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The Marshall Attack is nowadays regarded as one of the most popular and reliable of openings against 1 e4. One only has to point to the top players and specialists who play it: Adams, Ivan Sokolov, Svidler, Short, Khalifman, Kamsky (before he retired), Nunn, Blatny etc.

What has attracted all of them to the Marshall Attack? Certainly the fact that the Marshall is a counterrattacking opening helps a lot. With a bold opening Black wants, from the start, to take the initiative from White.

Basically, Black in the Marshall Attack gets the type of position he wants, usually at the cost of a pawn, which does not happen in other semi-open openings such as the French, Caro Kann, Alekhine, Pirc and Scandinavian. In the Marshall Black enjoys plenty of space for his pieces and the sacrifice of a pawn is a small price to pay for it. With energetic play, Black strives for the initiative, which forces White from the start to decide whether to accept the gauntlet by taking the gambit or to chicken out.

The other argument can be that the Marshall Gambit consists of many drawish lines – note that even Anand has recently been known to prepare forced drawing variations for Black in important games. This is true and is probably the main reason why Gary Kasparov, with the white pieces, never allows the Marshall Gambit.

I have to admit that it was a big job for me to include both the Marshall Gambit and the Anti-Marshall, especially due to space limitations. Surely there are more, much more, than around 100 important games played in such a complicated opening? Therefore I had to minimise coverage in some variations due to lack of space (for instance, in the 8 a4 \text{b7} 9 \text{d3} Anti-Marshall I have concentrated mainly on the promising sideline 9...\text{e8}?).

In general I have tried to deal with the most important recent games, including those played in early 2003.

The book is divided into three parts:

Part 1: The Main Line Marshall
Part 2: Other Marshalls
Part 3: The Anti-Marshall

Altogether there are 105 games over ten chapters. In each chapter I have done a survey explaining the various ideas, often recommending what to do and what not to do.

In the Anti-Marshall I have included all lines where White avoids the critical position after 8 \text{c3} \text{d5}, plus the extra option of the increasingly popular 8 \text{c3} \text{d5} 9 \text{d4}?.

First of all, one should be made aware of
how this fascinating opening unfolded. It started with the following game.

**Capablanca-Marshall**

*New York 1918*

1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 ∆b5 a6 4 ∆a4 ∆f6 5 0-0 ∆e7 6 ∆e1 b5 7 ∆b3 0-0 8 c3 d5

![Chess board diagram](image)

9 exd5 ∆xd5 10 ∆xe5 ∆xe5 11 ∆xe5 f6?! 12 ∆e1 ∆d6 13 h3 ∆g4

Capablanca must have had a deep think here.

14 ∆f3 ∆h4 15 d4 ∆xf2 16 ∆e2!

Surprised by a home-prepared new variation, Capablanca finds at the board the best way out of the complications and refutes Black’s plan.

16...∆g4 17 hxg4

Not falling for 17 ∆xh2 ∆g3 followed by ∆h4xe2 and ∆a8-e8, after which White could resign.

17...∆h2+ 18 ∆f1 ∆g3 19 ∆xf2 ∆h1+ 20 ∆e2 ∆xf2 21 ∆d2 ∆h4 22 ∆h3 ∆e8+ 23 ∆d3 ∆f1+ 24 ∆c2 ∆f2 25 ∆f1 ∆g1 26 ∆d5 c5 27 dxc5 ∆xc5 28 b4 ∆d6 29 a4!

After patient defence White takes a chance and starts a counterattack.

29...a5 30 axb5 axb4 31 ∆a6 bxc3 32 ∆xc3 ∆b4 33 b6 ∆xc3 34 ∆xc3 h6 35 b7 ∆e3 36 ∆xf7+ 1-0

This defeat did not deliver a final blow to the whole opening. Black started to adopt a new system with the move 11...c6 instead of 11...f6?!

A lot of thanks should go to former World Champion Boris Spassky, who was playing it successfully in his Candidate matches in the mid 1960s (he blunted Mikhail Tal’s favourite move 1 e4 in their 1965 match) and soon the Marshall Gambit gained the nickname ‘drawing weapon’.

However, in this book the reader will see plenty of beautiful sacrifices and nice kingside attacks by both White and Black (I tried to be objective). Sometimes I was having sleepless nights checking analysis and critical positions with Fritz 7 and the results were amazing – once the legendary late World Champion Mikhail Tal gave a wrong assessment! This just confirms how the Marshall Gambit is rich in possibilities for both sides and it will be some time, if ever, before the refutation is found.

I would like to thank James Coleman and Dave Bland for supplying me with games that had not appeared in my database.

Also, I would like to devote this book to my late parents Dr Dragan Lalić and Dr Nellie Lalić, who supported me with my chess during their lives.

Bogdan Lalić,

Sutton,

June 2003
CHAPTER ONE

The Old Main Line: 12 d4 and 15  @e3

1 e4 e5 2  @f3  @c6 3  @b5 a6 4  @a4  @f6 5 0-0  @e7 6  @e1 b5 7  @b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5  @xd5 10  @xe5  @xe5 11  @xe5 c6 12 d4  @d6 13  @e1  @h4 14 g3  @h3 15  @e3  @g4 16  @d3

In this chapter we deal with the old main line of the Marshall, where the real struggle begins around move 30. To complete the state of theory we have to thank a lot of correspondence players, although there are still a lot of positions that need to be tested.

The main continuation, 16...@ae8 17  @d2  @e6, we see in Games 1-4. After 18 a4 bxa4 19  @xa4 f5 20  @f1  @h5 we come to the critical position (Games 1-3). After 21 f4 (Game 1) Black does best by playing 21...@b8, thus switching play to the b-file. Excellent attacking chances are given to Black after 21 c4? f4! 22 cxd5  @xe3! (Game 2). Ivanchuk’s cold blooded 21  @xa6?! should have led to a draw in Game 3 if, instead of playing for a win with 28...h5?!, Black had played the correct 28...@xf4!. The positional continuation 18...@h5 is seen in Svidler-Kamsky (Game 4), in which the new plan starting with 20  @c4 has been nicely neutralised by Kamsky’s purposeful play.

In Morovic-Adams (Game 5) Black plays 17...@h5 with the independent idea of playing ...@g4-f5 chasing away White’s queen. However, this idea of achieving an easy draw with Black doesn’t get the desired result and White is clearly better with correct play.

16...f5?! (Games 6-8) is a sideline with which Black is trying to avoid the main lines beginning with 16...@ae8. Kindermann-Sokolov (Game 6) witnesses the paradoxical situation for the Marshall Gambit, where the swap of queens actually helps Black rather than White – this means 17  @f1?! is out of business. In Game 8 Black actually played 16...@h8?! However, the position transposed to lines with 16...f5?!

The correct continuation is 17 f4, which we see in the remaining two games of this chapter. In both games Black goes for outright attack by playing ...g7-g5. However, by playing a2-a4! quickly and keeping the vital f4-square constantly under control (i.e. not capturing on g5 too early), White’s chances are clearly better.

Game 1
Mendys-Siciarz
Correspondence 1992

1 e4 e5 2  @f3  @c6 3  @b5 a6 4  @a4  @f6 5 0-0  @e7 6  @e1 b5 7  @b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5  @xd5 10  @xe5  @xe5 11  @xe5 c6 12 d4  @d6 13  @e1  @h4 14 g3  @h3 15
\( \text{The Marshall Attack} \)

\[ \text{\textcolor{red}{\text{e3 g4 16 d3 e8 17 d2 e6}}}. \]

This is a multipurpose move – Black prepares to double the rooks on the e-file thus putting pressure on White. For the time being he refrains from playing ...f7-f5. However, it should be mentioned that in many lines Black can still revert to the standard ...f7-f5 plan. So basically his options are kept open.

18 a4

Before Black launches his kingside attack, White must seek counterplay on the opposite wing and the opening of the a-file will suit this aim. White’s plan is rather obvious and straightforward – by playing 19 axb5 axb5 20 a6! he will force Black to defend against the threats on the sixth rank.

18...f5 19 wF1 wH5 20 f4 bxa4

At first glance breaking up the pawn chain might seem anti-positional but the text has the following points:

1) If White takes on a4 with his rook, his first rank will be weakened.

2) Black will search for counterplay along the b-file.

However, for his activity Black will have to pay a price in that his a6-pawn is left at White’s mercy and is doomed to fall.

21 axa4 b8 22 wF2?

Also bad is 22 wxa6? xB3 23 dxb3 dxe3 24 wC8+ eE8 25 xC6 f3 26 xD6 wH3! and White cannot avoid being mated, while 22 wxa6?! xB3 23 dxb3 dxe3 is very complicated but good for Black. These variations demonstrate that White has to watch out for the sacrifice on b3 all the time.

22...xB3! 23 dxb3 wD1!

The point behind 22...xB3!. Despite the fact that with rook and two pawns against two minor pieces White (after his twenty-fifth move) is not doing too badly from the materialistic point of view, there are many weak points in White’s camp and this leads to a near-decisive advantage for Black.

24 dC5

24 xA6 xB3 25 a8+ wF7 26 a7+ wG6, as in Gorkievich-Vitormskij, correspondence 1979, is also very gloomy for White.

24...xC5 25 xA6 xF8 26 d2 wG6! 27 c4 wF6 28 wE8 f3 39 d5 wE4 30 wB4 wF6 31 xE4

Desperation, but 31 wC3? wXh2+! 32 wXh2 wH6+ 33 wG1 wH1 mate is a nice finish.

31...xG4 32 wC5 wD1+ 33 wF2 wF3+ 34 wE1 wH1+ 35 wE2 wXh2+ 36 wD1 wH1+ 37 wD2 wG2+ 38 wE1

Or 38 wD1 wC2+ 39 wE1 wB1+ followed by ...wXb2+ with an easy win for Black.

38...wXg3+ 39 wE2 wG4+ 0-1

\( \text{Game 2} \)

J.Fernandez-Claridge
Correspondence 1998

1 e4 e5 2 d3 f3 dC6 3 d5 a6 4 a4 a4 wF6
5 0-0 \( \text{b7} \) 6 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{c6} \) 7 \( \text{b3} \) 0-0 8 \( \text{c3} \) d5 9 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{exd5} \) 10 \( \text{exf5} \) \( \text{exf5} \) 11 \( \text{e5} \) c6 12 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 13 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{h4} \) 14 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{wh3} \) 15 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 16 \( \text{wd3} \) \( \text{a8} \) 17 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xe6} \)

An alternative is 17...f5 18 \( \text{f4} \)

\( \text{xb2} \) with both a positional and material advantage to Black according to Yugoslav GM Dragoljub Minic.

c) 18 \( \text{xd5} \) cxd5 19 a4 bxa4 20 c4 (worse is 20 \( \text{axa4} \) f5 21 \( \text{wh1} \) f4! 22 \( \text{xh4} \) \( \text{xf1} \) + 23 \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 24 \( \text{gxf4} \) h3 and Black wins at least the exchange) 20...dxc4 21 \( \text{xc4} \) h5! with a strong initiative on the kingside according to Mikhail Tal.

18...bxa4 19 \( \text{xa4} \) f5 20 \( \text{wh1} \) 

White has to think about the safety of his monarch because the foolhardy 20 \( \text{xa6} \) f4! would have led to an irresistible attack for Black on the kingside in all variations.

20...\( \text{wh5} \)

The old game Parma-Spassky, Yugoslavia-USSR 1965 saw 20...f4? which led to a very bad position for Black after 21 \( \text{wh3} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 22 h4! (preventing ...\( \text{g7} \)\( \text{g5} \)) 22...\( \text{h6} \) 23 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 24 \( \text{h6} \) 25 a4! \( \text{g6} \) 26 \( \text{axb5} \) axb5 and now according to Topalov 27 \( \text{a7} \) would have given some advantage to White in Anand-Topalov, Las Palmas 1993. However, Black is certainly not without counterplay due to the weak squares around White's king.

18 a4

Other moves are clearly weaker:

a) 18 \( \text{xd1} \) ! \( \text{xd1} \) 19 \( \text{axd1} \) \( f5 \) 20 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 21 \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{h5} \) 22 \( \text{exe5} \) \( \text{exe5} \) 23 \( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{f4} \) 24 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{b6} \) 25 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{f3} \) 26 \( \text{h1} \) (not a very attractive square for the white queen) 26...\( \text{e6} \) 27 h4 and now in the game Ljubojevic-Nunn, Amsterdam 1988 Black missed the strong reply 27...\( \text{xf5} \), which would have kept White's queen in prison.

b) 18 c4? \( \text{f4} \) 19 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{h6} \) 20 \( \text{we4} \) \( \text{xb2} \) + 21 \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 22 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 23 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 24 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 25 \( \text{g1} \) cxd5 26 \( \text{xd5} \) with his last move White wins material, leaving Black with no choice but to go 'all-in'. The position is difficult to evaluate because of the unequal material and it is no wonder that even the late great World Champion Mikhail Tal gave a wrong assessment. Currently this move is considered bad, yet a long time ago it was considered the best for White!

21...\( \text{f4} \)!
Obviously Black has no choice because 21...\text{Qxe}3! 22 fxe3 c5, although possible, would have kept Black’s attacking chances on the kingside to a minimum.

22 cxd5 \text{Qxe}3!

Again the strongest move because 22...fxe3?! 23 dxe6 \text{Qxf}2 (of course not 23...\text{exf}2?! 24 \text{Wxf}2 \text{Qxf}2 25 e7\text{+} winning for White) 24 e7\+ \text{Wh}8 25 e8\text{W}+! \text{Wxe}8 26 \text{Qxe}3! \text{Qxf}1+ 27 \text{Qxf}1 with 28 \text{Qxa}6 to follow gives an obvious advantage for White according to the analysis of the recently deceased Russian GM Alexey Suetin.

23 fxe3 fxg3 24 dxc6+! \text{Wh}8 25 hxe3

Forced because 26 \text{Qxf}1? \text{Qf}3! is very bad for White.

26...\text{Wg}5!

Black can draw here with 26...\text{Wh}6 27 \text{Qc}4 \text{Wh}3! 28 \text{Qxd}6 \text{Wg}3\+ and it’s perpetual check, The text, as we shall see, is even stronger.

27 \text{Qf}4

Should White defend the e-pawn by 27 \text{Qc}4, there follows 27...\text{Qe}2! winning material so White decides to give up the exchange in order to diminish Black’s attacking potential.

27...\text{Qxf}4 28 e\text{xf}4 \text{We}7 29 \text{Qf}1

Forced because 29 \text{Qxa}6?? loses outright after 29...\text{Wc}3+ 30 \text{Wf}1 \text{We}2+ picking up the rook.

29...\text{We}4!

This is stronger than the alternatives:

a) 29...\text{h}5 30 \text{Qxa}6 \text{Wc}2 31 \text{Qa}8+ \text{Wh}7 32 \text{Qg}8+ \text{Wg}6 33 \text{Qd}5 \text{h}3 34 \text{Qa}1 \text{Wxb}2 35 \text{Qd}1 \text{We}2 with roughly equal chances, Kaufman-Sternberg, Beltsy 1979.

b) 29...\text{Wc}2?! 30 \text{Qb}4 \text{h}5! is a promising continuation for Black. Now 31 \text{Qb}8+ \text{Wh}7 32 \text{Qg}8+ was wrongly assessed by Tal as clearly better for White but in fact after 32...\text{Wh}6! (not 32...\text{Wg}6? 33 \text{c}7\+ threatening \text{b}8-b6+ and it is White who is winning) 33 \text{Qf}7 \text{g}6! 34 \text{Qe}8 \text{Wf}3! it was White who found himself in a critical position in Rooks-


30 \text{d}5

Or 30 \text{Qxa}6 \text{Wxd}4+ 31 \text{Qg}2 \text{Wxb}2+ 32 \text{Qg}1 \text{h}5! with excellent winning chances for Black, while after 30 \text{Qb}4 \text{Wxc}6 31 \text{Qb}8+ \text{Qc}8 32 \text{Qd}5 \text{Qc}7 33 \text{Qa}8 \text{Wd}7! 34 \text{f}5 \text{h}5 35 \text{Qe}6 \text{Wxd}4+ Black’s attack comes first. The general conclusion is that, despite White having enough material for the queen, all the chances are with Black due to the weakened position of the white king.

30...\text{Wd}3 31 \text{Qb}4 \text{g}5!

Giving the black king some air and simultaneously softening up the white kingside.

32 \text{c}7

Or 32 \text{Qc}4 \text{Wd}4+ 33 \text{Qg}2 \text{gxf}4 34 \text{gxf}4 \text{Wxf}4 35 \text{Qg}1 \text{h}5 36 \text{b}3 \text{h}4 37 \text{Qa}4 \text{Wd}4+ 38 \text{Qg}2 \text{Wb}2+ 39 \text{Qg}1 \text{h}3 0-1 Frost-Claridge, correspondence 1998.

32...\text{Qg}7 33 \text{Qc}4 \text{Wd}4+ 34 \text{Qg}2 \text{Qe}4+ 35 \text{Qf}2

Alternatives are no better: 35 \text{Qh}2 \text{Qf}3! or 35 \text{Qg}1 \text{gxf}4 36 \text{gxf}4 \text{Qh}3 with an easy win for Black in both cases.

35...\text{gxf}4 36 \text{gxf}4 \text{Wxf}4+ 37 \text{Qg}1 \text{a}5 38 \text{Qa}4 \text{Wd}4+ 39 \text{Qg}2 \text{We}4+ 40 \text{Qf}2 \text{Qf}3+ 41 \text{We}1 \text{Wd}1+ 42 \text{Wf}2 \text{Wxa}4 0-1

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 3}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Ivanchuk-Short}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Riga 1995}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
1 \text{e}4 \text{e}5 2 \text{Qf}3 \text{Qc}6 3 \text{Qb}5 \text{a}6 4 \text{Qa}4 \text{Qf}6
\end{center}
5 0-0 6 e7 6 xe1 b5 7 e3 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 xd5 10 xe5 xe5 11 xe5 c6
12 d4 d6 13 xe1 wh4 14 g3 wh3 15
e3 g4 16 wd3 eae8 17 d2 e6 18
a4 bxa4 19 xa4 f5 20 wf1 wh5 21
xa6!?

Very bravely played.
21 f4 22 xf4!

This is an important improvement over 22
xc6 fxe3 23 xe3 xe3 24 xe6+ xe6
25 we1 d5 and White resigned without
waiting for 26 xd6 g4 etc., Lilienthal-
Hallier, correspondence 1965.

22...h3

After 22...xe1 23 xe1 xf4 24 xc6
e6!? White has a way out with 25 xd5+
f8 26 e6!, keeping a small advantage.
23 xe6 xf1 24 xf1 xf4 25 axc6
we3 26 xd5 xd5 27 gx4

This strange position with unequal mate-
rial is not easy to handle for either colour –
however, the first impression is that if any
side can play for a win it is White, whose
knight on f1 is ideally placed for the defence
of his weakened kingside. After the potential
exchange of rooks Black’s queen will be no
match for White’s rook, knight and passed
queenside pawns.

27...f3 28 d5! h5?!

After 28...xd5 29 xe3 followed by f4-f5
White stands much better. However, Black
missed a draw with 28...xf1! 29 c8+ f7
30 c7+ f8. Black might have overesti-
ated his chances now he plays for a win.
29 xe4 h4 30 g6! wd3 31 xe6 wxe6
32 c8 h3 33 xe3 wd2 34 f1 wb2
35 xf8+ xf8 36 c8+ f7 37 h8
xc3 38 xh3 xd3+ 39 xe1 we4 40
e2 g8

Of course not 40...xf4?? 41 e3 etc.
41 f5 f7 42 g3 wh1 43 h3 we4 44
g4 wh1 45 h4

It should be noted the stubbornness with
which White continues to play for a win
when many players would concede the draw.
The arising ending is difficult to assess –
White’s chances of winning are about 50%.
45...wh2 46 f1 we5+ 47 f3 wd5+
48 xe4! wd1+ 49 g2 wd5 50 g3
wc6 51 h3 wc2 52 f3 wd1 53 g4
wg1 54 xe6!

Taking control of more and more space.
54...wd4+ 55 e4 wd7 56 g5+ g8
57 \texttt{wh5!} 

With excellent technique White has managed to squeeze his opponent and the further march of his king will quickly decide the game.

57...\texttt{wd8} 58 \texttt{g6} \texttt{wd7} 59 h5 \texttt{wb5} 60 \texttt{e4} 1-0

After 60...\texttt{wd7} 61 \texttt{dx6} wins.

\textbf{Game 4}

\textbf{Svidler-Kamsky}

\textit{Groningen 1995}

1 \texttt{e4} \texttt{e5} 2 \texttt{f3} \texttt{c6} 3 \texttt{b5} a6 4 \texttt{a4} \texttt{f6} 5 0-0 \texttt{e7} 6 \texttt{e1} b5 7 \texttt{b3} 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 \texttt{exd5} \texttt{exd5} 10 \texttt{exf6} \texttt{c5} 11 \texttt{d5} e6 12 d4 \texttt{d6} 13 \texttt{e1} \texttt{wh4} 14 g3 \texttt{wh3} 15 \texttt{e3} \texttt{g4} 16 \texttt{fd1} \texttt{ae8} 17 \texttt{e2} \texttt{f6} 18 \texttt{a4} \texttt{wh5}

This is the positional treatment in contrast to the more normal plan of pushing the f-pawn. Black keeps the f5-square free for his bishop from where White's queen can be attacked. In short, Black prefers piece play using the light squares.

Also very popular is the plan starting with 18...f5 19 \texttt{wf1} \texttt{wh5} 20 f4 (if White interposes 20 axb5, he must reckon with 20...f4?! giving Black good chances) 20...\texttt{f5}! (Black wants to force White to take on a4 with the rook, after which his first rank will be weakened; White has the better ending after 20...g5 21 axb5 axb5 22 \texttt{xd5} cxd5 23 \texttt{fxg5} \texttt{exe3}? 24 \texttt{xf6} f4 25 \texttt{f3}! \texttt{f3} 26 \texttt{wxh6} \texttt{xd3} 27 \texttt{dxf3} \texttt{xg2}! etc.) 21 \texttt{xa4} (or 21 \texttt{d5} cxd5 22 \texttt{g2} \texttt{dxe8} 23 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{wh8} 24 \texttt{f2} \texttt{e2}! with a very active position for Black)

and now Black is at a crossroads with a choice between the following possible continuations:

a) 21...g5?! is insufficient after 22 \texttt{xa6} gxf4 23 \texttt{xf6}! (much stronger than 23 \texttt{exe6}? fxg3 24 hgx3 f4! 25 \texttt{xd6} fxg3 26 \texttt{wg2} \texttt{xd6} etc.) 23...\texttt{xf6}! 24 \texttt{exe6}! (stronger than 24 \texttt{exe6}? \texttt{d3}+ 25 \texttt{xe3} \texttt{exe3} 26 \texttt{xd5}+ \texttt{h8}! with unclear play, Tal-Geller, USSR Championship 1975) 24...\texttt{xd5} 25 \texttt{xd5} cxd5 26 \texttt{g2}! with a clear advantage to White.

b) After 21...\texttt{f8} all sources mention that 22 \texttt{xa6} is an error due to 23...\texttt{exe3} 23...\texttt{exe3} 24...\texttt{exe6} \texttt{we8} 25 \texttt{xd5}+ \texttt{h8} 26 \texttt{d4} \texttt{fxe4} 27 \texttt{xd6} \texttt{d3} 28 \texttt{b3}? \texttt{e3}!, but instead of the poor 28...\texttt{b3}? White can play 28...\texttt{e6}! 29 \texttt{wh1} \texttt{xd1} 30 \texttt{e8} with a winning king and bishop ending.

c) Black’s best try is probably 21...\texttt{b8} 22 \texttt{xd5} (the threat was...\texttt{b8xb}) followed by \texttt{d5xe} winning two minor pieces for a rook) 22...\texttt{cxd5} 23 \texttt{e6} \texttt{we8} (or 23...\texttt{e8} 24 \texttt{wh5}! \texttt{wh7} 25 \texttt{h3}, Short-Pinter, Rotterdam 1988, when after 25...\texttt{h3} 26 \texttt{f3} – with the idea of playing \texttt{e5} – White retains his extra pawn and has a clear positional advantage) 24 \texttt{f2} \texttt{wd7} 25 \texttt{exe6} \texttt{exe6} 26 \texttt{c4}
dx\textit{c}4 27 \textit{w}xc4 \textit{w}xc4 28 \textit{\Delta}xc4 but even here Black is facing an uphill struggle to draw in the arising ending, Chandler-P.Littlewood, London 1987.

All these examples show that Black still has to demonstrate a way to equality in the jungle of variations starting with 18...f5.

19 axb5 axb5 20 \textit{\Delta}e4

This is the idea of super-GM Viswanathan Anand. An alternative is the older continuation 20 \textit{\Delta}f1 which does not cause Black any problems after 20...\textit{\Delta}f5 and now:

a) 21 \textit{w}d2 \textit{\Delta}e4 22 \textit{\Delta}c2 f5 23 \textit{\Delta}d1 \textit{w}h3 24 f3 f4! 25 fxe4 fxg3 26 \textit{g}g2 gxf2+ 27 \textit{\Delta}h1 \textit{w}xg2+ 28 \textit{\Delta}xg2 \textit{\Delta}xe4 29 \textit{\Delta}b3 h1\textit{w}+! 30 \textit{\Delta}xh1 \textit{\Delta}h4+ 31 \textit{\Delta}g2 \textit{\Delta}g4+ with a drawn position as in Rubinchik-Vitomskis, correspondence 1989. It is very risky for White to continue to play for a win with 32 \textit{\Delta}h3 because of 32...h5 33 \textit{\Delta}d1 \textit{\Delta}xf1! 34 \textit{\Delta}xf1 \textit{g}3+ 35 \textit{\Delta}h4 \textit{\Delta}xe3 etc.

b) 21 \textit{w}d1 \textit{\Delta}g4 22 \textit{w}d2 \textit{w}h3 23 \textit{\Delta}d1 \textit{\Delta}xd1 24 \textit{\Delta}xd1 f5 25 f4 g5! 26 \textit{w}g2 \textit{w}xg2+ 27 \textit{\Delta}xg2 \textit{f}e8 28 \textit{\Delta}d2 \textit{\Delta}xe1 29 \textit{\Delta}xe1 \textit{\Delta}xe1 30 \textit{\Delta}xe1 \textit{\Delta}xf4 with an equal ending in Karpov-Short, Tilburg 1991.

20...\textit{\Delta}f5

Against 20...\textit{\Delta}c7?! there is a devilish idea after 21 \textit{\Delta}d2 \textit{\Delta}e8 22 \textit{\Delta}d1! \textit{\Delta}xd1 23 \textit{\Delta}exd1 when 23...\textit{\Delta}xe4? 24 \textit{\Delta}xe4! \textit{\Delta}xd1+ 25 \textit{\Delta}g2!!

when Black is lost due to the weakness of his back rank. In the game Anand-Kamsky, Sanghi Naghar (1st matchgame) 1994 Black played 23...f5 24 \textit{\Delta}g5 \textit{\Delta}e2 and now 25 \textit{w}f3 would have left White with a clear advantage.

21 \textit{\Delta}d2 \textit{\Delta}xe4! 22 \textit{\Delta}xe4 \textit{\Delta}f6 23 f3 \textit{w}g6!

Hitting both e4- and g3-squares, which means Black will restore the material balance.

24 \textit{w}f1 \textit{\Delta}xe4 25 fxe4 \textit{\Delta}xe4 26 \textit{\Delta}f4 \textit{\Delta}d3

27 \textit{w}f2 \textit{\Delta}xf4 28 \textit{w}xf4 \textit{h}6 29 \textit{w}f2 \textit{\Delta}e8

30 \textit{\Delta}e1 \textit{\Delta}xe1+ 31 \textit{\Delta}xe1 \textit{\Delta}e4 32 \textit{w}f2 ½-½

**Game 5**

**Morovic-Adams**

**Santiago 1997**

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{\Delta}f3 \textit{\Delta}c6 3 \textit{\Delta}b5 a6 4 \textit{\Delta}a4 \textit{\Delta}f6

5 0-0 \textit{\Delta}e7 6 \textit{\Delta}e1 b5 7 \textit{\Delta}b3 0-0 8 c3 d5

9 exd5 \textit{\Delta}xd5 10 \textit{\Delta}xe5 \textit{\Delta}xe5 11 \textit{\Delta}xe5 c6

12 d4 \textit{\Delta}d6 13 \textit{\Delta}e1 \textit{\Delta}h4 14 g3 \textit{\Delta}h3 15 \textit{\Delta}e3 \textit{\Delta}g4 16 \textit{w}d3 \textit{\Delta}ae8 17 \textit{\Delta}d2 \textit{\Delta}h5

This move can lead by transposition to the
line 17...\texttt{e}6 18 a4 \texttt{wh}5. Here Black tries to sidestep this variation and to force a draw by a perpetual attack against White's queen. However, White has a way to avoid this draw.

18 a4

The strongest reply. Black quickly achieved the initiative after 18 \texttt{df}1 \texttt{e}6 19 \texttt{d}d1!? (better was 19 a4 transposing to 17...\texttt{e}6 18 a4 \texttt{wh}5 19 \texttt{df}1 etc.) 19...f5 20 \texttt{ex}g4 \texttt{ex}g4 21 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{e}6 22 \texttt{g}2?! (Black gets a promising attack after both 22 c4 bxc4 23 \texttt{wx}c4 \texttt{wh}8 and 22 f3 \texttt{wh}3 23 \texttt{we}2 \texttt{f}4 24 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{d}7 25 g4 h5 26 h3 bxg4 27 bxg4 c5 but the text is clearly worse) 22...f4 23 f3 \texttt{wh}5 24 g4 \texttt{wh}4! 25 \texttt{ce}2 \texttt{ex}g4+! 26 fxg4 f3+ 27 \texttt{h}1 (forced since after 27 \texttt{wx}f3 \texttt{xf}3 28 \texttt{xf}3 \texttt{h}3+ 29 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{h}6 Black's attack breaks through) 27...fxe2 28 \texttt{ex}e2 \texttt{h}8 29 \texttt{g}1 h6 30 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{f}4 31 \texttt{e}1 \texttt{g}5 32 \texttt{h}3?! (better was 32 \texttt{d}d1 preventing the late intrusion of the Black queen to d3) 32...\texttt{g}6! 33 \texttt{d}d1 \texttt{b}8 34 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{b}1 35 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{g}8 (White is in a kind of zugzwang and the pin along the first rank is decisive) 36 \texttt{b}3 \texttt{f}4 37 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{xc}3 38 \texttt{e}6 \texttt{xa}2 39 \texttt{xc}6 \texttt{xb}3 40 \texttt{xa}6 \texttt{e}2+ 41 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{b}8 42 \texttt{d}1 \texttt{d}1 0-1 Ivanchuk-Adams, Terrassa 1991.

18...\texttt{f}5?!

A better option was 18...\texttt{e}6. With the text Black aims to force a draw by repetition.

19 \texttt{f}1

19 \texttt{d}d1 appears to be a blunder but is actually playable: 19...\texttt{xd}1 (worse is 19...\texttt{g}6?! 20 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{xc}3 21 \texttt{xc}3 \texttt{f}4 22 \texttt{xe}8 \texttt{xe}8 23 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{d}3 24 \texttt{g}2 – of course not 24 \texttt{h}4? \texttt{x}f1 25 \texttt{gx}e6 \texttt{e}1!! etc. – 24...\texttt{d}6 25 axb5 axb5 26 \texttt{e}5 with advantage to White) 20 \texttt{xf}5 \texttt{xc}3 21 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{e}2 22 \texttt{xc}3 \texttt{xb}2 23 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{a}2 24 axb5 axb5 25 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{c}7 26 \texttt{e}1 \texttt{d}8 with equal play in Leyva-Pupo, Holguin 1992.

19...\texttt{h}3 20 \texttt{d}1 \texttt{f}5 21 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{c}5

Or 21...\texttt{f}4 22 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{d}3 23 \texttt{xf}5 \texttt{xf}5 24 \texttt{c}2! with advantage for White because after 24...\texttt{xe}1? 25 \texttt{xf}5 Black's knight on e1 is trapped.

22 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{b}4

White is also much better after 22...\texttt{f}4 23 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{xc}3 24 \texttt{fx}e3 \texttt{h}6 25 axb5 axb5 26 \texttt{e}5 etc.

23 \texttt{xa}6 \texttt{b}xc3 24 \texttt{b}xc3 \texttt{xc}3 25 \texttt{xd}6 \texttt{xd}1 26 \texttt{h}4! \texttt{e}3

Obviously the only move because otherwise Black would be a whole piece down for nothing.

27 \texttt{axd}1

Of course not 27 \texttt{xf}5?? \texttt{xe}1 mate or 27 \texttt{fx}e3?? \texttt{f}2+ with mate to follow, but 27 \texttt{axd}1?! was possible and leads to a draw after 27...\texttt{ec}4! 28 \texttt{xc}5 (or 28 \texttt{fx}e3 \texttt{xe}3+ 29 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{ec}4+ with perpetual check) 28...\texttt{e}8! (threatening the nasty ...\texttt{e}3-c1+ mating) and White has nothing better than 29 \texttt{fx}e3 \texttt{xe}3+ 30 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{ec}4+ with a draw.

27...\texttt{exe}1+ 28 \texttt{xe}1 \texttt{wc}2 29 \texttt{dx}c5 \texttt{wa}4 30 \texttt{g}2! \texttt{wb}4 31 \texttt{we}5

Deserving of attention is 31 \texttt{d}d1?! \texttt{g}4 32 \texttt{c}6! etc.

31...\texttt{d}7 32 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{c}6 33 \texttt{h}5 \texttt{f}6 34 \texttt{we}7?!

Stronger is 34 \texttt{we}6+ \texttt{h}8 (forced because after 34...\texttt{f}7? 35 \texttt{d}d1 White immediately wins) 35 \texttt{we}7 \texttt{g}8 36 \texttt{f}4.

34...\texttt{f}7 35 \texttt{wd}8+ \texttt{f}8 36 \texttt{we}7 \texttt{f}7 37 \texttt{we}6 \texttt{d}7?!

Simpler was 37...\texttt{xc}5 38 \texttt{d}d1 \texttt{h}6! which leads to a draw. 39 \texttt{d}d8+ followed by \texttt{xf}7 is not possible because White would get mated.
first by ...\textit{W}c5-c1+.
38 \textit{W}e3 \textit{H}f8 39 \textit{W}e7 \textit{H}f7 40 \textit{W}e3 \textit{H}f8 41
\textit{W}c1 \textit{H}e8 42 \textit{H}xe8+ \textit{H}xe8 ½-½

Marshall starting with 16...\textit{H}ae8 etc. Black, without hesitation, gets on with his kingside
attack, thus trying to save an important
tempo by not playing ...\textit{H}a8-e8.

From White’s point of view he should
prevent Black from playing ...f5-f4 at all costs
because then Black would be able to double
rooks along the open f-file, thus leaving
the white monarch at the mercy of all of Black’s
pieces.
17 \textit{W}f1?! \textit{W}xf1+!

After 43 \textit{Q}f4 \textit{H}c6 it would be very diffi-
cult, if not impossible, to convert White’s
extra pawn into a win due to Black’s bishop
being stronger than White’s knight.

\begin{game}
\textbf{Game 6}

\textbf{Kindermann-I. Sokolov}

\textit{Biel 1988}

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{C}c6 3 \textit{C}b5 a6 4 \textit{a}4 \textit{Q}f6
5 0-0 \textit{H}e7 6 \textit{H}e1 b5 7 \textit{C}b3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 \textit{exd5} \textit{Q}xd5 10 \textit{Q}xe5 \textit{Q}xe5 11 \textit{H}xe5 c6
12 d4 \textit{H}d6 13 \textit{H}e1 \textit{W}h4 14 g3 \textit{W}h3 15
\textit{H}e3 \textit{g}4 16 \textit{W}d3 f5?!

18 \textit{Q}xf1?

No dear reader, this is not a misprint!
Black is ready to enter the endgame a pawn
down, which is a paradox for the Marshall
Gambit. More important is the time gained
by this exchange, which will enable Black to
play ...f5-f4 with a strong initiative.

This is a serious mistake because on f1
White’s king will be insecure. Better instead is
18 \textit{H}xf1 f4 19 \textit{g}xf4 \textit{Q}xf4 20 \textit{Q}d2, which was
seen in a couple of games in my database.
Now instead of 20...\textit{W}h8, I think Black
should play 20...\textit{H}d8! planning the ma-
noeuvre ...\textit{H}d8-d6-g6, with a very promising
position and full compensation for the sacrifi-
ced pawn.

18...f4!

Of course!
19 \textit{g}xf4 \textit{Q}xf4 20 \textit{Q}g1 \textit{C}c7! 21 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{H}f6
22 \textit{Q}e4 \textit{H}g6 23 \textit{Q}g3 \textit{H}f8 24 \textit{C}c2 \textit{H}f5
25 \textit{Q}xf5 \textit{H}xf5 26 \textit{d}d2 \textit{H}h5

Despite the fact that the position is some-
somewhat simplified, Black has maintained a strong initiative that means White must be careful all the time. The immediate threat is ...h5-h4 winning a piece.

27 \( \text{e}4 \text{f}4 \) 28 \( \text{xf}4 \text{xf}4 \) 29 \( \text{f}1 \text{f}8 \) 30 \( \text{d}1 \text{h}3 \) 31 \( \text{d}2 \)

Again this move is forced because 31 \( \text{e}2 \) would have lost on the spot after 31...h4 – White’s knight cannot move due to \( \text{g}6-g1 \) mate.

31...\( \text{g}5 \) 32 \( \text{e}3 \) h4 33 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 34 \( \text{d}1 \text{h}2+ \) 35 \( \text{e}2 \text{f}4 \) 36 \( \text{h}1 \text{g}2 \)

As a consequence of the lasting initiative, Black has regained his sacrificed pawn and keeps a great positional advantage due to his powerful passed h-pawn.

37 \( \text{d}2 \) g5 38 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \)!

This is not necessary, better was 38...g4 at once.

39 b3 \( \text{g}7 \) 40 c4 bxc4 41 bxc4 \( \text{g}6 \) 42 \( \text{b}1 \) h3 43 \( \text{h}1 \) g4 44 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \) ? 45 c5 \( \text{g}6 \) 46 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 47 \( \text{g}3 \) h2 48 \( \text{h}1 \)

The only move because after 48 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{g}1 \) the game is terminated.

48...\( \text{f}4 \) 49 \( \text{e}4 \)

Perhaps more resistance would have been put up if White had kept all the rooks on the board.

49...\( \text{g}5 \) 50 \( \text{xf}4 \text{f}4 \) 51 \( \text{e}2+ \) \( \text{f}5 \) 52 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 53 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 54 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 55 \( \text{g}3 \) a5 56 a4 \( \text{g}5 \)!

Practically leaving White in zugzwang, Black has finally found the way to break through.

57 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{g}1 \) 58 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{xh}1 \) 59 \( \text{xh}1 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 60 f3 gxf3 61 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 62 \( \text{g}4 \) 0-1

No, resignation is not too early because after 62...\( \text{g}1 \) 63 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 64 \( \text{xh}2 \) \( \text{f}3+ \) 65 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 66 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \) the arising knight and pawn ending is an elementary win for Black.

---

**Game 7**

**Sax-Ehlvest**

*Skelleftea (World Cup) 1989*

1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 3 \( \text{b}5 \) a6 4 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 5 o-o \( \text{e}7 \) 6 \( \text{e}1 \) b5 7 \( \text{b}3 \) 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 \( \text{xd}5 \) 10 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 11 \( \text{xe}5 \) c6 12 d4 \( \text{d}6 \) 13 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 14 g3 \( \text{h}3 \) 15 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 16 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \)!

Of course 16...\( \text{b}3 ? \) 17 \( \text{f}1 \) only helps White because after \( \text{b}1-d2 \) Black’s bishop will be attacked.

17 \( \text{f}4 \)

This is White’s best reply. The thematic move ...f5-f4 has been prevented and this keeps White’s kingside solid.

17...\( \text{h}8 \)

Again harmless is 17...\( \text{f}3 ? \) 18 \( \text{f}1 \) etc.

18 \( \text{xd}5 \) exd5 19 \( \text{d}2 \) g5 20 \( \text{f}1 \)

White should avoid the obvious trap 20 fxg5? \( \text{xg}3 \)!, when Black wins.

20...\( \text{h}5 \) 21 a4!

White has to seek counterplay on the op-
posite flank. The main point of this strong move will be obvious in another six moves.

21 a4! is much stronger than immediately taking on g5 with 21 fxg5. Play continues 21...f4 22 xf4 exf4! 23 gxf4 f8 24 e5 (the only move because otherwise Black would take on f4 with a devastating attack) 24...xe5 25 dxe5 h6! (another thematic move – Black tries to open the g-file along which he can endanger the white king) 26 e1 hxg5 27 f5! xf5 28 d3 f2!? 29 f1! (excellent defence; everything else loses, for example if 29 xf2? xh2+ 30 f1 – or 30 e3?? f4 mate – 30...h3+ 31 xh3 xh3+ and the endgame is easily winning for Black) 29 xb2 30 xd5 f3 31 d8+ g7 32 d7+ f7 33 xf7+ xf7 and this ending is assessed by GM John Nunn as equal, but I think that White might even be in trouble here, for example: 34 e6+ e8 35 g3 xa2 36 f5 e2 37 a1 e5! etc.

21...bxa4 22 fxg5 f4 23 xf4 xf4 24 gxf4 f8 25 e5!

The only move!

25...xe5 26 dxe5 h6 27 xa6!

Now the importance of 21 a4! is obvious – Black’s king is weak too and White’s queen can potentially harass it.

