} \) 6 \( \text{Qbd2} \) 0-0 is a form of Leningrad Dutch, and Black does best to continue in the Dutch spirit: 7 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 8 0-0 \( \text{Qh8} \) 9 a3 e5! 10 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 11 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qcx5} \) 12 \( \text{Qe2} \) c5 13 \( \text{Qb5} \) a6 14 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 15 \( \text{Qf3} \) d5 16 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 17 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) !) Koshy-Conquest, Dhaka 1995) 4...c5 5 e3 b6 6 \( \text{Qf3} \) d5 7 \( \text{b5}+ \)

4...\( \text{xd7} \) 8 \( \text{Qd3} \) (8 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 9 \( \text{Qxa8} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 10 \( \text{Qxa7} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) \( \text{\( \mp \)} \)) 8...\( \text{Qf6} \) 9 \( \text{Qxc5} \) bxc5 10 \( \text{Qc2} \) (10 \( \text{Qxf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 11 \( \text{Qxd5}\)

11 \( \text{Qxa8} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) ++ 10...0-0 11 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) with equality, Flohr-Brinckmann, Rogaška Slatina 1929.

3 \( \text{b2} \)

3 \( \text{dxe5} \) dx e5 4 \( \text{Qxd8} \) 5 \( \text{Qxd8} \) f6 is equal since White's bishop has no real role on b2.

3...\( \text{e6} \)

3...\( \text{xd4} \) !? 4 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 5 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) is an active approach for Black that gives him at least an equal position.

4 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{Qce7} \) 5 e4 f5 6 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 7 \( \text{Qf3} \) c6 8 \( \text{dxe6} \) \( \text{bxe6} \)

Black has more pawns in the centre, and White lacks coordination to get the initiative. Black has no problems.

9 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 10 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 11 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 12 0-0 0-0 \( \text{=} \)

\( \text{Mittelstiedt-Fernengel, Pocking 1996.} \)

**Conclusion:** 2 b3 is not a real threat to Black's opening plans.

E)

2 e3 \( (D) \)
This move is also very flexible, with possible transpositions to many different openings such as the Old Indian or some lines of the Dutch Defence.

2...d7

Or:

a) With 2...f5!? Black hopes to reach variations of the Dutch Defence where the move e3 might not be very useful; for example, 3 d3 (3 f4 g6 4 f3 g7 5 d3 f6 6 bd2 0-0 7 0-0 bd7 8 c3 h6 9 b3 h7 10 e1 e5 ½ N. Martinez-Xu Yaping, Istanbul wom OL 2000) 3.e5! 4 c3 d6 5 f3 c6 6 x3d2 c7 7 c4 xxe4 8 xc4 xe4 9 xxe4 d5 10 c2 exd4 11 xd4 xf6 12 xe3 we7 with equality, Ovezova-Adam, Szeged girls U-14 Wch 1994.

b) 2...e5!? is the standard way to get an ending. After 3 dxe5 dxe5 4 xd8+ xd8 the position is equal; for example, 5 f3 (5 c4 f6 6 c3 c6 7 d2 c7 8 0-0-0 d7 9 xge2 xce7 10 xg3 xb6 11 b3 d7 12 xce4 f5 13 a5 xg3 14 xg3 xce7 15 d2 xd8 = Simon-Bagirov, Germany 1996/7) 5..f6 6 x4 c6 7 0-0 x5 8 d1+ x7 9 dbd2 d7 10 xe4 x7 11 d2 x6 12 xc3 xb6 13 x3 f5 14 g3 x6½ Lisovik-Borsuk, Alushta 1992.

3 c4

3 f4!? e5 is good for Black.

3...e5 4 d3

After 4 f3 g6 Black gets a satisfactory game by continuing in King's Indian fashion with ...g7, ...gf6 and ...0-0.

4...gf6 5 f3 (D)

5...e7

5.c6 6 xc2 x7 7 0-0 0-0 transposes to a harmless variation of the Old Indian, with which Julian Hodgson has scored well. For example, 8 b1 x8 (8...e4 9 xd2 d5 10 b4 x8 11 b5 e5! 12 cxd5 cxd4 13 cxd4 xd6 14 xc4 xb6 15 xxd6 x6d6 16 xb3 xfd5 17 a3 x8 18 x6d5 x6d5 19 ac4 x6e6 is unclear, Kallai-Hodgson, French Ch 1999) 9 b4 xf8 10 b5 e4 11 bxc6 bxc6 12 x2 db8 13 c2 d5 14 a4 xbl 15 cxb1 wc7 16 c3 db6 17 a5 a4 18 xc3 a3 19 xa3 xe2 20 xex2 xg4 21 xg3
h5 with the initiative for Black, Veras-Hodgson, Lucerne Wch 1989.

6  \textit{d}3 0-0 7 0-0  \textit{e}8 8  \textit{e}2  \textit{f}8

8...h6 also leads to a quiet position:
9 h3 b6 10 dxe5 dxe5 11  \textit{d}1  \textit{b}7 12  \textit{f}5  \textit{xf}3 13  \textit{xf}3  \textit{d}6 14  \textit{e}4  \textit{e}7
15  \textit{xd}6  \textit{cxd}6 16  \textit{b}3  \textit{c}5 favours Black, Kolarov-Pirc, Gyula 1965.

9 b3  \textit{g}6

This position is similar to an Old Indian. Now 10  \textit{a}3? is a bad tactical mistake due to 10...e4! 11  \textit{xe}4  \textit{xe}4
12  \textit{xe}4  \textit{xe}4 (12...d5!) 13  \textit{xe}4  \textit{d}5
14  \textit{xd}5  \textit{c}6 15  \textit{g}5  \textit{xd}5 16  \textit{xd}5  \textit{xa}3, when Black has an advantage, Michenka-Vokač, Ceske Budejovice 1996.

**Conclusion:** After 2  \textit{e}3 there are many transpositional possibilities, although the quiet Old Indian-type positions are playable for Black.
When planning this book, one major discussion dealt with the repertoire choice against 1 d4 d6 2 e4 and 1 e4. We had three options: the normal Pirc (2...d6 3 c3 g6), the Czech system (2...d6 3 c3 c6) or the Modern (2...g6). The main line of the Czech (4 f4) seemed to us too dubious for Black although some of the sublines (especially 4 f3 g4) fit together with the repertoire very well. The Modern move-order 2...g6 3 c3 g7 gives Black additional weapons in some Pirc variations, especially against 4 c3 and 4 g5. However, Black has to take into consideration some additional options for White, especially 3 c4, which leads to either a King’s Indian or to some Modern line. There is an important psychological point not to allow a 1 d4 player to return to a 1 d4 opening after he has ‘gambled’ with 2 e4. However, there certainly do exist plenty of 1 d4 players who are quite confident in playing the Pirc with White. Eventually, partly because of Nunn’s recommendation, the more forcing Pirc was chosen. Only later did we recall that there is a fourth option, namely the endgame/Philidor variation with 2...d6 3 c3 e5 briefly discussed in Line B of Chapter 33, which fits well with our repertoire as a simple alternative to the Pirc. There may be players who feel uneasy with some complicated Pirc lines and players who find the Pirc too theoretical.

The Pirc Defence is a theoretically respected and positionally well-founded system with a lot of material to study. Our coverage here is therefore highly selective, since our primary aim has been just to provide Black with a viable repertoire. We have chosen only solid lines with tolerable practical results for Black. For those who require more detail, we can recommend the fairly recent book The Ultimate Pirc by Nunn and McNab. However, we do have plenty of new material compared with that book: new examples, original suggestions and even some variations that are not discussed there.

1 e4 d6 2 d4 d5 f3 3 c3 g6 (D)

Unfortunately, the Pirc is not always a perfect choice from the psychological point of view. In the diagram position (and a move earlier) White has a wide choice of variations and systems leading to quite a variety of position-types. White has a few choices with good chances to make a draw at will. There are also excellent chances for
White, with 4 \( \mathcal{g}g5 \) for instance, to make the game terribly difficult from either the positional or the tactical point of view.

In the Pirc there are historically two main lines: the Austrian Attack (4 f4) and the Classical Pirc, which features natural development by 4 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) and 5 \( \mathcal{L} e2 \). Although positionally very different, these are quite concrete lines with not so many chances for White to lead a well-prepared opponent into unknown territory right from the start.

This is why the popularity of the lines 4 \( \mathcal{L} e3 \) and 4 \( \mathcal{L} g5 \) is gradually increasing. Especially the former is a flexible move, retaining options of many different plans. The latter is probably more appealing than 4 f4 for an attacking player who wants to play for a win. 4 g3 followed by \( \mathcal{A} g2 \) and \( \mathcal{D} ge2 \) is a positional system, but it seems White has trouble getting anything if Black has done his homework well. The importance of the other 4th move alternatives is more marginal though the flank attack idea with 4 \( \mathcal{L} e2 \) and h4 seems to be quite popular beneath the top levels. Also, 4 \( \mathcal{L} c4 \) has a somewhat dubious reputation because the active c4-bishop tends to become exposed or blocked.

The third-move alternatives to 3 \( \mathcal{Q} c3 \), namely 3 \( \mathcal{L} d3 \) and 3 f3, should also be taken seriously. The latter is a useful weapon for a universal player who knows something about everything. Black has several options – but all of them can lead to position-types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Games</th>
<th>W's score</th>
<th>W's rating</th>
<th>W's Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 ( \mathcal{L} d3 )</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2335</td>
<td>2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f3</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2313</td>
<td>2356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 f4</td>
<td>4144</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>2384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ( \mathcal{D} f3 )</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>2394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ( \mathcal{L} e3 )</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2363</td>
<td>2419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ( \mathcal{L} g5 )</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2334</td>
<td>2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 g3</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>2410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ( \mathcal{L} e2 )</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2288</td>
<td>2335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from other openings. Against 3 \( \texttt{d3} \) Black is likely to get a comfortable positional fight with standard moves.

The table at the bottom of the preceding page gives statistics for White’s main lines.

The statistics provide some useful information but there is also some uncertainty because of the many transpositions between lines. It seems that 4 \( \texttt{e3} \) is the most effective of the main choices but the high performance is mainly caused by the fact that the natural response, 4...\( \texttt{g7} \), is not doing well. With our recommendation 4...\c6 Black has performed more acceptably. Besides, the badly performing 4 \texttt{f3} normally transposes to \texttt{e3} lines. We also see the practical value of 3 \texttt{f3}. Maybe Black is not always well prepared for such a move or maybe it is a good ploy to force a Pirc specialist to play something else. It must be noted that if we take statistics from the last five years, the performances don’t change much but 4 \( \texttt{e3} \) and 4 \( \texttt{g5} \) are close in popularity to 4 \texttt{f4} and 4 \( \texttt{f3} \). It is therefore logical to pay most attention to these four moves.

Most of the lines introduced here are also applicable with the Modern move-order. The Pirc/Modern is quite a popular opening in the hands of players who want to play for a win and who like pawn-chain strategies and manoeuvring. Some top players use the Pirc occasionally. There are also some players just below the world’s absolute elite who specialize (or have specialized) in the Pirc/Modern, such as Chernin, M.Gurevich, Azmaiparashvili and of course Nunn.
21 The Austrian Attack with 5...c5

Our choice against the Austrian Attack is 5...c5 (rather than 5...0-0). The theoretical and practical value of these two lines is about the same but the variation tree of 5...c5 is narrower and easier to control. For someone who really hates draws we can recommend 5...0-0 (not covered here) because there is a forced draw after 5...c5 (see the note to White’s 10th move in Line A) and some other lines lead to a drawish position. Black has a desperate attempt in Line A at move 8 to play for a win but strong nerves are needed. In Line B we have better chances for a fight, but this is White’s choice.

1 e4 d6 2 d4 Qf6 3 Qc3 g6 4 f4
g7 5 f3
5 e5 Qfd7! 6 Qf3 c5 transposes to note ‘b’ to White’s 6th move.

5...c5 (D)

This is our recommendation. The main alternative is 5...0-0, which demands even more hours with the theory books.

Now (after 5...c5):

A: 6 Qb5+ 169
B: 6 dxc5 172

The alternatives don’t promise White much:

a) The Benoni-type system 6 d5 0-0 7 Qd3 (7 Qc4?! allows the typical trick 7...b5! 8 Qxb5 Qxe4 9 Qxe4 Qa5+ 10 Qc3 Qxc3+ 11 bxc3 Qxb5, which is fine for Black) 7...e6 8 0-0 (8 dxe6 Qxe6 9 0-0 Qc6 is OK for Black) 8...exd5 9 exd5 Qa6 = doesn’t offer White much because of the trick 10 f5 c4! 11 Qxc4 Qxf5.

b) 6 e5 Qfd7! 7 exd6 (with 7 e6 fxe6 8 Qg5 Qf6 9 dxc5 0-0 10 Qc4 d5 White has destroyed his own centre but 7 dxc5 dxe5 8 fxe5 Qxe5 9 Qxd8+ Qxd8 10 Qxe5 Qxe5 11 Qc4 Qe6!? 12 Qxe6 Qxc3+ 13 bxc3 fxe6 leads to an interesting unclear ending, Velimirović-Vujadinović, Niš 1994) 7...0-0 8 Qe3 (8 dxe7 Qxe7+ 9 Qe2 Qd8 is risky for White) 8...exd6 9 Qd2 Qe6
10 0-0-0 ♔a5 11 ♔b1 ♔c6 gives Black at least equality. 12 h3 and now:
  b1) 12...♕e6!? 13 a3 (13 d5 ♔b4 14 ♔c4 ♔f5 =) 13...♕fc8 looks interesting, because 14 d5? ♔xd5 doesn’t work.
  b2) 12...♗b8 13 dxc5 dxc5 14 ♔d5 ♔xd5 15 ♔xa5 ♔xa5 16 ♔xd5 b6 17 ♔e5 ½–½ V.Fedorov-Manion, Philadelphia 1992.

A)

6 ♔b5+ ♔d7 (D)

7 e5

Here the alternative for White is another Benoni-style continuation, 7 ♔xd7+ ♔fxd7 8 d5, but Black immediately achieves the ideal Benoni move 8...b5!. Then:

a) White cannot hope much with 9 ♔xb5 ♔a5+ 10 ♔c3 ♔xc3+ 11 bxc3 ♔xc3+ 12 ♔d2 ♔c4 13 ♔e2 ♔b6 14 a4 a5 15 ♔xc4 ♔xc4 16 ♔c3 0-0 17 ♔e2 ♔d7 18 ♔d2 ♔c6 19 g4 e6 = Rötsagov-Agresti, Stockholm 1997.

b) 9 0-0 b4 10 ♔e2 ♔b6 11 f5!? (11 ♔g3 ♔d8d7 12 ♔e2 ♔c7 is equal)

11...♔d8d7 12 ♔f4 ♔f6! (stopping ♔g5)
13 ♔e2 ♔c7 14 a3 a5 = D.Popescu-G.Popescu, Bucharest 1993.

C) 9 ♔e2 b4 10 ♔d1 ♔b6 11 0-0 0-0 12 ♔f2 (12 c4?!?) 12...♕c8 13 ♔e1?!
(13 f5 ♔a6 14 ♔cl offers White better counterplay according to Shirov) 13...a5 14 ♔b1 e6?! (14...♔d7 is good for Black) 15 c4 bxc3 16 bxc3 ± Shirov-Beliavsky, Madrid 1997.

White has scored very well in practice with 7 ♔xd7+ but theoretically it doesn’t look dangerous.

7...♕g4 8 e6

White has two important alternatives:

a) 8 ♔xd7+ (solid but rather drawish) 8...♕xd7 9 d5 dxe5 10 h3 e4 (D) and then:

11 h×g4!? (relatively unpopular) 11...exf3 12 ♔xf3 ♔a6 13 ♔d2 ♔b4?! 14 0-0-0 0-0-0 15 ♔e4 and now Black should play 15...♔b5 (not 15...♔xa2+? 16 ♔b1 ♔b5 17 ♔a3 ♔b4 18 ♔xc5 ±) according to Nunn. After 16 ♔b3, 16...♔xd5 seems to be tactically justified.
a2) 11...Qxe4 Qf6 is the main line:
   a21) 12 Qe5 Wa4 (12...Wc7) 13 Qxf6+ Qxf6 14 0-0 Qd7 =.
   a22) 12 Qxc5 Wxd5 13 Wxd5 Qxd5
        14 Qxb7 Qe6 gives Black nice compensation, for example, 15 0-0 Bb8 16
        Qc5 Qxb2 =.
   a23) 12 Qxf6+ Qxf6 13 0-0 0-0 and then:
        a231) 14 c4 e6 (or 14...Wd6 15 f5
               Qd7 16 Qh6 Qd8 17 fxg6 hxg6 18
               Qe2 b5 =) 15 Qe5 Wd6 16 Qb3 b6 17
               Qg4 Qg7 18 Wf3 (18 Qe3 =) 18...f5 19
               Qe5 Qd7 20 Qc6 Qfe8 21 Qd1 Qf6 ½
               Cuijpers-Van der Sterren, Dutch Ch
               (Hilversum) 1983.
        a232) After 14 Qe5 Wd6 15 c4!
               (15 Qe3 Qd7) 15...Qd7 16 Qg4 Qd4+
               17 Qe3 Qxe3+ 18 Qxe3, Dvoretsky
               gives 18...f5! = as a solid equalizer.
        a233) 14 Qe3 Qxb2 (less reliable
               looks 14...Qa6 15 Qe5 Wd6 16 Qg4
               Qxb2 17 Qbl Qg7 18 f5 with good
               attacking chances for White. Yusupov-
               Hort, Bundesliga 1993/4) 15 Qbl Qg7
               16 Qxe5 Qd8 17 c4 (after 17 Qe5
               Qc7 18 Qa3 Black has the nice move
               18...Qc6!; for example, 19 Qf3 Qd4
               20 Wd4 Qf5 21 Qb3 Qa8 ½ Liss-
               Chernin, Rishon le Zion 1994; 17 Qel
               Qxd5 18 Qxe7 Qxd1 =) 17...Wc7 18
               Qd4 Wxc4 19 Qxg7 Qxg7 20 Qxb7
               Qxd5 21 Qxd5 Qxd5 22 Qxe7 (22 Qcl
               Qd7 23 Qc7 Qc5 24 Qxa7 Qxa7 25
               Qxa7 Qd3 = Gara-Zimmerman, Bud-
               dapest 1994) 22...Qc6 23 Qc7 Qd8
               with equality, Acs-Chernin, Hungarian
               Ch 1999.
   b) 8 h3 Qxb5 (8...cxd4 9 Qxd4
      Qh6 10 g4 Qxb5 11 Qxb5 0-0 is also
      very complicated) 9 Qxb5 (9 hxg4
      dxe5 10 Qxb5 transposes to line 'b2')
      9...dxe5 (D) is highly unclear:

   b1) 10 Wc2 is unconvincing: 10...e4
       11 Qe5 (11 hxg4 exf3 12 Wxf3 Qd7
       =) 11...Qf6 12 Qc4 0-0 13 dxe5?! (13
       Wxe5 may be better, although Black's
       position looks active) 13...Qc6! 14
       Qxc6 Qxc6 15 Qe3 e5! 16 fxe5 Qh5
       17 0-0 Qxe5 with a slight advantage
       for Black. Bednar-Zimmerman, Kom-
       arno 1997.
   b2) 10 hxg4 Wd5+ is the main line.
      White has three options, two of which
      look slightly suspect:
      b21) 11 Qd2 Qxb5 12 dxe5 Wxb2
      13 Qbl Wxa2 14 Qxb7 Wd5! (Black is
      a little better due to his strong central-
      ized queen) 15 Wb1 0-0 (15...Qc6?!
      16 Qc7? 0-0 ½ Antal-Zimmerman,
      Budapest 1996) 16 Qb3 c4 (why not
      16...Wxb3 17 exb3 Qc6 =?) 17 Qb5
      Wd4+ 18 Qf2 c3?! 19 Qxc3 Wxf4 20
      Qxe7 with a complex position, Grosar-
      b22) 11 Qf2 c4 12 Wc1 (12 Qg5?!
      Wxb5 13 dxc5 Qa6 14 Qxe4 Qxc5 =)
      12...Wxb5 13 Qxe4 Qd7 14 Qe1 0-0 is
unclear though Black apparently has a safer king. Sathe-Hennigan, British Ch (Swansea) 1987.

b23) 11 c3 is probably the strongest: 11...e4 12 wxe2 exf3 13 d6+ (13 gxf3 cxd4 14 d6+ f8 b) Belikov-Kubanov, St Petersburg 1993) 13...d7
14 xb7 w6 15 xf3 cxd4 is very hard to evaluate. V.Fedorov-Ma.Tsettlin, USSR 1977 continued 16 w5+ c7 (16...c8) 17 xf7 xb7 18
xg7 wxg7 2 19 e5+ h7 20 f1 (20 xe7+) 20...c6 21 b5+ c7 and Black could be quite happy.

8...fxe6

If Black really has to play for a win, there is the line 8...xb5 9 exf7+ d7
10 xb5 w5+ 11 c3 h5 (or 11...cxd4
12 xd4 h5) 12 h3 cxd4 13 xd4
e6 14 de2 (14 f3!?) h6 15 0-0
xc3 16 bxc3 is unclear) 14...h6 15
e3 f8!? 16 d3 f5 17 f2 xf7 18 0-0-0!?! (18 0-0) 18...h4, Oll-Gurevich, Tallinn 1987, but of course Black
has to be very careful in such a high-risk position. This line has been rather unpopular in recent years.

9 g5 xb5 (D)

10 xb5

In the line 10 x66 x4 11 xb5
(11 xd8 f2+ 12 d2 e3+ is a
well-known forced draw) 11...w5+ 12 d3 (12 c3 f2+ 13 d2 e3+ 14
e2 w4+ 15 e1 e4+ 16 w2
xe2+ 17 xc2 d7 18 ec7 a6 19
xa8 axb5 20 a4 bxa4 21 xa4 c6 is
much better for Black, Lange-Pahtz, Dresden 1988) 12...f2+ 13 d1
e3+ 14 e2 xb5+ 15 xf2 d4+ 16
g3 e7 17 d5 (Dlugy gives 17
e6 h6 18 h3 c6 19 h2 d5 20 c3
e8 f defending successfully)
17...f6 18 xc5+ e8 19 xb7
xb7 20 xb7 a5 f the knight gets
into trouble.

10...w5+ 11 c3 xb5 12 x66
12 xg4 cxd4 13 x66 ec4 transposes to the main line.

12...wc4

The more natural move 12...a6!? is a little risky in view of 13 xg7+
f7 14 e6 (14 xg4 xg7 15 e3!!
xb2 16 0-0 xc3 17 eel xh8 18
h4! also gives White an initiative for the
sacrificed material) 14...xe6 15
xg4+ f7 16 c3 xb2 17 0-0
xc3 18 eael with a strong initiative
for White (Nunn and McNab).

13 xg4 cxd4 (D)

14 xg7+

14 f5 f6 15 xg6 g8 16 g7 c6!
17 c7+ d8 18 e6+ (the alternative
18 xa8 xg7 19 e4 e5 is too risky for White) 18...e8 = Shirov-Khalifman, Groningen 1990, is another
practically forced draw.

14...f7 15 f5

The ending after 15 f5 e6+ 16
c3 dx3 17 xe6+ xe6 18 xc3 is
quite pleasant for Black, who has an active king.

15...\textit{\texttt{xg7}} 16 \textit{\texttt{Wh4 \texttt{Cc6}}}

Now:

a) 17 \textit{\texttt{Wf1?! \texttt{Whf8?! \texttt{Wh6+ \texttt{h8 \texttt{Whxf8 \texttt{exf8 20 0-0-gxf5 21 \texttt{b1 \texttt{b5 gives Black good compensation for the exchange, Beliavsky-Hodgson, Belgrade 1993. }}}}}}}}

b) Hodgson's suggestion 17 \textit{\texttt{Ah6+}} is untested. Then:

b1) 17...\textit{\texttt{g8?! \texttt{e4! (18 \texttt{Wf1 b5 19 0-0-dxc3 20 f6! is interesting) is good for White given that the natural 18...\texttt{gxf5?! \texttt{Wxf5 dxc3 loses to 20 \texttt{Wf1! \texttt{Wh4+ 21 \texttt{Wf2 \texttt{Wf6 22 \texttt{Wd5+ e6 23 \texttt{Wxf6 exd5 24 0-0-0. }}}}}}}}}}}

b2) 17...\textit{\texttt{f7?! \texttt{Wf1 \texttt{Wc8 19 f6 \texttt{e6+ 20 \texttt{d1 dxc3 21 f7+ \texttt{d7 is a suggestion by Nunn and McNab, which gives Black compensation in the form of his safer king.}}}}}}}

\textbf{Conclusion}: All the lines are probably OK for Black but there is a lot of theory to study here. For some players it might be a problem that White can take a draw in this line if he wants.

This is the more positional choice, if anything can be described as positional in the Austrian Attack.

6...\textit{\texttt{a5 7 \texttt{d3}}}

Or:

a) The endgame after 7 \textit{\texttt{d3 \texttt{xc5 8 \texttt{e3 \texttt{a5 9 \texttt{b5+ \texttt{xb5 10 \texttt{xb5 (10 \texttt{xb5+ \texttt{c6 =) 10...\texttt{a6 11 d3 0-0 is not dangerous because 12 \texttt{xa7 \texttt{h5 13 \texttt{c3 \texttt{xb2 14 \texttt{bl \texttt{g7 offers Black at least equality, A.Sokolov-M.Gurevich, USSR Ch (Riga) 1985.}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}

b) Equally tame is 7 \textit{\texttt{b5+ \texttt{d7 8 \texttt{xd7+ \texttt{dxd7 9 0-0 \texttt{xc5+ 10 \texttt{h1 0-0, with an easy life for Black.}}}}}}}

7...\textit{\texttt{xc5 8 \texttt{e2 \texttt{g4 9 \texttt{e3 \texttt{a5 10 0-0 \texttt{c6 11 h3}}}}}}}

White has some alternative ideas instead of this obvious-looking move:

a) The committal 11 \textit{\texttt{a3 0-0 12 b4?! (12 h3 \texttt{xf3 13 \texttt{xf3 transposes to the main line; in Kuznetsova-M.Gurevich, Cappelle la Grande 2001 Black generated counterplay in an instructive way: 12 \texttt{ab1 \texttt{d7 13 b4 \texttt{d8 14}}}}}}}}

\textit{\texttt{}}
b2) 12 a3 Qd7 13 We1 Qc5 14 f5?! (sounder is 14 h3 Qxd3 15 cxd3 Qd7 =) 14...Qxd3 15 cxd3 gxf5 16 Qg3?! (16 Wh4?! f4! 17 Qxf4 Wh5 £ Kasimdzhanov) 16...fxe4 17 dxe4 (17 Wxg4 f5) 17...h5? (Kasimdzhanov gives 17...Wh5! 18 Qd5 Qd7 19 h3 Qg6 20 Wh4 f5?! 18 b4 Wh8 19 b5 Qg6 20 bxc6 Qxc6 21 ecx7 Qb8 with complicated play, Kotsur-Kasimdzhanov, Istanbul OL 2000.

b2) 12 We1 Qac8 (12...Qb4!? 13 h3 Qxd3 14 cxd3 Qd7 certainly looks playable) and now:

b21) There is little point in 13 a3 Qfd8 14 h3 (14 Qd2?!?) 14...Qxf3 15 Qxf3 e6! 16 Qgl Qe8 17 Qd1?! (according to Ribli 17 Qaf1 Qxc3 18 bxc3 Qxc3 19 f5, with compensation, is more critical) 17...d5! 18 e5 f5 19 exf6 Qxf6 £ Glek-Ribli, Bundesliga 1996/7.

b22) 13 Qd2 intending to trap the bishop with f5 seems to force a retreat:

b221) 13...Qe6! 14 f5 Qd7 15 Qc4 Qd8 16 Wh4?! (Mortensen’s suggestion 16 a4 stops the most obvious counterplay) 16...h5! 17 Qxb5 Qb4 18 Qxa7 Qxc4 19 Qxc4 Qxc2 with a messy position, Mortensen-Cu.Hansen, Espoo Z 1989.

b222) 13...Qd7 14 Qb3 Qd8 15 a4! (15 Wh4 Qg4 16 Qgl f5 17 Rae1 e6 = Agnos-McNab, London Lloyds Bank 1990) 15...Qe6 (or 15...Qb4 16 Qxa7) 16 Qd4 Qxd4 17 Qxd4 a6 18 f5 Qc4 19 a5 Qd7 20 Qxg7 Qxg7 (Mortensen-Sokolovs, Copenhagen 1997) and according to Mortensen White should play 21 Rae4! Qxd3 22 cxd3 Qc5 23 Qd4 Qb3 24 Qb4 Qxa5 25 Qd5 with attacking chances, but this all looks rather complicated and unclear.

c) A very similar idea is 11 We1 0-0 12 Qd2 (12 Quh1 transposes to line “b2”), and now:

c1) 12...Qb4!? 13 Qb3 Qd8 (Black could consider 13...Wh5!?) 14 f5 is risky because the bishop is in trouble.

c2) 12...Qd7 13 Qb3 Qd8 and now:

c21) 14 Wh1?! Qg4?! (14...Qb4 should be OK) 15 Qgl f5 16 exf5 gxf5 17 Qc4+ Wh8 18 Qd1 ± M. Andersson-Burwick, Stockholm 1998.

c22) 14 h3 Qb4 15 Wh2 b5! 16 a3 Qxd3 17 cxd3 Wb8! 18 d4 b4 19 axb4 Wxb4 20 Qc1 Qc6 was fine for Black in Mortensen-Yrjölä, Espoo Z 1989.

11...Qxf3 12 Qxf3 0-0 13 a3 Qd7 14 Qd2 (D)
14...\textit{\textit{W}d8}

This is the current trend, and is favoured especially by Chernin. The plan is to continue with solid moves like ...\textit{e}6, ...\textit{Ec}8, ...\textit{a}6 and ...\textit{b}5, and to wait for White to commit himself with some active move like \textit{f}5. However, there doesn’t seem to be anything wrong with the old line 14...\textit{W}b6+ 15 \textit{\textit{h}1 Ec}5 16 \textit{\textit{ab}1 x}d3 17 \textit{\textit{c}xd3 f}5! 18 \textit{g}4 \textit{e}6. After, for example, 19 \textit{g}xf5!? \textit{exf}5 20 \textit{\textit{ad}5 W}d8 21 \textit{\textit{c}3 Ec}7 22 \textit{e}5!? \textit{dxc}5 23 \textit{x}c5+ \textit{\textit{W}xc}7 24 \textit{\textit{b}4 Wf}7 25 \textit{x}f8 \textit{\textit{Wxf}8 26 fxe}5 \textit{\textit{Exe}5 Black has sufficient compensation, Glek-Chernin, Neu Isenben 1991.

15 \textit{\textit{h}1}

15 \textit{\textit{a}e1} \textit{e}6 16 \textit{\textit{W}h1 Ec}8 17 \textit{f}5 \textit{a}6 18 \textit{\textit{W}g}3 \textit{\textit{Ec}5 19 \textit{\textit{f}4 Wf}6 20 \textit{\textit{Exe}5 Exe}5\textit{21 \textit{\textit{De}2 Dh}5 22 \textit{\textit{E}3 W}h4 23 \textit{\textit{gl} Fe}8 = Fierz-M. Gurevich, Cappelle la Grande 2001.

15...\textit{e}6

Now:

a) 16 \textit{\textit{W}g}3 \textit{a}6 17 \textit{\textit{f}5 \textit{\textit{E}5 18 \textit{\textit{f}4 W}f}6! 19 \textit{\textit{Exe}5 Exe}5 (the position is very similar to the note to White’s 15th move; Black has at least equalized thanks to his dominant knight) 20 \textit{Wh}4 \textit{Gg}7 21 \textit{\textit{De}2 h}6! 22 \textit{\textit{D}d}4 exf5 23 exf5 \textit{g}5 \textit{Van der Poel-Chernin, San Bernardino 1994.

b) After the slightly illogical move 16 \textit{\textit{E}c}4, Black has many attractive options: 16...\textit{\textit{D}d}4!? (the two alternatives 16...\textit{a}6 17 \textit{\textit{a}2 \textit{W}c}7 18 \textit{\textit{ad}1 \textit{b}5 19 \textit{\textit{E}c}1 \textit{\textit{D}b}6 20 \textit{\textit{D}d}3 \textit{\textit{ad}8 = Armaso-

\textit{\textit{I}kr}istiansen, Gausdal Z 1987 and 16...\textit{Ec}8 look solid enough) 17 \textit{\textit{Wd}1 (17 \textit{\textit{W}f}2!? \textit{\textit{xc}2 18 \textit{Ec}1 \textit{\textit{D}d}4 19 \textit{\textit{Ec}6 20 \textit{\textit{fd}1 gives White compensation) 17...d}5! 18 \textit{exd}5 \textit{\textit{D}b}6 19 \textit{\textit{a}2}!\textit{19 \textit{\textit{d}3 \textit{Dxd}5 = 19...\textit{exd}5 20 \textit{\textit{Ec}2 \textit{\textit{D}f}5 \textit{\textit{f}5 \textit{Campora-Chernin, San Bernardi-

\textit{\textit{n}o 1991.

c) 16 \textit{f}5 most likely offers Black the \textit{e}5-square prematurely.

d) 16 \textit{g}4 is more logical but untested. Maybe White has time to do something useful before playing \textit{f}5.

\textbf{Conclusion}: Here White has better chances for fighting for an advantage than in Line A but in practice Black has done OK and theoretically there are no lines that are terribly frightening.
22 The Classical Pirc with 6...\texttt{g}4

1 e4 d6 2 d4 \texttt{d}f6 3 \texttt{c}c3 g6 4 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{g}7 5 \texttt{e}2 0-0 6 0-0 \texttt{g}4 (D)

White has better chances to create some opening problems for Black.

We have chosen to recommend this reliable move instead of 6...c6, which is more unclear in nature. We believe that the line 6...\texttt{c}c6 7 \texttt{d}5 \texttt{b}8 is not to everyone’s taste, and the same comment applies to the Schmid Benoni, which arises after 6...c5 7 \texttt{d}5.

Now:
A: 7 \texttt{e}3 176
B: 7 \texttt{h}3 182

The former is the most popular move, but it seems at the moment that White is struggling to find anything promising at all. An important new discovery is the solidity of the move 8...\texttt{b}8 in Line A2. In Line B, White has several other possibilities:

a) 7 \texttt{g}5 is not very popular. The play after 7...\texttt{c}c6 resembles Line A:
   a1) 8 h3 \texttt{d}f3 9 \texttt{d}f3 h6 10 \texttt{e}e3 e5 11 dxe5 dxe5 12 \texttt{c}c2 \texttt{h}7 (12...\texttt{w}e7 13 c3 \texttt{f}d8!? 14 \texttt{w}a4 \texttt{d}7 15 \texttt{a}d1 \texttt{b}6 16 \texttt{w}c2 \texttt{h}7 17 b3 \texttt{f}6 18 \texttt{c}c1 \texttt{g}5 19 \texttt{b}2 was very close to equality in Vuković-Bogdanovsky, Nikšić 1992) 13 g3 \texttt{g}5 14 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{e}6 15 c3 a5 16 \texttt{w}d8 \texttt{f}xd8 17 \texttt{a}d1 \texttt{f}8 = Abramović-Todorčević, Yugoslav Ch 1993.

   a2) The other option is 8 \texttt{w}d2 e5 (8...\texttt{d}d7 9 \texttt{d}d5 \texttt{f}6 is also playable):

   a21) 9 dxe5 dxe5 and then:

   a211) 10 \texttt{a}ad1 \texttt{xf}3 11 \texttt{xf}3 \texttt{d}d4 12 \texttt{w}e3 1/2-1/2 Kavalek-Benko, USA Ch (Oberlin) 1975.

   a212) 10 \texttt{w}d8 \texttt{ax}d8 11 \texttt{xf}6 \texttt{xf}6 12 \texttt{d}d5 \texttt{g}7 13 \texttt{xc}7 \texttt{xf}3 14 \texttt{xf}3 \texttt{w}d2 15 \texttt{a}acl \texttt{d}d4 16 \texttt{f}d1?!

   (16 \texttt{d}d5) 16...\texttt{xd}1+ 17 \texttt{xd}1 \texttt{h}6 18 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{xc}2 gave Black active play in Salai-Novak, Slovakian Ch (Bardejov) 1981.

   a22) 9 d5 \texttt{c}7 10 \texttt{a}ad1 \texttt{h}8!? 11 \texttt{d}e1 \texttt{d}7 12 \texttt{h}6 \texttt{eg}8 13 \texttt{x}g7+


\( \text{b1) After 8 d5 Black can use the offered b4-square: 8...\text{b8}! 9 \text{a5, and now:}
\)

b11) 9...c6 10 a6 (10 \text{a4?! } \text{a6}
11 dxc6 \text{dxc6} 12 \text{exb7 b8} 13 a6 may be dangerous for Black) 10...bxa6 11
\text{dxc6 dxc6} 12 \text{a6} \text{b4} 13 \text{a4 a5}
14 \text{b4 d7} 15 \text{a3 wb8} = \text{Belavsky-Speelman, Linares 1992.}

b12) 9...\text{d7}, not allowing \text{a4},
is better according to Speelman. Moro-
ovic-Chernin, Buenos Aires 1992
continued 10 a6 bxa6 11 \text{xaxa6 bxa6}
12 \text{c6} 13 \text{e3 wc8} 14 \text{a1 wb7} 15 \text{a2 xc4 (15...fb8!)} 16
\text{xc4 exd5} 17 \text{xd6 exd6 } 1/2-1/2.

b2) 8 a5 looks more logical. It is hard to say whether Black should now block White's a-pawn:

b21) 8...a6 (very natural) 9 \text{e3 (9
d5 \text{a7} 10 b3 d7} 11 \text{e1} 12 \text{dxe6}
\text{xe6} 13 \text{f1 e8} 14 \text{f4 d7 =
Benjamin-Chernin, New York Open 1997) 9...e5 10 d5 \text{e7} 11 \text{d2 and here:}

b211) 11...d7 12 \text{a4 a4} 13
\text{c4 d7} 14 b4 (Glek gives 14 c4 e5
15 b4 \pm) 14...f5 15 f3 \text{f7} 16 c4 (ac-
\text{cording to Glek, 16 g4! \text{f8} 17 h4 is}
\text{stronger}) 16...\text{f8} 17 c5 \text{h6 is un-
\text{clear, Glek-Gurevich, Vlissingen 1997.}
This is not such a bad King's Indian,
though White's queenside pawns look
\text{threatening.}

b212) Perhaps better is 11...\text{xe2}
12 \text{xe2 d7} 13 \text{a4 h5} 14 c4 f5
15 f3 \text{xe4?!} 16 \text{xe4 f5} 17 g3 \text{f7}
18 \text{f2 h6} 19 \text{f3} (19 \text{h1 is un-
\text{clear}) 19...\text{f8 with counterplay since}
f3 is weak, Palac-Lechtynsky, Rimavs-
ska Sobota 1990.

b22) 8...e5 (allowing White to play
\text{a6}) 9 d5 \text{e7} 10 a6 b6 and then:

b221) 11 \text{g5 h6 12 \text{xf6 f6}
13 \text{d1 d7} 14 \text{g4 e8} 15 \text{d3}
\text{d7} 16 \text{b4 f5 = Benjamin-Gufeld,
Honolulu 1998.}

b222) 11 \text{d1 d7} 12 \text{d3 e6?!}
13 dxc6 \text{xc6} 14 \text{f3 c8 (better is}
14...\text{xe4!} 15 \text{xe4 d5 =) 15 \text{b4}
\text{a8} 16 \text{d3} = \text{Wolff-Manion, Phila-
delphia 1994.}

A)

7 \text{e3 c6 (D)}

Now:

A1: 8 \text{d2} 177

A2: 8 d5 180

There are a few alternatives:
a) 8 h3 \( \text{xf3} \) 9 \( \text{xf3} \) transposes to note 'b' to White's 9th move in Line B.

b) 8 \( \text{d2} \) (a rather unambitious move) 8...\( \text{xe2} \) 9 \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{d7} \) (9...e5)
10 \( \text{b3} \) e5 11 d5 d7 12 \( \text{ad1} \) h8
13 \( \text{a5} \) c8 14 b4 f5 15 f3 g8 = Rozentalis-Lugovoi, Neum ECC 2000.

c) The clumsy-looking 8 \( \text{d3} \) allows Black to equalize easily with 8...e5 9 d5 d7:

  c1) 10 h3?! \( \text{c8} \) 11 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d7} \) 12 \( \text{e4} \) f5 gave Black rapid counterplay in Gligorić-Nunn, Baden 1980.

  c2) 10 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{h5} \)? 11 b1 \( \text{f4} \) 12 \( \text{xf4} \) exf4 13 c3 \( \text{xf3} \) 14 \( \text{xf3} \) g5 15 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g6} \) = Sulskis-J.Schmidt, Germany 1995/6. Black has a nice grip on the e5-square.

  c3) 10 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 11 \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 12 \( \text{g5} \) c6?! 13 h3 \( \text{f6} \) 14 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) = Gligorić-Azmaiparashvili, Erevan 1989.

A1)

8 \( \text{d2} \)

This is the most natural move.

8...e5 (D)

9 d5

The conclusion has been reached that there is not much life in the line 9 dxe5 dxe5 10 \( \text{ad1} \) c8 11 c1 (11 h3 \( \text{d8} \) 12 c1 \( \text{xf3} \) 13 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{d4} = \) 14 \( \text{xd4} \) exd4 15 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 16 exd5 \( \text{d7} \) 17 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{b5} \) and Black even possesses a slight initiative, Britton-Lawton, London 1984) 11...d8 12 \( \text{xd8} \) and now both recaptures are OK:

a) The most popular 'equalizer' has been 12...\( \text{xd8} \) 13 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{f8} \) 14 h3 \( \text{xf3} \) 15 \( \text{xf3} \) h5 with the plan of ...\( \text{h7} \) and ...\( \text{h6} \). However, the position is far from dead as yet. The logical continuation is 16 \( \text{b5} \) e8 17 c3 \( \text{h7} \) 18 \( \text{a3} \) (18 g4!?) 18...\( \text{h6} \) 19 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 20 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{d8} \) 21 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{e8} \) with a very slight initiative for White, Motwani-Emms, British Ch (Edinburgh) 1985.

b) 12...\( \text{xe4} \) is a good plan since e6 is an ideal square for the knight. Now:

  b1) After 13 h3 \( \text{xf3} \) 14 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 15 \( \text{d1} \) (1/2–1/2, Varga-C.Horvath, Budapest 1994) 15...\( \text{c6} \) the solid nature of the position and strong knight on e6 compensate for the bishop-pair. In
Kaidanov-Wolff, Hastings Masters 1990. Black even got slight plus after 16...e2 c7 17 c3 a5 18 c2 d8 19 g4 hxg4 20 hxg4 d5.

b2) 13 d1 e6 = 14 dxe5 (a draw was agreed here in the game Atalik-McNab, Moscow OL 1994) 14...e2 15 e2 e4 16 d3 e8 is very drawish since neither side has any weaknesses.

9...e7 10 aad1 (D)

The main idea of this move is to stop Black playing ...e6. Experience has shown that allowing this gives Black good counterplay:

a) 10 h3?! d7 11 h2 c6! (better than 11...dxe4 12 dxe4 f5 13 f3 ±) 12 dxc6 e6 13 f3 d5! 14 c5 e8 15 e7 e7 16 xd5 d5 17 exd5 e4 18 e2 xd5 with a slight advantage for Black, Kobaliya-Gubanov, St Petersburg 1995.

b) 10 ael?! e2 11 e2 c6! 12 dxc6 bxc6 13 d1 d5 14 c5 e8 15 d3 c7 16 a3 aad8, Vokač-Jansa, Czechoslovak Ch 1986.