27 hxg5 28 d6! xf4 29 f1! f5

Immediately losing is 29...h3? 30 xf4 gxf4 31 f8+ h7 32 xf4, while after 29 xf1+ 30 xf1 h3 31 e3 e2 32 f8+ h7 White has 33 f1.

30 xd5 h3 31 xf4 gxf4 32 xd5 g5+ 33 h1 h4 34 wa8+ g7 35 wb7+ h8 36 wb8+ h7 37 wc7+ h6 38 wc6+ h7 39 f3 wg4 40 e4+ g7 41 g1!

Game 8

Timmermans-Neil
British League 1996

1 e4 e5 2 f5 d3 c3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5
0-0 e7 6 h1 b5 7 h3 0-0 8 c3 6 9
exd5 dxe5 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 dxe5 c6
12 d4 d6 13 h1 h4 14 g3 h3 15
e3 g4 16 d3 h8!

This move I regard as not so accurate because it stops Black from playing other plans (if he wants to play ...f7-f5 he should do so immediately, assuming he wants to avoid entering the long old main line with 16...ae8).

Which lines does it cut out? Well, for instance, after 16 f5?! 17 f4 g5 18 d1 h5 19 d2, besides 19 ae8, Black can try the plan of 19...h6!? with the idea of tucking his king away on the safe square h7, anticipating
the opening of the g-file. Against this plan White should not go in for pawn grabbing with 20 \texttt{Wg2 Wh7 21 Axe5 cxd5 22 Wxd5 \texttt{Aad8}}, which gives Black excellent attacking chances, but should continue with the same plan White plays in the text, leaving him with a comfortable advantage.

Just when it appeared that Black was getting the upper hand with his kingside attack, he has obviously overlooked this fantastic geometrical motif. The text leads to the exchange of rooks, leaving Black in a hopelessly lost position.

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

17 Axe2 f5 18 W\texttt{f1} \texttt{Wh5} 19 Axe5 cxd5 20 f4 Axe2 21 a4! g5 22 axb5 axb5 23 Wf2 Ze7
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White is just too solid and this is the reason why Black’s attack cannot break through.

Black has also played 23...Z\texttt{e6}, for example: 24 fxe5 Ze8 25 b3 Ze7 26 h4 Ze8 27 Ze1 b4 28 e4! dxc4 29 bxc4 Zf3 30 Axe2 Ze2 31 Zxe2 Zxe2 32 Ze1 Zxf1 33 Wxf1 Zxe1 34 Zxe1 Wxe1+ 35 Zxe1 b3 36 Zf3
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Summary
16...\textit{ae}8 17 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}6 is very complex, but the critical line 18 a4 bxa4 19 \textit{xa}4 f5 20 \textit{f}1 \textit{h}5 looks okay for Black after 21 f4 and 21 \textit{xa}6, while 21 c4? is certainly a mistake.

It’s nice to have one little line which you can use to reach a satisfactory position without learning all this opening theory, but sadly this is not the \textit{case} with 16...f5?! (Game 6-8). Still, as a surprise weapon this line can occasionally serve its purpose but, all in all, I recommend playing 16...\textit{ae}8 instead of 16...f5?!

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3 \textit{b}5 a6 4 \textit{a}4 \textit{f}6 5 0-0 \textit{e}7 6 \textit{e}1 b5 7 \textit{b}3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 \textit{xd}5 10 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 11 \textit{xe}5 c6 12 d4 \textit{d}6 13 \textit{e}1 \textit{h}4 14 g3 \textit{h}3 15 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}4 16 \textit{d}3 \textit{(D)} \textit{ae}8
16...f5?!

17 \textit{f}1 – Game 6
17 f4 \textit{h}8 18 \textit{xd}5 cxd5 19 \textit{d}2 g5 20 \textit{f}1 \textit{h}5 21 a4 \textit{(D)}
21...\textit{xa}4 – Game 7
21...\textit{ae}8 – Game 8

17 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}6
17...\textit{h}5 – Game 5

18 a4 bxa4
18...\textit{h}5 – Game 4

19 \textit{xa}4 f5 20 \textit{f}1 \textit{h}5 \textit{(D)} 21 f4 – Game 1
21 c4 – Game 2
21 \textit{xa}6 – Game 3
1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 b5 a6 4 Qa4 Qf6 5 0-0 Qe7 6 b6 1 b5 7 Qb3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 Qxd5 10 Qxe5 Qxe5 11 c6 Qxc6 12 d4 Qd6 13 e1 Wh4 14 g3 Wh3 15 Qe4

In this chapter we see the very popular rook manoeuvre Qe1-c4, with which White prevents Black’s standard attack of ...Qc8-g4 etc. It may look as if White’s rook on e4 is exposed. However, in some lines the rook endangers itself even further by going to h4.

In Game 9 we shall see that 15...Qb7?! stands close to being refuted. It is important to observe, despite looking awkward at first glance, how usefully placed the white rook is in an attacking role on the h-file.

In T.Ernst-Hebden (Game 10) White immediately tries to chase away Black’s queen from its attacking position by playing 16 Wh1?! However, it will later transpire that this plan in fact helps Black’s development more than it does White’s.

Games 11-15 deal with the often-played 16 Wh3. After the logical reply 16...Qf5 White has the choice between exchanging on d5 (Game 11), which gives Black control of the e4-square, and offering a positional sacrifice of the exchange by playing 17 Qc2? (Games 12-15). The positional exchange sacrifice is very interesting — its aim is to diminish Black’s attacking potential on the kingside while at the same time reckoning on Black’s kingside weaknesses caused by the sharp and brave 15...g5!.

17...Qf4?! (Game 12) is an attempt by Black to break up White’s rock-solid kingside, but Black’s kingside then becomes vulnerable so this move enjoys a dubious reputation.

Although Black lost after 17...Qf4? (Game 13), the reader can see from the commentary of the game that Black could have improved on his play so this move can be considered a viable sideline.

Games 14-15 witness 17...Qxe4, when Black accepts the challenge by taking the offered exchange sacrifice. 20 Qd5? (Game 14) is a positional error because after the exchange White’s compensation for the sacrificed exchange becomes minimal. The correct move is 20 Qd3! (Game 15) leading to a complicated position with mutual chances where each side has its trump.

16 Wh3?! has lately been the focus of theoretical research and has been played by a couple of super-GMs. For the moment it has replaced the standard 16 Wh3.

After 16...f5 White should firstly include 17 Qxd5+. It seems that after 17 Qe6? (Game 16) White loses by force — despite his
large material advantage he is unable to prevent being mated!

The initiative is a continuously important theme of the Marshall Attack and Ponomariov-Anand (Game 17) confirms this. Anand produces a study-like combination leading to perpetual check, which leads to the conclusion that 16 We2 f5 is fully playable for Black.

In the final game of this chapter (Ponomariov-Adams) we see 16...Qf6. A very complicated position arises with White having a minor piece and a pawn for a rook.

**Game 9**
**Leko-Adams**
**Dortmund 1999**

1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 b5 4 a4 Qf6 5 Qe2 6 Qe1 Qf5 7 Qg5 8 Qe3 Qxe5 11 Qxe5 c6 12 Qd4 Qd6 13 Qe1 Wh4 14 g3 Wh3 15 Qe4

With this rook manoeuvre White is preventing both...Qg4 and...Qxf5 (if 15...Qf5?? then 16 Qh4! traps the queen) and sometimes, as in this game, the rook can be switched to the h-file with some threats against the black monarch.

15...Qh7?

We shall see both 15...Qd7 and 15...g5 in later games.

16 Qh4 Qe6 17 Qd2 f5

Neither alternative grants Black an easy game:

a) 17...Qf8 18 Qe4 Qe7 19 Qc5 Qxc5 20 dxc5 Qe7 21 Wd3! g6 22 Wd2 h5 23 Qxd5 exd5 24 Wd4 and White was a pawn up with a dominant position due to the passive bishop on b7 in Nunn-Hebden, London 1990.

b) 17...Qae8 18 Qe4 Qe7 19 Qc5 Qxc5 20 dxc5 Qe7 21 Wd4 (the difference is that with the rook on f8, against 21 Wd3 Black can answer 21...f5 avoiding the weakening of the dark squares around his king) 21...f5 22 Qf4 Qf7 23 Qd6 Qe6 24 Wd2 h6 25 c4 bxc4 26 Qxc4 g5 27 f4 Qe2 28 Wxe2 Qxe2 29 Qc2 and White has a clear advantage with his extra pawn in Sandipan-Yurtsev, Asian Championship, Calcutta 2001.

18 Wh5! h6 19 Qf3 Qe7 20 Qh3 c5

Black seeks the only way to get some activity but freeing his light-squared bishop also strengthens its counterpart on b3.

Very passive for Black is 20...Qae8 21 Qf4!, planning to follow up with Qc5 etc.

21 dxc5 Qxc5 22 Qf4 Qae8

After 22...Qe2 White can ignore Black's threat of taking on f2 with check by playing 23 Qxh6, when he obtains a decisive kingside attack. Note how the seemingly awkwardly-placed rook on h3 fulfils an attacking role.

23 Qd1

Of course not 23 Qc1?? Qxe1+ 24 Qxe1 Qxe1+ 25 Qg2 Wh7!, when White has no defence against the deadly discovered check on the a8-h1 diagonal.

23...Qe7

After 23...Qe2 all Black's threats are repelled by 24 Qd2!.

24 Qg5! Qd7

24...Qf7 25 Qxh6 gxh6 26 Qg5! Qxh2+ 27 Qxf2 Qe3+ 28 Qf1 Qxg5 29 Qxg5+ hxg5 30 Qxd5 Qxd5 31 Qe5 leads to a probable won ending for White.

25 Qe1 Qb6

Or 25...Qf7 26 Qe5! Qxh5 27 Qxh5 Qe8

27
28 \texttt{\textfrak{d}2} \texttt{\textfrak{d}e7} 29 \texttt{\textfrak{d}3} and White retains the extra pawn for the ending.

\textbf{26 \texttt{\textfrak{e}2} \texttt{\textfrak{h}7}}

Again the bishop is taboo – 26...\texttt{\textfrak{xg}5?} 27 \texttt{\textfrak{w}h7+} \texttt{\textfrak{f}7} 28 \texttt{\textfrak{xg}5+} \texttt{\textfrak{f}6} 29 \texttt{\textfrak{h}6+} \texttt{\textfrak{xg}5} 30 \texttt{\textfrak{g}6+!!} \texttt{\textfrak{w}xg}6 31 \texttt{\textfrak{w}h}4 is a nice mate!

\textbf{27 \texttt{\textfrak{h}4}!}

White is preparing to sacrifice his bishop on \texttt{\textfrak{h}6}, which Adams overlooks.

\textbf{27...\texttt{\textfrak{a}5}?}

The only move was 27...\texttt{\textfrak{d}6} but after 28 \texttt{\textfrak{c}2}! it is difficult to suggest any good move for Black. Here we see White attacking on the kingside which is not often the case in this opening.

\textbf{28 \texttt{\textfrak{xh}6!} \texttt{\textfrak{w}xh}6}

Also losing is 28...\texttt{\textfrak{gxh}6} 29 \texttt{\textfrak{e}6!} \texttt{\textfrak{xf}2+} 30 \texttt{\textfrak{f}1} \texttt{\textfrak{e}3+} 31 \texttt{\textfrak{e}2} \texttt{\textfrak{xf}3+} 32 \texttt{\textfrak{xf}3} \texttt{\textfrak{w}b}7+ 33 \texttt{\textfrak{e}2}!

and mate follows after the capture on \texttt{\textfrak{h}6}.

\textbf{29 \texttt{\textfrak{w}g}5 \texttt{\textfrak{a}4} 30 \texttt{\textfrak{e}6} 1-0}

\textbf{Game 10}

\textbf{T.Ernst-Hebden}

\textbf{Gausdal 1987}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1 \texttt{\textsf{e}4} \texttt{\textsf{e}5} 2 \texttt{\textfrak{d}f}3 \texttt{\textfrak{c}c}6 3 \texttt{\textfrak{b}b}5 \texttt{\textsf{a}6} 4 \texttt{\textfrak{a}4} \texttt{\textfrak{c}c}6
  \item 5 0-0 \texttt{\textfrak{e}7} 6 \texttt{\textfrak{e}1} \texttt{\textsf{b}5} 7 \texttt{\textfrak{b}3} 0-0 8 \texttt{\textsf{c}3} \texttt{\textfrak{d}5}
  \item 9 \texttt{\textsf{exd}5} \texttt{\textfrak{d}5} 10 \texttt{\textfrak{xe}5} \texttt{\textfrak{dxe}5} 11 \texttt{\textfrak{xe}5} \texttt{\textsf{c}6}
  \item 12 \texttt{\textsf{d}4} \texttt{\textsf{d}6} 13 \texttt{\textfrak{e}1} \texttt{\textfrak{w}h}4 14 \texttt{\textfrak{g}3} \texttt{\textfrak{w}h}3 15 \texttt{\textfrak{e}e}4 \texttt{\textsf{g}5}!
\end{itemize}

This sharp move, after many years of tournament practice, has rebuffed all challenges and is regarded as Black’s most dynamic choice. The idea behind this at outwardly strange move is to deny White’s rook access to the \texttt{\textfrak{h}4}-square. It’s based on the tactical cheapo 16 \texttt{\textfrak{xg}5??} \texttt{\textfrak{w}f}5!, attacking both the rook on \texttt{e}4 and bishop on \texttt{g}5.

\textbf{16 \texttt{\textfrak{w}f}1?!}

This looks natural but we shall see that Black’s queen will feel even better off on \texttt{g}6 from where it will be possible to control the important \texttt{d}3-square. So theory, with good reason, considers the text less strong than 16 \texttt{\textfrak{f}3}.

\textbf{16...\texttt{\textfrak{w}h}5!}

Stronger than 16...\texttt{\textfrak{h}6}?! 17 \texttt{\textfrak{f}3} \texttt{\textfrak{h}8} 18 \texttt{\textfrak{d}2} \texttt{\textfrak{h}3} 19 \texttt{\textfrak{w}e}1 \texttt{\textfrak{f}4}?! (Black is trying at all costs to open the \texttt{g}-file for attack but White wisely rejects the sacrifice) 20 \texttt{\textfrak{f}1}! (White can draw after 20 \texttt{\textfrak{gx}f}4?! \texttt{\textfrak{gx}f}4 21 \texttt{\textfrak{h}1} \texttt{\textfrak{g}8} 22 \texttt{\textfrak{e}2} \texttt{\textfrak{w}7} 23 \texttt{\textfrak{w}2} \texttt{\textfrak{e}7} 24 \texttt{\textfrak{xe}7}!)

22
\[^g2+\] 20...\[^g7\] 21 \[^f2\] \[^d3\] 22 \[^d2\] \[^xc1\] 23 \[^xc1\] f5 24 \[^e6\] \[^ad8\] 25 \[^f2\] and Black had inadequate compensation for the pawn in Kr.Georgiev-Tseshkovsky, Moscow 1985.

17 \[^e2\]

Worse is 17 \[^d2?!\] \[^f5\] (also very good for Black is 17...f5!? 18 \[^e1\] f4 etc. with a strong attack) 18 \[^e1\] h3 19 \[^e2\] \[^g4\] 20 \[^f1\] \[^ae8\] 21 \[^a3\] h3 (avoiding 21...\[^e2\] 22 \[^d1\] with a pleasant exchange for White) 22 \[^d3\] \[^f4\] 23 \[^xf4\] (or 23 gxf4? gxf4 24 \[^h1\] f3 and it is difficult to find a defence for White) 23...gxf4 24 \[^c2\] \[^g4\] 25 \[^xe8\] \[^xe8\] 26 \[^e1\] \[^e2\] 27 \[^d2\] \[^f3\] 28 d5 c5! (White is completely tied down and is almost in zugzwang!) 29 \[^a3\] fxg3 30 \[^g5+\] \[^h8\] 31 hxg3 \[^g8\] 32 \[^h4\] \[^xg3\] 0-1 Smolensky-Heffner, correspondence 1985.

17...

...\[^f6\]-h4 followed by ...\[^e8\]-e1. Against this plan there is little that White can do.

26 a4

Desperation.

26...\[^h4\] 27 \[^e4\] \[^g8\]

White was hoping for 27...\[^xe4\]? 28 \[^d2\] and the threat of \[^h3\]xf7 gives him a chance.

28 \[^f2\]

There was nothing better because if 28 \[^f2\], 28...\[^xe4\]! 29 \[^xh4\] \[^xf3\] is mate while if 28 \[^d1\], 28...\[^h3\] or 28...\[^xe4\] 29 fx4 \[^f2\] wins for Black. After the text Black wins the queen and the rest needs no further explanation.

28...\[^xg1+\] 29 \[^xg1\] \[^g5+\] 30 \[^h1\] \[^f1\]

31 \[^g4\] h5 32 \[^d2\] \[^e2\] 33 \[^e5\] \[^xe5\]

34 \[^d1\] \[^f1\] 0-1

---

Due to the threat ...\[^f4\]-e2+, White has no option but to accept the offered piece. This kind of sacrifice is seen both in the Marshall and the King's Indian Defence. Bearing in mind White's dormant queenside pieces, the sacrifice is completely sound. Black will gain control of the g-file and this will expose the white king.

22 gxf4 gxf4+ 23 \[^h1\] \[^h8\] 24 \[^g1\] \[^f6\]

25 f3 \[^e8\]!

Black prevents White having the opportunity to free himself by \[^d2\]-e4 (when ...\[^e8\]-xe4 wins at once) and is planning

\[^f6\]-h4 followed by ...\[^e8\]-e1. Against this plan there is little that White can do.

26 a4

Desperation.

26...\[^h4\] 27 \[^e4\] \[^g8\]

White was hoping for 27...\[^xe4\]? 28 \[^d2\] and the threat of \[^h3\]xf7 gives him a chance.

28 \[^f2\]

There was nothing better because if 28 \[^f2\], 28...\[^xe4\]! 29 \[^xh4\] \[^xf3\] is mate while if 28 \[^d1\], 28...\[^h3\] or 28...\[^xe4\] 29 fx4 \[^f2\] wins for Black. After the text Black wins the queen and the rest needs no further explanation.

28...\[^xg1+\] 29 \[^xg1\] \[^g5+\] 30 \[^h1\] \[^f1\]

31 \[^g4\] h5 32 \[^d2\] \[^e2\] 33 \[^e5\] \[^xe5\]

34 \[^d1\] \[^f1\] 0-1

---

**Game 11**

Jonsson-Berzinsh

Hallsberg 1993

1 e4 e5 2 \[^c3\] \[^c6\] 3 \[^b5\] a6 4 \[^a4\] \[^f6\]

5 0-0 \[^e7\] 6 \[^e1\] b5 7 \[^b3\] 0-0 8 c3 d5

9 exd5 \[^xd5\] 10 \[^xe5\] \[^xe5\] 11 \[^xe5\] c6

12 d4 \[^d6\] 13 \[^e1\] \[^h4\] 14 g3 \[^h3\] 15

\[^e4\] g5! 16 \[^f3\] \[^f5\] 17 \[^xd5\] \[^xd5\] 18

\[^e3\] \[^e4\]

This is the more popular choice and probably stronger than the rarely seen 18...\[^ad8\] (used by Adams against Leko in Wijk aan Zee 2001), after which Black gets just about enough compensation for the
pawn. That game continued 19 \( \textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}e8 20 \textit{b}3 \textit{g}7 21 \textit{b}2 \textit{g}4 22 \textit{w}g2 \textit{w}g2+ 23 \textit{w}xg2 \textit{x}e3 24 \textit{f}xe3 \textit{w}e8 25 \textit{c}e1 \textit{f}5 26 \textit{f}f2 \textit{d}3 27 \textit{d}1 1/2-1/2 (it is difficult to see how White can make further progress).

19 \( \textit{e}xe4 \textit{d}xe4 20 \textit{w}f6

Of course not 20 \( \textit{w}xe4?? \textit{a}e8 winning for Black.

This is the critical position arising from 17 \( \textit{a}xd5 which is rightly considered as a drawing line because both sides have perpetual checks in many lines (Black using the d1-h5 diagonal after 20..\( \textit{w}g4 21 \textit{c}3 \textit{e}7 22 \textit{w}xe7 \textit{d}1+1! is one demonstration).

20...

This is slightly more accurate than 20..\( \textit{w}g4, which often leads, by transposition, to an ending as in the text game. However, it can also have a separate meaning after 21 \( \textit{d}d2 \textit{f}4 (a very messy position arose after 21..\textit{a}e8 22 \textit{f}1 - 22 \textit{w}xd6? \textit{c}3! is very difficult to meet - 22..\textit{c}7 23 \textit{w}xa6 \textit{f}5 24 \textit{w}xb5 \textit{f}4 and in this hair-raising position a draw was agreed in the game Timman-Ivanchuk, Linares 1991) 22 \textit{f}f1 \textit{a}c1 23 \textit{a}c1 \textit{w}h5 (here we see the difference; with the queen on \textit{g}4 White will win a tempo with the manoeuvre \textit{f}f1-e3) 24 \textit{a}e3 \textit{w}g6 25 \textit{d}d5 \textit{w}g7 26 \textit{e}c1 \textit{d}d8 27 \textit{e}7+ \textit{f}8 28 \textit{w}xg7+ \textit{a}xg7 29 \textit{a}xe4 and White was better in the game Hernandez Molina-R.Fernandez, correspondence 1994. Two pawns usually outweigh the exchange when there are no open files for the rook as in this game.

21 \( \textit{w}xg5+

Also here there is 21 \( \textit{d}d2, which is best met by 21..\textit{a}e8! 22 \textit{w}xd6 \textit{e}3! with a strong attack - there is just enough time for White to bring both the rook on \textit{a}1 and the bishop on \textit{c}1 into play.

21...

The best plan, after which it is not easy to assess who is better in the arising ending.

The other plan, bringing the king into the centre, promises less after 23..\( \textit{h}7 24 \textit{a}4 etc.

Black's plan is simple - play ..\textit{f}5-\textit{f}4 and, after the exchange of bishops, ..\textit{e}4-\textit{e}3, when Black's rooks will become dangerously active.

24 \( \textit{a}4?

White's move is thematic - he opens the a-file in order to create weaknesses in the black camp. However, sometimes thematic moves, as played in this game, just don't work!

Maybe here White should try 24 \textit{a}e1, thus preventing ..\textit{f}5-\textit{f}4.

24...

After 25 axb5 very unpleasant for White is 25..\textit{e}3.

25...

In order to prevent ..\textit{f}8-\textit{f}2 but after the next move Black's pawn on \textit{a}4 will become strong.

28...\textit{b}xa4 29 \textit{e}4 \textit{w}f1+ 30 \textit{w}f1 \textit{d}b8 31 \textit{c}4 \textit{d}xb2!!
White had overlooked this tactic. After 32 \( \square x b 2 \) \( a 3 \) there is nothing to stop the pawn from promoting. The rest is simple.
\[
32 \text{ d}5 \text{ } \text{d}3 \text{ d}6 \text{ } \text{d}x \text{d}6! 0-1
\]

The Modern Method: 12 d4 and 15 \( \text{c}4 \)

This move is considered to be a sideline against 17 \( \text{c}2 \) and theory strongly condemns it. White should just stay calm and ensure his kingside remains solid. Usually White gets one or sometimes two pawns for the exchange but then Black’s attack disap-

pears. The game now takes a positional turn – eventually Black’s weaknesses begin to tell.
\[
18 \text{ } \text{x} f4 \text{ } \text{g}x \text{f}4
\]

With this move Black has recently been trying to rehabilitate 17...\( \text{d}4 \)?! Old theory just considers 18...\( \text{c}x \text{e}4 \)?! 19 \( \text{c}x \text{e}4 \) \( \text{g}x \text{f}4 \) 20 \( \text{c}x \text{c}6 \) \( \text{f}x \text{g}3 \) 21 \( \text{f}x \text{g}3 \) with an obvious advantage to White (Harding).
\[
19 \text{ } \text{d}2 \text{ } \text{h}8
\]

After 19...\( \text{c}a \text{d}8 \) White can continue 20 \( \text{a} \text{e} \text{c}1 \), when his centralised pieces grant him an advantage despite the material deficit.
\[
20 \text{ } \text{b}3 \text{ } \text{g}8
\]

Or 20...\( \text{f}x \text{g}3 \) 21 \( \text{f}x \text{g}3 \) \( \text{c}x \text{e}4 \) (if 21...\( \text{g}8 \) 22 \( \text{c}3 \) White keeps the advantage) and now 22 \( \text{w}f6 \) followed by \( \text{w}x \text{e}4 \) is indeed terrible for Black.
\[
21 \text{ } \text{f}x \text{f}4 \text{ } \text{f}x \text{f}4 \text{ } 22 \text{ } \text{w}x \text{f}4 \text{ } \text{w}h5 \text{ } 23 \text{ } \text{c}e \text{e}1 \text{ } \text{g}8 \text{ } 24 \text{ } \text{c}e \text{e}5 \text{ } \text{c}x \text{e}5 \text{ } 25 \text{ } \text{w}x \text{e}5 \text{ } \text{g}8 \text{ } 26 \text{ } \text{c}e \text{e}4
\]

The weaknesses of the dark squares grant White a positionally won game.
\[
26...\text{w}g6 \text{ } 27 \text{ } \text{f}6 \text{ }+ \text{ } \text{f}8 \text{ } 28 \text{ } \text{c}5\text{+}
\]

Very attractive looking is 28 d5 \( \text{c}x \text{d}5 \) 29 \( \text{c}x \text{d}5 \) but Black can hold his own after 29...\( \text{c}e \text{e}6 \) 30 \( \text{w}h8 \) \( \text{g}8 \) etc.
\[
28...\text{w}g7 \text{ } 29 \text{ } \text{w}x \text{c}6 \text{ } \text{d}8 \text{ } 30 \text{ } \text{e}6 \text{+ } \text{f}8 \text{ } 31 \text{ } \text{w}x \text{g}6 \text{ } \text{f}x \text{g}3 \text{ } 32 \text{ } \text{c}c7 \text{ } \text{d}6 \text{ } 33 \text{ } \text{f}3
\]

With three pawns for the exchange the win for White is but a question of time but sometimes miracles can happen in chess.
\[
33...\text{c}6 \text{ } 34 \text{ } \text{d}5 \text{ } a5 \text{ } 35 \text{ } a4 \text{ } b4 \text{ } 36 \text{ } c4 \text{ } \text{c}6 \text{ } 37 \text{ } \text{f}2 \text{ } g5 \text{ } 38 \text{ } \text{e}3 \text{ } \text{d}3 \text{ } 39 \text{ } \text{d}5 \text{ } \text{e}5 \text{ } 40
\]

25
Better is 18...gxh4? with the intention of softening up White’s kingside after the exchange on g3. Then play can continue 19 \( \text{Q}d2 \text{fxg3} 20 \text{hxg3} \) (worse is 20 \( \text{fxg3} \)), weakening the e3-square; Hursch-Leonard, correspondence 1999 continued 20...\( \text{Qxe4} \) 21 \( \text{Qxe4} \) f5 22 \( \text{Qxf}2 \) \( \text{Wh}6 \) 23 \( \text{Qxf5} \) \( \text{Qae8} \) 20...\( \text{Qxe4} \) 21 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Wh}6 \) 22 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{Qad}8 \) 23 \( \text{Qe}1 \) and according to American Grandmaster Leonid Shamkovich we have reached a balanced position in which Black’s worse pawn structure grants White sufficient compensation for the material deficit, but not more than that.

19 \( \text{Qd}2 \) \( \text{Qg}4 \) 20 \( \text{Wh}1 \) \( \text{Qe}2+ \)

Or 20...f5 21 \( \text{Qe}1 \) \( \text{Qe}2+ \) 22 \( \text{Qxe}2 \) \( \text{Qxe}2 \) 23 \( \text{Qxc}6 \) \( \text{Qae}8 \) 24 \( \text{Qc}1 \) (even stronger is 24 \( \text{Qb}3+ \) \( \text{Qg}7 \) 25 \( \text{Qc}7+ \) \( \text{Qg}6 \) 26 \( \text{Qf}7+ \) \( \text{Qf}6 \) 27 \( \text{Qxe}8 \) \( \text{Qxe}8 \) 28 d5 with a winning position for White, Noble-Sarfaty, Auckland 1993) 24...f4 25 \( \text{Qc}4 \) \( \text{Qxc}4 \) 26 \( \text{Qxe}4 \) f3 27 \( \text{Qd}5+ \) \( \text{Qh}8 \) 28 \( \text{Qe}5+ \) \( \text{Qg}8 \) 29 \( \text{Qxg}5+ \) \( \text{Qh}8 \) 30 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) \( \text{Qxf}3 \) 31 \( \text{Qe}5+ \) \( \text{Qg}8 \) 32 \( \text{Qe}6+ \) \( \text{Qxe}6 \) 33 \( \text{Qxe}6 \) \( \text{Qf}7 \) 34 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Qd}5 \) 35 b3 and with four pawns for the piece White has a clear winning advantage in Perez-de la Paz, Santa Clara 1998.

21 \( \text{Qxe}2 \) \( \text{Qxe}2 \) 22 \( \text{Qxc}6 \) \( \text{Qh}5 \) 23 \( \text{Qh}6 \)!

After this strong move, which gives an unpleasant pin on the h-file, Black’s position falls to pieces.

23...f5 24 \( \text{Qxg}5+ \) \( \text{Qg}6 \) 25 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Qh}5 \) 26 \( \text{Qf}4 \) \( \text{Qae}8 \) 27 \( \text{Qe}5 \) 1-0

Although White’s position is indeed
dominant, Black’s resignation is somewhat premature.

after 21...\textit{xf4} 22 \textit{xf4} \textit{e1+} 23 \textit{g2} \textit{ae8}
would have led to a deadly pin on the first rank.

21...f4!

Thematic. Black needs space for his rooks
to work in even at the cost of some material.

22 \textit{xf4}

White could also play 22 \textit{d3} instead but
after 22...\textit{xg3} Black’s advantage is obvious
due to his dangerous attack on the f-file.

\textit{xf4} 23 \textit{gxf4} \textit{a7}!

An instructive manoeuvre which occurs
from time to time in this opening. The rook
is switched to the kingside to put pressure on
White’s weak f-pawns.

24 \textit{h1} \textit{e7} 25 \textit{g1+} \textit{h8} 26 \textit{f1} \textit{e4}

The ending will be very difficult for White
to defend because there is no way White can
get his knight to c5.

27 \textit{g2}

Or 27 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 28 \textit{c3} \textit{xf4} 29
\textit{xd5} \textit{xf2} and Black has made a decisive
intrusion along the seventh rank.

27...\textit{xf3+} 28 \textit{xf3} \textit{e1}

Very accurate. This forces White to aban-
don the g-file. White’s king is in zugzwang.

29 \textit{h1} \textit{e4} 30 \textit{d2} \textit{xf4+} 31 \textit{e3}
\textit{xf2} 32 \textit{a4} \textit{g2} 33 \textit{axb5} \textit{axb5} 34 \textit{b3}
\textit{f2} 35 \textit{f3} \textit{b2} 36 \textit{b4} \textit{gc2} 37 \textit{d3}
\textit{f2} 38 \textit{e3} \textit{e2+} 39 \textit{d3} \textit{a2} 40 \textit{e3}
\textit{ae2+} 41 \textit{d3} \textit{e4}!

Creating a mating net around the king.

42 \textit{e5} \textit{fe2}! 0-1
Kingside pawn majority, supported by a strong pair of bishops, proved decisive in Milos-Egger, Sao Paulo 1993.

21...\textbf{We4}

Facing Black's growing attack along the f-file, White logically seeks the exchange of queens, reckoning that two pawns for the exchange will give him the better chances.

21...\textbf{Wd7}

Stanisewski-Blatny, Nalenczow 1985 confirmed that the endgame favours White after 21...\textbf{Wxe4}?! 22 \textbf{Ax}e4 \textbf{Ae}8 23 \textbf{Qd}2 \textbf{Ae}6 24 \textbf{Qg}2 \textbf{Wg}7 25 \textbf{g}4 \textbf{h}6 26 \textbf{Wh}4 \textbf{Ae}8 27 \textbf{Qf}3! \textbf{Ae}7 28 \textbf{Af}5 \textbf{Me}1 29 \textbf{Xe}1 \textbf{Xe}1 30 \textbf{Aa}7! etc.

Interesting is 21...\textbf{Wf7}?! (with pressure along the f-file) which, to date, has not been tested in tournament play.

For 21...\textbf{Wh}3 it is important to mention the game Kr.Geojiev-Lukacs, Baile Herclu lane 1982 which continued 22 \textbf{Ah}4! \textbf{Aa}7 23 \textbf{Qd}2 \textbf{Hg}7 24 \textbf{Af}1 \textbf{Wd}7 (or 24...\textbf{Wh}4?!) 25 \textbf{Qe}6+ followed by \textbf{Wx}d6 which is clearly better for White - Black needs his dark-squared bishop in order to pressurise g3) 25 \textbf{Ae}1 \textbf{Cc}7 26 \textbf{Xe}7! \textbf{Ae}7 27 \textbf{Ab}1 \textbf{f}xg3 28 \textbf{hx}g3 \textbf{Ae}8 29 \textbf{Ae}7 \textbf{Ae}7 30 \textbf{Qf}3 and White was slightly better - he has two pawns for the exchange whilst Black's kingside onslaught has been repelled.

22 \textbf{Qd}2 \textbf{Ae}8 23 \textbf{Wh}1!

Although h1 looks like an awkward square for the queen, it is in fact forced because 23 \textbf{Wg}2?! is refuted outright by 23...\textbf{Wg}4! (also

Practice has shown that White needs his light-squared bishop in order to justify the exchange sacrifice.

20...f4

The alternative is to insert 20...h6, which is a recommendation of John Nunn. It is important to mention the game Hovde-Sarkin, correspondence 1991-92 which continued 21 \textbf{Ad}2 \textbf{Aa}7 (this position John Nunn assessed as unclear) 22 \textbf{C}a3 \textbf{Ag}7 23 \textbf{Ce}1 \textbf{W}f6 24 c4?! \textbf{Cc}7?! 25 \textbf{Wh}1 b4 26 \textbf{Cc}2 a5? (Black had to play 26...c5 instead) 27 c5! \textbf{Cc}7 28 \textbf{Cc}4+ with an obvious advantage for White. Instead of the passive 24...\textbf{Cc}7, an interesting try would have been 24...\textbf{Cd}4?! 25 \textbf{Xxb}4 \textbf{Xxb}4 26 \textbf{Cc}5 \textbf{f}4 27 \textbf{f}5 with mutual chances in a very messy position.

Black can also play 20...\textbf{We}1+ but this doesn't yield much after 21 \textbf{Wg}2 \textbf{Ae}8 22 \textbf{Ad}2 \textbf{Cc}6 23 \textbf{Aa}3 \textbf{Xxa}3 24 \textbf{bxa}3 \textbf{Qb}6 25 \textbf{Me}1 \textbf{Wd}5 26 \textbf{Xxe}8 \textbf{Ae}8 27 \textbf{Xxf}5 \textbf{Cc}4 28 \textbf{Ah}6 \textbf{Cc}2 29 \textbf{Wxd}5+ \textbf{cxd}5 30 \textbf{h}4!. White's...
worthy of consideration is 23...f3? with the idea that if 24 \( \Box x f 3 \)!, 24...\( \Box g 4 \)! wins material 24 \( \Box h 4 \) f3 (this is the point – Black gets in ...f4-f3 with gain of tempo by attacking the white queen on g2) 25 \( \Box f 1 \) \( \Box f 4 \) 26 \( \Box b 1 \) \( \Box f 7 \) 27 \( \Box e 4 \) \( \Box h 3 + \) 28 \( \Box f 1 \) \( \Box f 4 \)! with a winning position for Black in the game Nameth-J.Horvath, correspondence 1992.

23...\( \Box f 7 \)

Now 23...\( \Box g 4 \) achieves nothing after 24 \( \Box e 4 \) etc.

24 \( \Box e 4 \) \( \Box f 8 \) 25 \( \Box f 3 \) \( \Box g 8 \) 26 \( \Box h 1 \) fxe3?!

This releases the tension on White’s kingside. Black should keep up the pressure hoping to eventually play ...f4-f3, which would promise some kingside initiative.

27 \( \Box x g 3 \)! \( \Box e 7 ? \)

This loses by force. Better was 27...h6 28 \( \Box d 2 \) \( \Box g 7 \).

28 \( \Box e 5 + \) \( \Box g 8 \) 29 \( \Box h 6 \) \( \Box f 8 \) 30 \( \Box g 1 + \) \( \Box g 7 \) 31 \( \Box x g 7 \)!

A good assessment of the situation, reckoning that Black will not find a safe haven for his king.

31...\( \Box x e 5 \) 32 \( \Box x e 5 + \) \( \Box f 7 \) 33 \( \Box d 6 + ! \) \( \Box e 7 \)

Forced because if 33...\( \Box x d 6 \) 34 \( \Box g 7 + \) easily wins.

34 \( \Box f 5 \) \( \Box d 8 \) 35 \( \Box e 1 \) 1-0

Black resigned because there is no decent defence against the deadly discovered check on the e-file.

As we shall see there is, in one line, a marked difference to the queen being on f3 as against e2. After \( \Box e 2 \), ...\( \Box f 5 - e 4 \) doesn’t win the exchange.

16...f5?!

The plan involving a kingside attack using pieces with 16...\( \Box f 6 \) and not pushing the f-pawn can be seen in Game 18.

17 \( \Box e 6 \)?

The correct 17 \( \Box x d 5 + ! \) cxd5 18 \( \Box e 6 ! \) is seen in Game 17.

17...\( \Box x e 6 \) 18 \( \Box x e 6 + \) \( \Box h 8 \) 19 \( \Box x d 6 \)

Unfortunately for White 19 \( \Box x d 5 \) now loses to 19...\( \Box a e 8 \) while the relatively more resilient 19 \( \Box e 2 \) \( \Box a e 8 \) 20 \( \Box f 1 \) \( \Box x f 1 + ! \) 21
The Marshall Attack

\[ \text{xf1} f4! \text{ still leaves Black on top despite the queens being off the board. This is due to the dormant White queenside pieces.} \\
19...\text{a8e} 20 \text{a6d2} \\
\text{Black also wins after 20 a3 f4 21 axd5 fxe3.} \\
20...f4 21 axd5 \\
\text{Or 21 a6d1 a6f6! 22 c5 a6h6 etc. with a mating attack.} \\
21...cxd5 22 f3 g4! 0-1

White resigned as he is unable to prevent mate in a couple of moves.

Game 17
Ponomariov-Anand
Linares 2002

1 e4 e5 2 a3 c6 3 a5 b6 4 a4 \text{xf6} \\
5 0-0 a7 6 a1 b5 7 a3 0-0 8 c3 d5 \\
9 exd5 cxd5 10 a5 xe5 11 a5 c6 \\
12 a4 d6 13 e1 a6 14 a3 a3 15 a4 g5! 16 a6 2?! f5!! 17 a5 a5+! cxd5 \\
18 a6e6! f4!

As we have already learned, timing in the Marshall Attack is of primary importance. Black hurries with his kingside attack, ignoring the threat to his dark-squared bishop. In this game Anand proves that 16...f5!! is playable for Black and it leads to a draw by perpetual check!

'Normal' moves lead to a nearly lost position for Black, which we see from the following analysis:

a) 18..c7 19 c6 a7 20 e7! with a decisive penetration into Black’s position.

b) 18...xe6 19 xe6+ f7 (or 19..h8 20 xg5 and there is no good defence against the nasty threat g5-f6+) 20 xd2! (It is important to retain the queen on e6, thus preserving an iron grip on Black’s position – just observe the poor role that Black’s dark-squared bishop is playing. On the contrary 20 xd6?! would have turned the position around in Black’s favour after 20 a8e 21 a6d2 f4! and suddenly Black’s attack is irresistible) 20..c7 21 f3 h6 22 xg5 hxg5 23 xf7+ xf7 24 xg5+ followed by a6h3 and White wins.

19 a6xd6 a6g4 20 f1

Forced since after 20 f3? a6e8 21 f1 a6xf1+ 22 a6xf1 fxg3 23 hxg3 a6f3+ 24 a6g2 a6e2+ 25 a6g1 a6h3 White will soon be mated.

20... a6xf1+!

White should not be allowed to buy necessary time for relief. Despite the exchange of queens, Black’s attack is extremely strong due to the inactivity of White’s queenside pieces.

21 a6xf1 a6e8 22 a6d2

Risky for White is 22 a6h6?! after which both 22..g7 and the subtle 22..a6f6! 23 f3 (What else? 23 a6xf6?? a6h3+ 24 a6g1 a6c1 is mate) 23..a6h6 24 a6xg4 a6xh2 and Black has at least a draw, if not more, with his rooks dominating the seventh rank.
22...h3+ 23 g1 fxg3 24 hgx3 e2 25 e3

This move leads to a draw but the following variations prove that Anand’s opening preparation was fantastic. In case White continues to play for a win (based on his overwhelming material advantage), he could have ended up in a lost position. For instance:

a) 25 h6? g4! 26 f4 g2+ 27 h1 e8!

and White can do nothing against Black’s rook invading the seventh rank with a mating attack to follow.

b) 25 f4 e8! 26 h6 g4! leads to the previously seen scenario with White helpless to do anything against Black’s mating attack.

25...xe3! 26 fxe3 f1+ 27 h2 g4!

Although a pawn up, White is too passive to play for a win as after 28 d2!? xa1 29 xax6 e1 30 b3 e2+ 31 g1 xb2 Black is more than happy.