10...d7

10...b5?! was popular after Azmai-parashvili beat Karpov with Black, but it has been considered dubious because of 11 a3 (or the immediate 11 xb5) 11...a5 12 xb5 (12 b4 axb4 13 axb4 a3 14 g5 e3 15 xf6 e3 16 xf3 e3 17 xg7 e7 = Karpov-Azmai-parashvili, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1983) 12...xf3 (12...e4 13 e4 f5 14 e5 ±) 13 xf3 h5 14 h1 f5 15 g5 f6 16 g1 xg5 17 xg5 d7 18 xh4 ± Enders-Buchal, German Ch (Binz) 1995. However, the practical results have been good for Black since not many players dare to take the pawn.

11 eel

After 11 h6 Black has several options including 11...e6 (other possibilities are 11...h5, 11...e8 and 11...e8) 12 xh6 e8 13 e1 e8, and then:

a) 14 w2 e7 15 f4 exf4 16 xf4 e8 17 d4 e5 18 f2 (Planinc-Ree, Wijk aan Zee 1974) 18...e7 19 d3 e7 =.

b) 14 w3 e7 15 f4 exf4 16 xf4 ee8 17 d4 e5 18 f2 = threatening to occupy e5 with the knight, Degerman-Kaiszauri, Stockholm Rilton Cup 1980.

In this type of closed position it is not usually logical for White to exchange the dark-squared bishops.

11...b5! (D)

In this position the ...b5 advance, coupled with the plan of...b8, aad8 and ...c6, has been considered sound for Black.

12 a3

White has also tried:
This typical plan of counterplay is sometimes prepared with ...\( \text{\textit{a}d8} \). Here, however, 14...\( \text{\textit{a}d8} \) is met by 15 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{axb4} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{b}xb4} \) \( \text{\textit{a}xa3} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{h}a1} \) \( \text{\textit{x}a1} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{x}a1} \), when Black’s counterplay has been prevented at the cost of a pawn, Kuczynski-Cherinin, Polanica Zdroj 1992.

15 \( \text{dxc6} \) \( \text{\textit{x}c6} \) 16 \( \text{b}4 \)

Or:

a) 16 \( \text{\textit{f}2} \)? \( \text{\textit{d}8} \) transposes to note ‘a’ to White’s 12th move.

b) The idea 16 \( \text{\textit{h}6} \) \( \text{\textit{b}4} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{x}g7} \) \( \text{xg7} \) 18 \( \text{axb4} \) \( \text{axb4} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{b}1} \) \( \text{\textit{b}6} \) + 20 \( \text{\textit{h}1} \) \( \text{\textit{a}b8} \) 21 c4 \( \text{\textit{x}c3} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{x}c3} \) \( \text{\textit{d}8} \) = doesn’t look very logical for White, Barlov-Jansa, Bor 1985.

16...\( \text{d}5! \)

The other key move of Black’s counterplay.

17 \( \text{\textit{c}5} \) \( \text{\textit{e}8} \)

Now:

a) 18 \( \text{\textit{f}2}?! \) \( \text{axb4} \) 19 \( \text{axb4} \) \( \text{d}4 \) 20 \( \text{\textit{b}1} \) \( \text{\textit{a}2} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{d}3} \) \( \text{\textit{d}7} \) = Kuczynski-Cherinin, Budapest Z 1993.

b) White should perhaps content himself with the drawish line 18 \( \text{\textit{xe7} \( \text{f}1} \)
\(\text{x7 19 exd5 Qxd5 20 Qxd5 Qxd5 21 bxa5 Wa7+ 22 h1 Wxa5 23 Wxa5 Wxa5 24 c4 b7 25 d8+ f8 =.}\)

c) There is also the very complicated line 18 bxa5 dxe4 19 Qb4 exf3 20 gxf3 d7 21 a6 (Kaminski-Finkel, Groningen open 1993) 21...f5!, when White’s ragged position guarantees Black counterplay.

**Conclusion:** The old main line is perfectly OK for Black and White can expect no advantage after 9 d5 or after the almost dead 9 dxe5.

A2)

8 d5

This move became very popular after White’s possibilities were exhausted in the 8 Wd2 line.

8...Qb8 (D)

This surprising approach has become popular during the last few years and no refutation or any definite advantage for White has been found yet. In the old line 8...Qxf3 9 Qxf3 Qc5 10 Qe2 c6 11 f4 (or 11 a4 Wa5 12 Ka3 Qcd7) 11...Qed7 12 dxc6 bxc6 13 Qd3 \(\Box\) Black has encountered some problems though the last word has hardly been said yet.

9 a4

Maybe the most critical, but White has several other more or less sensible moves:

a) 9 h3 Qxf3 10 Qxf3 c6 (alternatively, 10...Qbd7 11 a4 a5 12 Qe2 c6 13 Ke1 Wc7 = Kindermann-Anand, Munich 1991) 11 a4 (11 g3 Qbd7 12 Qg2 Wa5 13 Wd2 Qfe8 14 Wad1 exd5 15 exd5 Qxe5 16 Wxe2 Qc4 17 Qc1 b5 gives Black counterplay, Unzicker-Roth, Bavaria 1994/5) 11...a5 12 Qbl!? (a surprising regrouping plan but it is better than no plan at all) 12...Qbd7 13 g3 Qb6 14 Qg2 Wc7 15 Sa2 Qfe8 16 b3 Qfd7 17 c4 Qb8 18 Wd2 Qad7 19 Qc3 Qa6 = Arbakov-Chernin, Berne 1995.

b) 9 Qd4 Qxe2 10 Wxe2 c5!? (another idea is 10...c6) 11 Qf3 (11 dxc6 Qxc6 =) 11...Wb6 12 Wb1 Wa6 = Chatalbashew-Popchev, Čačak 1991.

c) 9 Wd2 c6 10 Qad1 (10 a4 is possible) 10...Wa5 11 a3 Qc8 (11...Qfd7!? is unclear) 12 b4 Wc7 13 Qd4 Qbd7 14 Qfel a5 with counterplay, Blatny-Chernin, Pardubice 1993.

d) 9 Ke1 c6 10 Wd2 Wc7 11 Wad1 Qbd7 12 Ke6 Qxh6 13 Wxh6 Qxf3 14 Qxf3 a6 = Rötshagov-Chernin, Erevan OL 1996.

e) 9 Qd2 Qxe2 10 Qxe2!? (after 10 Wxe2 c6 White cannot play 11 Qc4? due to 11...Qxe4! 12 Qxe4 cxd5 \(\Box\) 10...c6 11 c4 Qg4 (since the exchange of bishops only benefits White, Black should try either 11...Qe8 followed by...e6 or the natural 11...Qbd7) 12 Qd4
\( \text{w} \)

Now:

a) 10 \( \text{Q}d4 \) is not dangerous for Black at all. There are no weak points in Black’s position and his pieces are well placed. 10...\( \text{Q}xe2 \) 11 \( \text{W}xe2 \) c6 12 f3 \( \text{W}c7 \) 13 \( \text{R}ad1 \) \( \text{Qa}6 \) 14 \( \text{W}d2 \) (intending to exchange dark-squared bishops with \( \text{Q}h6 \), which explains Black’s next move) 14...\( \text{B}f8 \) 15 \( \text{B}f1 \) \( \text{Q}b4 = 16 \text{B}b3 \text{Q}d7 17 \text{Q}d4 \text{A}c8 18 \text{Q}xg7 \text{Q}xg7 19 \text{W}d4+ \text{Q}g8 20 \text{W}d2 \text{Q}b6!? 

(basically it is a good idea to exchange queens in this type of position but because of the a5-pawn this tactical solution leads to complications) 21 \( \text{W}xb6 \) \( \text{Q}xb6 \) 22 \( \text{Q}xa5 \) \( \text{A}a8 \) 23 \( \text{Q}xb7 \) \( \text{Q}c8 \) 24 \( \text{Q}dxc6 \) (Kasparov gives the following long variation: 24 a5 \( \text{Q}c4 \) 25 \( \text{A}d4 \) \( \text{exd}5 \) 26 \( \text{Q}xd5 \) \( \text{Q}xc4 \) 27 \( \text{Q}xe5 \) \( \text{Q}xel \) 28 \( \text{Q}xe7+ \) \( \text{Q}g7 \) 29 \( \text{Q}c7 \) \( \text{A}a7 \) 30 \( \text{B}a6 \) \( \text{Q}xa6 \) 31 \( \text{Q}a8 \) \( \text{Q}a1 \) 32 \( \text{Q}f2 \) \( \text{Q}d3+ \) 33 \( \text{Q}e3 \) \( \text{R}c1 \) 34 \( \text{Q}xc1 \) \( \text{Q}xc1 \) 35 \( \text{Q}cxd6 \) \( \text{Q}a8 \) with equality) 24...\( \text{Q}xc6 \) 25 \( \text{Q}xd6 \) \( \text{exd}6 \) 26 \( \text{A}xh6 \) \( \text{Q}d4 \) 27 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{Q}xc2 \) 28 \( \text{Q}c1 \) and from here Rozentalis-Ponomariov, Belfort 1998 was soon drawn. This material balance (three pawns for a knight) doesn’t give either side an advantage.

b) The other plan, 10 \( \text{Q}d2 \) \( \text{Q}xc2 \) 11 \( \text{W}xe2 \) c6 12 \( \text{Q}c4 \), is somewhat more dangerous. Because of the b6-square, 12...\( \text{Q}xe4 \) is not possible now. Black must decide which knight belongs on d7. In Sutovsky-Chernin, Rishon le Zion 1994, Black decided that it is important to eliminate the strong knight on c4: 12...\( \text{Q}d7 \) 13 \( \text{R}ad1 \) \( \text{Q}e5 \) (the alternative 13...\( \text{W}c7 \) 14 \( \text{Q}d4 \) \( \text{Q}a6 \) 15 \( \text{W}xg7 \) \( \text{Q}xg7 \) 16 \( \text{B}f1 \) \( \text{Q}b4 \) 17 \( \text{e}5 \) gave White some initiative in Malishauskas-Marin, Elista OL 1998) 14 \( \text{Q}xe5 \) \( \text{Q}xe5 \) 15 \( \text{Q}d4 \) (15 \( \text{W}d4 \) ? \( \text{Q}d7 \) 16 \( f4 \) or the immediate 15 \( f4 \) might be slightly more promising) 15...\( \text{Q}xd4 \) 16 \( \text{A}xd4 \) \( \text{Q}d7 \) 17 \( \text{A}d3 \) \( \text{W}b6 = 18 \text{B}h3 \text{W}f6 \) 19 \( \text{W}d2 \) \( h5 \) 20 \( \text{B}h1 \) \( \text{cx}d5 \) 21 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{W}xb2 \) 22 \( \text{B}b1 \) \( \text{W}a3 \) 23 \( g4 ?? 

(instead of this desperate attack, the position is less
clear after 23 \( \text{x} \text{xb7} \) 23...\( \text{d} \text{xg4} \) 24 \( \text{g} \text{g}1 \) \( \text{d} \text{ac8} \) – +.

**Conclusion:** This approach has become popular in recent years and White has not yet found a very critical test, although he might have something after 10 \( \text{d} \text{d}2 \). In most cases Black gets a very solid position.

B)

7 \( h3 \) (D)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
B
\end{array}
\]

7...\( \text{xf3} \) 8 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{c} \text{c6} \) 9 \( \text{e}2 \)

It is important to protect d4 with a pawn. Otherwise:

a) The somewhat strange move 9 \( \text{d} \text{b5} \) aiming for the same thing, is not a big problem for Black: 9... \( \text{e} \text{e5} \) 10 \( \text{c} \text{c3} \) a6 (10...\( \text{h} \text{h8} \)?) 11 \( \text{a} \text{a3} \) \text{exd}4 12 \text{exd}4 \( \text{d} \text{d7} \) 13 \( \text{e} \text{e3} \) b6 14 \( \text{d} \text{d2} \) d5! 15 e5 f6 16 exf6 \( \text{d} \text{xf6} \) = Okhotnik-Petran, Cappelle la Grande 1989.

b) 9 \( \text{c}3 \) e5 10 dx\text{e}5 \text{dxe5} 11 \( \text{d} \text{d2} \) \( \text{e} \text{e7} \) 12 c3 is rather drawish: 12...\( \text{f} \text{f8} \)!

Or:

a) 10...\( \text{e} \text{e8} \) invites White to close the position with some spatial advantage after 11 d5 \( \text{e} \text{e7} \) 12 c4 \( \text{d} \text{d7} \) 13 \( \text{c} \text{c3} \) \( \text{h} \text{h8} \) 14 g 3 \( \text{g} \text{g8} \) 15 h4 (15 \( \text{g} \text{g2} \) \( \text{h} \text{h6} \) =) 15...\( \text{h} \text{h6} \) 16 \( \text{xe} \text{h6} \) \( \text{d} \text{d6} \) 17 \( \text{d} \text{d2} \) \( \text{g} \text{g7} \) 18 \( \text{g} \text{g}2 \) a5 (though 18...f5 19 exf5 \( \text{d} \text{xf5} \) 20 \( \text{e} \text{e4} \) h6 is level according to Gavrilo) 19 \( \text{h} \text{h3} \) \( \text{c} \text{c5} \) 20 \( \text{d} \text{d1} \) ± Keitlinghaus-Gavrilo, Pardubice 1995.

b) 10...\( \text{h} \text{h8} \) will be a more useful move if White closes the position; for example, 11 b4 \( \text{e} \text{e8} \) 12 d5 (after 12 b1 Black should continue 12...\text{exd}4
13 cxd4 \(\triangleleft xe4\) 14 b5 \(\triangleleft a5\) 15 \(\triangleleft c2\) d5 16 \(\triangleleft xc7\) \(\triangleleft d8\) - according to Yudasin) 12...\(\triangleleft e7\) 13 c4 a5 14 bxa5 \(\triangleleft xa5\) 15 \(\triangleleft b3\) \(\triangleleft a8\) (15...b6! is better according to Stohl) 16 \(\triangleleft d2\) \(\triangleleft a6\) 17 \(\triangleleft c3\) \(\triangleleft d7\) 18 \(\triangleleft b5\) \(\triangleleft b8\) 19 \(\triangleleft b4\) f5 (19...\(\triangleleft c5\) 20 \(\triangleleft e3\) b6 is unclear) 20 \(\triangleleft fd1\) b6 21 a4 \(\triangleleft h4\) - Hraček-Chernin, Brno 1993.

c) Another option is 10...\(\triangleleft e8\)!? 11 d5 \(\triangleleft e7\) 12 c4 \(\triangleleft d7\) 13 \(\triangleleft c3\) f5 14 \(\triangleleft b1\) (Illescas-Stohl, Kharkidhiki 1992) and after 14...a5 White's advantage is very small at best.

11 \(\triangleleft b3\) (D)

This move is generally considered to give White a slight advantage. There are alternatives:

a) 11 \(\triangleleft b1\) a5! 12 \(\triangleleft c3\) (12 \(\triangleleft b3\) \(\triangleleft h4!\)? 13 \(\triangleleft h2\) \(\triangleleft ae8\) 14 d5 \(\triangleleft cb8\) 15 c4 f5 16 \(\triangleleft c3\) \(\triangleleft c5\) - Petursson-Azmaiparshvili, Philadelphia 1994) 12...a4 13 \(\triangleleft d3\) \(\triangleleft h8\) = is OK for Black. Now White blundered with 14 g3? exd4 15 cxd4 \(\triangleleft de5\) \(\triangleleft f\) in Kamsky-Azmaiparshvili, Brussels rpd 1992.

b) The natural 11 \(\triangleleft e3\) \(\triangleleft b6\) seems quite safe for Black:

b1) 12 b3 exd4 13 cxd4 d5! 14 e5 f6 15 exf6 \(\triangleleft xf6\) =.

b2) 12 d5 \(\triangleleft e7\) 13 \(\triangleleft d3\) f5 14 c4 \(\triangleleft d7\) 15 \(\triangleleft c3\) \(\triangleleft f6\) (15...a5?! is probably better: Black should fix the queenside first) 16 b4 f4 17 \(\triangleleft d2\) h5 18 h4 \(\triangleleft d7\) - De Jong-Berelovich, Groningen 1995.

b3) 12 \(\triangleleft b3\) \(\triangleleft a5\) 13 \(\triangleleft c2\) \(\triangleleft ac4\) 14 \(\triangleleft c1\) exd4 15 \(\triangleleft xd4\) \(\triangleleft h4\) 16 \(\triangleleft e2\) \(\triangleleft e8\) 17 b3 \(\triangleleft e5\) 18 f4 \(\triangleleft c6\) 19 \(\triangleleft xc6\) bxc6 20 \(\triangleleft f3\) \(\triangleleft ab8\) gave Black counterplay in Gomez Esteban-Morović, Mesa 1992.

Now (after 11 \(\triangleleft b3\)):

a) 11...\(\triangleleft b6\)?? (the knight is not well placed here in the forthcoming closed position) 12 d5 \(\triangleleft e7\) 13 c4 f5 14 \(\triangleleft c3\) \(\triangleleft d7\) 15 \(\triangleleft b1\) a5 16 a3 \(\triangleleft f6\) 17 b4 axb4 18 axb4 fxe4 19 \(\triangleleft xe4\) \(\triangleleft xe4\) 20 \(\triangleleft xc4\) \(\triangleleft f5\) 21 g3 \(\triangleleft h4\) - Ivanchuk-Timman, Linares 1989. White has some spatial advantage. In the typical King's Indian position the c4-square is usually more important than d4 for the black knight.

b) 11...\(\triangleleft h8\) is more interesting (although a draw was agreed here in Volzhin-Yakovitch, Barbera 1999). After the natural 12 \(\triangleleft e3\) the active response 12...f5 13 exf5 gxf5 14 dxe5 dxe5 15 \(\triangleleft xc6\) bxc6 16 f4 \(\triangleleft d7\) gives White a more solid pawn-formation. Black can also experiment with 12...\(\triangleleft e7??\) 13 \(\triangleleft d2\) c6 or 12...\(\triangleleft h4??\) 13 \(\triangleleft d2\) h6.

**Conclusion:** This is probably the theoretically best way for White to play the Classical Pirc and is quite solid. White has some chances for a small plus but Black has several possibilities and the theory has not yet been exhausted. Very often the play will take on a King's Indian nature.
\textbf{23 The Pirc with }\mathcal{A}e3

\(\mathcal{A}e3\) is a flexible move which enables White to choose between various plans. One of the main ideas for White is to exchange the dark-squared bishops with \(\mathcal{W}d2\) and \(\mathcal{A}h6\) and in some cases build up an attack on the kingside. It makes sense for Black to wait with the bishop on \(f8\) and develop his own counterplay on the queenside. This idea works quite well after the immediate 4 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) (Line C). The main line of B is quite solid but can be reached in our repertoire only in the move-order 4 \(\mathcal{O}f3\) \(\mathcal{A}g7\) 5 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) (since after 4 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) we are recommending 4...c6). In Line A, White plays an early h3, which may be followed by various plans that tend to be more positional in nature.

1 e4 d6 2 d4 \(\mathcal{O}f6\) 3 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) g6

Now we consider three systems with \(\mathcal{A}e3\):

\textbf{A:} 4 h3 \(\mathcal{A}g7\) 5 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) \hspace{1cm} 184

\textbf{B:} 4 \(\mathcal{O}f3\) \(\mathcal{A}g7\) 5 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) \hspace{1cm} 188

\textbf{C:} 4 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) \hspace{1cm} 190

Naturally, there are plenty of possible transpositions between these three lines.

\textbf{A)}

4 h3 \(\mathcal{A}g7\) 5 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) \((D)\)

5...c6 6 a4

Or:

\(\text{a) } 6 \mathcal{O}f3 0-0 7 \mathcal{W}d2 \mathcal{O}bd7 \) \((7...b5 8 \mathcal{W}d3 \mathcal{O}bd7 9 e5! is rather dangerous for Black) 8 \(\mathcal{A}d3\) \((8 \mathcal{A}h6 e5 9 0-0-0 \mathcal{W}a5 10 \mathcal{A}xg7 \mathcal{A}xg7 11 \mathcal{O}b1 b5 12 \mathcal{O}c2 \mathcal{W}xd2 13 \mathcal{O}xd2 \mathcal{A}b7 = \) Tiviakov-Shirov, Linares 1995) 8...\(\mathcal{W}c7\) 9 0-0 b5 transposes to Line C2.

\(\text{b) } 6 f4!? is a sharp move, trying to argue that ...c6 is no more useful for Black in the Austrian Attack than h3 is for White. Now:} \)

\(\text{b1) } 6...\mathcal{W}b6!? (taking the challenge) 7 \mathcal{W}c1 \mathcal{A}h5!? (7...0-0) 8 \mathcal{O}ge2 f5 9 e5 0-0?! (Marin thinks 9...\(\mathcal{A}a6\) 10 \(\mathcal{G}g1\) g5 11 g3 c5 gives Black counterplay though the h5-knight might get into trouble after 12 dxc5 \(\mathcal{O}xc5\) 13 \(\mathcal{O}d5\) \(\mathcal{W}d8\) 14 \(\mathcal{O}ec3\) 15 \(\mathcal{G}g1\) g5 11 g3 \pm Hraček-Marin, Krynica Z. 1998.

\(\text{b2) } 6...0-0 (this is safer) 7 \mathcal{O}f3 \) \((7 \mathcal{O}f3 \mathcal{W}a5 8 \mathcal{A}d3 b5 9 \mathcal{O}ge2 b4 10 \mathcal{G}d1 \mathcal{A}b7 11 0-0 c5 12 d5 \mathcal{O}bd7 13 c4 bxc3 14 \mathcal{O}exc3 \mathcal{A}a6 15 \mathcal{A}xa6 \mathcal{W}xa6 = \)
Sveshnikov-Ponomariov, Bled 1999) 7...Qbd7 and then:

b21) 8 e5 seems to give White nothing: 8...dxe5 9 dxe5 Qd5! 10 Qxd5 cxd5 11 A.d3 (11 Awd2 Axb6) 11...b6 12 0-0 Ac5 13 b4 Qd3 14 cxd3 f6 = Sveshnikov-Ibragimov, Bled 1996.

b22) 8 A.d3 e5!? (8...Aa5) 9 dxe5 dxe5 10 fxe5 A.e8 11 e6 (11 A.g5 Axb6 12 A.e7 Axe5 gives Black compensation) 11...fxe6 12 0-0 (12 A.c4 Aec7) 12...Ad6 13 A.e2 Af7 14 A.c4 Aec7 15 a4 A.de5 = Cu.Hansen-Hsoi, Copenhagen 1995.

6...0-0 7 Af3

Or:

a) 7 a5 is met by 7...d5! 8 e5 A.e4 9 Axe4 dxe4 10 A.c4 c5 11 dxe5?! (11 c3 Axd4 12 Axd4 A.c6 13 Afd2 = is better according to Glek) 11...Ae7! 12 e6?! f5 13 c3 f4 14 A.d4 Aec6 = Piket-Glek, Wijk aan Zee 1997.

b) 7 g4!? (D) is a dangerous idea of GM Rantanen’s which is usually neglected by theory.

b1) The most natural move, 7...e5, may be somewhat inadequate, as current practice shows:

b11) 8 Ag2 d5!? (routine moves tend to lead to trouble) 9 exd5 Axd5 10 Axd5 cxd5 11 dxe5 A.xe5 12 c3 A.e6 13 A.f3 (13 A.e2 A.c6 14 0-0 f5 is unclear) 13...A.g7 14 A.d4 A.c6 15 A.xg7 A.xg7 16 0-0 Ab6 was close to equality in Pulkkinen-Mäki, Finland 1993.

b12) 8 dxe5!? (this is an interesting moment to exchange queens because of the vulnerability of f7) 8...dxe5 9 Axd8 Axd8 and now White has surprisingly good chances after either of the sensible developing moves:

b121) 10 A.f3 h5? (certainly the alternative plan suggested by Mäki is better: 10...Afd7 11 0-0-0 h6 12 A.c4 A.e8 ±) 11 A.c4 hxg4 12 A.g5 A.f8 13 A.c5 +- R.Lehtivaara-Hodgson, London Lloyds Bank 1989.

b122) 10 A.c4 A.b7? (10...Ae8 11 A.f3 h6 12 g5 h5 13 A.h4! Ad6 14 0-0-0 ± is not good, so Black should try 10...Ad6?? ± or 10...Afd7??) 11 0-0-0 b6 12 A.f3 A.b7? 13 A.g5 A.f8 14 A.xf7 =+ Norri-Kesisarja, Helsinki Ch 1996.

b2) 7...d5?! is a straightforward strike in the centre, and offers Black more hope. After 8 c5 A.c4 9 A.xc4 (9 A.xe2 f6) 9...dxe4 10 A.g2, 10...f5 needs testing, while in Rantanen-Wedberg, Eksjö 1981, 10...c5?! 11 A.xe4 (11 c3??) 11...Axd4 12 A.xd4 A.xc6 13 A.xc6 bxc6 14 A.c3 A.c7 15 A.e2 offered Black some compensation.

b3) 7...Aa5 is another possibility. 8 A.d2 (8 A.g2?!) d5 9 e5 A.e4 =) 8...e5

No simple equalizer has been demonstrated yet:
(8...b5 9 b4! \textit{W}xb4 10 \textit{B}b1 \textit{W}a5 11 axb5 is pretty dangerous for Black) 9 \textit{L}g2 \textit{B}bd7 (maybe 9...\textit{L}e6?) 10 \textit{Q}ge2 \textit{L}c4 to activate the bishop is worth trying, though in Aleksandrov-Suls- 

kis, Minsk 1996 Black got into trouble after 11 \textit{L}d1 \textit{B}bd7?? 12 dxe5 \textit{Q}xe5 13 f4 \textit{L}e8 14-0-0 \textit{B}b6 12 

b3 exd4 13 \textit{L}xd4 d5 14 exd5 \textit{B}xd5 15 \textit{L}ad1 \textit{Q}xc3 16 \textit{B}xc3 (16 \textit{L}xc3! \textit{W}c7 17 \textit{Q}f1 \textit{L}f6 =) 16...\textit{W}c7 17 \textit{W}g5 h6 

18 \textit{W}h4 \textit{g}h7 = Rantanen-Yrjolä, Helsinki 1984.

7...d5 (D)

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}[scale=0.8]
\node (a) at (0,0) {
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{W}\\
\end{tabular}
};
\node (b) at (2,0) {
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{L}\\
\end{tabular}
};
\node (c) at (4,0) {
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{B}\\
\end{tabular}
};
\node (d) at (6,0) {
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{Q}\\
\end{tabular}
};
\node (e) at (8,0) {
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{R}\\
\end{tabular}
};
\node (f) at (10,0) {
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{N}\\
\end{tabular}
};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

This is the most straightforward and logical approach.

8 e5

Not very ambitious is 8 \textit{L}d3 dxe4 9 \textit{Q}xe4 \textit{Q}xe4 (or 9...\textit{L}d5 10 \textit{Q}d2 a5 = 

11 0-0 b6, Espig-Bologan, Dresden 1996) 10 \textit{L}xe4 c5!? (10...\textit{L}f5 11 \textit{Q}xf5 \textit{W}a5+ is the simplest equalizer) 11 c3 

\textit{Q}d7 12 dxc5 \textit{Q}c7 13 \textit{B}b3 \textit{Q}xc5 14 

\textit{L}e4 b6!? 15 \textit{Q}d4 \textit{L}a6 16 \textit{B}b5 \textit{Q}ac8 = Espig-Schmidt, 2nd Bundesliga 

1991/2.

8...\textit{L}e4 9 \textit{Q}xe4

9 \textit{L}d3 \textit{Q}xc3 10 bxc3 c5 usually leads to closed positions:

a) 11 \textit{W}d2 \textit{Q}c6 12 h4!? and then:

a1) 12...c4 13 \textit{L}e2 f6!? (13...h5) 

14 h5 fxe5 15 hxg6 hxg6 16 \textit{L}h6 gave White a dangerous attack in Murshed- 


a2) 12...\textit{B}a5 13 h5 cxd4 should be 

an adequate antidote. Andonov-Zilber- 

man, Frunze 1989 continued 14 \textit{L}xd4 

\textit{W}xd2+ 15 \textit{L}xd2 \textit{Q}g4 16 \textit{W}h2 \textit{L}xh5 

17 g4 (17 c3 g5) 17...\textit{L}xd4 18 gxh5 

\textit{L}xe5 with an unclear position.

b) 11 0-0 and now:

b1) 11...\textit{Q}c6 12 \textit{W}d2 (now White 

could play 12 \textit{L}e1! c4 13 \textit{Q}f1) 12...c4 

13 \textit{L}e2 f6 14 exf6 exf6 15 \textit{Q}f1 \textit{Q}e6 

16 \textit{L}h2 \textit{W}d7 17 \textit{L}g4 \textit{Q}ae8 and Black 

equalized without trouble in Werner- 

Stangl, Budapest Elekes mem 1990.

b2) The immediate 11...c4 may be 

slightly more accurate: 12 \textit{L}e2 f6 (or 

12...\textit{Q}c6) 13 exf6 exf6 14 \textit{W}d2 \textit{Q}d7!? 

15 a5 \textit{B}e8 16 \textit{Q}f1 \textit{Q}f8 = Gomez 

Baillo-Rechlis, Novi Sad OL 1990.

9...dxe4 10 \textit{Q}g5

Probably better than 10 \textit{Q}d2? c5 

11 \textit{L}xe4 (11 c3?! \textit{Q}xd4 12 \textit{Q}xd4 f5?! 

gives Black counterplay) 11...\textit{Q}xd4 12 

\textit{W}xd4 \textit{W}xd4 13 \textit{L}xd4 \textit{Q}f5 14 \textit{Q}c5 

\textit{Q}xc6 15 \textit{L}c3 \textit{L}xe5 \textit{W} Grishanovich- 

Gubanov, St Petersburg Ch 1997.

10...c5 (D)

11 c3

After this move Black gets enough 

activity with accurate play. Another 

approach is 11 dx5 \textit{W}c7, and now:

a) Very unclear and rather unexplored is 12 \textit{W}d5 \textit{Q}c6 13 \textit{W}xe4 \textit{Q}xe5 

(or 13...\textit{L}f5 14 \textit{Q}f4 \textit{Q}xe5 15 0-0-0
b6? 14 0-0-0 ²f5. White has an extra pawn but his king position looks a bit shaky. It must be noted that Nunn and McNab consider this line somewhat better for White but in practice it has been somewhat rare.

b) 12 ²xe4 ²xe5 13 ²c3 ²c6 seems to give Black enough compensation no matter where White puts his bishop:

b1) 14 ²d3 f5! 15 0-0 f4 16 ²d2 f3 17 ²e1 ²xc5 18 ²e3? (18 ²e4 18...²b4 19 ²d5 ²h4 20 g3 ²xh3 21 ²f4 ²xf4? (better is 21...²g4) 22 ²f1 ²h5 23 ²xf4 is unclear, Sutovsky-Hodgson, York 1999.

b2) 14 ²c4 ²f5 15 0-0 ²ad8 16 ²e2 ²d4 17 ²xd4 ²xd4 (17...²xd4 is equal) 18 ²xe5 ²xe5 19 ²f6 ²e1 ²f6 20 ²b3 h5 21 ²e2 ²fd8 and Black’s bishop-pair and active pieces provide compensation, Lorenz-Espig, Chemnitz 1998.

b4) 14 ²b5 ²d8 (14...²f5??) 15 ²e2 ²e6 16 ²xc6 bxc6 17 0-0 ²db8 18 ²d1 ²e4 19 f3 ²c4 = Smyslov-Specman, Hastings 1988/9.

11...²d5! (D)

This is considered best as 11...cx d4
12 cxd4 ²d5 13 ²c1 enables White to play ²c4.

12 ²c2

The other possibilities are:

a) 12 dxc5?! ²xe5 13 ²d4 ²xd4 14 cxd4 (14 ²xd4 ²xd4 15 cxd4 f5 is more unclear) 14...²h6! 15 ²xe4 f5 16 ²c3 f4 17 ²d2 ²xd4 18 ²d5 ²e6 19 ²xf4 (19 ²xf4?!, Ilincic-Chernin, Prague 1989. 19...e5 20 ²d3 e4 21 ²f4 g5 ²f3 19...²e6! 20 ²c7 ²xf4 21 ²xa8 ²xf2+ 22 ²d2 ²b4 gives Black strong compensation.

b) 12 f4!? ²xf3 (12...²h6 13 c4 ±) 13 ²xf3 ²xf3 (13...²b3? looks attractive) 14 gxf3 cxd4 15 cxd4 ²c6 16 ²c4 ²f5 17 ²e2 ²ac8 (17...²ad8!? may be better) 18 ²ac1 h6 19 ²e4 ²d8 20 ²g3 e6 (20...²d7?!) 21 ²xf5 gxf5 22 ²hd1 ± Kostakiev-Pyrih, corr. 1991.

12...²h6

Also logical is 12...cx d4 13 cxd4 ²c6 14 ²xe4 ²b3 15 ²d3 (15 ²b5 ²h6 16 ²f3 ²f5 17 ²h4 g5 18 ²g3 ²b4+ ²f5 15...²xb2 16 ²b1 ²a2 17
b5 a6 18 b3 xb3 19 xb3 h6 20 f3 e6 (20...b5?!) 21 xb7 fb8 with good compensation, Rantanen-Mäki, Tampere 2000.

13 xe4 f5 14 f3 cxd4 15 cxd4 c6 16 d1 e8

Now:

a) White should avoid 17 c4 b4 18 xd5 xe2+.

b) 17 b1 a5+ 18 f2 xa4 19 b4 b3 a5 20 c4 a5 21 d2 b6 22 xa5 xa5 is a little better for Black. In Petrov-Delchev, Sofia 1992, White suffered for his king position: 23 a1 b6 24 c3 f8 25 xd5 a6 26 xd5 x2+ 27 e3 xe5 28 g4 f4+ 29 xf4 e2 30 g3 d6+ 31 f4 xd5 32 h1 xb3+ 33 h4 h2 34 g3 g5+ 0-1.

c) 17 d2 xe4 18 fxe4 xe4 19 d3 d5 20 0-0 = is White’s best.

Conclusion: Against this method (7 f3) the central break seems to be an adequate antidote but the subline 7 g4!?, called ‘the refutation of the Pirc’ in Finland, is usually underestimated.

B)

4 f3 g7 5 e3 (D)

5 0-0

This is our recommendation for Black in this position. However, 5...c6 is an important alternative, especially since Black will need to play this position if he follows our proposed repertoire (this position arises via 4 e3 c6 5 f3 g7). After 6 d2, Black has a difficult choice:

a) 6...0-0 7 h6 b5 (7...g4 8 xg7 xg7 9 g5 is also slightly better for White) 8 xg7 xg7 9 d3 ± is hardly to be recommended.

b) 6...g4 and then:

b1) 7 h3! xf3 8 gxf3 d5! 9 0-0 0 10 h4 h5?!(10...bd7 is unclear) 11 e2! d7 12 g3 xg3 13 fxg3 h5 14 h1 ± Piket-Minasian, Montecatini Terme 2000.

b2) 7 c2 0-0 8 h3 xf3 9 xf3 bd7 10 0-0 c7 11 a4 (11 ad1 b5 12 f1 ad8 13 a3 a6 14 g3 c5 is equal, Emmis-Nunn, Isle of Man 1994) 11...f8 12 f1 ad8 13 g3 e5 14 d5? b6 15 d3 a5 ± Gallagher-Cu.Hansen, Reykjavik 1998. Black is quite solid but White has the bishop-pair.

c) 6...a5?! is an interesting move favoured by some specialists such as Hodgson and McNab. Then:

c1) Black’s idea is to meet 7 d3 with 7...g4. After 8 c5!? xxc5 9 xxc5 bd7 10 b3 e6 11 xd7 xd7 12 0-0 0-0 13 ad1 ad8 Black didn’t have any trouble at all in L.Webb-McNab, British League (4NCL) 2000/1.

c2) 7 h3 may be more unpleasant, though after 7...0-0 (7...bd7 8 a3?!)
0-0 9 d3 e5 10 0-0 e8 11 c4 exd4 12 cxd4 c7 13 f3 d5 = Hebden-McNab, London MSO 2000) 8 d3 e5 0-0 d7 10 fd1 exd4 11 cxd4 e8 12 h6 xh6 13 xh6 b6 14 b3 a5 15 a4 e5 Black has almost equalized, Kindermann-Shirov, Biel 1995.

d) 6...h5 is the most natural move but not the most solid. 7 d3 g4 8 e5! is the only worry for Black. After 8...b4 (D) White has:

```
  a b c d e f g h
1 w w w w w w w w
2 b b b b b b b b
3 b b b b b b b b
4 b b b b b b b b
5 b b b b b b b b
6 b b b b b b b b
7 b b b b b b b b
8 w w w w w w w w
```

w  

\[ \text{d1) 9 c2!? (underestimated by some GMs) 9...d5 10 h6 0-0 11 h4! with fair attacking chances:} \]

```
  a b c d e f g h
1 w w w w w w w w
2 b b b b b b b b
3 b b b b b b b b
4 b b b b b b b b
5 b b b b b b b b
6 b b b b b b b b
7 b b b b b b b b
8 w w w w w w w w
```

\[ \text{d11) 11...xf3 12 gxf3 dxe5 13 xg7 (13 h5 f6! gives Black compensation) 13...xg7 14 h5 transposes to 'd12' but gives White less choice.} \]

```
  a b c d e f g h
1 w w w w w w w w
2 b b b b b b b b
3 b b b b b b b b
4 b b b b b b b b
5 b b b b b b b b
6 b b b b b b b b
7 b b b b b b b b
8 w w w w w w w w
```

\[ \text{d12) 11...dxe5 12 xg7 xg7 13 h5 (13...xh5 \( \pm \) 13...xf3 14 gxf3 d7! (Black is practically forced to start a king-march towards the queenside) 15 hxg6 hxg6 16 wh6+ f6 17 g1!? (17 h5!? c7 is also very critical: Black's position is dangerous but he might survive) 17...e6 18 0-0-0} \]

\[ \text{d6 19 dxe5+ c7 20 e6 fxe6 21 xg6 f6} \pm \text{ S.B. Hansen-Yrjölä, Reykjavik Z 2000.} \]

\[ \text{d2) 9 e4 exf4 (9...d5?! 10 h6 is dangerous for Black) 10 xh4 and now:} \]

```
  a b c d e f g h
1 w w w w w w w w
2 b b b b b b b b
3 b b b b b b b b
4 b b b b b b b b
5 b b b b b b b b
6 b b b b b b b b
7 b b b b b b b b
8 w w w w w w w w
```

\[ \text{d21) 10...xf3 (for some reason top players have ignored this line) 11 xf3 dxe5 12 0-0-0 exd4 (according to Ftačník, Black has problems after 12...a5 13 d5) 13 cxd4 xd4 14 xd4 xd4 15 xd4 a5 16 hd1 0-0, with the plan of...e5 and...f5, is worth considering, though White's compensation guarantees him at least equality.} \]

```
  a b c d e f g h
1 w w w w w w w w
2 b b b b b b b b
3 b b b b b b b b
4 b b b b b b b b
5 b b b b b b b b
6 b b b b b b b b
7 b b b b b b b b
8 w w w w w w w w
```

\[ \text{d22) 10...d5 11 d3 xf3 12 gxf3 b6 13 h4 (13 a3! bxa3 14 b4 b6 15 c3 c7 16 xa3 0-0 17 a5} \pm \text{ Nguyen Anh Dung-Postny, Budapest 2000) 13...xd7 14 h5 c5 (14...e6 may be safer) 15 dxc5 dxc5 16 e2 0-0 17 xd5 ac8 18 hxg6 hxg6 19 d4! with dubious complications though Black managed to get a draw in Deep Junior 6-Khalifman, Dortmund 2000.} \]

\[ \text{6 w2 e5!} \]

More reliable than 6...g4 7 g5!? h6 8 h3 c8 9 f3 c7 \( \pm \), when Black has targets on the kingside.

\[ \text{7 dxe5} \]

7 0-0-0!? is an aggressive alternative:

a) 7...exd4 8 xd4 e8 9 f3 c6 10 g4 leads to a line of the Philidor that is rather dangerous for Black.

b) 7...c7!? is probably best. 8 g5 (8 h6?! g4 9 d5?! xh6 10 xh6 xf3 11 gxf3 h5 was positionally excellent for Black in Breutigam-W.Watson, Bundesliga 1999/00) 8...c6 9 b1 (9 h3 b5! 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 d6
\[ \text{Conclusion:} \] The main line is not dangerous for Black after 6...c5 but the problem is that White has good chances to lure Black into the somewhat unpleasant sublines discussed in the note to Black's 5th move. In these lines the theory is not yet in a static state.

C)

4. c3 \( (D) \)

4...c6

The motive of this move is not to lose a tempo in the lines where White exchanges the bishops with \( \text{Qd}2 \) and
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\( \text{\textit{h6}}, \text{as in the line } 4...\text{\textit{g7}} 5 \text{\textit{wd2}} \text{c6} (5...0-0 6 0-0-0 is even riskier for Black) 6 \text{\textit{h6}} (6 \text{f3} also has more sting than when ...\text{\textit{g7}} has not been played) 6...\text{\textit{xh6}} 7 \text{\textit{wxh6}} \text{\textit{wa5}} 8 \text{\textit{ad3}} \pm. 5 \text{\textit{wd2}} \)

\( \text{Or:} \)

\( a) \text{ 5 \textit{gf3} and then:} \)

\( a1) \text{ 5...\textit{g7} transposes to the note to Black's 5th move in Line B.} \)

\( a2) \text{ 5...\textit{bd7}?! 6 \text{\textit{wd2} transposes to the note to Black's 5th move.} \)

\( b) \text{ 5 f3 (this often comes to the same thing as 5 \text{\textit{wd2}} 5...b5 6 g4 (6 \text{\textit{wd2} transposes to Line C1}) 6...\text{\textit{g7}} (the immediate 6...h5?! is not so stupid: 7 g5 \text{\textit{fd7}} 8 f4 \text{\textit{b6}?! 9 \text{\textit{f3}} d5 10 \text{\textit{e5}} b4 11 \text{\textit{e2}} \text{\textit{dxe4}} 12 \text{\textit{g3}} \text{\textit{d5}} \text{with an unclear position, Dimitrov-Llopis, Castello 1995}) 7 \text{\textit{wd2}} \text{h5 8 g5 (Beliavsky gives 8 g5 \text{\textit{fd7}} 9 \text{\textit{d3}} \text{\textit{b7}} 10 f4 b4 11 \text{\textit{f3}} c5 12 \text{\textit{gf3}} as unclear) 8...\text{\textit{xh5}} 9 \text{\textit{ge2}} \text{\textit{d7}} 10 \text{\textit{g1}?! (according to Beliavsky, White should play 10 a4 b4 11 \text{\textit{d1}} a5 12 \text{\textit{f2}} \text{\textit{b6}} 13 b3 c5 14 c4! with counterplay) 10...\text{\textit{c7}} 11 \text{\textit{g3}} \text{\textit{b7}} 12 0-0-0 a6 (aiming for ...c5 is often a good plan) 13 f4?! b4 14 \text{\textit{xh5}} \text{\textit{xh5}} 15 \text{\textit{e2}} c5! 16 \text{\textit{g3}} \text{\textit{h7} \text{D Beliavsky-Chemin, Reggio Emilia 1995/6.}} \)} 5...\text{\textit{b5}} 5...\text{\textit{bd7}} 6 \text{\textit{f3}} \text{\textit{c7} (D) is an interesting system successfully tried out many times by McNab. White then has two main options:} \)

\( a) \text{ 7 \text{\textit{d3}} e5?! (7...b5 transposes to Line C2) 8 0-0 (8 0-0-0?! b5?! leads to wild complications: 9 \text{dxe5} \text{\textit{dxe}} 10 \text{\textit{xb5! cxb5}} 11 \text{\textit{c5}} \text{\textit{c4}} 12 \text{\textit{wa5}} \text{\textit{b4}} 13 \text{\textit{xe5}} \text{\textit{xe4}} 14 \text{\textit{c7}+ \text{\textit{f8}} 15 \text{\textit{h6+}} \text{\textit{g8}} 16 \text{\textit{b5! f8}} 17 \text{\textit{xf8}} \text{\textit{bf8}} \text{with an unclear position, Grasso-May, corr. 1997; 8 h3 \text{\textit{g7}} 9 \text{dxe5} \text{\textit{dxe5}} 10 \text{\textit{dxe5}} \text{\textit{dxe5}} 11 \text{\textit{c4}?! 0-0 12 \text{\textit{c5}} \text{\textit{d8} \text{D L.Cooper-McNab, British Ch (Dundee) 1993}) 8...\text{\textit{g7}} 9 \text{dxe5} (9 \text{\textit{h6}?! 0-0 10 \text{\textit{g7}} \text{\textit{xg7} \text{\textit{xg7} =}) 9...\text{\textit{dxe5}} 10 \text{\textit{dxe5}} \text{\textit{dxe5}} 11 a4 (11 \text{\textit{c5}} \text{\textit{e6}}) 11...\text{\textit{e6}} 12 \text{\textit{a5}} 0-0 13 \text{\textit{a4} \text{\textit{d7}} 14 \text{\textit{b4}} \text{b5 = Waitskin-McNab, London 1998.} \}) 7 0-0-0?! is aggressive and might be the toughest test. The following pawn sacrifice seems almost forced: 7...b5 (7...e5 8 h3 \text{\textit{g7}} 9 \text{\textit{h6} \pm} 8 \text{e5} \}

\[ \text{\textit{h5}?!} \]
b4 9 \( \mathcal{B}b5 \text{ cxb5} 10 \text{ exf6 } \mathcal{B}xf6 11 \text{ } b5+ \mathcal{D}d7, \) and here:

b1) 12 \( \mathcal{D}d7+ \text{ wxd7} \) (12...\( \text{ wxd7} \)?)
13 \( \text{ wb4 } \mathcal{D}b8 \) transposes to 'b22')
13 \( \text{ wb4 } \mathcal{D}d5 14 \mathcal{A}a5 \text{ cxe3} 15 \text{ fxe3 } \mathcal{A}h6 
16 \mathcal{D}d3 0-0 \) gave Black some compensation in Calzetta-Gual, Terrassa 1999.

b2) 12 \( \text{ wb4} \) and now:

b21) 12...\( g8?! 13 \mathcal{C}c4 \text{ wb6} 14 
\text{ axd7+ } \mathcal{D}d7 15 \mathcal{D}d3! 0-0 16 \mathcal{D}b3 
\mathcal{A}a5 17 \mathcal{B}b1 \pm \text{ and Black's compensation proved insufficient in Nguyen- }
\text{Yrjölä, Istanbul OL 2000.}

b22) 12...\( \mathcal{B}b8 13 \text{ axd7+ } \mathcal{D}d7 14 
\text{ wc3 } \text{ wxc3} 15 \text{ bxc3 } \mathcal{D}b6 16 \mathcal{D}d2! \pm .

b23) 12...\( \mathcal{C}e8?! 13 \mathcal{D}d2 \mathcal{G}g7 \) sees Black relying on pressure along the open lines in front of the white king.