Game 18

Ponomariov-Adams
Linares 2002

1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 cxd5 10 xe5 e5 11 xe5 e6 12 d4 d6 13 e1 h4 14 g3 h3 15 e4 g5! 16 e2? f1 17 d2

Due to the threat ...f6-g4 there is no time for White to retreat his rook. However, he rightly reckons on positional compensation for the exchange due to the weaknesses created in Black’s position after ...g7-g5.

17...f5 18 f3

The old game T.Petrosian-Averbakh, Moscow 1947 witnessed 18 e5? xe5 19 dxex e5 20 f3 e8 21 f1 xf1+ 22 xf1 h6 23 h4 e4 24 e1 e5 25 f4 gxf4! 26 gxf4 (or 26 fxe5 h3! and Black’s h-pawn is unstoppable) 26...e7 with a winning position for Black.

18...c5!

A dynamic continuation. Black is planning ...c5-c4 in order to restrict White’s lightsquared bishop. In the game J.Polgar-Onischuk, European Team Championship, Batumi 1999 the players agreed a draw after
18...\(\text{dx}e4\), which seems premature because after both 19 \(\text{fx}e4\) and 19 \(\text{Qxe}4\) \(\text{dxe}4\) 20 \(\text{fxe}4\), with the idea of playing \(\text{e}4\)–\(c5\), White’s position is preferable despite the small material deficit. Black’s pawn weaknesses are obvious and White’s light-squared bishop exerts strong pressure against \(\text{f}7\).

19 \(\text{Wf}2\)

An alternative is 19 \(\text{Wd}3\) \(\text{c}xe4\) 20 \(\text{Qxe}4\) (worse is 20 \(\text{fxe}4\)?! because of the tactical cheapo 20...\(\text{Wx}h2+!\) etc., while directly losing is 20 \(\text{Wxg}5+\) \(\text{x}g6\) 21 \(\text{Wx}f6\) \(\text{Qx}g3\) 22 \(\text{hx}g3\) \(\text{Wx}g3+\) 23 \(\text{Wf}1\) \(\text{Qae}8\) with mate to follow) 20...\(\text{dxe}4\) 21 \(\text{fxe}4\) \(\text{f}7\) leading to a pretty balanced position; after 22 \(\text{dxc}5\)?! Black has the strong reply in 22...\(\text{Qae}8\)!

19...\(\text{c}4\) 20 \(\text{c}x\text{c}2\) \(\text{h}6?!\)

A good positional move. Before deciding where to place his heavy pieces, Black defends the somewhat exposed g5-pawn.

21 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{cxb}3?!\)

I don’t like this move because it frees White’s dark-squared bishop. Seriously coming into consideration is 21...\(\text{Qae}8?!\) 22 \(\text{bxc}4\) \(\text{bxc}4\) 23 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{c}xe4\) 24 \(\text{Qxe}4\) \(\text{Wc}6\) hoping for 25 \(\text{b}6\) \(\text{c}xe4\) 26 \(\text{fxe}4\) \(\text{Wx}g3\)!, which is clearly in Black’s favour.

22 \(\text{axb}3\) \(\text{Qfc}8\) 23 \(\text{b}2\)

Premature is 23 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{b}4\) 24 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{a}3\) followed by \(...\text{Qd}8\) with strong pressure against White’s centre.

23...\(\text{xb}4?!\)

This is a serious mistake after which Black will not even have the consolation of extra material compensating for his weak kingside.

Better instead was 23...\(\text{Qf}8!\) 24 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{bxc}4\) 25 \(\text{bxc}4\) \(\text{Qg}7\), defending his weakened kingside and later taking the exchange on \(\text{e}4\). This would have kept the game alive.

24 \(\text{e}5!\)

Maybe Black forgot about this simple reply.

24...\(\text{Qxc}2\) 25 \(\text{cxb}4\) \(\text{Qg}6\) 26 \(\text{Qc}5\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 27 \(\text{Qf}1\) \(\text{Qad}8\) 28 \(\text{d}5\)

Opening up the a1-h8 diagonal is of decisive importance.

28...\(\text{Qd}7\) 29 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{h}5\) 30 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{h}4\) 31 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{hx}g3\) 32 \(\text{hx}g3\) \(\text{h}5\) 33 \(\text{d}6\) \(\text{Qe}4\) 34 \(\text{Qac}1!\) \(\text{Qxc}5\) 35 \(\text{bxc}5\) \(\text{Qh}7\) 36 \(\text{f}6\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 37 \(\text{d}7\) \(\text{Qh}4\)

The last chance is a kingside attack because Black’s position is already lost due to White’s passed c- and d-pawns. However, White is alert and duly repels Black’s attack.

38 \(\text{Wg}2!\) \(\text{f}3\) 39 \(\text{Wxh}3\) \(\text{Qxh}3\) 40 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{g}4\) 41 \(\text{Qf}1\) \(\text{h}5\) 42 \(\text{d}8\) \(\text{W}\) \(\text{x}d8\) 43 \(\text{Qxd}8\) \(\text{xf}5\) 44 \(\text{Qf}3\) \(\text{h}5\) 45 \(\text{h}4\) 1–0
Summary
Firstly, it looks like 15...g5! is certainly the way for Black to play - I cannot recommend the 15...\textit{xb}7 of Game 9.

The line 15...g5! 16 \textit{w}f3 \textit{\textit{xf}3} 17 \textit{\textit{\textit{xd}5}} cxd5 18 \textit{e}e4 \textit{\textit{xe}4} 19 \textit{\textit{xe}4} dxe4 20 \textit{w}f6 is generally considered to be drawish, but 17 \textit{\textit{c}2} leads to more interesting play in which both sides have their chances.

It will be interesting to see if there are any new developments with 15...g5! 16 \textit{w}e2!? because Ponomariov-Anand (Game 17) looks like best play and leads to a draw by perpetual check! This is important as Game 18 looks better for White, who has a strong centre and play against Black's weak pawns.

\begin{verbatim}
1 e4 e5 2 \textit{d}f3 \textit{c}c6 3 \textit{d}b5 a6 4 \textit{a}4 \textit{d}f6 5 0-0 \textit{e}e7 6 \textit{e}e1 b5 7 \textit{\textit{\textit{b}3}} 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 \textit{\textit{\textit{xd}5}} 10 \textit{\textit{xe}5} \textit{\textit{xe}5} 11 \textit{\textit{xe}5} c6 12 d4 \textit{\textit{d}6} 13 \textit{\textit{e}e1} \textit{\textit{\textit{wh}4}} 14 g3 \textit{\textit{wh}3} 15 \textit{\textit{xe}4} g5! (D):

15...\textit{b}7 - Game 9

16 \textit{w}f3

16 \textit{w}f1 - Game 10

16 \textit{w}e2!? (D)

16...\textit{\textit{d}6} - Game 18

16...\textit{f}5

17 \textit{\textit{\textit{xd}5}} - Game 17; 17 \textit{\textit{\textit{e}6}} - Game 16

16...\textit{f}5 17 \textit{\textit{c}2}

17 \textit{\textit{\textit{xd}5}} - Game 11

17...\textit{\textit{xe}4}

17...\textit{\textit{\textit{f}4}}? - Game 13; 17...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{f}4}}} - Game 12

18 \textit{\textit{xe}4} \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{w}e}6}}}} 19 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{x}g}5}}}} f5 (D) 20 \textit{\textit{d}3} - Game 15

20 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{xd}5}} - Game 14

15...g5!

16 \textit{w}e2!?

19...\textit{f}5
\end{verbatim}
CHAPTER THREE

12 d3 d6 13 e1 h4
14 g3 h3 15 e4

1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6
5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 cxd5 10 xe5 xe5 11 xe5 c6
12 d3 d6 13 e1 h4 14 g3 h3 15 e4

This chapter is very similar to the previous one. White again plays e1-e4, but this time with a pawn on d3 rather than d4. The upshot of this is that the rook is protected on e4 and 15...g5 can simply be answered by 16 xg5. Thus Black has to look for other ways to proceed.

We shall deal with Black’s four replies:

1) 15...d7 (Games 19-22)
2) 15...d7 (Games 23-24)
3) 15...f5 (Games 25-33)
4) 15...f6 (Games 34-37)

(1) 15...d7 has never enjoyed as much popularity as the other three options – against White’s best play Black cannot hope to achieve enough compensation.

In Game 19 Geller chooses 16...ae8, allowing White to place a rook on h4. Which side profits out of this? If Murey had continued 18 e4 e7 19 h5! (instead of the somewhat passive 18 f1?! which gave Black serious counterchances), he would have achieved an excellent position.

After 16 f2 we see the strange-looking 16...g5 with the idea of preventing the manoeuvre e4-h4, even at the cost of weakening his kingside (Games 20-22). After 17 e3 h6, instead of the artificial-looking 18 d4?! of Game 20, quite promising for White is 18 e5!. In the following two games, both featuring Gata Kamsky, White plays 17 e2 with the idea of later planting, if possible, a knight on e4. However, after 17...f5, 18 e4? gave Black fantastic play along the f-file following 18...fxe4 19 dxe4 g4 20 exd5 c5! (Game 21) mainly because White’s f2-square was very vulnerable. Much better is 18 c4! (Game 22).

(2) 15...d7 is designed to blunt White’s e4-h4 manoeuvre. In Game 23 the plan starting with f7-f5 does not succeed because the intended f5-f4 is never executed. This is prevented by the well-timed 18 f4!, which secures White a long lasting positional advantage. In Game 24 Black prefers 16...b7 and after 17 e1 c5 18 e4 e7 White tries to close the a8-h1 diagonal by playing 19 f3!, which proves to have the serious drawback of weakening White’s second rank and generally allowing his kingside to be pressurised.

(3) 15...f5 is the subject of Games 25-33. Black transfers his queen to g6 and delays
the final decision as to which diagonal his light-squared bishop belongs on.

After 16 \texttt{Qd}2 \texttt{Wg}6 we see, in Game 25, the rare continuation of 17 \texttt{Qf}3. White eventually got into trouble after misplacing his rook on h4, which left it out of play.

Black's threat of playing ...\texttt{Cc}8-f5, attacking White's rook, is met by 17 \texttt{We}1 in the following eight games. The move 17...\texttt{Cc}7?!., as seen in Smagin-Malaniuk (Game 26), is too slow and leaves White with a comfortable edge. Nor is 17...\texttt{Gg}4?! (Game 27) to be recommended. Black provokes White into playing \texttt{f}2-f3, hoping later to exploit the weakening of the kingside, but due to his powerful knight on e4 White keeps things firmly under control.

Stronger is 17...f5 (Games 28-33). By playing 18 e4 White forces the gain of material and the play is extremely sharp and of a forcing character. In Gara-Pokorna (Game 28), Black later committed an error which was left unpunished.

Not so impressive was Leko's invention of 18 \texttt{Df}3 against Svidler (Game 29). The idea behind this move is to transfer his knight to e5, when Black will have to trade in his dark-squared bishop. But what about the time invested? In the meantime Black manages to open the f-file, providing him with a lasting initiative.

Very original is Judith Polgar's manoeuvre against Adams when she played 18 \texttt{Wf}3 followed by \texttt{b}3-d1, intending to trade queens by playing \texttt{Wh}5 (Game 30). However, Black got in a quick ...f5-f4 to prevent her plan. The game remained in the balance until she erred on move 28.

By playing 18 a4 White intends to open the a-file – see Anand-Khalifman (Game 31). In this game, instead of the usual 20 \texttt{Df}3, Anand plays the novelty 20 \texttt{Dc}4?! but even in this case Black's chances are not worse.

With 18 \texttt{f}4 (Games 32-33) White prevents the move ...f5-f4 and gains time, albeit at the cost of giving back the pawn. Black must constantly be careful not to end up in an unappealing ending with a bad bishop against a good knight – after playing ...f7-f5 there is no pawn left defending the weak e5-square. After the forced sequence of moves 18...\texttt{xf}4 19 \texttt{Wf}3 \texttt{Db}8! 20 \texttt{xd}5+ \texttt{xd}5 Petar Popovic chooses 21 \texttt{Df}5?!., which is a passive choice because on f1 the knight has no future. Black quickly gets the better position after activating his pair of bishops.

Stronger is 21 \texttt{Db}3! (Game 33), intending to place the knight on the ideal blockading square d4. Black's key mistake in this game was putting his light-squared bishop on the passive b7-square. The commentary of the game confirms that Black could have reckoned on equality by placing the bishop on d7.

(4) The remaining four games all see 15...\texttt{Df}6. After 16 \texttt{Wf}4 \texttt{Wf}5 17 \texttt{Cc}2 the best way of parrying the threat of d3-d4 is 17...\texttt{Wg}6, as in Leko-Adams (Game 34).

Very popular is the critical line after 17 \texttt{Dd}2 g5?! (Games 35-36). Ivanchuk's 18 \texttt{Dd}4?! is the main reason why he later got into trouble. By playing the cool 18...\texttt{Cc}5 19 \texttt{Df}3 \texttt{h}6! (probably missed by Ivanchuk when he played 18 \texttt{Dd}4?!), Timman emphasised the weak situation of the White rook in the centre of the board by eventually capturing it. Stronger, however, is Svidler's 18 \texttt{Wh}6!.

White plays 17 \texttt{Wh}4 in Game 37, which was in the past the main continuation of the line commencing 15...\texttt{Df}6. I do not like the risky move 18...g5 for two reasons: firstly, it weakens the kingside and, secondly, White can force a draw by repetition. Instead I recommend 18...\texttt{h}6? with the idea of ignoring the rook on h4 and concentrating on the play in the centre.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 19}

\textbf{Murey-Geller}

\textbf{Amsterdam 1987}

1 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{e}5 2 \texttt{Df}3 \texttt{Dc}6 3 \texttt{b}5 \texttt{a}6 4 \texttt{a}4 \texttt{Df}6
\end{center}
Black decides to retain his bishop on the c8-h3 diagonal in order to control the important g4-square and he refrains from the traditional attack with ...f7-f5. However, this seems to me to be less dynamic so it’s no wonder that in recent years black players have switched back to the above-mentioned plans.

16 郀d2 郀e8 17 郀h4!?  

I quite like this rook manoeuvre. From here it guards the g4-square and prevents Black’s kingside attack.

Another possibility is the natural 17 郀xe8 郀xe8 18 郀e4 郀e7 19 郀d2 郀b6 20 郀f1, which still awaits further tests in tournament play.

17...郀f5 18 郀f1?  

Better was 18 郀e4 郀e7 19 郀h5 郀g6 20 郀e5!, keeping everything under control and retaining the extra pawn, for example: 20...f5 21 郀d2 f4 22 郀e4 郀h8 23 郀h5.

18...郀g6 19 郀d2  

White was obviously afraid to play 19 郀f3 because of 19...郀e1, but maybe that was not so tragic for White as he can then try 20 郀e4!?

19...郀f5  

Also good is 19...郀e7 20 郀e4 郀f5 21 郀e5 郀xd3 22 郀xd5 cxd5 23 郀e3 郀d6 24 郀xd5 郀e4! or 24 郀xe8 郀xe8 25 郀xd5 郀e2 26 郀f4 郀e4? 27 郀xd6 郀xd5; in both cases Black has excellent play.

20 郀xd5  

Forced because 22 d4? is bad due to 20...郀e7, trapping White’s rook.

20...郀xd5 21 郀c3 郀e6!?  

An alternative is 21...郀xd3 22 郀d4 郀e4 and now 23 f3? fails to 23...郀xg3! with a crushing attack for Black, while after 23 郀xd5 郀c5 24 郀f4 郀c6! White is losing material.

22 a4 郀e7 23 郀f4 郀g5 24 郀f3?  

The position is very complicated so no wonder mutual errors occur. Much better was 24 郀d4! 郀f6 25 郀xd5 郀xd5 26 郀xd5 郀xd3 27 郀xf6+ 郀xf6 and the game would most likely have ended in a draw.

24...郀b4 25 c4 郀xe3?  

Now it is Black who returns the favour. This exchange helps White to free his rook so better was 25...d4 26 郀c2 郀g4 27 郀xb4 郀h5 28 郀xd4 郀f6! 29 h3 郀xh3 30 郀c6 郀e6! and if 31 郀xf8? 郀e1+ 32 郀xe1 郀xf3 and White cannot prevent mate.

26 郀xe3 a5 27 c5 d4 28 郀e4 郀d8 29 郀c1 郀f5 30 郀e5 郀d7  

After 30...郀xd3 31 c6! White’s passed c-pawn becomes very strong.

31 郀g5 郀f6 32 c6? 郀xc6 33 郀gc5 郀f3 34 郀g5!  

The point of White’s 32nd move – with his well-centralised pieces he has a big posi-
tional advantage.
34...\texttt{Wxg5} 35 \texttt{Wxf3} \texttt{Wd2} 36 \texttt{Ae1}+ 37 \texttt{Ag2} b3 38 \texttt{Ae2} \texttt{Wb4}?

Better was 38...\texttt{Wb1}! and if 39 \texttt{Axa5}, 39...\texttt{Ec8} with some chances of survival for Black.
39 \texttt{Wc6}! \texttt{Wb8} 40 \texttt{Axa5} \texttt{Ed6} 41 \texttt{Wb5} \texttt{Ab6} 42 \texttt{We5} \texttt{Wd8} 43 \texttt{We7} \texttt{Wb8} 44 \texttt{Ae4} g6 45 \texttt{Aa7} \texttt{Wd6} 46 \texttt{Wxd6} \texttt{Axd6} 47 \texttt{Ae7} \texttt{Ec8} 48 \texttt{Axb3}

White has a technically winning position. The game needs no further commentary.
48...\texttt{Ec2} 49 h4 \texttt{Ad} 50 \texttt{Ae1} \texttt{Ed7} 51 a5 f5 52 \texttt{Ae2} \texttt{Ad} 53 \texttt{Ae1} \texttt{Ed2} 54 a6 \texttt{Ae} 55 \texttt{Ae1} \texttt{Ee7} 56 a7 1-0

White controls the g2-square so Black has no chances of perpetual.

\textbf{Game 20}

\textbf{Mukhutdinov-Berzinsh}

\textit{Naberezhne Chelni 1993}

1 e4 e5 2 \texttt{Ae} 3 \texttt{Cc6} 3 \texttt{Ab5} a6 4 \texttt{Aa4} \texttt{Af6} 5 0-0 \texttt{Ae} 6 b6 7 \texttt{Ab} 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 \texttt{Axd5} 10 \texttt{Axe5} \texttt{Axe5} 11 \texttt{Axe5} c6 12 \texttt{Ae1} \texttt{Ae} 6 13 d3 \texttt{Wh} 4 14 g3 \texttt{Wh} 3 15 \texttt{Ae} 4 \texttt{Ae} 7 16 \texttt{Ae} 2 g5 17 \texttt{Ae} 3

The white knight is heading towards e5 as well as attacking the pawn on g5.

Other moves are weaker:

\begin{enumerate}
\item 17 \texttt{Ae} 1 \texttt{Ag} 4! and now 18 f3? leads to a lost position for White after 18...\texttt{Axe} 5! – that’s why White plays the rook to e2 in some lines in order to protect the second rank.
\item 17 c4?! \texttt{Af} 6 18 \texttt{Ae} 2 \texttt{Ae} 4 19 f3 \texttt{Ae} 5+ 20 \texttt{Ae} 1 \texttt{Ae} 8! 21 fxg4 \texttt{Axe} 5+ (better is 21...\texttt{Axe} 5 and if 22 \texttt{Ae} 4, 22...\texttt{Axe} 4! 23 dxe4 \texttt{Af} 4! and Black wins) 22 \texttt{Axe} 5 \texttt{Ae} 8 23 \texttt{Ae} 4 (now it’s White’s turn to make an error; instead the simple 23 \texttt{Ae} 1 would have refuted Black’s attack and White’s material advantage would have prevailed) 23...\texttt{Axe} 4! 24 dxe4 \texttt{Axe} 4 25 \texttt{Ae} 4 (of course 25 \texttt{Axe} 4? \texttt{Ae} 1 mate was not possible) 25...\texttt{Ae} 2+ 26 \texttt{Af} 2 (26 \texttt{Ag} 1 \texttt{Axe} 4+ 27 \texttt{Ae} 1 gxf4 28 \texttt{Ae} 1 \texttt{Axe} 2 29 \texttt{Ae} 2 \texttt{Axe} 4+ 30 \texttt{Ae} 2 \texttt{Axe} 1 wins) 26...\texttt{Ae} 2 27 \texttt{Ae} 5 \texttt{Axe} 4 28 \texttt{Ae} 2 \texttt{We} 2-0 Richard Trueta, Budapest 1993.
\end{enumerate}

17...h6 18 \texttt{Ae} 4?!

With the idea of sacrificing the exchange on d5 if the opportune moment arises. However, the move is a bit too artificial and the real attack for Black must surely lie in 18 \texttt{Ae} 5!

and now:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Exchanging the dark-squared bishops with 18...\texttt{Axe} 5? 19 \texttt{Axe} 5 is anti-positional: 19...\texttt{Ae} 8 20 d4 \texttt{Ae} 6 21 \texttt{Ae} 3 \texttt{Ae} 7 (Liss-Computer Junior, Bukiarei Haim [rapid] 1995). Instead of 22 \texttt{Ae} 2?! f6 23 \texttt{Ae} 2 (Black has sufficient compensation after 23 \texttt{Ae} 6+ \texttt{Af} 8! 24 \texttt{Af} 5 \texttt{Ae} 5 25 \texttt{Ae} 5 \texttt{Ae} 5 26 \texttt{Ae} 5 \texttt{Ae} 1+ 27 \texttt{Ag} 2 \texttt{Ae} 7 because of the unpleasant pin and awkward placing of the white rook on f5) 23...\texttt{Af} 5! with unclear play, the simple
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22...d2! would have left White a pawn up and with the better position. For instance, the tactical try 22...Qf6 23...xe6 Qxe6 24...xe6 Qg4+ gives nothing to Black after 25...xh6! Qxh6 (or 25...Qxh6 26 h4 etc.) 26 f3 etc.

b) 18...f5 with a further split:

b1) 19 Qxc6 Qf6. Ivanchuk assesses this as bad for White but it might be playable after 20 Wf3? Qxe4 21 dxex4 Qg4 22 Wg2 Qxg2+ 23 Qxg2 Qe8 24 f3 – White is slightly better with two pawns for the exchange.

b2) 19 Qg4 Qf4! (with pressure against White’s king – this an improvement over 19...Qf4!?) 20 Qxh6+ Qxh6 21 gxh6 Qxe4 22 fxg5 Qg6 23 dxex4 Qxe4 24 c2 Wh4 25 Wf3 Qae8 26 Qd2 is slightly better for White.

b3) 19 Qe1 Qf6!? and Black’s counterplay on the kingside must not be underestimated.

18...c5

It is interesting to see how 18...Qae8? would have lost on the spot after the clever tactical resource by White – 19...xd5 cxd5 20 Qxd5 Qc6 21 Qxg5!.

(Black must have been hoping for a Christmas present with 21...Qxd6?? Qxf3 22 Wf1 Qe1! and White is mated) 21...Wd7 (or 21...hxg5? 22 Qxg5+ followed by Qg5-h5+ wins immediately for White) 22 Qe4! etc.

19...xd5

Obviously forced after 18 Qd4?! has been played.

Black is hoping to get an attack after opening up the f-file but his aggressive possibilities will diminish after the exchange of the light-squared bishops. Much stronger was 21...Qg4, after which I prefer Black – the main point is that after 22 dxec5 Qe6! Black regains the sacrificed piece with interest!

22...xf6 fxex6 23...e5 Qd6 24 Qd3 Wh5 25 Wh2 Qfe8 26...e3 e5 27...xe5 Qxe5 28 dxex5 Qxe5 29 a4 g4?!

Stronger is 29...Qd3!, keeping White’s advantage to a minimum.

30 axb5 axb5 31 b4 Wh4 32 Wh2+ Qf8??

This spoils quite an interesting game. After 32...Wh5 it would be very difficult for White to convert his advantage into a win.

33...c5+ Qg7 34 Qd4

Winning the exchange back and ending up with a decisive material advantage.

34...Qxd4 35 Wh7+ Wh6 36 Wh6+ Qe6 37 Qxe6+ Wh6 38 Whd4

The queen ending is easily won for White so the rest needs no further commentary.

38...h5 39 Wh3+ Qg7 40 Wxb5 Qe1+ 41 Wh1 Qxc3 42 Wb1 Qe6 43 b5 Wb7 44 b6 Qf6 45 Wh1 Qg6 46 Wc2+ Qf6 47 Wc3+ Qg6 48 Wd3+ Qf6 49 Wd6+ Qf5 50 Wh6 Qd7 51 Wxh5+ Qe4 52 Wh6+ Qf3 53 Wh6+ Qe2 54 Wh5+ 1-0

Game 21

Anand-Kamsky
Dortmund 1992

1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 Qf6 5 0-0 Qe7 6 Qe1 b5 7 Qb3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 Qxd5 10 Qxe5 Qxe5 11 Qxe5 c6 12 Qe1 Qd6 13 d3 Wh4 14 Qg3 Wh3 15 Qe4 Qd7 16 Qd2 g5 17 Qe2 f5 18 Qe4!

White underestimated the strength of Black’s 21st move, wrongly assessing the position to be in his favour. Better is 18 c4! which is dealt with in the next game.
The following continuations should also be mentioned:

a) 18 $\Delta f3! f4!$ (Black must open both the f-file and the diagonal for his light-squared bishop, which means that defending the g5-pawn with 18...h6? is too slow and out of the question) 19 $\Delta xg5 \text{Wh}5 20 \text{gx}f4!$ (better than 20 $\Delta xf4? \text{Hx}f4!$ 21 $\text{gx}f4 \Delta xf4$ 22 $\Delta f3 \Delta xg5$ with advantage to Black) 20...Hxf4 21 $\Delta f3$, keeping open the option of playing $\Delta g5$e4 with unclear play because the knight on g5 is indirectly defended (21...$\text{Wh}xg5$ 22 $\Delta g2$!).

b) 18 $\Delta xd5+t! cxd5$ 19 $\text{Wh}b3 \Delta c6$ 20 $\Delta f3$ f4! is clearly weaker—light squares around White’s king in rather vulnerable, for instance: 21 $\Delta xg5 \text{W}g4$ 22 $\Delta e6$ $\text{fxg}3$ and White is in deep trouble.

**18...fxe4 19 dxe4 $\Delta g4$ 20 exd5 c5!**

Shutting out the bishop on b3.

**21 $\text{Wh}1 \text{Wh}6!**

Much stronger than the queen exchange which would have just led to equality.

**22 $\Delta e3$**

White must cover the vulnerable g3-square because both 22 $\Delta e6? \Delta xg3$! and 22 $\Delta e1? c4$ 23 $\Delta c2 \Delta xg3$! 24 $\text{hxg}3 \Delta f3$ lose for White.

**22...c4 23 $\Delta c2 \Delta c5$ 24 $\Delta d2$**

Other moves are not much better either:

a) 24 b4 $\Delta b6!$ 25 a4 $\Delta d8$ 26 axb5 axb5.

b) 24 a4 has the idea of bringing White’s rook on a1 swiftly into the game. However, this is met by 24...$\Delta a8!$ 25 $\text{W}e1$ (or 25 $\Delta xe8?$ $\text{W}xe8!$ and White has difficulty in defending the f2-square) 25...$\text{Wh}3$ 26 $\Delta d1 \text{W}f7!$ and it is very difficult to find a decent move for White in this position.

**24...$\Delta xe3$**

Even stronger was 24...$\Delta d8!$ 25 $\Delta e4$ $\Delta d8!$ 26 $\text{W}g2$ (the only move because 26 $\Delta a1?$ loses on the spot to 26...$\Delta xe4!$ 27 $\Delta xe4 \Delta xf2+ 28 \text{W}xh2 \Delta xf2 29 \Delta xf2 \text{W}xh2+ 30 \Delta e3 \text{Wh}g3+ 31 \Delta d4 \text{Wd}3+$ followed by...$\text{W}xh2$) 26...$\text{Wh}3$ 27 $\Delta h1 \Delta xe3$ 28 $\Delta xe3$ $\text{W}e2!$ etc.

**25 $\Delta xe3 \Delta a8$ 26 $\Delta e1 \Delta f3$ 27 d6 $\Delta c6$ 28 $\text{W}e2$**

After 28 $\Delta d1$ both 28...$\text{W}f7$ and 28...$\text{W}g6$ leave Black with a substantial advantage.

**28...$\text{Wh}3$ 29 $\text{Wf}1 \text{We}6!$ 30 $\Delta d1 \text{Wd}5$**

Black doesn’t allow White to activate his bishop after 30...$\text{W}xh6$ 31 $\Delta g4$.

**31 f3 $\text{W}xh6$ 32 $\Delta d4$**

Of course the g5-pawn is taboo because 32 $\Delta xg5??$ drops a piece to 32...$\text{W}c5+$.

**32...$\Delta xe1$ 33 $\text{Wxe1} g4!?$**

White is grovelling, the exchange down, after 33...$\Delta xf3$ 34 $\Delta xf3 \Delta xf3 35 \text{W}e4$. A Black win is still far from easy, but with the text Black wants more and plays to continue the attack.

**34 $f4!?$**

White could have also tried 34 $\text{W}d2!?$, with the idea of $\text{W}g5+$ to follow and some chances of survival.

**34...$\text{Wd}5$ 35 $\Delta f2$ $\text{Wg}2+$ 36 $\Delta e3 \text{W}e8+$**
37 \text{xe}5 \text{wx}2b2 \text{38 x}xg4 \text{wc}2?!

Simpler is 38...\text{wx}a2, after which the black win is just a matter of time.

39 \text{xd}4!

The king runs into the security of the dark squares – the best practical chance.

39...\text{wd}3+

The situation sharply turns around after the careless 39...\text{wx}a2?? 40 \text{xc}5! \text{wg}2 41 \text{wd}1! – all of a sudden the white king is safe while it is Black who has to worry about the oncoming penetration of White’s queen.

40 \text{c}5 \text{wd}5+ 41 \text{b}4

After 41 \text{b}6?? b4! there is no retreat for White's king.

41...a5+ 42 \text{a}3 \text{wd}3 43 \text{b}2 b4 44 \text{wa}1

44 cxb4? axb4 45 \text{xb}4 \text{xe}5! 46 fxe5 \text{wd}4+ and Black picks up a piece and wins easily.

44...a4!

The position is more subtle than it might appear at first glance. If 44...\text{xe}4, then 45 \text{c}2 \text{wd}5 46 \text{ff}1! (but not 46 \text{d}1? \text{xd}1+ 47 \text{xd}1 \text{bxc}3 48 \text{xc}3 \text{eb}8 49 b2 c3! and Black wins) 46...\text{d}3 47 \text{f}3 \text{xf}3 48 \text{f}3 \text{bxc}3 49 \text{xc}3 \text{eb}8 50 a4! and White is not far from holding the ending.

45 \text{ae}2?!

More resilient is 45 cxb4 a3 46 \text{ec}2 (not 46 \text{ec}2? \text{xe}5! 47 fxe5 \text{wd}4+ with mate to follow) 46...\text{d}5! 47 \text{f}5 (or 47 \text{b}1 \text{h}1+ 48 \text{c}2 \text{a}4+ 49 \text{c}3 \text{a}1+! 50 \text{xc}4 \text{c}1+ 51 \text{xd}4 \text{d}8+ and Black wins) 47...\text{d}4+! 48 \text{xd}4 \text{xe}2 49 \text{b}1 \text{hx}b2 with excellent winning chances for Black.

45...\text{we}4 46 \text{wd}1 \text{bxc}3?

A blunder which saves White from defeat. After the logical 46...\text{d}5! 47 \text{g}4 \text{xe}5! 48 fxe5 \text{xe}5 49 \text{d}4 \text{xd}4 50 \text{xd}4 a3! 51 \text{f}5 \text{g}7 52 b4 h6 53 g4 \text{f}6 the bishop ending would be won for Black due to the cage-like position of the white king.

47 \text{xc}4+!

The thriller continues – White is alive again!

47...\text{f}8

The point is that after 47...\text{xc}4?? Black is mated: 48 \text{g}4+ \text{f}7 49 \text{f}5+ \text{e}7 50 \text{f}6+ \text{d}7 51 \text{d}6+ \text{c}8 52 \text{c}7 mate!

48 \text{d}6+

Wrong is the tempting 48 \text{d}6+? \text{e}7 49 \text{d}8+ \text{e}8! and Black’s passed c-pawn will decide the game.

48...\text{e}7?!

From inertia Black plays for a win but more reasonable was 48...\text{g}7 49 \text{g}4+ \text{g}6 50 \text{e}5+ \text{f}8 51 \text{gx}g6 \text{hx}g6 52 \text{xc}3 with a draw to follow.

49 \text{d}3! \text{we}3 50 \text{c}2

White could have tried to play for a win with 50 \text{xe}7??, but after 50...\text{c}4! 51 \text{xc}4 \text{xc}4 Black’s c-pawn would guarantee Black a draw.

50...\text{e}8 51 \text{xe}7 \text{xe}7 52 \text{wb}1 \text{h}6 53 \text{a}3 \text{f}6 54 \text{wd}1 \text{wc}5

Or 54...\text{wd}2 55 \text{xd}2 \text{cxd}2 56 \text{g}4 with an immediate draw.

55 \text{wd}8+ \text{g}7 56 \text{wc}7+ \text{f}6 57 \text{wd}8+ \text{g}7 58 \text{wc}7+ \text{f}6 ½-½

\textbf{Game 22}

\textbf{Ivanchuk-Kamsky}

\textit{ Tilburg 1992 }

\begin{align*}
1 & e4 e5 2 \text{zf}3 \text{c}6 3 \text{zb}5 a6 4 \text{za}4 \text{zf}6 \\
5 & 0-0 \text{ze}7 6 \text{ze}1 b5 7 \text{zb}3 0-0 8 c3 \text{d}5 \\
9 & \text{exd}5 \text{xd}5 10 \text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 11 \text{xxe}5 c6 \\
12 & \text{ze}1 \text{zd}6 13 d3 \text{wh}4 14 g3 \text{wh}3 15
\end{align*}
12 d3 d6 13 e1 wh4 14 g3 wh3 15 e4

Be4 d7 16 d2 g5 17 e2 f5 18 c4!

This is stronger than 18 e4? from the previous game. However, even more accurate might be to first include 18 wf1!? in order to avoid some variations with ...Dd5-f4, and only after 18...wh5 to play 19 c4.

18...f4!

After 18...bxc4 19 dxc4 f4 20 cxd5 fxg3 21 hgx3 xf2!

22 xf2 wg3+ 23 g2 e3+ 24 f2 wg3+ leads to perpetual check, which White cannot avoid. For instance, 25 e1 h3+ 26 e1 e8+ 27 e2 xe2+ 28 xe2 e5?? (28...g4+ 29 f1 is also a draw) 29 d1 g4+ 30 c2 f5+ again with perpetual check (30...cxd5?! is worse after 31 b1! and White’s piece is worth more than Black’s two pawns). However, instead of 20 cxd5, White has the strong intermediate move 20 wf1! at his disposal, which is similar to what actually happens in the game. So Black rightly prefers not to exchange on c4 in order to keep the b5-pawn alive in case he sometimes may want to play ...b5-b4 denying White’s bishop the c3-square. Also Black’s queen could in some lines snuff out White’s d3-pawn.

19 wf1!

Black has a draw after 19 cxd5 fxg3 20 hxg3 xf2 21 xf2 wg3+ 22 g2 e3+, as was shown in the previous line.

19...fxg3?!

19...wh5! 20 cxd5 c5! 21 f3 g4 22 gxf4 wh8 might be worth trying.

Black is well behind in material but White still has to stop Black crashing through on the g-file – the position resembles the lines of the Mar del Plata Variation of the King’s Indian Defence!

20 hxg3

Worse is 20 xh3? gxg2+ 21 xf2 xh3 22 cxd5 c5 23 e4 ae8! (this is stronger than 23 xf2 24 xf2 f8 25 dxc6+ g7 26 d2 xf2 27 c3+ and d3-d4 to follow with roughly equal play) 24 dxc6+ g7 25 d2 xe4 with a winning position for Black when he follows up with ...f8xf2.

20...wh5

Another interesting possibility here for Black is 20...e4! but it seems that Black’s attack runs out of steam if White plays correctly, for instance:

a) 21 gxf4 wh5 22 c5+ wh8 23 cxd6 h3 24 f3! xf1 25 xf1 gxf4 26 g2 g8 27 xe8 xe8+ 28 g2 and White has too much material for the queen.

b) 21 c5+ wh8 22 cxd6 wh5 23 gxf4 h3 24 whx3 whx3 25 e3 wh4 26 g3! gxf4 27 e3 f6 28 e2 xed6 29 d2 b4 30 e1! and now 30...ae8? loses to 31 xe8 xe8 32 g5.

21 cxd5 g4

21...xe4 22 g3 e2 23 wg3 e1+ 24 f1 is also in White’s favour.

22 dxe6+ g7 23 e4

White is also winning after 23 e3 c5 24 d4! xd4 25 xd3 e8 26 c7! etc.
23...\texttt{Lex}g3 24 \texttt{fxf}3 \texttt{Exf}1+ 25 \texttt{Dxf}1 \texttt{Wh}3
26 \texttt{Dxe}7+ \texttt{Wxh}6 27 \texttt{Dxd}5 \texttt{fxb}8 28 \texttt{Ad}2 \texttt{f3}
29 \texttt{Dxf}3 \texttt{Dxf}3 30 \texttt{Ee}2 \texttt{Dg}6 31 \texttt{c7} \texttt{Df}8 32
\texttt{Eae}1

With a strong c7-pawn and a heavy attack against the black king, White is strategically winning.

32...\texttt{Wd}7 33 \texttt{Ee}6+ \texttt{Wxh}5 34 \texttt{g4}+! \texttt{Dxe}4
35 \texttt{Dxe}4+ \texttt{Df}3 36 \texttt{Df}1 1-0

But even more direct was 36 \texttt{Dh}2+ \texttt{g}3
37 \texttt{Dg}4+ \texttt{Dh}3 38 \texttt{Ee}3+ \texttt{Df}3 39 \texttt{Dxf}3 mate.

\textbf{Game 23}

\textbf{Liang Jinrong-Peng}

\textit{Chinese Championship 1992}

1 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{e}5 2 \texttt{Df}3 \texttt{Dc}6 3 \texttt{Db}5 \texttt{a}6 4 \texttt{Dxa}4 \texttt{Df}6
5 0-0 \texttt{Df}7 6 \texttt{D}1 \texttt{b}5 7 \texttt{D}3 0-0 8 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{Dd}5
9 \texttt{exd}5 \texttt{Dxd}5 10 \texttt{Dxe}5 \texttt{Dxe}5 11 \texttt{Dxe}6 \texttt{c}5
12 \texttt{D}1 \texttt{d}6 13 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{Wd}7 14 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{Wh}3 15 \texttt{Dxe}4 \texttt{Wd}7 16 \texttt{Dd}2 \texttt{f}5?!\texttt{cxd}5?! (better is 19...\texttt{Dxd}5 keeping open the long diagonal \texttt{a}8-h1) 20 \texttt{D}3 \texttt{a}5?! (also interesting was 20...\texttt{g}5) 21 \texttt{D}1 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{a}4 22 \texttt{D}4 \texttt{Dd}6 23 \texttt{Df}3 \texttt{Df}6 24 \texttt{Df}4 with a pawn up and better position for White, who controls the important dark squares.

17...\texttt{Dh}8

The violent 17...\texttt{f}4? backfires after 18 \texttt{Wh}5! \texttt{Dh}8 19 \texttt{Df}4, when it is White who is attacking. After the naive 19...\texttt{Df}5? 20 \texttt{Dxf}5! \texttt{Wx}5 21 \texttt{Dxd}6 Black can resign.

18 \texttt{f}4!

The key strategic move – White prevents Black’s traditional kingside attack of \texttt{f}5-\texttt{f}4, which means that in order to create some counterchances Black will have to embark sooner or later with \texttt{...g}7-\texttt{g}5. This means weakening his king as well.

Worse is the alternative 18 \texttt{Wh}5?! which leaves White’s queen exposed – for instance: 17...\texttt{Df}6 18 \texttt{Wh}4 (probably slightly better is 19 \texttt{Wh}3 but things are not entirely clear after 19...\texttt{c}5 20 \texttt{Df}3 \texttt{c}4? 21 \texttt{Dxc}4 \texttt{bxc}4 22 \texttt{Dxe}4 \texttt{Dc}6 23 \texttt{Df}1 \texttt{f}4 – of course not 23...\texttt{Dxf}3? 24 \texttt{Dg}2 etc. – 22 \texttt{Dd}4! \texttt{Wh}6 23 \texttt{Dh}4, and now both 23...\texttt{Dg}4 and 23...\texttt{Dg}4 give Black some compensation for the sacrificed material) 19...\texttt{c}5 20 \texttt{Df}3 \texttt{Dc}7 21 \texttt{Dg}5 \texttt{b}6 22 \texttt{Dd}2 (the planned counterattack 22 \texttt{Dc}6? loses to 22...\texttt{Dc}6 23 \texttt{Df}4? \texttt{Dh}7! 24 \texttt{Dxh}6 \texttt{gxh}6 25 \texttt{Wx}6 \texttt{Dg}8 etc.) 22...\texttt{Dc}6 23 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{c}4! and Black took over the initiative in the game Benjamins-Kamsky, US Championship 1991.

18...\texttt{Wa}7+

Here the queen will be somewhat far from the kingside action, but the normal 18...\texttt{g}5?! leads to a clearly better position for White after 19 \texttt{Df}3! (it is important not to let Black’s c8-bishop back into the game, which happens after 19...\texttt{f}xg5? \texttt{f}4! etc.) 19...\texttt{gxf}4 20 \texttt{Dxd}5 \texttt{cxd}5 21 \texttt{Dxf}4 \texttt{Dxf}4 22 \texttt{gx} f4 \texttt{d}4 23 \texttt{Dc}2 etc.