We now return to the position after 5...b5 (D):

Now:

| C1: 6 f3 | 192 |
| C2: 6 \( \mathcal{D}d3 \) | 194 |

C1)

6 f3 \( \mathcal{D}bd7 \) (D)

7 \( g4 \)

White has a range of other plans:

a) 7 0-0-0?! (having delayed playing ...\( \mathcal{G}g7 \), Black is quite well prepared to meet this) 7...\( \text{ wa5} \) (there is nothing in particular wrong with the natural 7...b4?! 8 \( \mathcal{D}ce2 \) a5 either) 8 \( \mathcal{D}bl \) and then:

a1) 8...\( \mathcal{A}a6?! 9 \text{ cxb5} (9 \text{ g4 } b4 10 
\mathcal{D}ce2 \text{ cdb6} 11 \text{ b3 } h5 12 \text{ gxh5 } \mathcal{D}xh5 
13 \mathcal{G}g2 \mathcal{G}g7 14 \text{ f4 } \mathcal{D}f6 15 \text{ Enklaar-Timman, Dutch Ch 1976}) 9...\( \mathcal{X}xd2 \) 10 
\mathcal{D}c7+ \mathcal{D}d8 11 \text{ axd2 } \mathcal{X}xfl 12 \mathcal{X}xa8 
\mathcal{A}a6 13 \mathcal{D}h3 h6 is unclear.

a2) 8...b4 9 \( \mathcal{D}ce2 \) \( \mathcal{A}a6 \).

a3) 8...\( \mathcal{B}b6 9 \mathcal{D}d5 \text{ wxd2} 10 \text{ wxf6+ } 
\text{ exf6} 11 \mathcal{A}xd2 \text{ d5} 12 \text{ exd5 } \mathcal{D}xd5 13 
\mathcal{D}e2 \mathcal{A}e6 = \text{ Marciani-Berebora, Croatian Cht 1996.}

b) 7 \( \mathcal{H}h4 \) (to provoke a weakness on g5) 7...h5?! (this is not forced since 7...\( \mathcal{B}b6 8 \text{ g4 } h5 9 \text{ g5 } \mathcal{D}fd7 \) transposes to the main line) 8 \( \mathcal{H}h3 \mathcal{G}g7 9 \mathcal{G}g5 
\text{ wa5} 10 \text{ e2 } \text{ cb6} 11 \text{ cd1 } \text{ wxd2+} 12 
\mathcal{X}xd2 0-0 = \text{ McShane-Gufeld, London 1995.}

c) 7 a4 (White starts action on the queenside) 7...b4 8 \( \mathcal{D}d1 \) (8 \( \mathcal{D}ce2?! a5 
9 \text{ g4 } \text{ cb6} 10 \text{ b3 } h5 11 \text{ g5 } \mathcal{D}fd7 12 \text{ f4} \)
\( \mathbf{b7} 13 \mathbf{\text{g}2} c5 14 \mathbf{\text{d}h3} \mathbf{\text{g}7} 15 0-0 \mathbf{\text{a}6}! \) gives Black counterplay, Van der Wiel-M.Gurevich, Linares Z (1995) 8...a5 9 c3 (9 \( \mathbf{\text{d}3} \mathbf{\text{g}7} 10 \mathbf{\text{e}e2} 0-0 11 0-0 \mathbf{\text{a}6}! ? = \) ) 9...bxc3 (9...\( \mathbf{\text{b}8} \) is less logical, though) 10 g4 e5 11 h4 h5 12 g5 \( \mathbf{\text{d}h7} 13 \mathbf{\text{e}h3} \mathbf{\text{g}7} 14 f4 bxc3 15 bxc3 \mathbf{\text{d}b6} 16 \mathbf{\text{d}3} \) was unclear in Gligoric-Popchev, Belgrade 1996) 10 bxc3 h5!? 11 \( \mathbf{\text{d}3} \mathbf{\text{a}6} \) = (generally this exchange eases Black’s life) 12 \( \mathbf{\text{d}e2} \mathbf{\text{g}7} 13 0-0 \mathbf{\text{d}xd3} 14 \mathbf{\text{w}x}d3 0-0 15 \mathbf{\text{e}f2} \mathbf{\text{w}c7} 16 \mathbf{\text{f}4} e5 is unclear, Ki.Georgiev-Leuw, Katerini 1992.

d) A very positional plan is 7 \( \mathbf{\text{d}h3} \mathbf{\text{g}7} 8 \mathbf{\text{d}f2} 0-0. \) Now:

d1) 9 a4!? b4 10 \( \mathbf{\text{c}cd1} a5 11 \mathbf{\text{e}e2} c5 12 c3 bxc3 13 bxc3 \mathbf{\text{e}8} 14 0-0 d5!? 15 dxe5 \mathbf{\text{xe}5} (15...\mathbf{\text{d}xe5} ? ! \) Ki.Georgiev-Torre, Leningrad 1987) 16 \( \mathbf{\text{d}d4} \mathbf{\text{e}6} \).

d2) 9 \( \mathbf{\text{c}c2} a5! ? \) (another sensible plan is ...\( \mathbf{\text{b}7}, \ldots \mathbf{\text{a}6} \) and ...c5) 10 0-0 \( \mathbf{\text{w}c7} 11 \mathbf{\text{e}ac1} \mathbf{\text{a}6} 12 \mathbf{\text{d}b1} e5 13 dxe5 dxe5 14 c4 b4 15 c5 \( \mathbf{\text{d}e}2 \) 16 \( \mathbf{\text{w}xe2} \mathbf{\text{d}h5} 17 \mathbf{\text{f}d1} \mathbf{\text{f}d8} 18 \mathbf{\text{d}d2} \mathbf{\text{f}4} = \) Granda-Rivas, Malaga 1991.

7...\( \mathbf{\text{d}b6} \) (D)

This is very natural, as the knight heads for c4 and frees the d7-square for the other knight.

Black can also play 7...\( \mathbf{\text{wa}5}! ? \) 8 g5 (8 \( \mathbf{\text{d}d3} \mathbf{\text{d}b6} 9 \mathbf{\text{d}ge2} h5 10 g5 \mathbf{\text{d}fd7} 11 \mathbf{\text{d}b1} \mathbf{\text{wa}6} 12 \mathbf{\text{w}c3} \mathbf{\text{a}4} 13 \mathbf{\text{w}b3} \mathbf{\text{w}b8} \) is equal, Tiviakov-Gipslis, Podolsk 1992) 8...\( \mathbf{\text{d}h5} 9 \mathbf{\text{d}ge2} \mathbf{\text{g}7} 10 \mathbf{\text{d}g3} \mathbf{\text{d}x}g3 11 \mathbf{\text{h}x}g3 b4 12 \mathbf{\text{d}d1} c5 = 13 \mathbf{\text{d}f2} \mathbf{\text{xd}4} ! ? \) (13...\( \mathbf{\text{a}6} \)) 14 \( \mathbf{\text{d}x}d4 \mathbf{\text{g}e}5 \) (Khezhumian-Arnold, Budapest 1998) 15 \( \mathbf{\text{e}e}2 \). 

8 h4

The main alternatives are:

a) 8 g5 \( \mathbf{\text{d}h5} (8...\mathbf{\text{f}d7} ? ! 9 h4 \mathbf{\text{g}7} 10 h5 \mathbf{\text{g}g8} 11 f4 \mathbf{\text{w}c7} 12 a4 b4 13 \mathbf{\text{d}d1} a5 14 \mathbf{\text{f}2} c5 15 \mathbf{\text{f}3} \mathbf{\text{b}7} \) is also playable, Mateo-Marin, Andorra la Vella 1999) 9 b3 (9 \( \mathbf{\text{d}3} e5 10 \mathbf{\text{d}ge2} \mathbf{\text{g}7} 11 dxe5 dxe5 12 a4 b4 13 \mathbf{\text{d}d1} a5 14 c3 b3 15 c4 \mathbf{\text{e}6} 16 \mathbf{\text{w}c3} 0-0 17 \mathbf{\text{w}xb3} \mathbf{\text{d}d7} 18 \mathbf{\text{w}c2} \mathbf{\text{w}c7} \) with compensation, Xie Jun-Torre, Shenzhen 1992) 9...e5? (according to Zakharevich, 9...\( \mathbf{\text{w}c7} 10 \mathbf{\text{d}ge2} e5 11 \mathbf{\text{d}g3} \mathbf{\text{f}4} 12 \mathbf{\text{d}xf4} \mathbf{\text{ex}f4} 13 \mathbf{\text{w}xf4} \mathbf{\text{g}7} \) is much better, when Black’s dark-square domination provides compensation) 10 a4 b4 11 \( \mathbf{\text{d}a2} c5 12 dxc5 dxc5 13 \mathbf{\text{w}xd8}+ \mathbf{\text{w}xd8} 14 0-0-0+ \pm \) Zabanov-Zakharevich, Kalluga 1995.

b) 8 b3 \( \mathbf{\text{b}7} \) (Black has many playable alternatives, such as 8...h5 9 g5 \( \mathbf{\text{f}d7} 8...a5! ? \) and 8...\( \mathbf{\text{w}c7} 9 \mathbf{\text{d}ge2} h5 10 g5 \mathbf{\text{f}d7} 11 \mathbf{\text{g}g2} \mathbf{\text{g}7} (1/2-1/2 Madl-Tella, Augsburg 2001) and now 12 f4 \( \mathbf{\text{b}7} \), with the plan...b4 and...c5, is logical) 9 h4 h5 10 g5 \( \mathbf{\text{f}d7} 11 f4 \mathbf{\text{g}7} 12 f5? 0-0 13 \mathbf{\text{h}3} ! ? (13 \mathbf{\text{g}2} \) is superior though after 13...b4 14 \( \mathbf{\text{d}c}e2 \) c5 Black is fine) 13...c5! \pm Gažik-Chernin.
Budapest 1993. White’s e4-pawn is a problem.

8...h5 9 g5 Qf6d7 10 d5!? (D)

The most critical move. After 10 f4 Qg7 (10...b4!? 11 Qd1 c5 is OK for Black, Mazi-Kogan, Bled 1998) 11 f5 b4 12 Qd1 c5 13 c3 bxc3 14 bxc3 Qb7 15 fxg6 fxg6 16 Qf2 0-0 ♞ Black was better developed in Blatny-Plachetka, Czechoslovak Ch (Bratislava) 1991. 10 b3 should be compared with note ‘b’ to White’s 8th move.

10...Qe5! 11 dxe6

11 Qd4 leads to very murky play, but Black got the upper hand in Nijboer-Timman, Dutch Ch (Rotterdam) 1997: 11...Qg7 12 dxe6 Qbc4 13 c7 Qd7 14 Qc1 0-0 15 Qd5 Qb7 16 Qh3 Qc8 17 f4 Qd7 18 Qxg7 Qxg7 19 b3 Qcb6 20 Qb2+ Qh7 ♞.

11...Qbc4 12 Qxe4 Qxc4 13 Qd4 Qg8!

Now:

a) 14 Qxb5?! Qa5+ 15 Qc3 Qe6 16 b4?! (the b-file is insufficient compensation for the pawn and additional weaknesses; White should continue

16 Qd2 Qg7 17 Qd3 Qxb2 18 Qb5, which is still unclear) 16...Qa3?! (according to Smirin, Black should accept the challenge with 16...Qxb4 17 Qb1 Qa5 18 Qd2 Qg7 19 Qd3 Qxd2 20 Qxd2 d5!, when he continues 21 exd5(?) 0-0-0!! ♞, but 21 c7 is less clear) 17 Qc1 Qxb4 18 Qb1 Qa5 19 Qge2 Qg7 20 Qd3 Qc5 21 Qb5 Qc8! 22 Qbd4 Qxd4 23 Qxd4 Qxc6 24 Qf2 Qf8 25 c3 Qc7 26 Qf4? Qb7? (26...Qc8 ♞) 27 Qb3 ♞b-1/2 Nijboer-Smirin, Pula Echt 1997.

b) The position remains complicated after 14 Qge2 Qg7 (14...Qa5 and 14...Qa6 are the unclear alternatives mentioned by Smirin) 15 Qd3 Qa6 16 Qd5! Qxb2 17 Qa3.

Conclusion: The systems with Qe3, Qd2 and f3 are quite popular, but Black doesn’t seem to have any problems at all, at least from a theoretical viewpoint. However, there are many alternatives and different move-orders.

C2)

6 Qd3 (D)
6...bd7 7 gf3 wc7??
This useful move prevents e5 and avoids playing ...g7 prematurely. Instead:

a) 7...g7 8 h6 0-0 9 xg7 xg7 10 e5 offers White some initiative.

b) 7...e5 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 h3 is the theoretical main line; e.g., 9...b7 10 0-0 g7 11 a4 a6 12 c2 0-0 13 g3 we7 14 c4 b4 15 c5 a5 16 wc2 ± Palac-Ftačnik, Ljubljana 1998.

8 0-0
Or:

a) 8 h3 g7 is hardly an improvement for White. Tischbierek-Hickl, Bundesliga 1995/6 continued 9 0-0 0-0 10 a3 b7 11 h6 e5 12 xg7 wxc5 13 dxc5 dxc5 14 xg7 dxe5 15 a4 b4 16 c5 17 w3 h6 =.

b) 8 h6 admits that Black has won the tempo-fight! Still, things are not very clear after 8...b4 9 e2 xh6 10 wxh6 c5 11 dxc5 wxc5 12 0-0 h7 13 g3 e6! (the idea is to connect the rooks with ...w7) 14 a3 a5 (the unclear 14...bxa3!? 15 xxa3 w7 was suggested by Pein) 15 xg2 (15 axb4?! may be more unpleasant) 15...w7 16 b3 wb6. Gipslis-Gofstein, Würzburg 1996.

8...g7 (D)

8...b7 is logical but has not been tested in high-level games. There is a moment when Black has to start thinking about castling and the queenside is hardly the right place for the king.

9 a4
Or:

a) Less dangerous should be 9 h3 0-0 10 a4 b4 11 c2 a5 (11...c5! is at least equal) 12 c3 h8 13 g3 c5 14 h6 ± Hjartarson-Karason, Reykjavik blindfold 1997.

b) Queenside action is typical in this line but this is also a logical moment to play 9 h6, when after 9...0-0 White has a wide choice:

b1) 10 c2 c5 11 c3 a6 (11...a5 12 g3 b4 13 w7 bg7 x7 14 wg5 bxc3 15 bxc3 e6 16 e5 wg8 17 edx6 x6 18 e4 w6 = Hodgson-Webster, British Ch (Millfield) 2000) 12 g3 w8 13 x7 b7 w7 14 h4 c5 15 d5 c4 16 c2 c5 17 wg5 g8! = Fressinet-Tkachev, Bordeaux rpd 2000. The knight retreat seems to be a very standard defence in this line, which has a lot in common with the Breyer line of the Spanish.

b2) 10 a3 e5 11 c2 a6 12 g3 c5 13 c3 b7 14 ad1 ad8 15 xg7 x7 16 wg5 g8! =½-½ Orlov-Schechkev, St Petersburg 1994. White’s knight checks lead nowhere.

b3) 10 a4 b4 11 c2 c5 12 c3 c4 13 b3 b4 w5!? e5 15 g3 de8 16 x7 x7 h4 de6 18 d2 d6 = Tissir-Tkachev, Shenyang 2000. This is an example of the buried bishop.
b4) 10 \( \text{hxg7} \text{xg7} \text{11 a4} \) (11 \( \text{e2}?! \) c5 12 c3 a6 13 \( \text{g3} \) is similar to line 'b1'; 11 \( \text{e}2 \text{e1} \) is met by 11...e5 =)
11...b4 12 \( \text{e}2 \) c5 13 \( \text{g3} \) (13 c3 c4? 14 b1 b3 15 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g8} \) 16 h4 e5 buries the bishop on b1, which is rather committal for White. Beliavsky-Gilianets, Russian Ch (Orel) 1992) 13...\( \text{cxd4} \) 14 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 15 b5 \( \text{c5} \) 16 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 17 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 18 \( \text{d}3 \) 18 e5 dxe5 19 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{d}6 =) 18...\( \text{xd4} \) 19 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 20 b3 a5 = Pavasović-Gallagher, Pula Z 2000.

We now return to 9 a4 (D):

\[ \text{B} \]

9...b4 10 \( \text{e}2 \) a5 11 c3 bxc3

Black has another way to defend:
11...\( \text{a}6 \) 12 \( \text{xa6} \) \( \text{xa6} \) 13 \( \text{g3} \) bxc3 14 bxc3 \( \text{h6} \) c5 15 \( \text{g7} \text{g7} \) 17 \( \text{g5} \) e6 18 e5 \( \text{g8} \) 19 \( \text{e1} \) h6 20 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{cxd4} \) 21 \( \text{cxd4} \) dxe5 22 dxe5 \( \text{c6} \) with equality. Emmerson-Webster, British Ch (Scarborough) 1999.

12 bxc3 0-0 13 \( \text{h6} \) e5

Black shouldn't risk 13...\( \text{xh6} \) 14 \( \text{wxd6} \) \( \text{g6} \) 15 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 16 \( \text{h5} \) when White gets an attack with the plan of f4 and e5.

14 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g8} \) 15 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f8} \) 16 \( \text{h4} \)

Black's position is defensible and this is obviously a hit into the air. The black knight occupies the strong square f4.

16...\( \text{e6} \) 17 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 18 dxe5 dxe5 19 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{f4} \) (D)

\[ \text{w} \]

Black is much better. Charbonneau-Zubov, Oropesa del Mar U-16 Wch 1999 did not last long: 20 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 21 \( \text{xh5} \) \( \text{xh5} \) 22 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 23 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{g4} \) 24 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{d3} \) 25 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{gxf2} \) 26 \( \text{d2} \) f6 27 \( \text{h5+} \) \( \text{h8} \) 28 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xe1} \) 29 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{h3} + 30 \text{gxd3} \text{e5} 0-1.

**Conclusion:** This style of natural development is the modern option for White. It demands very accurate play from Black.
In this chapter we discuss the aggressive plan starting with 4 \( \text{g}5 \) followed by moves like \( \text{w}d2, \text{f}4 \) and often \( \text{e}5 \). Black has good defensive resources and chances for counterplay but some of the lines are extremely sharp. Usually Black can somehow benefit from the bishop's position. In our main recommended response Black erases it from the board and strives to use the dark squares. In Line A White puts the bishop on \( \text{f}4 \), which is a less natural square and hardly a real problem.

1 e4 d6 2 d4 \( \text{f}6 \) 3 \( \text{c}3 \) g6

Now:

A: 4 \( \text{f}4 \) 197
B: 4 \( \text{g}5 \) 198

4 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 5 \( \text{f}4 \) is more innocent than Line A but occurs a little more frequently. Black has some active responses, including 5...\( \text{c}6 \) (D):

a) After 6 d5 e5! 7 dx6 \( \text{xe}6 \) Black equalizes straight away; for example, 8 \( \text{w}d2 \) 0-0 9 0-0-0 \( \text{xa}2 \)!? (a more traditional approach is 9...a6 10 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 11 f3 \( \text{d}7 \) 12 g4 b5 13 \( \text{bl} \) \( \text{e}8 \) 14 h4 b4 15 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 16 \( \text{xd}4 \) h6 17 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{xf}3 \)!? 18 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 19 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{w}6 \) with attacking chances, Grosar-Avrukh, Elista OL 1998) 10 \( \text{g}5 \) (10 \( \text{xa}2 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 11 \( \text{w}3 \) \( \text{w}6 \) 12 c3 \( \text{xf}2 \) 13 \( \text{xf}2 \) \( \text{xf}4 \) with three pawns

and a solid position as compensation) 10...\( \text{e}6 \) 11 \( \text{w}f4 \) \( \text{w}7 \) 12 \( \text{wh}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 13 \( \text{dxe}5 \) dxe5 14 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \) Am.Rodriguez-Mowsziszian, Terrassa 1996 and now Mowsziszian gives as a possible continuation 14...h6 15 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) + 16 \( \text{wh}6 \) c6 intending ...b5.

b) 6 \( \text{w}d2 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 7 d5 (Black has no problems after 7 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 8 \( \text{xf}3 \) e5 = or 7 0-0-0 \( \text{xf}3 \) 8 \( \text{xf}3 \) e5 9 dxe5 \( \text{dxe}5 \) 10 \( \text{w}d8+ \text{d}8 \) 11 \( \text{xd}8+ \text{xd}8 \) 12 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{d}4 \) =) 7...\( \text{xf}3 \) 8 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 9 \( \text{e}2 \) c6 10 0-0-0 (10 dx6 bxc6 11 0-0-0 \( \text{w}a5 \) =) 10...0-0 11 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 12 \( \text{w}xh6 \text{cx}d5 \) 13 \( \text{d}d5 \) \( \text{d}d5 \) 14 \( \text{d}x \) 15 f4 \( \text{w}c7 \) 16 c3 e6 17 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 18 \( \text{w}d2 \) f5 = Grosar-Smirin, Bratto 1997.

A)

4 \( \text{f}4 \) (D)
This is not a very well known idea but it is not so easy to face. The potential problem compared with \( \mathcal{A}e3 \) is that the bishop is on a more vulnerable square.

4...c6 5 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \)

5 h3 is sometimes a waste of time and after 5...\( \mathcal{A}g7 \) 6 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \) 0-0 7 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) b5 8 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) \( \mathcal{D}bd7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{A}h6 \) e5 10 \( \mathcal{A}xg7 \) \( \mathcal{X}xg7 \) 11 0-0 (11 0-0-0 exd4 12 \( \mathcal{D}xd4 \) \( \mathcal{W}b6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{D}ce2 \) \( \mathcal{D}c5 \) 14 f3 a5 leads to a more lively position, but Black has nice counterplay) 11...\( \mathcal{A}b7 \) 12 a4 a6 = Black was perfectly OK in Zubov-Rakhman-gulov, Alushta 1999.

5...b5

5...\( \mathcal{D}bd7 \) 6 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( \mathcal{W}a5 \) is another interesting method but 5...\( \mathcal{A}g7 \) loses the tempo mentioned earlier if White replies 6 \( \mathcal{A}h6 \).

6 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \)

Less active is 6 a3 \( \mathcal{D}bd7 \) 7 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( \mathcal{D}b6 \) 8 h3 \( \mathcal{A}g7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) 0-0 10 0-0 a6 (preparing ...\( \mathcal{C}5 \)) 11 \( \mathcal{C}5 \) dxc5 12 dxc5 \( \mathcal{D}fd5 \) = Lutikov-Karasev, Rostov 1976.

6...\( \mathcal{D}bd7 \) 7 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( \mathcal{D}b6 \)

7...\( \mathcal{A}g7 \) 8 0-0 0-0 9 \( \mathcal{C}f1 \)?! (9 \( \mathcal{A}h6 \) \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) transposes to note 'b' to White's 9th move in Line C2 of Chapter 23) 9...\( \mathcal{D}b6 \) 10 h3 \( \mathcal{B}4 \) 11 \( \mathcal{C}e2 \) c5 12 dxc5 dxc5 13 \( \mathcal{D}c5 \) \( \mathcal{D}fd5 \) gave Black good counterplay in Kamber-Piket, Lugano 1989.

Now (after 7...\( \mathcal{D}b6 \)):

a) 8 0-0?! \( \mathcal{A}g4 \) (now this move is unpleasant) 9 \( \mathcal{C}5 \) \( \mathcal{H}h5 \) 10 exd6 \( \mathcal{A}xf3 \) 11 gxf3 \( \mathcal{A}xf4 \) 12 \( \mathcal{X}xh4 \) \( \mathcal{X}x6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{W}d6 \) exd6 \( \mathcal{G} \) G.Kuzmin-Conquest, London Lloyds Bank 1985.

b) It seems White should play 8 h3 \( \mathcal{A}g7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{H}h6 \) 0-10 \( \mathcal{X}xg7 \) \( \mathcal{X}g7 \) 11 0-0 \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 12 a4 b4 13 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) a5 14 \( \mathcal{A}g3 \) e5 (14...\( c5 \)? 15 \( \mathcal{C}5 \) dxe5 16 dxe5 \( \mathcal{A}g8 \) looks playable and more solid) 15 c3 bxc3 16 \( \mathcal{W}xc3 \) \( \mathcal{G} \) Kuzmin-Ponomariov, Donetsk Z 1998.

Conclusion: 4 \( \mathcal{A}f4 \) is theoretically not so dangerous as 4 \( \mathcal{A}e3 \), although White has scored very well in practice.

B)

4 \( \mathcal{A}g5 \) (D)
a) 5 \( \text{W}e2! ? \) is rare but might be more dangerous than it looks. The natural continuation is 5...0-0 6 0-0-0 e6 7 h4 b5, when 8 e5?! b4 9 exf6 exf6 is good for Black.

b) There are certainly players who hate the line 5 e5 dxe5 (after 5...\( \text{Q}f7 6 \text{exd6 cxd6 7} \text{W}d2 \pm \) White usually gets some initiative) 6 dxe5 even if Black has excellent chances for equality in the ending after 6...\( \text{Q}g4 \) (not 6...\( \text{W}xd1 +. ? 7 \text{Q}xd1 \text{Q}g4 8 \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}xe5 9 \text{Q}f3 \text{Q}d6 10 \text{Q}xe7, which is simply bad for Black) 7 \( \text{W}xd8+ \text{Q}xd8 \) (\( \text{D} \)). Then:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b1) After the genuine pawn-sacrifice 8 \( \text{Q}xf3 \text{Q}xe5 \) (8...\( \text{Q}c6! ? 9 \text{Q}h4 \text{Q}xe5 10 \text{Q}g5 \text{Q}d7 11 \text{Q}g3 \text{Q}c6 12 \text{Q}b5 gives White the initiative, Raaste-Parma, Nice OL 1974) 9 0-0-0+ \text{Q}d7 10 \text{Q}xe5 (10 \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}c6 11 \text{Q}h5 \text{Q}xf3 12 \text{Q}xf3 f6 13 \text{Q}b4 \text{f}xg5 14 \text{Q}xc6+ \text{Q}e8 \dagger) 10...\text{Q}xe5 11 \text{Q}c4 \text{Q}xc3! ? (11...\text{Q}f6 12 \text{Q}h6 \text{Q}c8 13 \text{Q}e4 \text{Q}d6 14 \text{Q}he1 \text{Q}c6 15 \text{Q}d5 = \text{Q}e8 16 \text{Q}f7 \text{Q}d8 17 \text{Q}d5, Mayr-Berelovich, Berlin 1994) 12 \text{bxc3 f6 13} \text{Q}h6 \text{Q}c8 14 \text{Q}he1 \text{Q}c6 15 \text{f}4 \text{Q}d8 Black has at least equality, Kolenbrander-Neuvonen, Netherlands 1991; for example, 16 \text{Q}d5 a5 17 \text{Q}xc6 \text{Q}xc6 18 \text{Q}xe7 \text{Q}xg2.

b2) 8 \( \text{Q}d1+ \text{Q}d7 \) and then:

b21) White can try 9 \( \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}c6 \) 10 \( \text{Q}b5 \) (10 \text{f}4 \text{h}6 11 \text{Q}h4 \text{g}5 gives Black counterplay, Haubt-Hort, Bundesliga 1980/1) 10...\( \text{Q}gxe5 \) 11 \text{Q}f4 \text{h}6 12 \text{Q}h4 \text{a}6 (12...\( \text{Q}g4 ? \) looks less clear) 13 \( \text{Q}c2 \text{g}5 =.

b22) 9 \text{e}6 \text{fxe6} 10 \text{Q}c4 \text{Q}e8 11 \text{Q}d3 (the alternatives give Black counterplay: 11 \text{Q}b5 \text{Q}a6 12 \text{Q}d4 \text{Q}b4 13 \text{Q}xe6 \text{Q}xe6 14 \text{Q}xe6 \text{Q}xc2+ 15 \text{Q}f1 \text{Q}e5 \dagger; 11 \text{Q}g2 \text{Q}e5! 12 \text{Q}b3 \text{Q}a6 13 \text{Q}e4 \text{Qf7} 11...\text{Q}c6 12 0-0 (or 12 \text{Q}b5 \text{Q}e8 13 \text{Q}bd4 \text{Qxd4} 14 \text{Q}xd4 \text{Qf7} \dagger 15 \text{h}4?! \text{Q}e5 16 \text{Q}e2 \text{c}5 \dagger \text{Schellhorn-Chandler, Hamburg 1980} 12...\text{Q}ge5 (after 12...a6? 13 \text{Q}e1 \text{Q}g5 14 \text{Q}xe5 \text{Q}xe5} 15 \text{Q}b3 White has strong pressure on the central files as compensation) 13 \text{Q}xe5 \text{Q}xe5 14 \text{Q}b5 (14 \text{Q}b3 \text{c}5) 14...\text{Q}e8 15 \text{Q}xd7! \text{Q}xd7 (and not 15...\text{Q}xd7? 16 \text{Q}d1+ \text{Q}c6 17 \text{Q}xa7+ +) 16 \text{Q}xe6 \text{Q}e5 17 \text{f}4?! (worse are 17 \text{Q}d1 \text{Q}d8 18 \text{f}4 \text{Q}c5 \dagger \text{and} 17 \text{Q}e1 \text{a}6? \dagger) 17...\text{Q}d6 18 \text{Q}h6 \text{Q}d8 (Black can consider 18...\text{Q}d8!!) 19 \text{Q}g7 \text{Q}f8 20 \text{Q}xd6+ \text{Q}h6 \text{Q}c8 21 \text{Q}xf8 \text{Q}xf8 22 \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}c8, intending...\text{e}6, ...\text{Q}c7 and ...\text{Q}d8, an equal ending is very close.

c) White also has the aggressive 5 \text{f}4 \( \text{D} \):

c1) After the immediate 5...\text{c}5, 6 \text{e}5 is quite unpleasant.

c2) 5...0-0-0 6 \text{Q}d2 (6 \text{Q}f3 \text{c}5 7 \text{dxe5} \text{Q}a5 8 \text{Q}d3 \text{Q}xc5 should be OK for
Black) 6...c5 7 dxc5 (7 e5 g4 8 dxc5 dxe5 9 wxc8+ bxc8 10 xxe7 xe8 11 xdx6 exf4+ ?) 7...dxc5 8 0-0-0 c6 is not so bad for Black.

c3) 5...h6 6 xh4 e5 is the most critical and perhaps best. Then:

c31) 7 dxc5 wa5 leads to rather standard and comparatively positional Pirc play: 8 d4 (a risky plan is 8 d2 xxc5 9 h3 dbd7 10 xex3 0-0 11 0-0-0 a6 12 g4 b5 13 dbd3 dbb7 14 g5 hxg5 15 xex2 c7 16 xex5 b4 17 db2 c5 18 g3? b5 19 kokkila-yrjolä, Finnish Cht 2000) 8...xc5 9 d2 0-0 10 xc2 dbd7 11 h3 a6 12 a4 b6 13 xex2 c7 14 0-0 dbb7 = Schmitt-Gulko, Geneva 1997.

c32) 7 e5 leads to wild complications: 7...h5 8 dxc5 xdx5 9 exd6 g5 10 xex2 (equally messy is 10 xg3 0-0 11 xfx4 xfx4 12 wff3 dxc6 13 0-0-0 e5 14 gce2 xex6 15 xg3 fxg3 16 xex5 f5 17 xgl xff6, Hall-Agrest, Harlinge 1998) 10...0-0 11 xd2 xex5 12 0-0-0 xg4 13 xex3 dxc6 14 xdx6 (14 h4 dxc5 15 xdx5 xff6 16 xex5 dxc6 is equal) and now Black’s activity appears to compensate for the dangerous-looking

d6-pawn: 14...xe5!? (after 14...xe8 15 h4, Sorokin-Jansa, Ostrava 1992, Nunn and McNab recommend 15...wa5 16 b1 with a complex position) 15 xex5 xex5 16 gxf3 dxe5 17 xex5 xex5 18 db5 xex5 19 xex5 dbd7 20 xd4 (20 xex5?) 20...xe4 led to a murky position in Cranbourne-Molo, corr. 1994.

5...h6 (D)

The main line 5...0-0 6 f4 c6 7 xex3 b5 8 xex3 xg4 9 e5! has been unsuccessful for Black in practice. This is why we avoid it with the text-move, which has scored reasonably well.

![Diagram]

6 xh4

Or:

a) The modest move 6 xh4 allows 6...xg4 7 xex3 e5 8 dxc5 xex5 9 0-0-0 dbc6 10 xex5 (both 10 h3 xxe4 11 xex4 xex4 12 xex4 13 xex4 14 xex4 15 wff6 16 xex5 dxc6 is equal) and now Black’s activity appears to compensate for the dangerous-looking

d6-pawn: 14...xe5!? (after 14...xex5 15 h4, Sorokin-Jansa, Ostrava 1992, Nunn and McNab recommend 15...wa5 16 xex5 with a complex position) 15 xex5 xex5 16 gxf3 dxe5 17 xex5 xex5 18 db5 xex5 19 xex5 dbd7 20 xd4 (20 xex5?) 20...xg4 led to a murky position in Cranbourne-Molo, corr. 1994.

5...h6 (D)

The main line 5...0-0 6 f4 c6 7 xex3 b5 8 xex3 xg4 9 e5! has been unsuccessful for Black in practice. This is why we avoid it with the text-move, which has scored reasonably well.

![Diagram]

6 xh4

Or:

a) The modest move 6 xh4 allows 6...xg4 7 xex3 e5 8 dxc5 xex5 9 0-0-0 dbc6 10 xex5 (both 10 h3 xxe4 11 xex4 xex4 12 xex4 13 xex4 14 xex4 15 wff6 16 xex5 dxc6 is equal) and now Black’s activity appears to compensate for the dangerous-looking
idea; b2 is a target) 12 \textit{f}e3 b5 13 f4 \textit{e}c4 14 \textit{xc}4 bxc4 15 c3 0-0 16 \textit{f}f3 f5 \textit{f} Lugovoi-Sakaev, St Petersburg 1995.

b) A more dangerous line for White is 6 \textit{f}f4!? \textit{bd}7 (6...g5 7 \textit{xe}3 \textit{eg}4 is likely to come to the same thing after 8 0-0-0 \textit{d}7 7 0-0-0 g5 8 \textit{xe}3 (8 \textit{g}3 \textit{eh}5 transposes to the main line) 8...\textit{eg}4 9 h4 \textit{xe}3 10 \textit{w}xe3 (10 fxe3!? g4 11 h5 is a suggestion by Stohl; now Black could play 11...\textit{b}6 to stop \textit{c}4) 10...g4 and then:

b1) Black got a powerful bishop after 11 h5 c5 12 \textit{ge}2 a6 (12...\textit{wa}5!? to continue...b5) 13 dxc5 \textit{xc}5 14 \textit{d}4 \textit{wa}5 (Stohl thinks 14...\textit{d}7 15 \textit{c}4 \textit{c}8, with counterplay, is even better) 15 \textit{c}4 \textit{d}7 16 \textit{d}5 \textit{a}4 in J.Polgar-Smirin, Groningen PCA 1993.

b2) 11 f4?! is more dangerous:

b21) 11...\textit{gxf}3?! 12 \textit{xf}3 c5 13 \textit{h}3!! (13 dxc5 \textit{xc}5 14 e5 is critical according to Yudasin because Black's position is ragged after 14...0-0 15 exd6 exd6 16 \textit{c}4 ±) 13...\textit{wa}5 14 \textit{hb}1 a6 15 \textit{g}3 exd4 16 \textit{xd}4 \textit{e}5 17 \textit{d}5. Sutovsky-Arest, New York Open 1998, and now 17...\textit{d}6 looks at least equal with the strong bishop on e5.

b22) 11...\textit{c}5?! looks better. After 12 dxc5 (12 \textit{ge}2 \textit{wa}5) 12...\textit{xc}5 13 \textit{h}5+ (13 \textit{e}5 0-0 \textit{f}7) 13...\textit{d}7 14 e5 0-0 (or the unclear 14...\textit{xb}5 15 \textit{xb}5 \textit{wb}6) 15 \textit{xd}7 \textit{wd}7 16 exd6 exd6 17 \textit{ge}2 \textit{e}8 Black's piece activity and the strong g7-bishop compensate for his weaknesses.

6...\textit{bd}7

An alternative move-order for Black is 6...g5 7 \textit{lg}3 \textit{eh}5 8 0-0-0 (8 \textit{c}4 e6 9 \textit{ge}2 \textit{d}7!? followed by ...\textit{b}6 and ...\textit{d}5 should be OK for Black) 8...\textit{d}7, transposing to the main line. This move-order avoids the next note.

7 0-0-0

7 f4 58 d5 \textit{wa}5 9 \textit{f}3 (9 a3 \textit{d}5 is unclear) 9...\textit{b}4! 10 \textit{c}3 c4 11 \textit{d}2 \textit{xb}2 12 0-0 \textit{g}4 13 \textit{d}4 \textit{w}6 14 \textit{fd}1 and now, instead of 14...\textit{ge}6 (Shabalov-Smirin, Philadelphia 1997), Black can try 14...g5 15 \textit{xf}4 gxf4 with a very unclear position.

7...g5 8 \textit{lg}3 \textit{eh}5 (D)

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_diagram.png}
\end{center}

Now Black's most promising counterchances are usually based on the move...c5 and the power of the dark-squared bishop.

9 \textit{ge}2

Or:

a) 9 f3 \textit{lg}3 10 \textit{h}4c3 c5 11 dxc5 (11 \textit{ge}2 transposes to the main line) 11...\textit{xc}5 12 \textit{b}5+ \textit{f}8 13 \textit{ge}2 a6 14 \textit{c}4 1/2-1/2 Leko-Chernin, Hungarian Ch (Budapest) 1997.

b) 9 \textit{c}4 c5 (less active is 9...e6?! 10 \textit{ge}2 \textit{b}6 11 \textit{b}3 \textit{d}7) 10 \textit{ge}2 \textit{wa}5 11 \textit{eh}1 (11 \textit{d}5 \textit{xd}2+ 12 \textit{xd}2
\[ \text{Conclusion:} \text{ Some players might consider this line rather unpleasant for Black. While it is not clear White can get any advantage at all, the line with 5 e5 is somewhat irritating and some other lines like 5 f4 lead to extremely complex positions. In the main line, Black tends to gain counterplay on the dark squares. Against this system Black can exert much more pressure if he can adopt the Modern move-order. After 1 e4 d6 2 d4 g6 3 \text{c3 \text{g7} 4 \text{g5 Black can comfortably play 4...a6, 4...c6 or even 4...d7.} \]
25 Pirc: Miscellaneous Lines

Here we examine all other lines after 1 e4 d6 2 d4 əf6, which vary considerably in nature. C3 is the line with most practical importance. Many players consider the systems starting with 4 g3 as a good positional way to play for a win and it often works well when Black doesn’t have a sufficiently concrete and active plan. There are a few such plans and here we focus on one.

4 əc4 (Line C2) and 4 əe2 intending h4 (Line C1) are quite aggressive systems which don’t have totally sound reputations but especially in Line C2 there are some extremely messy variations and these lines can thus be dangerous if Black is unprepared.

3 əd3 (Line A) is a positional plan which is not particularly dangerous if Black is prepared. We take the most Pirc-style approach from several alternatives.

3 f3 (Line B) doesn’t allow Black any Pirc-style options, so we adopt an approach (3...d5) which often leads to French-type play. Another Old Indian-style approach is discussed in Chapter 33.

1 e4 d6 2 d4 əf6

Now:

A: 3 əd3  203
B: 3 f3    207
C: 3 əc3   210

In Line C we deal with all lines for White after 3 əc3 g6 that have not already been discussed in earlier chapters.

A)

3 əd3 (D)

B

3...g6

Black has quite a reliable equalizer in 3...e5 4 c3 d5!?, which leads to positions akin to the Petroff Defence. However, a Pirc player may feel uncomfortable in these positions. The main line runs 5 dxe5 əxe5 6 əf3 əc6 7 əbd2 əc5 = 8 əb1!? (8 əc2 əg4 9 0-0 əe7 10 əe1 əd7 11 b4 əe6 12 əd3 a5 13 b5 əcd8 14 a4 c5 is equal, Egiazarian-Marin, Bucharest 1998; 8 əb5!? 8...g4 9 b4 əe6 10 əa4 əh5 11 0-0 (A.Fedorov-Khalifman,
Maikop (1998) and now 11...a6 is unclear according to Fedorov.

4 \( \text{Qf3} \)

Or:

a) 4 \( \text{Qe2} \) (this move is more passive) 4...\( \text{Qg7} \) 5 c3 0-0 6 0-0 e5 7 f4 \( \text{Qc6} \) 8 fx\( \text{e}5 \) dxe5 9 d5 \( \text{Qe}7 \) 10 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qe}8 \) 11 c4 c5 12 \( \text{Qbc}3 \) b6 13 \( \text{Qd}2 \) f6 = Tomczak-Rosenthal, 2nd Bundesliga 1997/8.

b) After 4 f4 Black tends to get counterplay against the pawn-centre: 4...c5?! 5 c3 (5 dxe5 \( \text{Qa5+} \) ) 5...\( \text{Qg7} \) 6 \( \text{Qf3} \) exd4 7 exd4 0-0 8 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 9 0-0 \( \text{Qg4} \) 10 \( \text{Qc}3 \) and now the most logical is 10...e5?! (also possible are 10...\( \text{Qxf3} \) 11 \( \text{Qxf3} \) c5 and 10...\( \text{Qb6} \) ) 11 fx\( \text{e}5 \) dxe5 12 d5 \( \text{Qd}4 \) 13 \( \text{Qe}2 \) \( \text{Qxf3} \) 14 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{Qe}8 \) 15 \( \text{Qe}2 \) \( \text{Qxf3}+ \) 16 gxf3 \( \text{Qd}6 \) = with a nice blockading knight, Müllner-McNab, corr. Wch 1990-5.