19 \texttt{d}4 \texttt{Df}6 20 \texttt{Df}3 \texttt{c}5 21 \texttt{Df}3 \texttt{c}4 22
\texttt{Dc}2 \texttt{g}6 23 \texttt{Dc}5

The presence of this knight on the stronghold \texttt{e}5 grants White a steady advan-
Black hasn’t gained the usual compensation for the sacrificed pawn.

23...\texttt{b7} 24 \texttt{d2} \texttt{e4}?

After this obvious mistake Black’s position becomes critical. Much better was 24...\texttt{e4}!?

25 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe4} 26 \texttt{d5} \texttt{wb7} 27 \texttt{g4}!

With this tactical blow, White takes complete control of the game.

27...\texttt{g8}

Or 27...\texttt{fxg4} 28 \texttt{wd4+}, which transposes to the game.

28 \texttt{wd4} \texttt{fxg4} 29 \texttt{wxe4} \texttt{fe8} 30 \texttt{wd4}
\texttt{ad8} 31 \texttt{f3} 32 \texttt{b3} \texttt{w7} 33 \texttt{xe8}
\texttt{e8} 34 \texttt{bx4} \texttt{xc4} 35 \texttt{xc4} \texttt{bxc4} 36
\texttt{b1} \texttt{d8} 37 \texttt{b7+} \texttt{f6} 38 \texttt{xd7}+

With his extra material, White has emerged with an easily winning ending.

38...\texttt{f5} 39 \texttt{g2} \texttt{e4} 40 \texttt{h4} \texttt{d3} 41
\texttt{d4} \texttt{b4} 42 \texttt{xc4} \texttt{xc3} 43 \texttt{xc3} \texttt{xc3}
44 \texttt{xc6} \texttt{b6} 46 \texttt{g4} \texttt{d2+}
47 \texttt{g3} \texttt{xa2} 48 \texttt{f5} 49 \texttt{f6} \texttt{a1} 50 \texttt{g5}
a3 51 \texttt{f1} 52 \texttt{g6} a2 53 \texttt{a6} \texttt{g1+} 54
\texttt{h3} \texttt{xg6} 55 \texttt{xd7}+

Game 24

Leko-I.Sokolov
Groningen 1995

1 ...\texttt{e4} \texttt{e5} 2 \texttt{d3} \texttt{c6} 3 \texttt{b5} a6 4 \texttt{a4} \texttt{f6}
5 \texttt{g5} \texttt{e7} 6 \texttt{e1} b5 7 \texttt{b3} 0-0 8 \texttt{c3} d5
9 ...d5 \texttt{xd5} 10 \texttt{exd5} \texttt{e5} 11 \texttt{exe5} \texttt{c6}
12 ...d6 13 ...h4 14 g3 ...h3 15

\texttt{e4} \texttt{d7} 16 \texttt{d2} \texttt{b7} 17 \texttt{e1} c5 18
\texttt{e4} \texttt{e7} 19 f3?!?

The intention of this move is to plug the long a8-h1 diagonal, but it allows Black a strong kingside attack by pushing the f-pawn.

Better are the following alternatives:

a) 19 \texttt{g5} f6 20 \texttt{d2} \texttt{wh8} 21 \texttt{wh5} f5 22
\texttt{xg5} \texttt{xg5} 23 \texttt{xc6} 24 \texttt{f3} c4 25 \texttt{c2}
b4! with counterplay for Black due to the excellently placed knight on d5, T.Ernst-I.Sokolov, European Team Championship 1992.

b) 19 a4! b4 20 \texttt{g5} \texttt{xg5} 21 \texttt{xg5} bxc3
22 bxc3 \texttt{ad8} 23 \texttt{e4} \texttt{c6} 24 \texttt{wh5} \texttt{xc3} 25
\texttt{wxh6} \texttt{xd3} 26 \texttt{e4} \texttt{c5} 27 \texttt{xc5} \texttt{d4} 28
\texttt{f1}! \texttt{c8} 29 \texttt{a3} with a white advantage in
the arising ending, J.Polgar-Adams, Tilburg 1997.

19...\texttt{h8} 20 \texttt{d2} f5! 21 \texttt{f2} f4 22 \texttt{dxe4}

After 22 ...\texttt{xd5} Black has a strong intermediate move in 22...\texttt{fxg3}!, continuing his attack.

22...\texttt{fxg3} 23 ...h3 \texttt{wh3} 24 \texttt{we2} c4! 25
\texttt{c2}?

White had to be brave and accept the sacrifice with 25 ...\texttt{xc4} \texttt{xc3}! Now the only defence is the hidden possibility 26 \texttt{wg2}!, which seems to lead to a drawn ending after 26...\texttt{wxc4} 27 \texttt{wxe4} 28 \texttt{axe4} 29
\texttt{ad1} bxc4 30 \texttt{xc4} \texttt{e5} 31 \texttt{c3} etc.

25...\texttt{xd3} 26 \texttt{xd3} \texttt{ad8} 27 \texttt{f1}

Black’s queen on h3 is too strong to be tolerated, which is seen from the line 27
This lets White off the hook due to the fact that Black has missed White’s 35th.

By this tactical cheapo White forces the exchange of the last rook, after which Black’s advantage of the bishop pair is just of a symbolic nature.

\[35...\text{xf}1+ 36 \text{xf}1 \text{e}7 37 \text{e}2 \text{g}6 38 \text{e}3 \text{g}7 39 \text{a}3 \text{c}8 40 \text{f}4 \text{d}8 41 \text{c}4 \text{c}7+ 42 \text{f}3 \text{bxc}4 43 \text{xc}4 \text{b}7 44 \text{b}4 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\]

**Game 25**

Garcia Gildardo-Bryson

Thessaloniki Olympiad 1984

1 \text{e}4 \text{e}5 2 \text{f}3 \text{c}6 3 \text{b}5 \text{a}6 4 \text{a}4 \text{f}6 5 0-0 \text{e}7 6 \text{e}1 \text{b}5 7 \text{b}3 0-0 8 \text{c}3 \text{d}5 9 \text{exd}5 \text{exd}5 10 \text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 11 \text{xe}5 \text{c}6 12 \text{d}3 \text{d}6 13 \text{e}1 \text{Wh}4 14 \text{g}3 \text{Wh}3 15 \text{e}4 \text{Wh}5 16 \text{d}2 \text{Wh}6 17 \text{f}3

A rare move which has a bad reputation, and subsequently due to this game it has not been repeated. However, things are not so clear and indeed it might be playable.

17...f5!

Black doesn’t seem to care about the threats along the a2-g8 diagonal. Much stronger and the acid test for 17 \text{f}3 is 17...\text{g}4? followed by ...\text{g}6-h5 with a dangerous pin.

18 \text{h}4

An alternative is 18 \text{d}4?? and now 18...\text{e}6?? drops a piece after 19 \text{c}4, while 18...\text{h}8?? 19 \text{xd}5 \text{cxd}5 20 \text{f}4! grants White a solid positional advantage due to his grip of the dark squares. So best for Black is 18...f4! 19 \text{xd}5 \text{cxd}5 20 \text{xd}5+ \text{e}6 21 \text{xa}8 \text{xa}8 with quite a lot of play for the material deficit. White’s kingside is under severe attack.

18...\text{f}6 19 \text{d}4 \text{e}6 20 \text{f}3 \text{c}5 21 \text{h}4 \text{h}6 22 \text{d}4?

White had to chase away the knight from d5 with 22 c4!. Now 22...\text{bxc}4? 23 \text{xc}4 followed by \text{xc}6 is very bad for Black so he should settle for 22...\text{e}7 (threatening to trap the rook by ...\text{e}7-g6) 23 d4 \text{a}7 (after 23...\text{g}6 24 \text{cxb}5 \text{xb}4 25 \text{xb}4 it is obvious that White has plenty for the sacrificed exchange) 24 \text{c}2 \text{g}6 25 \text{h}5 \text{f}4 26 \text{cxb}5 \text{xb}5 27 \text{f}5. This line is interesting but I wonder how many players as White would be brave enough to try this?

22...\text{d}6 23 \text{f}4

Or 23 \text{e}2 \text{c}8 24 \text{e}5 \text{g}5 25 \text{h}3 \text{f}4 with an attack, but the text seriously spoils White’s pawn structure on the kingside.

23...\text{xf}4 24 \text{xf}4 \text{c}8

25 \text{xe}6+ \text{xe}6 26 \text{d}5 \text{cxd}5 27 \text{wxd}5 \text{h}8

44
Worth considering is 27...\( \text{f7!} \).
28 a4 b4 29 \( \text{d}1 \) bxc3 30 bxc3 \( \text{b}8 \) 31 \( \text{d}4 \)

Avoiding the trap 31 \( \text{d}4?? \text{d}6\), which wins outright for Black.
31...\( \text{a}7 \) 22 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 33 c4 \( \text{f}8 \) 34 \( \text{h}3 \)

White gives up a pawn in order to activate his poorly placed rook, but Black conserves his huge positional advantage anyway.
34...\( \text{x}f4?! \)

Much stronger was 34...\( \text{b}8 \)!
35 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 36 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{g}4+ \) 37 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{e}4 \)
38 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 39 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 40 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 41 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{g}3+?! \)

More accurate was 41...\( \text{c}1+ \) 42 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{d}4! \) with the idea of exchanging White's other active rook. After 43 \( \text{g}6+ \) \( \text{h}7 \) 44 \( \text{x}f5 \) \( \text{xa}4 \) Black would have created greater winning chances than in the game.
42 \( \text{hx}g3 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 43 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 44 \( \text{f}7+ \) \( \text{g}8 \)
45 \( \text{x}f5 \) a5 46 \( \text{d}8! \)

Leading to a draw by a study-like motif.

46...\( \text{a}3 \) 47 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{xa}4 \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

Because after 48 \( \text{f}4! \) g3 49 \( \text{e}4 \) Black loses his a-pawn as \( \text{c}6\text{xa}5 \) follows.

In expectation of White playing \( \text{d}2\text{-e}4 \), Black removes the bishop from the attack. However, being a pawn down Black just hasn’t time for such prophylactic moves. The move is simply too slow and doesn’t fulfill the demands of the position because without using the f-pawn Black can hardly expect to breakthrough on the kingside.
18 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 19 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 20 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{h}3 \)

Or 20...\( \text{c}6 \) 21 \( \text{e}2 \) g5 22 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{ae}8 \) 23 \( \text{w}f2 \) f5 24 f4 \( \text{b}6 \) 25 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 26 \( \text{xe}3 \) gxf4 27 \( \text{xf}4 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 28 d4 \( \text{c}7 \) 29 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{xb}3 \)
30 \( \text{xb}3 \) f4 31 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 32 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 33 \( \text{xe}5 \) and White emerged a healthy pawn to the good in De la Villa Garcia-Pablo Marin, Spanish Championship 1991.
21 \( \text{we}2! \) \( \text{ad}8 \) 22 \( \text{d}4 \)

Another possibility is 22 \( \text{g}2 \) c5 23 a4 \( \text{c}8 \) 24 \( \text{xb}5 \) \( \text{xb}5 \) 25 \( \text{a}8 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 26 \( \text{xd}8 \) \( \text{xd}8 \) 27 \( \text{c}2 \) (also good is 27 \( \text{dc}3 \) with the idea of trading some pieces because 27...\( \text{df}4? \) loses on the spot to 28 gxf4 \( \text{xb}3 \) 29 \( \text{d}5! \) and due to the back rank weakness Black loses material) 27...g5 28 \( \text{dc}3 \) b4 29 d4 \( \text{xd}4 \) 30 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 31 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 32 \( \text{df}5 \) (deserving of attention is 32 \( \text{wb}5 \) and if 32...\( \text{xd}4 \), 33 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 34 \( \text{we}5! \) and White is winning) 32...\( \text{g}4! \) (better is 32...\( \text{b}3 \) 33 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 34 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 35 \( \text{df}4 \)
(White misses 33 \( \text{wb}5! \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 34 \( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{c}8 \)

Game 26

Smagin-Malaniuk

USSR Championship 1986

1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 3 \( \text{b}5 \) a6 4 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
5 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 6 \( \text{e}1 \) b5 7 \( \text{b}3 \) 0-0 8 c3 d5
35 \textbf{Wxf6 Ec2} 36 h4! \textbf{Axc2} 37 \textbf{Ah6l winning}
33...\textbf{Exd4} 34 \textbf{Exd4} Exd4+ 35 \textbf{Ef1} Ec5 (the position has switched to Black's favour) 36 \textbf{Gg2??} (the only move was 36 \textbf{Gd2} with chances to survive) 36...b3 and White resigned as he loses a piece, Malar-Mikulas, Bratislava 1991.

\textbf{22...f5 23 f4}

Of course White doesn’t let Black play ...f5-f4, starting a kingside attack.

\textbf{23...Wxe2 24 Wxe2}

After the exchange of queens Black is committed to defend an unappealing endgame a pawn down, which is a nightmare position for every Marshall Gambit devotee!

\textbf{24...Axe8} 25 Cxe8+ Cxe8 26 Cf2 Ag4

\textbf{27 Ac3}

This is possible because 27...Axe3?? loses to 28 Cxd5+ cxd5 29 Cxe3.

\textbf{27...Af8 28 Aa1 Ac8}

After 28...Axf6 White plays 29 Aa2! threatening h2-h3.

\textbf{29 Aa2 Ac6} \textbf{30 d5!}

This loses a second pawn. However, 37...Ae6? loses a piece after 38 h3 Ah5 39 g4.

\textbf{38 h3 gfx4} 39 gfx4 Ah5 40 Cxf5+ Ac5

\textbf{41 Cg2} b4?

Accelerating defeat.

\textbf{42 Aa3l-0}

Winning a piece after 42...Ag6 43 f5 followed by Aa3-e4+.

\underline{Game 27}

\textbf{Anand-Adams}

\textit{FIDE World Ch., Groningen 1997}

1 e4 e5 2 Aa3 Cc6 3 Aa5 a6 4 Aa4 Aa4 5 0-0 Aa6 6 Aa5 b5 7 Aa3 0-0 8 c3 d5

\textbf{9 exd5 Axd5} 10 Cxe5 Cxe5 11 Cxe5 c6

\textbf{12 d3 Ac6} 13 Aa1 Ae4 14 g3 Wh4 15 Ae4 Wf5 16 Cxh6 g6 17 Aa1 Ag4?!

\textbf{30...cxd5}

Or 30...Axd5 31 Axd5 cxd5 32 Ac5+ Af7 33 Axc8 Axb8 34 Cc3 g6 35 Cxd5 and in the long run White will win the ending.

\textbf{31 Ac4!} Axe1 32 Axe1 Ae7 33 Ae3
The pet line of the English super-GM Michael Adams. Black is trying to provoke f2-f3, which weakens White’s vulnerable g3-pawn. Still, the move gives White enough time to protect his kingside.

It is no wonder that nobody has tried 17...Qf4? because it only helps White after 18 Qxe4 Qh3+ 19 Qg2 Qg4 20 f3 Qd7. Now, amongst the many moves White can play, 21 a4! leaves him clearly on top.

18 f3 h3

Black has also tried the following in tournament practice:

a) 18...h5 19 Qe4 Rae8 20 Qg2! (it is easy to make a mistake and go for material with 20 g4? f5! 21 Qxd6 fxg4!!

Kr. Georgiev-Bryson, Dubai Olympiad 1986

b) 18...f5 19 Qe4 Qxe4 20 dxe4! (stronger than 20 fxe4 Qxg3! 21 e2?? Qf4 22 Qxf4 Qxf4+ 23 Qg2 Wh6 24 Qg4 with only a small advantage for White, whose b3-bishop is better than Black’s counterpart, Mrva-Betko, Czechoslovakian Championship 1992) 20...Qxg3 21 hxg3 Qxg3+ 22 Qf1 Qh3+ 23 Qe2 Qg2+ 24 d3 Qh4+ 25 cxb4 Qad8+ 26 d3 Qxd1 27 Qxd1 d5 28 Qd2 g4 29 Qf1 d8 30 Qc3 and White enjoys a huge positional advantage.

19 Qe4 Rae8

Black didn’t have enough compensation for the pawn after 19...Qc7 20 Qe3 Rae8 21 Qd2 in Svidler-Adams, FIDE World Championship, Groningen 1997.

20 Qe2!

An important prophylactic move. White covers the second rank against a possible sacrifice on g3.

20...h5 21 Qg5

Stronger than 21 Qg5 Qf5 etc.

21...Qc7 22 Qd2 Qh8

It is not better to play 22...f5 23 Qf2 Qxe2 24 Qxc2 Qxg5 25 Qxh3 etc.

23 Qae1 Qf6 24 Qf2 Qxe2 25 Qxe2

Weaker is 25 Qxe2??, which allows Black the unexpected tactical motif 25...Qxg3! 26 hxg3 Qxg5 and Black is okay.

25...Qf5 26 Qxd5 cxd5 27 Qf4!

It is important to swap dark-squared bishops, which will leave weak dark squares in Black’s camp.

27 Qxf4 28 Qxf4 Qxd3 29 Qd2 Qb1

After 29...Qf5 very unpleasant for Black is 30 Qd6!.

30 Qd6 Qe8 31 Qxd5?

A mistake that lets Black off the hook. With the simple 31 Qxa6! Qg5 32 Qd1 Qc2 33 Qxb5! White could have obtained a decisive material and positional advantage.

31...Qh7 32 Qg2 Qe5 33 Qb3 Qe8 34 a3 Qf5 35 Qb4 Qd7! 36 Qd4 Qc6

Black’s initiative gives him just enough compensation to draw.
37 \( \text{Wd3} + \) \( \text{h6} \) 38 \( \text{Wd4 Wa8} \) 39 \( \text{hd3 We8} \) 40 \( \text{g4!} \) \( \text{Ze2} \) 41 \( \text{Wf4} + \) \( \text{h7} \) 42 \( \text{Wf5+ Wg6} \) 43 \( \text{Whxh5} + \) \( \text{Whxh5} \) 44 \( \text{gxh5 } \text{Zxb2} \) 45 \( \text{Zd6 Zf8} \) 46 \( \text{Zxa6} \) \( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \)

**Game 28**

**Gara-Reg.Pokorna**

**European Girls U18 Championship 2000**

1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{Zf3 \text{Cc6}} \) 3 \( \text{Zb5 a6} \) 4 \( \text{Za4 Zf6} \) 5 0-0 \( \text{Ze7} \) 6 \( \text{Ze1 b5} \) 7 \( \text{Zb3 0-0} \) 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 \( \text{Zxd5} \) 10 \( \text{Zxe5 Zxe5} \) 11 \( \text{Zxe5 c6} \) 12 d3 \( \text{Zd6} \) 13 \( \text{Ze1 Wh4} \) 14 g3 \( \text{Wh3} \) 15 \( \text{Ze4 Wf5} \) 16 \( \text{Zd2 Wg6} \) 17 \( \text{Ze1 f5} \)

Of course 17...\( \text{Wxd3??} \) is out of the question due to the obvious 18 \( \text{Zc2} \) winning the queen. The text is a standard treatment in the Marshall Gambit – Black uses her f-pawn as a battering ram in order to breakthrough White’s kingside. Black should keep her attack going and not count on material – it is time that’s expensive in such positions.

18 c4

A direct attempt that in fact wins material because with her last move Black has weakened the a2-g8 diagonal. What follows is a rather forcing line in which tactical skill and memorising of the variations is of utmost importance.

18...f4

Of course there was no time for the retreat of the d5-knight because then c4-c5+ would have won Black’s bishop on d6, so Black must proceed with her attack.

19 \( \text{Ze4} \)

White must protect the vulnerable g3-square. Weaker is the greedy 19 \( \text{cx}d5? \) \( \text{fxg3} \) 20 \( \text{cx}d6+ \) \( \text{Zh8} \) 21 \( \text{fxg3 } \text{Zxg3} \) 22 \( \text{hxg3 } \text{Zxg3} \) 23 \( \text{Zh1} \) \( \text{Zg4} \) and Black certainly has more than a draw, such is the exposed nature of White’s king.

19...\( \text{fxg3} \) 20 \( \text{fxg3} \) \( \text{Zg4} \) 21 \( \text{Wc2 bxc4} \) 22 \( \text{dxc4} \)

Black has a promising position with his strong pair of bishops after 22 \( \text{Wxc4 Zc7} \) 23 \( \text{Wc2 Zh8} \) 24 \( \text{Zxd5 cxd5} \) 25 \( \text{Zf2 Zac8} \), Hellers-Wahls, World Junior Championship 1988.

22...\( \text{Zae8}! \)

Black sacrifices a piece but the last piece joins the attack. An important alternative is seen in Smagin-Hebden, Moscow 1986, when 22...\( \text{Zb4?} \) backfired because Black’s bishop should be targeting White’s kingside. White soon gained the initiative with 23 \( \text{Zd2 Zf4} \) 24 \( \text{Zxf4 Zxe1} \) 25 \( \text{Zxe1 Zf5} \) 26 \( \text{Wg2 Zxe2} \) 27 \( \text{Zc2 Zh6} \) 28 g4! \( \text{Zxg4} \) 29 \( \text{Zf1 Zc2} \) 30 \( \text{Zg5!} \) \( \text{Zxf1} \) 31 \( \text{Zxg6 Zxg2} \) 32 \( \text{Zf7+} \) \( \text{Zf8} \) 33 \( \text{Zxe6} \) and won because Black’s bishop was trapped!

23 \( \text{cx}d5 \) \( \text{Zf3} \) 24 \( \text{dxc6+ Zh8} \) 25 \( \text{Zd5} \)

The critical position of the whole line. In the first game played in this variation White quickly lost after 25 \( \text{Zd2? Zxe4} \) 26 \( \text{Zxe4 Zxe4} \) 27 \( \text{Zc3 Zf5} \) 0-1 A.Ivanov-Agopov, USSR 1984. Clearly 25 \( \text{Zd2} \) was too slow.
and no doubt it was responsible for White’s quick defeat.

No better is 25 \textit{\text{xf}4}\? \textit{x}f4 26 \textit{c}7 (or 26 \textit{\text{xf}2} \textit{xc}2 27 \textit{xc}2 \textit{e}3 and despite queens being off the board White is in trouble due to the unpleasant pin) 26...\textit{b}6+ 27 \textit{f}2 \textit{xc}7 28 \textit{c}5 \textit{e}5 29 \textit{f}1 \textit{d}6 30 \textit{e}6 \textit{f}6 0-1 Scholz-Shkurovich, correspondence 1987.

Deserving of attention is the untired move 25 c7??: This can lead to wild complications as demonstrated by my following analysis using Fritz: 25...\textit{xe}4 26 c8\textit{w} \textit{xg}3! 27 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xh}2+!

and now:

a) 28 \textit{xh}2 \textit{f}2+ 29 \textit{h}3 (forced since 29 \textit{h}1?? walks into mate after 29...\textit{h}5+) 29...\textit{h}5+ 30 \textit{h}4 (too risky is 30 \textit{g}3??, which seems to be losing for White because his king can end up in a mating net after 30...\textit{h}2+ 32 \textit{g}4 \textit{g}2+ 33 \textit{xg}2 \textit{xg}2+ 34 \textit{h}4 \textit{xc}8 35 \textit{f}4 \textit{h}6!, threatening the deadly ...\textit{g}7-\textit{g}5) and now Black has a choice between taking perpetual check with 30...\textit{f}3+ or continuing the battle with chances for both sides after 30...\textit{h}2+ 31 \textit{xh}2 \textit{xh}4+ 32 \textit{g}2 \textit{xc}8 33 \textit{e}3 etc.

b) 28 \textit{h}1 \textit{f}1+! 29 \textit{xf}1 \textit{xe}4+ 30 \textit{xh}2 \textit{xc}8 and this confusing position needs some practical tests.

25...\textit{xe}4!

Using the fact that White can’t take on g3 with the knight due to the pin along the b1-h7 diagonal. With this sacrifice Black softens up White’s kingside on the traditionally weak g3-square. No doubt worse is 25...\textit{f}5?? (trying to win back some material but losing the initiative) 26 \textit{e}3 etc.

26 \textit{hx}g3

26...\textit{xe}4?

It is strange, but this move is considered by many sources as Black’s best!

Correct is 26...\textit{xe}4! (which is even given a ‘??’ by some authors). The main line runs 27 \textit{f}4+? \textit{xe}1+ (worse is 27...\textit{fx}f4? 28 \textit{f}2 \textit{h}5 29 \textit{h}2 \textit{x}d5 30 \textit{g}4 as in Andrijevic-Pavlovic, Yugoslavia 1988) 28 \textit{xe}1 \textit{xc}2 29 \textit{xf}3. Here a lot of authors consider White’s position to be superior due to the strong passed c-pawn. I think this is wrong and after 29...\textit{xb}2 Black’s chances are by no means worse.

Instead of 26...\textit{xe}4!, Black can also try 26...\textit{h}5! but White is clearly better after 27 \textit{h}2 \textit{xd}5 28 \textit{xe}4 \textit{e}1 29 \textit{xc}1 etc.

27 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 28 \textit{xe}4?

Much stronger is Fritz’s recommendation 28 \textit{g}2! – after the exchange of queens the arising ending with two minor pieces for a rook is an easy win for White.

28...\textit{xc}3+ 29 \textit{g}2

This is an attempt to play for a win because 29...\textit{g}2 \textit{e}1+ 30 \textit{h}2 \textit{h}4+ leads to a draw.

29...\textit{e}1+ 30 \textit{h}2 \textit{f}2 31 \textit{f}3 \textit{e}5+ 32 \textit{h}3 \textit{xc}2 33 \textit{xc}2 \textit{h}5 34 \textit{a}4 \textit{g}5

After 34...\textit{h}4, threatening \textit{xe}5-g3+,
White has the clever resource 35 \( \texttt{xa3} \! \).\\n35 \( \texttt{xa3} \) \( \texttt{we6} \) 36 \( \texttt{c7} \)

Avoiding the obvious trap 36 \( \texttt{d5?} \) \( g4! \) and suddenly it is White who is in trouble.

36...\( \texttt{wc6+} \) 37 \( \texttt{xf3} \) \( \texttt{wc2+} \) 38 \( \texttt{h3} \) \( \texttt{wc7} \)
39 \( \texttt{xc5} \) \( \texttt{wh7+} \) 40 \( \texttt{g3} \) \( \texttt{uc7+} \) 41 \( \texttt{f4} \)
\( \texttt{wg7+} \) 42 \( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{xb2} \) 43 \( \texttt{h1+} \) 44 \( \texttt{g7} \)
\( \texttt{he5} \) \( \texttt{wa3}+ \) 45 \( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{xa4} \) 46 \( \texttt{d5} \) \( \texttt{ff7} \) 47
\( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{wa1} \) 48 \( \texttt{d6} \) \( \texttt{g1+} \) 49 \( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{wc5+} \)
50 \( \texttt{d5+} \) \( \texttt{he7} \)

It is not clear in this position whether White will win or whether Black will draw due to the reduced material left on the board. The rest is interesting only for those who are in love with endings.

51 \( \texttt{e6+} \) \( \texttt{d7} \) 52 \( \texttt{e5} \) \( \texttt{f18+} \) 53 \( \texttt{e4} \)
\( \texttt{wb4+} \) 54 \( \texttt{f3} \) a5 55 \( \texttt{xh5} \) \( \texttt{wc3+} \) 56 \( \texttt{g4} \)
\( \texttt{wg7+} \) 57 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{wd4} \) 58 \( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{g1+} \) 59
\( \texttt{g3} \) a4 60 \( \texttt{d5+} \) \( \texttt{e7} \) 61 \( \texttt{d3} \) \( \texttt{c1} \) 62
\( \texttt{e4} \) \( \texttt{wc4} \) 63 \( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{wb4} \) 64 \( \texttt{h4+} \) \( \texttt{e6} \) 65
\( \texttt{e3} \) \( \texttt{bd7} \) 66 \( \texttt{f5+} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 67 \( \texttt{e1} \) \( \texttt{f8} \) 68
\( \texttt{e4} \) a3 69 \( \texttt{d3} \) \( \texttt{b7} \) 70 \( \texttt{b3} \) \( \texttt{b6} \) 71
\( \texttt{b3} \) \( \texttt{b7} \) 72 \( \texttt{b3} \) \( \texttt{b6} \) 73 \( \texttt{b3} \) \( \text{½–½} \)

### Game 29

**Leko-Svidler**

*Dortmund 1998*

1 \( \texttt{e4} \) \( \texttt{e5} \) 2 \( \texttt{d3} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 3 \( \texttt{b5} \) a6 4 \( \texttt{a4} \) f6
5 0–0 \( \texttt{e7} \) 6 \( \texttt{e1} \) b5 7 \( \texttt{b3} \) 0–0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 \( \texttt{exd5} \) 10 \( \texttt{xe5} \) \( \texttt{xe5} \) 11 \( \texttt{xe5} \) c6
12 d3 \( \texttt{e6} \) 13 \( \texttt{e1} \) \( \texttt{wh4} \) 14 g3 \( \texttt{wh3} \) 15
\( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{f5} \) 16 \( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{wg6} \) 17 \( \texttt{e1} \) f5 18 \( \texttt{f3} \)

Leko's novelty hasn't been repeated in later games because Black gets relatively easy attacking chances on the kingside using the semi-open f-file.

18...f4 19 \( \texttt{e5} \)

It is possible to play 19 \( \texttt{h4} \) \( \texttt{f6} \), when the aforementioned pressure along the f-file gives Black full compensation for the pawn.

19...\( \texttt{exe5} \)

An attempt for a brilliancy prize with the queen sacrifice 19...\( \texttt{fxg3} \)?? backfires after 20
\( \texttt{xg6} \) \( \texttt{gxh2+} \) 21 \( \texttt{g2} \) \( \texttt{exe1} \) \( \texttt{f} \)
22 \( \texttt{exe1} \) \( \texttt{xg6} \) 23 \( \texttt{wc4} \) and White is winning.

20 \( \texttt{exe5} \) \( \texttt{fxg3} \) 21 \( \texttt{hxg3} \)

The alternative is 21 \( \texttt{fxg3} \) \( \texttt{g4} \) (avoiding the obvious 21...\( \texttt{h3} \)?? 22 \( \texttt{xd5} \) and White wins an important pawn) 22 \( \texttt{wc2} \) \( \texttt{ae8} \) 23
\( \texttt{f4} \) with approximately even chances.

21...\( \texttt{g4} \) 22 \( \texttt{we1} \)

Worse is 22 \( \texttt{f1} \)?? \( \texttt{ae8} \) 23 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{we6} \) 24
\( \texttt{f4} \) h6 25 \( \texttt{e5} \) \( \texttt{g6} \) 26 \( \texttt{xe8} \) \( \texttt{xe8} \) 27 \( \texttt{e1} \)
\( \texttt{xe1} \) 28 \( \texttt{xe1} \) \( \texttt{f3} \)!! and White is in trouble due to the unpleasant mating threats along the h-file.

22...\( \texttt{f3} \)

A drawish alternative is 22...\( \texttt{ae8} \) 23 \( \texttt{g5} \)
\( \texttt{xe5} \) (23...\( \texttt{f3} \) 24 \( \texttt{d4} \) – worse is 24 \( \texttt{h4} \)!!
\( \texttt{xe5} \) 25 \( \texttt{xe5} \) \( \texttt{f4} \) 26 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{e6} \) 27 \( \texttt{h2} \)
\( \texttt{e2} \) – 24...\( \texttt{xe5} \) 25 \( \texttt{xe5} \) \( \texttt{f5} \) 26 \( \texttt{b8+} \) \( \texttt{f8} \)
also leads to a draw) 24 \( \texttt{xe5} \) \( \texttt{f5} \) 25 \( \texttt{b8+} \)
\( \texttt{e8} \) 26 \( \texttt{e5} \) \( \texttt{f5} \) etc.

23 \( \texttt{d2} \)

The alternative is 23 \( \texttt{d1} \)!! in order to ex-
change Black’s deadly light-squared bishop: 23...\(\text{g}x\text{d}1\) 24 \(\text{w}x\text{d}1\) \(\text{g}x\text{f}2\)! 25 \(\text{g}x\text{f}2\) \(\text{w}f6+\) 26 \(\text{g}x\text{f}4\) \(\text{g}x\text{f}4\) and now 27 \(\text{b}e4\) looks dangerous for White but it is a great question how Black should use the discovered checks on offer. Maybe 27...\(\text{c}x\text{d}3+\) 28 \(\text{b}e3\) \(\text{d}8\) 29 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{c}x\text{d}4\) 30 \(\text{c}x\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}x\text{b}2\) with a balanced position despite the unbalanced material!

23...\(\text{a}e8\) 24 \(\text{a}4\)

Safer is 24 \(\text{c}4\)? \(\text{b}x\text{c}4\) 25 \(\text{d}x\text{c}4\) \(\text{d}f6\) (Black can draw at will by 25...\(\text{b}x\text{c}5\) 26 \(\text{w}x\text{c}5\) \(\text{c}e5\) 27 \(\text{w}b8+\) \(\text{f}8\) 28 \(\text{w}e5\) \(\text{f}5\) with a repetition) 26 \(\text{c}5+\) \(\text{w}h8\) 27 \(\text{b}e3!\) \(\text{d}e4\) (or 27...\(\text{w}g4\) 28 \(\text{b}x\text{e}8\) \(\text{b}x\text{e}8\) 29 \(\text{w}f4\) \(\text{w}h5\) 30 \(\text{w}h4\) and White defends against the mate) 28 \(\text{w}x\text{e}8\) \(\text{w}e8\) 29 \(\text{b}d1\) \(\text{a}x\text{d}1\) 30 \(\text{c}x\text{d}1\) \(\text{w}h5\) (surprisingly 30...\(\text{g}x\text{f}2?\) loses to 31 \(\text{c}a5!\) with the deadly threat of \(\text{b}d1\)-\(\text{d}8\)) 31 \(\text{f}f1\) \(\text{g}g4\) 32 \(\text{d}d4!\) and the position is about equal – White is a pawn up which is compensated by Black’s strong pressure on the light squares.

24...\(\text{h}6\) 25 \(\text{d}1?\)

Just when White wanted to exchange Black’s strong \(\text{f}3\)-bishop, along comes the decisive error. Better was 25 \(\text{d}4\) with the point that after 25...\(\text{b}e5\) 26 \(\text{w}x\text{e}5\) \(\text{f}5\) White has 27 \(\text{c}c2!\) \(\text{w}h5\) 28 \(\text{w}e6+!\) and suddenly Black’s king has no good squares because White takes the rook on \(\text{f}5\) with check. So it wasn’t White’s mistake on move 24 that was the decisive error (as stated by some commentators), but his next move!

25...\(\text{c}x\text{e}5\) 26 \(\text{w}x\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}x\text{d}1\) 27 \(\text{c}x\text{d}1\) \(\text{w}x\text{d}3\) 28 \(\text{w}d4\) \(\text{w}f3\) 29 \(\text{a}e1?\)

This definitely loses to a nice tactic. The only chance was 29 \(\text{b}e1\) \(\text{f}5\) 30 \(\text{e}8+\) \(\text{a}7\) 31 \(\text{c}e5\) \(\text{b}x\text{e}5\) 32 \(\text{w}x\text{e}5\) \(\text{d}1+\) 33 \(\text{a}1\) \(\text{b}a4\), when Black has much the better position due to the strong knight on \(\text{d}5\).

29...\(\text{c}e3!\) 30 \(\text{f}x\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}e2!\)

White’s bishop has no good squares to retreat to!

31 \(\text{f}12\) \(\text{w}x\text{f}2+\) 32 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{xg}3\) 33 \(\text{a}b5\) \(\text{f}5\) 34 \(\text{w}d8+\) \(\text{h}7\) 35 \(\text{w}d3\) \(\text{w}g6\) 0-1

But quicker was 35...\(\text{w}h3+\) 36 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{g}4+\) 37 \(\text{h}2\) \(\text{h}5+\) 38 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{g}6+\) followed by \(\text{h}5\)-\(\text{h}5\) mate.

---

**Game 30**

**J.Polgar-Adams**

*Dos Hermanas 1999*

1 \(\text{e}4\) 5 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 3 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{a}6\) 4 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{d}f6\) 6 0-0 \(\text{e}7\) 6 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{b}5\) 7 \(\text{b}3\) 0-0 8 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 9 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{d}5\) 10 \(\text{b}x\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}5\) 11 \(\text{c}e5\) \(\text{e}5\) 12 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 13 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{w}h4\) 14 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{w}h3\) 15 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{w}f5\) 16 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{w}g6\) 17 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{f}5\) 18 \(\text{w}3\)

---

At the logical continuation after her previous move. Instead, grabbing a second pawn with 19 \(\text{b}e6\)! \(\text{c}x\text{d}5\) 20 \(\text{w}x\text{d}5\) \(\text{b}8\) would have been very risky – although White is two pawns to the good, her task is not easy because of the problems on the a8-h1 diagonal.

19...\(\text{f}4\) 20 \(\text{g}4\)

Black wins back a pawn with an excellent position after 20...\(\text{w}h5\)! \(\text{xg}3\) 21 \(\text{xg}3\) \(\text{xg}3\) 22 \(\text{w}x\text{g}6\) \(\text{f}2+\) followed by \(\text{xh}5\).

20...\(\text{h}5\) 21 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 22 \(\text{w}g2\)

A reasonable decision. White gives back a pawn but fortifies her kingside. Computers would certainly consider 22 \(\text{w}x\text{c}6?!\) winning material, claiming that White is winning.
However, Black gets an enormous attack, for example: 22...hxg4 23  
西瓜8? f3! (from now on White's king will be in a cage) 24 h4 (obviously the only move) 24...fxf5 and now:

a) 25 a7  
西瓜d3! 26  
西瓜d4 (or 26  
西瓜e6 g3! 27  
西瓜d6  
西瓜f2+ 28  
西瓜xf2  
西瓜g4+ 29  
西瓜3  
西瓜d6+ 30  
西瓜g4  
西瓜d+ winning) or 26...g3 27  
西瓜f3  
西瓜f2+ 28  
西瓜xf2  
西瓜g3+ 29  
西瓜e3  
西瓜e8+ with a winning attack.

b) 25  
西瓜c6 g3 26  
西瓜f3  
西瓜f2+ 27  
西瓜xf2  
西瓜d3 with numerous threats.

True, instead of the greedy 23  
西瓜a8?, better is 23 hxg4  
西瓜g4 24  
西瓜g2  
西瓜e8 25  
西瓜e4  
西瓜h5 26  
西瓜h1  
西瓜h1+ 27  
西瓜h1  
西瓜e4 28  
西瓜c4 f3!, although even here after the exchange of queens White’s position looks very dangerous because Black can start a mating attack using the g- and h-files!

22...hxg4 23 hxg4  
西瓜g4

Slightly worse is 23...fxg4f 24 f3!, when White obtains the better ending due to her superior pawn structure.

24  
西瓜e6  
西瓜h5 25  
西瓜g4

Worse is 25  
西瓜f6?  
西瓜d1 26  
西瓜d6  
西瓜e8 27  
西瓜e4  
西瓜f3 28  
西瓜h2  
西瓜e5! 29  
西瓜h5+  
西瓜xh5 30  
西瓜3  
西瓜g3 31  
西瓜g3  
西瓜h1+ 32  
西瓜e2  
西瓜h2+ 33  
西瓜e3 e5! and White is mated!

25...fxg4 26  
西瓜d6

and now:

b1) 33  
西瓜h5+  
西瓜h5 34  
西瓜d2  
西瓜f3 35  
西瓜f2  
西瓜f6! 36  
西瓜f6  
西瓜f6 and White's king is not defensible.

b2) 33  
西瓜d8!?  
西瓜d1+ 34  
西瓜f2  
西瓜h4 35  
西瓜h8+  
西瓜h7 36  
西瓜g5+  
西瓜g6 37  
西瓜f3  
西瓜h1 38  
西瓜f4  
西瓜c2+ 39  
西瓜g3  
西瓜x1 with a technically winning ending for Black.

c) 30  
西瓜g1  
西瓜f3+ 31  
西瓜e1  
西瓜f5 32  
西瓜f2+
\( g8 \) 33 \( d7 \) \( g3 \) with numerous threats.

d) 30 \( Wh2 \) \( e5 \) (with the idea of \( Wh5-f3+ \) followed by \( \text{f5-e5-h5} \)) with an easy win for Black. This virtually refutes 30 \( Wh2 \).

30...g5 31 b4

The best. White must complete the development of her queenside and at the same time generate some counterplay along the a1-h8 diagonal.

31...g4 32 \( b2 \) g3+ 33 \( g1 \) f3+ 34 \( g2 \)

The tactical attempt 34 \( xf3? \) doesn’t yield the desired effect after 34...\( xf3 \) 35 c4+ \( g8 \) 36 \( g6+ \) \( h7 \) 37 \( g5+ \) \( xg6 \) 38 \( xf3 \) \( e2! \) and Black is winning.

34...\( h2! \) 35 c4+ \( g8 \) 36 \( wd1? \)

This loses quickly. The most stubborn defence was hidden in 36 \( g1! \) ! Now Black can force a draw with 36...\( f3+ \) or play the much stronger 36...\( g4! \) (worse is 36...f3? 37 \( xg3 \) f2+ 38 \( g2 \) f1\( + \) 39 \( xf1! \) and White wins, but certainly not 39 \( xf1?! \) \( e2! \) 40 \( xe2+ \) \( xe2 \) and White will soon be mated!) 37 \( h6 \) f3 38 \( h8+ \) \( f7 \) 39 \( h7+ \) \( e6! \) 40 \( e1! \) \( f5 \)! and now:

a) 41 \( d6+ \) \( g6 \) 42 \( g7+ \) \( h6! \) – a fantastic position!