4...\( \text{Qg7} \) 5 0-0 0-0 6 c3

White can also attempt to do without this move: 6 \( \text{Qe}1 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 7 d5 (7 h3 e5 8 c3 transposes to the main line) 7...\( \text{Qb}4 \) 8 \( \text{Qf}1 \) a5 (or 8...\( \text{Qg}4 \) 9 \( \text{Qbd}2 \) a5 =) 9 c4 \( \text{Qg}4 \)! 10 \( \text{Qbd}2 \) c6 11 h3 \( \text{Qd}7 \) 12 a3 \( \text{Qa}6 \) 13 \( \text{Qb}1 \) exd5 14 cxd5 a4 15 b4 \( \text{Qb}3 \) 16 \( \text{Qxb}3 \) \( \text{Qa}4 \) is equal, Landau-\( \text{Ehlvest} \), Beijing 1996. Black has a very comfortable position.

6...\( \text{Qc}6 \) (D)

The alternative 6...\( \text{Qbd}7 \), with the plan of ...e5, ...b6 and ...\( \text{Qb}7 \), is also quite solid.

7 \( \text{Qe}1 \)

Here White has plenty of other moves:

a) 7 \( \text{Qa}3 \) e5 8 \( \text{Qc}2 \) \( \text{Qg}4 \) 9 \( \text{Qe}1 \) transposes to note 'b' to White's 8th move.

b) 7 h3 e5 8 \( \text{Qe}1 \) transposes to the main line.

c) It is maybe too early to play 7 b4 \( \text{Qg}4 \) 8 h3?! (better is 8 \( \text{Qbd}2 \) e5 9 d5 \( \text{Qe}7 \) 10 h3 \( \text{Qd}7 \) 11 c4 \( \text{Qh}5 \) 12 \( \text{Qb}3 \) \( \text{Qf}4 \) 13 \( \text{Qc}2 \) with an unclear position according to Leko) 8...\( \text{Qxf}3 \) 9 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) \( \text{Qd}7 \) 10 \( \text{Qd}2 \) (10 b5?? \( \text{Qxd}4 \) was a surprising blunder in Korchnoi-Azmaiparashvili, Amsterdam 1990) 10...e5 11 d5 \( \text{Qe}7 \) 12 \( \text{Qe}2 \) c6 13 c4 exd5 14 exd5 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 15 exd5 e4 16 \( \text{Qb}1 \) exd3 17 \( \text{Qxd}3 \) \( \text{Q} \) Leko-Cu.Hansen, Copenhagen 1995.

d) 7 d5 \( \text{Qb}8 \) leads to a different type of play. Now White can either stop ...\( \text{Qg}4 \) or continue his normal plans:

1) 8 h3 c6 (8...e5 9 dxe6 \( \text{Qxe}6 \) is possible) 9 c4 e6 (9...\( \text{Qa}6 \)??) 10 dxe6 \( \text{Qxe}6 \) 11 \( \text{Qc}3 \), Korchnoi-Cu.Hansen, Biel IZ 1993. and now 11...\( \text{Qa}6 \) 12 \( \text{Qe}1 \) \( \text{Qc}5 \) 13 \( \text{Qf}1 \) a5 is about level.

2) 8 c4 and then:

2a) After 8...e5??, 9 \( \text{Qc}3 \) leads to some kind of King's Indian, while 9 dxe6 fxe6?? 10 e5 \( \text{Qh}5 \) 11 exd6 cxd6 12 g3 \( \text{Qc}6 \) was fine for Black in Leko-Smirin, Wijk aan Zee 1994.
d22) 8...\(g4\) 9 h3 (9 \(\text{Q}bd2\) \(\text{Q}a6\) 10 h3 \(\text{Q}d7\) 11 \(\text{Q}e1\) e5 12 dxe6 \(\text{Q}xe6\) 13 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}d7\) = Landa-Schekachev, Jurmala 1991) 9...\(\text{Q}xf3\) 10 \(\text{Q}xf3\) \(\text{Q}a6\) 11 \(\text{Q}c3\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 12 \(\text{Q}e2\) (12 \(\text{Q}d2\) e6 13 \(\text{Q}ael\) f5 is unclear, Cybulak-Schekachev, Moscow 1991) 12...\(\text{Q}ae5\) 13 \(\text{Q}d2\) a5 14 \(\text{Q}ahl\) e6 = Korchnoi-Sznapiik, Lucerne OL 1982. In this line Black gets active knights and central play as compensation for the bishop-pair.

e) 7 \(\text{Q}g5\) is another important and logical continuation, with similarities to lines of the Torre. 7...h6 8 \(\text{Q}h4\) e5 (D) (8...\(\text{Q}h5\)??, with the plan of ...\(\text{Q}f4\), ...g5 and ...e5, is certainly worth considering but is also a riskier way to play for a win) and now:

![Diagram](image)

\(f5\)

\(e2\) 9 dxe5 \(\text{Q}xe5\) (of course 9...dxe5 can be played, but the text-move is very solid) 10 \(\text{Q}xe5\) dxe5 and now:

e21) 11 \(\text{Q}a3\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 12 \(\text{Q}b3\) (White even has chances to get into trouble here: 12 f3?! \(\text{Q}h5\) 13 \(\text{Q}f2\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 14 g3 \(\text{Q}h3\) 15 \(\text{Q}e1\) \(\text{Q}fd8\) ? Pochnev-Azmairashvili, Albena 1986) 12...\(\text{Q}h5\) 13 \(\text{Q}fd1\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 14 \(\text{Q}xf6\) \(\text{Q}xf6\) 15 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 16 a4 \(\text{Q}e6\)?! 17 a5 (17 \(\text{Q}xb7\)?? may be possible) 17...\(\text{Q}ab8\) 18 \(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{Q}xe4\) 19 \(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}c5\) = King-Burgess, British Ch (Blackpool) 1988.

e22) 11 a4 \(\text{Q}e8\) 12 \(\text{Q}a3\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 13 \(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{Q}h5\) 14 \(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 15 \(\text{Q}xf6\) \(\text{Q}xf6\) 16 a5 a6 17 \(\text{Q}c1\) \(\text{Q}g7\) 18 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 19 \(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{Q}g4\) 20 \(\text{Q}g3\) \(\text{Q}c5\) = O.Rodriguez-McNab, Thessaloniki OL 1988.

e23) 11 \(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 12 \(\text{Q}d2\) (or 12 \(\text{Q}e2\)??) 12...\(\text{Q}e8\) 13 \(\text{Q}fd1\) \(\text{Q}h5\) 14 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}f4\) 15 \(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 16 \(\text{Q}xe6\) \(\text{Q}xe6\) 17 \(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 18 \(\text{Q}f2\) \(\text{Q}h3\) - Kharitonov-Korotylev, Moscow 1996.

7...e5 (D)

![Diagram](image)

\(e1\) 9 \(\text{Q}bd2\) \(\text{Q}e8\) (with the idea of playing ...\(\text{Q}h5\) without weaknesses but Black may also consider the more aggressive 9...g5?? 10 \(\text{Q}g3\) \(\text{Q}h5\) since 11 \(\text{Q}xe5??\) dxe5 12 \(\text{Q}xh5\) exd4 doesn't look unattractive for Black) 10 dxe5 \(\text{Q}xe5\) 11 \(\text{Q}xe5\) dxe5 12 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}h5\) 13 \(\text{Q}e3\) c6 14 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}h7\) = Todorovic-Kosanski, Belgrade GMA 1988.

\(8\text{ h3}\)

After White's alternatives he tends to suffer due to the weakness of d4.
a) 8 8bd2 8h5! 9 8b3 8g4 (9...h6 10 8e3 8f6 is possible) 10 8e2 h6 (10...8f4?! 11 8xf4 exf4 is unclear) 11 h3 8e8 12 8e3 8f4 13 8f1 g5?! 14 dxe5 8xe5 15 8xe5 8xe5 16 8d4 8f6! 17 8f3 8e6 18 8xe5 dxe5 19 8a4 8h8 gives Black typical kingside counterplay, Blodstein-Belov, Voskresensk 1993.

b) 8 8a3 8g4 9 8c2 8h5 10 d5 8e7 11 c4 h6 12 8e3 8d7 13 g3 8e8 14 8h4 (after 14 c5?!, Bruzon-Becerra Rivero, Havana Capablanca mem 1999, Black should take the pawn: 14...dxc5! 15 8c2 b6 16 b4 f5 with counterplay) 14...f5 15 exf5 gxf5 16 8e2 g2 ±.

8...h6 (D)

Or:

a) The very natural 8...8h5 9 8g5 tends to favour White.

b) 8...8d7 is also quite playable, and usually transposes to the main line. In Kramnik-Timman, Wijk aan Zee 1998 Black equalized easily after 9 8bd2 8h5 10 8b3 a5 11 a4 8e8.

9 8a3

Instead:

a) Opting for a King’s Indian-type position with 9 d5?! is not very good here: for example, 9...8e7 10 c4 8h7 11 8c3 f5 ±.

b) 9 8e3 allows an interesting break in the centre: 9...d5?! (9...8h5 10 8bd2 8f6 is a typical method) and now:

b1) 10 8xe5 8xe5 11 dxe5 8xe4 12 8d2 8f5 13 8c2 (13 8xe4 dxe4 14 8c2 8h4 =) 13...8xd2 14 8xd2 8xd3 15 8xd3 8e7 = de la Villa-San Segundo, Pamplona 1997/8.

b2) 10 exd5 exd4 11 8h6 8xd5 12 8f4 8f5 13 c4 (13 8xf5 8xf5 14 8xc7 8d5 15 g4 8f6 16 8g3 dxc3 is unclear) 13...8d7 14 8xf5 8xf5 15 8xc7 8ac8 16 8h2 8fd8 and the d-pawn represented good compensation in Svirin-Diackov, Russian Cht (Podbolsk) 1992.

9...a6

This is quite a logical moment to play 9...8e8 since Black hardly has to worry about a closed King’s Indian-type position after White has put the knight on a3; for example: 10 8e2 8d7 11 8d2 (11 b4?! allows 11...d5! 12 exd5 8xd5 13 dxe5 8xc3 with a slight advantage for Black) 11...a5! (it is important to get space on the queenside) 12 b3 8h5 13 8c1 g5 14 8f1 8f6 15 dxe5 dxe5 16 8e3 8f4 17 8d5 8xd5 18 exd5 8a7 and Black has counterplay with...c4 or...f5 and...e4, Rublevsky-Krasenkow, Polanica Zdroj Rubinstein mem 1996.

10 8c2 8e8 11 8d2

White can hardly hope for anything more than a half-point with 11 dxe5 dxe5 12 8xe3 8e6 13 8c2 (13 b3 8h5
14 \&f1 \&xd1 15 \&xd1 \&ad8 16 \&b2 f5 17 exf5 gxf5 18 \&h4 \&xd1 19 \&xd1 \&e7 20 \&a3 f4 with counterplay for Black. (Kuzmin-Grigorov, Cappelle la Grande 1993) 13...\&d7 14 \&g4 \&h7 = Baimuratov-Tustainowski, Bratislava 1993.

11...\&d7 12 a4 a5

Now:

a) 13 \&a3? allows Black to equalize easily or even get more. 13...exd4 14 \&xd4 (14 exd4 \&b4 15 \&b1 d5?) {15...\&c6 =} 16 e5 \&e4 17 \&xe4 dxe4 18 \&xe4 \&c6 with nice positional compensation) 14...d5 (here too the positional pawn sacrifice 14...\&xd4!? 15 exd4 d5 16 e5 \&e4 17 \&xe4 dxe4 18 \&xe4 \&c6 \(\mp\) is very good) 15 exd5 \&xe1+ 16 \&xe1 \&xd4 17 cxd4 \&xd5 18 \&c4 \&xd4 19 \&e4 \&f6 20 \&f1 c6 (20...\&c6 \(\mp\)) 21 \&xa5 \&e8 22 \&f3 \&xf3 23 gxf3 \(\mp\). Now, instead of the incorrect 23...\&xh3? (Magem-Tkachev, Las Vegas FIDE 1999), the accurate 23...b6 24 \&c4 \&xh3 keeps more of an advantage.

b) 13 dxe5 dxe5 14 \&e3 \&e6 15 \&a3 \&e7 16 \&c2 is a recommendation by Gershon, offering White a minimal plus.

**Conclusion:** It seems this positional line doesn’t offer White much. In many cases Black has more than one promising continuation at his disposal and he can even choose a good form of the Petroff Defence at move four.

**B)**

3 f3 (D)
the active 12...b5?! 13 cxb5 \( \text{\&} b7 \) 14 bxc6 \( \text{\&} x c 6 \) 15 d5! \( \pm \) cannot be recommended.

b) 4 \( \text{\&} c 3 \) dxe4 5 fxe4 (5 \( \text{\&} g 5 \)) 5...e5! 6 dxe5 \( \text{\&} x d 1 + \) 7 \( \text{\&} x d 1 \) (7 \( \text{\&} x d 1 \) \( \text{\&} x e 4 \) leads to equality) 7...\( \text{\&} g 4 \) 8 \( \text{\&} d 5 \) \( \text{\&} d 7 \) 9 \( \text{\&} e 1 \) c6 10 \( \text{\&} c 3 \) \( \text{\&} x e 5 \) 11 \( \text{\&} f 3 \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) Cherepanov-Malinin, Arkhange
dalsk 1996. After 11...\( \text{\&} d 6 \) Black is fine.

4...\( \text{\&} f d 7 \) (D)

The very hypermodern 4...\( \text{\&} g 8 \)? has been a speciality of Valeri Beim. However, some players may not like to play such a move.

5 f4

Or:

a) After 5 \( \text{\&} d 3 \)?! c5 6 c3 \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 7 \( \text{\&} e 2 \) e6 8 0-0 cxd4 9 cxd4 \( \text{\&} b 6 \) 10 \( \text{\&} h 1 \) \( \text{\&} x d 4 \) 11 \( \text{\&} x d 4 \) \( \text{\&} x d 4 \) 12 \( \text{\&} c 3 \) a6 Black was a pawn up in Boissone

b) 5 \( \text{\&} c 3 \) c5 6 \( \text{\&} g 5 \)? (6 \( \text{\&} x d 5 \) c6 7 \( \text{\&} c 3 \) cxd4 8 \( \text{\&} x d 4 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 9 \( \text{\&} a 4 \) \( \text{\&} x d 5 \) =) looks suspect: 6...h6 7 \( \text{\&} h 4 \) g5 8 \( \text{\&} g 3 \) cxd4 9 \( \text{\&} b 5 \) e6 10 f4 \( \text{\&} a 5 + \) 11 \( \text{\&} f 2 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 12 \( \text{\&} f 3 \) \( \text{\&} c 5 \) (12...\( \text{\&} b 6 \)?)

13 \( \text{\&} g 1 \) \( \text{\&} e 4 \) \( \mp \) Timman-Hodgson, Amsterdam Donner mem 1996.

c) 5 c4 is an important alternative:

c1) 5...c6 6 cxd5 cxd5 7 f4 (or 7 \( \text{\&} c 3 \)?) 7...c5 8 \( \text{\&} f 3 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 \) transposes to the main line and may be best.

c2) 5...dxc4 6 \( \text{\&} x c 4 \) e6 (6...\( \text{\&} b 6 \) 7 \( \text{\&} b 3 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 8 \( \text{\&} e 2 \) \( \text{\&} f 5 \) transposes to a line of the Queen's Gambit Accepted - \( \text{\&} c 3 \) cxd5 9 0-0 \( \text{\&} e 6 \) 10 a3 a5 11 \( \text{\&} b 2 \) \( \text{\&} c 5 \) was fine for Black in the game L.B.Hansen-Adams, Wijk aan Zee 1993) 8...\( \text{\&} x e 5 \) 9 \( \text{\&} f 3 \) a6 10 \( \text{\&} c 3 \) b5 11 \( \text{\&} d 3 \) \( \text{\&} b 7 \) 12 a3 \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 13 \( \text{\&} e 4 \) 0-0 (13...\( \text{\&} c 8 \)?) 14 h4 \( \text{\&} e 7 \) 15 \( \text{\&} e 3 \) f6 16 \( \text{\&} c 2 \) gave White the initiative in Kas
parov-Cu.Hansen, Tásinge (1) 1990, though things didn't look so clear around move 9.

5...c5 6 \( \text{\&} f 3 \)

This is hardly a good moment for the aggressive 6 e6?! fxe6 7 \( \text{\&} d 3 \) g6 8 h4 \( \text{\&} g 7 \) 9 h5 \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 10 \( \text{\&} f 3 \) (10 hxg6 hx6 is unclear) 10...\( \text{\&} x d 4 \) 11 \( \text{\&} g 5 \) c4 12 \( \text{\&} e 5 \) \( \text{\&} f 1 \) \( \text{\&} f 5 \) 14 hxg6 hxg6 15 \( \text{\&} x h 8 + \) \( \text{\&} x h 8 \) 16 g4 \( \text{\&} d 6 \) \( \mp \) Nepomni
shay-Rashkovsky, St Petersburg 1994.

6...\( \text{\&} c 6 \) (D)

7 c4

This is maybe too sharp. Alternatives:

a) 7 c3 cxd4 8 cxd4 \( \text{\&} b 6 \) should be OK for Black as he now gets his light
squared bishop out; for example, 9 \( \text{\&} c 3 \) (9 b3 \( \text{\&} f 5 \) 10 \( \text{\&} d 3 \) \( \text{\&} e 4 \) 11 \( \text{\&} b 2 \) f5 12 0-0 e6 \( \mp \) Kaspi-Gofshtein, Tel-Aviv Czerniak mem 1998) 9...\( \text{\&} f 5 \) (9...\( \text{\&} g 4 \) 10 \( \text{\&} e 2 \) e6 is also logical) 10 \( \text{\&} e 2 \) e6 11 0-0 \( \text{\&} e 7 \) 12 b3 0-0 13 \( \text{\&} b 2 \) f6 14 \( \text{\&} x f 6 \) \( \text{\&} x f 6 \) 15 \( \text{\&} e 5 \) \( \text{\&} d 7 \) with an
b22) 11 \( \text{f}2 \text{e}6 \) 12 \( \text{d}3 \) transposes to a line of the French that is considered bad for Black. 12...\text{d}4?! 13 \( \text{c}e4 \text{b}4+ \) 14 \text{c}3 \text{d}xc3 15 bxc3 \text{c}7 16 0-0 \( \pm \) was Sadler-Hodgson, Bundesliga 1998/9, while 12...\text{g}5 is risky in view of 13 \( \text{h}5!? \text{g}xf4 \) 14 0-0-0. Speelman suggested 12...\text{b}6.

7...\text{e}6 8 \text{cxd}5 \text{exd}5 9 \text{c}3

Or:

a) 9 \text{d}3? \text{cxd}4 10 0-0 \text{c}5 (to play ...\text{b}6 and ...\text{b}4) 11 a3 \text{b}6 12 b4 \text{xd}3 13 \text{xd}3 \text{g}6! \pm Sjödahl-Hodgson, Harplinge 1998.

b) 9 a3!? \text{b}6 (9...\text{cxd}4?! 10 b4) 10 b4! \text{cxd}4 11 \text{e}2, with compensation, is an untested recommendation by Seirawan. Black could play 11...\text{c}7 with ...\text{b}6 to follow.

9...\text{cxd}4 10 \text{c}4 (D)

\hfill

10...\text{dxe}5!

This tactical strike is far better than 10...\text{b}6 11 \text{e}3 \( \pm \).

11 \text{d}5

11 \text{xc}6 \text{xc}6 12 \text{xd}5 led to another Hodgson victory: 12...\text{e}6 13 \text{xd}8+ \text{xd}8 14 \text{b}5 \text{c}5 15 \text{d}2
\[ f2+ 16 \textit{d}e2 0-0 17 \textit{d}e3 \textit{x}e3 18 \textit{x}xe3 \textit{d}e8 \mp \text{ Lodhi-Hodgson, Dhaka 1993. Of course 11 fxe5 is not possible either in view of 11...\textit{w}h4+ 12 \textit{g}3 \textit{x}d4 13 \textit{x}d4 \textit{x}d4 14 \textit{x}d5 \textit{d}g4!}. 11...\textit{d}d7! 12 \textit{x}d5 \textit{c}c5 13 \textit{h}3 \textit{g}4! 14 \textit{d}d2 \textit{h}4+ 15 \textit{f}f1 0-0-0 16 \textit{x}c5 \textit{e}6 17 \textit{x}e6 \textit{f}xe6 18 \textit{g}3 \textit{h}3+ 19 \textit{g}2 \textit{x}g2+ 20 \textit{x}g2 \textit{d}xd5 = \text{ Seirawan-Adams, Bermuda 1999.}

After the tactical struggle the game was transformed to an ending where the activity of Black’s pieces compensated for the advantage of the bishop-pair.

\textbf{Conclusion:} After 3 f3 there are no Pirc-style options but this French-style solution is quite interesting, the critical continuation being 7 \textit{d}e3. If Black likes more peaceful play, maybe he should consider 3...e5.

C)

3 \textit{d}c3 \textit{g}6

Now:

C1: 4 \textit{d}e2 210
C2: 4 \textit{d}c4 212
C3: 4 \textit{g}3 215

In Line C1 we focus on White following up with 5 g4 or 5 h4.

The ‘extended’ fianchetto 4 h3 \textit{g}7 5 g4 0-0 6 \textit{g}2 is probably premature at this point because of the typical strike 6...c5! (6...e5 7 \textit{d}ge2 \textit{d}c6 8 \textit{d}e3 is what White wants) 7 dxc5 (7 d5?! \textit{a}6 is not a very good form of Benoni and 7 \textit{d}ge2 \textit{x}d4 8 \textit{x}d4 \textit{d}c6 leads to a slightly suspicious form of Dragon) 7...dxc5 8 \textit{x}d8 \textit{d}xd8 9 \textit{d}e3 \textit{a}6 =, which is quite comfortable for Black. This is why players aiming for this system usually play 4 \textit{d}e3 first.

C1)

4 \textit{d}e2 \textit{g}7 (D)

\textit{w}

5 \textit{h}4

Instead, 5 \textit{d}f3 is of course a Classical Pirc.

The other flank attack idea 5 g4 invites an active answer:

\textit{a}) The Benoni-style 5...c5 6 g5 (6 d5 \textit{a}6 7 g5 \textit{d}d7 comes to the same thing: 6 dxc5 \textit{w}a5 should be fine for Black) 6...\textit{d}d7 7 d5 \textit{d}a6 another plan is possible: 7...a6 8 a4 \textit{w}a5 9 \textit{g}2 h6 10 \textit{x}h6 \textit{x}h6 11 \textit{a}xh6 {11 \textit{f}4 is unclear} 11...\textit{x}h6 12 \textit{d}f3 \textit{d}f6 \mp \text{ Tähtävöri-Lehtinen, Finnish Ch 1996) 8 \textit{h}4 \textit{d}c7 9 h5 (9 a4 a6 10 \textit{w}d3 \textit{b}8 11 h5 b5 gives Black counterplay. M.Nielsen-Andreasen, Roskilde 1998) 9...b5 10 h6 \textit{d}xc6+ 11 bxc6 0-0 12 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}b7 13 \textit{d}f3 e6 14 dxe6 \textit{f}xe6 15 \textit{w}xd6 \textit{a}xe4 gave Black counterplay in the game G.Portisch-Boronyak, Zalaegerszeg 1993.}
b) The central strike 5...d5!? 6 e5 \( \square \text{c}4 \) is another attractive idea against White’s hazardous play; for example, 7 \( \square \text{x}e4 \) (7 f3 \( \square \text{x}c3 \) 8 \text{bxc}3 \text{h}5 \text{f}7 \text{f}4!!?) 7...\text{dxe}4 8 \text{\text{c}5} \text{c}5 9 \text{c}3 \text{cxd}4 10 \text{cxd}4 \text{c}6 11 \text{w}d2 \text{\text{e}6} 12 \text{\text{c}h}3 \text{\text{w}d}7 13 \text{\text{f}4!} \text{\text{g}x}g4 14 \text{e}6 \text{\text{x}e}6 15 \text{d}5 \text{\text{x}d}5 16 \text{\text{x}d}5 \text{e}6 17 \text{\text{c}3} \text{\text{w}d}2+ 18 \text{\text{x}d}2 0-0-0+ 19 \text{\text{c}2} \text{f}5 is unclear, Einarsson-Karason, Reykjavik 1998.

5...\text{h}5 (D)

This is the safest move.

a) 5...\text{c}5 6 \text{dxe}5 \text{w}a5, as recommended by Nunn and McNab, is a playable option.

b) 5...\text{c}6 is an interesting alternative, which is for some reason condemned by Nunn and McNab. Almost every line seem to lead to an unclear position with practical chances for both sides:

\begin{enumerate}
\item 6 \text{b}3?! 5 \text{d}5 \text{d}4 8 \text{cxd}4 9 \text{wxd}4 0-0 10 \text{\text{d}2} \text{e}8 11 \text{f}3 \text{c}6 with standard compensation.
\item 6 \text{h}5 \text{gx}h5 7 \text{b}5 (7 \text{\text{c}3} \text{g}4 8 \text{h}xh5 \text{\text{c}x}c3 9 \text{f}x\text{c}3 \text{c}6 10 \text{\text{d}2} \text{\text{d}7} 11 0-0-0 \text{w}7 12 \text{\text{f}3} 0-0-0 =; 7 \text{\text{b}3} \text{c}5 8 \text{\text{d}xe}5 \text{\text{d}xe}5 is unclear, as is 7 \text{\text{g}5} \text{h}6 8 \text{\text{h}4} \text{\text{g}4} 9 \text{f}3 \text{\text{d}7} 7...\text{\text{d}7} (7...\text{a}6!? 8 \text{g}x\text{c}6+ \text{b}c6 9 \text{\text{g}e}2 \text{\text{b}8}) 8 \text{\text{g}e}2 \text{a}6 9 \text{\text{x}c}6 \text{\text{x}c}6 10 \text{\text{g}3} \text{b}5 11 \text{\text{g}5}.
\end{enumerate}

6 \text{\text{d}3}

It is logical to play the knight to g5. White has two main alternatives:

a) 6 \text{f}3 \text{g}4 7 \text{g}5 (7 \text{\text{c}3} \text{\text{c}6}) 7...\text{\text{c}xe}2 8 \text{\text{w}xe}2 \text{d}6 and then:

\begin{enumerate}
\item 9 \text{\text{e}5!?} \text{\text{h}7} 10 \text{\text{g}3} \text{dxe}5 11 \text{dxe}5 \text{\text{f}8} (or 11...\text{w}d7 12 0-0 0-0) 12 0-0 \text{w}d7 13 \text{\text{d}1} \text{g}4 = Vratonjić-Vadasz, Budapest 1990.
\end{enumerate}

a2) 9 \text{\text{e}3} \text{\text{g}4} 10 0-0-0 \text{e}5 11 \text{dxe}5 \text{\text{c}xe}5 12 \text{\text{c}xe}3 \text{\text{d}xe}5 = Nadezhdin-Nalesny, Russia Cup (Novgorod) 1997.

b) 6 \text{\text{g}5} \text{c}6 7 \text{w}d2 (after 7 \text{a}4 Black has the plan 7...\text{a}5 8 \text{d}2 \text{\text{d}a}6 with...\text{\text{b}4} (to follow) 7...\text{b}5 and here:

b1) 8 \text{\text{f}3!?!} \text{e}5 (8...\text{\text{b}7} 9 0-0-0 \text{\text{b}d}7 = might be preferable) 9 \text{\text{g}e}2 \text{\text{w}c}7 10 0-0-0 0-0 11 \text{\text{d}xe}5 \text{dxe}5 12 \text{\text{f}d}1 \text{\text{e}6} 13 \text{\text{w}d}6 with a slight advantage for White, Donev-Mittelberger, Vorarlberg Ch 1995.

b2) 8 \text{a}3 \text{\text{b}d}7 (Black can opt for the standard plan of...\text{a}6, ...\text{\text{b}7}, ...\text{w}c7 and...\text{c}5, starting with 8...\text{a}6) 9 \text{\text{b}6} 10 \text{\text{c}5} \text{\text{g}4} 11 \text{\text{d}5?!} (White's plan is too aggressive) 11...\text{\text{d}xe}5 12 \text{\text{f}e}5 \text{\text{d}xe}5 13 \text{dxe}6 \text{\text{w}d}2+ 14 \text{\text{d}2} \text{a}6 15 0-0-0 \text{\text{c}x}c6 \text{\text{f}7} Potterat-Jordachescu, Odorhei 1993.

6...\text{\text{d}6}

6...\text{\text{c}3} 7 \text{\text{h}3} 0-0 is also possible.

7 \text{\text{g}5} 0-0 8 \text{\text{e}3} \text{e}5 (D)

9 \text{d}5

White’s plan to castle queenside by 9 \text{\text{d}xe}5 \text{\text{c}xe}5 10 \text{\text{w}d}2 (10 \text{f}3 \text{c}6 11 \text{a}4
allows Black to equalize with the effective central break 11...d5 12 0-0 dxe4 13 \[\text{Wxd8} \text{Exd8} 14 \text{Qgxe4} \text{Qe8} = \text{Mestrovic-Praznik, Bled 1995} \] 10...\[\text{Ad7} 11 0-0-0-b5! 12 f3 b4 13 \text{Qd5} a5 14 \text{Qd4} \text{Exd5} 15 exd5 a4 16 f4 b3 17 cxb3 axb3 18 a3 \text{Qg4} gave Black plenty of play in Kobalja-V. Fedorov, Russia Cup (Moscow) 1996.

9...\[\text{Qd4!} \]

This kind of pawn sacrifice is a very important weapon in Black's arsenal, especially in this line.

10 \[\text{Exd4} \text{Exd4} 11 \text{Wxd4} c6! \]

Black has at least adequate compensation because of his domination of the dark squares.

12 \[\text{Qxc6} \]

12 \[\text{Qd2} \text{cxd5} 13 \text{exd5} \text{Qf5} 14 0-0 \text{Ec8} 15 \text{Qd3} \text{Exd3} 16 \text{Wxd3} \text{Qg4} 17 \text{Rael} \text{Wb6} and Black won easily in Kiik-Maki, Helsinki 1993 – a nice example.

12...\[\text{Bxc6} 13 0-0 \text{Qd5} 14 \text{Wc4} \text{Qf4!} \]

15 \[\text{Wxc6?!} \text{Qxc3} 16 \text{Qf3} \]

16 \[\text{Qc4?!-} \]

16...\[\text{Qxb2} 17 \text{Qxa8 \text{Qxa1} 18 \text{Qxa1} \text{Wb6}} \]

\[\text{† Wade-Smyslov, Havana Capablanca mem 1965. White had to give up his queen after 19 e5 d5 20 g3 \text{Qg4.}} \]

Conclusion: Black has enough counterplay against these flank attack ideas. Against 5 h4, 5...h5 is a safe answer while 5...\[\text{Qc6} \]

is a more obscure one.

C2)

4 \[\text{Qc4} \text{Qg7 (D)} \]

5 \[\text{Qf3} \]

A very sharp variation starts with 5 \[\text{Wb2} \text{Qc6:} \]

a) 6 \[\text{Qf3} \text{Qg4} \text{and then:} \]

a1) 7 \[\text{Qe3} \text{is not too critical: 7...0-0} \]

8 \[\text{Qb3} (8 0-0-0 \text{Qxe4} 9 \text{Qxe4} d5 10 \text{Qd3} \text{dxc4} 11 \text{Qxe4} \text{Qd6 = Beyer-Buchal, Bundesliga 1994/5}) 8...e5 9 \text{dxe5} \text{dxe5} 10 \text{Qc5} \text{Qd4} 11 \text{Qe3} \text{Qxf3} \]

12 \text{gxf3} \text{Qd7! 13 \text{Qxf8} \text{Wxf8} 14 \text{Qe2} \text{Qh6 with excellent compensation for Black.} \]

a2) 7 e5?! \[\text{Qxf3} 8 \text{gxf3} (8 \text{Qxf3?!} \text{Qxd4}) 8...\[\text{Qxd4} 9 \text{exf6} \text{Qxe2} 10 \text{fxg7} \text{Qg8 leads to a type of position that is} \]
very hard to assess. Black has a material advantage but three pieces can easily beat the queen if Black weakens his pawn-structure. 11 \( \text{h}x\text{e}2?! \) (11 \( \text{h}x\text{e}2 \text{h}x\text{g}7 \) 12 \( \text{h}x\text{e}3 \text{c}6 \) 13 0-0-0 \( \text{w}a5 \) 14 \( \text{f}4 \) 0-0-0 is equally unclear, Rocha Jorge-Silva, Brazil 1997) 11...\( \text{x}g7 \) 12 \( \text{h}x\text{h}5 \) 13 \( \text{h}x\text{h}6 \) \( \text{h}x\text{h}7 \) 14 \( \text{g}5 \) c6 15 \( \text{h}x\text{e}1 \) d5 16 \( \text{x}d3 \) \( \text{w}d7?! \) (16...\( \text{w}d6 \) 17 \( \text{w}f1 \) e6 is less weakening) 17 \( \text{w}f1 \) f5? 18 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \pm \) Zelčić-Z.Horvath, Pula 1996.

b) 6 e5 and now:

b1) 6...\( \text{x}d4 \) 7 \( \text{ex}f6 \) \( \text{g}x\text{e}2 \) 8 \( \text{x}g7 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 9 \( \text{g}x\text{xe}2 \) leads to obscure play.

b2) 6...\( \text{g}4 \) 7 e6 is very sharp, although after 7...\( \text{x}d4 \) (7...f5 8 d5 \( \text{a}5 \) is unclear) 8 \( \text{x}g4 \) \( \text{x}c2+ \) 9 \( \text{w}f1 \) (9 \( \text{w}d1?! \)) 9...\( \text{x}a1 \) 10 \( \text{ex}f7+ \) \( \text{w}f8 \) 11 \( \text{h}4 \) d5! 12 \( \text{x}d5 \) c6 the position is very good for Black according to Nunn and McNab.

b3) 6...\( \text{d}7 \) (\( D \)) is safer:

Now the tactical attempts are suspect:

b31) 7 e6? \( \text{f}x\text{e}6 \) 8 \( \text{x}e6 \) \( \text{d}x\text{e}5 \) - .

b32) 7 \( \text{x}f7+?! \) \( \text{x}f7 \) 8 e6+ \( \text{g}8 \) (8...\( \text{w}e8 \) 9 \( \text{x}d7+ \) \( \text{x}d7 \) \( \mp \) may be even better) 9 \( \text{ex}d7 \) \( \text{x}d7 \) 10 \( \text{f}f3 \) h6 11 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{g}4?! \) (11...\( \text{w}h7 \) 12 0-0-0 c5 is playable) 12 h3 \( \text{xf3} \) 13 \( \text{x}f3 \) \( \text{h}7 = \) Norqvist-Andersson, Österskar 1994.

b33) Therefore White should settle for 7 \( \text{f}f3 \) \( \text{h}6 \).

b331) 8 \( \text{b}5?! \) 0-0 9 \( \text{x}c6 \) (9 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{x}e5 \) 10 \( \text{x}e5 \) \( \text{d}d4 \) = ) 9...\( \text{x}c6 \) 10 0-0 \( \text{g}4 \) 11 \( \text{e}1 \) (11 h3 \( \text{xf3} \) 12 \( \text{x}f3 \) \( \text{x}e5 \) 13 \( \text{d}x\text{e}5 \) \( \text{w}d7 \) 14 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{w}e6 \) \( \mp \) Eiber-Koch, Finkenstein 1993) 11...f6 12 e6 (12 \( \text{ex}d6 \) \( \text{ex}d6 \) 13 h3 \( \text{xf5} \) 14 \( \text{x}f4 \) \( \text{xe}8 \) \( \mp \) ) 12...f5 13 h3 \( \text{h}5 \) 14 \( \text{w}d3 \) h6?! 15 \( \text{h}2 \) g5 16 f4 g4 \( \mp \) Herbrechtsmeier-Ol.Schmidt, 2nd Bundesliga 1996/7 may be somewhat nasty though one game doesn’t prove much.

b332) 8 \( \text{b}3 \) 0-0 and now:

b3321) 9 e6 is too straightforward: 9...\( \text{f}x\text{e}6 \) 10 \( \text{x}x\text{e}6+ \) \( \text{x}x\text{e}6 \) 11 \( \text{x}x\text{e}6+ \) \( \text{h}8 \) 12 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{x}d4 \) 13 \( \text{w}h3 \) h6 \( \mp \) Holzer-Zimmerman, Oberwart 1998.

b3322) 9 h3 \( \text{a}5 \) 100-0 transposes to a line of the Alekhine that is acceptable for Black: 10...h6?! (10...\( \text{x}b3 \) 11 \( \text{ax}b3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 12 \( \text{f}4 \) is considered good for White, e.g., 12...f6 13 \( \text{ex}d6 \) \( \text{ex}d6 \) 14 d5! \( \mp \) Kapengut-Barkovsky, Minsk 1984) 11 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{x}b3 \) 12 \( \text{ax}b3 \) f6 (12...f5) 13 c4 \( \text{x}e5 \) 14 \( \text{d}x\text{e}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) led to an odd and rather messy position, in the game Kveinyš-Speelman, Moscow OL 1994.

5...0-0 (\( D \))

6 \( \text{w}e2 \)

The natural 6 0-0 is tame because of the standard trick 6...\( \text{d}x\text{e}4! \):

a) 7 \( \text{d}x\text{e}4 \) d5 8 \( \text{d}d3 \) (8 \( \text{d}x\text{d}5 \) \( \text{x}d5 \) 9 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 10 h3 \( \text{xe}6 \) 11 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}5 = \) ) 8...\( \text{d}x\text{e}4 \) 9 \( \text{x}e4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 10 c3 c5 = .
b) 7 ∆xf7+ ∆xf7 8 ∆xe4 h6 9 ∆d3!? (the classic exchange sacrifice 9 h3 ∆f8 10 ∆e1 ∆c6 11 d5 ∆xf3 12 gxf3 ∆xd4 13 ∆g2 g5 14 c3 ∆xf5 gave Black excellent compensation in the game Honfi-Adorjan, Hungarian Ch 1974) 9...∆f5 10 ∆e3 ∆c6 11 c3 (11 ∆e1 ∆b4!) 11...e5 12 ∆xe5 ∆xe5 13 ∆xe5 ∆xe5 14 ∆g3 ∆g7 15 ∆xf5 ∆xf5 = Anastasian-Ehlvest, New York Open 1998. Black has no problems at all.

6...c6 7 e5

Other moves are not dangerous for Black, especially if White allows...d5:

a) 7 a4?! d5 8 ∆b3 ∆g4! 9 e5 ∆xf7 10 h3 ∆xf3 11 gxf3 e6 12 f4 c5 7 Kovačević-Nikolac, Croatian Ch (Pula) 1998.

b) 7 ∆b3 ∆g4 8 h3 ∆xf3 9 ∆xf3 ∆bd7 10 ∆e3 e6! (with the idea of blocking the b3-bishop) 11 a4 d5 12 exd5 ∆xd5 13 ∆xd5 exd5 14 a5 (14 0-0 a5) 14...b5 15 axb6 axb6 16 0-0 b5 = Skripchenko-Av.Bykhovsky, Tel-Aviv Czemniak mem 1998.

c) 7 0-0-0 8 ∆b3 ∆g4 9 e5 ∆fd7 10 h3 ∆xf3 11 ∆xf3 e6 12 ∆d1?! c5 13 c3 ∆c6 14 ∆e3 cxd4 15 cxd4 f6 7 Jurković-Vismara, Cannes 1997.

7...dxe5

7...∆d5 tends to transpose to the main line after 8 ∆d2 (8 h3? ∆xc3 9 bxc3 c5 is unclear) 8...dxe5 9 dxe5.

8 dxe5 ∆d5 9 ∆d2 ∆g4 (D)

10 0-0-0

An important alternative is 10 h3 ∆xf3 11 gxf3 (11 ∆xf3 e6 12 ∆e2 ∆d7 13 f4 ∆h4+ 14 ∆f2 ∆xf2+ 15 ∆xf2 f6! 16 exf6 ∆xf6 17 ∆e1 b5 18 ∆b3 ∆c5 19 g3 a5 7 didn’t work well for White in Sermek-Nogueiras, Moscow OL 1994) 11...e6 12 f4 (12 0-0-0 transposes to the main line) 12...∆d7 13 h4 ∆xc3 14 ∆xc3 ∆b6 15 ∆b3 (15 ∆d3 ∆a4!) 15...h5 16 ∆d2 a5! 17 a3 ∆d5 (17...a4!? 18 ∆a2 ∆d5 19 0-0-0 b5 also looks positionally nice) 18 c4 ∆e7 19 0-0-0 ∆f5 20 ∆c3 and now, instead of 20...∆e7 = Rublevsky-Khalifman, Russian Ch 1st Petersbourg) 1999, Black could even fight for the advantage with the more ambitious line 20...∆b6!? 21 ∆c2 ∆fd8 22 ∆xf5 exf5 23 ∆xd8+ ∆xd8 24 ∆e3 ∆b3! 7.
10...e6 11 h3 ∆xf3 12 gxf3 ∆d7 13 f4 Wh4!

This is even stronger than the neutral 13...∆7b6.

14 Whg4

Because even White's alternatives haven't worked well, it seems Black's blockading strategy is getting its rewards. Both 14 ∆xd5 cxd5 15 ∆b5 ∆b6 16 ∆d1 Wh8 17 Wg2? ∆c4 18 Whg4 Wh7 = Adam-Freisler, Prague 1986 and 14 ∆xd5 cxd5 15 ∆d1 a6 16 ∆g4 Wh7 17 h4 h5 18 ∆g2 Wh8 19 ∆d1 ∆c4 20 ∆e2 ∆ac8 21 ∆b1 d4 = Brumen-Mohr, Ljubljana 1998 are excellent for Black.

14...Whxf2 15 ∆xd5 cxd5 16 ∆xd5 h5 17 ∆e7+

The knight gets into trouble after 17 Whg1 Whxg1 18 ∆e7+ Wh7 19 Whxg1 Wh8 20 Whb4 Whb8 =.

17...Wh7 18 f5 Whxf5 19 Whb4 Whxe5

= Sosna-M. Přibyl, Czech Ch 1997/8.

Conclusion: There are some quite obscure sublines but the main line, which is the most common in practice, seems to be fine for Black.

C3)

4 g3 Whg7 5 Whg2 0-0 (D)

6 Whge2

6 ∆xf3 is not very logical. The simplest answer is 6...∆g4 7 ∆e3 (7 0-0 ∆c6 8 ∆c3 e5 9 d5 ∆c7 10 Whd2 h5!? gives Black counterplay, Garcia Cano-Marín, Badalona 1997) 7...∆c6 8 h3 ∆xf3 9 Whxf3 e5 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 0-0 ∆d4 12 Whd1 Wh7 (or 12...c6 13 ∆e2 ∆e6 with equality, Pachow-I. Belov.

Katowice 1993) 13 ∆b1?! (13 Whd4 Whd8 14 Whd5 =) 13...h5! 14 Whd2 h4 with good play for Black, Spassky-Timman, Tilburg 1978.