Black loses material but the white king is defenceless!

b) 41 \( xh2 \) \( gxh2+ \) 42 \( f1 \) \( f2! \) 43 \( xf2 \) \( g6+! \) 44 \( e3 \) \( f4+ \) 45 \( e2 \) \( f2+ \) 46 \( d1 \) \( xh2 \) and Black wins.

36...f3+

Now it is all very easy for Black.

37 \( xg3 \) \( wg4+ \) 38 \( f2 \) \( wh4+ \) 39 \( e3 \)

Or 39 \( g1 \) \( g4+ \) 40 \( f2 \) \( h4+ \) 41 \( e3 \) (also losing is 41 \( g1 \) \( f2+ \) 42 \( xf2 \) \( xf2 \) 41...\( g5+ \) 42 \( f2 \) \( g4+ \) 43 \( g1 \) \( xe4! \) and Black wins.

39...\( wf4+ \) 40 \( d4 \) \( we5+ \) 41 \( e3 \) \( g4+ \) 42 \( d2 \) \( wb2+ \) 43 \( c2 \) \( xa1 \) 44 \( g6+ \) \( h7 \) 45 \( xg4 \) \( f2 \) 0-1

Game 31

Anand-Khalifman

FIDE World Ch., New Delhi 2000

1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 3 \( \text{\text{b5}} \) a6 4 \( \text{\text{a4}} \) \( \text{\text{f6}} \)
5 0-0 \( \text{\text{e7}} \) 6 \( \text{\text{e1}} \) b5 7 \( \text{\text{b3}} \) 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 \( \text{\text{xd5}} \) 10 \( \text{\text{xe5}} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 11 \( \text{\text{xe5}} \) c6
12 d3 \( \text{\text{d6}} \) 13 \( \text{\text{e1}} \) \( \text{\text{wh4}} \) 14 g3 \( \text{\text{wh3}} \) 15 \( \text{\text{f4}} \) \( \text{\text{f5}} \) 16 \( \text{\text{d2}} \) \( \text{\text{gg6}} \) 17 \( \text{\text{e1}} \) f5 18 a4!? 53

This discovery, made by Anand, is the latest fashion in the Marshall Gambit! White hurries to open up the a-file which will in many variations enable him to play \( a1-a6 \) with strong counterplay to compensate for Black’s kingside pressure.

18...\( \text{\text{b8}} \)

If Black plays 18...\( f4 \), White shouldn’t take on \( b5 \) allowing Black to sacrifice a piece on \( g3 \) with a strong attack, but should settle for 19 \( \text{\text{e4}} \). After 19...\( xg3 \) 20 \( \text{xg3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 21 \( \text{\text{d2}} \), with the idea of playing \( \text{\text{d2-g5}}, \) he would maintain the advantage.

19 axb5 axb5 20 \( \text{\text{e4}}! \)?
The alternative is 20 \text{Qf3} 4 21 \text{Qe5} \text{Qxe5} 22 \text{Qxe5} \text{fxg3} 23 \text{fxg3} \text{Qg4} 24 \text{Wxe1} \text{Qh3} and now, instead of 25 \text{Qc3?!} \text{Qf1}+ 26 \text{Wxf1} \text{Qxf1} 27 \text{Wxf1} \text{Qf8} (or 28...\text{Wxd3} and Black is slightly better) 28 \text{Wxf8+} \text{Qxf8} 1/2-1/2 as in Anand-Adams, Dos Hermanas 1999, better looks 25 \text{Qg5?!} followed by \text{Qc1-f4}.

Too optimistic for White is 20 \text{c4?!} \text{f4!} 21 \text{cxd5} \text{fxg3} 22 \text{fxg3} \text{Qxg3} 23 \text{h1} (or 23 \text{hxg3} \text{Qxg3} + 24 \text{Qh1} \text{Qg4} 25 \text{dxc6+} \text{Qh8} 26 \text{Qxe2} \text{Qxe2} 27 \text{Wxe2} \text{Qf2} 28 \text{Wxf2} \text{Qxf2} – White has enough material for the queen but the very bad coordination of his pieces gives Black a clear advantage) 23...\text{Qg4} 24 \text{Qxe6} \text{Qxe6} 25 \text{dxc6} \text{Qc2}!, when the situation looks rather grim for White.

\text{20...fxe4} 21 \text{dxe4} \text{Qg4} 22 \text{Wd4} \text{Qf3}!

The best move. Weaker are both 22...\text{Qc8?!} and 22...\text{Qc7?!} because in each case White can respond with 23 \text{Qa6}!, threatening to take on c6, after which Black’s position crumbles like a sand castle.

\text{23 exd5 c5}

The whole point of Black’s play initiated with his 22nd move. White is two pawns up but his light-squared bishop has been blocked, while Black’s menacing bishop on f3 reminds White to be very careful against various mating threats.

\text{24 Wh4}

White transfers his queen to the kingside in order to prevent the intrusion of Black’s queen to h3. The alternative, awaiting further tests, is 24 \text{Wd2} \text{Qf4} 25 \text{Wxf4} (the queen sacrifice is forced because after the careless 25 \text{Wc2?} \text{Qg4!} suddenly White is left without any good defence) 25...\text{Qxf4} 26 \text{Qxf4} \text{Qf8} 27 \text{d6} (or 27...\text{Qc3?!} \text{Qxf4} 28 \text{d6+} \text{c4} 29 \text{d7} \text{Qf8} 30 \text{Qxf3} \text{Qd8}! and Black is much better) 27...\text{c4} 28 \text{Qd1} \text{Qc6} 29 \text{Qd6} \text{Qe8} 30 \text{Qf1} (White can draw by 30 \text{Qxe8+} \text{Qxe8} 31 \text{Qf1} \text{Qe4} 32 \text{Qf3} \text{Qb1} 33 \text{Qxc6} \text{Qxd1+} 34 \text{Qg2} etc.) 30...\text{Qe4} 31 \text{Qd5} with a balanced position.

\text{24...Qxe8} 25 \text{Qd2}

Worth consideration is 25 \text{Qxe8+} \text{Qxe8} 26 \text{Qf4} \text{Qe4} 27 \text{Qf1} and now:

a) 27...\text{Qh1} 28 \text{Wh3!} (28 \text{f3} \text{Qxf3} 29 \text{Qxd6} \text{Qe3+} 30 \text{Qd2} and Black hasn’t got more than a draw by perpetual check) 28...\text{Qxf4} 29 \text{Qxf4} \text{Qf3}! (forced because after 29...c4?) 30 \text{Qd1} \text{Qxd5} 31 \text{f3}! Black’s bishop is suddenly trapped!) 30 \text{d6+} \text{c4} 31 \text{d7} \text{Qd8} 32 \text{Qd1} and despite White’s weakened kingside Black is fighting for a draw due to his deficit of material.

b) 27...c4?! might be better: 28 \text{Qxd6} \text{Qxh4} 29 \text{gxh4} \text{cxb3} followed by ...\text{Qf3xd5} is a probable draw but White might instead try 28 \text{Qa2}! with the point that 28...\text{Qh1} 29 \text{Wh3} \text{Qxf4} is met by 30 \text{Qb1} targeting h7.

All those variations await further testing but it is clear how dangerous 18 a4?! is for Black.

Besides 25 \text{Qxe8+}, White has played 25 \text{Qe3} (as in the Anand-Adams, Dortmund 2000) with the idea of closing the e-file. Now Black should have continued 25...\text{Qe5}!, threatening to win the white queen by ...\text{Qe5-h5}, and after the forced 26 \text{Wh3 c4} 27 \text{Qa2} \text{Qa8}?! Black would have had enough compensation for the material deficit.

\text{25...Qe4} 26 \text{Qe2} \text{Wh5}!

With the deadly threat ...\text{Wh5-f3}!

\text{27 Qf4 c4} 28 \text{Qxe4}!

Forced because 28 \text{Qxd6} \text{Qf3}! 29 \text{Qxe4} \text{Qxf2+} 30 \text{Qh1} \text{Qf3+} 31 \text{Qg1} \text{Qxe4} is winning for Black.

\text{28...Qxe4} 29 \text{Qc2} \text{Qxf4} 30 \text{Qxe4} \text{Qxe4}
31 gxf4 ½-½
31...wxd5 32 wg5 wxf5 33 wa8+ wxa8 34 wxf5 wa1+ 35 wg2 wxb2 is clearly equal.

Game 32
P.Popovic-M.Pavlovic
Cetinje Team Championship 1993

1 e4 e5 2 df3 d6 3 db5 a6 4 da4 df6
5 0-0 de7 6 de1 b5 7 db3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 wxe5 10 dxe5 wxe5 11 wxe5 c6
12 d3 d6 13 de1 wh4 14 g3 wh3 15 ed4 wif5 16 ed2 wg6 17 de1 f5 18 f4

White decides to give back the pawn to slow down Black’s ...f5-f4 break. He will be able to gain the necessary time to consolidate his kingside by attacking the black bishop on f4.

18...wxf4 19 wf3

Rarely seen is 19 df3 and now, instead of the poor 19...wc7? 20 e5 xce5 21 xce5 de6 22 c4 bxc4 23 dxc4 db6 24 e3 ab8 25 wd6 f7 26 wxg6 hxg6 27 ec5 which leaves Black with a bad ending, much better is 19...xc1! 20 xce1 f4 21 xxe5 (worse is 21 c4? de3!) 22 cxb5+ wh8 23 wd2 wh5! 24 gxf4 wg4+ 25 xf2 wxf4 26 xxe3 dg4 27 xd1 da8! and it is obvious that White is not going to survive all the pressure) 21...wh6 22 wf3 with a near level position.

19...db8!

The best move. As we shall see, Black’s rook on a8 is indirectly defended by tactics.

20 xdx5+ cxd5 21 df1?!

This is too passive. Better is 21 df3!, which is shown in the next game.

What happens if White takes on d5 with check? Well, after 21 wxd5+ wh8 White has two possibilities:

a) 22 wxa8+ wb6+ 23 d4 db7 (here is the obvious point behind 18...db8!) 24 ec6! wc7! and White has to give up his queen after which he has to struggle for a draw.

b) 22 df3 dxg3! and now:

b1) 23 xe2? xc7+ 24 eg2 wb6+ 25 d4 db7 26 wd7 eg8 27 dg5 wa8+ wins for Black.

b2) 23 hxg3? wxg3+ 24 df1 (24 dh1? da7! with ...xc8-b7 to follow is winning for Black) 24...f5 25 dg5 h6! 26 df7 xf7 27 ec8+ wh7 28 wxf7 ad3+ 29 xe2 xe8+ 30 we6 f3+ 31 xd2 f2 32 we4+ wg6! 33 wxg6+ wxe6

with a beautiful win for Black which well demonstrates his attacking potential.

b3) 23 wxa8! (forced) 23...xc1+ 24 df1 f4 25 xc1 ec8+ 26 df2 ah3 27 wxc8+ wxe8 28 xf4 is one long line in which Black is slightly better but the most likely outcome is a draw.

21...db7 22 de7 ec6 23 we3 f4?!

With this move Black loses the lions share of the advantage. Much stronger was 23...df6! with the idea of controlling the important e6-square. After 24 wg5 de6 25 wxg6 fxg6 followed by ...f5-f4 Black’s pair
of bishops would have become very strong in the open position.

24 \textit{We}6+ \textit{W}xe6 25 \textit{W}xe6 \textit{L}d7 26 \textit{L}e7 \textit{L}h3 27 \textit{L}xf4 \textit{L}xf4 28 \textit{gx}f4 \textit{W}xf4 29 \textit{L}e3

The game soon fizzled out into a draw.

29...\textit{g}4 30 \textit{g}3 \textit{d}4 31 \textit{L}d2 \textit{L}af8 32 cxd4 \textit{xd}4 33 \textit{e}e4 \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}

\textbf{Game 33}

\textbf{Am. Rodriguez-L. Perez}

\textit{Cuban Championship 1998}

1 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}5 2 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3 \textit{b}5 a6 4 \textit{a}4 \textit{f}6 5 0-0 \textit{L}e7 6 \textit{e}1 b5 7 \textit{b}3 0-0 8 \textit{c}3 \textit{d}5 9 \textit{ex}d5 \textit{xd}5 10 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 11 \textit{xe}5 c6 12 d3 \textit{d}6 13 \textit{e}1 \textit{W}h4 14 g3 \textit{W}h3 15 \textit{e}4 \textit{W}f5 16 \textit{d}2 \textit{W}g6 17 \textit{e}1 f5 18 f4 \textit{xf}4 19 \textit{W}f3 \textit{b}8! 20 \textit{xd}5+ cxd5 21 \textit{L}b3!

Much stronger than 21 \textit{g}f1?! as in the previous game. The knight is now striving to occupy the excellent d4-square. Black must avoid at all costs the exchange of the dark-squared bishops because, due to the pawn structure, his light-squared bishop will be no match for White’s knight.

21...\textit{b}777!

The bishop hurries to occupy the long diagonal but it is still not clear on which diagonal the bishop stands better. White may be able to close the diagonal the bishop is now on. Much better for Black is 21...\textit{w}f7!, for example: 22 \textit{D}d4 \textit{La}7 23 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}d7 24 \textit{c}5 \textit{b}4! 25 \textit{Lae}1 \textit{Lae}8 26 \textit{f}1 \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} Leko-Adams, Linares 1999.

22 \textit{f}4 \textit{La}7+ 23 d4 \textit{Lae}8 24 \textit{W}f2 \textit{L}e4 25 \textit{d}d2 \textit{h}6?

In order to avoid grovelling in an unappealing position, Black sacrifices the exchange to activate his light-squared bishop. This is his best practical chance.

26 \textit{W}xe4 \textit{d}xe4 27 \textit{h}4 \textit{W}g4 28 \textit{W}e2 \textit{W}h3 29 \textit{f}1 \textit{b}8 30 \textit{W}h2 \textit{W}g4 31 \textit{xb}8 \textit{xb}8 32 \textit{f}4 \textit{W}g6 33 \textit{W}f2 e3 34 \textit{W}h2

34 \textit{W}xe3 \textit{W}e8 35 \textit{W}f2 \textit{W}e2! 36 \textit{W}xe2 \textit{W}xg3+ 37 \textit{f}1 \textit{W}xf4+ gives some counterplay for Black.

34...\textit{e}8 35 \textit{L}e1 e2?

A grave positional mistake giving White the f2-square for his queen after which the game is virtually won.

36 \textit{W}f2 \textit{W}c6 37 \textit{W}h2 g6 38 \textit{h}5!

White has managed to defend against the threats along the a8-h1 diagonal and now the time is ripe for his decisive counterattack!

38...gxh5 39 \textit{xf}5 \textit{h}4 40 \textit{gxh}4 \textit{W}h7 41 \textit{f}f7+ 1-0

\textbf{Game 34}

\textbf{Leko-Adams}

\textit{Madrid 1998}

1 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}5 2 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3 \textit{b}5 a6 4 \textit{a}4 \textit{f}6 5 0-0 \textit{L}e7 6 \textit{e}1 b5 7 \textit{b}3 0-0 8 \textit{c}3 \textit{d}5 9 \textit{ex}d5 \textit{xd}5 10 \textit{xe}5 \textit{exe}5 11 \textit{xe}5 c6 12 d3 \textit{d}6 13 \textit{e}1 \textit{W}h4 14 g3 \textit{W}h3 15 \textit{e}4 \textit{f}6

Black’s knight is re-routed towards the kingside, possibly g4. Also, in some variations Black avoids lines where White exchanges on d5.

16 \textit{W}h4 \textit{W}f5 17 \textit{L}c2

17 \textit{d}d2 is the subject of Games 35-36, while 17 \textit{f}4 is discussed in Game 37.

17...\textit{W}g6!

The most reliable reply. Black is ready to meet d3-d4 with ...\textit{c}8-f5 and simultaneously he intends to play ...\textit{c}8-g4 with a
creeping kingside initiative.

Another interesting possibility at this point is 17...\textit{2e}8!?, and now White can choose between the following:

a) 18 d4 \textit{2d}5 19 \textit{2b}3 \textit{2f}5 leads to repetition which is a recurring theme in the lines after 17 \textit{2c}2.

b) 18 \textit{2e}3 \textit{2xe}3! 19 fxe3 g5 20 \textit{2d}4 \textit{2c}7 and now:

b1) 21 e4 \textit{2b}3 22 \textit{2f}1 \textit{2xf}1+ 23 \textit{2xf}1 c5 24 \textit{2d}5 \textit{2xd}5 25 exd5 \textit{2h}3+

followed by ...\textit{2e}8 with more than sufficient compensation for the pawn in the endgame due to his strong pair of bishops.

b2) 21 \textit{2d}2 c5 22 \textit{2e}4 \textit{2xe}4 23 \textit{2xe}4 \textit{2b}7 with a very promising position for Black in Darga-Jimenez, Havana 1964.

c) 18 \textit{2f}4?! g5! (now the point behind 17...\textit{2e}8!? becomes clear – the rook on f8 will not hang after White takes on d6) 19 d4 (better was 19 \textit{2xd}6 gxh4 with only a small advantage for Black) 19...\textit{2e}4 20 f3 \textit{2xf}4! 21 \textit{2xe}4 \textit{2xe}4! 22 \textit{2xf}4 gxh4 23 fxe4 \textit{2xe}4 24 \textit{2d}2 \textit{2e}3+ 25 \textit{2g}2 c5! with clear advantage for Black in Poltiev-Sadomskij, correspondence 1956-57.

d) 18 \textit{2d}2 \textit{2g}4 (clearly worse is 18...g5? 19 \textit{2e}4! leaving Black with a rotten kingside) 19 \textit{2f}3 (the only move since 19 \textit{2e}4? \textit{2xe}4 20 f3? – or 20 dxe4 \textit{2xf}2+) 21 \textit{2h}1 \textit{2e}7! 22...\textit{2g}3! 21 \textit{hxg}3 \textit{2e}5! leaves White without a good defence) 19...\textit{2g}6 and now White can try either 20 \textit{2g}5? or 20 d4 \textit{2f}5. Black has sufficient compensation for the pawn because he has control of both the c-file and the light squares.

18 \textit{2d}2

Dubious is 18 \textit{2f}4?! \textit{2e}7! (of course Black doesn't swap his dark-squared bishop; instead he leaves White's badly placed rook on h4) 19 d4 \textit{2f}5 20 \textit{2xf}5 \textit{2xf}5 21 \textit{2e}5 \textit{2d}5 22 \textit{2g}4 g5! and White's rook is trapped.

18...\textit{2g}4 19 \textit{2f}3

This leads to an unpleasant pin but White doesn't want to weaken his second rank with the alternative 19 f3 \textit{2f}5.

19...\textit{2fe}8 20 \textit{2g}2 \textit{2d}5

Also worth consideration is 20...h6!? and if 21 d4, then 21...\textit{2f}5 22 \textit{2xf}5 \textit{2xf}5 23 \textit{2f}4 g5.

21 d4

Here it is White who can play differently with 21 h3 \textit{2f}5 22 \textit{2d}4! etc.

21...\textit{2f}5 22 \textit{2xf}5 \textit{2xf}5 23 \textit{2d}2 \textit{2f}6

Black is ready to meet the manoeuvre \textit{2d}1-b1 with ...\textit{2f}6-e4. Weaker is 23...h6 24 \textit{2b}1! etc.

24 \textit{2f}4 \textit{2f}8 25 \textit{2d}2

Possibly playable is 25 \textit{2e}5 g5 26 \textit{2xf}6 gxh4 27 \textit{2xf}4 while another alternative is 25 \textit{2b}1! \textit{2e}4 26 \textit{2e}5 \textit{2xf}3+ 27 \textit{2xf}3 \textit{2d}2+ 28 \textit{2g}2 \textit{2xb}1 29 \textit{2xb}1 f6 followed by ...\textit{2e}2 entering the White camp. White is a pawn up but the out-of-play rook on h4 gives Black adequate compensation.

25...\textit{2d}6 26 \textit{2f}4 \textit{2f}8 27 \textit{2d}2 \textit{2d}6 \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}
It might be a disappointing end for the reader but such is a scientific top level game nowadays. The position is in the balance because Black has excellent control of the light squares while White’s rook on h4 is out of play.

**Game 35**

**Ivanchuk-Timman**  
Wijk aan Zee 1999

1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 e7 6 a1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 cxd5 10 b5 e5 11 xe5 c6 12 xe1 d6 13 d3 Wh4 14 g3 Wh3 15 xe4 d6 16 Wh4 Wh5 17 d2 g5?!

Black is not tired of harassing White’s rook. It should be mentioned that White’s d3-pawn was taboo again, this time due to 17...Whx3?? 18 d4! and Black loses a piece. 18 d4?!

White continues to be stubborn and willingly sacrifices the exchange. We shall see the stronger continuation 18 Wh6! in the next game.

18...c5 19 d3 h6!

A subtle idea that casts doubts over White’s artificial eighteenth move — Black calmly protects his g5-pawn.

Also interesting is 19...c6?!, continuing with his development while White’s rook still cannot escape. On the contrary, weaker is the greedy 19...xd4? 20 dx4 Wh3 (forced because both 20...Wh5 21 Wh3! and 20...Wh7? 21 Whg5 looks pretty bad for Black, who has his kingside completely ruined) 21 Whg5 Whg4 22 Wh3 Wh6 (even worse is 22...Wh7! 23 Wh7 and White nets the third pawn; after Black removes the rook from h8 White plays Whx7+ and the bishop is taboo due to Whg5+ with a fork) 23 Whf1 and White is slightly better because he has two pawns for the exchange and a healthy pawn structure.

20 Whf4?

This is the decisive mistake. White intends to exchange the dark-squared bishops with the manoeuvre Whf4-d6 but this original idea just will not work. White could have tried to justify his eighteenth move by 20 h4?! and then Black has the following choices:

a) 20...Whxd4 21 Whxd4 Whh3 22 hxg5 Whg4 23 Whf3 hxg5 24 Whxg5 Whxh3 25 Whd2 Whh7 is about equal.

b) 20...Whc6 21 hxg5 Whb3 22 axb3 hxg5 23 Whd2 Whh7 is about equal.

c) 20...Whg4! 21 Whxg4? Whxg4 22 d4 Whd6 23 hxg5 Whxg3 24 Whel! Whd8 needs further testing, for example:

- c1) 25 Whxg4+ Whc1 26 Whg2 Whxg4 27 Whxg3 h5! 28 g6 Whc6 is better for Black due to the unpleasant pin along the first rank.

- c2) 25 Whg2 seems best, against which Black can start a very strong attack by sacrificing a piece with 25...Whf2? 26 Whxh2 Whh3+ 27 Whg1 Whg4 28 Whc2 Whh8!. The threat of ...Whg4-f3 is very annoying for White — certainly it is food for thought!

20...Whb7

Later it was discovered that even stronger is 20...Whd8! with the deep idea of avoiding the exchange of dark-squared bishops. After 21 Whd6 Whb6! it would be very difficult for White to defend against the imminent ...c6-c5. In the case of 20...Whd6? 21 Whxd6 Whh3 22 Whd6 Whg4, besides 23 Whf3, White can also try 23 Whh1! with good counterplay.

21 Whd6 Whd6 22 Whd6 c5 23 Whd2 Whd8

58
24 $\text{exd} 8$

The alternative was 24 $\text{b6}$ $\text{exd} 3$ 25 $\text{bxa} 7$ $\text{Qe} 4$ 26 $\text{Qxe} 4$ $\text{exd} 1$+ 27 $\text{Kx} 1$ $\text{exe} 4$ 28 $\text{Qd} 7$ $\text{c4}$ (after 28...$\text{b1}$+??) 29 $\text{g} 2$ $\text{c4}$ 30 $\text{g} 1$ $\text{xb} 2$ 31 $\text{h} 5$! White gets reasonable drawing chances) 29 $\text{d} 1$ $\text{g} 4$ and Black is much better.

24...$\text{exd} 8$ 25 $\text{c} 2$

Or 25 $\text{c} 2$? c4! 26 $\text{dxc} 4$ $\text{exd} 2$! 27 $\text{w} 2$ $\text{xf} 3$ and Black wins.

25...$\text{g} 4$ 26 $\text{we} 2$

White’s situation is worse than it might look at first glance. After 26 $\text{c} 1$ $\text{c} 4$ 27 $\text{d} 1$

$\text{exd} 3$ 28 $\text{hxg} 4$ $\text{hxg} 4$ 29 $\text{we} 8$+ $\text{g} 7$ 30 $\text{we} 5$+ $\text{h} 7$ 31 $\text{we} 7$ $\text{a} 5$ 32 $\text{e} 1$ there comes the well known sacrifice 32...$\text{exd} 2$! 33 $\text{w} 2$ $\text{f} 3$ 34 $\text{f} 1$ $\text{e} 6$! 35 $\text{g} 1$ $\text{h} 3$ with mate to follow.

26...c4! 27 d1

27 $\text{de} 4$ doesn’t save White after 27...$\text{exd} 3$

28 $\text{wx} 4$ $\text{wx} 4$ 29 $\text{f} 6$+ $\text{g} 7$ 30 $\text{hxg} 4$ $\text{dxc} 2$

31 $\text{e} 3$ $\text{xd} 2$ 32 $\text{e} 1$ $\text{e} 4$ 33 $\text{f} 1$ $\text{d} 3$+ and the ending is pretty hopeless.

27...$\text{exd} 3$ 28 $\text{wx} 4$ $\text{wx} 4$ 29 $\text{hxg} 4$

$\text{xd} 2$ 30 $\text{b} 1$ $\text{e} 4$ 31 $\text{e} 1$ $\text{d} 3$ 32 $\text{b} 4$

$\text{xa} 2$ 33 $\text{c} 1$ $\text{f} 5$ 34 $\text{h} 3$ $\text{f} 7$ 35 $\text{f} 1$

$\text{e} 4$ 36 $\text{g} 2$ $\text{f} 6$ 37 $\text{xe} 4$ $\text{fxe} 4$ 38 $\text{e} 1$

$\text{f} 5$ 39 $\text{h} 4$ $\text{a} 3$

The rook and pawn ending is easily winning for Black, who is a pawn up with an active king. It only needs good endgame technique which Timman will demonstrate.

40 $\text{e} 3$

This leads to another exchange sacrifice but under much better conditions for White. The weak side of the aggressive 17...g5? will be revealed – Black’s kingside is like White’s, vulnerable to attack as well.

It should also be mentioned that 18 $\text{de} 4$ is not as strong as the text: 18...$\text{gxh} 4$ 19
The Marshall Attack

\[ \text{Qxd6 \text{g}6 planning \ldots \text{c}8-g4 etc.} \]

18...\text{Qg4} 19 \text{Qe4} \text{Qxh6} 20 \text{Qxd6 \text{g}6} 

The attempt of counterattacking with 20...\text{Wh3?} doesn't achieve much after 21 \text{Qc2} (better than 21 \text{Qxc8 \text{Bxc8} 22 \text{Qg5? \text{Qg4} 23 \text{Qf3 \text{Whxh2+} 24 \text{Qf1 \text{Wh5 25 \text{Qf4 \text{Wh1+} 26 \text{Qc2 \text{Ec8+} 27 \text{Qxd2 \text{Qxa1 28 \text{Qxg4 \text{Qe1+} 29 \text{Qc2 h5 30 \text{Qxf7+ \text{Qxf7 0-1 Valko-Egri, Nyiregyhaza 1994 – obviously not an exemplary game by White} 21...\text{Qf5 22 \text{Qg5 Qg4 23 f3 \text{Qxd3 24 \text{Qd2 Qe5 25 \text{We3!}}}}}}}}}}}

and White keeps everything under control, while it is difficult to give Black any good advice since his minor pieces are under attack and he will lose some material.

21 \text{Qe4!} 

Gaining time by attacking Black’s pawn on g5. This is far stronger than 21 \text{Qxc8?! \text{Bxc8}, when Black is at least equal.} 

21...\text{Qg4} 

With the text Black gives up a pawn in order to get some activity for his pieces.

21...\text{g4?! 22 Qg5! Qf5 23 Qd2 results in a dominating position for White.} 

After 21...\text{Qf5 22 Qxg5 Qxd3 23 Qf3! Qc4 24 Qe5 Qe6 25 Qxh6 Qxh6 26 Qxc4 Bxc4 27 Qxc4 we reach the position where there is little doubt that White is better – two pawns for the exchange and a healthy pawn structure. Compare this to Black’s shattered pawns.} 

22 Qxg5 Qf5 23 Qf4 Qad8 24 We2 

This is stronger than 24 f3 Qfe8! 25 Qe2 

\[ \text{Qc5 etc.} \]

24...\text{Qfe8 25 Qe1 Qg7?!} 

Covering the vital f6-square, which is visible in the line 25...\text{Qde5} 26 Qxe5 Qxe5 27 Qf6+! and White is winning. However, better was 25...Qxe4 26 fxe4 Qf6 planning ...Qf6-d5, although the advantage is still with White. 

26 f3 Qe5 27 Qc2 c5 28 Qe3! f6 

Despite all efforts Black’s position is very difficult because White firmly keeps control of the e4-square. Thus hopeless for Black is 28...c4? 29 d4 Qxd3 30 Qxd3 cxd3 31 Qxd3 Qc7 32 d5!, with Qd3-d4+ following.

29 Qh1 Qxe4?!

Perhaps a result of time trouble. Maybe Black should have gone in for a slightly improved version of the previous line with 29...c4?! 30 d4 Qxd3 31 Qxd3 cxd3 32 Qxd3 Qe7 with some chances to save the game, although materially White should be winning with three pawns for the exchange. However, Black would still have some slight chances due to the pin down the e-file.

30 fxe4 Qd7 31 d4 exd4 32 exd4 Qb6 

White’s central pawns have started to roll and there is nothing for Black to do. After 32...f5 33 g4! fxg4 34 d3 White gets an irresistible kingside attack.

33 Qf2 Qd5 34 Qd2! 

Avoiding a trap. After 34 exd5? Qxe1+ 35 Qxe1 Qxc2 36 Qe7+ Qg6 37 Qxd8 Qd1+ 38 Qg2 Qe2+ it’s perpetual check because the winning try 39 Qh3?? Qh5!!
suddenly turns out to be a study-like loss – White is unable to prevent mate despite the extra piece and reduced material!
34...e7 35 e5 f5 36 e6! Wh6 37 h3 g8 38 h5 g7 39 d5 Wxe5 1-0

Black resigned as White is clearly winning after 40 c3 Wxc3 41 bxc3 d5 42 Wxf5 h6 43 Wh7+ h8 (43...Wh8 44 c2 g6 45 c7 Wxe7 46 Wf6+ 44 f6+ g6 45 h4!)

Game 37
Hulley-Alenby
Correspondence 1994

1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 Ne7 6 Be5 b5 7 c3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 Nxd5 10 Ne5 Qxe5 11 Qxe5 c6
12 e1 d6 13 d3 Wh4 14 g3 Wh3 15 Ae4 d6 16 Ae4 Wf5 17 Ae4

Certainly the move which tests 15...e6 the most. White intends to exchange dark-squared bishops, which would greatly diminish Black’s kingside initiative.

17...e7

This move is considered the best at Black’s disposal because 17...g5? led to a position without prospects for Black after 18 cxd6 gxd6 19 e8 Q 20 Wh2 b7 21 ed2 c5 22 f3 h6 23 h3 Wg5 24 f2 g5 25 c5 Qh5 26 f1. Now the game Anand-L-Cooper, British Championship 1988 ended abruptly after 26 Wh5 27 Wh5+ and Black resigned; after 28 Wh7+ Wh8 29 Wh5+ Black loses his rook.
18 c2 g5

An interesting new idea was tried in Ariskin-Gorbunov, Kstovo 1998, where the continuation was 18...h6!? 19 d4 Wh5 20 e5 c6 21 b3 Wh3 22 Ae2 c5 23 f3 e4 24 c2 Ae5 25 Ae2 Axe4 26 Ae4 c5 27 Wxh4 Ae4. Surely White’s play can be improved upon, but Black’s idea is interesting in any case because after the text move, the mainline continuation after 17 c4, White has a guaranteed draw, which sometimes Marshall devotees like to avoid!
19 d4 Wh5 20 b3 Whf5 21 c2 Wd5 22 c4?

The winning try – White will sacrifice a couple of pawns or even a piece in order to achieve a strong kingside attack.

22...Bxc4 23 Ae3 Wxa5 24 b4!

Continuing with sacrificrial play.

24...cxb4?

After 24...Whxb4? 25 c5 Wxc3 26 Wc1! things would not have been any rosier for Black than in the game. The critical line is 24...cxb3 25 cxb3 Wxc3 26 c5 Wf5 (or 26...c5 27 Wh7+ Wh8 28 c6+ Wh6 29 Wh7+ Wh6 30 Whh8+ Whh8!) 31 Whh8+. White wins the queen but Black will have enough material as compensation so it is a big question whether White has more than a draw in this line.

25 c5+ Ae8

Black desperately frees the f8-square for his king. The alternatives do not save Black from defeat:

b) 25...d6 26 Whf4! Ae4 27 Wxe4 f6 28 Wxf6+ Wxf6 29 Wh7+ and Black is mated.

26 Ae4+ Whf5 27 Whf6+ Wh5 28 Axe4 Wxh8 29 Whf7+ Wh5 1-0

A game played in the best attacking style reminiscent of the early 19th century.
Summary
Those interested in playing 15...\texttt{d}d7 should take a closer look at Game 22, which led to a complex struggle with some advantage to White, but Black certainly had counterchances.

In Game 24, better was the possibility of 19 a4! as indicated in the game commentary. This would have given White a small but lasting advantage, which means the plan with 15...\texttt{f}d7 does not yield Black full equality.

After 15...\texttt{f}5 16 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{g}6 17 \texttt{e}e1 the critical move is certainly 17...f5, after which White has quite a few interesting ways forward but Black looks to be okay.

Finally, after 15...\texttt{f}6 16 \texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}5 17 \texttt{d}d2 g5 18 \texttt{h}6! (Game 36), White obtains two pawns for the exchange and, with Black's weakened kingside, White clearly has the better play. So, at the moment, the ball is in Black's court here.

1 e4 e5 2 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{c}6 3 \texttt{b}b5 a6 4 \texttt{a}4 \texttt{f}6 5 0-0 \texttt{e}7 6 \texttt{e}e1 b5 7 \texttt{b}3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 \texttt{x}d5 10 \texttt{x}e5 \texttt{x}e5 11 \texttt{x}e5 c6 12 d3 \texttt{d}6 13 \texttt{e}e1 \texttt{h}4 14 g3 \texttt{h}3 15 \texttt{e}4

(D) \texttt{f}5

15...\texttt{d}7 16 \texttt{d}d2
16...f5 – Game 23; 16...\texttt{b}7 – Game 24
15...\texttt{d}7 16 \texttt{d}d2
16...\texttt{e}8 – Game 19
16...g5
17 \texttt{f}3 – Game 20
17 \texttt{e}2 f5: 18 c4 – Game 22; 18 \texttt{e}4 – Game 21
15...\texttt{f}6 16 \texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}5
17 \texttt{c}2 – Game 34; 17 \texttt{f}4 – Game 37
17 \texttt{d}d2 g5?: 18 \texttt{d}4 – Game 35; 18 \texttt{h}6! (D) – Game 36

16 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{g}6 17 \texttt{e}1
17 \texttt{f}3 – Game 25

17...f5
17...\texttt{g}4 – Game 27; 17...\texttt{c}7 – Game 26

18 \texttt{f}4 (D)
18 \texttt{f}3 – Game 29; 18 \texttt{f}3 – Game 30; 18 a4 – Game 31; 18 c4 – Game 28
18...\texttt{f}4 19 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{b}8 20 \texttt{xd}5+ \texttt{xd}5 21 \texttt{b}3 – Game 33
21 \texttt{f}1 – Game 32
CHAPTER FOUR

12th and 13th Move Options for White

1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 cxd5 10 e5 c6

In this chapter we will deal with the main alternatives for White on the twelfth and thirteenth moves. These are the following:

1) 12 d4 d6 13 e2 (Games 38-40)
2) 12 g3 (Games 41-45)
3) 12 xd5 (Games 46-51)

(1) White’s set-up using the rook on e2 is chiefly for defensive purposes. This rook move was considered some twenty years ago as an important finesse but has recently gone out of fashion due to the fact that Black has several good plans at his disposal.

In Game 38 we see a pet line of the English GM John Nunn. However, nowadays after 14 f3, instead of retreating the bishop to h5 (which was Nunn’s original idea), Black has started to develop his bishop on f5 where it is indeed more actively placed.

The main line after 13 e2 goes 13...h4 14 g3 h3 15 d2 f5 and now White is at the crossroads: does he exchange Black’s light-squared bishop by playing 16 c2 (Game 39) which allows Black a kingside attack after 16...xc2 17 xc2 f5; or does he seek counterplay on the opposite flank by playing 16 a4, as in Game 40?

(2) 12 g3 used to be a pet line of former World Champion Bobby Fischer, which only confirms its strategical value. The move is aimed at preventing Black’s queen from joining in the kingside attack via h4. However, it weakens some important squares around the king, notably h3. Although nowadays white players are not so attracted by this move as they used to be in the past, every Marshall devotee still should be prepared to meet it.

The positional approach 12...f6 is seen in Games 41-42. An excellent example of Black’s counterplay is the game F.Braga-Geller (Game 41), in which Black sacrifices a piece and in return obtains some lasting strategical gains (in particular the pin along the d-file). The similar positional piece sacrifice is seen in Game 42.

Transferring the knight to the kingside by 12...d6 is seen in Game 43, while the other choice for Black is 12...d6 (Games 44-45).

(3) 12 xd5 is the so-called Kevitz Variation, in which White exchanges his light-squared bishop for Black’s knight on d5. Players who prefer clear-cut positions rather than wild complications usually adopt this line. It enjoys a very solid reputation but it doesn’t put enough pressure on Black, so
with correct play Black will not have too many problems in achieving equality.

After the sequence 12 $\text{dx}5 \text{cx}d5 13 \text{d}4 \text{d}6 14 \text{e}3 \text{h}4 15 \text{h}3 Black chooses 15...f5? in Game 46 and 15...g5? in the following game.

Games 48-51 witness Black’s main move, 15...$\text{w}4. The reader should study Gufeld-Blatny (Game 48) where, after a repetition of moves (a common occurrence when Black chooses 15...$\text{w}4), Black decides to play on with ...$\text{w}6-g6.

Game 49 witnesses the line 15...$\text{w}f4 16 $\text{e}5 \text{w}f6 17 $\text{e}1 \text{g}6 18 $\text{f}3$, which was at its peak during the 1965 Tal-Spassky match in Tbilisi.

In the last two games in this chapter Black’s threat of ...$\text{c}8$-$\text{xh}3$! is parried by 18 $\text{h}1$, after which Black can choose either 18...$\text{f}5$ (Game 50) or 18...$\text{d}7$ (Game 51).

**Game 38**

**Djurhuus-D.Pedersen**

**Gausdal 1994**

1 e4 e5 2 $\text{f}3 \text{c}6 3 \text{b}5 a6 4 \text{a}4 $\text{f}6 5 0-0 \text{e}7 6 \text{e}1 b5 7 $\text{b}3 0-0 8 \text{c}3 d5 9 exd5 $\text{x}d5 10 \text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 11 \text{xe}5 \text{c}6 12 \text{d}4 \text{d}6 13 $\text{e}2

The idea behind this move is to defend the potentially vulnerable second rank. This might seem too abstract, but one variation can confirm it. If Black continues 13...$\text{g}4$ and White responds with 14 $\text{f}3$, then 14...$\text{d}8-h4$? is a mistake because of 15 g3 $\text{xg}3 16 \text{hxg}3 \text{w}xg3+$ and now White has 17 $\text{g}2$! refuting Black’s sacrificial play.

**13...$\text{g}4**

![Chess Diagram]

This rare continuation is a favourite of English GM John Nunn, who has adopted it on several occasions. Black is provoking f2-f3, hoping in the future to exploit the slight weakening of the kingside.

**14 $\text{f}3 \text{h}5?!**

Recently Black started to rehabilitate the variation by playing 14...$\text{f}5$ and indeed Black’s light-squared bishop stands well on the b1-h7 diagonal: 15 $\text{xd}5 \text{cx}d5 16 \text{d}2 \text{d}3 17 \text{f}2$ (wrong is 17 $\text{e}3 \text{w}h4! 18 \text{xd}3 \text{xe}2+ 19 \text{f}1 \text{g}3 20 \text{e}3 \text{ae}8! and White has no defence) 17...b4 18 $\text{xe}4 \text{e}8$ (also good is 18...$\text{w}c7 19 \text{f}1 \text{xf}1 20 \text{xf}1 \text{xe}2 21 \text{c}2 \text{w}b2 22 \text{w}d3 \text{f}6 23 \text{e}3 \text{g}3$ with full compensation for the sacrificed pawn because White’s king is not safe, Kotronias-I.Sokolov, Elenite 1992) 19 $\text{f}1 \text{xf}1 20 \text{xf}1 \text{w}b8! 21 \text{g}3 \text{xb}4 22 \text{g}2 \text{xd}4$ with equal play, Kotronias-De Vreugt, Kavala 2002.