6...e5 7 h3

Or:

a) Naturally, the simplifying 7 dxe5 dxe5 8 Whxd8 Whxd8 9 Whg5 c6 10 0-0 Wh8 11 Whad1 Whd7 12 Wh3 ∆e5 13 ∆xc8 Whxc8 = Bykhovsky-Ponomariov, Torshavn 2000 is very easy for Black.

b) Generally 7 0-0 has not been considered very dangerous because after 7...∆c6 (D) White cannot play ∆e3, so his options are:

b1) 8 h3 Whd4 9 Whxd4 ∆xc4 10 ∆xc6 Whc3 11 Whd8 Whxd1 12 ∆xb7 Whb7 (12...Whxb2 13 Whxb2 Whxb2 14 Whb1 Whg7 15 Wha5 Wha6 16 Whxa8 Whxf1 17 Whxf1 Whxa8 18 Whc6 also leads to equality) 13 Whb7 Whab8 14 Whxd1 Whxb7 = Gadjilu-Fridman, Pula Echt 1997.

b2) 8 d5 ∆e7 9 f4 (9 h3 c6! 10 g4 cxd5 11 exd5 h5! 12 g5 Wh7 13 ∆g3 Whf5 14 Whxf5 Whxf5 15 h4 f6! was pleasant for Black in Pulkkinen-Mäki,
Finnish Ch. 1995) and Black has a couple of good moves:

b21) 9...\texttt{Ee8} 10 \texttt{Ee3} (10 \texttt{Wh1 f5} 11 \texttt{Exf5 gxf5 is unclear}) 10...f5 11 \texttt{Wd2 Ef6} 12 \texttt{fxe5 dx5} 13 \texttt{Eg5 Wd6!} 14 \texttt{Wh1 Ad7} = Kochiev-Yrljolä, Jyväskylä 1991.

b22) After 9...\texttt{Exf4} 10 \texttt{Efxf4} (10 \texttt{gxf4 c6} 11 \texttt{dx6 bxc6 =}) 10...\texttt{Eg4} 11 \texttt{Wd2 c5} 12 \texttt{dx6 Exc6 =} Black controls the e5-square, which compensates for the weakness of d6. Gulko-Van der Wiel, Amsterdam OHRA 1987 continued: 13 \texttt{h3 Ege5} 14 \texttt{b3 Ee6} 15 \texttt{Aad1 Ac8} 16 \texttt{Wh1 Wa5} 17 \texttt{Eg5 Wxd2} 18 \texttt{Exd2 Ead5} 19 \texttt{Exd5 Eb4} 20 \texttt{Eg4} \texttt{Exa2} 21 \texttt{Eb5 Wd8} 22 \texttt{Exa7 Ea8} 23 \texttt{Gb5 Eb4}.

b3) 8 \texttt{dxe5 dxe5} 9 \texttt{Eg5} (9 \texttt{Ead5 Ze7} 10 \texttt{Eg5 Ef5} 11 \texttt{h6}) 12 \texttt{Ee3 Ef5} 13 \texttt{Ee5 =}) and now:

b31) The popular line 9...\texttt{Ee6} 10 \texttt{Ebd5 Ebd5} 11 \texttt{Ee5 Ze7} 12 \texttt{Ee7} 13 \texttt{Eh6} 14 \texttt{Ee5} 15 \texttt{Ee3} \texttt{Ee8} may be slightly better for White but leads to complicated play.

b32) 9...\texttt{Wxd1} is more reliable. Now we have:

b321) 10 \texttt{Eaxd1 Eb4} 11 \texttt{Ead2} (11 \texttt{a3 Efxc2} 12 \texttt{Ead2 Ed4} 13 \texttt{Exd4 exd4} 14 \texttt{Ebd4 h6} 15 \texttt{Ee1 Ac6 =} 11...\texttt{c6} 12 \texttt{Efd1 Ee6 =} Hille-Baumermann, Hamburg 1993.

b322) 10 \texttt{Efxd1 Eb4} 11 \texttt{Ead5} (11 \texttt{Ebd5 Eb6 =}; 11 \texttt{Ead2 c6} 12 \texttt{Ead1} is the same as 'b321') 11...\texttt{Efxd5} 12 \texttt{Exd5 Eg4} 13 \texttt{f3 Ef5} 14 \texttt{c3} (14 \texttt{Ee7 Exe2} 15 \texttt{Exf8 Exf8} 16 \texttt{Eae1 Ac5+} 17 \texttt{Eh1 Ac3} is at least equal; for example, 18 \texttt{Eh3 Exc1} 19 \texttt{Exf5 gxf5} 20 \texttt{Exc1 Exd4} 21 \texttt{Exd4 exd4} 22 \texttt{Eac1} \texttt{Ed8 =}) 14...\texttt{Ea6} 15 \texttt{Ead2 f6} 16 \texttt{Ee3 Ef8} 17 \texttt{Ead1 Ef8} = Marcelin-Royer, Argenteuil 1997.

7...\texttt{Ee6} 8 \texttt{Ee3 exd4}

8...\texttt{Ead7} 9 0-0 a6 will generally transpose: 10 \texttt{f4 exd4} 11 \texttt{Exd4 Exe8} 12 \texttt{Eel} is note 'b' to White’s 12th move; 10 \texttt{a4 exd4} 11 \texttt{Exd4 Exe8} and now 12 \texttt{Eh2} is note 'a' to White’s 11th move, while 12 \texttt{Eel} transposes to the main line.

9 \texttt{Exd4 Ead7} 10 0-0 \texttt{Exe8} (D)
a) 11 \( \texttt{h2} \) a6 12 a4 \( \texttt{Qe5!?} \) 13 b3 c5 14 \( \texttt{Qd2} \) c6 15 \( \texttt{Wd2} \) b5 16 axb5 axb5 17 \( \texttt{Axa8} \) \( \texttt{Wxa8} \) 18 \( \texttt{Wxd6?} \) (18 \( \texttt{Qd5=} \) =) 18...\( \texttt{Qxe4} \) 19 \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) gave Black a lot of play in Koelman-Rausis, Haarlem 2000.

b) There is an important alternative which has been more popular in recent years, viz. 11 \( \texttt{Qde2} \) (motif: White has more space) 11...h5! 12 a3 a5, and now:

b1) 13 \( \texttt{Af4?!} \) \( \texttt{Bb8} \) (13...b4?! 14 f3 b4 (14...\( \texttt{Qe5?!} \)) 15 axb4 axb4 16 \( \texttt{Qce2} \) \( \texttt{Qe5} \) 17 \( \texttt{Qd3} \) \( \texttt{Qc4} \) 18 \( \texttt{Qd4?!} \) (18 \( \texttt{Axf2} \) 18...c5 19 \( \texttt{Axf2} \) \( \texttt{Qc6} \) \( \texttt{Qe6} \) \{Gabriel-Hickl, Bad Homburg 1997.

b2) 13 \( \texttt{Qd4?!} \) b4 14 e5! \( \texttt{Qxe5} \) (perhaps Black should try 14...\( \texttt{Qxd4} \) 15 exf6 bxc3 16 fxg7 cxb2 17 \( \texttt{Abl} \) \( \texttt{Qf5} \) 18 \( \texttt{Axf2} \) \( \texttt{Bb8} \) 19 \( \texttt{Qc3} \) though Sadler thinks White has enough compensation) 15 axb4 c6 16 b5 cxb5! 17 \( \texttt{Qdxb5} \) and now:

b21) 17...\( \texttt{Qxb5} \) 18 \( \texttt{Qxb5} \) d5 19 \( \texttt{Qd4} \) \( \texttt{\pm} \).

b22) 17...d5 (Sadler-Nevednichy, Erevan OL 1996) and now 18 \( \texttt{Qd6} \) \( \texttt{Be6} \) 19 \( \texttt{Qb7} \) \( \texttt{Wc7} \) 20 \( \texttt{Qc5} \) gives White some plus.

b3) 13 g4 (the most thematic move) 13...b4 14 axb4 axb4 15 \( \texttt{Qxa8} \) \( \texttt{Wxa8} \) 16 \( \texttt{Qd5} \) \( \texttt{Qxd5} \) 17 exd5 \( \texttt{Qe5} \) 18 b3 c5! 19 \( \texttt{Qg3} \) (bad is 19 \( \texttt{Be1?!} \) f5 20 g5 \( \texttt{Qf7} \) 21 h4 \( \texttt{Qxe3?!} \) 22 fxe3 \( \texttt{Wxe8} \) 23 \( \texttt{Qd2} \) \( \texttt{Qxe5} \) with nice compensation, Relange-Chabanon, French Ch (Narbonne) 1997, while 19 dxc6? \( \texttt{Qxc6} \) looks like suicide). Now Black has a difficult but pleasant choice:

b31) 19...f5 20 gxf5 \( \texttt{Qxf5} \) 21 \( \texttt{Qxf5} \) gxf5 is a comfortable way to equalize; the favourable pawn-structure compensates for the bishop-pair.

b32) 19...\( \texttt{Qc8} \) 20 \( \texttt{Qe4} \) \( \texttt{Qb8} \) 21 f4 \( \texttt{Qxg4} \) 22 hxg4 f5 23 gxf5 gxf5 24 \( \texttt{Qg5} \) \( \texttt{Qxe3} \) 25 \( \texttt{Qh5} \) h6 (Black can try 25...\( \texttt{Wxe8} \) 26 \( \texttt{Qxh7+} \) \( \texttt{Qf8} \) 27 \( \texttt{Qf3} \) with an unclear position) 26 \( \texttt{Qf7+} \) \( \texttt{Qh8} \) 27 \( \texttt{Qxd7} \) hgx5 28 fxg5 \( \texttt{Qf8} \) 29 \texttt{h4} with counterplay.

We now return to 11 \( \texttt{Be1} \) (D):

\[\text{Diagram} \]

11...a6

Maybe Black can also equalize with 11...\( \texttt{Qxd4} \) 12 \( \texttt{Qxd4} \) c5! (12...\( \texttt{Qc6} \) \( \texttt{\pm} \)) 13 \( \texttt{Qe3} \) \( \texttt{Qc6} \) 14 \( \texttt{Qf4} \) (though 14 \( \texttt{Wd3?!} \) may be something for White) 14...\( \texttt{Qe6} \) 15 \( \texttt{Qd5} \) \( \texttt{Qd7} \) 16 \( \texttt{Qxf4} \) \( \texttt{Qxf5} \) 17 c3 \( \texttt{Qae8} = 18 \texttt{Wd2} \) (18 f3 d5 \( \texttt{\pm} \)) 18...\( \texttt{Qxe4} \) 19 \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) 20 \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) 21 \( \texttt{Qxd6} \) \( \texttt{Qxd6} \) 22 \( \texttt{Qxd6} \) \( \texttt{Qe2} \) 23 \( \texttt{Qb1} \) c4 24 \( \texttt{Qc5} \) \( \texttt{Qc6} \) \( \texttt{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} \) Relange-Gadjilu, Pula 1997.

12 a4
Or:

a) After 12 \( \text{Qh}2 \) the safest line is 12...\( \text{Qxd}4 \) (12...\( \text{Qe}5 \) and 12...\( \text{Qb}8 \) are also possible) 13 \( \text{Qxd}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 15 \( \text{Qf}4 \) \( \text{Qe}6 \) as the d6- and e4-pawns are equally weak.

b) 12 \( \text{Qf}4 \) is the main alternative:

b1) 12...\( \text{Qa}5! \) 13 \( \text{Qf}2! \) (13 \( \text{Qd}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{Qde}2 \) \( \text{b}5! \) gives Black a useful initiative because after 15 \( \text{Qxd}6? \) \( \text{Qc}4 \) 16 \( \text{Qxc}5 \) \( \text{Qe}8 \) 17 \( \text{Qa}7 \) \( \text{Qc}7 \) the queen is trapped) 13...\( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{Qb}3 \) (14 \( \text{Qf}3! \)?) 14...\( \text{Qc}4 \) 15 \( \text{Qe}5! \) \( \text{Qxe}5 \) 16 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Qc}5 \) 17 \( \text{Qc}7 \) (17...\( \text{Qe}6 \) 18 \( \text{Qxd}8 \) \( \text{Qaxd}8 \) 19 \( \text{Qxe}6 \) \( \text{Qxe}6 \) 20 \( \text{Qxb}7 \) \( \text{Qb}8 \) = is better according to Svidler) 18 \( \text{Qxd}7 \) \( \text{Qe}xd7 \) 19 \( \text{Qxe}8+ \) \( \text{Qxe}8 \) 20 \( \text{Wf}3 \pm \) Solozhenkin-Svidler, St Petersburg Ch 1995.

b2) 12...\( \text{Qxd}4 \) 13 \( \text{Qxd}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{Qxf}6 \) \( \text{Qxf}6 \) 15 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Qd}4+ \) 16 \( \text{Qh}2 \) \( \text{Qe}6 \) 17 \( \text{Qd}5 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) (17...\( \text{Qb}6 \)?) 18 \( \text{Qe}2 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 19 \( \text{Qxd}8+ \) \( \text{Qxd}8 \) also gives Black compensation. Byrne-Mednis, USA Ch 1984) 18 \( \text{Qxd}8+ \) \( \text{Qxd}8 \) 19 \( \text{Qad}1 \) \( \text{Qed}6 \) 20 \( \text{Qd}4 \) \( \text{Qe}6 \) 21 \( \text{Qxc}6 \) \( \text{Qxc}6 \) 22 \( \text{Qe}2 \) (22 \( \text{Qe}4? \) \( \text{Qg}1+ \), Honfi-Zimmerman, Budapest 1995) 22...\( \text{Qxc}3 \) 23 \( \text{Qxd}7 \) \( \text{Qxd}7 \) 24 \( \text{Qxc}3 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \), which is a likely draw.

12...\( \text{Qa}5 \) (D)

12...\( \text{Qb}4 \) is another route to equality with the same plan: ...\( \text{c}5 \), ...\( \text{Qc}6 \) and exert pressure on the e4-pawn.

13 \( \text{g}4 \)

White has also tried:

a) 13 \( \text{Qd}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{Qde}2 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 15 \( \text{Qad}1 \) \( \text{b}5! \) 16 \( \text{axb}5 \) \( \text{axb}5 \) 17 \( \text{Qxb}5 \) (after 17 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Qxd}6 \) 18 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Qxe}4 \) 19 \( \text{Qxc}5 \) Black can at least force a draw with 19...\( \text{Qxg}2 \) 20 \( \text{Qxg}2 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \) 21 \( \text{Qc}6 \) \( \text{Qxd}8 \) 17...\( \text{Qxe}4 \) 18 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Qxd}6 \) 19

\( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Qxd}6 \) 20 \( \text{Qxc}6 \) \( \text{Qxc}6 \) 21 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Qe}5 \) 22 \( \text{Qf}1 \) (1/2-1/2 Khenkin-Tkachev, French Cht 1998/9) 22...\( \text{Qc}4 \) !?.

b) After 13 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{Qb}3 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) (or the unclear 14...\( \text{Qc}4! \)?) 15 \( \text{Qc}1 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 16 \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{Qc}7 \) 17 \( \text{Qd}3 \) \( \text{Qb}5 \) 15 \( \text{exb}3 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 16 \( \text{Qf}2 \) \( \text{Qc}7 \) 17 \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{Qe}7 \) the e4-pawn will become a real weakness following 18...\( \text{Qae}8 \).

13...\( \text{c}5 \)

Now:

a) 14 \( \text{Qde}2 \)?! \( \text{Qc}6 \) 15 \( \text{Qg}3 \) \( \text{Qc}4 \) 16 \( \text{Qc}1 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 17 \( \text{Qf}1 \)? (White is still alive after 17 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{Qxe}1 \) 18 \( \text{Qxe}1 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 19 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 20 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Qe}7 \) 20 \( \text{Qxc}3 \) \( \text{Qxg}4 \) is much better for Black. Khenkin-Tischbierek, Las Palmas 1997.

b) According to the Las Palmas tournament bulletin, White should play 14 \( \text{Qb}3 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 15 \( \text{exb}3 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 16 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}5 \)?? (16...\( \text{Qe}6 = \)?) 17 \( \text{Qxc}5 \) \( \text{Qc}7 \) with compensation.

Conclusion: 4 \( \text{g}3 \) has a solid and positional reputation but theoretically it seems White can get nothing if Black plays accurately enough.
26 Other First Moves for White: Introduction

In Chapters 26-30 we concentrate on White’s first-move alternatives to 1 d4 and 1 e4. First we pay attention to the systems where White plays c4, c3 and d3. After those moves White may still play d4 at some point; this can easily transpose to lines we have considered earlier but there are also some independent possibilities. White can also skip the active d4, and play in the style of the English Opening. Also important are the flexible English systems where White brings his king’s knight into the arena via e2. We also deal with 1 b3, 1 b4 and 1 f4 although they are rather unusual in practice.

This is in fact the easiest part of the whole repertoire. We have a very logical plan against most of White’s slow approaches. First we occupy the centre with the moves ...d6, ...e5 and ...f5. Then we develop the kingside with ...c6, ...e7 and 0-0. This is the basic system suitable against everything else except 1 f4. In that case we adopt the system of Part 2: 1...d6 with 2...g4 to follow.

After the standard moves of our repertoire there might be several reasonable approaches depending on the system White has chosen. A very typical way to mobilize the queenside is ...c6 and ...a6 (possibly with ...a5 first), and maybe ...e6. Another plan is to develop the queen’s knight via c6. Sometimes Black can find more interesting and unconventional things to do. For example, Black might adopt the active attacking plan on the kingside familiar from the Dutch Defence: ...c6, ...d4 and ...h3.

In fact, we play a system which Dutch players can usually only dream about when they desperately try to play ...e5. The fianchetto of the king’s bishop, in the Leningrad Dutch style, may be at our disposal if White plays really slowly. In the early phase before the move ...f5 we can often transpose to various kinds of Modern systems, too.
27 The Réti and English with \( \text{d}f3 \)

1 \( \text{d}f3 \) d6 (D)

2 d4 is of course a very common move, but it has already been dealt with in Chapters 11-16 via the move-order 1 d4 d6 2 \( \text{d}f3 \).

A)

2 g3 e5 3 \( \text{g}2 \) f5 (D)

There are of course many move-orders available to both sides in lines where the forces do not come into contact in the initial stages. However, there is no reason for Black to deviate from the plan, as described in the previous chapter, of ...d6 intending ...e5, with ...f5 and natural, aggressive development to follow.

We divide the material into two sections as follows:

A: 2 g3 220
B: 2 c4 221

In Line A we are mainly interested in lines where White plays \( \text{g}2 \) and d3, intending to make the e4 advance, and omits c4.

4 0-0

4 d3 \( \text{f}6 \) 5 c3 \( \text{a}6 \)!? (both 5...\( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{d}b3 \)?! \( \text{a}6 \) and 5...g6 are playable)

6 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 7 b4 and now:

a) There is nothing wrong with 7...0-0-0 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 9 \( \text{g}5 \)?! (9 \( \text{b}d2 \)

=) 9...d5 10 \( \text{f}3 \) e4 11 \( \text{d}4 \) c5 12 bxc5 \( \text{x}c5 \) 13 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \)

\( \text{F} \) Felegyhazi-Rinberg, Nyiregyhaza 1994.
b) 7...c6 8 a4 Qc7 9 Qbd2 0-0 (9...Qe6!? works against b5) 10 b5 e4! 11 Qd4 c5 12 Qc2 d5 13 c4 Qe6 14 cxd5 Qcxd5 15 a6 Qc6 16 exd3, Finihajesalo-Tella, Finnish Chl 2000, and Black’s superior structure (d3 is weak) should count after the active 16...f4 ½.

4...Qf6 5 d3 Qe7 (D)

6 e4

White has several alternatives; some more active, some less active:

a) 6 c4 0-0 7 Qc3 transposes to Line B1.

b) 6 c3 0-0 7 Qb3+ Qh8 8 Qbd2 (8 Qg5 d5 ½) 8...Qa6 is not dangerous for Black.

c) Rather passive is 6 Qbd2 0-0 7 e4 Qc6 8 c3 a5! (preventing b4 for a while) 9 a4 Qh8 10 Qc2 Qe8 11 Qb1 Qh5 12 Qe1? (12 b4) 12...fxe4 13 dxe4 Qg4 14 b4 Qd7 15 Qe3 Qb6 16 b5 Qd8 17 a3 Qe6=1liadis-Kotonias, Komotini 1993.

d) 6 Qc3 0-0 7 e4 Qc6 (7...fxe4 8 dxe4 transposes to the note to Black’s 6th move) 8 Qe1 (8 Qd5 Qh8 9 Qxe7 Wxe7 10 Qe1 f4! 11 gxf4 exf4 12 f3 Oe5 13 d4 Wg5 14 c3 Qe7 gives Black the initiative. S.Nikoljé-Nikije-vic, Belgrade 1991) and now there are two logical options:

d1) 8...Wxe8 9 Wxf5 (9 Qd5 Qd8) 9...Qxf5 10 h3 Wd7 11 Wh2 Qae8 with an equal position, Karlik-Jakubiec, Litomysl 1995.

d2) 8...fxe4 9 dxe4 Qg4 10 h3 Qh5 11 g4 Qg6 12 Qd3 (12 Qh4 Qxe4) 12...Qd7 13 Qe3 a6 14 Qad1 Wh8 15 Qd5 Qc5?! 16 Qxc5 dxc5 17 c3 Qd6 = Sorokin-Vyzhmanav, Moscow rpd 1992.

6...0-0

6...fxe4!? 7 dxe4 0-0 (7...Qxe4!? 8 Qxe5 Qf6 = should be playable although there is weakness on e6) 8 Qc3 c6 9 a4 a5 10 h3 Qa6 11 Qe2 Qh8 12 b3 Qe6 = Bukhman-Goldin, Philadelphia 1991.

7 exf5 Qxf5 8 Qbd2

8 Qh4!? Qg4 9 f3 Qe6 10 f4 Qc6 = is more active.

8...Qc6 9 Qc4 Wd7 10 He1 Qh3 11 Qh1 Qg4!

Pressure on the f-file is unpleasant for White: 12 c3 Qh8 13 b4 b5! (Black opens another front) 14 Qcd2 (14 Qe3 a5 15 bxa5 Qxa5 16 Qd5 f3) 14...a5 15 bxa5 Qxa5 16 b2?! Wf5 17 We2 d5 = Seeman-Poluljakhov, St Petersburg Chigorin mem 1997.

Conclusion: These systems with Qf3 and e4 are rather modest, and White often has to fight for equality.

**B)**

2 c4 e5 3 Qc3 f5 (D)
Now:

B1: 4 d3 222
B2: 4 d4 224
B3: 4 g3 226

In Line B3, we consider lines where White follows up with a later d4, rather than d3. Lines with g3 and d3 are covered in Line B1.

B1)

4 d3 Qf6 5 g3
5 e4!? Qe7 6 Qe2 0-0 7 0-0 c5!?
(Black has of course several playable possibilities like 7...Qc6, 7...Qa6 8 a3 fxe4 9 dxe4 Qc5 10 b4 Qc6 = or 7...a5) 8 a3 Qc6 9 Qb1 Qd4 10 exf5 Qxf5 11 Qg5 h6 12 Qge4 Qxe4 13 dxe4 Qe6 14 b3 a6 15 Qg4 Qf7 is equal, G.Mohr-Srebrnić, Slovenian Ch 1992.

5...Qe7 6 Qg2 0-0 7 0-0 (D)
7 c5 Qh8 8 cxd6 cxd6 9 0-0 Qc6 10 Qg5 Qe8 11 e3 Qe6 12 Qd2 Qb8 13 Qc1 Qf7 14 a3 h6 15 Qxf6 Qxf6 was fine for Black in Sherwin-Conquest, British League (4NCL) 1999/00 because of his large pawn-centre.

7...Qe8

With this move Black starts an aggressive general plan: ...Qh5, ...f4, ...Qh3 and ...Qg4.

7...Qa6!? 8 Qb1 c6 9 b4 Qc7 is quite a solid plan:

a) 10 c5!? Qh8 11 cxd6 Qxd6 12 b5 cxb5 13 Qxb5 Qxb5 14 Qxb5 a6 15 Qbl Qb8 16 a4 b5 = Kamsky-Malaniuk, Moscow Intel rpd 1994.

b) 10 b5 c5 (10...Qe8!??) 11 Qg5 Qg4 12 Qxe7 Qxe7 13 b6 axb6 14 Qxb6 Qa6 15 Qbl = Alterman-Vander Wiel, Erevan OL 1996.

8 c5

This is the most critical move, by which White tries to open lines. However, White has alternatives:

a) The tame 8 e3 is certainly not very critical: 8...Qh5 9 Qd2 Qxd1 10 Qxd1 a5 (10...Qa6??) 11 f4 Qa6 12 Qf3 ½-½ Spraggett-Ivkov, Cannes 1990.

b) 8 Qd5 Qd8! (a beautiful study-like prophylactic move) 9 Qg5 (9 Qxf6+ Qxf6 10 Qb1 a5 11 b3 c6 12 a3 Qa6 13 b4 axb4 14 axb4 Qc7 15 Qb2 Qd7 16 Qc2 f4 = Stoll-Milov, Berne 1994) 9...Qbd7 10 Qc1 c6 11 Qxf6+...
xf6 12 xf6 xf6 13 b4 f4! 14 d2 h6 15 e3 (Black’s attack is strong after 15 gxf4 exf4 16 xf4 h5 17 xd6 f4) 15...fxg3 16 fxg3 h5 with a slight advantage for Black. Vaganian-Lobron, Frankfurt rpd 1997.

c) After 8 b4 Black can play:
   c1) 8...a5!? 9 bxa5 (9 b5 Qbd7) 9...d8 10 a4 c6 11 a3 a5 12 c2
   xc3 13 wxc3 c5 14 a5 Qc6 15 c1

c2) 8...h5 is logical:
   c21) 9 wce2 f4! 10 b5 (10 gxf4 h3 gives Black an attack) 10...h3 11
d5 Qxd5 12 cxd5 Qd8 = (Black has carried out his general plan unhindered)
   13 xh3 wxe3 14 d4 fxg3 15 fxg3 Qd7 16 b2 exd4 17 Qxd4 (17
   Qxd4) 17...g5! 18 wc3 Qe5 = Barcelo-Esola, Palma de Mallorca 1991.

   c22) Again 9 Qd5 should be met by 9...d8! 10 xf6+ xf6 11 b2
c6 (11...f4!, with...h3 to follow, looks good) 12 b5 d8 13 a4 g5 14
   d2 = Seibold-Burkhardt, Bavaria 1996/7.

   c23) 9 c5 (sharp action is needed)
   9...dxc5 10 bxc5 Qc6 11 d4!? (11 Qb5
   xc5 12 Qxe7 b8 13 wb3+ h8 is slightly better for Black) 11...e4 12
c5 Qxe5 13 dxe5 Qg4 14 d5+
h7 15 c6 (15 h3 Qxe5) 15...Qe6 16

   8...h8

   This is a useful move, since White often has some tactics based on the
   king’s position on g8.

   Black has various other playable moves but a very logical one is 8...Qc6
   9 cxd6 Qxd6, when White must worry about the...e4 break:

   a) 10 a3 Qh8 11 b4?! e4! 12 dxe4
   fxe4 13 Qd4 Qxd4 14 Qxd4 Qe5±
   15 Qc5 b6 16 Qc3 and now instead of
   16...Qf5 (Wenzel-Seul, Bundesliga
   1994/5), the strike 16...Qg4 17 Qd2
   Qxf2++ is murderous.

   b) 10 Qb5 is critical, but doesn’t
   stop Black’s general plan.

   c) 10 Qd2 Qe6 11 Qa4 Qh5 12
   Qc4 Qd4! 13 Qxd6 cxd6 14 Qd1 f4!
   15 Qxb7? d5 16 Qa8 f3! and Black

   9 Qg5!? (D)

   Another, maybe more natural continuation is 9 cxd6 cxd6 (perhaps more
   solid is 9...Qxd6 =, when 10 a3 c6 11
   b4 a5 gave Black counterplay in Dinh-
   Tu, Melbourne 1995) 10 a3 (why not
   10 b4!? Qc6 11 b5 Qd4 12 a4 instead?)
   10...Qc6 11 b4 a6 12 b5 axb5
   13 Qxb5 Qd8 14 a4 Qe6 15 a3 d5?!
   16 d4 e4 17 Qe5 Qg4! 18 Qxg4 fxg4
   19 f3 gxf3 20 exf3 exf3 21 Qxf3 with
   equality. Spiridonov-Gofshtein, Paris
   1998.
9...c6
A solid move, although 9...c6 10  
\text{e}5 \text{d}8 is more according to the
spirit of the line. Black can use his
massive pawn-centre.
10 \text{c}x\text{d}6 \text{c}x\text{d}6 11 \text{e}1 \text{a}6 12 \text{e}4?!
This is a strange decision due to the
bad bishop on g2 and weakness of f2,
though it is not easy to find a con-
structive idea for White. However, 12
a3 \text{g}6?! 13 b4 \text{c}7 = is quite logical.
12...\text{f}x\text{e}4 13 \text{d}x\text{e}4 \text{d}x\text{e}4 14 \text{d}x\text{e}4
\text{c}5 15 \text{b}3 \text{b}6 16 \text{c}3?!
Things are quite easy for Black af-
after 16 \text{c}3 \text{g}4 \text{g}4.
16...\text{g}4!
This is Sammalvuo-Yrjilä, Helsinki
2000. White hadn’t sacrificed the ex-
change deliberately, but still he got
some compensation, which grew rap-
idly after Black played active moves at
the wrong moments: 17 \text{d}x\text{e}5 \text{d}e2 18
\text{c}4 \text{x}f1 19 \text{x}f1 \text{c}5 20 e5! \text{e}6
21 b3 \text{d}7 22 \text{c}1!! \text{c}5 23 b4 \text{c}7
(23...\text{b}6) 24 f4 b5?! (24...\text{b}6) 25
\text{a}3 \text{a}8 26 \text{b}2 c5 27 \text{f}5 \text{h}6 28 \text{f}6
\text{c}x\text{b}4 29 \text{d}3 \text{c}5 30 \text{x}d7 \text{e}3+ 31
\text{h}1 \text{g}6? (31...\text{c}2 32 \text{c}6 \pm) 32 \text{c}6
\text{d}2 33 \text{g}7+ \text{x}g7 34 \text{f}x\text{g}7+ \text{g}8
35 \text{d}5+ 1-0.

**Conclusion:** This is an important
line in practice and Black has scored
well even though White’s developing
moves are the most natural. Black has
a clear-cut general plan which tends to
work well if White doesn’t react ac-
tively enough.

B2)

4 d4 e4 5 \text{g}5

This is the only independent possi-
bility in this move-order. Otherwise:

a) 5 \text{g}5 transposes to Chapters 2,
3 and 6.

b) 5 \text{d}2 \text{f}6 6 e3 transposes to
Line B of Chapter 5.

5...\text{e}7

Better than 5...\text{f}6 6 \text{d}2 ±.
6 \text{c}x\text{e}7 \text{x}e7 (D)

6...\text{x}e7 is less natural though it is
playable. A set-up with the queen on
e7 and the knight on f6 is more active.

\begin{center}
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7 \text{d}2

Or.

a) White doesn’t benefit much from
the knight adventure 7 \text{d}5 \text{d}8 8
\text{d}2 c6 9 \text{c}3 \text{f}6 10 e3 0-0 11 \text{e}2,
when, compared with the main line,
Black has played ...c6 instead of
...\text{e}7. 11...\text{a}6 12 \text{b}3 \text{c}7 13 0-0
\text{e}8? (13...\text{h}8 intending ...\text{d}5 looks
natural) 14 \text{ae}1 \text{g}6 15 \text{d}1 \text{h}8 16
\text{w}b4 c5! 17 \text{a}3 \text{b}6 gave Black a good
position in Rozsnyai-Nagy, Hungary
1998.

b) White can also head for the f4-
square: 7 \text{g}1 \text{f}6 8 e3 c6 (in the game
Ibragimov-Sakaev, São Paulo 1991, a closed strategy worked well: 8...0-0 9
\( \mathcal{Q}h3 \) e6 10 \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}a6 \) 11 h4 \( \mathcal{Q}c7 \) 12 d5
\( c5!? \) 13 a3 \( \mathcal{W}e5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{R}b1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \)
a5 16 \( \mathcal{Q}e2 \) \( \mathcal{R}bf8 \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) 9 h4 \( \mathcal{Q}a6 \) 10
\( \mathcal{Q}h3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c7 \) 11 d5 (11 \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e6 \) is level)
11...\( \text{cxd5}! \) 12 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \mathcal{W}e5 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) 0-0
14 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 15 a4 a6 16 a5 \( \mathcal{Q}e8 \)
(16...\( \mathcal{R}bf8! \), with...b5 to follow, is another plan) 17 \( \mathcal{Q}c4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f7 \) 18 \( \mathcal{Q}d1 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}ad8 \) 19 \( \mathcal{Q}a4 \) g6 20 \( \mathcal{W}d4 \) \( \mathcal{R}fe8 \) 21 \( \mathcal{Q}b6 \)
h6 22 \( \mathcal{Q}e2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}a8 = \) Knott-Rowson, British Ch (Torquay) 1998.

7...\( \mathcal{Q}f6 \)

Interesting, somehow natural but probably unnecessary is 7...e3!? 8 \( \mathcal{Q}xe3 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 9 e4 f5 (9...\( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) 10 \( \mathcal{Q}e3 \) 0-0 11 \( \mathcal{Q}e2 \)
\( \pm \) 10 \( \mathcal{W}b3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{Q}d5?! \) (11 \( \mathcal{Q}f3 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \) \( \mathcal{W}f7 \) 13 \( e3 \) \( \pm \) looks better)
11...\( \text{cxd4} \) 12 \( \mathcal{W}d3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \) 13 \( \text{cxd5} \) c5
14 dxc6 \( \mathcal{Q}xc6 \) 15 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}d4 \)
0-0 17 \( \mathcal{Q}b1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) \( \mp \) Tarasenko-Vaulin,
Moscow 1995.

8 e3 0-0 9 \( \mathcal{Q}e2 \)

The value of 9 b4!? depends on how much counterplay 9...f4!? gives Black
(note that 10 \( \mathcal{Q}xf4 \) allows 10...e3).

9...c5!? (D)

Of course the natural moves 9...a5 and 9...\( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) are also possible.

10 \( \mathcal{Q}h3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e6 \)

Rogers's 10...b6! is preferable, since it makes the b3-knight look clumsy:

a) After 11 dxc5? dxc5! 12 \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \)
\( \mathcal{W}e5! \) 13 \( \mathcal{Q}xf6+ \) \( \mathcal{R}xf6 \) \( \mp \) Black has a
strong centralized queen.

b) 11 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}b7 \) and now White
should play safe with 12 0-0. Instead, the ambitious 12 0-0-0?! is very risky:
12...\( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 13 f4 \( \mathcal{Q}xf3 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}xf3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}h8 \) 15
\( \mathcal{W}f1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) 16 \( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) 17 \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \)

Now:
a) 13 \( \text{wd}2 \text{ad}8 \) 14 \( \text{d}a1 \) ?! (Lautier thinks that 14 \( a3 \) = intending \( \text{da}5 \) and \( b4 \) is better) 14...\( \text{db}4 \)! 15 \( d5 \) ?! (15 \( a3 \) \( \text{dc}6 \) 16 \( \text{dc}2 \) \( d5 \) \( f7 \) is also promising for Black) 15...\( \text{h}5 \) 16 \( f3 \) \( \text{exf}3 \) 17 \( \text{gxf}3 \) and then:

a1) 17...\( \text{d}e8 \) ?! 18 \( a3 \) \( \text{da}6 \) 19 \( \text{dc}2 \) \( f4 \)! 20 \( \text{exf}4 \) (20 \( \text{e}4 \) ?! \( g5 \) \( f7 \) is followed by ...\( \text{db}8 \)-\( d7 \)-\( e5 \) is positionally very bad for White) 20...\( \text{g}6 \) 21 \( \text{de}1 \)! \( \text{dh}5 \) 22 \( f5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \)? (22...\( \text{xf}5 \) 23 \( f4 \) \( \text{f}7 \) \( f7 \) is more natural and better) 23 \( f4 \) \( \pm \) Lautier-Cu. Hansen, Bolt 1992.

a2) 17...\( f4 \)! is better. 18 \( \text{exf}4 \) (18 \( \text{e}4 \) \( g5 \) \( f7 \)) 18...\( \text{g}6 \) \( f7 \) followed by ...\( \text{dh}5 \).

b) According to Lautier White should play 13 \( \text{d}5! \) \( \text{dx}d5 \) 14 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{b}4 \)! 15 \( a3 \) (15 \( \text{dx}c5 \) ?! \( \text{xa}2 \)! 16 \( \text{dc}4 \) \( \text{dc}5 \) 17 \( \text{dc}5 \) \( \text{ad}8 \) \( f7 \)) 15...\( \text{d}x\text{d}5 \) 16 \( \text{dc}5 \) \( \text{dx}c5 \) 17 \( \text{xc}5 \), but Black seems to get a lot of counterplay after 17...\( \text{ad}8 \) (17...\( \text{fd}8 \) 18 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \pm \)) 18 \( \text{c}2 \) \( b6 \) 19 \( \text{c}4 \) (19 \( \text{c}6 \) ? \( f4 \) \( f7 \)) 19...\( \text{g}5 \) 20 \( \text{h}1 \) \( f4 \).

**Conclusion:** Black need not be worried about this possibility since the exchange of the dark-squared bishops is not unfavourable for him.

**B3**

\[
\begin{align*}
4 & \text{g}3 \text{f}6 5 \text{g}2 \text{e}7 60-00-0(D) \\
7 & \text{d}4 \\
7 & \text{c}5 \text{c}6 8 \text{cx}d6 \text{cx}d6 9 \text{d}4?! (9 \text{b}4?! \text{c}4; 9 \text{d}3) 9...\text{c}e4 10 \text{g}5 \text{d}5 \text{f7} \text{g}7 \text{f7} \text{g8} 10 \text{h}1?! (10 \text{h}3 \text{transposes to Line B2 of Chapter 2}) 10...\text{xd}5 11 \text{g}5 \text{e}4 \\
\end{align*}
\]

\( \text{b}6 \) 12 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 13 \( \text{b}3 \) \( d5 \) 14 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 15 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 16 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 17 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{xd}1 \) 18 \( \text{xd}1 \) \( \text{f}6 \) = Vogt-Züger, Zurich 1999.

8...\( \text{c}6 \) 9 \( \text{d}5 \)

Allowing Black to play ...\( d5 \) usually doesn't promise White anything:

a) 9 \( \text{c}2 \) \( d5 \) 10 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{cxd}5 \) =.

b) 9 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 10 \( \text{f}3 \) \( d5 \) and now:

b1) 11 \( \text{f}4?! \) \( \text{dx}c4 \) 12 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 13 \( \text{b}3 \) \( b4 \) 14 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \pm \) Friedman-Bologan, New York 1993.

b2) Better is 11 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{cxd}5 \) 12 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 13 \( \text{xf}6 \) (13 \( e3 \) \( \text{d}a5 \) is also equal) 13...\( \text{xf}6 \) 14 \( e3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) =

9...\( \text{bd}7 \) 10 \( \text{c}2 \) (D)

10 \( f3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 11 \( \text{fxe}4?! \) \( \text{b}6+ \) 12 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{f}4 \) looks risky for White.

This position can be compared with the similar one in Line B2 of Chapter 2 where White's knight is on \( h3 \) instead of \( c2 \). Which one is better? From \( h3 \) the knight has a shorter route to \( e6 \) at least.

10...\( \text{e}5 \) 11 \( \text{b}3 \) \( c5 \)?

Now Belov considers the position completely equal, since the \( c2 \)-knight doesn't look very active. However,
Black has some alternatives to test: 11...\textit{d}d7 and 11...\textit{h}h8, for example.

12 f3 exf3 13 exf3 \textit{e}e8

White has some space advantage but it is not easy to benefit from the only weakness in Black’s camp: the e6-square. White is slightly better after 13...\textit{d}d7 14 f4 \textit{e}eg4 15 h3 \textit{h}h6 16 \textit{w}d3 \textit{h}h5 17 \textit{h}h2 \textit{f}f6 18 \textit{f}f3, Lupu-Bern, Haifa Echt 1989.

14 f4 \textit{g}g6

Black is going to over-protect the weak e6-square, but more natural is 14...\textit{f}f7 15 \textit{b}b2 \textit{f}f6 16 \textit{b}b1 \textit{g}6 with the regrouping plan...\textit{g}g7, ...\textit{f}f6 and ...\textit{c}c8.

15 \textit{h}h2 \textit{f}f6 16 \textit{b}b1

Black gets counterplay after 16 \textit{w}d2 \textit{d}d7 17 \textit{a}ae1 \textit{b}b5!?.

16...\textit{d}d7 17 a3 \textit{c}c7 18 b4 \textit{b}b6 19 \textit{w}d2

After 19 bxc5 bxc5 20 \textit{a}al \textit{b}b8 21 \textit{w}d2 \textit{a}a8! with...\textit{b}b6 to follow, Black can regroup his pieces nicely.

19...\textit{e}e8 20 \textit{f}f3 \textit{f}f8 21 \textit{e}e2

Or 21 bxc5 bxc5 22 \textit{e}e2 \textit{b}b8 23 \textit{xf}f6 \textit{xf}f6 = 24 \textit{a}a5 \textit{b}b2!.

21...\textit{x}xb2 22 \textit{x}xb2 \textit{f}f6 23 \textit{b}b1

After 23 \textit{c}c3!? \textit{a}a6 24 \textit{e}e1 \textit{f}f4 White still has some advantage according to Belov, though it is not easy to see what is he going to do after, for example, 24...\textit{x}xe1+ 25 \textit{w}xe1 (25 \textit{x}xe1 \textit{c}c8) 25...\textit{c}c8 26 \textit{d}d2 \textit{c}c8 27 \textit{b}b1 \textit{g}g7.

23...\textit{a}a6! 24 \textit{c}c3 \textit{e}e7


\textbf{Conclusion:} This line is very similar to the ones in Part 1 except that the knight comes to c2 instead of h3. White gains a small space advantage in the closed position but can hardly benefit from the only weakness in Black’s position, namely the e6-square.
28 The English Opening without an Early $\textsf{\&f3}$

1 e4 d6 2 $\textsf{\&c3}$

Of course, 2 d4 is discussed under 1 d4 d6 2 c4.

2...e5 (D)

![Chessboard Diagram]

W

3 g3

For 3 d4, see 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 $\textsf{\&c3}$.

3...f5 4 $\textsf{\&g2}$

White can also play the immediate 4 d4 $\textsf{\&e7}$ 5 dxe5 dxe5 6 $\textsf{\&xd8+} \textsf{\&xd8}$ 7 e4!? (7 $\textsf{\&g2}$ $\textsf{\&f6}$ transposes to Line A) 7...$\textsf{\&c6}$ 8 $\textsf{\&e3}$ (Suba's idea; 8 $\textsf{\&d2}$ $\textsf{\&f6}$ 9 $\textsf{\&d3}$ 0-0 10 exf5 e4 11 $\textsf{\&xe4}$ $\textsf{\&e8}$ 12 f3 $\textsf{\&xf5}$ 13 0-0-0 $\textsf{\&xe4}$ 14 $\textsf{\&xe4}$ $\textsf{\&e5}$ 15 $\textsf{\&c2}$ $\textsf{\&g4}$ 16 $\textsf{\&el}$ $\textsf{\&xc4}$

† Varberg-Rowson, Copenhagen Politiken Cup 1996) 8...$\textsf{\&f6}$ 9 $\textsf{\&d3}$ g6?! (9...fxe4 10 $\textsf{\&xe4}$ 0-0 11 $\textsf{\&e2}$ $\textsf{\&g4}$ looks at least equal) 10 $\textsf{\&ge2}$ 0-0 11 0-0 $\textsf{\&e6}$ 12 b3 $\pm$ Suba-Yepes Martinez, Castellar 1995.