**15 $\text{xd}5$**

Even stronger is 15 $\text{w}f1 \text{g}6 16 \text{w}f2 \text{w}f6 17 g3 $\text{d}3 18 \text{e}1 \text{w}g6 19 \text{d}2 \text{f}5 20 \text{h}8 21 \text{f}3 \text{e}4 22 \text{e}5 \text{xe}5 23 \text{xe}5 24 $\text{c}2 \text{xc}2 25 \text{xc}2 \text{w}e6 26 \text{d}2 \text{g}5 27 \text{f}1 \text{g}4 28 \text{b}3! \text{ac}8 29 \text{e}4 and White was a clear pawn up in the game Kindermann-
Nunn, Dortmund 1991.
15...cxd5 16 Qd2 f5 17 Qf1
An alternative is 17 wxb3 e8!? 18 xe8+ wxe8 19 Qf1 (but not 19 wxd5+ Qf7 20 wxd6 wxe3+ 21 Qf1 wxe8 22 g3 wxe1+ 23 Qxe1 wxe3 24 Qh3 wxf2 25 wxe8+ wxe8 26 g4 fxg4+ with a winning attack for Black)
19...Qf7 20 a2 f4 21 a4 wxb8 22 axb5 wxb5 23 Qc2 Qg6 24 Qc1 Qd3 25 Qxf4 Qxf4 26 Qxf4 Qxb2 27 Qg5 Qc4 28 Qg3 h6 29 wxc1 wxe8 30 wf1 a5 and White, due to his extra pawn, was slightly better in Kotronias-Nunn, Kavala 1991.
17...f4 18 wxb3 wg5?
On g5 the queen will be exposed to some cheapos due to the pin on the c1-h6 diagonal.
19 g4!
An elegant way of meeting the threat...h5xf3.
19...Qae8?
Black had to retreat his bishop by playing 19...Qf7, although even then he would have stood worse. The text, however, loses by force.
20 h4! wxe4 21 Qh2 wxe1 22 Qxh5
White plays accurately. Black was hoping for 22 wxe5? Qxe5! with the deadly threat...Qe5-g5+ etc.
22...Qe2 23 Qe3!

23...wxa1 24 wxd5+ Qh8
Or 24...Qf7 25 Qf5! and White wins.
25 wxd6 Qa8 26 Qg6 h6 27 Qg5! 1-0

Black cannot avoid being mated after 27...Qc1 28 g6 Qg1+ 29 Qg2 etc.

**Game 39**

**Ljubojevic-Nunn**

_Szirak, 1987_

1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 b6 4 a4 Qf6 5 0-0 Qe7 6 Qd1 b5 7 a3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 Qxd5 10 a5 Qxe5 11 Qxe5 c6 12 d4 b6 13 Qe2 Qh4

The main move and surely the most natural one. By threatening mate on h2, Black forces White to weaken the light squares around his king by playing g2-g3.

The idea of Czech GM Pavel Blatny, 13...Qc7 intending to play...wxd8-d6, hasn't for some reason attracted other Marshall devotees but it might be playable. After 14 Qd2 wxe6 15 Qf1 f5 16 Qd4 Qxf4 17 a4 Qh8 18 cxd4 f4 18 f3 g5 19 axb5 g4? 20 Qxe5 Qxe5 21 cxd5 Qxf3 22 wxf3 Qg4 23 wxe2 cxd5 24 wxe6 Qf5 we get a messy position which is difficult to evaluate.

14 g3 Qh3

Sometimes Black plays 14...Qh5 with the idea of keeping the h3-square reserved for Black's bishop. Then play can continue 15 Qd2 Qh3 (worse is 15...Qf5 16 Qe1 Qg4 17 f3 Qh3 18 Qe4 Qc7 19 a4! Qxg6 20 axb5 axb5 21 Qxa8 Qxa8 22 Qg5 Qf5 23 a2! Qd7 24 cxd5 cxd5 25 wxe7 Qf5 26 g4 1-0 Kindermann-Steinbacher, Biel 1991) 16 f3 Qc7 17 Qe4? Qxf3 18 Qg5 Qh5 19 Qxh3 Qxh3 20 a2 Qae8 21 Qf1 Qd7 22 Qe1 Qxe2 23 wxe2 with a tiny advantage for White due to his pair of bishops.

15 Qd2 Qf5 16 a2

The simple strategy with 16 a5 cxd5 17 a3 Qae8 18 Qf1 is best met by 18...h5!, intending...h5-h4, granting Black a long lasting initiative on the kingside.

16...Qxc2 17 wxc2 f5 18 c4

White can prevent ...f5-f4 only by playing 18 f4!, against which Black can continue with either 18...Qg4 19 Qf1 Qxf4 or
The Marshall Attack

18...\textit{\textbf{xf}}4!, when 19 \textit{\textbf{gx}}f4? \textit{\textbf{wg}}4+ 20 \textit{\textbf{zg}}2 \textit{\textbf{w}}xg2+! 21 \textit{\textbf{xg}}2 \textit{\textbf{Qe}}3+ followed by ...\textit{\textbf{Qxc}}2 is winning for Black.

18...\textit{\textbf{wg}}4!

An important intermediary move that brings disharmony into the white camp.

19 \textit{\textbf{Ke}}6?!

White plays optimistically. The safer option was 19 \textit{\textbf{Ke}}1, against which there can follow 19...f4! (a thematic breakthrough in the Marshall Attack by which Black kills two birds with one stone – both the f-file will be opened and the critical square g3 will be undermined; for achieving such aim the sacrifice of the d5-knight is a small price to pay)

20 f3 \textit{\textbf{Wh}}3 21 cxd5 fxg3 22 \textit{\textbf{Qf}}1 gxh2+ 23 \textit{\textbf{Kh}}1 \textit{\textbf{Rh}}6 24 f4! (the only defence because White is losing after both if 24 \textit{\textbf{We}}4? \textit{\textbf{Qg}}6! and 24 \textit{\textbf{Wg}}2? \textit{\textbf{Qg}}6!) 24...\textit{\textbf{Zh}}6 25 \textit{\textbf{Wf}}2 \textit{\textbf{Af}}8 26 \textit{\textbf{Qc}}6 \textit{\textbf{Qxe}}6 27 dx6 \textit{\textbf{Wxe}}6 28 \textit{\textbf{Qd}}2 \textit{\textbf{Qxf}}4 29 \textit{\textbf{Qxf}}4 \textit{\textbf{Wxe}}4+ 30 \textit{\textbf{Wg}}2 \textit{\textbf{Wxf}}4 31 \textit{\textbf{Qxh}}2 \textit{\textbf{Wxd}}4 with roughly equal chances, Mokry-Panczyk, Polanica Zdroj 1984.

19...\textit{\textbf{Qf}}4?!

This looks very spectacular but in fact it only leads to perpetual check. Later it was found that a stronger continuation was 19...f4! (Black cheekily continues with his plan regardless of the fact that with his last move White has attacked the bishop on d6)

20 \textit{\textbf{We}}4 (the only move since 20 \textit{\textbf{Qxd}}6 fxg3 21 hxg3 \textit{\textbf{Qxf}}2! or 20 fxg3 \textit{\textbf{Qe}}3 is equally hopeless for White) 20...\textit{\textbf{Qe}}3! 21 \textit{\textbf{Qf}}3 (again forced because after 21 fxe3? \textit{\textbf{Wd}}1+ Black's attack breaks through) 21...fxg3 22 \textit{\textbf{Wxg}}4. Here Dr John Nunn gives 22...gxh2+ 23 \textit{\textbf{Qxh}}2 \textit{\textbf{Oxg}}4+ 24 \textit{\textbf{Wg}}2 \textit{\textbf{Af}}6 as slightly better for Black, but I like 22...\textit{\textbf{Oxh}}2+ 23 \textit{\textbf{Qxh}}2 \textit{\textbf{Oxg}}4+ followed by ...\textit{\textbf{Qg}}4x2 even more, when Black keeps his extra pawn and has the better ending.

20 \textit{\textbf{Qxd}}6?

Later a defence was found in 20 f3!, after which Black has nothing better than to settle for a draw by perpetual check with 20...\textit{\textbf{Qh}}3+ 21 \textit{\textbf{Qg}}2 \textit{\textbf{Qf}}4+ 22 \textit{\textbf{Wg}}1 \textit{\textbf{Qh}}3+, Hübner-Timman, Tilburg 1987.

20...\textit{\textbf{Qae}}8!

Now White is defenceless against both ...\textit{\textbf{Qe}}1+ and ...\textit{\textbf{Qe}}2.

21 \textit{\textbf{cxb}}5

This loses but what doesn't?

21...\textit{\textbf{Qe}}2 22 \textit{\textbf{Wc}}4+ \textit{\textbf{Zh}}8 23 \textit{\textbf{Wxe}}2 \textit{\textbf{Qxe}}2+ 24 \textit{\textbf{Qg}}2 \textit{\textbf{f4}} 25 bxc6 fxg3 26 hxg3 \textit{\textbf{Qf}}4+ 0-1

Game 40

De Firmian-Adams

New York 1996

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{\textbf{Qf}}3 \textit{\textbf{Oc}}6 3 \textit{\textbf{Qb}}5 a6 4 \textit{\textbf{Qa}}4 \textit{\textbf{Qf}}6
5 0-0 \textit{\textbf{Qe}}7 6 \textit{\textbf{We}}1 b5 7 \textit{\textbf{Qb}}3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 \textit{\textbf{Qxd}}5 10 \textit{\textbf{Qxe}}5 \textit{\textbf{Qxe}}5 11 \textit{\textbf{Qxe}}5 c6
12 d4 \textit{\textbf{Qd}}6 13 \textit{\textbf{Qe}}2 \textit{\textbf{Wh}}4 14 g3 \textit{\textbf{Qh}}3 15
\textit{\textbf{Qd}}2 \textit{\textbf{Qf}}5 16 a4

With this move White opens up the a-file
with the aim of weakening Black’s back rank in the event of an exchange of rooks.

26...h3+ 27 e2 g4+ 28 d2 xd1 29 xd1 d5 30 a8+ h7 31 e8 f5
The battle is over.
32 e2 wh2+ 33 d3 xb2 0-1

Game 41
F.Braga-Geller
Amsterdam 1986

1 e4 e5 2 df3 d6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 h6 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 edx5 e5 10 xe5 xe5 11 xe5 c6 12 g3

16...axe8!?

For Black it is more useful to exchange off the rook on e2, which defends White’s position, rather than the idle one on a1.
17 xe8

Bad is 17 axb5? df4!! 18 gxh4 e4+ 19 f1 d3 20 e4 f3! 21 e1 xe2 22 xe2 wh1+ 23 d2 xe4 24 d1 xf4+ 25 e3 e1 26 xf4 e4+ 0-1 Enders-Goldberg, Bundesliga 1992.

17...xe8 18 ff1 h5!

Stronger than 18...b4 19 c4 f6 20 c5 c7 21 e4 etc.

19 axb5 axb5 20 xa6?

The threat to Black’s c6-pawn is just an illusion – with this move White loses precious time. Correct was 20 xd5! cxd5 21 e3, which would have kept the game in the balance.

20...c7!

White has obviously overlooked this strong move because now 21 xe6? drops a rook after 21...c4! due to the mortal threat of mate on g2.

21 a7 h4

Onwards towards the white king!

22 e3 hgx3 23 fxg3 hxc3! 24 hxg3

White is forced to give up his queen because if 26 h1?, 26...e4+ forces mate on the next move.

This move is nowadays rarely seen, although it was employed a couple of times by the great Robert Fischer. White denies the h4-square to Black’s queen but weakens the light squares (in particular h3) around his king, which is obviously a drawback.

12 f6

This is the positional treatment. With this set-up (with the bishop on f6), Black renounces a direct attack against the white king but prefers to seek long-term positional compensation for the sacrificed pawn. The bishop might exert very unpleasant pressure against White’s undeveloped queenside. This can be seen in many lines where Black plays the thematic ...b5-b4! opening up the a1-h8 diagonal.

13 e1 c5

Unclear is 13...a7 with the idea of exchanging rooks via e7. Then play could con-
tinue 14 d4 \( \text{e}7 15 \text{xe}7 \text{wx}e7 16 \text{d}a3! \) (Black has sufficient compensation for the pawn after 16 \( \text{xd}5 \text{cx}d5 17 \text{e}3 \text{e}8 18 \text{d}2 \text{h}3 19 \text{f}3 \text{c}6 20 \text{e}1 \text{g}4 21 \text{g}2 \text{h}3 22 \text{f}3 \text{g}4 23 \text{wh}1 \text{h}5 24 \text{h}4 \text{f}5, \) Fischer-O’Kelly, Havana 1965) 16...\( \text{h}3 17 \text{c}2 \text{e}8 18 \text{d}2 \text{e}4 19 \text{e}1 \text{g}6 20 \text{c}2 \text{f}5 21 \text{xf}5 \text{f}5 22 \text{f}3 \text{g}6 23 \text{d}3 \text{g}4 24 \text{g}2 \text{g}6 25 \text{f}3, \) White has managed to repel Black’s pressure and the extra pawn soon told in Desi-Angelov, correspondence 1984.

14 d4

Black obtains very active play after 14 d3 \( \text{b}7 15 \text{d}2 \text{b}4! 16 \text{xb}4 \text{xb}4 17 \text{e}4 \text{c}7 18 \text{c}4 \text{c}6 19 \text{f}4 \text{d}4 20 \text{c}1 \text{h}8 21 \text{wh}5 \text{f}5 22 \text{d}2 \text{d}6 23 \text{e}5 \text{xe}5 24 \text{xe}5 \text{c}7 25 \text{e}3 \text{f}4, \) Sironovsnej-Rapoport, correspondence 1974.

14...\( \text{b}7! ? \)

Not so logical is 14...c4?!, trying to fortify his well placed knight on d5 but on the other hand leaving the f6-bishop with nothing to do on the a1-h8 diagonal. This move was successful in the old game Glienke-Matthaus, correspondence 1956 in which White lost badly after 15 \( \text{c}2 \text{a}7 16 \text{e}4? \text{e}7 17 \text{g}2 \text{g}4! 18 \text{f}3 \text{xe}1+ 19 \text{w}x1 \text{c}8 20 \text{f}1 \text{f}5 21 \text{d}d2 \text{d}3 22 \text{d}1 \text{e}3 0-1. \) However, White’s play could clearly have been improved upon. In particular, 16 \( \text{d}2 \) with \( \text{d}2-c4 \) to follow gives White a huge advantage.

15 dxc5

Less convincing for White are the following alternatives:

a) 15 \( \text{c}2? \text{e}8 \) and now:

a1) 16 \( \text{xc}5 \text{d}7 17 \text{e}4 \text{ad}8 18 \text{d}2 \text{xc}3! 19 \text{c}6 \) (an interesting tactical solution which, however, does not solve all of White’s problems; after the natural 19 bxc3 \( \text{xe}4 \) Black is at least slightly better) 19...\( \text{xc}6 20 \text{x}e6 \text{xd}1 21 \text{xe}8+ \text{xe}8 22 \text{xe}8 \text{xe}8 \) and due to the double threat \( ...\text{e}1+ \) and \( ...\text{xb}2 \) it is obvious that White is in trouble.

a2) 16 \text{xe}8+ \text{xe}8 17 dxc5 \text{d}8 18 \text{d}3 \text{g}6 19 \text{f}1 \text{b}4!

Maybe this move doesn’t grant Black full compensation for the sacrificed material but it has been scoring quite well in tournament practice. Rather than trading on d4, when following cxd4 White can occupy the c3-square with his knight, Black sacrifices a second pawn.

It is also possible to play the normal 14...\( \text{cx}d4 \) 15 \text{xd}4 \( \text{b}7 16 \text{c}3 \text{xc}3 17 \text{bxc}3 \text{d}7, \) planning \( \text{d}7-c6 \) in some lines, but then White is at least slightly better so why give up a pawn and then struggle to get it back?

(again this thematic move – Black strengthens the influence of his dark-squared bishop while White lags behind in development) 20 \( \text{h}6 \) (or 20 \text{d}2 \( \text{c}6! \) etc.) 20...\text{b}xc3 21 \text{bxc}3 (already a decisive mistake after which White loses material; he should
have played 21 \( \texttt{cxc3} \) although White still keeps an inferior position) 21...\( \texttt{Qb4!} \) 22 \( \texttt{xcxb4} \) \( \texttt{xa1} \) 23 \( \texttt{e3} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 24 f3 \( \texttt{e8} \) 25 \( \texttt{Qd2} \) \( \texttt{exc3} \) 26 \( \texttt{xa1} \) \( \texttt{e6} \) 27 \( \texttt{xe4} \) \( \texttt{xe4} \) 28 \( \texttt{fxe4} \) \( \texttt{e2} \) 29 \( \texttt{Qf3} \) \( \texttt{xe4} \) 30 \( \texttt{Wf6} \) \( \texttt{wb1+} \) 0-1 Cappellani-Lagurnina, Catania 1991.

b) 15 \( \texttt{Qe3?!} \) \( \texttt{xe8} \) 16 \( \texttt{Wd2} \) \( \texttt{exe3} \) 17 \( \texttt{fxe3} \) \( \texttt{d7} \) 18 \( \texttt{Wf2} \) \( \texttt{cxd4} \) 19 \( \texttt{exd4?} \) (correct is 19 \( \texttt{cxd4} \) but after 19...\( \texttt{a5} \) 20 \( \texttt{a4} \) \( \texttt{bxa4} \) 21 \( \texttt{xa4} \) \( \texttt{xc6} \) 22 \( \texttt{d5} \) \( \texttt{b5} \) Black’s initiative is clear due to his powerful pair of bishops and the lack of coordination of White’s pieces – in particular the a4-rook is misplaced) 19...\( \texttt{exe1+} \) 20 \( \texttt{exe1} \) \( \texttt{xe8} \) 21 \( \texttt{Wf2} \) \( \texttt{g5?!} \) 0-1 Paes de Lira-Mendes de Prado, Brazil 1994. There is no good remedy against the oncoming ...\( \texttt{e3} \).

15...\( \texttt{xe8} \)

This was an original idea first played by Geller. The compensation for the two pawns is obvious but it is difficult to assess whether it is sufficient or not. However, under tense tournament conditions playing this position as White is not easy, especially with his underdeveloped queenside. On the other hand, Black’s moves are not difficult to find. – note in particular ...\( \texttt{Wd7} \) connecting the rooks. Black will also have the options of ...\( \texttt{Wd7-c6} \) or ...\( \texttt{b5-b4} \).

16 \( \texttt{Qd2} \)

White can avoid the sacrifice which comes next with the following moves:

a) 16 \( \texttt{a4} \) \( \texttt{exe1+} \) 17 \( \texttt{exe1} \) \( \texttt{Wd7} \) 18 \( \texttt{Wd1} \) \( \texttt{xe8} \) 19 \( \texttt{Qe3} \) \( \texttt{f5} \) 20 \( \texttt{Qxd5} \) \( \texttt{Qxd5} \) 21 \( \texttt{Qd2} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 22 \( \texttt{xb5} \) \( \texttt{a5} \) 23 \( \texttt{We2} \) \( \texttt{Wd5} \) 24 f3 b4! 25 c4 (or 25 ...\( \texttt{Qe4} \) \( \texttt{xe4}! \) 26 \( \texttt{fxe4} \) \( \texttt{xe4} \) when Black has at least a draw by perpetual check) 25...\( \texttt{Wd6} \) 26 \( \texttt{Qf1} \) \( \texttt{Qd4} \) 27 \( \texttt{Qa6} \) \( \texttt{Qe8} \) 28 \( \texttt{Qa5} \) \( \texttt{c7} \) 29 \( \texttt{Qa6} \) \( \texttt{Qe8} \) and White should have taken the draw after 30 ...\( \texttt{Qa5} \) in Bierenbroods-Helle, correspondence 1996.

b) 16 ...\( \texttt{Qd2?!} \) doesn’t solve the problem of queenside development. Black has 16...\( \texttt{Wd7} \) 17 \( \texttt{Qe3} \) \( \texttt{Qad8} \) 18 \( \texttt{Qxd5} \) \( \texttt{Qxd5} \) 19 \( \texttt{Qd2} \) and, instead of 19...\( \texttt{Qb7?!} \), much better is 19...\( \texttt{Qh3} \) 20 f3 \( \texttt{h5} \)! with an initiative.

c) 16 \( \texttt{Qe3} \) \( \texttt{exe3} \) 17 \( \texttt{Wxd8} \) (with the queens remaining on the board White is even worse: 17 \( \texttt{fxe3?} \) \( \texttt{Qe7} \), threatening ...\( \texttt{Qe4} \) or capturing on c5, gives Black a substantial advantage) 17...\( \texttt{Qxa8} \) 18 \( \texttt{fxe3} \) \( \texttt{Qc7} \) followed by ...\( \texttt{Qxc5} \) with a clear advantage to Black, whose rampant bishop pair begins to tell. The weak pawn on c3 now becomes very vulnerable.

d) 16 ...\( \texttt{Qxe8+} \) \( \texttt{Qxe8} \) 17 ...\( \texttt{Qxd5} \) \( \texttt{Qd8}! \) and Black regains his piece and has a near-crushing attack on the a1-h8 diagonal.

16...\( \texttt{Qxc3?!} \) 17 \( \texttt{Qxc3} \) \( \texttt{Qxc3} \)

With this piece sacrifice Black’s dark-squared bishop becomes the most important piece on the board!

18 \( \texttt{c6?!} \)

White returns a pawn in order to take away the c6-square from the black queen. The alternative and possibly critical continuation is 18 ...\( \texttt{Qb1} \). Now Black should not play
the slow 18...\texttt{Wd7}? 19 \texttt{Exe8+ Xxe8}, when both 20 \texttt{Ac2} (Assmann-Hansel, Germany 1995) and 20 \texttt{Df1 Wc6} 21 \texttt{f3 Wxc5+} 22 \texttt{g2} (Van Asperen-McCorry, correspondence 1999) repelled Black’s attack, but the aggressive 18...\texttt{Wd3!}.

The Marshall Attack

I guess Geller must have had this in mind before playing the piece sacrifice. A possible continuation after 18...\texttt{Wd3!} could be 19 \texttt{Exe8+} (the threat was ...\texttt{Exe1+} followed by ...\texttt{Wxb1} so this exchange is practically forced) 19...\texttt{Exe8} 20 \texttt{Ac2} (20 \texttt{Df1} with the plan to go for a counterattack is not sufficient either after 20...\texttt{Wxb1} 21 \texttt{Wd7 Exa8} 22 \texttt{Wxb7 Wxc1} etc.) 20...\texttt{Wd5} 21 \texttt{f3 Wxc5+} 22 \texttt{g2 Wd8}! and it is not easy to see how White can get out of the pin on the d-file because after 23 \texttt{Ab3} there comes the very strong 23...\texttt{b4} etc. Despite being a piece up, White’s task is by no means easy.

18...\texttt{Exc6} 19 \texttt{Exe8+ Wxe8} 20 \texttt{Ab1 Ed8} 21 \texttt{Wc2}

Or 21 \texttt{Ac2 Wd7} and Black regains his piece with advantage.

21...\texttt{Exd2}

The tempting 21...\texttt{We1??} 22 \texttt{Df1} \texttt{e4} is refuted by 23 \texttt{Ag5}! winning for White.

22 \texttt{Exd2 Ae4} 23 \texttt{Af7+}

This is forced because White loses after 23 \texttt{Ee1? Exc2} 24 \texttt{Exe8+ Exe8} 25 \texttt{Exc2 Ae2!}, picking up one of the bishops.

23...\texttt{Exf7} 24 \texttt{Wb3+ Ad5} 25 \texttt{Wb4 We4}

Otherwise White plays \texttt{Ee1} with unclear play, so Black heads into the ending. Then, even with opposite coloured bishops, White’s weaknesses on the a8-h1 diagonal and the pawn on a2 grant Black considerable winning chances.

26 \texttt{Wxe4 Axe4} 27 \texttt{Ab2 Ad4} 28 \texttt{h3?}

White wants to control the light squares on the kingside by playing g3-g4 and later bringing his king to g3. However, this plan is too slow. He should have tried to bring his king into the centre by first pushing his pawn to f4 instead. After the text White is lost.

28...\texttt{Ed5} 29 \texttt{Ec2}

Or 29 a3 \texttt{Ed3}! and the a3-pawn drops.

29...\texttt{Aa4} 30 \texttt{Ac7+ Ae6} 31 \texttt{g4 Exa2} 32 \texttt{Ae3 b4}

Black’s pair of passed pawns on the queenside decide. The rest requires no further explanation.

33 \texttt{Ad4} 34 \texttt{Axa7} 35 \texttt{h8} 36 \texttt{h2} 37 \texttt{g3} 38 \texttt{h2} 39 \texttt{h1} 40 \texttt{h2} 41 \texttt{gh4} 42 f4 5 0-1

\textbf{Game 42}

\textit{T.\textsc{Ernst-Dam}}

\textit{Lugano 1988}

1 e4 e5 2 \texttt{Af3 Ac6} 3 \texttt{Ab5} a6 4 \texttt{Aa4 Af6} 5 0-0 \texttt{Ae7} 6 \texttt{Be1} b5 7 \texttt{Ab3} 0-0 8 \texttt{c3} d5 9 exd5 \texttt{Axh5} 10 \texttt{Axh5} \texttt{Axe5} 11 \texttt{Axe5} c6 12 g3 \texttt{Af6} 13 \texttt{Ae1} c5 14 d4 \texttt{Ab7} 15 dxc5 \texttt{Wd7}

70
Black hurries to connect his rooks – soon one of them will appear on e8 -- and the queen can go to c6 creating mating threats on the a8-h1 diagonal.

16  \( \text{\texttt{Qd2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qxc3?!}} \)  17  \( \text{\texttt{bxc3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Axc3}} \)  18  \( \text{\texttt{Ab1}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Ead8}} \)  19  \( \text{\texttt{Ae2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wc6}} \)  20  \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wxc5+}} \)  21  \( \text{\texttt{Ag2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Axf3+?!}} \)

A spectacular sacrifice of a second piece with which Black is trying to force a draw by perpetual check!

22  \( \text{\texttt{Axf3}} \)

Deserving of attention is John Nunn’s recommendation of 22  \( \text{\texttt{Axf3?!}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Exd1}} \)  23  \( \text{\texttt{Axd1}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wd5}} \) and now White does not play 24  \( \text{\texttt{Ab3?!}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wd3}} \)  25  \( \text{\texttt{Ac2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Ac8}} \), when his forces would be tied up, but 24  \( \text{\texttt{Ac2!}} \), when the position is difficult to assess. Although the material is roughly equal, White probably stands better.

22... \( \text{\texttt{Ad3+}} \)  23  \( \text{\texttt{Ag2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wc6+}} \)  24  \( \text{\texttt{Ag1}} \)

Or 24  \( \text{\texttt{Ah3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wd7+}} \) with an immediate perpetual check.

24... \( \text{\texttt{Ad4+}} \)  25  \( \text{\texttt{Af2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Axf2+}} \)  26  \( \text{\texttt{Axg2}} \)

This is just suicide. White stubbornly continues to play for a win by avoiding the perpetual check, but now he ends up in a lost position.

28... \( \text{\texttt{Wf5!}} \)

White must have underestimated this strong centralising move, after which he must shed a great deal of material and his position becomes hopeless.

29  \( \text{\texttt{Wf1}} \)

The only move that can be made in order to find an escape route for the white king.

29... \( \text{\texttt{Ee8+}} \)  30  \( \text{\texttt{Ad1}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Exd2+}} \)  31  \( \text{\texttt{Exd2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wf2+?!}} \)  32  \( \text{\texttt{Cc3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Cc8+}} \)  33  \( \text{\texttt{Ad3}} \)

Or 33  \( \text{\texttt{Ab4}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Cc5+}} \)  34  \( \text{\texttt{Aa5}} \) b4+  35  \( \text{\texttt{xa6}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wd6+}} \)  36  \( \text{\texttt{Ab5}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Cc5+}} \)  37  \( \text{\texttt{xb4}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wd4+}} \), with imminent mate to follow.

33... \( \text{\texttt{Ead8+}} \)  34  \( \text{\texttt{Ea5}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wf5+}} \)  35  \( \text{\texttt{Ee2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wxb1}} \)  36  \( \text{\texttt{Ad2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Ee8+}} \)  37  \( \text{\texttt{Af2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wd3!}} \) 0-1

---

**Game 43**

**Fischer-Spassky**

Santa Monica 1966

1  \( \text{\texttt{Ee4}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Ee5}} \)  2  \( \text{\texttt{Ef3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Cc6}} \)  3  \( \text{\texttt{Ab5}} \) a6  4  \( \text{\texttt{Aa4}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Ef6}} \)  5 0-0  \( \text{\texttt{Ee7}} \)  6  \( \text{\texttt{Ee1}} \) b5  7  \( \text{\texttt{Ab3}} \)  0-0  8  \( \text{\texttt{Cc3}} \) d5  9  \( \text{\texttt{Exd5}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Axh5}} \)  10  \( \text{\texttt{Ee5}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Exe5}} \)  11  \( \text{\texttt{Exe5}} \) c6  12  \( \text{\texttt{g3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Ef6?!}} \)

The point of this manoeuvre is to transfer
the knight to the kingside. This, however, appears somewhat slow and is insufficient for Black to obtain full equality.

13 d4 \(\mathcal{d}d6\) 14 \(\mathcal{e}e1\) \(\mathcal{g}g4\) 15 \(\mathcal{w}d3\)!

White is not obliged to play the more natural 15 \(f3\), which would have weakened White’s kingside and the g3-square in particular. Then Black has the choice between the following:

a) 15...\(\mathcal{h}f5\) 16 \(\mathcal{e}e3\) \(\mathcal{w}c7\) 17 \(\mathcal{f}f2\) \(\mathcal{h}fad8\) 18 \(\mathcal{d}d2\) \(\mathcal{f}f8\) 19 \(\mathcal{f}f1\) \(h5\) 20 \(\mathcal{w}d2\) \(\mathcal{d}d5\) 21 \(\mathcal{w}g5\) with a clear advantage to White as in Bauerndistel-Laschek, correspondence 1978.

b) 15...\(\mathcal{h}h5\) 16 \(\mathcal{e}e3\) \(\mathcal{e}e8\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}d2\) \(\mathcal{c}c7\) 18 \(\mathcal{f}f2\) \(c5\) 19 \(d5\)?! \(\mathcal{e}xe1+\) 20 \(\mathcal{w}xe1\) \(\mathcal{e}e8\) 21 \(\mathcal{w}f1\) \(c4\) 22 \(\mathcal{h}c2\) \(\mathcal{d}xd5\) 23 \(\mathcal{w}h3\) \(\mathcal{g}g6\) 24 \(\mathcal{x}xg6\) \(hxg6\) 25 \(\mathcal{d}d4\) \(\mathcal{e}e7\) with equal play, Kremer-Sadowo, correspondence 1976.

c) 15...\(\mathcal{h}h3!\) is Black’s best reply. 16 \(\mathcal{g}g5\) \(\mathcal{w}c7\) 17 \(\mathcal{x}xf6\) \(gx\overline{f}6\) 18 \(\mathcal{f}f4\) \(\mathcal{f}x\overline{f}4\) and now:

c1) 19 \(\mathcal{w}h5\) \(\mathcal{x}xg3\) 20 \(\mathcal{e}e2\) \(\mathcal{e}e8\) 21 \(\mathcal{h}h1\) \(\mathcal{e}xe2\) 22 \(\mathcal{w}xe2\) \(\mathcal{f}f4\) 23 \(\mathcal{d}d2\) \(f5\) with advantage for Black, Yudovich-Zapletal, correspondence 1972-76.

c2) Even worse is the acceptance of the sacrifice with 19 \(\mathcal{g}xf4?\) \(\mathcal{h}h8!\) (but not the impulsive 19...\(\mathcal{w}xf4?\) due to 20 \(\mathcal{w}d3!\) with a double threat to Black’s bishop and exchanging the queens via \(g3\), thus repelling Black’s attack) 20 \(\mathcal{h}h1\) \(\mathcal{g}g8\) 21 \(\mathcal{f}f3\) \(\mathcal{g}g2+\) 22 \(\mathcal{x}xg2\) \(\mathcal{x}xg2\) 23 \(\mathcal{x}xg2\) \(\mathcal{w}xf4\) with a winning position for Black.

15...\(c5\) 16 \(\mathcal{d}xc5\)

The recommendation of GM Lev Gutman, 16 \(\mathcal{c}c2\) \(c4\) 17 \(\mathcal{w}f1\) \(\mathcal{w}d7\) 18 \(f3\) \(\mathcal{h}h3\) 19 \(\mathcal{w}f2\), is quite possible but the text move is more clear-cut. In the ending it will be more difficult for Black to find compensation for the pawn.

16...\(\mathcal{d}xc5\) 17 \(\mathcal{w}xd8\) \(\mathcal{a}axd8\) 18 \(\mathcal{f}f4\)

Even stronger is 18 \(\mathcal{g}g5!\) \(\mathcal{a}ae8\) 19 \(\mathcal{d}d2\) and Black has absolutely no compensation for the pawn. This variation casts serious doubts over the whole line starting with 12...\(\mathcal{h}hd2?!\).

18...\(h6!\) 19 \(\mathcal{a}a3\)

White is obliged to place his knight on this awkward square since the more obvious move 19 \(\mathcal{d}d2?\) loses material to 19...\(\mathcal{g}g5!\).

19...\(g5\) 20 \(\mathcal{e}e3\) \(\mathcal{x}xe3\) 21 \(\mathcal{e}xe3\) \(\mathcal{d}d2\) 22 \(\mathcal{c}c2?!\)

Black has succeeded in getting his rook to the seventh rank, thus largely improving his
chances. It is strange that Fischer played this somewhat passive move when he had the chance of gaining the advantage by 22 c4! b4 23 Qe2 a5 24 Qe5.

22...Qe8 23 Qxe8+ Qxe8 24 Qe3 Qf3 25 Qc2 Qd6 26 b3 Qf8

Black’s strong rook on d2 is paralysing White’s position and thus White’s winning attempts are in vain.

27 a4 Qe4 28 Qxe4 Qxe4 29 axb5 axb5 30 b4 Qb2 31 g4 Qg7 32 f1 Qf6 33 Qa5 Qb1+ 34 Qe2 Qb2+ 35 Qf1 ½-½

(a) 14 d3 Qa7!

Game 44
Contini-Adinolfi
Correspondence 1998

1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qe6 3 Qb5 a6 4 Qa4 Qf6 5 0-0 Qe7 6 Qe1 b5 7 Qb3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 Qxd5 10 Qxe5 Qxe5 11 Qxe5 c6 12 g3 Qd6 13 Qe1 Qe8

With this move Black goes for the exchange of White’s only active piece – the rook on e1. White’s other rook, still on a1, will take some time to join in and in the meantime White must defend accurately especially as Black will have control of the e-file.

This line is extremely popular amongst correspondence players.

14 d4

White has other continuations at his disposal:

c2) Deserving of attention is 16...Qf3?! 17
\[ \text{The Marshall Attack} \]

\[ e3 \text{d7 18} \text{xd2 e8 19} \text{e2 g4 20} \text{f3} \]

(White avoids a draw by repetition with 20 \text{f1} h3 or 20 \text{d3 f5 etc.}) 20...\text{h3 21 e1 h5 with compensation for the sacrificed pawn.}

14...\text{g4?}

This tempting move backfires and allows a forced refutation. For 14...\text{xe1+} see the next game.

Another possibility was 14...\text{a7?!} with the idea of transferring the rook to e7 as has been played in a couple of games. I believe this alternative to be quite playable for Black.

15 \text{xe8+ xxe8 16 xg4! we1+ 17 g2 xc1 18 we2 f4+}

Planned when Black played 14...\text{g4?}, but it does not work. By now there was no way back, not even after the variation 18...a5 19 \text{xd5 exd5 20 wd2 xd2 a4 22 a3 f5 23 f4 f7 24 f1 e8 25 f3 f4 26 e3 (Hellers-J. Howell, New York 1990), or 18...e7 19 \text{xd5 exd5 20 wd2 xd2 21 \text{xd2 when Black enters a poor ending a pawn down. This explains the piece sacrifice in the game.}}

19 gxf4 \text{xf4 20 f1!}

Much stronger than the previously played

20 \text{f3 g5+ 21 f1 c1+ and 20 h5 e4+ 21 f3 g6+ 22 h1 h6, when Black draws by perpetual check.}

20...\text{c1+ 21 d1! xh2 22 wd2 1-0}

The ending after 22...f4 23 xc1 xc1 24 a4 is technically winning for White.

---

\[ \text{Game 45} \]

\text{Shefler-Lanz}

Correspondence 1974

1 e4 e5 2 \text{f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6}

5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5

9 exd5 xd5 10 xe5 xe5 11 xe5 c6

12 g3 d6 13 e1 e8 14 d4 xe1+ 15 xe1 h3 16 we4

After this Black’s initiative is of almost decisive proportions. White had to play 16 \text{d2 d7 17 f1 e8 18 e3 f5 19 e2? with a complicated struggle ahead where it is not easy to see how Black can retain his initiative. In the meantime, White has good chances to consolidate his position.}

16...w7 17 e3 e8 18 wd3 f4!

The bishop is taboo since if the g-file is opened White will get mated after ...\text{g4+}. 19 \text{d2?}

This definitely loses but White’s position was very difficult anyway. It was a big question whether he could have saved the game because after 19 \text{d2 we6 20 a3 f5 Black wins a piece.}

19...\text{xe3 20 fxe3 xe3 0-1}

---

\[ \text{Game 46} \]

\text{G.Orlov-Vzdovzhkov}

USSR 1990

1 e4 e5 2 \text{f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6}
5 0-0 \( \text{Ke}7 \) 6 \( \text{Ke}1 \) b5 7 \( \text{Kb}3 \) 0-0 8 \( \text{c}3 \) d5 9 exd5 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 10 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Qxe}5 \) 11 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) c6
12 \( \text{Qxd}5 \)

This is known as the Kevitz Variation of the Marshall Attack.

12...\( \text{cxd}5 \)

It is obvious that Black’s d5-knight is a powerful piece which controls some important squares (in particular f4). However, it is not clear if White’s light-squared ‘Spanish’ bishop is worth less than Black’s knight. One thing is clear: after the exchange White’s plan of playing a2-a4 and opening the a-file is not so attractive anymore. Besides, Black does not have to consider an attack against his knight – compare this with lines in which White plays a2-a4, Black takes on a4 and White follows up with c3-c4.

The good side of the exchange on d5 is that White clarifies the situation in the centre. Black has to be careful not to allow White to swap the dark-squared bishops after the manoeuvre \( \text{Wd1-f3} \) and \( \text{c1-f4} \). In this case he would be left a pawn down with a weak light-squared bishop against the strong knight due to the weakness of the dark squares, e5 in particular. So Black must react actively on the kingside in order to destroy the pawn shelter around White’s monarch.

13 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 14 \( \text{Ze}3 \)

The alternative is 14 \( \text{Ze}1 \) \( \text{Wh4} \) 15 g3 \( \text{Wh3} \) 16 \( \text{Wf3} \) etc.

14...\( \text{Wh4} \) 15 \( \text{h3} \) f5?!

This game will show that from the three main moves at Black’s disposal in this position (15...f5?!, 15...\( \text{Wf4} \) and 15...g5??), this move is the worst and this has been proven through tournament practice.

As we shall see, 15...\( \text{Wf4} \) (Games 48-51) is a solid option with the only practical drawback being that when a stronger player plays Black against inferior opposition, he must avoid the drawing continuations and after 15...\( \text{Wf4} \) there is a possibility for White to repeat moves.

16 \( \text{Wf3}! \)

That White needs his queen on f3 in order to cover White’s vulnerable kingside, namely the h3- and g2-squares, could be seen from the following example: 16 \( \text{Wb3}?! \) \( \text{g7} \) 17 \( \text{Qd2} \) f4 18 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Wh5} \) 19 \( \text{Ze6} \) \( \text{had8} \) 20 \( \text{Ze1} \) \( \text{c8} \) 21 \( \text{Ze5} \). The old game Poljak-Olifer, Kiev 1960 continued logically with 21...\( \text{xe5} \) 22 \( \text{xe5} \) (worse is 22 dxe5? \( \text{Wh}3! \) and there is no way White can defend here) 22...\( \text{Wg6} \) 23 \( \text{Wh2} \) f3 and now:

a) 24 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{d3!} \) with a dangerous initiative due to White’s weakened light squares.

b) 24 \( \text{g4?} \) \( \text{xe4}! \) 25 \( \text{hxg4} \) (or 25 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{d6+} \) with a positionally won game for Black) 25...\( \text{xe4} \) 26 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{h4} \) 27 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{f5!} \) 28 \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{g4} \) 29 \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{g2}+ \) 30 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{g1}+ \) 31 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{x}2+ \) and 32...\( \text{e2} \) mate.

16...\( \text{b7} \) 17 \( \text{Qd2} \)

The alternative is the odd-looking but not necessarily bad 17 \( \text{a3?!} \). Although ‘the
The Marshall Attack

Knight on the rim’ rule is well known, Black could not prove its drawbacks in Perenyi-Wegner, Balatonbereny 1988: 17...g5 18 â6e6 g4 19 âe2 âad8 20 g3 âh5 21 âh6 âfe8 22 âe1 âc6 23 hxg4 fxg4 24 âd2 âf5 25 âg5+ âxg5 26 âxg5 and in the later stages of the game White managed to convert his material advantage into a win.

17...g5 18 âe2 g4

Black is trying to improve on the well-known game Hübner-Nunn, Skelleftea (World Cup) 1989, in which Black played 18...f4? allowing the tactic 19 âf3 âh5 20 âxg3!!

| ![Chess Diagram](image.png) |

...with a winning position for White since after 20...âxg5, 21 âg3! wins Black’s queen.

19 âe6 âad8 20 âf1

This is not bad but even stronger is the nice idea found by Polish grandmaster Marcin Kamiński: 20 g3! âxh3 21 âc4!!

When both 21...dxe4 and 21...fxe4 lose to 22 âs6! trapping Black’s queen! The game Kaminski-Panczyk, Lubniewice 1989 continued 21...f4 22 âxd6 fxg3 23 âxg3 âxd6 24 âf4 âxf4 25 âd8+ and Black resigned because after the forced 25...âf8 26 âxf8+ âxg8 27 âf1+ wins.