4...$\textsf{\&f6}$

Now:

A: 5 d4 229

B: 5 d3 230

Another plan is 5 c3 $\textsf{\&e7}$ 6 $\textsf{\&ge2}$ 0-0 7 0-0 c6 8 d4 $\textsf{\&a6}$ (D), when White’s c4-pawn is vulnerable, and Black may be able to exploit this. White now has time to do something on the queenside:

![Chessboard Diagram]

W

a) 9 a3 $\textsf{\&c7}$ 10 b4 $\textsf{\&e6}$! 11 b5 $\textsf{\&xc4}$ 12 bxc6 bxc6 13 $\textsf{\&xe6}$ $\textsf{\&b8}$ 14 $\textsf{\&a4}$ d5! 15 dxe5 $\textsf{\&e4}$ 16 $\textsf{\&xe4}$?! $\textsf{\&xe4}$ 17 $\textsf{\&d1}$ $\textsf{\&c8}$ with a massive attack for Black, Reinderman-Van der Wiel, Dutch Ch 1996.
b) 9 b3 e4!? (9...\(\Box c7\) 10 \(\Box a3\) e4 11 \(\Box d2\) d5 12 \(\Box xe7\) \(\Box xe7\) = Urday-Pomes, Oviedo rpd 1992) 10 d5 c5 11 \(f3\) exf3 12 \(\Box xf3\) \(\Box c7\) 13 a4 \(\Box d7\) 14 \(\Box g2\) \(\Box e5\) 15 \(\Box f4\) \(\Box f6\) = Idigoras-Slipak, Buenos Aires 1992.

c) 9 \(\Box b1\) \(\Box c7\) (9...\(\Box e6\)!! 10 d5) 10 b4 (less logical is 10 b3 e4 11 \(\Box b2\) d5 12 \(\Box c1\) g5 13 \(\Box c2\) \(\Box d6\) 14 c5 \(\Box c7\) 15 f4 h6 = Spraggett-Vaganian, Montpellier Ct 1985) 10...\(\Box b8\)!? (now the natural idea 10...\(\Box e6\) 11 b5 \(\Box xc4\) 12 bxc6 bxc6 13 \(\Box xc6\) \(\Box b8\) 14 \(\Box xb8\) \(\Box xb8\) 15 \(\Box a4\) \(+=\) is not so good for Black, but 10...e4!? looks playable) 11 b5 c5 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 b6 axb6 14 \(\Box xb6\) \(\Box xd1\) 15 \(\Box xd1\) \(\Box d8\) 16 \(\Box xd8+\) \(\Box xd8\) 17 \(\Box a3\) \(\Box e6\) 18 \(\Box b5\) e4 = Williams-Ansell, British League (4NCL) 1999/00.

A)

5 d4 \(\Box e7\)

Better than 5...e4?! 6 f3 exf3 7 \(\Box xf3\) \(+=\).

6 dxe5

6 \(\Box f3\) e4 7 \(\Box g5\) c6 is likely to transpose to Chapter 2 or Line A of Chapter 4. Hjartarson-Psakhis, Iceland-Israel 1996 continued 8 d5 \(\Box d6\) 9 \(\Box h3\) \(\Box c7\) 10 a4 0-0 11 0-0 and now Black's most solid idea is 11...a5 followed by ...\(\Box a6\).

6...dxe5 7 \(\Box xd8+\) \(\Box xd8\) (D)

Black doesn't seem to have any trouble at all in this ending. As in the other typical endings in our repertoire, Black has the central squares under control and the queenside pieces can be placed harmoniously; typically the knight comes to a6 and bishop to c7. Here Black usually castles but the king also has the more central f7-square at its disposal.

8 b3

The other moves are not dangerous either:

a) White even got into trouble after 8 c4?! c6 (8...\(\Box c6\) 9 \(\Box g2\) 0-0 =) 9 \(\Box g2\) \(\Box a6\) 10 0-0 \(\Box c5\) 11 \(\Box g5\) 0-0 12 exf5 \(\Box xf5\) 13 h3 \(\Box d3\) \(+=\) in Bilek-Barcza, Hungarian Ch (Budapest) 1957.

b) 8 \(\Box f3\) \(\Box c6\) 9 0-0 e4 10 \(\Box g5\) \(\Box e5\) 11 b3 c6 12 \(\Box b2\) h6 13 \(\Box h3\) \(\Box c7\) 14 f3 exf3 15 exf3 \(\Box d7\) 16 \(\Box ad1\) 0-0-0 17 \(\Box a4\) b6 18 \(\Box f4\) \(\Box he8\) = Schandorff-Gulko, Copenhagen Politiken Cup 2000.

8...c6 9 \(\Box b2\) 0-0

9...\(\Box a6\) 10 \(\Box f3\) c4 11 \(\Box d4\) \(\Box f7\) is also level. After 12 \(\Box c2\) \(\Box c5\) 13 b4 \(\Box e6\) 14 f3 exf3 15 exf3 a5! 16 a3 f4!

Black took the initiative in Saloan-Gofshtein, French Cht 1998.

10 \(\Box f3\) \(\Box e8\)

Black can also play:

a) 10...e4 11 \(\Box d4\) \(\Box b6\) 12 \(\Box d1\) \(\Box d8\) 13 \(\Box c2\) \(\Box xd1+\) 14 \(\Box xd1\) \(\Box f7\) with an equal position. McNab-Gayson, British League (4NCL) 2000/1.
b) 10...\( \text{Qbd7} \) 11 0-0 \( \text{Qe8} \) 12 \( \text{Qad1} \)
\( \text{Qc7} \) 13 \( \text{Qh4} \) g6 14 e4 f4 15 \( \text{Qf3} \) fxg3
16 hxg3 \( \text{Qf8} \) (16...\( \text{Qc5} \) 17 b4 \( \text{Qe6} \) 18
\( \text{Qfe1} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) = 19 \( \text{Qd5?} \) exd5 20 exd5
\( \text{Qb6} \) ! 21 c5 \( \text{Qxc5} \) 22 bxc5 \( \text{Qxc5} \) \( \text{Qf1} \) (Taimanov-Vaganian, Leningrad 1977))
17 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 18 \( \text{Qh2} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 19 \( \text{Qa4} \)
\( \text{Qad8} \) 20 \( \text{Qfd1} \) \( \text{Qxd3} \) 21 \( \text{Qxd3} \) \( \text{Qg8} \)=

11 0-0 \( \text{Qa6} \) 12 \( \text{Qad1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 13 e4?
This idea doesn't work, though after normal moves Black can ensure at
least equality with a quick ...e4; e.g.,
13 \( \text{Qfe1} \) e4 14 \( \text{Qd4} \) f4!? (14...\( \text{Qf7} \) =)
15 gx f4 \( \text{Qxf4} \) with unclear play or 13
\( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 14 e4 (14 \( \text{Qh3} \) g5?) 14...f4 =.
13...fxe4 14 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 15 \( \text{Qde1} \) \( \text{Qc5} \)
\( \text{Qf1} \) (Erich-Psakhis, Vlissingen 2000).

Conclusion: This ending offers
White nothing.

B)
5 d3 \( \text{Qe7} \) \( (D) \)

\( \text{W} \)

6 e3
Alternatively:

a) A fairly standard plan from
White's point of view is 6 e4 c6 7
\( \text{Qge2} \) 0-0 8 0-0 \( \text{Qa6} \) (8...a5 first is cer-
tainly playable) 9 d4!? (the solid moves
9 \( \text{Qb1} \) and 9 b3 are good enough for
equality while the plan 9 h3? \( \text{Qe8} \) 10
\( \text{Qe3} \) ? \( \text{Qh5} \) 11 \( \text{Qc1} \) f4! 12 \( \text{Qxf4} \) exf4
13 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Qh3} \) 14 \( \text{Qh5} \) \( \text{Qh5} \) 15
\( \text{Qxh3} \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Qf1} \) proved unsuccessful in
S.Horvath-Ibragimov, Szekszard 1995)
9...\( \text{Qe} \) and now the slow 10 a3? \( \text{Qxe4} \)
11 dx e5 dx e5 12 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 13 \( \text{Qxe4} \)
\( \text{Qc5} \) 14 \( \text{Qg2} \) Qf5+ allowed Black im-
measurable activity in Varberg-Gulko, Co-
penhagen 1996.

b) Some strong players seem to
like 6 f4!?:

b1) 6...exf4 7 \( \text{Qxf4} \) 0-0 8 \( \text{Qf3} \) c6 9
\( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 10 0-0 \( \text{Qc5} \) 11 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qg4} \)
12 h3 \( \text{Qe5} \) 13 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 14 \( \text{Qe3} \) g6 15
\( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) = Serper-Dolmatov, Manila

b2) 6...0-0 7 \( \text{Qf3} \) exf4 (7...\( \text{Qc6} \) 8
0-0 \( \text{Qb8} \) 9 c3 \( \text{Qe8} \) 10 a3 a6 11 \( \text{Qc2} \)
\( \text{Qd7} \) \( \text{Qf4} \) Ch-83, Chempokov, USSR
Army Ch (1990) 8 gx f4 (8 \( \text{Qxf4} \) trans-
pose to "b1") 8...c6 9 0-0 \( \text{Qa6} \) 10 \( \text{Qh1} \)
\( \text{Qc7} \) 11 b3 \( \text{Qe8} \) 12 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qh5} \) 13 c3
\( \text{Qd7} \) 14 \( \text{Qb2} \) \( \text{Qae8} \) 15 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 16
\( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qh6} \) 17 \( \text{Qae1} \) c5 \( \text{Qb} \) Makary-
chev-Vaulin, Russian Ch (Kazan)
1995. Black's pieces are placed har-
moniously and he is at least equal.

6...0-0 7 \( \text{Qge2} \) c6

7...a5 8 0-0 c6 9 b3 \( \text{Qa6} \) 10 \( \text{Qb2} \)
\( \text{Qd7} \) 11 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 12 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 13 f4
\( \text{Qg4} \) 14 h3 \( \text{Qh6} \) 15 \( \text{Qa4} \) exf4 16 exf4
\( \text{Qf6} \) 17 \( \text{Qxf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 18 \( \text{Qb6} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 19
\( \text{Qxd7} \) \( \text{Qxd7} \) = was not quite as con-
vincing in Hjartarson-Christiansen,
Reykjavik tt 1990.
Once again Black finds a function for this bishop: there is a weakness on e3.

13 h3 \( \text{xf7} \) 14 \( \text{h2} \) b6 15 ael exf4 16 \( \text{xf4} \) d8 (D)

16...g5!? is risky because after 17 \( \text{a4} \) gxf4 18 \( \text{xb6} \) fxg3+ 19 \( \text{h1} \) axb6 20 \( \text{xf6} \) the black king is vulnerable.

17 e4 fxe4 18 \( \text{xe4} \) dxe4 19 dxe4 a5 20 c3 dxc3 21 wxc3 c5
21...d5!? 22 cxd5 cxd5 23 g2 d4 = doesn't look bad either.

22 g2 exel 23 exel e8 24 d4 e6 25 xe6 xe6 26 xe6 c8

This ending should be a draw, albeit with a little accuracy needed from Black, Markowski-Seul, Biel 1997.

Conclusion: This slow continuation is solid for White but Black should equalize with our standard, flexible development system.
29 Rare First Moves

Here we consider:
A: 1 b3 232
B: 1 b4 234
C: 1 f4 235

Instead, 1 g3 d6!? will often transpose to variations considered in the previous two chapters, but here is an independent possibility: 2 g2 e5 3 e4 (3 c4 f5 4.gc3 transposes to Chapter 28) 3...c6 4.c2 f5!? 5 d4 (5 exf5 helps Black’s development: 5...xf5 6 0-0 xf6 7 d4 e7 8 c3 d7 9 dxe5 dxe5 10 e3 xdx1 11 xdx1 g4 f Minich-Franzen, Trnava 1989) 5...fxe4 6 d5 cxe7 7 c4 xf6 8 bc3 f5 9 h3 h5 10 g5 d7 11 d2 0-0-0 led to a rather unconventional position that is difficult to assess in Mowsziszian-Granados Gomez, Paretana 1999.

A)
1 b3 d6 2 b2 e5 (D)
3 e3
Or:

a) 3 c4 f5 4 g3 (4 d4 e4 5 e3 transposes to the main line) 4...f6 5.g2 transposes to ‘c1’.

b) 3 d4 transposes to Line D of Chapter 19.

c) Against the double fianchetto 3 g3 Black can naturally continue with the standard 3...f5, leading to the following possibilities:

   c1) After 4.g2, Black’s basic set-up is especially good, and he gets a very active position: 4...f6 5 c4 e7 6 c3 e6 7.d2 0-0 8 0-0 c8! (8...d6 9 bc3 d7 10 d4 e4 11 d5 e5 12 f3 exf3 13 xf3 xdx1 14 a4 d7 15 g2 e5 = L.Schneider-Ziegler, Stockholm 1987) 9 d4 c4 10 d5 e5 11 a3 g5 12 d2 d7 13 xdx1 c8 14 f3 xf3 15 xf3 g4 16 xg4 xg4 17 f2 e5 + Brunsch-Weisenburger, Baden 1995.

c2) 4 d4 e4 and then:

   c21) 5 e5 xf6 6 xe2 c6 7 xf4 d5 8 h4 d6 9 e4 0-0 10 e3 xf4 11 xf4 xe6 12 a3 d7 13 d2 d7 14 cxd5 dxd5 15 d6 d7 f6 16 e5 xc3 17 xc3 g4 = Hecht-Bilek, Budapest 1973.

   c22) 5 d5 xf6 and here:

   c221) 6 e3?! e7 7 h3 xdx7 8 g5 e5 9 e2 0-0 10 h4 dxf4 11
\( \text{c.12) } 6 \text{ Bh3!? Bb5? (6...g6!?) 7} \text{ Bf4 Bg7 is another plan) 7} \text{ Be2 Cc7 8} \text{ Ce3 Be5 9} f3 0-0 10 \text{ Bd2 c6 11} \text{ Bf4 exf3 12} \text{ exf3 Cc8 13} 0-0-0 = \text{ Kallio-Fogarasi, Budapest 2001.}

3...f5

This is also quite a good moment to play in Modern Defence style: 3...g6 4 \text{ Bh3 f6 5} d4 e4 6 \text{ Bfd2 f5 7} c4 \text{ Bf6 8} \text{ Ce3 0-0 9} \text{ Bc2 Cc6 10} \text{ Be2 Bb4 11 Be1! f4? (11...c6 12 a3 Ba6 =) 12 a3 fxe3 13 Bxe3 Bd3+ 14 Cxd3 exd3 15 0-0 Cg4 16 Bxd3 Bh4 17 h3 Bh2 with attacking chances for Black, Pla-}


4 d4 e4 (D)

---

This position is again very similar to the 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 Bf3 main lines, but White has used two moves to develop his bishop at once to b2, which may turn out not to be time well spent if Black manages to play ...d5. This is why in many examples White aims to play d5 first.

5 c4

---

Other options:

a) 5 \text{ Be2 Bf6 6} d5 \text{ Cc7 7} \text{ Bc4 0-0 8} \text{ Ce3 (8} \text{ Be2 a5 0-0 Bc6 10} c4 \text{ Cc5 11} \text{ Ba3 g5 12} \text{ Bh3 Bg4 13} \text{ Bb5 Cc5 \quad \text{Mephisto-Suetin, Dortmund 1990}) 8...c6 9 Bc2 a5 10 Bd2 Ba6 11 Bxc6 Bxc6 12 Bc4 Cc7 13 Bd4 g5 14 Bh5 Bxh5 15 Bxh5 Cxd5 with unclear play, M.Nei-Yrjölä, Helsinki 1995.}

b) 5 \text{ Bh3 Bf6 6} c4 (6 \text{ Bf4 Cc7 7} h4 c6 8 c4 Ba6 9 \text{ Ce3 Cc7 10} \text{ Bxd2 Ce6 11 g3 Bxf4 12} \text{ exf4 d5 \quad \text{Ashley-Hoang Thanh Trang, Budapest 1997}) 6...g6 7 \text{ Bf4 Cg7 8} \text{ h4 0-0 9} \text{ Ce3 Cc6 10} a3 Ce7 11 Cc1 Cd8 12 B4 Ba6 = Emodi-Berkovich, Budapest 1992.}

c) 5 d5 \text{ Bf6 6} \text{ Bh3 (6} h4 \text{ Cc7 7} \text{ Bh3 0-0 8} \text{ Be2 Bbd7 9} \text{ Bc3 a6 10} h5 \text{ Be5 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} Vokač-Marin, Krynica 1998) 6...c6 7 \text{ Bf4 Cc7 8} \text{ h4 0-0 (8...a5!? 9} a4 Ba6 10 \text{ Cc4 Cc7 11} \text{ Ce3 Cg4 12} \text{ Cc5 Bxh5 13 Cxg7+ Bf8 14} g3 Bf6 15 Cxh5 Be5 16 \text{ Bxd2 b5 is unclear, M.Nei-Paasikangas, Espoo 1996) 9} \text{ Ce3 Bh8 10} \text{ Bxd2 Bxd7 11} \text{ Ce2 cx5 12} \text{ Bxd5 Bxd5 13} \text{ Cxd5 Cc6 14} \text{ Bf4 Bf6 15} c4 Bxb2 16 \text{ Cxb2 Bxa5+ 17} \text{ Bxd2 Bxd2+ 18} Cxd2 Cc8 = Van-}


5...Bf6

Positionally very logical is 5...d5!? 6 \text{ Bc3 (6} \text{ cxd5 Bf6) 6...Bxa3 7} \text{ Bxa3 Bf6 8} \text{ Bxd2 0-0 9} \text{ cxd5 Cxd5 10} \text{ Cc4 Ce6 11 Be2 Cxd7 12 Cc1 c6 13 Bxd5 Cxd5 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} Hug-Knežević, Stary Smo-}

kovec 1974.

6 \text{ Bc3 Bc7 7} \text{ Be2}

7 \text{ Bh3 Be6 (7...c6, with the same plan as in the main line, is certainly possible) 8} \text{ Bf4 Bf7 9} \text{ h4 Bbd7 10} \text{ Cc2 Bf8 11} \text{ Bxd2 c6?!) (it is time to}
exchange White's best piece by means of 11...\(\text{Qg6}\) 12 d5 c5 13 f3 exf3 14 \(\text{Exf3}\) \(\text{Wd7}\) 15 0-0-0 a6 16 a4 (16 e4! \(\pm\)) 16...0-0-0 17 \(\text{Edel}\) \(\text{Qg6}\) 18 \(\text{Ece2}\) \(\text{Qe5}\) 19 \(\text{Qg3}\) a5 1/2-1/2 Dorr-Veterama, USA 1995.

7...c6 8 \(\text{Qf4}\) a6

Black continues with standard plans, including support for ...d5. If White plays d5 himself, Black will try to create counterplay with ...\(\text{Qc7}\) and ...b5.

9 d5 0-0 10 \(\text{Ee2}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 11 h4 c5 12 \(\text{Wc2}\) \(\text{Ab8}\) 13 h5 a6 14 a4 \(\text{We8}\) 15 a5 \(\text{Qd8}\)

with a level but difficult positional fight, Hodgson-Agrest, Harplinge 1998.

**Conclusion:** This seems to be a perfectly viable option against 1 b3, especially because this is hardly an approach that Nimzo/Larsen players are likely to be well prepared for.

B)

1 b4 d6 2 \(\text{Ab2}\) e5 (D)

Here we follow our basic preferred set-up against the English Opening, namely quick kingside activity with ...d6, ...e5, ...f5, ...\(\text{Qf6}\), ...\(\text{Qc7}\) and ...0-0.

3 c4

Other moves:

a) 3 f4?! exf4 4 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 5 g3? \(\text{fxg3}\) 6 hxg3 \(\text{Qg4}\) 7 \(\text{Qg2}\) c6 8 d3 \(\text{Qe7}\) 9 \(\text{Qbd2}\) \(\text{Wc7}\) 10 a3 \(\text{Qbd7}\) \(\varpi\) Gross-Zuch, Germany 1988.

b) 3 e3 f5 4 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 5 d4 e4 6 \(\text{Qfd2}\) d5 7 b5 \(\text{Qd6}\) 8 \(\text{Qe2}\) 0-0 9 0-0 \(\text{Qe6}\) 10 a4 c6 11 \(\text{Qa3}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 12 g3 \(\text{Qbd7}\) 13 f4 \(\text{Qc8}\) \(\varpi\) Gernert-Medwed, Wolfstein 1994.

c) 3 e4 f5 4 d3 (4 \(\text{Qc3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 5 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{fxe4}\) 6 \(\text{Qd5}\) \(\text{Qxd5}\) 7 \(\text{Qxd5}\) c6 8 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) \(\varpi\) Culiverhouse-Friesen, Soest 1996; 4 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 5 f4 \(\text{fxe4}\) 6 \(\text{fxe5}\) \(\text{Qg4}\) 7 \(\text{e6}\) \(\text{Qg5}\) 8 \(\text{Qc3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 9 \(\text{Qge2}\) d5 is also much better for Black, Solano-Ugalde, Costa Rica 1997) 4...\(\text{Qf6}\) 5 \(\text{Qd2}\) g6 6 \(\text{Qc2}\) \(\text{Qg7}\) 7 c4 0-0 8 h3 \(\text{Qc6}\) \(\varpi\) Rajewski-Eckl, Bad Wörishofen 1992.

3...f5 4 e3 \(\text{Qf6}\) 5 \(\text{Qf3}\)

5 \(\text{Qc3}\) g6 6 d3 \(\text{Qg7}\) 7 \(\text{Wb3}\) 0-0 8 \(\text{Qe2}\) c6 9 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) = Feldman-Burrows, New York 1999.

5...\(\text{Qc7}\) 6 d4

Or 6 \(\text{Qc3}\) 0-0 7 \(\text{Wb3}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 8 d4 e4 9 \(\text{Qg5}\) c6 = with a familiar position-type, Sokolsky-Persitz, corr. 1968.

6...c4 7 \(\text{Qfd2}\) d5 (D)

This position is quite similar to 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 \(\text{Qf3}\) main lines, and Black continues applying the ideas that are well known there.

8 b5

Or:

a) 8 \(\text{Wb3}\) c6 9 \(\text{Qc3}\) 0-0 10 g3 \(\text{Qh8}\)

11 h4 dxc4 12 \(\text{Qxc4}\) b5 13 \(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Qa6}\)
14 a3  \( \text{Qc7} \) 15  \( \text{Wc2} \)  \( \text{Ke6} \) \( \text{+=} \) Sokolsky-Suetin. USSR Cht (Leningrad) 1953. This is a nice example of how to gain control of d5.

b) Closing the position with 8  \( c5 \) makes life easy for Black: 8...0-0 9  \( \text{Qc3} \)  \( c6 \) 10  \( a4 \)  \( \text{We7} \) 11  \( g3 \)  \( \text{Ke6} \) 12  \( \text{Qe2} \)  \( \text{Qh5} \) 13  \( \text{Qg2} \)  \( \text{Qd7} \) with equality. Reuter-Von Oppen, Koblenz 1990.

8...\( \text{We6} \) 9  \( a4 \) 0-0 10  \( \text{Web3} \)  \( \text{Qe6} \) 11  \( \text{Qc3} \)  \( \text{Qbd7} \) 12  \( \text{Ke2} \)  \( \text{Qh8} \) 13  \( \text{Kh3} \)  \( \text{We7} \) 14  \( c5 \)  \( f4?! \) 15  \( \text{Qd1} \)

15  \( \text{Qxe4} \)  \( \text{fxe3} \) 16  \( \text{fxe3} \)  \( \text{Qxe4} \) 17  \( \text{Qxe4} \)  \( b6 \) is certainly risky for White because of his vulnerable king.

15...\( \text{Ab8} \) 16  \( \text{We4} \) 17  \( \text{Wxf4} \) 18  \( \text{We3} \)  \( \text{Wg6} \)

\( \text{+=} \) Rocznik-Walczak, Poland 1981.

**Conclusion:** Although there are certainly many viable options against the Sokolsky, this is a way to lead the game into familiar position-types.

C)

1  \( \text{f4} \)  \( \text{d6} \) \( (D) \)

Well, 1...\( \text{d6} \) is possible after every first move by White. After 1  \( \text{f4} \) it is especially useful, as the plan of ...\( \text{e5} \) offers good activity, provided Black avoids transpositions to certain other openings. Especially the King's Gambit Declined (in the form of 1  \( \text{e4} \)  \( \text{e5} \) 2  \( \text{f4} \)  \( \text{d6} \)) should be avoided without special preparations.

2  \( \text{Qf3} \)

Or:

a) Moves like 2  \( \text{g3} \) and 2  \( \text{e3} \) are effectively met by 2...\( \text{e5} \).

b) 2  \( \text{d4?!} \) transposes to Line A of Chapter 19.

c) After 2  \( \text{e4} \) we recommend either:

\( \text{c1) } \) 2...\( \text{f6} \) and then:

\( \text{c11) } \) 3  \( \text{d3} \)  \( \text{c5} \) (3...\( \text{g6} \) 4  \( \text{xf3} \)  \( \text{g7} \) 5  \( \text{g3} \)  \( \text{c5} \) transposes to a Closed Sicilian)

4  \( \text{xf3} \)  \( \text{c6} \) 5  \( \text{g3} \)  \( \text{xf4} \) 6  \( \text{xf4} \)  \( \text{d5} \) 7  \( \text{e5} \)  \( \text{Qh5} \) 8  \( \text{g2} \)  \( \text{g4} \) 9  \( \text{c3} \)  \( \text{e7} \) 10  \( 0-0 \)

\( \text{Qxf4} \) 11  \( \text{gxf4} \)  \( \text{Wd7} \) 12  \( \text{d4} \)  \( \text{Wf5} \) 13  \( \text{Wd2} \) 0-0 14  \( \text{Qe1} \)  \( \text{Wg6} \) 15  \( \text{Qc2} \)  \( \text{Qh4} \) with the plan ...\( \text{Qe7-f5} \) leads to an unclear position. Danielsen-J.Andersen. Danish League 1998/9.

\( \text{c12) } \) 3  \( \text{Qc3} \)  \( \text{g6} \) 4  \( \text{d4} \) transposes to the Austrian Attack of the Pirc (Chapter 21).
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c2) 2...d5!? challenges White’s centre at once. The loss of tempo means nothing, as the premature f4 is a weakness in quite a number of theoretical positions. White now has:

c21) 3 exd5?! £f6 (3...£xd5!? is also possible) 4 £c3 (4 c4 e6 5 £c3 exd5 6 exd5 £xd5 7 £f3 £c6 8 £c4 e6 9 d4 £b4 10 £xd5 exd5 11 0-0 0-0 ✖ Montell-Oratovsky, Salou 2000)
6...£xd5 5 £f3 e6 (5...£xc3!? looks possible) 6 £c4 £b4 7 £b3 £8c6 ✖ Mas-Reilly, Genting Highlands 1998.

c22) 3 £c3?! dxe4 4 £xe4 £d7 5 £f3 £g6 6 £f2 e6 7 g3 £d6 8 £g2 0-0 ✖ Petraki-Djuric, Athens 1997.

c23) 3 e5 c5 4 £f3 £c6 5 c3 (5 £c3 £g4 6 £b5 e6 7 £xc6+ bx6 8 d3 £h6 9 0-0 £f5 10 £e1 h5 ✖ DanielSEN-SkyttE, Copenhagen 1999) 5...£g4 6 h3 £xf3 7 £xf3 e6 8 d3 f6 9 exf6 £xf6 10 £a3 £d6 11 £e2 0-0 12 g4 £e7 13 £d2 £ae8 14 0-0-0 a6 15 £c2 b5 with an initiative for Black. Beshukov-Ivanov, Novgorod 1999.

2...£g4?! (D)

Now we can turn to the ideas of the Hodgson System. Otherwise:

a) After 2...e5?, 3 fxe5 transposes to a line of the From Gambit, while 3 e4 transposes to a King’s Gambit Declined.

b) 2...£f6 3 £c3 g6 4 c4 £g7 5 d4 is an Austrian Attack (Chapter 21).

3 e4

White has some alternatives:

a) 3 b3?! £xf3 4 exf3 £d7 5 £b2 £g6 6 £a3 g6 7 c4 £g7 8 g3 c6 9 £h3 e6 10 £e2 £e7 gives Black a slight advantage, Mashiri-J.M.Nielsen, Copenhagen 1998.

b) 3 g3?! £xf3 4 exf3 £d6 5 f5 d5 6 d4 c5 7 £b6 8 dxe5 £xc5 9 £d4 £xd4 10 exd4 £c6 ✖ Petro-Ookhotnik, Saropatak 1995.

c) 3 e3 e5 4 h3 £xf3 5 £xf3 c6 6 b3 £e7?! (6...exf4 7 exf4 £f6 8 £b2 d5 = is more accurate) 7 £b2 £f6 8 fxe5 dxe5 9 £c3 £d7 10 0-0-0 £a5 11 £b1 £e7 12 £e4 ✖ Klausen-Novoselski, Zurich 1988.

3...e5

In addition to this very logical move, Black has also two fair alternatives:

a) 3...£d7?? is playable though a little less active: 4 £c4 e5 5 £c3 £g6 6 0-0 £e7 7 d3 0-0 8 h3 £xf3 9 £xf3 exf4 10 £xf4 £c6 11 £b6 12 £a2 d5 13 exd5 (13 e5?!) 13...£bxd5 14 £xd5 £xd5 15 £f2 £h4 16 £f3 ½-½ Mozes-Korpics, Budapest 1992.

b) 3...£f6?! looks interesting. The idea is to meet 4 £c3 with 4...e6 5 d4 (5 h3?!) 5...d5!, for example, 6 e5 £e4! 7 £d3 £b4 8 £d2 £xd2 9 £xd2 £xf3 10 gxf3 £h4+ 11 £e2 c5 with a slight advantage for Black, Le Floc-Ohkhotnik, Guichen 1993.

4 fxe5
Safer is 4 d3 e7 5 e2 c6 6 0-0 
fd6 7 e3 0-0 (7...exf4 8 xf4 d5!
looks logical) 8 c3 c8!? 9 h3 exf4
10 xf4 d5 11 exd5 (11 xd5! wins a
pawn and is unclear) 11...b4 12 d2
fxd5 13 xd5 xd5 = Durst-Mahdi,
Velden 1996.

4...dxex5 5 c4 c6 6 c3

6 0-0? is a tactical mistake due to
6...xf3 7 xf7+ (7 xf3 d4+ 8
h1 xc4 ++) 7...xf7 8 xf3+ f6
9 b3+ e8 10 xb7 d4 ?

6...xf3?!

This is hardly necessary, as Black
has natural moves such as 6...c5 and
6...d7 at his disposal.

7 xf3 xf6 8 b4? (D)

Instead of this careless move White
should play 8 0-0 c5+ 9 h1 with an
equal game.

8...xb4! 9 cxb4 d4 10 c3
e4+ 11 d1

11 f1 f4+ 12 e1 h4+ 13
e1 e4 ?

11...xg2 12 e1 e4 13 e3
d6

It is understandable Black didn’t
find 13...f2+! 14 e2 xb4+ 15
e3 fd3! ++ in practical play but he
retains a huge plus.

14 e2 xh2 15 f3 f6 16 b2
h4

† Grimm-M. Hermann, Germany
1996/7.

Conclusion: Against Bird’s Open-
ing, the continuation with 1...d6 and
2...g4 is interesting but not so well
known.
30 Other Options for Black:
Introduction

In Chapters 30-33 we study some variations that are closely related to the other material in this book. These variations may overlap partly with the main repertoire introduced earlier, but we think that it might be very useful for the reader to have some extra options. Also some 'lazy' players, not wishing to spend time studying the masses of theory of the Pirc Defence or Hodgson Variation, may find these simpler alternatives very much to their liking.

A Short Word About the Czech System

The Czech System, 1 e4 d6 2 d4 Qf6 3 Qc3 c6, could be an excellent alternative to the Pirc in our repertoire because after the natural move 4 Qf3 Black plays 4...Qg4 which will very likely lead to lines in Chapter 15. However, there are some theoretical problems for Black after the aggressive 4 f4 (D):

a) 4...Qb6?! became unpopular after the game Leko-Hodgson, Čačak 1996: 5 e5! Qd5 6 Qxd5 exd5 7 Qd3 g6 8 Qe2! Qc6 9 c3 Qf5 10 Qxf5 gxf5 11 Qg3 ±.

b) 4...Qa5 is the thematic reply:
   b1) 5 Qd3 e5 6 Qf3 and then:

   b11) After 6...Qg4 7 Qe3 Qbd7 8 0-0 Qe7 9 h3 Black has an unpleasant choice. The exchange 9...Qxf3 10 Qxf3 0-0 11 Qe2! seems to give White the bishop-pair for nothing and after 9...Qh5 10 Qe1 Black may not have anything better than going in for a similar position with 10...Qxf3 since 10...exf4 11 Qxf4 Qg6?! 12 e5! led to unfavourable complications for Black in Browne-Benjamin, USA Ch (Modesto) 1995.

   b12) However, the rare 6...exd4 7 Qxd4 g6 looks more playable and dynamic; for example, 8 Qf3 Qg7 9 0-0 0-0 10 Qe1 Qbd7 11 f5 Qc5 12 Wh4 gxf5 13 Wh6 Qxe4 14 Qxe4 fxe4 15 Qg5 Qf5 with complicated play, Sion Castro-Azmaiparashvili, San Roque
1996. Maybe 8 \( \text{Q} \text{b}3 \text{W} \text{c}7 \text{9} \text{0-0} \text{\text{A}g}7 \text{10} \text{a}4 \) is slightly better for White.

b2) Another problem is 5 e5!? \( \text{Q} \text{e}4 \text{6} \text{Wf}3 \), when 6...\( \text{Q} \text{xc}3 \text{7} \text{\text{A}d}2 \text{\text{A}f}5 \text{8} \text{\text{A}d}3 \text{\text{A}xd}3 \text{9} \text{\text{c}xd}3 \text{W} \text{d}5 \text{10} \text{\text{b}xc}3 \text{\text{d}xe}5 \text{11} \text{\text{f}xe}5 \text{W} \text{xf}3 \text{12} \text{\text{Q}xf}3 \) gave Black an unpleasant ending in Motwani-Adams, Moscow OL 1994. The more complicated possibility 6...d5 7 \( \text{A} \text{d}3 \text{Qa}6 \text{8} \text{Qge}2 \text{\text{b}4} \text{9} \text{0-0} \text{\text{Q}xc}3 \text{10} \text{\text{b}xc}3 \text{\text{Q}xd}3 \text{11} \text{\text{c}xd}3 \text{g}6 \) still looks good for White, who is better developed and has a strong centre.

All these lines look rather suspicious at the moment but theoretical evaluations tend to change from time to time and some new ideas might make everything look brighter. There is always some surprise value with systems like the Czech, which in fact may be an attractive choice for a creative player.
In this chapter we study the positions arising after 1 d4 d6 2 c4 ∆f6 3 ∆c3 ∆f5 (or 3 ∆f3 ∆f5). This variation is a fully playable minor alternative to the main variations presented in this book.

The main idea of the move ...∆f5 is to stop White expanding in the centre with c4, at least for a while. In practice the move ...∆f5 might also trick opponents into King’s Indian lines for which they are unprepared, thus offering good practical chances for players who know the basic ideas well. In the critical lines Black usually gains quite active counterplay if White tries to refute the opening directly. White has, of course, many more positional options, but the most he can hope for with them is the normal small opening advantage.

The variation is playable as a separate opening, and in this chapter we have a full repertoire for Black. However, some knowledge of the King’s Indian is especially useful, as there are many flexible transpositions to well-known positions. Also in Line C2 there can arise main lines of the Classical King’s Indian, but with an extra move (...∆d7) for Black, which offers scope for creative new ideas.

1 d4 d6 2 c4 ∆f6 3 ∆c3

3 ∆f3 ∆f5 4 ∆c3 transposes to Line C.
3...∆f5 (D)

This is the starting position of this variation. Black’s last move might appear a bit illogical, as White’s e4 may kick the bishop quite badly later on. Black, however, is seeking active counterplay. We now consider:

A: 4 g3 241
B: 4 f3 242
C: 4 ∆f3 247

White has many alternatives, but they are not especially dangerous for Black:

a) 4 ∆b3?! attacking the b7-pawn, is one of the standard plans for White, and Black must continue actively with 4...∆c6 5 e3 (5 ∆f3 a5 6 d5 ∆b4 7
\( \text{d4 d7 is also a logical variation} \)

5...a5! 6 a3 (6 \( \text{xb7 b4} \) 7 \( \text{d2} \) c6 leaves the white queen in too much danger) 6...\( \text{c8} \) 7 \( \text{f3} \) e5 8 d5 \( \text{b8} \) 9 \( \text{h4 g6} \) (9...d7?! is also OK) 10 \( \text{xg6} \) h\( \text{hxg6} \) 11 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 12 \( \text{b1} \) c6 13 e4 \( \text{c7} \) 14 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{d8} \) 15 0-0 \( \text{h6} \) and Black is OK, Levit-Multophp, Chicago 1990.

b) 4 \( \text{e4} \) has been tested a few times but Black should not have any problems: 4...\( \text{xe4} \) 5 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 6 \( \text{xf3} \) d5 7 \( \text{b3} \) e6 8 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{d7} \) c5 (9 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{b8} \) 10 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{b6} \) 11 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{b4} \) 12 \( \text{d1} \) exd5 13 \( \text{d3} \) 0-0 with good compensation, Kargoll-Lenz, Baden-Baden 1990) 9...\( \text{e7} \) (9...\( \text{e7} \) 10 \( \text{f3} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b8} \) 12 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{dxc5} \) 13 \( \text{dxc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 14 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{b6} \) 15 \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 16 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xb2} \) + Bonin-Fedorowicz, London Lloyds Bank 1987) 10 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{xf2} \) 11 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xh1} \) 12 \( \text{b5} \). Bode-Flögel, 2nd Bundesliga 1990/1, and now 12...\( \text{c7} \) should be winning.

c) 4 \( \text{h3} \) is possible, intending \( \text{g4} \): 4...\( \text{e5} \) 5 \( \text{dxe5} \) (5 \( \text{g4} \) \text{exd4} 6 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 7 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 8 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e7} \) 9 \( \text{f3} \) 0-0 was at least equal for Black in Pelikan-Rubinetti, Buenos Aires 1965) 5...\( \text{dxe5} \) 6 \( \text{xd8+} \) \( \text{xd8} \) is yet another queenless middlegame, but Black should be quite OK after 7 g4 \( \text{e6} \) 8 \( \text{g2} \) c6 9 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{h2} \) \text{f6} 11 0-0-0 \( \text{c7} \) 12 \( \text{f3} \) a5 13 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{a6} \) = Raetsky-Walek, Mladá Boleslav 1992.

d) 4 \( \text{g5} \) ?! \( \text{bd7} \) and now:

d1) 5 \( \text{f3} \) ?! is slightly passive, and Black takes the initiative with 5...\( \text{b6} \) 6 \( \text{h4} \) (6 \( \text{f4} \) c5 7 d5 g5! 8 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 9 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g7} \) is slightly better for Black, Müller-Stichlberger, Finkenstein 1992)

6...g5! 7 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 8 h3 c5 9 d5 \( \text{b6} \) 10 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{e4} \) \( \pm \) Milković-Zivković, Bosnjaci 2000.

d2) 5 f3 h6 and then:

d21) 6 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 7 e4 is a natural idea to give up the bishop-pair in exchange for a couple of moves, but Black seems to be OK after 7...\( \text{h7} \) 8 e5?! (8 \( \text{ge2} \) c5 =) 8...\( \text{dxe5} \) 9 dxe5 \( \text{xd1} \) + (9...\( \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{e6} \) is unclear) 10 \( \text{xd1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 11 \( \text{b5} \) 0-0-0 12 \( \text{xa7} \) + \( \text{b8} \) 13 \( \text{b5} \) e6, when Black has the initiative.

d22) After 6 e4 \( \text{hxg5} \) 7 \( \text{exf5} \) the curious pawn-structure gives Black sufficient targets to obtain counterplay: 7...c6 8 g4 e6 9 \( \text{fxe6} \) \( \text{e7} \) 10 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 11 \( \text{e3} \) 0-0-0 \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) Appleberry-Gheorghiu, Ventura 1971.

A)

4 g3 e5! (D)

5 \( \text{g2} \)

5 \( \text{f3} \) leads to a slightly different position-type where the centre remains closed: 5...\( \text{c6} \) 6 d5 \( \text{e7} \) 7 \( \text{g5} \) (7 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e4} \) 8 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 9 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{c8} \) =
Obodchuk-Bielczyk, Hlohovec 1993)
7...g6 8 c4 d7 9 h4 h6 10 xf6 
xf6 11 h5 e7 12 b5 d8 13 h3 
h3 14 xh3 c8 = Hort-Kavalek, 
Bugojno 1980.
5...c6
5...exd4!? is worth noting, as in ev-
every forcing variation there can be a 
forcing refutation: 6 xb7! is the only 
move for White and now 6...dxc3 7 
xa8 is a mess, in which Black's only 
try so far was not a success, but there 
might be room for a tactical novelty 
here: 7...c6 (7...xb2 8 xa2 c6 9 wa4 
± is not good, but 7...c2!? might be 
possible) 8 xxc3 d7 9 wa4 ec7 10 
e3 c5 11 ecx5 dxe5 12 f3 h5 
(12...d6!? 13 e4 de8 14 ee2 h6 
15 b1 d7 16 h7! ++ Mozetić-
P.Kovačević, Yugoslav Ch (Tivat) 
1995.
6 d5 d4 7 e4 g4
It is useful for Black to block the 
long diagonal in front of the g2-bishop, 
because 7...d7 8 ge2 g4 9 h3 
gives White a small advantage.
8 f3 d7 9 ge2 c5! (D)
Black gets either a good central post 
for his knight, or in case of an en 
passant capture, enough activity on the 
queenside. Instead 9...xe2 10 xe2 
e7 11 f4 c6 12 f5! was clearly better 
for White in Andreet-Benoit, Val Mau-
buée 1990.
10 dxc6 xc6 11 e3 e7 12 0-0 
0-0
This is the critical position. Black 
has had no special problems in the 
games played so far, but there are 
some interesting ideas for White that 
need further testing. Worse is 12...a6 
13 a4 (13 a3 d5 14 b3 b5 with coun-
terplay) 13...0-0 14 g4! d5 15 b3 
with an advantage for White.
Now (after 12...0-0):
  a) 13 d2 a6 14 d1 d5 15 b3 b5 
gives Black good counterplay, Piket-
Sokolov, Amsterdam 1996.
  b) 13 g4!? is a suggested improve-
ment.
  c) 13 d5?! xd5 14 exd5 (14 
  cxd5!? a5 seems to be an improve-
ment, as 15 b3 ± leaves the a5-knight 
  quite badly placed) 14...b8 15 b4 a5 
  16 a3 g5!? 17 f4 f6 18 xe5 xe5 
  19 d4 c7 = Norri-Vrjölä, Finnish 
  Ch 2001.

Conclusion: 4 g3 is not especially 
dangerous for Black. However, our 
main line here has not been played 
much, so there is still room for new 
ideas.

B) 4 f3

White's most natural plan is to 
play e4 at once, supporting it with f3. 
Black's f5-bishop would look quite
stupid were it not for the following tactical operation:

4...e5! (D)

This is the only move for Black. White now achieves the e4 advance, but Black can insert ...exd4 to mix things up.

5 e4

Otherwise:

a) White can also go for the endgame again, but it is OK for Black: 5 dxe5 dxe5 6 wxd8+ (6 wb3 is harmless: 6...wc8 7 e4=6e6 8 ad3 bbd7 9 be3 c6 10 wc2 dc5 11 wfl 6 c6 12 be2 0-0 13 0-0 exc3 14 xec3 c5 15 c3 d8 16 c2 wc7 ? Buck-Berger, Finkenstein 1996) 6...wxd8 7 e4 (7 ag5 is illogical, as the exchange on f6 just strengthens Black's centre; for example, 7...c6 8 0-0-0+ ec7 9 g3 e6 10 b3 dc5 = Visier-Tal, Palma de Mallorca 1966) 7...e6 and then:

a1) 8 ag5!? c6 0-0+ ec7 10 f4! meets the demands of the position well, but 10...ec5 11 f5 ec8 12 h3 bbd7 13 df3 ec8 14 ec2 a5. Paroulek-Kubanek, Podebrady 1936, is playable for Black, though White has some initiative with 15 g4!?

a2) 8 d5 fd7! 9 g3 c6 10 ec3 eb4+ 11 ad2 edx2+ 12 edx2 f6 = Derrmann-Moehringer, Eger 1988.

a3) 8 ec3 c6 and here:

a31) 9 a3 bbd7 10 ad1 ec7 11 b4 db6! 12 c5 dc4 13 ecx4 ecx4 14 eg2 ec7 15 df2 dh8 = Wittke-Kountz, Badenweil 1988.

a32) 9 c5!! bbd7 10 a4 ec7 11 b3 b5! 12 cxb6+ axb6 13 ec1 db7 14 ecx2 b5 15 ec3 cb4 = Kovacs-Gyurkovics, Hungarian Ch 1993.

a33) 9 0-0-0+ ec7 and this endgame is quite pleasant for Black, and closely reminiscent of the positions arising after 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 dxe5. The king is safe at c7, and Black's pieces can easily find some good squares. For example: 10 g3 xa6 11 a4 bbd7 12 ah3 dc5 13 ecx6 edx6 14 ec2 ec5 15 ec3 g6 16 d2 a5! = Miekiewicz-Bieczyk, Polish Ch (Suwalki) 1999.

b) 5 d5 closes the centre, attempting to deny Black any counterplay. Black's best try is the thematic counter 5...e4! (D), when White has a choice:

b1) 6 ag5 wins the centre for White, but Black gets counterplay after 6...exf3 7 gxf3 ec7 8 ec6 9 h4 h6 10 ec3 bbd7 11 whd2 dh5 because of the weakened dark squares; for example, 12 ae2 af6 13 eg2 ed5 14 dh4 eh7 15 ec2 g5 16 hxg5 xg5 17 ec3 eh4+ 18 ec2 ag5 19 ec3 ah4+ 1/2-1/2 Doncheva-Shikova, Bankia 1992.

b2) 6 g4 seems to be a forced draw:

6...cxg4 7 fxe4 fh4+ 8 wh2 e5 9
\( \text{\textbullet} x e 3 \text{\textbullet} g 5 + \ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \) Ulybin-Anand, Prestwich 1990. Neither side has a good way to deviate. If White’s king advances, it will be mated.

b3) After 6 \( \text{\textbullet} d 4 \) Black has many playable moves:

b31) 6...\( g 6 \)!? 7 \( \text{\textbullet} h 3 \text{\textbullet} a 6 \) 8 \( f x e 4 \) leads to a position where White’s extra pawn is of no importance, as it remains a good target for the well-developed black pieces: 8...\( g b 4 \) (8...\( c 5 \)!? 9 \( d x c 6 \text{\textbullet} b 4 \) 10 \( \text{\textbullet} d 1 \text{\textbullet} x c 6 \) gives Black compensation because of White’s weak doubled pawns) 9 \( \text{\textbullet} d 1 \) a5 10 \( \text{\textbullet} f 2 \text{\textbullet} e 7 \) 11 g3 \( \text{\textbullet} d 7 \) 12 \( \text{\textbullet} g 2 \text{\textbullet} f 6 \) 13 \( \text{\textbullet} d 2 \) h5 14 \( \text{\textbullet} b 1 \text{\textbullet} e 5 \), Van der Werf-Vl.Georgiev, Andorra 1997.

b32) 6...c5!? 7 \( \text{\textbullet} f 2 \text{\textbullet} e 7 \) is also possible, with an unclear position.

b33) 6...\( e x f 3 \) 7 \( g x f 3 \) c5 8 \( \text{\textbullet} f 2 \text{\textbullet} e 7 \) 9 h4 0-0 10 e4 \( \text{\textbullet} d 7 \) 11 \( \text{\textbullet} d 3 \) b5 12 \( \text{\textbullet} g e 2 \) (12 \( \text{\textbullet} x b 5 \) ?!) 12...\( b x c 4 \) 13 \( \text{\textbullet} x c 4 \text{\textbullet} c 8 \) 14 \( \text{\textbullet} g 5 \text{\textbullet} b d 7 \) 15 \( \text{\textbullet} f 4 \text{\textbullet} e 5 \) 16 \( \text{\textbullet} c 2 \text{\textbullet} b 8 \) 17 0-0-0 \( \text{\textbullet} f 6 \) 18 \( \text{\textbullet} d 2 \) \( \text{\textbullet} a 6 \) 19 \( \text{\textbullet} g 1 \) 20 \( \text{\textbullet} x e 2 \) c4 gives Black a slight advantage, Videki-Bernard, Cannes 1989.

5...\( e x d 4 \) (D)

This is the point. Black now obtains quite attractive play based on his active pieces.

6 \( \text{\textbullet} x d 4 \)

Now Black can gain time on the white queen. Other moves:

a) 6 \( \text{\textbullet} d 5 \)!? is best answered by 6...\( g 6 \)!? 7 \( \text{\textbullet} x d 4 \text{\textbullet} e 7 \), when White should probably play something other than 8 \( \text{\textbullet} x e 7 \)!! as Black gets too much activity with 8...\( \text{\textbullet} x e 7 \) 9 \( \text{\textbullet} g 5 \text{\textbullet} c 6 \) 10 \( \text{\textbullet} d 2 \) h6 11 \( \text{\textbullet} e 3 \) 0-0 12 \( \text{\textbullet} h 3 \text{\textbullet} a e 8 \) 13 0-0-0? \( \text{\textbullet} x c 4 \)!? Schüssler-Keene, Skara Echt 1980.

b) 6 \( \text{\textbullet} b 5 \) \( d 7 \) 7 \( \text{\textbullet} x d 4 \) and now:

b1) Black can also try to get to the Sämiscb King’s Indian with 7...g6; for example, 8 \( \text{\textbullet} g e 2 \text{\textbullet} g 7 \) 9 \( \text{\textbullet} c 3 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{\textbullet} e 2 \text{\textbullet} c 6 \) 11 \( \text{\textbullet} e 3 \text{\textbullet} x d 4 \) 12 \( \text{\textbullet} x d 4 \text{\textbullet} h 5 \) 13 0-0 \( \text{\textbullet} x d 4 \) 14 \( \text{\textbullet} x d 4 \text{\textbullet} g 5 \) 15 \( f 4 \text{\textbullet} x f 4 \) 16 \( \text{\textbullet} x f 4 \text{\textbullet} x f 4 \) 17 \( \text{\textbullet} d 5 \text{\textbullet} e 5 \) 18 \( \text{\textbullet} x e 5 \) dxe5 19 \( \text{\textbullet} f 6 + \text{\textbullet} g 7 \) 20 \( \text{\textbullet} x d 7 \text{\textbullet} f e 8 \) = Bodiroga-Jovič, Kragujevac 2000.

b2) 7...\( c 6 \) 8 \( \text{\textbullet} g e 2 \text{\textbullet} e 7 \) 9 \( \text{\textbullet} e 3 \) 0-0 and now Black seems to have at least an equal position, but this is not a big surprise as all his moves have been
normal developing moves. White has a choice:

b21) 10 \(\text{c}3 \text{xd}4 \) (10...\(\text{h}5\)?)
11 \(\text{xd}4 \text{e}6 \) 12 \(\text{e}2 \text{d}7\) is equal, with the plan ...\(\text{f}6\) to weaken White’s dark squares.

b22) 10 \(\text{xc}6 \text{bc}6 \) (10...\(\text{xc}6\)?) 11 \(\text{d}4 \text{d}7 \) 12 \(\text{d}3 \text{e}8 \) 13 0-0 \(\text{c}5 \) 14
\(\text{e}2 \text{e}6 \) 15 \(\text{c}3 \) ± Houdart-Callens, Antwerp 1997) 11 \(\text{c}3 \text{e}8\) is also equal, as the doubled pawns control the centre very well.

b23) 10 \(\text{f}4 \text{e}8 \) 11 \(\text{e}2 \text{e}5 \) 12 0-0 \(\text{c}6 \) 13 \(\text{c}1 \text{f}8 \) 14 \(\text{d}2\) a5 and now:

b231) 15 \(\text{fd}1\)?! and now Black can seize the initiative with a thematic central break: 15...d5! 16 exd5 (16 exd5 \(\text{c}5 \) 17 \(\text{b}5 \text{exe}4 \) 18 \(\text{c}7 \text{exe}3 \) 19
\(\text{exe}8 \text{exe}8 \) 20 \(\text{xf}3 \) \(\text{e}6\)) 16...exd5 17 \(\text{xd}5 \) (17 c5 \(\text{a}4 \) 18 \(\text{b}5 \text{e}6 \) 19
\(\text{d}4 \text{d}7\) is the last playable option for White) 17...\(\text{xd}5\) 18 exd5 \(\text{b}4\) 19
\(\text{c}2 \text{xf}3+\) 20 \(\text{xf}3 \text{exe}3 \) ± Feigentella, Augsburg 2001.

b232) The careful 15 \(\text{f}2\) is White’s best, reaching a typical position. After 15...\(\text{c}7 \) 16 \(\text{fd}1 \text{ad}8 \) 17 \(\text{g}3 \) \(\text{c}8\)
= all the black pieces stand very well.

6...\(\text{e}6 \) (D)

6...\(\text{e}6 \) 7 \(\text{b}3 \) (7 \(\text{f}4 \text{g}6 \) 8 \(\text{c}3 \text{c}6 \) 9
\(\text{d}3 \text{g}4 \) 10 \(\text{d}2 \text{b}4 \) 11 \(\text{bl} \text{g}7 \)
12 \(\text{f}3 \text{c}6 \) 13 \(\text{h}3 \text{f}6 \) 14 \(\text{a}3 \text{a}6 \) 15
\(\text{e}2 \) 0-0 16 \(\text{f}5 \text{d}7 \) 17 \(\text{g}4 \text{e}5 \) 18
0-0-0 \(\text{e}8\) was unclear in Portisch-Christiansen, Szirak 1987; 7 \(\text{d}3 \text{c}6 \) 8 \(\text{c}3 \text{b}4 \) 9 \(\text{d}5 \text{xd}3+\) 10
\(\text{xd}3 \text{d}7 \) 11 \(\text{e}2 \text{g}6 \) 12 \(\text{d}2 \text{g}7 \)
13 \(\text{c}3 \) \(\text{xc}3+\) 14 \(\text{exe}3 \) 0-0 15 \(\text{c}2\) ±
Balashov-Tal, Moscow 1971) 7...\(\text{c}6 \)
8 \(\text{d}2\) transposes to the main line.

7 \(\text{d}2\)

This is the main line of the \(\text{c}3\) and f3 variation. White has lost a move with his queen, but Black must give this tempo back with his bishop. However, the white queen has committed itself to d2, blocking the c1-bishop.

White has another option, namely 7 \(\text{f}2\)!

a) 8 \(\text{b}3 \text{g}6 \) 9 \(\text{b}2 \text{g}7 \) 10 \(\text{d}1 \text{e}7 \)
11 \(\text{d}3 \) 0-0 12 \(\text{bl} \) a5 13 \(\text{d}5 \text{xd}5 \)
14 \(\text{cxd}5 \text{d}4 \) 15 \(\text{e}2 \) 15 \(\text{d}2\), as played in Ganbold-Bayarsaihan, Erdenet 1994, may be met by 15...\(\text{exe}4 \) ±
15...\(\text{h}5\) gives Black enough activity.

b) 8 \(\text{d}5\)!! \(\text{e}7 \) 9 \(\text{c}2 \) 0-0 10 \(\text{g}3 \)
\(\text{e}5\) (10...\(\text{e}8\)!? seems pretty natural)
11 \(\text{c}2 \text{c}6 \) 12 \(\text{xc}7+ \text{exe}7 \) 13 \(\text{f}4 \) (13
0-0 \(\text{c}4 \) 14 \(\text{xc}4 \) \(\text{xc}4 \) 15 \(\text{f}5 \text{e}5 \)
16 \(\text{c}3 \text{c}5 \) 17 \(\text{fd}1 \) \(\text{fd}8 \) is slightly better for Black, Kerpf-Lenz, 2nd
Bundesliga 1988/9) 13...\(\text{e}4 \) 14 \(\text{d}4 \)
\(\text{fd}8 \) 15 0-0 ±.

c) 8 \(\text{e}3\) (planning to castle queenside) 8...\(\text{e}7 \) (8...\(\text{e}5\)?) 9 0-0-0!? 0-0
10 \(\text{bl} \) a6 11 \(\text{g}4 \text{e}5 \) 12 \(\text{d}5\) (12 \(\text{c}5\)?
is unclear) 12...\(\text{b}5 \) 13 \(\text{exe}7+ \text{exe}7 \) 14
\(\text{c}5 \) \(\text{fd}8 \) 15 \(\text{cxd}6 \) \(\text{xd}6 \) 16 \(\text{xd}6 \) \(\text{xd}6\)
17 a2 a4 18 g3 d3 19 xd3 wxd3+ 20 al ed8 = Johannes-Meulders, Antwerp 1997.
7...e6 (D)

This is the critical variation after 3...f5 4 f3, but Black also has an active position here.

8 b3
8 a3 e5 (8...g6!? will probably transpose to the main line) 9 b3 d3 11 g2 0-0 12 0-0 c6 13 h1 a h8 (another idea is 14...d7!?) 15 ad1 wc7 16 f4

8...g6 9 a2
9 g2 10 h2 0-0 11 h4!? (11 g3 e5 12 g2 h3 13 0-0 exg2 14 xg2 a6 15 ad1 b5 16 d5 bxc4 17 xexe5 dxe5 18 bxc4 c6 19 d3 a5 = Chabanon-J.Ivanov, Escalades Z 1999) 11...a5 12 h5 xhx5 13 g4 e5 14 a2 xf6 15 f4 xxc4 16 bxc4 xxc4 17 c2 dxb2 18 xxb2 h5 19 c1 b4 20 ce2 d5 and the strong g7-bishop together with the exposed white king give Black enough activity, Maksimović-Petrović, Novi Sad 1996.

9...g7 10 a3
10 ge2 0-0 11 g3 is best met by the active 11...h5! 12 a2 h4, when White’s pieces can’t get to their best squares in the centre: 13 af1 a5 (or 13...d7 14 d5 xxb2 15 xxb2 a5 16 fe3 b4 17 d1 xd5 18 xdx5 xdx5 19 xdx5 ef6 20 ad1 gh5 21 wd2 w6 22 0-0 ef4 23 g3 hxg3 24 hxg3 xxe2+ 25 xxe2 fe8 = Kouaty-Fedorowicz, Brussels 1987) 14 e3 h6 15 cxd5 xdx5 16 exd5 e5 17 g3 xe8 18 wc3 c6 19 dxc6 xec8 20 wd4 xec6 with a slight advantage for Black, Azmaiparashvili-Vasiu-kov, USSR 1981.

10...0-0 11 ge2 a5!
ECO gives 11...a6 12 0-0 e5 13 ad1 xdx3 (13...wb8 ± Krogius) 14 wxd3 ± Krogius-Suba, Sochi 1977, as Black has exchanged his active knight for the worse of White’s bishops. The text-move seems to have more point.

12 0-0 d7
12...exf5!? 13 ad1 a4 14 xdx4 axb3 15 axb3 gh5 16 f4 e6 17 xxe6 bxc6 18 a4 wb8 19 xg7 xg7 20 a2 f5 is also possible, Garcia Palermo-Lebredo, Bayamo 1983.

13 ad1 c5
Black has developed his pieces well, and his active minor pieces neutralize White’s slight space advantage. The plan ...a4xb3 gives him good activity. The rest of the instructive game Teilla-Ubilava, Benasque 1997 was 14 af4 a4 15 cd5 ce5 16 xxe5 dxe5 17 xxe6 fxe6 18 e3 axb3 19 axb3 wd4
20 b4 d4 21 f2 h6 22 c2 xd2 23 xd4 e3 24 xe6 db2 0-1.

**Conclusion:** 4 f3 is best met by active queenside counterplay, similar to that frequently seen in the King's Indian. The 5th move alternatives 5 dxe5 and 5 d5 lead to roughly equal play.

C)

4 d5

This move, simply developing a piece, seems to be White's strongest option, as Black's plans here are not so clear as in Lines A and B. Of course one should note that the positions in this line can also be reached via 3 e4 (or indeed 1 d5).

4...g6 (D)

![Diagram](image)

This is Black's best option, aiming for a set-up similar to a King's Indian. The other possibility is to go for an Old Indian-type position with ...d5, ...e5, ...e7 and ...c6, but this allows White to play e4 and obtain a small advantage.

Now:

C1: 5 g3 249

C2: 5 h4 251

The latter is the line most likely to give Black problems, and is also the most frequently played.

White has a variety of other moves, some of which are quite important:

a) 5 g5 d4 e4 6 dxe4 dxe4 7 b3 (7 d2!? 7) ...b6 8 e3 b7 9 h6 d7 10 xf8 xf8 11 g3 g7 12 g2 e5 13 dxe5 dxe5 14 0-0 e8 15 c3 f6 16 d1 d2 17 xg2 18 c2 e5 19 4f4 4f6 = Hözl-Blatny, Klagenburg 1997.

b) 5 e3 d4 e4 6 dxe4 dxe4 7 e2 (7 b3 b6 8 d5 h6 9 g5 f5 10 e4 d7 11 f4 d6 12 d2 c5 13 c2 0-0 14 c3 cxd3+ 15 bxc3 e5 16 dxe6 fxe6 17 g3 e5 T Brewig-Bosch, Amstelveen 1994) 7...g7 8 0-0 0-0 9 b3 e5 10 dxe5 c6 11 b2 dxe5 12 c1 e8 13 c3 f6 14 d2 f5 15 d3 d7 16 a3 f5 = Rogers-Mestel, British Ch (Swansea) 1987.

c) 5 d2 g7 (5...e5!?; 5...h6!?) 6 e4 g4 7 f3 d7 8 b3 a5! 9 d3 a4 10 d1 0-0 11 d3 a3 12 b3 c5 13 e2 c6 14 c2 c5 15 d2 e5 16 dxe5 dxe5 17 g5 d5 18 c3 d4 and the strong black knights compensate for the sacrificed material, Kobylkin-Tseshkovsky, Krasnodar 1999.

d) 5 h3! g7 (5...d4!? 6 g4 c8 7 e4 c5 8 d5 e6 9 e3 0-0 10 d2 (10 d3 exd5 11 cxd5 e8 12 f2 d7 13 g5 f6 14 e3 f5 15 gxf5 d6 was unclear in Yusupov-Dizdarević, Dresden Z 1998) 10...e8 11 d2 a6 12 0-0 d7 13 a4 exd5 14 cxd5}
h5 15  \text{hxf4} \text{hxg4} 16 \text{hxg4}  \text{\textup{Q}}h7 17  \text{\textup{Q}}g3  
\text{\textup{Q}}g5 18  \text{\textup{Q}}g2 f5 19 \text{exf5} \text{gxf5} 20  \text{\textup{Q}}c4  
\text{\textup{Q}}xc3 21 bxc3  \text{\textup{Q}}e4 and the active pieces compensate for the weakened 

e) 5 \text{\textup{Q}}g5!?  \text{\textup{Q}}g7 (5...\text{\textup{Q}}d7!?) 6 e4  
\text{\textup{Q}}g4 (D) and now:

1) 7  \text{\textup{a}}e2  \text{\textup{a}}xe2 8 \text{\textup{w}}xe2  \text{\textup{c}}c6 9 d5  
(9 e5  \text{\textup{Q}}xd4 10 \text{exf6}  \text{\textup{Q}}xe2 11 fxg7  
\text{\textup{D}}g8 12  \text{\textup{Q}}xe2  \text{\textup{D}}xg7  \text{\textup{F}} Bonin-Shirazi,  
New York 1991) 9...\text{\textup{Q}}xd4 10  \text{\textup{D}}d1 c5 11  \text{\textup{D}}xf3  
\text{\textup{Q}}d7 12 0-0 0-0 13  \text{\textup{D}}xd4  \text{\textup{cxd}}4  
14  \text{\textup{Q}}e2  \text{\textup{b}}b6 15  \text{\textup{Q}}b1  \text{\textup{f}}fc8 16  \text{\textup{b}}3  \text{\textup{Q}}xc4  
17  \text{\textup{Q}}b2  \text{\textup{b}}b4 18  \text{\textup{Q}}h1  d3  \text{\textup{F}} Zaltsman- 

e2) 7  \text{\textup{f}}3  \text{\textup{d}}d7 8 e5! (8 f4 e5 9 fxe5  
dxe5 10 d5 {10 dxe5  \text{\textup{Q}}g4 11  \text{\textup{w}}d5  
\text{\textup{Q}}xe5 12  \text{\textup{w}}xb7  \text{\textup{Q}}c6 gives Black compensation}) 10...c6 11  \text{\textup{a}}e2 0-0 12 0-0  
\text{\textup{Q}}a6 is at least OK for Black, Lputian-Dizdarević,  
Sarajevo 1998) is critical, but Black can try 8...\text{\textup{Q}}g8 9 f4  
dxe5 10 fxe5 f6! ? with some counterplay.

f) 5  \text{\textup{b}}b3! ?  \text{\textup{w}}e8 (D) and White has tried almost everything here:

f1) 6  \text{\textup{Q}}h4  \text{\textup{d}}d7 7 e4  \text{\textup{Q}}c6 8 d5  
should give Black counterplay because of the white knight on h4 and the 
weakened dark squares in the centre: 8...\text{\textup{Q}}xd8 (8...\text{\textup{Q}}d4!? ) 9  \text{\textup{a}}e2  \text{\textup{Q}}g7 10 h3  
0-0 11  \text{\textup{Q}}e3  e6 12  \text{\textup{d}}d1 b6 13  \text{\textup{w}}c2  \text{\textup{Q}}b7  
14 g4 c6 is OK for Black, Tratar-Luciani, Nova Gorica 2000.

f2) 6 h3  \text{\textup{Q}}g7 7 g4 is an interesting extended fianchetto, but White is also 
weakening his own position: 7...\text{\textup{Q}}d7 8  
\text{\textup{Q}}g2  \text{\textup{Q}}c6 9  \text{\textup{w}}d1 e5 10 d5  \text{\textup{Q}}e7 11  \text{\textup{a}}e3  
b6 12  \text{\textup{w}}d2 h5! with counterplay.  
Daloz-Blatny, Corsica rpd 1997.

f3) 6  \text{\textup{a}}g5  \text{\textup{Q}}g7 7  \text{\textup{e}}3  \text{\textup{h}}6 8  \text{\textup{h}}4 is 
gainst best met by the thematic 8...g5! 9  \text{\textup{Q}}g3  \text{\textup{Q}}h5 10  \text{\textup{Q}}e2  \text{\textup{Q}}d7 11  \text{\textup{w}}d1  
e6 12 0-0  \text{\textup{Q}}g6 13  \text{\textup{Q}}e1  \text{\textup{Q}}xg3 14  \text{\textup{f}}xg3 0-0  
15 g4 c5 \text{\textup{F}} Meister-Hickl, Bundesliga 

f4) 6 e3 \text{\textup{Q}}g7 7  \text{\textup{e}}2 0-0 8  \text{\textup{Q}}d2 e5 9  
d5 a5 10 e4  \text{\textup{d}}d7 is a King's Indian-type closed position, but the white 
pieces are not ideally posted and Black has counterplay: 11  \text{\textup{w}}c2  \text{\textup{Q}}a6 12  \text{\textup{Q}}f1  
\text{\textup{Q}}e8 13  \text{\textup{Q}}e3  f5 14  \text{\textup{f}}3 \text{\textup{Q}}f6 15  \text{\textup{Q}}d2  
b6 16 a3  \text{\textup{Q}}c5 = Campos-Morales, Gran 
Canaria 1989.

f5) 6 g3 \text{\textup{Q}}g7 7  \text{\textup{g}}2  \text{\textup{Q}}c6 8 d5  \text{\textup{Q}}d8  
9 0-0 0-0 and Black controls e4 and
the h3-c8 diagonal, and this gives him typical counterplay against all White's options:

f51) 10 ♘d2 ♘e4! 11 ♘xe4 ♘xe4 12 ♙e3 f5 13 ♘c3 ♘xc3 14 ♘xc3 e5 =.

f52) 10 ♘e3 ♘h3 11 c5 ♘g2 12 ♘g2 ♙d7 13 h3 dxc5 14 ♘xc5 b6 15 ♘d4 c5! 16 ♘e5 ♘h7 = Epishin-Bauer, Bad Zwesten 1997.

f53) 10 ♗e1 ♗e4! 11 ♗xe4 ♗xe4 12 ♙e3 f5 13 ♘h3 e6 14 ♙b3 c6 15 dxc6 ♘xe6 16 ♘e3 d5 17 ♘d2 dxe4 18 ♘xc4 ♘d5 19 ♘g2 f4!? with active play for Black, Krasenkov-Romanishin, Cuto 1999.

g) White can also try to close the centre immediately with 5 d5 (D), when Black can choose the position-type he wishes to have:

B

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]

\[ \]
6 \( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \)

White has a variety of other moves here:

a) 6 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \mathcal{Q}g77 \mathcal{Q}g2 \mathcal{Q}xc3 8 \mathcal{Q}xc3 \mathcal{Q}e4 \) is good for Black: 9 0-0 0-0 10 \( \mathcal{C}c1 \) d5?! 11 \( \mathcal{Q}xe5?! \) \( \mathcal{Q}xe2 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}e1 \) dxe5 13 \( \mathcal{Q}a4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d5+ \) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}g1 \) b5 15 e4?? \( \mathcal{Q}xe5 \) 0-1 Ru.Rodrigues-V.Georgiev, Faro 1999.

b) 6 \( \mathcal{W}b3 \mathcal{Q}xc3 \) 7 bxc3 (7 \( \mathcal{W}xc3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}g7 \) 8 \( \mathcal{Q}g2 \) \( \mathcal{W}ce8 \) 9 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{W}f6 \) 10 \( \mathcal{W}a4+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{W}c2 \) 0-0 12 \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) c5 13 dxe5 dxe5 14 \( \mathcal{Q}a3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}ad1 \) \( \mathcal{W}f6 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}h1 \) \( \mathcal{W}h8 \) 14 \( \mathcal{W}xa7 \) \( \mathcal{W}xd5 \) gives Black sufficient play) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}xf3+ \) 13 \( \mathcal{Q}g2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \) (14 \( \mathcal{W}d1 \) \( \mathcal{W}b8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}xd5 \) \( \mathcal{W}xd5+ \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}xb2 \) 17 \( \mathcal{Q}bl = \) 14 \( \mathcal{W}b8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}xa7 \) \( \mathcal{W}xd5+ \) 16 \( \mathcal{Q}xb2+ \) 17 \( \mathcal{Q}g1 \) 0-0 18 \( \mathcal{Q}g2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}a8 \) 19 \( \mathcal{W}xc7 \) \( \mathcal{Q}g4 \) 0-1 Maurer-Sharif, Liechtenstein 1996.

8 0-0-0 0-0 9 \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xf3 \) 10 \( \mathcal{Q}xf3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 11 \( \mathcal{Q}e1 \)

11 \( \mathcal{W}bl \) 1/2-1/2 Iskusnykh-Khalifman, Russian Ch (St Petersburg) 1999.
11...\(\mathcal{d}e5\) 12 \(\mathcal{d}b1\) a5 13 b3 \(\mathcal{d}e8\) 14 \(\mathcal{d}b2\) e5 15 dxe6 \(\mathcal{d}xe6\) 16 \(\mathcal{d}xe6\) \(\mathcal{d}xe6\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}xe6\) fxe6 18 f4 \(\mathcal{d}xb2\) 19 \(\mathcal{d}xb2\) \(\mathcal{w}f6\) 20 \(\mathcal{d}e2\) \(\mathcal{w}f7\)

The position is equal, Yermolinsky-Hodgson, Rakvere 1993.

**Conclusion:** 5 g3 leads to positional lines, in which Black should do quite well with a common-sense approach.

**C2**

5 \(\mathcal{d}h4\) \((D)\)

This move, chasing the bishop and securing White a chance to play e4, is probably the most critical option.

5...\(\mathcal{d}d7\) 6 e4 \(\mathcal{d}g7\)

**Or:**

a) 6...c5!? is not played so often, but is one of the main challenges for White. 7 d5 e6 8 \(\mathcal{d}f3\) (8 dxe6?! \(\mathcal{d}xe6\) 9 \(\mathcal{d}f3\) \(\mathcal{d}e6\) 10 \(\mathcal{d}f4\) looks quite critical) 8...exd5 9 exd5 (9 cxd5?! \(\mathcal{d}g7\) 10 \(\mathcal{d}d3\) 0-0 11 0-0 b5! 12 \(\mathcal{d}xb5\) \(\mathcal{d}xe4\) 13 \(\mathcal{d}xd7\) \(\mathcal{d}xc3\) 14 bxc3 \(\mathcal{d}xd7\) \(\mathcal{f}\) Kalinichenk-Varavin, Novosibirsk 1989) 9...\(\mathcal{g}7\) 10 \(\mathcal{e}2\) 0-0 11 0-0 and now a typical position has been reached, but with an extra tempo ...\(\mathcal{d}d7\) for Black, so the critical question is if there are ways to make use of this tempo. The idea 11...\(\mathcal{d}a6\)!?, with the normal well-scoring plan of ...\(\mathcal{d}c7\), ...\(\mathcal{b}8\), ...\(\mathcal{e}6\) and ...\(\mathcal{b}5\), suggests itself as the bishop is already supporting the ...b5 break.

b) 6...e5 7 \(\mathcal{d}f3\) \(\mathcal{g}7\) (7...exd4 8 \(\mathcal{d}xd4\) \(\mathcal{g}7\) 9 \(\mathcal{d}e2\) 0-0 10 0-0 transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 9th move; 7...\(\mathcal{d}c6\)!? 8 d5 \(\mathcal{d}e7\) lets White play 9 c5!, which gives him positional pressure: 9...\(\mathcal{d}g7\) 10 \(\mathcal{w}b3\) \(\mathcal{w}b8\) 11 cxd6 cxd6 12 \(\mathcal{d}b5\) 0-0 13 \(\mathcal{d}g5\) \(\mathcal{g}4\) 14 \(\mathcal{d}d2\) h6 15 \(\mathcal{d}e3\) \(\mathcal{c}8\) 16 \(\mathcal{d}e2\) \(\mathcal{g}4\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}xg4\) \(\mathcal{d}xg4\) 18 0-0 \(\mathcal{d}d7\) 19 a4 f5 20 f3 f4 21 \(\mathcal{f}2\) g5 22 \(\mathcal{f}c1\) \(\mathcal{f}f7\) 23 \(\mathcal{d}b5\) \pm Nikitin-Malaniuk, St Petersburg 2000) 8 \(\mathcal{c}2\) (8 dxe5 dxe5 9 \(\mathcal{d}xe5\) \(\mathcal{d}xe4\) 10 \(\mathcal{d}xe4\) \(\mathcal{d}xe5\) 11 \(\mathcal{d}g5\) f6 12 \(\mathcal{d}c1\) \(\mathcal{w}e7\) transposes to the main line.

7 \(\mathcal{c}2\) e5

7...0-0 8 \(\mathcal{d}f3\) \(\mathcal{w}e8\)! is one idea to use the extra tempo, but White has 9 e5! dxe5 10 \(\mathcal{d}xe5\) \(\mathcal{f}5\) 11 \(\mathcal{f}3\) c6 12 0-0 \(\mathcal{d}bd7\) 13 \(\mathcal{f}4\) \(\mathcal{d}xe5\) 14 \(\mathcal{d}xe5\) \pm Sosonko-Riemersma, Dutch Ch (Rotterdam) 1997.

8 \(\mathcal{d}f3\) 0-0 \((D)\)

9 0-0

This position is well known in the Classical King’s Indian, except for the small difference that the black bishop is on d7 here. Black can play ideas similar to the main lines of the King’s Indian, but there are also some more creative tries.

a) 9 dxe5 dxe5 10 \(\mathcal{d}xe5\) is not dangerous for Black because 10...\(\mathcal{d}xe4\) 11 \(\mathcal{d}xe4\) (11 \(\mathcal{d}xd7\) ? \(\mathcal{d}xc3\) wins for
Black) 11...\text{\textit{xe}5 12 \textit{g}5 \textit{w}e8 13 \textit{f}6+ \textit{x}f6 14 \textit{xf}6 \textit{w}e6 15 \textit{d}4 (15 \textit{c}3 \textit{e}8=\text{\textit{f}}) 15..\textit{e}8 16 \textit{e}3 \textit{c}6 favours Black according to Khalifman.

b) 9 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}4 10 \textit{g}5 \textit{f}6 has been tried, but with no effect: 11 \textit{c}1 (11 \textit{h}4 \textit{c}6 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 \textit{d}5+ \textit{h}8 14 0-0-0 was unclear in Khalifman-Sokolov, Pärmu 1996) 11..\textit{c}6 12 d5 \textit{e}7 13 \textit{d}2 \textit{h}6 14 c5 \textit{f}7 15 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}8 16 \textit{xd}6 \textit{cxd}6 17 a4 \textit{f}5 18 f3 \textit{h}6 = Schüssler-Benjamin, Reykjavik tt 1990.
9..\textit{c}6
Or:

a) 9..\textit{w}e8 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 \textit{e}3 \textit{a}6 12 \textit{d}2 is a little better for White according to Khalifman, but the only example looked OK for Black and featured some original tactical ideas: 12..\textit{w}e7?! 13 \textit{d}5 \textit{xd}5 14 \textit{xd}5 c6 15 \textit{c}1 (15 \textit{b}3!? 15..\textit{xd}5 16 \textit{xa}6 d4 17 \textit{xb}7 \textit{ab}8 18 \textit{d}5 (18 \textit{c}7?!?) 18..\textit{xd}3 19 \textit{xc}4 \textit{xf}2+ 20 \textit{xf}2 \textit{h}6 21 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}7 is unclear, Southam-Whitehead, North Bay 1998.

b) 9..\textit{xd}4?! 10 \textit{xd}4 \textit{e}8 11 f3 \textit{c}6 gives White a slight advantage according to Khalifman, but there is the interesting plan 12 \textit{e}3 \textit{h}5! 13 \textit{d}2 \textit{f}4, and now:

b1) 14 \textit{xc}6 is a move that is not considered very dangerous for Black in the position where the bishop is on c8. 14..\textit{xe}2+ 15 \textit{xe}2 bxc6 (another idea is 15..\textit{xc}6!?) 16 \textit{ad}1 \textit{e}6 (16..\textit{b}8?!, with the point 17 b3 a5 18 c5 a4!!, is one possible idea where \textit{ad}7 is useful) 17 b3 c5 18 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}8 (18..a5?! looks a safe improvement) 19 \textit{a}5!, Cebalo-Loncar, Makarska Tusepi 1995.

b2) 14 \textit{fd}1?! is the main move when the bishop is on c8, but here Black has a clear extra tempo after 14..\textit{xe}2+ 15 \textit{xe}2 and now a suitable plan might be 15..a6 16 \textit{ae}1 \textit{xd}4 17 \textit{xd}4 b5?!

10 d5 \textit{e}7 11 \textit{e}1
Black has no problems after 11 \textit{d}2?! a5 or 11 b4?! \textit{h}5 12 \textit{e}1 f5 13 \textit{g}5 \textit{f}6 14 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}8.
11..\textit{e}8
11..c6 12 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}8 13 \textit{c}3 \text{\textit{f}}3
12 \textit{e}3 \textit{f}5 13 \textit{f}3 \textit{f}4
13..c5?! 14 \textit{xd}6 bxc6 15 c5 \text{\textit{f}}3
14 \textit{f}2 \textit{h}5 15 \textit{c}5 \textit{xc}5 16 \textit{xe}5 \textit{d}6 17 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}5 18 \textit{h}1 \textit{g}6

**Conclusion:** The variation starting with the slightly surprising 5 \textit{h}4 seems to be one of the most critical tries against the Old Indian with \textit{f}5. However, besides the quite playable main line, there also seem to be many unexplored ideas.
32 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e6 3 f3 e5 4 f3 e4

Besides the 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 f3 main line, Black has another, more positional approach available, namely the variation 3...e4 4 g5 f6. White usually gets some advantage because of his strong centre, as Black's main plan is to protect the e4-pawn with his pieces, not pawns, and usually the game has focused on the sharp play that White initiates with 5 c3 f5 6 g4. However, Black has some targets for his counterplay, and some strong players have played this variation quite frequently.

1 d4 d6 2 c4 e6 3 c3 e5 4 f3 e4 (D)

W

A: 5 g1 253
B: 5 d2 254
C: 5 g5 256

Line C can also be reached via the move-order 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 f3 e4 4 g5 f6 5 c3 f5, though then White doesn’t have the sidelines (5 g1 and 5 d2) available. This is important, as the most critical position at the moment seems to be in precisely the ‘sideline’ 5 c2 f5 6 b3.

A)

5 g1

White is going to regroup with e3 and g2-g3. Black has committed his knight to f6, which means that it will not be possible to support the centre with ...f5.

5...h6 6 e3

Or:

a) 6 g3 c6 7 d5 f5 8 g2 bd7 is equal according to Epishin, as Black’s e4-pawn is quite strong.

b) 6 f4 g5?? d2 g7 8 e3 f5 9 g2 g6 10 b3 b6 11 g3 0-0 12 e2 c5 is fine for Black because of his active piece-play, Bisguier-Bronstein, Budapest 1961.

6...c6 (D)

Black’s main plan is to support the centre with ...d5. However, this should
be done carefully, as the d5-pawn can become weak sometimes.

7 2ge2 2f5!
7...d5 8 2f4 ± Epishin.
8 2g3 2g6 9 f3 d5
9...exf3 10 gxf3 ± intending e4 (Epishin). Black should fight for the centre as long as possible.

10 cxd5
Epishin gives 10 2b3!? as an alternative; for example, 10...2b6 11 cxd5 2xb3 12 axb3 cxd5 13 2b5 2d7 14 2xa7 2xa7 15 2xa7 2c6 16 2xc6 bxc6 and Black’s better pawn-structure gives him enough compensation.

10...exf3! 11 gxf3
11 dxc6 fxg2 12 cxb7 gxl 13 2xhl 2bd7 14 bxa8 2xa8 is quite a mess, and it has not been tested yet.

11...cxd5 12 2d3!
12 2b3 2d7 13 2b5 2c6 14 e4 a6 ±.

12...2xd3 13 2xd3 2c6
with possibilities for both players, Lputian-Epishin, Rostov 1993.

Conclusion: The continuation 5 2g1 is not especially dangerous for Black, though it might result in some sharp positions.

B)

5 2d2
At the moment this logical, though slightly passive, way of attacking e4 is the best choice for White.

5...2f5 (D)

5...2e7 develops too slowly, allowing White to take the initiative with 6 e3 g6 7 2e2 h5 8 0-0 2h6 9 f3! 2xe3+ 10 2h1 0-0 (10...exf3 11 2xf3 2h6?!) 11...xd4 12 2de4 2xc3 13 2xc3 ±) 12 2de4 2xe4 13 2xe4 2xe4 14 2xh6 2xh6 15 2d2 ++) 11 2dxe4 2xc1 12 2xc1 2c6 13 2d2 2h7 14 2d5 2d8 15 f4 ±. S. Sokolov-Gheorghiu, Kavala tt 1990.

6 e3
This is the old main line, but line ‘b’ may render it irrelevant:

a) 6 2c2 2g6 (6...c6 7 f3 d5 8 cxd5 cxd5 9 e3 2c6 10 2b5 2c8 11 0-0 2g6 12 fxe4 dxe4 13 2dx4 2xe4 14 2xe4 a6 15 2xc6+ 2xc6 16 2b3 2c7 17 2d5 2e7 18 2c3 0-0 gives
Black sufficient compensation, Shocron-Wexler, Buenos Aires 1958), and now White must avoid the variation 7 dxe4? Qxe4 8 Qxe4 d5 9 cxd5 (9 a4+ h5 10 xb5+ c6 11 b7 dxe4 12 xa8 b4+ 13 d2 xd2+ 14 xd2 xd4+ + Radzenko-Nisman, USSR 1971) 9...b4+, when Black has the advantage.

b) After 6 wb3!, Black's position is critical: 6...c6 (6...c8 7 e3 c6 8 h3 h5 9 dxe2 dxe7 10 a3 a6 11 f3 ± Plaskett-Dunnington, Hastings 1987/8) 7 e3 and now:

b1) 7...a5 and here:

b11) 8 xb7 b4 (better than 8...b8 9 xc6+ d7 10 a6 a8 11 b7 b8 12 xb8 xb8 13 dxe4 ±) 9 b5 b8 10 xc7+ d7 ±.

b12) 8 a3 b8 9 g3 c7 10 g2 g6 and then:

b121) 11 c2 g7 (11...xd4 12 exd4 e3 13 de4 ±) 12 cxe4 xe4 13 xc4 0-0 14 0-0 fe8 15 f3 ± 13...0-0-0 13...xe4 15 xe4 ±.

b122) 11 d5 xd5 12 cxd5 c8 13 h3 h5 14 c2 ± Grdinić-Kovačević, Pula 1990.

b2) 7...b8 and now:

b21) 8 a4?! d7 9 d5 e5 10 xa7 c8 11 d4 c5 12 dxc6 xc6 13 b6 e7 is probably good enough for Black. Yusupov-Ljubojević, Linares 1988.

b22) 8 g3! (White simply attacks the e4 weakness, and there is not much Black can do) 8...d5 (8...c7 9 g2 a6 10 d5 d8 11 c2 ± Khalifman) 9 exd5 b4 10 c4 d6 11 a3 a6 12 a4+ f8 13 b4 ± Aleksandrov-Varavin, St Petersburg 2000.

6...c6 7 d2 (d)

b) 7...d7

Black gains counterplay thanks to this queen move before making the...d5 push.

7...d5 8 wb3 wb7 9 exd5 (9 f3 exf3 10 xf3 d6 11 e5 xe5 12 dxe5 g4 ± Gligorić-Schmid, Zurich 1961) 9...xd5 10 f3 exf3 11 xf3 d6 12 xe5 xe5 13 dxe5 e4 14 0-0 c6 15 d1 ± Smyslov-Bronstein, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1949.

8 g4

Other options:

a) 8 d5 a6 9 b3 c8 10 d2 c7 11 d4 g6 12 a3 0-0 (the alternative 12...c5!? 13 0-0 d3 is unclear) 13 b4 exd5 14 cxd5 c7 15 b3 g4 16 xe6 cxe6 (16...f6! 17 dxe6 xe6 18 xe6+ xe6 19 xg4 f7 ±) 17 dxe6 xe6 18 xe6 fxe6 19 xg4 f5 20 xf5 xf5 21 d5 1-0 Lundin-Vestol, Helsinki 1947.

b) 8 b4 a6 9 b1 c5 (9...c7!? 10 b5 c5 might be possible) 10 dxe5 c5 11 a3 cxb4 12 c5 bxc3 13 b5 cxd2+ 14 xd2 xc5 15 0-0 e7 16
\( \text{\textit{Conclusion: 5 }} \text{Dd2 Df5 6 Wh3 is a real problem for Black at the moment.} \)

\( C) \text{\textit{5 Dg5 Df5 (D)}} \)

\( \text{6 g4} \)

\text{Or:} 6 \text{Wc2?! is very well answered by the thematic tactical operation 6...h6! 7 Dgxe4 Dxe4 8 Dxe4 Wh4!, when Black has at least equality: 9 Dxd6+ (9 Da4+ Dd7 10 Wc2 Df5 11 Da4+ Dd7 12 Wc2 1/2-1/2 Cruz-Rubinetti, Buenos Aires 1964; 9 g4?! Wxg4 10 f3 Wh4+ 11 Dd1 Dc6 12 e3 g6 13 Wf2 Wd8 14 Dg3 Dd7 15 Dd2 Dg7 and Black is slightly better, Schön-Davies, W.Berlin 1987) 9...Dxd6 10 Wxf5 Db4+ and then:}

a1) 11 Dd2 Dxd2+ 12 Wxd2 Wxd4 13 Dc1 Wxc4+ 14 Dh1 Wd4 (14...0-0? 15 e3 Wb4 16 Dd3 g6 17 Wf6 Dd7 18 Wc3 Wb6 19 Dc1 c6 20 a4 a5 21 Da3 Dfe8 22 h3 Dd8 = Ward-Nay, Paris 1988) 15 a3 Dc6 16 e3 Dd1+ 17 Da2 Db4+ 1/2-1/2 Moskowitz-Smook, Hollywood 1954.

a2) 11 Dd1 Wxd4+ 12 Dc2 Wxc4+ 13 Dbl Dd7 14 e4 Dc5 15 Wxc5 Dxc5 16 f3 Df7 17 Df4 c6 18 Dc2 Dhd8 19 Dd1 Df8 20 Dc4 Dc6 21 Dxe6 Dxe6 1/2-1/2 Boleslavsky-Bronstein, Budapest Ct 1950.

b) 6 f3?! is possible but it should not be too dangerous for Black: 6...exf3 7 Dxf3 (7 gxf3 c5 8 d5 g6 9 e4 Dc8 10 De3 Dg7 11 Wd2 Dbd7 12 f4 0-0 13 Dg1 a6 14 a4 Dg8 15 Dd3 Df8 16 Dg3 Dg4 17 Dg1 h6 18 Dh3 f5 19 0-0-0 Dxc3 20 Wxc3 Dxe4 Dg6 - Gulko-Benjamin, USA Ch (Los Angeles) 1993) 7...Df7 8 Dd3 Dxd3 9 Wxd3 c6 10 0-0 d5 11 e5 b6 12 b4 h6 13 Dh3 a5 14 Da4 Dbd7 15 b5 (not 15 Df4? axb4 16 Dxb6, Delamarre-Van der Wiel, Wijk aan Zee 1995, 16...Dxc5! -+) 15...exb5 16 Wxb5 bxc5 is good for Black.