20...gxh3 21 âs6?! 

Surprisingly this natural move lets Black off the hook! 21 g3! âg4 22 âf3 âh5 23 âh6 with a clear advantage to White was later found to be more accurate. It is not often that you see White attacking in the Marshall!

21...âg4 22 âe6+ âh8 23 âxh3 âc8 24 âh6 âf7 25 âg5 âg7! 26 âxg7+

Black’s threats along the g-file were about to become deadly so White is practically forced into this exchange.

26...âxg7 27 âxd8 f4 28 âe1 âg6

From the materialistic point of view, Black is doing quite badly but a closer look into the position reveals that Black’s powerful pair of bishops grants him sufficient counterplay.

29 âh4 âf3 30 g3 h5 31 a3 âg4 32 âh2 âf1 33 âxg4 hgx4 34 âh2 âd7 35 âg5

Due to the possible intrusion of Black’s queen to h3, White’s rook must be idly left on the h-file, which means he doesn’t objectively have any winning chances.

35...âf5 36 âd8 ½-½

---

**Game 47**

**Hübner-Nunn**

*European Team Ch., Haifa 1989*

1 e4 e5 2 âf3 âc6 3 âb5 a6 4 âa4 âf6 5 0-0 âe7 6 âe1 b5 7 âb3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 âxd5 10 âxe5 âxe5 11 âxe5 c6 12 âxd5 cxd5 13 d4 âd6 14 âe3 âh4 15 h3 g5?!

This sharp continuation is considered to be the main line for Black. The expert on the Marshall Attack, English Grandmaster John Nunn, has adopted it in quite a few games.

The aim of the g-pawn advance is to soften up White’s kingside by means of ...g5-g4.
This is an attractive option considering that White’s queen usually goes to f3 in order to defend the kingside.

16 \textit{Wh}3 \textit{Le}6 17 \textit{Wf}6 \textit{Hfe}8

The alternatives are weaker:

a) 17...\textit{Hae}8? is the usual story of ‘wrong rook’s move’. It transpires that Black will need rooks on d8 and e8 in order to chase away White’s queen as necessary with ...\textit{Cd}6-e7 and, if \textit{Wh}f6-e5, ...\textit{Hc}7-d6 with a draw by repetition. The game Hübner-Pinter Budapest 1989 continued 18 \textit{Dc}a3 (or 18 \textit{Dd}2 \textit{Wf}4! 19 \textit{Wxf}4 \textit{Dxf}4 20 \textit{Dxc}1 \textit{Dxh}3! 21 \textit{Dxe}8 \textit{Dxe}8 22 \textit{Df}3 – of course not 22 \textit{gxh}3?? \textit{Dg}1+ followed by ...\textit{Dx}d2 and Black wins – 22...\textit{Dxc}1 23 \textit{Dxc}1 \textit{Dg}4 24 \textit{Dxg}x5 h6 25 \textit{Dh}3 \textit{Dxh}3 26 \textit{gxh}3 \textit{Dc}2 27 b4 \textit{Dxa}2 with a dead draw; Black should know this tactical cheapo because if he doesn’t then he is simply a pawn down for nothing) 18...\textit{Wh}h5 19 \textit{Dd}2 h6 20 \textit{Dc}2 \textit{Df}4 21 \textit{Dd}3 \textit{Dc}2 22 \textit{Dxf}4 \textit{gx}4 23 \textit{Dc}1 \textit{Wh}b2 24 \textit{Dad}1 and, due to bad pawn structure and weak dark squares in Black’s camp, White’s advantage is indisputable.

b) 17...\textit{Wh}h5 is not seen so much nowadays:

b1) An instructive game is Yermakov-Sikov, correspondence 1965/66: 18 \textit{Dc}1? h6

19 \textit{Dc}3 \textit{Wh}7!

(the Marshall student should remember this king manoeuvre – Black builds up a deadly attack along the g-file by doubling rooks and there is not much that White can do to prevent it – White’s queen merely helps Black execute his plan) 20 \textit{Dd}2 \textit{Dg}8 21 \textit{Df}1 \textit{Dg}6 22 \textit{Wf}3 g4! 23 \textit{hx}g4 \textit{Dx}g4 24 \textit{Dg}3 \textit{Wg}6 25 \textit{Dc}2 \textit{Dg}8 26 g3 \textit{Wf}5 27 \textit{Dg}2?? (a mistake which accelerates defeat) 27...\textit{Wh}h3+!! 0-1.

b2) 18 \textit{Dd}2 g4 19 \textit{Dxe}6! \textit{fxe}6 20 \textit{Dxe}6+ \textit{Wf}7 21 \textit{Wxd}6 \textit{Wxf}2+ 22 \textit{Dh}2 \textit{Dc}8 23 \textit{Wg}3. We are now following the analysis of the late World Champion Mikhail Tal, who assessed the position as slightly better for White. The game Kuhnikanno-Matteh, correspondence 1984 continued 23...\textit{Dc}1 24 \textit{Dxg}4+! \textit{Wh}8 25 \textit{Df}3 \textit{Dg}8 and in this position White should have played 26 \textit{Dg}5! \textit{Dxg}5 27 \textit{Dxg}5 \textit{Dxa}1 28 \textit{Wxd}5 with advantage because White’s king is
safe whilst on the contrary Black’s naked king will bring him lots of headaches. The material, an exchange for two pawns, is roughly balanced.

18 \text{\textit{a3}}

Galkin-Jenni, Yerevan 1999 saw 18 \text{\textit{d2}} \text{\textit{e7}}? 19 \text{\textit{u5}} \text{h6} 20 \text{\textit{g4!}} \text{\textit{ad8}} 21 \text{\textit{wh2}} \text{\textit{hxg4}} (there was no good defence against \text{\textit{d2-f3}} trapping the black queen) 22 \text{\textit{hxg4}} \text{\textit{g4+}} 23 \text{\textit{g2}} \text{\textit{d1+}} 24 \text{\textit{gf1}} \text{g4} 25 \text{\textit{exc7}} \text{\textit{exc7}} 26 \text{\textit{xh6}} 1-0.

18...\text{\textit{wh5}} 19 \text{\textit{d2}} \text{\textit{e7}} 20 \text{\textit{f3}}

An extremely complicated struggle arose in Wolff-Hellers, New York 1990 after 20 \text{\textit{wh5?}} \text{\textit{ad8}} 21 \text{f4} \text{\textit{g6}} 22 \text{\textit{fxg5}} \text{\textit{f5}} 23 \text{\textit{g3}} \text{\textit{e4}} 24 \text{\textit{e1}} \text{\textit{d6}} 25 \text{\textit{h4}} \text{\textit{e6}} 26 \text{\textit{e2}} \text{\textit{d8}} 27 \text{\textit{fe1}} f6?!. Black enjoys adequate compensation due to White’s inactive knight on a3 – the game later ended in a draw.

20...\text{\textit{g6}} 21 \text{\textit{ae1}} \text{\textit{g4}} 22 \text{\textit{g3}} \text{\textit{gxh3}} 23 \text{\textit{gxh3}} \text{\textit{d6!}} 24 \text{\textit{hxg6+}} \text{\textit{hxg6}} 25 \text{\textit{d2}} \text{\textit{g7}}

Black is threatening to double rooks on the h-file to pick up the h3-pawn. If anyone is better in the endgame then it is Black, but the opposite-coloured bishops guarantee a peaceful end.

28 \text{\textit{e1}} \text{\textit{xh3}} 29 \text{\textit{c7}} \text{\textit{mac8}} 30 \text{\textit{xc8}} \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}

The problem of modern day tournament chess of how to avoid a draw when the stronger player has the black pieces also applies to the Marshall Attack. Black could have taken the draw with 19...\text{\textit{wh4}} but he decides to play for the win.

20 \text{\textit{d2}} \text{\textit{f5}} 21 \text{\textit{f3}} \text{\textit{f4!}} 22 \text{\textit{e1}}

A wise choice – White rejects the option of swallowing up the hot pawn by 22 \text{\textit{xd5+}} \text{\textit{h8}}, which would merely help Black opening the a8-g2 diagonal for his light-squared bishop. The g2-square would clearly have become vulnerable.

22...\text{\textit{wh8}} 23 \text{\textit{b3}} \text{\textit{f5}} 24 \text{\textit{d2}} \text{\textit{h5}}

Preparing ...\text{\textit{f5-e4}} which, played immediately, would have led to nothing after 25 \text{\textit{g4}}.

25 \text{\textit{xd5}} \text{\textit{xe3}} 26 \text{\textit{f3}} \text{\textit{g4}} 27 \text{\textit{e4}} \text{\textit{f5}}

Perhaps a wiser choice would have been
to settle for a draw by 28...g4 instead?
29 a5 c8 30 c6 b7 31 d5 xc6
32 dxc6 c7 33 ad1 d3 34 we4
xe4 35 xe4 e6

On 35...fd8?! White has the strong reply
36 c7.
36 d4 d6 37 xd3 xd3 38 f1 d6
39 e2 xc6 40 lc1

Deserving of attention is 40 h1!? g6 41
h3 in order to prevent the advance of
Black's kingside pawn majority.
40...e6+ 41 d3 d6+ 42 e2 xd1
43 xd1 h7 44 e2 g6 45 b3 f5
46 c4 bxc4 47 bxc4 g5

The ending should be drawn but White
was getting short of time.
48 a3 e4 49 c5 e5 50 f3 g4 51
f2 a5 52 d3 f5 53 c5 e5 54
f4 gxf3 55 xf3 d8 56 c6 d6 57
d4 xd6 58 e4 b5

Or 58...h4 59 g1! (avoiding the trap 59
xf4? h3 60 g3 h4! 61 xh4 h2 and
Black wins) 59...h3 60 h2 c7 61 f5
b5 62 g4 a4 63 xh3 a3 64 g4
taxe2 65 xf4 xf4 66 xf4 a5 67 g5 a4
68 f4 a3 69 f5 drawing.
59 xf4 b4 60 g3 a3 61 f4 xe2
62 f5 b3 63 h3 c4 64 h4 c7 65
f6 d6 66 e1 d8 67 h4 xe6+ 68
xe5 c4 69 e5 c3 70 d8 b5 71
g4 a5 72 f6 b6 73 c3 c4 74
f1 c5 75 f3??

Since the match Tal-Spassky, Tbilisi 1965,
in which the former World Champion Boris
Spassky adopted the Marshall Attack in order
to blunt Tal's play with the white pieces, this
move has been considered the best for Black.
Still, from time to time we see Black develop-
ing his light-squared bishop on other squares.
For example:
a) 18...d7 is played with the idea of
keeping the e-file open for active operations.
At the same time the move contains a trap:
19 wxd5? c6! 20 g5 (forced because 20
xc6?? h2+ wins the queen) 20...ae8 21
d1 we4 22 f3 (22 d2 we2 23 f1 we6
with the idea of following up with ...g6 is
certainly no improvement for White) 22...\textit{\texttt{c\texttt{2}}} 23 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{2}}} 23 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{x\texttt{f\texttt{3}}}}} 24 \textit{\texttt{w\texttt{x\texttt{e\texttt{2}}}}} (forced because 24 gxf3? \textit{\texttt{h\texttt{h\texttt{2+}}}}! 25 \textit{\texttt{h\texttt{1}}} \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{x\texttt{f\texttt{3}}}}}+ 26 \textit{\texttt{w\texttt{x\texttt{h\texttt{2}}}}} \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{2+}}} wins immediately for Black) 24...\textit{\texttt{e\texttt{x\texttt{e\texttt{2}}}}} 25 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{d\texttt{2}}} 26 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{g\texttt{3}}} 26 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{a\texttt{3}}} 27 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{2}}} 28 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{d\texttt{3}}} is an amusing winning line for Black.}}}}\texttt{}}

After 18...\textit{\texttt{d\texttt{7}}} A.Sokolov-Geller, New York 1990 continued 19 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{3}}} 19 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{a\texttt{8}}} 20 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{d\texttt{2}}} 20 \textit{\texttt{h\texttt{5}}} 21 \textit{\texttt{h\texttt{1}}} 22 \textit{\texttt{f\texttt{4}}} 23 \textit{\texttt{f\texttt{c\texttt{2}}} 23 \textit{\texttt{d\texttt{b\texttt{8}}} 22 \textit{\texttt{a\texttt{x\texttt{b\texttt{5}}} 23 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{x\texttt{e\texttt{4}}} 24 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{x\texttt{e\texttt{4}}} 25 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{d\texttt{6}}} 26 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{d\texttt{6}}} and White is again on top) and now White missed the strong reply 24 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{d\texttt{1}}} with a big advantage because if 24...\textit{\texttt{w\texttt{x\texttt{b\texttt{2}}}}}, 25 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{a\texttt{6}}} wins the exchange.}}}}\texttt{}}

b) 18...\textit{\texttt{f\texttt{5}}} 19 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{e\texttt{3}}} 20 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{d\texttt{2}}} 21 \textit{\texttt{b\texttt{8}}} 22 \textit{\texttt{a\texttt{x\texttt{b\texttt{5}}} 23 \textit{\texttt{g\texttt{4}}} 24 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{2}}} 25 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{x\texttt{h\texttt{3}}} 26 \textit{\texttt{f\texttt{4}}} repelled Black's attack in J.Howell-M.Heidenfeld, Groningen 1989.}}}}

19 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{3}}}

Equal is 19 \textit{\texttt{f\texttt{4}}} 20 \textit{\texttt{f\texttt{4}}} 21 \textit{\texttt{g\texttt{3}}}! (stronger than going for the ending after 21...\textit{\texttt{w\texttt{x\texttt{g\texttt{3}}} which is better for White}) 22 e4! \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{6}}} 23 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{x\texttt{d\texttt{5}}} 24 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{3}}} 25 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{d\texttt{8}}} 26 \textit{\texttt{w\texttt{x\texttt{g\texttt{6}}} hxg6, Kholtmoye- Tal, Kislovodsk 1966.}}}}\texttt{}}

Judit decides to play for the win by keeping her extra pawn, although Black will have adequate compensation due to his strong pair of bishops.

19...\textit{\texttt{a\texttt{8}}}!

![Diagram](image.png)

Since Black has developed his bishop on c6 there is nothing for the black rook to do on the e-file any more. Black now creates active play along the e-file.

20 \textit{\texttt{c\texttt{2}}} 21 \textit{\texttt{x\texttt{b\texttt{4}}} 22 \textit{\texttt{a\texttt{3}}} 23 \textit{\texttt{d\texttt{6}}} 24 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{2}}} 24 \textit{\texttt{b\texttt{4}}} 25 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{1}}} 25 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{1}}} 26 \textit{\texttt{d\texttt{3}}} is an amusing winning line for Black.}}}

Attacking White's weakened a-pawn, thus keeping the game balanced.

26 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{6}}} 27 \textit{\texttt{a\texttt{b\texttt{8}}} 28 \textit{\texttt{a\texttt{7}}} 29 \textit{\texttt{d\texttt{7}}} 30 \textit{\texttt{b\texttt{5}}} 31 \textit{\texttt{b\texttt{6}}} 32 \textit{\texttt{b\texttt{7}}} 33 \textit{\texttt{h\texttt{4}}} 33 \textit{\texttt{f\texttt{4}}} 34 \textit{\texttt{f\texttt{4}}} 35 \textit{\texttt{a\texttt{b\texttt{2}}} 36 \textit{\texttt{a\texttt{c\texttt{5}}} 37 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{3}}} 38 \textit{\texttt{a\texttt{b\texttt{6}}} 39 \textit{\texttt{g\texttt{3}}} 40 \textit{\texttt{w\texttt{f\texttt{4}}} 41 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{e\texttt{5}}} 42 \textit{\texttt{g\texttt{2}}} 43 \textit{\texttt{c\texttt{6}}} 44 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{e\texttt{4}}} 44 \textit{\texttt{f\texttt{3}}} 45 \textit{\texttt{g\texttt{1}}} 46 \textit{\texttt{e\texttt{x\texttt{f\texttt{3}}} 47 \textit{\texttt{a\texttt{b\texttt{2}}} 48 \textit{\texttt{d\texttt{1}}} 49 \textit{\texttt{g\texttt{1}}} 50 \textit{\texttt{g\texttt{2}}} mate.}}}}\texttt{}}

The b7-pawn drops and White is lost.

48 \textit{\texttt{d\texttt{2}}} 48...\textit{\texttt{b\texttt{3}}} 0-1
Game 50
Van der Wiel-Nunn
Amsterdam 1990

1 e4 e5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 ∆f6 5 0-0 ∆e7 6 ∆e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 ∆xd5 10 ∆xe5 ∆xe5 11 ∆xe5 c6
12 ∆xd5 cxd5 13 d4 ∆d6 14 ∆e3 ∆h4
15 h3 ∆f4 16 ∆e5 ∆f6 17 ∆e1 ∆g6 18 ∆h1 f5

20 ∆g4
After 20 ∆f3?! the surprising 20...f5! 21 ∆xd5+ ∆h8, with the nasty threat ...∆c2-e4,
i’s very strong for Black.
20...∆xg4 21 hxg4 f5!

As we shall see, the only difference between this move and 18...∆d7 is that in some lines it will be useful for Black to include ...∆f5-c2. Generally it is considered nowadays that this line leads to a draw, with White having no chance whatsoever to extract even the slightest opening advantage.

19 ∆e3

Awkward for White is 19 ∆d2?! ∆e8 20 ∆f3 ∆c2! 21 ∆d2 ∆e4 and if 22 ∆h4? ∆f6! White is suddenly in trouble.

19...∆c2

An alternative is 19...∆e4 20 ∆g4 ∆xg4 21 hxg4 f5! 22 gx5 ∆xf5. Now, instead of the correct 23 ∆d2 leading to a draw by perpetual check after 23...∆h5+ 24 ∆g1 ∆h2+ etc., in the game Tempestini-Tinture, correspondence 1991 White chose the weaker 23 f3? ∆g3! 24 ∆f1 (after 24 fxe4 Black has 24...∆h5+ winning) 24...∆c8 25 ∆f2 ∆d3 26 ∆xg3 ∆xf1 27 ∆d2 ∆g2+ and White was forced to resign.

Despite the exchange of queens, White’s king is not completely safe on h1.

22 gx5 ∆xf5 23 ∆g1

White can try to avoid perpetual check with 23 g4, which looks slightly risky. The game Wendehals-Stock, correspondence 1993 continued 23...∆f3 24 ∆d2 ∆h3+ 25 ∆g2 ∆h2+ 26 ∆g1 ∆f8 27 b3 ∆h4 28 f3 ∆h3 29 a4 ∆g3+ 30 ∆h1 ∆h3+ 31 ∆g1 ∆g3+ ½-½.

23...∆h5 24 ∆d2

Only Black will have winning chances after the weakening move 24 f3? ∆g3 etc.

24...∆h2+ 25 ∆h1 ∆b8+

26 ∆g1 ∆h2+ 27 ∆h1 ½-½
1 e4 e5 2  \textit{Q}f3  \textit{Q}c6 3  \textit{b}b5 a6 4  \textit{a}a4  \textit{Q}f6  \\
5 0-0  \textit{Q}e7 6  \textit{Q}e1  b5 7  \textit{b}b3 0-0 8  c3  d5  \\
9 exd5  \textit{Q}xd5 10  \textit{Q}xe5  \textit{Q}xe5 11  \textit{Q}xe5  c6  \\
12  \textit{Q}xd5 cxd5 13  d4  \textit{Q}d6 14  \textit{Q}e3  \textit{h}h4  \\
15  \textit{h}3  \textit{f}f4 16  \textit{Q}e5  \textit{Q}f6 17  \textit{Q}e1  \textit{W}g6 18  \\
\textit{Q}h1  \textit{Q}d7  \\
This seemingly modest move has the following ideas behind it: \\
1) Black leaves the e-file open along which the black rook(s) will be able to exert strong pressure, reckoning that White will develop his dark-squared bishop on e3. \\
2) Black retains the option of playing ...\textit{f}7-\textit{f}5, which is naturally out of the question with the bishop on f5. \\
19  \textit{Q}e3  \textit{f}5  \\
Worthy of attention is 19...\textit{Q}ae8 20  \textit{Q}d2  \textit{Q}e6?! 21  \textit{Q}f1  \textit{Q}fe8 22  \textit{W}d2  \textit{f}5 23  \textit{f}4  \textit{Q}e7!  \\
24  \textit{W}f2  \textit{Q}e8 with very active play for Black, Viau-Slavchev, correspondence 1991. \\
20  \textit{f}4  \textit{Q}ae8 21  \textit{Q}d2  \textit{Q}xe3?!  \\

An incredible exchange sacrifice based purely on positional grounds. In return, Black’s pair of bishops will control a lot of important squares. Also his light-squared bishop comes to life after ...\textit{f}5-\textit{f}4. It is difficult to tell whether the sacrifice is 100 percent sound but in a tournament game it has great practical value. \\
22  \textit{Q}xe3  \textit{Q}xf4 23  \textit{Q}e2  \textit{Q}g3 24  \textit{Q}f3  \\
Passive is 24  \textit{Q}f1?!  \textit{Q}d6 followed by ...\textit{f}5-\textit{f}4. \\
24...\textit{W}h6  \\
Keeping an eye on the potentially vulnerable h3-pawn, where Black can sacrifice a piece. \\
25  \textit{Q}e7  \textit{W}d6 26  \textit{W}e2  \textit{h}6 27  \textit{Q}e1!  \\

Although White has managed to invade the black camp with his rook, there is no real target to be attacked since Black’s pair of bishops (especially the one on g3) is very strong. Hence it is understandable for White to give back the exchange to reduce Black’s pressure. From now on Black will have to watch out for his weakened dark squares. \\
27...\textit{Q}xe1 28  \textit{W}xe1  \textit{f}4 29  \textit{W}e5  \textit{W}xe5 30  \\
\textit{Q}xe5  \\
Or 30  \textit{Q}xe5  \textit{Q}f5 31  \textit{Q}a7  \textit{W}f6 32  \textit{Q}a8+  \\
\textit{Q}h7 33  \textit{Q}d8  \textit{Q}c4 34  \textit{Q}d7 and despite the initial reaction that Black is in trouble, he has the cold-blooded 34...\textit{Q}f7 35  \textit{Q}f8+  \textit{Q}g8 when the discovered check doesn’t give White more than a draw. \\
30...\textit{Q}f5 31  \textit{Q}e7  \textit{h}f7 32  \textit{Q}e5  \textit{Q}f5 33  \textit{Q}e7  \\
\textit{h}f7 34  \textit{Q}e5 ½-½
Summary

Ljubojevic’s overoptimistic play, starting with 19...e6?! led to his demise in Game 39. However, after best play, starting with 19...e1 etc., all White can hope for is a draw. After 16 a4 (Game 40) both 16...d3 and 16...ae8!? grant Black sufficient counterplay but I prefer 16...ae8?!. One must take into consideration that two white pieces from the queenside (the a1-rook and the c1-bishop) do not participate in the fight.

In the encounters with 12 g3, Game 42 should have ended in a draw; White only loses after overestimating his position. Transferring the knight to the kingside by 12...d6?! (Game 43) is too slow and leaves White with an indisputable edge. The final option, 12...d6, grants him sufficient compensation for the pawn if he exchanges on e1 on move fourteen (Game 45). On the contrary, Black should avoid embarking on the combination which contains a hole with 14...g4?, as illustrated in Game 44.

15...f5!? (Game 46) is clearly Black’s worst choice of the three possible moves. However, the viable option 15...g5!? (Game 47), despite looking dubious at first glance, leads to enough counterplay for Black, who can hope to play...g5-g4 at a later stage.

In Game 48 one should remember the importance of Blatny’s 24...h5!, the main aim of which is to prevent White playing the h3-g4 manoeuvre to trade queens. After this strong move Black achieves sufficient counterplay.

In Game 49 Almasi plays actively with 19...ac8! followed by...b5-b4, looking for counterplay along the e-file which is unusual in the Marshall Gambit – normally Black is more interested in the e-file. Still, the position is kept in the balance and any mistake proves costly. Indeed, the game saw the advantage switching back and forth.

In the last two games, both 18...f5 and 18...d7 grant Black equality due to activity along the e-file.

1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 cxd5 10 c5 xe5 11 xe5 c6 12 xd5 d5

12 g3

12...d6 – Game 43
12...d6 13 e1 c5 14 d4 b7 15 dxc5
15...e8 – Game 41; 15...d7 – Game 42
12...d6 13 e1 e8 14 d4
14...g4 – Game 44; 14...xe1+ – Game 45
12 d4 d6 13 e2
13...g4 – Game 38
13...h4 14 g3 h3 15 d2 h5
16 h2 – Game 39; 16 a4 – Game 40

12...cxd5 13 d4 d6 14 e3 h4 15 h3 h5
15...g5!? – Game 47; 15...f5?! – Game 46

16 e5 f6 17 e1
17 d3 – Game 48

17 f6 18 h1
18 f3 – Game 49

18...f5 – Game 50
18...d7 – Game 51
CHAPTER FIVE

Alternatives to the Main Line 11...c6

1 e4 e5 2 ²f3 ²c6 3 ²b5 a6 4 ²a4 ²f6 5 0-0 ²e7 6 ²e1 b5 7 ²b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 ²xd5 10 ²xe5 ²xe5 11 ²xe5

In this chapter we look at less common alternatives for Black on move eleven: 11...²f4?!, 11...²b6?!, 11...²b7 and 11...²f6. Playing these moves has the advantage of not having to learn the reams of theory that accompany the main move 11...c6.

In Games 52-53 Black chooses the very rare 11...²f4?!, and 11...²b6?!. On the contrary, the move 11...²b7 (Games 54-59) is played far more and is in fact a serious alternative to the main move 11...c6.

In Games 54-55 we see the positional treatment starting with 12 ²f3, when White must choose between 13 ²xd5? and 13 ²xd5.

Games 56-59 deal with 12 d4, which is the most frequently played move by White. The old continuation is 12...²d7?! (Games 56-57), with the idea of quickly connecting the heavy pieces and starting action along the e-file or on the kingside. In Games 58-59 Black plays 12...²f6, with which he abandons the idea of a kingside attack and intends to seek compensation for the sacrificed pawn using other factors such as having a bishop on f6 exerting strong pressure along the long diagonal. Also, moves like ...c7-c5 and ...b5-b4 often come in handy. In short, Black reckons on quick development and active piece play.

Games 60-62 deal with 11...²f6, which was preferred by Frank Marshall in his historic encounter with Capablanca, the debut of the Marshall gambit. With 11...²f6 Black, without hesitation, starts a kingside attack and aims for the ...²f6-g4 manoeuvre.

Games 61 and 62 are very instructive. Black follows the long forcing line 12 d4 ²d6 13 ²e1 ²g4 14 h3 ²h4 15 ²f3 ²xf2 16 ²e2 ²g4 17 hxg4 ²g3 18 ²xf2 ²h2+ 19 ²f1 ²h1+ 20 ²e2 and tries to improve upon the stern game Capablanca-Marshall.

Game 52
Comp. Zugzwang-Wehmeier
Lippstadt 1993

1 e4 e5 2 ²f3 ²c6 3 ²b5 a6 4 ²a4 ²f6 5 0-0 ²e7 6 ²e1 b5 7 ²b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 ²xd5 10 ²xe5 ²xe5 11 ²xe5

²f4?!

This rare continuation can still be seen in correspondence games (the Swedish player Jan Lind often uses it) and it can also be used as a surprise weapon. However, theory, not without good reason, considers this move inferior to the standard 11...c6 because Black loses time in transferring his knight to g6.
which in turn gives White time to catch up with the development of his queenside.

12 d4

Weaker is 12 筽f3 筽d6! 13 d4 (13 筽xf4? 筽xe5 14 筽xe5? 筽e8! etc. wins for Black) 13...筽xe5 14 dxe5 筽d3 15 筽xa8 筽xc1 etc.

12...筽g6 13 筽h5

On h5 the white rook seems to be somewhat awkwardly placed so it is not entirely clear whether this move or 13 筽e1 is better. I would say that it might simply be a matter of taste and that both moves are of equal strength.

Let us see some examples with 13 筽e1 筽b7:

a) 14 筽e3 筽h8 15 筽d2 f5 16 f3 筽h4?! (this is suspicious; better is 16...筽d6?) 17 a4 筽d6 18 axb5 筽g6 19 g3 筽d6 20 f4 筽ae8 21 bxa6 筽a8 22 d5 筽xe3 23 筽xe3 筽c5 24 筽c4 筽e8 25 筽f2 筽h6 26 筽d3 筽g6 27 筽g2 筽xe3 28 筽xc3 筽xf4+ 29 gxf4 筽b6 and Black has managed to regain some of the sacrificed material but White's chances are still preferable, Hermansson-Lind, correspondence 1996.

b) 14 筽d2 with a further split:

b1) 14...筽h4 15 筽e4 筽h8 16 f3 筽d7 17 筽f4 筽ae8 18 a4 f5 19 筽g5 筽xg5 20 筽xg5 筽xf3?! (Black had absolutely no compensation at all for the pawn so he tries this desperate move that surprisingly wins, thanks to his generous opponent) 21 筽xe8 筽xe8 and now in Zolotanos-Barenboim, USSR 1968 White could have punished his opponent with 22 gxf3 筽g6 23 f4 h6 24 axb5 axb5 25 筽a6! 筽xa6 26 筽xh4, when the two bishops clearly outweigh the black rook. Instead he played the weaker 22 筽e1? 筽xg2 23 筽xe8 筽xe8 24 axb5, overlooking 24...h6! 25 筽d2 axb5 26 筽f2 筽h4 27 筽e3 g5 after which Black later managed to convert his extra pawn into a win.

b2) 14...c5 15 筽f3 c4 16 筽c2 f5 17 筽e5 (or 17 筽c2 筽h8 18 筽c5 筽xe5 19 dxe5 筽d5 20 f3 筽c5+ 21 筽h1 筽ae8 22 筽f4 筽f7 23 筽ad1 筽e6 24 b3 筽h5 25 bxc4 g5 26 筽g3 f4 27 筽d7 – 27 筽f2 筽h6 28 h3 筽xf3! 29 筽xf3 30 筽xf3 31 gxh3 筽xf2 is good for Black – 27...fxg3 – weaker is 27...筽h6? 28 筽xb7 fxg3 29 h3 etc. – 28 筽xh7+ 筽xh7 29 筽xb7 筽xh6 30 h3 筽xh3+! 31 gxh3 筽xf3+ 32 筽xf3 筽xf3 33 筽c4 筽xc3 34 cxb5 axb5 35 筽g2 筽g7 36 筽c2 筽f8 and the ending in Jonsson-Lind, Sollentuna 1995 was later drawn) 17...筽d5 18 f3 筽xe5 19 dxe5 (even stronger is 19 筽xh6, not weakening the a7-g1 diagonal, after which Black has no compensation for the sacrificed pawn) 19...筽c6 (the old analysis of the late former World Champion Mikhail Tal's run 19...筽c5+ 20 筽h1 f4! 21 b3 筽xd1 22 筽xd1 筽c6 and Black is okay – food for thought) 20 筽e2 g5 21 筽e3 h5 22 筽f2 筽f7 23 筽c5 with clear advantage for White in Kondali-Dalko, correspondence 1972. Obviously Black's play was not great, but even after better play I don’t think he should have
enough for the pawn.

13...\textit{b7}

13...\textit{d7} had success in Gromer-Vanden Bosch, Hamburg Olympiad 1930 after 14 \textit{c3} \textit{h4} 15 \textit{f4} \textit{e8} 16 \textit{e2} \textit{g6} 17 \textit{e4} \textit{g4} 18 \textit{e5} \textit{xc5} 19 \textit{dxc5} \textit{f5} etc. However, instead of the poor 16 \textit{e2}, much stronger is 16 \textit{d3}! \textit{g6} 17 \textit{g5} \textit{d6} 18 \textit{h3} with some advantage to White.

14 \textit{g4}!?

This is an improvement over 14 \textit{d3} and now:

a) 14...\textit{e8}?! 15 \textit{c3} \textit{c5} 16 \textit{f5} \textit{c4} 17 \textit{f2} \textit{wc7} 18 \textit{d2} \textit{ad8} 19 \textit{wh3} \textit{h6} 20 \textit{xg6}! (wrong is 20 \textit{xh6}? \textit{gxh6} 21 \textit{xg6} \textit{fxg6} 22 \textit{hxh6} \textit{f6} 23 \textit{xg6}+ \textit{g7} 24 \textit{xf3} \textit{f7} 25 \textit{g3} \textit{e2}, which ended up in Black’s favour in Kurtesch-Balogh, correspondence 1966) 20...\textit{fxg6} 21 \textit{we6}+ \textit{h7} 22 \textit{hxh6}+!

b) Better is 14...\textit{c5}?! 15 \textit{c2} \textit{cxd4} 16 \textit{cxd4} \textit{e8} 17 \textit{c3} \textit{wd6}! 18 \textit{c3} \textit{c6} 19 \textit{b3} \textit{ad8} and Black has some compensation due to his active pieces. After 20 \textit{d1} there follows 20...\textit{xd4}! with complications because Black’s bishop is taboo due to White’s weak back rank and there is no obvious way White can make use of the pin on the d-file.

14...\textit{wd6} 15 \textit{ae3} \textit{ae8} 16 \textit{od2} \textit{a8} 17 \textit{wh1} \textit{wd7}

After 17...\textit{h4} White has the strong reply 18 \textit{we4}! etc.

18 \textit{a4} \textit{h4} 19 \textit{we4}

Also possible is 19 \textit{we2}!?

19...\textit{xf5} 20 \textit{xf3} \textit{g6} 21 \textit{e5} \textit{wd6} 22 \textit{xf7}+!?

This leads to both a positional and material advantage for White, although the weaker 22 \textit{wh3} is also adequate.

22...\textit{xf7} 23 \textit{xf7} \textit{xf7} 24 \textit{wh7}+ \textit{g8}

25 \textit{wh3} \textit{f6} 26 \textit{wd5}+?!

Even stronger was 26 \textit{xf4}! etc.

26...\textit{xe6} 27 \textit{wc6} \textit{f8} 28 \textit{d5} \textit{c8} 29

\textit{wx6} \textit{xf6} 30 \textit{axb5} \textit{axb5} 31 \textit{c5} \textit{e8}

32 \textit{ad3} \textit{ab7} 33 \textit{f3} \textit{a8} 34 \textit{xa8} 35 \textit{b3} \textit{lb7} 36 \textit{f2} 37 \textit{e2} \textit{e8} 38

\textit{b4} \textit{bd7} 39 \textit{d1} \textit{e5} 40 \textit{g3} \textit{d6} 41

\textit{xd6} \textit{exd6} 42 \textit{g4} \textit{e7} 43 \textit{h4} \textit{e5} 44

\textit{d6}?

An unexplicable blunder of pawn. Perhaps the computer was getting tired! With the simple 44 \textit{c4}! a win for White would have been just a matter of time.

44...\textit{cxd6} 45 \textit{e1} \textit{f6} 46 \textit{d3} \textit{c6} 47

\textit{f4} \textit{c8} 48 \textit{g1} \textit{a5} 49 \textit{b4} \textit{c6} 50 \textit{e4}

\textit{e7} 51 \textit{h5} \textit{b7}+ 52 \textit{xd3}!

More active was 52 \textit{d4}!, which still retains some winning chances.

52...\textit{gxh5} 53 \textit{g5} \textit{f5}

Stronger was 53...\textit{c5}! with an easy draw.
54 \( \text{g6+} \) \( \text{f17} \) 55 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f16} \) 56 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{bxc4}+ \) 57 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{e4} \) 58 \( \text{b5} \) d5+ 59 \( \text{b4} \) d4 60 \( \text{g6+} \) \( \text{f7} \) 61 \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{g7} \) 62 b6 \( \text{d3} \) 63 \( \text{a7+} \) \( \text{h6} \) 64 \( \text{d7} \)

White cannot win after 64 b7 \( \text{xb7} \) 65 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{d5+} \) followed by \( \text{xd5xf4} \) etc.
64...\( \text{xe} \text{h5} \) 65 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 66 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 67 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{b7} \) 68 f5 \( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \)

---

**Game 53**

**Olivier-Montavon**

*Geneva 1997*

1 \( e4 \) e5 2 \( \text{d} \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 3 \( \text{b5} \) a6 4 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5 0-0 \( \text{c7} \) 6 \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{e} \text{1} \) b5 7 \( \text{b3} \) 0-0 8 \( \text{c3} \) d5 9 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 10 \( \text{axe} \text{5} \) \( \text{exe} \text{5} \) 11 \( \text{exe} \text{5} \) \( \text{db6?} \)!

From time to time we come across this rarely seen move. With the text Black keeps the a8-h1 diagonal open. However, bearing in mind that Black removes his knight to the queenside, he can hardly expect to justify his pawn sacrifice. I am sure that Frank Marshall would not have been happy with 11...\( \text{db6} \). It is mainly used as a surprise weapon but has poor results in competitive play.

12 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 13 \( \text{g5} \)

White tries to prevent Black from playing \( \text{Wd} \text{8-h4} \). However, this move is not compulsory and the following alternatives are possible as well:

a) 13 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{Wh4} \) 14 g3 \( \text{Wh3} \) 15 \( \text{Wf3} \)? \( \text{g4} \) 16 \( \text{Wg2} \) \( \text{Wh5} \) 17 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f3} \) 18 \( \text{Wf1} \) \( \text{Wh8} \) 19 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{b7} \) 20 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{Wf5} \) 21 f3 \( \text{Wg6} \) 22 \( \text{c4} \) f5 23 \( \text{Wxd6} \) exd6 24 \( \text{Wg2} \) \( \text{a8} \) 25 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{a8} \) 26 \( \text{c2} \) f4 27 gxf4 \( \text{Wh5} \) 28 \( \text{Wf2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 29 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{d5} \) 30 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{c8} \) 31 f5 and Black's attack was not sufficient to justify the deficit of material, Am.Rodriguez-Mendoza, Bogota 1990.

b) 13 \( \text{c3} \) is a move I quite like because the rook fulfills a good defensive role on the third rank: 13...\( \text{Wh4} \) 14 g3 \( \text{Wh3} \) 15 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 17 \( \text{d4} \) (this is better than 17 \( \text{c2} \) f5 18 f4 g5 19 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{d5} \) 20 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{Wh8} \) 21 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 22 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{ae8} \) with compensation for the pawn because White was weak along the a8-h1 diagonal, Boese-Montavon, Leipzig 1998) 17...\( \text{h8} \) 18 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d5} \) 19 \( \text{e2} \) f5 20 \( \text{xd6} \) exd6 21 f3 f4 22 g4 \( \text{g6} \) 23 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{a8} \) 24 \( \text{d1} \) g5 25 \( \text{Wh3} \) \( \text{Wh7} \) 26 \( \text{c2} \) h6 27 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{c7} \) 28 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{g7} \) 29 \( \text{Wh5} \) a5 30 h4 with a winning position for White who, besides being a pawn up, has a kingside attack as in the game Klovans-Montavon, Leipzig 1998.

13...\( \text{Wh7} \) 14 \( \text{h4} \)\( \text{e8} \)

Sometimes Black prefers 15...\( \text{h4} \), which might be a bit more accurate – this can be seen later on when we analyse White's eighteenth move. Note that the f8-square would then be freed for the black king.

16 \( \text{h4} \)

White can also try 16 f3 closing the long diagonal. It is simply a matter of taste which of 16 f3 and 16 \( \text{h4} \) to choose. Both moves are of equal strength – with the text White hurries to bring his bishop to g3 in order to reinforce his kingside.

16...\( \text{d5} \)

Or 16...\( \text{xe1}+ \) 17 \( \text{xe1} \) \( \text{a8} \) 18 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{d5} \) 19 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f4} \) 20 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 21 \( \text{d1} \) g6 and a draw was agreed in the old game Bertok-Stein, Stockholm 1962. However, in the final position I think White should have played on with little risk as he had the extra pawn, although it's true that Black's two bishops would have made the White piece struggle.

17 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 18 \( \text{e4?} \)
Stronger is 18 dxc5 \( \text{dx} \text{c}5 \) (if 18...\( \text{Q} \text{f}4 \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{e}4 \) \( \text{Qxe}4 \) 20 \( \text{Qxe}4 \) \( \text{Qxe}4 \) 21 \( \text{Qxe}4 \) \( \text{Qg}4 \) 22 \( \text{Qh}1 \) \( \text{Qxc}5 \) 23 \( \text{Qg}3 \) White is a pawn ahead) 19 \( \text{Qe}4 \) with a clear advantage for White because Black will have to retreat his bishop to c7 putting an end to his activity. 19...\( \text{Qb6?} \) loses by force to 20 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 21 \( \text{Qf}6+! \)
21...\( \text{gx}f6 \) 22 \( \text{Qg}3+ \) and to avoid mate Black must give up his queen.
18...\( \text{Qxe}4! \)

Black sacrifices the exchange rather than allow his dark-squared bishop to be exchanged for White’s knight. This is one more example confirming that the initiative is of vital importance in the Marshall Attack.

19 \( \text{Qxe}4 \) \( \text{Qf}4 \) 20 d5 f5 21 \( \text{Qe}3 \) c4 22 \( \text{Qc}2 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 23 f3

Interesting is the following sharp variation: 23 \( \text{Qd}2 \) \( \text{Qxg}2 \) 24 \( \text{Qg}3 \) \( \text{Qa}8+ \) 25 \( \text{Qxf}4 \) \( \text{Qb}7+ \) 26 \( \text{Qc}4 \) fxe4 and White will be slaughtered on the long diagonal!

23...\( \text{Qxg}2! \)

This sacrifice shows that Black has a good positional feeling for the initiative. Objectively this move should have led to a draw by perpetual check.