\( \text{6...Axg4 (D)} \)

White will collect the e4-pawn, making the pawn-formation nicely unbalanced. White has more pawns in the centre, which basically guarantees him some advantage, though Black has been getting counterplay even against very strong opposition.
\[ \begin{align*}
7 & \text{Ng2} \\
7 & \text{Qxe4?} \text{Qxe4 (7...Qbd7 8 Qd3} \\
& \text{Qe7 9 Qg3 Qf5 10 Ng2 Qb8 11} \\
& \text{Qxf6+ Qxf6 12 Qe3+ Qe7 13 Qb5} \\
& \text{Qxc3 14 Qxe3 Qd8 15 Qxa7 c6 16} \\
& \text{Qxc6 bxc6 17 Qxc6+ Qc7 18 Qxb8} \\
& \text{Qxb8 19 Qd2 \pm Alburz-Ginsburg,} \\
& \text{Lone Pine 1979) 8 Qxe4 allows} \\
& \text{central counterplay by 8...d5!}:
\end{align*} \]

a) \[ \begin{align*}
9 & \text{Qc3 dxc4 10 Qa4+ Qd7} \\
(10...Qc6?! 11 d5 Qd7 12 Qxc4 Qb4} \\
& \text{is unclear; 10...c6?! 11 Qxe4 Qe6 12} \\
& \text{Qd3 Qa6 =} 12 Qxc4 Qc6 12 Qb5} \\
& \text{Qxb5 13 Qxb5 Qa6 14 Qf4 c6 15} \\
& \text{Qc3 0-0-0 16 Qg1 Qe6 = Lein-Lisitsyn,} \\
& \text{USSR Ch 1968.}
\end{align*} \]

b) \[ \begin{align*}
9 & \text{cxd5 Qxd5 10 Ng2 Qb4+ 11} \\
& \text{Qf1 (11 Qd2? Qxd4 12 Qb3 Qc6 13} \\
& \text{0-0-0 Qe6 14 Qxb4 Qxb4 15 Qxb4} \\
& \text{Qxb4 16 a3 Qd5 17 Qc5 0-0-0 = Dol} \\
& \text{ezal-Ježek, Podebrady 1956) 11...Qd7} \\
& \text{12 Qb3 Qc6 13 Qe3 (13 d5 Qd4 14} \\
& \text{Qe3 (14 Qxb4 Qxe2+ 15 Qgl Qf3+} \\
& \text{16 Qxf3 Qxf3 =) 14...Qc2 15 Qf6+} \\
& \text{Qd8 16 Qxd7 Qxe3+ 17 Qxe3 Qxd7} \\
& =) 13...Qe6 14 Qd3 Qd5 15 a3 Qe7 16} \\
& \text{h4 f5 = Poldauf-Vesely, Prague 1989.}
\end{align*} \]

7...Le7

This is the basic position, where White can take with knight or bishop.

C1: 9 Qxe4 257

C2: 9 Qxe4 258

Opinions differ as to which is best.

C1)

9 Qxe4 Qc6

9...Qd7 10 Qb3 c6 11 Qg3 Qc7 12

0-0 0-0 13 Qf4 Qd7 14 e4 Qf6 15

Qe3 Qh4 16 Qae1 =, Pinter-McNab, Malta OL 1980.

10 Qe3

Or:

a) \[ \begin{align*}
10 & \text{0-0-0 Qd7 11 Qg3 (11 f4 Qh3} \\
& \text{12 Qxh3 Qxh3 13 d5 Qd8 14 Qf3} \\
& \text{Wh4 15 Qg3 Qg4 16 Qh1 h5 17 Qd3} \\
& \text{g6 18 Qd2 h4 19 Qe4 Qf5 20 Qc3 Qh5} \\
\text{and Black is fine, Nogueiras-McNab,} \\
\text{Malta OL 1980) 11...Qf6 12 d5 Qc7} \\
& \text{13 a4 Qg6 14 Qa3 0-0-0 15 a5 Qde8}
\end{align*} \]
(Nikolić-Benjamin, Horgen 1994) 16 f3 \h3 17 e4 ±.

b) 10 \g3 \f6 11 \e3 0-0 12 \d2 \bb8 13 h3 \d7 14 \h5 \h4 15 \g1 g6 16 0-0-0 \h8 17 \f4 \pm Piket-Van der Wiel, Dutch Ch 1995.

c) 10 \d3 0-0 11 \g3 d5!? 12 cxd5 \b4 13 \bb3 c6 14 dxc6 \xc6 15 e3 \b4+ 16 \f1 \e7 17 a3 \a5 18 \d3 \ad8 19 b4 \b6 20 \b2 \f6 21 \bl \fe8 gives Black a lot of compensation, Tuomala-Lehto, Finnish Cht 1989.

d) 10 h3 \d7 11 0-0 0-0 12 \c3 f5 13 \xd5 \h4 14 c5 \h8 15 cxd6 cxd6 16 \f4 \e6 17 \c3 \e7 18 \b5 \d5 19 f3 \g6 20 \xd6 \e7 21 \xe7 \xe7 22 \d2 f4 and Black's activity is worth more than a pawn, Farago-Jacobsen, Silkeborg 1988.

10...0-0-0 11 \d2 \f5 12 \c3
12 0-0-0!?
12...\h4

There is an interesting imbalance in the position: White has the better centre, but Black is well developed and White's king doesn't always know where to go. The basic evaluation as ± because of White's centre is maybe closest to the truth, though some players, especially Hickl and Speelman, have argued that Black is OK.

13 0-0
13 0-0-0!?.

13...\d7 14 \h1 \ae8 15 \g1 \g6 16 \af1 \e7 17 \g5 \f5 18 \hx4 \hx4 19 \f4 \xg2 20 \xg2 c6 21 f3

+ Salov-Speelman, Brussels 1988. White has blockaded the centre and controls the g-file, while Black's pieces are slightly passive. The game concluded 21...\e7 22 \f1 f6 23 h4 d5! 24 cxd5 cxd5 25 \h2 b5! 26 a3 \f5+\f5.

Conclusion: White may get a small positional advantage here because of his strong centre, but Black has good chances of holding the position.

C2)

9 \xe4 (D)

\n
\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{9...c6}
\end{center}

9...\c6!? is a fairly logical move, but it has only been played once: 10 \d3 \h5 11 \gl \g6 12 \xd5 \d7 13 \xc7 \xc7 14 \g4? 0-0-0 15 \f5+ \b8 16 \g5 f6 17 \e3 \b4 18 \b1 \xf5 19 \xf5 g6 20 \b1 \e6 21 \f4 d5 and Black is much better, Rötteler-Werner, Badenweil 1990.

10 \d3

10 \c2 is worse due to 10...\h5 11 \g1 \g6, when the white queen is more passive than in the main line, and Black had strong counterplay after 12 \f4 \a6 13 0-0-0 \d7 14 \xg6 fxg6 15 e4 0-0 16 \e3 \h4 17 f4 \h3 18
\( d2 \text{Ae8} \) in Neurohr-Hickl, Bundesliga 1989/90.

10...\( a\text{h5} \)

Not 10...\( d\text{d7?} \) 11...\( x\text{h7} +-. \)

11...\( w\text{h3} \)

White forces a weakening of Black’s pawns, as the h-pawn is pinned.

a) 11...\( g\text{g1} \) \( g\text{g6} \) 12...\( f\text{f4} \) \( d\text{d5!} - = \).

b) 11...\( f\text{f4} \) \( g\text{g6} \) 12 0-0-0 \( a\text{a6} \) (or 12...\( d\text{d7} \) 13...\( w\text{g3} \) \( f\text{f6} \) 14...\( f\text{f3} \) intending \( h4) \) 13...\( h4 \) (13...\( x\text{g6} \) \( h\text{g6} \) 14...\( d\text{d5} \) \( h\text{h4} \) 15...\( e\text{e3} \) \( w\text{a5} \) 16...\( b\text{bl} \) \( e\text{e8} \) 17...\( g\text{g3} \) \( h\text{h5} \) 18...\( e\text{e4} \) \( f\text{f8} \) 19...\( e\text{hel} \) \( g\text{g8} \) gives Black counterplay, Brenninkmeijer-Blees, Dutch Ch (Hilversum) 1989) and now:

b1) 13...\( x\text{h4} \) 14...\( x\text{xg6} \) \( f\text{xg6} \) 15...\( c\text{c4}+ \) \( f\text{f7} \) (15...\( e\text{c7?} \) 16...\( x\text{xh7} +--) \) 16...\( x\text{xd6} \). ±.

b2) 13...\( w\text{d7} \) 14...\( h\text{h5} \) \( x\text{xc4} \) 15...\( w\text{xc4} \). ±.

b3) 13...\( d\text{d5} \) 14...\( c\text{xd5} \) \( b\text{b4} \) 15...\( w\text{c3} \) \( x\text{xe4} \) (15...\( c\text{xd5?} \) 16...\( x\text{xg6} \) \( h\text{xg6} \) 17...\( a\text{a3} \) \( f\text{f3} \) \( h\text{h5} \) 19...\( e\text{e4} \) is much better for White, Polugaevsky-Hickl, Haifa Echt 1989; 15...\( c\text{xd5?} \) 16...\( x\text{xd5} \) \( x\text{xd5} \) 17...\( h\text{h5} \) \( f\text{f5} \) 18...\( e\text{e5} +--) \) 16...\( x\text{xe4} \) \( x\text{xd5} \) 17...\( x\text{xd5} \) \( x\text{xd5} \) 18...\( x\text{xd5} \) \( c\text{xd5} \) 19...\( d\text{d2} \) ± Polugaevsky.

11...\( g\text{g6} \)

11...\( a\text{h4?} \) 12...\( g\text{g1} \) 0-0-0 13...\( a\text{g5} +-. \)

12...\( x\text{xg6} \) \( f\text{xg6} \)

White’s better pawn-structure should give him a small advantage, but Black has some tactical ideas that can easily give him counterplay.

13...\( f\text{f4} \)

13...\( e\text{e4} \) \( a\text{a6} \) 14...\( e\text{e3} \) 0-0-0 15...\( c\text{c7} \) 16...\( f\text{f4} \) \( h\text{h8} \) 17...\( d\text{f6} \) 18...\( d\text{d1} \) \( x\text{xd5} \) 19...\( c\text{xd5} \) \( w\text{e8} \) 20...\( f\text{f1} \) \( b\text{b5} \) ? and Black has counterplay, Reich-Hickl, Bad Wörishofen 1990.

13...0-0

The alternative 13...\( w\text{d7} \) ? has also been suggested.

14...\( e\text{e3} \)

14...\( w\text{e6+} \) \( h\text{h8} \) 15...\( g\text{g3} \) \( a\text{a6} \) 16...\( h\text{h4} \)

15...\( f\text{f5} \) 17...0-0-0 \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) Psakhis-Hickl, Dortmund 1989, but 14...\( g\text{g3} \) ? might be an improvement.

14...\( a\text{a6} \) 15...0-0-0 \( c\text{c7} \) 16...\( b\text{bl} \) \( a\text{a6} \)

17...\( e\text{e4} ? \)

17...\( a\text{al} \) gives White a slight advantage according to Speelman.

17...\( g\text{g5} ? \) 18...\( g\text{g3} \) \( w\text{e8} \) 19...\( a\text{a1} \) \( w\text{g6} \)

20...\( w\text{g2} \) \( e\text{e8} \)

The position is unclear, Kasparov-Speelman, Belfort 1988. The rest of the game was 21...\( d\text{d1} \) 22...\( c\text{c5} \) 23...\( x\text{xc5} \) 24...\( x\text{xc5} \) 25...\( e\text{e8} \) 26...\( x\text{xh4} \) \( d\text{d2} \) 27...\( d\text{d4} \) \( x\text{e2} \) 28...\( x\text{h1} \) \( c\text{c2} \) 29...\( b\text{bl} \) \( x\text{xc5} \) 30...\( w\text{e4} \) \( f\text{f6} \) 31...\( w\text{e6+} \) \( x\text{h8} \) 32...\( e\text{e5} \) 33...\( x\text{h1} \) \( x\text{xf2} \) 34...\( a\text{3} \) \( x\text{e2} \) 35...\( x\text{h4} \) \( w\text{g6} \) 36...\( x\text{xc6} \) \( f\text{f5} \) 37...\( x\text{f4} \) 38...\( x\text{e4} \) \( x\text{h7} \) 39...\( x\text{g1} \) \( x\text{f7} \) 40...\( x\text{xa6} \) 41...\( c\text{c4} \) \( x\text{d7} \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \).

**Conclusion:** White probably also has a small advantage here, but again Black has good chances of making his counterplay real.
In this book we study the endgame system in many different forms. After 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 dxe5 dxe5 4 \textit{Wxd8+ Bxd8} the endgame is already good for Black, as White has lost the possibility of controlling the d4-square with his c-pawn. After 1 d4 d6 2 g3 e5 3 dxe5 dxe5 4 \textit{Wxd8+ Bxd8} White might get some pressure against Black's king in the centre, especially with the early break f4. The most principled forms of this endgame, 1 e4 d6 2 d4 c5 and 1 e4 d6 2 d4 \textit{Qf6} 3 \textit{Qc3} e5, are studied in this chapter.

Black's Main Ideas

The main idea for Black in the endgame positions in this chapter is introduced in the diagram above. Black is ready to accept doubled isolated pawns in the centre, and later to build an ultra-solid central formation with \ldots \textit{Qd6}, \ldots \textit{Qe7}, \ldots \textit{Qf6} and \ldots \textit{Qbd7}. Since the centre is totally closed, Black can create activity either on the queenside with \ldots \textit{Rb8} and \ldots b5, or on the kingside with \ldots \textit{Rag8} and \ldots g5, for example. The doubled pawns guard the central squares very well, though Black should keep an eye on the weak e5-pawn.

The most direct way to reach the endgame is 1 e4 d6 2 d4 e5. In this
move-order it is less wise for Black to accept doubled pawns, as White can target the e5-weakness more effectively with plans like \( \mathcal{O} \text{bd}2-c4, b3 \) and \( \mathcal{O} \text{b}2 \), and \( \mathcal{O} \text{h}3-f2-d3 \). However, after 5...\( \mathcal{O} \text{e}8 \) it is difficult for White to gain anything concrete from his development advantage, since the structure is completely symmetrical.

White’s main plan is to pressurize Black’s weakness on e5, and control the position all over the board. However, White’s task is not very easy, as there no clear concrete plans that are always good. Probably White is forced to seek winning chances in a long ‘physical’ endgame.

1 \text{e}4 \text{d}6 2 \text{d}4

We now discuss:

A: 2...\text{e}5

B: 2...\text{f}6 3 \text{c}3 \text{e}5

C: 2...\text{f}6 3 \text{f}3 \text{e}5

A)

2...\text{e}5 (D)

\[ \text{3 dxe5} \]

3 \text{f}3 is the standard Philidor Defence, which is regarded as good for White. Here is a very brief summary of the main problems facing Black in this opening:

a) 3...\text{f}6?! 4 dxe5 \text{c}xe4 is well met by the tactical move 5 \text{d}5!!; for example, 5...\text{c}5 6 \text{g}5 \text{d}7 (6...\text{e}7 7 \text{exd}6 \pm) 7 \text{exd}6 \text{xd}6 8 \text{c}3 0-0 9 0-0-0 \text{c}6 10 \text{b}5 \text{g}4 11 \text{xd}6 \text{exd}6 12 \text{e}3 \pm Tiviakov-Barbero, Imperia 1993.

b) 3...\text{d}7 4 \text{c}4 \text{c}6 (4...\text{e}7?! 5 dxe5 \text{dxe}5 6 \text{d}5! \pm; 4...\text{h}6?! 5 dxe5 \text{dxe}5 6 \text{xf}7\text{+}! \text{xf}7 7 \text{e}5\text{+} \pm) 5 0-0 \text{e}7 (5...\text{c}7?!?) 6 \text{d}5 \text{exe}5 (not 6...\text{exe}5?! 7 \text{exe}5 \text{dxe}5 8 \text{h}5 \text{g}6 9 \text{exe}5 \pm) and now the tactical idea 7 \text{g}5! secures White the bishop-pair and an advantage; for example, 7...\text{xg}5 8 \text{h}5 \text{c}7 9 \text{xg}5 \text{gf}6 10 \text{e}2 \pm Gipslis-Csombor, Budapest 1977.

c) 3...\text{xd}4!? might be Black’s best line but tends not to equalize.

3...\text{dxe}5 4 \text{xd}8+ \text{xd}8

The game has transformed into a queenless middlegame after just four moves. Black’s king will stay in the centre, which is good if he can simplify the game further to a genuine endgame. This means that White has to play actively.

5 \text{c}4

Or:

a) 5 \text{f}3?! gives Black no problems, as White loses his most active option to attack the centre with f4, and Black just continues with standard plans: 5...\text{f}6 6 \text{c}3 \text{e}6 7 \text{bd}2 \text{d}7 8 \text{e}4 \text{xc}4 9 \text{xc}4 \text{c}5 10 0-0-0 \text{xe}3\text{+} 11 \text{xe}3 \text{c}7 12 \text{d}3 \text{c}8 13
\[ d2 \rightarrow c5 \ 14 \ c3 \ b6 \ 15 \ f3 \ d8 \ 16 \ b3 \ e6 \ 17 \ d1 \ xd1 + 18 \ xd1 \ b7 \text{ with equality, Tribulani-Mordiglia, Forinia 1995.} \]

b) 5 \ c3 \ f6 \ transposes to Line B, which is generally a better move-order for Black.

c) 5 f4!? is logical here, trying to open the position while the black king remains in the centre. Black's best approach is to support the e5-square with 5...\d7 6 \f3 \d6, which should give him good chances to equalize: 7 \bd2 \gf6 8 \c4 (8 \c4!? \text{ exf4 9 \xd6 exd6 10 \xf4 \xe4 11 \e4! with compensation}) 8...\text{ exf4 9 \xf7 \d8 10 \b3 h6 11 0-0 g5 12 \e1 \e8! 13 h3 \e5 (13...a5!? 14 a4 \e6 15 \h1 g4 is also possible for Black) 14 \xe5 \xe5 15 \c4 \f5!} and Black was OK in Hector-Gretarsson, Nordic Ch (Reykjavik) 1997.

5...\e8!?

This move has mainly been played by Ivan Novak, and his results show no reason to complain, though basically the position should be evaluated as \pm. However, Novak's logical plans are hard to break. Alternatives:

a) 5...f6?! does nothing to challenge White's advantage, and White secures the better game with the active plan 6 f4; e.g., 6...\d6 7 fxe5 \xe5 8 \f3 \c6 9 \c3 \g4 10 \e3 \g7 11 0-0-0+ \e8 12 h3 \h5 13 g4 \g6 14 \b5 a 6 15 \xe5 axb5 16 \xg6 hxg6 17 \xb5 \xa2 18 \h1 \a5 19 c4 \pm Bronstein-Beni, Munich 1958.

b) 5...\e6 leads to the provocative endgame with doubled e-pawns, but here it is not to be recommended, as White's b1-knight has a clear route d2-c4 via which to attack the e5 weakness; for example, 6 \xe6 \xe6 7 \f3 \d6 8 \bd2 \d6 9 0-0 \c6 10 a3 a5 11 b3! \e7 12 \b2 \d7 13 a4! \pm and White has implemented the general plan \bd2, b3, \b2, a4 with \c4 to follow, and Black has no counterpart, D.Paulsen-C.D.Meyer, 2nd Bundesliga 1993/4.

We now return to 5...\e8 (D):

![Diagram](image)

6 \f3

Alternatives:

a) 6 \c3 c6! 7 \ge2 \d7 8 \c3 \c5 9 \xc5 \xc5 10 0-0 a5! 11 a4 \f6 12 \g3 \g6 13 f3 \e7 14 \fd1 \f7 15 \b3 h5 16 h4 \b6 17 \e2 \e6 = 18 \f1 f5 19 g3 \a8 20 \g2 f4 21 \d2 \h8 22 \h1 g5 and Black now even has the initiative, Pokorna-Novak, Bratislava 1998.

b) 6 \e3 \d7 7 \c3 c6 8 a4 a5 9 0-0-0 \c5! 10 \xc5 \xc5 11 \f3 f6 12 \d2 \d6! 13 \e1 \e6 14 \xe6 \xe6 15 \d3 \f7 16 f3 \h8 17 \d1 \e7 18 \e2 \f7 = Sarana-Novak, Slovakian Ch 1995/6.
6...\texttt{Qd7} 

6...\texttt{f6} 7 \texttt{e3} \texttt{Qd7} 8 \texttt{a3} \texttt{c5} 9 \texttt{xc5} \texttt{xc5} 10 \texttt{c3} c6 11 b4 \texttt{e6!} 12 \texttt{xe6} \texttt{xe6} 13 0-0-0 \texttt{Qh6} 14 h3 \texttt{Qe7} 15 g3 \texttt{Ff7} 16 \texttt{Dd2} \texttt{Dd6} 17 \texttt{Qhd1} \texttt{Qhd8} = 18 \texttt{Qd3} a5 19 \texttt{Dd2} axb4 20 axb4 \texttt{Qa1} + 21 \texttt{Qb2} \texttt{Qxd1} 22 \texttt{Qxd1} \texttt{Qg5!} gave Black the better game in Pajer-Novak, Bratislava 1995.

7 0-0 \texttt{c5} 8 \texttt{Qg5} \texttt{Qh6} 9 \texttt{Qc3} c6 10 a4 a5 11 \texttt{Qe2} \texttt{Qe7} 12 \texttt{Qg3} \texttt{Qb6} 13 \texttt{b3} f6 14 \texttt{Qf3} \texttt{Qf7} 15 \texttt{Qe1} \texttt{Qd6} 16 \texttt{Qd3} \texttt{Qd7} 17 \texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Qb6} 18 \texttt{Qad1} \texttt{Qf8} 19 \texttt{Qh1} \texttt{Qe6}

The game is equal, Papanetz-Novak, Slovakian Cht 1995/6.

**Conclusion:** 1 e4 d6 2 d4 e5 is a slightly suspect move-order for Black, firstly because of the transposition to the Philidor by 3 \texttt{Qf3}, and secondly because of the endgame. In the latter, the Novak plan with 5...\texttt{Be}8 is worth noting, and is more challenging than 5...\texttt{Qe}6.

---

**B)**

2...\texttt{Qf6} 3 \texttt{Qc3} e5 \texttt{(D)}

By playing the endgame system in this move-order Black gets a better version of the possible Philidor, and in the pure endgame system White has committed his knight to c3.

4 \texttt{dx}e5

4 \texttt{Qf3} transposes to a form of the Philidor Defence that is difficult to reach via standard move-orders. Black has quite a stable position, but it is slightly passive. For example: 4...\texttt{Qbd7} 5 \texttt{Qc4} \texttt{Qe7} 6 0-0 0-0 7 a4 c6 8 \texttt{Qe1} \texttt{Qc7} 9 a2 b6 10 h3 \texttt{Qb7} 11 \texttt{Qg5} (11 \texttt{Qh4} \texttt{Be8} 12 \texttt{Qf5} \texttt{Qf8} 13 \texttt{dx}e5 \texttt{dx}e5 14 \texttt{Qf3} \pm Sergienko-Belikov, Voronezh 1998) 11...a6 12 d5 \texttt{Qac} 8 13 dxc6 \texttt{Qxc6} 14 \texttt{Be2} h6 15 \texttt{Qxf6} \texttt{Qxf6} 16 \texttt{Wd}3 \texttt{Wb}7 17 \texttt{Qd1} \pm Zakharov-A Horvath, Murek U-18 Ech 1998.

4...\texttt{dx}e5 5 \texttt{Qxd8+} \texttt{Qxd8} 6 \texttt{Qc4}

Naturally, White has many alternatives here:

a) 6 \texttt{f4} is also an important direct move here, and again the e5-square is key to Black’s defence: 6...\texttt{Qc6} (or 6...\texttt{Qbd7}!? 7 \texttt{Qf3} \texttt{Qd6} 8 f5 c6 9 \texttt{Qd3} h6 10 g4 \texttt{i2-i3} V.Ivanov-Belikov, Moscow 1994) 7 \texttt{Qf3} \texttt{Qd6} 8 f5 h6 9 \texttt{Qe3} a6 10 0-0-0 \texttt{Qe7} 11 \texttt{Qg1} b5 12 a3 \texttt{Qb7} 13 g4 \texttt{Qb8} 14 \texttt{Qd3} \texttt{Qbd7} 15 h4 h5 16 gxh5 \texttt{Qxh5} 17 a4 b4 18 \texttt{Qe2} \texttt{Ba5} 19 \texttt{Qg2} \texttt{Qf6} 20 \texttt{Qxg7} \texttt{Qxe4} 21 \texttt{Qxe4} \texttt{Qxe4} = Hector-Buhr, 2nd Bundesliga 1997/8.

b) 6 \texttt{Qg5} is one of the tricky lines, but Black can continue with the standard plan ...\texttt{Qd6}, ...\texttt{Qbd7}, ...\texttt{Qe}8 and his position seems to be quite stable. 6...\texttt{Qd6}! and now:

b1) 7 \texttt{Qd}5 \texttt{Qbd}7 8 \texttt{Qc4} \texttt{Qe}8! 9 f3 \texttt{Qxd}5 10 \texttt{ex}d5 a6 11 a4 b6 12 \texttt{Qe}2
b7 13 0-0 f5 14 ²ae1 ³f7 15 ³d2 ³f6 ≡ Sasu Ducsoara-Litinskaya, Dresden wom 1997.

b2) 7 ³c4 ³e6 (7... ³e7? 8 ³d5+ ±) 8 ³xe6 fxe6 9 0-0-0 ³e7 10 ³ge2 h6 11 ³h4 ³c6 = Lednický-Zapletal, Prievdz 1998.

b3) 7 0-0-0 ³bd7 (7... ³e6?! 8 f4! gives White the initiative) 8 f3! a6 9 ³ge2 h6 10 ³e3 ³e7 and Black’s position seems to be quite stable, though White seized the initiative with 11 g4! in Veresagin-Akhmetov, Russian Cht (Orel) 1996.

c) 6 ³f3 develops quickly and naturally. 6...³d6 (D) and now:

c1) 7 ³c4 is not so strong any more, as the black king finds a good central square with 7...³e7; for example, 8 ³g5 c6 9 0-0 ³c7! 10 ³h4 h6 11 ³e3 (11 ³xf6+ ³xf6 12 ³d3 ³e7 13 ³f5+ ³xf5 14 ³xd7 15 ³e4 ³ad8 16 ³hd1 ³f6 17 ³xf6 gxf6 18 ³xd8 ³xd8 19 ³xd8 ³xd8 = Karasev-Komliakov, St Petersburg 1996) 11...³b6! 12 ³hel g6 = Geller-Nevednicny, Tiraspol 1994.

c2) 7 ³g5 ³e6 8 0-0-0 and now it is best for Black to play the careful 8...³bd7! to stabilize the centre:

c21) 9 ³h5 ³e7 10 ³xd6 cxd6 is generally useful for Black, as his centre becomes even stronger: 11 ³d2 h6 12 ³h4 g5 13 ³g3 ³a8!? 14 f3 ³c7 15 ³b1 ³hc8 16 c3 d5! 17 exd5 ³xd5 18 ³e1 f6 19 ³b3 a5 ‰ Kljakso-Candar, Bled 1993.

c22) 9 ³xf6+ forces a weakening of Black’s pawns, but it also allows the black king a safe square on e7: 9...gxf6 (9...³xf6? 10 ³xe5 ±) 10 ³h4 ³c5 11 ³d2 c6 12 ³a4 ³f8 13 ³b1 ³e7 14 ³e2 b5 15 ³c3 ³b4 16 ³d3 ³c5 17 ³e3 ³xc3 18 ³xc3 ³ad8 with an equal position, Inkiov-Spasov, Sofia 1996.

c23) 9 ³b5 ³c8 is slightly inconvenient for Black, but with precise moves he is OK; for example: 10 ³xf6 ³xf6 11 ³g5 a6 12 ³e2 ³f8 13 ³xe6 fxe6 14 f3 ³d7 15 ³d3 ³e7 16 ³d1 ³d7 17 ³e3 b5 = Björnsson-Rauis, Cappelle-la Grande 1993.

6...³e6 7 ³xe6

7 ³b3 doesn’t make a great deal of sense, and Black has no problems after 7...³c6 8 ³g5 ³d4 9 0-0-0 ³e8 10 ³xf6 gxf6 11 ³d5 ³xd5 12 ³xd5 c6 13 ³c4 b5 14 c3 ³e6 15 ³h3 ³c5 = Varavin-Chuprov, Omsk 1996.

7...³xe6 (D)

8 f3

White’s main plan is to develop his pieces to exert pressure on e5 (³h3-f2-d3, ³d1-e3-c4, ³e3) while at the same time keeping Black’s counterplay under control. This overall plan has resulted in many different moves:

8...£c5! 9 £a4 £d6 10 £e3 £bd7
Otherwise:

a) 10...b6!? offers Black a chance to play a different set-up. After 11 £h3 £e7 12 £f2 £c5 13 b3 he can challenge the white plan of attacking the weak point £5 with 13...£c6 14 £d3 £b4. Black managed to hold the position after 15 £d2 £xd3 16 £xd3 £d7 17 £b2 £c6 18 c4 £d7 19 £c3 £c7 20 £d3 £b8 21 a3 £a5 22 b4 £xb4+ 23 £xb4 £xb4+ 24 £xb4 £d7 25 £d3 £hf8 26 £hbl £h6 27 £c2 £c6 28 £d2 £c5 in Ryskin-Belikov, Czestochowa 1992.

b) 10...£d7! aims to overprotect £5 with 11 £h3 £e7 12 £f2 £c6 when again Black can counter White’s build-up against £5 with 13 £d3 £b4; for example, 14 £xb4 £xh4+ 15 £e2 £b5!? 16 a3 £a5!? (16...£d6 17 £c3 £a6 18 £a4! £e6 19 £hd1 gave White pressure in Väisänen-Epishin, Novosibirsk 1993) 17 £c5 £b6 and according to Stohl, Black has sufficient counterplay.

11 0-0-0

11 £e2 £e7 12 b3 is best met by the thematic queenside counterplay with 12...£b5! 13 £g2 £b4+ 14 £d2 £xd2+ 15 £xd2 £hd8 16 £e3 £c5 and Black has no problems; for example: 17 £a4 £a5 18 £d4 £d4 19 £a4 £c5 20 £e4 £e4 21 £b5 £d5 22 £c4 £c4 23 £c6 £c6 24 £c6 £c6 25 £d3 £d3 26 £d3 £f8 27 £e1 £d5 28 £b2 £d7 29 £b7 £c5 30 £b2 £d7 31 £c7 £c7 £b5/£b5 Väisänen-Gallagher, French Cht 1998.

a) 8 £e3 is natural, but Black sometimes has an option of playing ...£c5 to exchange the bishop; for example, 8...£bd7! 9 £f3 £c5 (9...£b4??) 10 £e2 £e7 11 £h3 £xe3 12 £xe3 £e8 13 £f2 £d6 ± Bancod-Bauer, Wielburg 1996.

b) After 8 £g5 £e6! 9 0-0-0+ £d6 10 £ge2 £e7 11 £f3 £a5 12 £d2 £h6 15 £c3 £ab8 16 £c2 £c5 17 £b3 £hc8 18 £b1 £c4 19 £b4 £c6 = Rossetto-Leskovar, Cipolletti 1993.

c) 8 £ge2 is a flexible move, but Black has no special problems: 8...a6 9 £e3 £d6 10 0-0-0 £bd7 11 £f3 £e7 12 £d2 £h6 13 £hd1 £h5! 14 £bl £b4 15 a3 £a5 16 £d3 £hc8 17 £g4 £b6 18 £hxg5 19 £xg5 £c5 20 £e3 £f7 = Panchenko-Bologan, Gausdal 1991.

d) 8 £h3 commits the knight prematurely, since on £g5 it usually has no clear purpose, while the plan of £f3 and £f2 is quite slow: 8...£d6 9 £e3 £e7 10 0-0-0 £c6 11 £f3 £a6 12 £f2 £h5 13 £d3 £hf8 14 £e2 £f4 15 £xf4 exf4 16 £f2 £g8 17 £g4 £e5 18 £xe5 £xe5 19 £c5+ £d6 20 £d4 £c5 21 £f2 £e6
plan for White to guarantee an advantage in the endgame system.

C)

2...\textit{\texttt{g}f6} 3 f3

Against this move there are some options given in Line B of Chapter 25, but the endgame system is also possible here.

3...e5 (D)

\[ \text{Diagram:} \]

4 dxe5

The other, more strategic, approach is 4 d5 but \textit{\texttt{Black}} should be quite OK with the continuation 4...\textit{\texttt{c}e7} 5 \textit{\texttt{c}e3} 0-0, and now:

a) 6 \textit{\texttt{d}d3} c6 7 c4 b5 8 \textit{\texttt{c}c3} b4!? (8...bxc4 9 \textit{\texttt{x}c4} \textit{\texttt{b}b7} 10 \textit{\texttt{w}b3}! \textit{\texttt{w}c7} 11 \textit{\texttt{g}e2} \textit{\texttt{b}bd7} 12 \textit{\texttt{c}c1}! \pm \textit{\texttt{Gelfand-Adams, Tilburg 1996}}) 9 \textit{\texttt{c}ce2} a5 10 \textit{\texttt{g}g3} \textit{\texttt{a}a6} 11 \textit{\texttt{e}e2} \textit{\texttt{c}c5} 12 0-0 cxd5 13 cxd5 \textit{\texttt{f}fd7} 14 \textit{\texttt{c}c4} \textit{\texttt{g}g5} 15 \textit{\texttt{w}c1} \textit{\texttt{e}xe3}+! 16 \textit{\texttt{w}xe3} g6 = \textit{\texttt{Van den Doel-Hartoch, Netherlands 1994}}.

b) 6 c4 c6 (6...\textit{\texttt{d}d8}!? is also possible, with the plan 7 \textit{\texttt{d}d2} h6! 8 \textit{\texttt{c}c3} \textit{\texttt{g}g5}! 9 \textit{\texttt{x}g5} \textit{\texttt{w}xg5} 10 \textit{\texttt{w}xg5} \textit{\texttt{h}xg5} 11 \textit{\texttt{g}4} \textit{\texttt{f}f6} 12 \textit{\texttt{h}h3} \textit{\texttt{h}h7} 13 \textit{\texttt{h}h5} \textit{\texttt{d}a6} =

Conclusion: The endgame system 1 e4 d6 2 d4 \textit{\texttt{f}f6} 3 \textit{\texttt{c}c3} e5 is a sound opening for \textit{\texttt{Black}}. The Philidor positions in this move-order are playable, and it is difficult to point out a clear
Starostits-Voloshin, Trinec 1998) 7...\texttt{c}c3 (7 \texttt{d}d2 b5 8 \texttt{c}xb5 \texttt{c}xd5 9 \texttt{e}xd5 \texttt{b}d7 10 \texttt{c}c3 \texttt{b}7 11 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{e}c8 12 \texttt{b}3 a6 13 \texttt{bxa6} \texttt{b}xa6 gives Black a counterplay, Ivanchuk-Khalifman, Tilburg 1994) 7...a6! 8 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{cxd5} 9 \texttt{c}xd5 \texttt{b}d7 10 \texttt{d}d3 b5 11 \texttt{g}ge2 \texttt{b}6 12 \texttt{b}4 \texttt{d}7 13 0-0 \texttt{b}8 14 \texttt{f}fc1 \texttt{b}7 15 \texttt{d}d1 \texttt{f}c8 16 \texttt{b}2 \texttt{d}8 = Votava-Mokry, Turnov 1996.

4...\texttt{dxe5} 5 \texttt{w}xd8+ \texttt{xd}8 6 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{e}e7!?.

In this position this move, connected with the plan of ...\texttt{c}e6 and ...\texttt{d}xe6, seems to be the best option.

a) 6...\texttt{e}e6 7 \texttt{x}xe6 fxe6 leads an endgame that is slightly suspect for Black; for example, 8 \texttt{h}h3!, and now:

a1) 8...\texttt{c}c5 9 \texttt{d}f2 \texttt{xf}2+ 10 \texttt{xf}2 \texttt{c}6 (10...\texttt{d}bd7!? is another idea) 11 \texttt{c}c3 \texttt{e}e7 12 \texttt{a}a3! a6 13 c3 \texttt{hd}8 (13...\texttt{mag}8!?) 14 \texttt{e}e2 \texttt{h}6 15 \texttt{c}c2 \texttt{d}7 16 \texttt{hd}1 \texttt{ad}8 17 \texttt{xd}7+ \texttt{xd}7 18 \texttt{e}e1! \texttt{de}8 19 \texttt{d}d3 \texttt{dd}6 20 \texttt{xf}2! b6 21 \texttt{g}g3 (Yusupov-Christiansen, Las Palmas 1993) 21...\texttt{f}6 ± Stohl.

a2) 8...\texttt{d}d6 9 \texttt{c}c2! \texttt{e}e7 10 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{c}c6 11 \texttt{d}d2 b5 12 \texttt{c}c3 a6 13 \texttt{c}f2 \texttt{b}8 14 \texttt{a}4! ± Bezgodov-S. Kasparov, Minsk 1998.

b) 6...\texttt{e}e8 is a bit too passive, despite the fact that Black has chances to equalize; for example, 7 \texttt{e}e3 \texttt{bd}7 8 \texttt{d}d2 (8 \texttt{c}c3 c6 9 a4 a5 10 \texttt{g}ge2 \texttt{c}c5 11 \texttt{d}d1 \texttt{e}e7 12 \texttt{c}c1 \texttt{d}8 13 \texttt{d}d3 \texttt{xe}3 14 \texttt{xe}3 \texttt{c}d6 15 \texttt{b}b3 b6 16 c3 \texttt{a}a6 17 \texttt{c}c2 g6 18 0-0-0 \texttt{c}c4 19 \texttt{he}1 \texttt{xe}3 20 \texttt{xe}3 \texttt{ad}8 21 \texttt{f}f2 \texttt{g}5 = Blatny-Ftačník, Bundesliga 1994/5) 8...\texttt{c}c5 9 \texttt{c}g5 (9 \texttt{xc}5 \texttt{xc}5 10 b4 \texttt{e}e6 11 \texttt{d}e2 a5 12 \texttt{bxa}5 \texttt{xa}5 13 \texttt{b}b3 \texttt{a}a3 14 \texttt{ec}1 \texttt{e}e7 15 \texttt{d}d3 \texttt{d}7 leads to equality, Czebe-De Santis, Budapest 1997) 9...h6 10 \texttt{h}h4 and now:

b1) 10...\texttt{h}h5!? 11 \texttt{c}c2 \texttt{f}f4 12 \texttt{xf}4 \texttt{exf}4 13 \texttt{b}b3?! (13 0-0-0!!?) 13...\texttt{e}e3 14 \texttt{ad}1 g5 15 \texttt{f}f2 \texttt{xf}2+ 16 \texttt{xf}2 \texttt{e}e5 gives Black a slight advantage, Blatny-Jansa, Zlín 1997.

b2) 10...\texttt{a}a7 11 \texttt{af}2 and now:

b21) 11...\texttt{c}c5 12 \texttt{h}h3 \texttt{xf}2+? (12...\texttt{b}b6! = Kramnik) 13 \texttt{xf}2 \texttt{e}e7 14 0-0-0 ± Kramnik-Speelman, Biel IZ 1993.

b22) 11...\texttt{h}h5! 12 \texttt{c}c2 \texttt{f}f4 13 \texttt{xf}4 \texttt{exf}4 = Kramnik.

We now return to the position after 6...\texttt{e}e7 (D):

7 \texttt{e}e3

7 \texttt{c}c3 gives Black two ways to cover the d5-square:

a) 7...\texttt{e}e6!? 8 \texttt{d}d5+ \texttt{xd}5 9 \texttt{exd}5 \texttt{d}6 10 b3 \texttt{c}c5 11 \texttt{a}a3+ \texttt{e}e6 12 \texttt{xd}5+ \texttt{xd}5 13 \texttt{d}d1+ \texttt{e}e6 14 \texttt{d}d8? \texttt{b}b4+ 0-1 Reilly-Leskiewicz, Melbourne 1998.

b) 7...\texttt{c}c6 8 \texttt{e}e3 \texttt{e}e6 9 \texttt{c}c5+ \texttt{e}e8 10 \texttt{xf}8 \texttt{xf}8 11 \texttt{xe}6 \texttt{fxe}6 12 \texttt{h}h3 a5
13 ufactd1 ufacte7 14 ufacte3 ufactbd7 = Bojko-
vić-Shumiakina, Yugoslav Ch (Igalo)
1994.

7...1dxe6 8 1dxa3 (D)

8 1d2 is more passive than the text-
move: 8...1d7 9 0-0-0 1xc4 (9...g6? 10
1d2 h5 11 1h2 1h6 12 1b1 1hd8 13
1d3 1e8 14 1c4 b6 15 a4 f6 16
1c1 c6 = T.Georgadze-Rivas, Malaga
1991) 10 1xc4 1e6 11 1h3 h6 12 f4
1g4 13 f5+ 1e7 14 1f2 1xe3 15
1xe3 1e8 16 1d3 c6 17 1c4 f6 18 g4
1b6 = Sveshnikov-Panchenko, Mos-

8...1bd7

8...1xc4 is premature, and only
helps White develop: 9 1xc4 1e6 10
a4! 1e6 11 1h3 h6 12 c3 a6 13 1f2
1c7 14 a5 1ad8 15 1e2 1d7 16 g4
h5 17 g5 f5 18 gxf6 gxf6 19 1hg1
1dg8 20 1d3 f5 21 exf5+ 1xf5 22
1ad1 1e6 23 1f2 1d6 24 b4 1e7 25
1d2 = Ionescu-Nevednichy, Bucha-
rest 1994.

9 0-0-0

9 1x6 1xe6 10 1b5 1e8 11
1xa7? c6 3.

9...a6 10 1xc6 1xe6

Black has good chances of neutral-
izing White’s initiative, and if this suc-
cedes, then Black’s king might be a
good piece in the more simplified end-
game.

11 1d4

Thus far Ionescu-Nevednichy, Bu-
charest 1995. Now the logical route to
equality seems to be 11...1c5 12 1h3
h6 13 1f2 1xe3+ 14 1xe3 1hd8.

Conclusion: The endgame system is
also possible against 3 f3, and espe-
cially the new approach with 6...1e7
is worth noting. Black should also be
aware of the sideline with 4 d5.
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