24 \( \text{Qxg}2 \) f4 25 \( \text{Qf}2 \) \( \text{Qg}4+ \) 26 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{Qxf}3 \) 27 \( \text{Qe}7 \) \( \text{Qh}3+ \) 28 \( \text{Qg}1 \) \( \text{Qc}7+! \)

Black continues to play for the win rather than accepting the draw with 28...\( \text{Qg}4+. \)

29 \( \text{Qc}5 \)

Also deserving of attention was 29 b4, which would have led to a draw.

29...\( \text{Qd}8? \)

Wrong – this is overoptimistic. This was the last chance for Black to take the draw.

30 \( \text{Qe}7 \) \( \text{Qd}5 \) 31 \( \text{Qe}8+ \) \( \text{Qf}7 \) 32 \( \text{Qf}8+ \) \( \text{Qe}6 \)

33 \( \text{Qe}1+ \) \( \text{Qd}7 \) 34 \( \text{Qe}7+ \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 35 \( \text{Qf}5? \)

Simpler was 35 \( \text{Qx}g7 \) after which White easily wins with his extra material.

35...\( \text{Qg}4+ \) 36 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{Qh}3+ \) 37 \( \text{Qg}1 \)

White is still winning after 37 \( \text{Qe}1! \), not fearing 37...\( \text{Qxf}5 \) because after 38 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) (of course the black queen is taboo because of mate on d1) 38...\( \text{Qxc}2 \) 39 \( \text{Qxc}7+ \) \( \text{Qxc}7 \) 40 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) \( \text{Qb}1+ \) 41 \( \text{Qd}1 \) \( \text{Qxd}1+ \) 42 \( \text{Qxd}1 \) g5 43 \( \text{Qf}8+ \) g4 44 \( \text{Qh}6 \) f3 45 \( \text{Qe}1 \) \( \text{Qd}6 \) 46 \( \text{Qf}2 \) \( \text{Qe}5 \) 47 h3 \( \text{Qf}5 \) 48 \( \text{Qg}3! \) the ending is a straightforward win for White.

37...\( \text{Qg}4+ \) 38 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{Qd}8 \) 39 \( \text{Qxd}5 \)

Or 39 \( \text{Qe}6+ \) \( \text{Qb}7 \) 40 \( \text{Qf}7+ \) \( \text{Qc}7 \) 41 \( \text{Qe}7 \) \( \text{Qxc}5 \) 42 \( \text{Qf}5! \), not falling for the trap of taking the rook which allows perpetual check.

39...\( \text{Qxd}5 \) 40 \( \text{Qe}4?? \)

An incredible blunder, dropping a rook, in what is assumed to be time trouble. White was naturally still winning after 40 \( \text{Qa}7 \) etc.

40...\( \text{Qd}1+ \) 41 \( \text{Qg}2 \)

Or 41 \( \text{Qe}1 \) \( \text{Qxc}1+ \) 42 \( \text{Qxc}1 \) \( \text{Qxc}7 \) 43 \( \text{Qxe}7 \) (43 \( \text{Qxd}5+ \) \( \text{Qxc}5 \) would not save White) 43...\( \text{Qxe}4 \) with a winning endgame for Black.

41...\( \text{Qxe}7 \) 0-1

---

Game 54

V. Ivanov-Vuori

Correspondence 1986

1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 3 \( \text{Qb}5 \) a6 4 \( \text{Qa}4 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \) 5 0-0 \( \text{Qe}7 \) 6 \( \text{Qe}1 \) b5 7 \( \text{Qb}3 \) 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 10 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Qxe}5 \) 11 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Bd}7 \)

Black develops his bishop on the long diagonal. This move is seen from time to time and could prove successful if White is not prepared for it.

12 \( \text{Qf}3 \)

12 d4 is seen in Games 56-59.

12...\( \text{Qd}6 \) 13 \( \text{Qxd}5? \)
This is wrong – the correct continuation will be seen in our next game. With the text White gains a huge material advantage but he will have to pay a high price for it – his first rank is badly weakened. Also, his queenside is well behind in development.

13...\textit{\textbf{e8}}

This is the move that is usually played but I think 13...\textit{\textbf{c7}}, in order not to give White the opportunity to take on f7, might be even stronger, for example:

a) 14 \textit{\textbf{wxe3}} \textit{\textbf{bxc8}}! 15 \textit{\textbf{wxg7}} \textit{\textbf{xe7}} 16 \textit{\textbf{f1}} \textit{\textbf{xe8}} and we have reached a curious position when after the exchange of queens White is still helpless to defend his back rank!

b) 14 \textit{\textbf{8f1}} \textit{\textbf{bxc8}}! (Black should put this rook on e8 and not the other one) 15 \textit{\textbf{d1}} \textit{\textbf{xd5}} 16 \textit{\textbf{xd5}} \textit{\textbf{e5}} 17 \textit{\textbf{f3}} \textit{\textbf{hxh2}} 18 \textit{\textbf{g3}} \textit{\textbf{g6}}! 19 \textit{\textbf{d4}} \textit{\textbf{f7}} 20 \textit{\textbf{d2}} \textit{\textbf{xe3}}! 21 \textit{\textbf{fxe3}} \textit{\textbf{gxf3}} followed by ...\textit{\textbf{xf6}} and Black wins.

14 \textit{\textbf{xf7+}}

In some games White has tried 14 \textit{\textbf{wxe7+?}} but the results have been incredibly poor for White – Black has actually won all the games! For instance:

a) 14...\textit{\textbf{wfx7}} 15 \textit{\textbf{xd6+}} \textit{\textbf{w8}} 16 \textit{\textbf{xe8}} \textit{\textbf{wxe8}} 17 \textit{\textbf{xf1}} \textit{\textbf{e4}} (White has two pieces for a rook but his undeveloped queenside makes his position untenable) 18 \textit{\textbf{f3}} \textit{\textbf{d3+}} 19 \textit{\textbf{g2}} \textit{\textbf{g2+}} 20 \textit{\textbf{g3}} \textit{\textbf{d6}} 21 \textit{\textbf{a3}} \textit{\textbf{g6+}} 22 \textit{\textbf{h3}} \textit{\textbf{exg2}} 23 \textit{\textbf{c2}} \textit{\textbf{g1}} 0-1 Kettner-Kountz, Ledenburg 1992.

b) 14...\textit{\textbf{wh8?!}} might also be winning for Black but is more complicated. 15 \textit{\textbf{wxf1}} \textit{\textbf{wh4}} and now both 16 \textit{\textbf{d4}} \textit{\textbf{xf8}} (Black also wins with 16...\textit{\textbf{we4}}) 17 \textit{\textbf{h5}} \textit{\textbf{e4}} 18 \textit{\textbf{hxh7+}} \textit{\textbf{wxh7}} 19 \textit{\textbf{we6}} \textit{\textbf{hxg2+}} (0-1 Nowrouzy-Wenger, Graz 1993) and 16 \textit{\textbf{h5}} \textit{\textbf{we4!}} lose immediately for White. After 16 \textit{\textbf{wxf3}} \textit{\textbf{wh2}} 17 \textit{\textbf{g4}} (17 ...\textit{\textbf{h3}}+ 18 \textit{\textbf{wyg2}} \textit{\textbf{xe1}} wins the queen) 17...\textit{\textbf{f3!}} 18 \textit{\textbf{a3}} \textit{\textbf{xf2}} 19 \textit{\textbf{wxg2}} \textit{\textbf{h1+}} 20 \textit{\textbf{g1}} \textit{\textbf{xe1+}}! Black again has managed to breakthrough. So White’s most resilient defence is 16 \textit{\textbf{d3}} \textit{\textbf{f8}}! 17 \textit{\textbf{h5}} (or 17 \textit{\textbf{g5}} \textit{\textbf{wh2}} and White is helpless), but after 17...\textit{\textbf{wg4!}} Black is still winning.

14...\textit{\textbf{we7}}

15 \textit{\textbf{wxf7+}}

The only try is 15 \textit{\textbf{wxe3}} \textit{\textbf{wh4}} and now:

a) 16 \textit{\textbf{d4}}? loses after 16...\textit{\textbf{wxc2}} 17 \textit{\textbf{wh2}} \textit{\textbf{wxc2}} 18 \textit{\textbf{d3}} \textit{\textbf{f5}} 19 \textit{\textbf{gxf5}} \textit{\textbf{g5}} 20 \textit{\textbf{h6+}} \textit{\textbf{wxh6}} 21 \textit{\textbf{g4}} \textit{\textbf{d5}} 22 \textit{\textbf{wxc2}} \textit{\textbf{d4}} 23 \textit{\textbf{a6}} \textit{\textbf{f5}} 24 \textit{\textbf{d6}} \textit{\textbf{g4}} 25 \textit{\textbf{e3}} \textit{\textbf{e5}} 26 \textit{\textbf{f3}} \textit{\textbf{wh2}} 27 \textit{\textbf{we5}} 28 \textit{\textbf{d5+}} \textit{\textbf{wh1}} 29 \textit{\textbf{h1}} \textit{\textbf{d4}} 30 \textit{\textbf{d6}} \textit{\textbf{f5}} 31 \textit{\textbf{f6}} \textit{\textbf{h5}} 32 \textit{\textbf{d5}} \textit{\textbf{e6}} 33 \textit{\textbf{d3}} \textit{\textbf{g5}} 34 \textit{\textbf{d4}} 35 \textit{\textbf{h1}} 36 \textit{\textbf{wxe6}} 37 \textit{\textbf{h3}} 38 \textit{\textbf{wh2}} 0-1 Nebel-Abicht, Ruhr Championship 1996.

b) 16 \textit{\textbf{d3}} \textit{\textbf{g4}} and now 17...\textit{\textbf{h5}} looks very promising for Black.

White has the choices between the following:

a1) 18 \textit{\textbf{gxh5?!}} \textit{\textbf{c8}}! 19 \textit{\textbf{d3}} \textit{\textbf{g4}}! 20 \textit{\textbf{d5}} \textit{\textbf{h8}} 21 \textit{\textbf{d4}} \textit{\textbf{wh1+}} 22 \textit{\textbf{wh7}} \textit{\textbf{c2+}} 23 \textit{\textbf{wxg2}} \textit{\textbf{fxc2}} and Black wins.

a2) 18 \textit{\textbf{d5}} ?", however, might just be
holding the position for White after 18...\texttt{\textbackslash}xe7 19 \texttt{\textbackslash}xh5+ \texttt{\textbackslash}g6 20 \texttt{\textbackslash}c2+ \texttt{\textbackslash}c4 21
\texttt{\textbackslash}xb2 \texttt{\textbackslash}xb2 22 \texttt{\textbackslash}d3 \texttt{\textbackslash}f3 23 \texttt{\textbackslash}d4+ \texttt{\textbackslash}e4 24 \texttt{\textbackslash}a3
– Black has only a slightly better ending. This gives the impression that after 13 \texttt{\textbackslash}xd5?,
13...\texttt{\textbackslash}e8 is not the best move for Black and that 13...\texttt{\textbackslash}e7!? is even stronger.
15...\texttt{\textbackslash}xf7 16 \texttt{\textbackslash}e5+ \texttt{\textbackslash}f6 17 \texttt{\textbackslash}xe7 \texttt{\textbackslash}xe7
18 \texttt{\textbackslash}d4 \texttt{\textbackslash}e4

Black has both a positional and material advantage. With his dormant queenside, White is unable to put up any resistance.
19 \texttt{\textbackslash}e3 \texttt{\textbackslash}d3+ 20 \texttt{\textbackslash}e1 \texttt{\textbackslash}xh2 21 \texttt{\textbackslash}d2
\texttt{\textbackslash}e4 22 \texttt{\textbackslash}f5 23 \texttt{\textbackslash}d5 \texttt{\textbackslash}ae8 24 \texttt{\textbackslash}d4+ \texttt{\textbackslash}g6 25 \texttt{\textbackslash}c4 \texttt{\textbackslash}b4! 0-1

Denying the c3-square for the knight on b1.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 55}
Anand-Short
\textit{Manila Olympiad 1992}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
1 e4 e5 2 \texttt{\textbackslash}f3 \texttt{\textbackslash}c6 3 \texttt{\textbackslash}b5 a6 4 \texttt{\textbackslash}a4 \texttt{\textbackslash}f6
5 0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash}e7 6 \texttt{\textbackslash}e1 b5 7 \texttt{\textbackslash}b3 0-0 8 \texttt{\textbackslash}c3 d5
9 exd5 \texttt{\textbackslash}xd5 10 \texttt{\textbackslash}xe5 \texttt{\textbackslash}xe5 11 \texttt{\textbackslash}xe5
\texttt{\textbackslash}b7 12 \texttt{\textbackslash}f3 \texttt{\textbackslash}d6 13 \texttt{\textbackslash}xd5
\end{center}

Obviously the strongest reply. After the forced 13...c6 followed by capturing on d5
with a pawn, Black will close the a8-h1 long diagonal. In some ways this helps White because in many variations he is obliged to make a concession by playing g2-g3 – this would have catastrophic consequences if the
long diagonal were opened.
13...c6 14 \texttt{\textbackslash}e2

Basically there is not much difference whether White places his rook on e1 or e2
because White, later on, often exchanges on e8 so the two rook moves may transpose.
Worth considering is 14 \texttt{\textbackslash}e1 cxd5 15 d4
\texttt{\textbackslash}c7 16 g3 \texttt{\textbackslash}e8 17 \texttt{\textbackslash}c3 b4 18 cxb4 \texttt{\textbackslash}c2 19
\texttt{\textbackslash}xb2 20 \texttt{\textbackslash}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash}ac8 21 \texttt{\textbackslash}f1 \texttt{\textbackslash}e2 22 \texttt{\textbackslash}f4
\texttt{\textbackslash}xe1 23 \texttt{\textbackslash}xe1 \texttt{\textbackslash}xf8 24 \texttt{\textbackslash}e8 \texttt{\textbackslash}xd4 25 \texttt{\textbackslash}e3
\texttt{\textbackslash}b2 26 \texttt{\textbackslash}c5 \texttt{\textbackslash}c5 (forced) 27 bx\texttt{\textbackslash}c5 and
White is the exchange up in Gross-Svatos, Czech League 1997.

Of course White can't afford to take the hot pawn with 14 \texttt{\textbackslash}xf7+?? \texttt{\textbackslash}xf7 15 \texttt{\textbackslash}f5
\texttt{\textbackslash}e7!, after which he could resign because of his vulnerable back rank.
14...cxd5 15 d4 \texttt{\textbackslash}c7 16 g3

There is a tactical reason why 16 h3? is bad – after 16...\texttt{\textbackslash}ae8 we have:

a) 17 \texttt{\textbackslash}d2 b4! (Black can keep White worrying about his queenside before he completes normal development with \texttt{\textbackslash}db1-d2) 18
\texttt{\textbackslash}b3 \texttt{\textbackslash}xe2 19 \texttt{\textbackslash}xf2 \texttt{\textbackslash}c3 20 \texttt{\textbackslash}xc3 \texttt{\textbackslash}xh3 21
\texttt{\textbackslash}c3 \texttt{\textbackslash}e8 22 \texttt{\textbackslash}c1 \texttt{\textbackslash}b4 with advantage for
Black in Szegel-Stern, Poznan 1999 because Black has managed to regain the sacrificed pawn and has retained the presence of his pair of bishops.

b) Even worse is 17 \texttt{\textbackslash}xe8 \texttt{\textbackslash}xe8 18 \texttt{\textbackslash}c3
b4! and now 19 cxb4?? leads to a forced mate
after the brilliant 19...\texttt{\textbackslash}c1+!!

\begin{center}
20 \texttt{\textbackslash}xc1 \texttt{\textbackslash}c1 mate.
\end{center}
16...\texttt{Eae8}

Usually Black places this rook on e8 because if White doesn’t exchange on e8, then Black’s rook can be useful on f8 as Black can later play ...f7-f5.

Premature is 16...f5? 17 \texttt{Exf4}, when Black is weak on the dark squares.

17 \texttt{Dd2}

The alternative is 17 \texttt{Exe8} \texttt{Exe8} 18 \texttt{Ec3} b4 19 a3 a5 but tournament practice has shown that White’s extra pawn is not important since White’s pieces are very restricted.

Also deserving of attention is 17 \texttt{Ec3}? b4 18 \texttt{Cxb4} \texttt{Cxb4} 19 \texttt{Cc3} \texttt{Cxc3} 20 \texttt{Cc1}? \texttt{Wa5} 21 \texttt{Bxc3} \texttt{Ee7†} 22 \texttt{Cc6} \texttt{Exe2} 23 \texttt{Wg4†} g6 24 \texttt{Wxe2} with a winning position for White in Viljanen-Perho, correspondence 1989. However, instead of the poor 21...\texttt{Ee7†}, the logical continuation 21...\texttt{Ee4!} would have kept White’s advantage to a minimum.

17...b4 18 \texttt{Cxb4} \texttt{Cc2} 19 \texttt{Ee3} \texttt{Ec8†}

The bishop has nothing to do on the long a8-h1 diagonal so Black transfers it to the c8-h3 diagonal in order to pressurise the white kingside (h3 in particular). This is an improvement over the earlier 19...\texttt{Exb4†}? 20 \texttt{Df1} \texttt{Ec4} 21 \texttt{Db3} a5 (the piece sacrifice 21...\texttt{Ed1}? 22 \texttt{Exb4} \texttt{Ec8†} seen in Haba-Pirrot, Germany 1992 didn’t prove to be correct – 23 \texttt{Cg2} \texttt{Ei5} 24 \texttt{Dc3} \texttt{Exe3} 25 \texttt{Cxe3} \texttt{Ec4+} 26 \texttt{Wh3} and White was winning) 22 \texttt{Ec3} (worse is 22 \texttt{Eh4†} \texttt{Da6} 23 \texttt{De3} \texttt{Wc6} 24 a3 \texttt{Ed2} 25 \texttt{Df5} \texttt{Wc2} 26 \texttt{Ec5†} \texttt{Cc1!} 0-1 Pinter-

\texttt{nagel-Borchert, correspondence 1989) 22...\texttt{Da6} 23 \texttt{Ec1} \texttt{Wc2} 24 \texttt{Exe2} \texttt{Dxe2} 25 a3 \texttt{Ec4} 26 \texttt{Axh4} \texttt{Axh3} 27 \texttt{Dd2}† with material advantage to White in B.Müller-Karlsch, correspondence 1989.

20 \texttt{Df1} \texttt{Exb4} 21 a3 \texttt{Dc5} 22 \texttt{b4}

Nice is the forcing variation 22 \texttt{Wxd5†} \texttt{Ee1†} 23 \texttt{Wa3} \texttt{Db7} 24 \texttt{Wf4} \texttt{Ee6†}, with the idea of playing ...\texttt{Eh6} against which White has no decent reply.

22...\texttt{Db6} 23 \texttt{Exe8} \texttt{Exe8} 24 \texttt{De3} \texttt{Ee6}

Black has improved the placement of his light-squared bishop – in some lines he may create mating threats with ...\texttt{Eh3}. Black’s pair of bishops fully compensate for White’s extra pawn. Anand realises that any winning try could backfire and reconciles himself to a peaceful result.

25 \texttt{Wd1} \texttt{Cc8} 26 \texttt{Dd2} \texttt{½-½}

\texttt{Game 56}

\texttt{Rogers-Djuric}

\texttt{Brocco 1988}

1 e4 e5 2 Df3 \texttt{Dc6} 3 Db5 a6 4 Df4 \texttt{Dc8} 5 0-0 Dc7 6 \texttt{Dxe1} b5 7 Db3 0-0 8 c3 d5

9 exd5 \texttt{Dxd5} 10 Dxe5 \texttt{Dxe5} 11 Dxe5 \texttt{Db7} 12 d4 \texttt{Wd7†}! 13 Dd2

There are many other possibilities for White but it seems most logical to continue with the development of his queenside.

The fourth edition of \texttt{ECO} (2002) gives as the main line for White the simple continua-
The Marshall Attack

tion 13 \(\text{h}x\text{d}5\) \(\text{h}x\text{d}5\) 14 \(\text{f}4\) (or 14 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{d}8\) 15 \(\text{a}4?\) \(\text{b}4!\) 16 \(\text{f}1\) e5 17 \(\text{d}x\text{c}5\) \(\text{f}6\) 18 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 19 \(\text{g}4\) h5 20 \(\text{xb}4\) \(\text{xg}2\) with clear advantage to Black, Wikner-Berzinsh, Hallsberg 1993) 14...\(\text{d}7\) 15 \(\text{e}1\) c5 16 \(\text{d}c5\) \(\text{c}6\) 17 \(\text{g}4\) \(\text{x}c5\) 18 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{a}e8\) 19 \(\text{d}f3\) (worse is 19 \(\text{b}3?!\) \(\text{x}e1+\) 20 \(\text{x}e1\) \(\text{e}8\) 21 \(\text{e}x\text{e}8+\) \(\text{e}x\text{e}8\) 22 \(\text{d}2\) h5! 23 \(\text{d}1\) – 23 \(\text{x}h5?\) \(\text{e}4!\) – 23...\(\text{e}4\) 24 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}6\) 25 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 26 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}4\) 27 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{b}4!\) and Black had more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn due to White’s vulnerable \(\text{f}4\)-pawn and Black’s powerful pair of bishops, Dvoirys-Yermolinsky, Vilnius 1984) 19...\(\text{x}e1+\) 20 \(\text{x}e1\) \(\text{e}8\) 21 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{f}6\) 22 \(\text{d}4\) and assesses the position as slightly better for White. However, I doubt if White can convert his material advantage into a win and I consider this position as drawish.

Also it should be mentioned that after 13 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}8\) 14 \(\text{d}2\) (14 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{x}f5\) 15 \(\text{x}f5\) \(\text{e}8\) 16 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 17 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{f}6\) 18 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{g}7\) – the awkward position of the white rook grants Black sufficient compensation – 19 \(\text{d}2\) e5 20 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 21 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{cxd}4\) 22 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{f}8\) 23 \(\text{xe}8\) \(\text{xe}8\) 24 \(\text{cxd}4\) \(\text{d}x\text{d}4\) 25 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{d}8\) is equal, Harley-Hebden, Hastings 1988/89) 14...\(\text{e}5!\) 15 \(\text{d}x\text{c}5\) \(\text{f}6\) 16 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{g}3\) Black stands well.

13 ...\(\text{h}5\) is similar to lines with 13 \(\text{f}3\):
13...\(\text{e}6\) 14 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{x}f5\) 15 \(\text{x}f5\) \(\text{e}4\) and:
    a) Inferior is 16 ...\(\text{g}5?\) \(\text{d}6\) 17 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}8\) 18 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{b}7\) 19 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{e}1\) 20 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{xc}1!\)

and White resigned in Gardner-Harding, correspondence 1975 because after 21 \(\text{xc}1\) \(\text{xf}4\) Black emerges a whole rook up.

b) 16 ...\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{d}6\) 17 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{b}7\) (of course the rook on e5 was taboo) 18 ...\(\text{e}8\) 19 \(\text{x}e8+\) \(\text{x}e8\) 20 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{e}1\) (again we come across the motif of White’s weak back rank) 21 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}4\) 22 ...\(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{x}a1\) 23 ...\(\text{xc}7\) \(\text{d}5\) with clear advantage to Black, Beikert-B.Schneider, Germany 1988.

Note that 13 \(\text{a}4?!\) needs to be mentioned, although it must be wrong considering White is behind in development.

13 \(\text{d}4\) 14 \(\text{e}4\)

This is safer than 14 \(\text{d}3\) against which Black can venture an unclear piece sacrifice with 14...\(\text{x}g2?!\) 15 ...\(\text{x}e7\) (obviously this is forced since 15 ...\(\text{x}g2??\) \(\text{g}4+\) and Black wins) 15...\(\text{x}e7\) 16 ...\(\text{x}g2\) \(\text{d}8\) 17 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}8\) 19 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{h}5\) 20 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{d}6\) with an unclear position, Tukmakov-Tseitlin, Odessa 1972. White has the extra material but Black has plenty of play against White’s weakened king, which makes it very difficult to evaluate the position.

14...\(\text{g}6\) 15 ...\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{xc}5\) 16 \(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{e}8\) 17 ...\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{h}8\)

Black removes his king from the \(a2-g8\) diagonal in order to play ...\(f7-f5\) preparing for a kingside attack. Objectively speaking, White’s chances are much the better since there is no weakness in the white camp (White has only to be careful with his king’s rook) and, besides, White has a pair of bishops and an extra pawn. Black’s only hope consists of rapid development and pressure along the e-file. White’s weak back rank should also be noted.

18 \(\text{h}5!\) \(\text{e}4\)

Obviously 18...\(\text{f}5??\) fails to the well known tactic 19 \(\text{xh}7!\) \(\text{hxh}7\) 20 \(\text{h}5\) mate.

The alternative 18...\(\text{h}6\) was seen in Hartmann-Vodep, correspondence 1996 in which White won quickly after 19 \(\text{a}4\) (in his commentary to the text game Grandmaster Ian Rogers recommends 19 \(\text{h}3\) for White but the
text is also good because we can reach the same position but with White’s pawn on a4 rather than on a2, which cannot be bad for White) 19...f5 20 $\text{axh6! gxh6} 21 \text{exh6+ g8} 22 \text{w5 w6} 23 \text{wh7+ f6} 24 \text{h4! f4} (obviously the only move since there was no other way to defend the mate on g5) 25 \text{h6 g8} 26 \text{axg8 xg8} 27 \text{axb5 axb5} 28 \text{e1} 1-0. In this game Black lost quickly without making any obvious mistakes which shows that the whole variation starting with 12...w7 is not playable for Black and that only 12...f6 can revitalise the line with 11...b7.

19 h3 e7 20 e5! f5 21 d5 g6 22 e6!

Very strong indeed. Black’s kingside initiative has come to an end since his minor pieces, especially the knight, are not active enough. After 22 e6 Black has an unpleasant choice – either to suffer the presence of White’s powerful rook on e6 or to eliminate it, thus giving White a strong passed e-pawn. In short, White is a pawn up with the better position.

22...d8 23 g5! xd5 24 xd8 xe6 25 w7 xd7 xe7 26 xc7.

With the bishop pair and an extra pawn, the win is simply a matter of technique.

26...ce8 27 d6 h6 28 d1 wh7 29 f3 a5 30 g3 c6 31 c2 f8 32 c7 a4 33 d6 e8 34 d8 h5 35 b6 f4 36 c5 h8 37 d3 h6 38 b8 h4 39 a3

\text{h7 40 f2 h6 41 b6 1-0}

\text{Game 57}
\text{Kudrin-Hebden}
\text{Las Palmas 1989}

1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 h6 6 h3 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 cxd5 10 xe5 xe5 11 xe5 b7 12 d4 w7 13 d2 f4

Rarely seen is 13...f3 14 fxe3 dxe5 15 cxd4 e6 16 f4 b7 17 b4 de 18 c2 d4 19 f5 g5 20 xg5 xe5 21 cxe5 d6! (bad is 21...xe5? 22 dxe4 xf4 23 w7 with a double attack on b7 and e8) 22 w4 d3 23 e6! with advantage to White, Kloevans-Ma.Tseitlin, Novosibirsk 1986.

14 e4 d6

Black tries to improve over 14...g6 from the previous game but, as we shall see, it is not enough for reaching full equality.

15 cxd6 cxd6 16 a5 c6 17 g3

White rightly understands that Black’s main compensation for the pawn is the misplaced rook on g5.

Also possible is 17 w4!? eae8 18 c3 w7 19 h4! w8 20 h5 f5 21 xe5 xe5 22 xf5 d4 23 b5 xe4 24 wxe4 g5 25 f3+ 26 xg2 xg2 27 a5 1-0 Wolff-Leisebien, correspondence 1991. White played more weakly in the game Henao-Djuric, Saint John 1988 with 17 c3 c8 18 a4 d4 19 axb5 axb5 20 c2? (better is
20 d5 f5 21 a7 with complicated play) 20...d5 21 xe4 xe4 22 wc2 f5 23 g3 we6 24 xe1? de7! (also good was the simple 24...h6 25 xg6 xg6 26 wb3 wc6 with a material advantage for Black but with the text Black wants to control the position even more than that) 25 wd1 g6 26 wd2 we6 27 f3 xe6 28 g4 (an ugly move but there is nothing else as otherwise the rook on g5 is trapped) 28...h6 29 gxf5 dxg5 30 xe5 xe5 31 xg6 h6 32 xe1 f4 33 f4 xg4+ 34 h1 xe7 35 g5 e7 36 e1 a2 37 wb1 e2 1-0.

Dissatisfied with the results after 12...wd7?! Black has recently switched to this move in an attempt to rehabilitate the 11...e5 line. Black’s idea is clear – with the eventual ...c7-c5 he will open up the long a1-h8 diagonal for his dark-squared bishop. However, I would like to emphasise that with the placement of the bishop on f6 instead of d6, Black will try to achieve positional compensation for the pawn rather than go all out for the usual kingside offensive.

13 xe1

The most logical continuation. Sometimes White plays 13 xg5 instead, which I think is unnecessary since White’s light-squared bishop is at least as strong as the black knight on d5. The game Sisniega-Milos, Sao Paulo 1991 continued 13...xe4 14 e1 e8 15 e3 wd6 16 d2 e7 17 d1 a8 18 d2 e6 19 f3 h4 20 f2 xg7 21 d2 xe1 22 xe1 a2. Taking the pawn restored the material balance and a level ending arose.

13...e8

The more active 13...c5 can be seen in the next game.

14 a3

The alternative 14 d2 doesn’t promise any advantage to White, for example:

a) Bad is 14...b4? 15 c4 d4 16 d5 d3 17 xe8+ xe8 18 c2 xb2 (the piece sacri-
fice 18...\( \text{\textit{Qxf2?}} \) was refuted in De Firmian-Kriemel, US Championship 1994 after 19 \( \text{\textit{Qxf2 \text{\textit{Qd4+}}} 20 \text{\textit{Qxf1 \text{\textit{We5}}} 21 \text{\textit{We1 \text{\textit{Wg1+}}} 22 \text{\textit{Qe2 \text{\textit{Wxg2+}}} 23 \text{\textit{Qd1 \text{\textit{Qf2}}} 24 \text{\textit{Wxe4 \text{\textit{Wxh2}}} 25 \text{\textit{Qf3 \text{\textit{Wh3}}} 26 \text{\textit{Qc3 \text{\textit{Qxe3}}} 27 \text{\textit{Qxe3 \text{\textit{c6}}} 28 \text{\textit{d6!}}} 29 \text{\textit{Qf2 \text{\textit{Wh5}}} 30 \text{\textit{Qxe5 \text{\textit{Wxe5}}} 31 \text{\textit{Qxe5 \text{\textit{c5}}} 32 \text{\textit{Qd1 \text{\textit{Qd8}}} 33 \text{\textit{Qa4 1-0}}} 19 \text{\textit{Qxb2 \text{\textit{Qxb2}}} 20 \text{\textit{Qb1 \text{\textit{Qc3}}} 21 \text{\textit{Qe4 \text{\textit{We5}}} 22 \text{\textit{Qd3! \text{\textit{Qe8}}} 23 \text{\textit{Qxc3 \text{\textit{bxc3}}} 24 \text{\textit{Qf4 \text{\textit{Qe2}}} 25 \text{\textit{Qxh7+ \text{\textit{Qf8}}} 26 \text{\textit{h3}}} with a technically winning position for White, who has both the extra pawn and the attack in De Firmian-Crawley, Lugano 1989.}

b) 14...\( \text{\textit{Qxf4} 15 \text{\textit{Qxf3 \text{\textit{Qxf3}}} 16 \text{\textit{Qxe8+ \text{\textit{Wxe8}}} 17 \text{\textit{Qxf3 \text{\textit{Qg5}}} 18 \text{\textit{Qxf4 \text{\textit{Qxf4}}} (with White's weakened kingside Black has sufficient compensation for the pawn) 19 \text{\textit{Qd3 \text{\textit{Qe7}}} 20 \text{\textit{Qf5 \text{\textit{Qd6}}} 21 \text{\textit{Qe4 \text{\textit{Qe4}}} (White played poorly in Joocks-Stern, Germany 1998, which continued 21 \text{\textit{Qf4 \text{\textit{Qe8}}} 22 \text{\textit{Qd5 \text{\textit{Qg4}}} 23 \text{\textit{Qh6!}}} 24 \text{\textit{a4 \text{\textit{Qxa4}}} 25 \text{\textit{Qxa4 \text{\textit{Qe1+}}} 26 \text{\textit{Qg2 \text{\textit{Qe2}}} 27 \text{\textit{Qf3 \text{\textit{Qxb2}}} 28 \text{\textit{Qa2 \text{\textit{Qc2}}} 29 \text{\textit{Qxa6 \text{\textit{Qc1}}} 30 \text{\textit{Qa8+ \text{\textit{Qg7}}} 31 \text{\textit{Qe3 \text{\textit{Qh1+} 0-1}}} 21 \text{\textit{Qe8} 22 \text{\textit{Qxe7}}} 23 \text{\textit{a4 \text{\textit{g6}}} 24 \text{\textit{axb5 \text{\textit{axb5}}} 25 \text{\textit{Qa8+ \text{\textit{Qg7}}} 26 \text{\textit{Qb8 \text{\textit{Qc2}}} 27 \text{\textit{Qxb5}}} and here the players agreed a draw in Koch-Hauchard, French Championship 1993.}

14...\text{\textit{b4} 15 \text{\textit{Qc4}}}

The text is stronger than 15 \text{\textit{Qxb4?! \text{\textit{Qxb4}}} 16 \text{\textit{Qc3 c5!} 17 \text{\textit{Qh5 \text{\textit{Qd7}}} 18 \text{\textit{Qc4 \text{\textit{Qg6}}} 19 \text{\textit{Qh3 \text{\textit{Qxh3}}} 20 \text{\textit{Qxh3 \text{\textit{cxd4}}} 21 \text{\textit{Qd2 \text{\textit{Qxe1+}}} 22 \text{\textit{Qxe1 \text{\textit{Qd3}}} 23 \text{\textit{Qf1 \text{\textit{Qd8}}} 24 \text{\textit{Qf3 \text{\textit{Qd5}}} with a clear advantage to Black due to his better pawn structure in J.Howell-Pirrot, Bad Wörishofen 1991.}

15...\text{\textit{bxc3} 16 \text{\textit{Qa6!}}}

Harmless is the continuation 16 \text{\textit{Qe5 \text{\textit{Qd6}}} 17 \text{\textit{Qe2 \text{\textit{Qe7}}} 18 \text{\textit{bxc3 \text{\textit{Qxc3}}} 19 \text{\textit{Qc4 \text{\textit{Qd5}}} 20 \text{\textit{Qxd5 \text{\textit{Qxd5}}} 21 \text{\textit{Qa3 \text{\textit{Qe6}}} 22 \text{\textit{Qxd5 \text{\textit{Qd5}}} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} as in the old game Mukhin-Romanashin, Vilnius 1971.}

16...\text{\textit{Qxd4} 17 \text{\textit{Qxe8+!}}}

This is an improvement over 17 \text{\textit{Qxb7}} from the game Servat-Adla, Buenos Aires 1990 and is in fact the greatest problem for 12...\text{\textit{Qf6}} devotees and the whole line starting with 11...\text{\textit{Qb7}.}

Black was just about okay after 17 \text{\textit{Qxb7 \text{\textit{Qf6}}} 18 \text{\textit{Qf1 \text{\textit{Qxb2}}} 19 \text{\textit{Qxb2 \text{\textit{Qxb2}}} 20 \text{\textit{Qxd5 \text{\textit{Qxa1}}} 21 \text{\textit{Qxa1 \text{\textit{Qxg3}}} in Servat-Adla, Buenos Aires 1990. Best is then 21...\text{\textit{Qc5}} after which White's small material advantage is compensated by Black's strong centralised pieces.

17...\text{\textit{Qxe8} 18 \text{\textit{Qxb7 \text{\textit{Qxb2}}} 19 \text{\textit{Qxb2 \text{\textit{Qxb2}}} 20 \text{\textit{Qxd5 \text{\textit{Qxa1}}} 21 \text{\textit{Qxa1 \text{\textit{Qwa5}}} 22 \text{\textit{Qd1!}} \text{\textit{Qe8}}} 23 \text{\textit{g3 \text{\textit{g6}}} 24 \text{\textit{a4 \text{\textit{Qe2}}} 25 \text{\textit{Qwa3 \text{\textit{Qf3}}} 26 \text{\textit{Qg2}}} In this position, which is of a technical nature, the two minor pieces clearly outweigh the rook and pawn. White improves the position of his king against any possible unpleasant checks on his back rank. The position can be assessed as close to winning for White.

26...\text{\textit{Qwe5} 27 \text{\textit{Qc4 \text{\textit{Qwa1}}} 28 \text{\textit{Qxc7 \text{\textit{Qf6}}} 29 \text{\textit{Qc4 \text{\textit{Qe1}}} 30 \text{\textit{Qc5 \text{\textit{Qwa1}}} 31 \text{\textit{Qf4 \text{\textit{Qg1+}}} 32 \text{\textit{Qh3}}}
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White’s king is safe enough on h3 as Black has insufficient pieces to create serious mating threats.

32...f5 33 wC7+ d6 34 wF4+ g7 35 e6+ f6 36 d4! wE1 37 f3

Although at first glance it looks rather awkward, White must play this move since after the reckless 15 d2? f4! Black’s initiative would become extremely dangerous.

15...wC7 16 c2

Anand-Short, Amsterdam 1993 saw 16 xe8+ xe8 17 xd5 xd8 18 f4! (of course White is so far behind in development that there is not even time to consider the possibility of 18 xf7+ wxf7 19 wF1, after which his position becomes very difficult regardless of his advantage in material) 18...wF4 19 wF3 wF3 20 xf7 xf7 21 gxh7+ c2 bxc3 23 bxc3 xe8 24 e7 b6 25 c4 xc5 26 e3 d4 27 e1 xe3 28 fxe3 e8 and the ending, despite the material imbalance, is drawish. White could have tried the queen sacrifice with 19 xf7? xe1 20 xdl, which appears to be somewhat advantageous for White, but I think Black can save himself as he can soon play ...f6-e5 blocking White’s passed c-pawn.

16...xc5 17 a2xe6

An active continuation trying to justify

12...f6.

14 dxc5 xe8 15 a3

Game 59
Kulaots-Giorgadze
Wichern 1999

1 e4 e5 2 xf3 d6 3 d5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 e7 6 a1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 a5 10 xe5 xe5 11 xe5 12 d4 f6 13 e1 c5!

An active continuation trying to justify

12...f6.

14 dxc5 xe8 15 a3

White must be a player with strong nerves in order to play the alternative 20 xe4 xc4 21 xc4 d3 22 xf1. Black’s initiative looks threatening but I cannot find anything forced here. Perhaps Black should settle for 22...f6 23 f3 (23 g3? weakening the long diagonal is ugly) 23...xf3 24 xf3 xc2 and Black regains his sacrificed material and has the better position.

20...xe3 21 xe3 d8 22 aae1 xe3 23 xc3 wc6 24 f3 a5 25 d4

After 25 a3 Black can play 25...xd6, having in mind the possibility of ...d2. It is obvious that in this position, despite the pawn deficit, Black with his powerful pair of bishops doesn’t run the risk of losing.
Alternatives to the Main Line 11...c6

25...\textit{wc}5 26 \textit{qc}2 \textit{g}6 27 \textit{db}3 \textit{wx}e3+ 28 \textit{xe}3 \textit{a}4 29 \textit{dd}4

White decides to give back his extra pawn after which the game fizzles out into a draw. The text is practically forced since after 29 \textit{ce}5?! \textit{dd}2! 30 \textit{ec}4 \textit{ce}8! Black will pick up a queenside pawn with excellent chances.

29...\textit{xd}4 30 \textit{cxd}4 \textit{xd}4 31 \textit{ff}2 \textit{ff}8 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}

\textbf{Game 60}
 Eslon-Barczay
 Kecskemét 1983

1 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}5 2 \textit{ff}3 \textit{cc}6 3 \textit{bb}5 \textit{a}6 4 \textit{aa}4 \textit{ff}6 5 0-0 \textit{ee}7 6 \textit{ee}1 b5 7 \textit{bb}3 0-0 8 \textit{c}3 d5 9 \textit{exd}5 \textit{xd}5 10 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 11 \textit{xe}5 \textit{ff}6

Marshall’s original continuation.

12 \textit{d}4 \textit{dd}6 13 \textit{ee}1 \textit{gg}4

Premature is the piece sacrifice 13...\textit{hx}h2+? 14 \textit{hx}h2 \textit{gg}4+ and now:

a) 15 \textit{gg}3? \textit{dd}6+ 16 \textit{ff}4 \textit{gg}6! and the threatened discovered check on e3 is very unpleasant for White. 17 \textit{ff}3 \textit{ff}6?! threatens ...\textit{gg}4+, or 17 \textit{ee}2 f5 18 \textit{ff}3 (with or without including \textit{bb}3+ \textit{hh}8) 18...\textit{bb}7+ 19 \textit{d}5 \textit{ac}8 threatening ...\textit{gg}4-h2+ with a strong attack for Black.

b) 15 \textit{gg}1! \textit{hh}4 16 \textit{ff}3 \textit{bb}7 17 \textit{gg}3 \textit{ae}8 (this is supposed to be the idea behind the line starting with 13...\textit{hx}h2+? but, as we shall see, the sacrifice can be refuted) 18...\textit{dx}e8 \textit{dx}e8 19 \textit{dd}2! \textit{xg}3 20 \textit{fxg}3 \textit{ee}2 21 \textit{dd}5 with \textit{bb}3-d1 to follow, when Black’s attack comes to an end and White’s material advantage is decisive.

14 \textit{h}3 \textit{hh}2+?

This tempting move is a direct mistake, which will be demonstrated in this game. White will be able to refute Black’s attack with accurate play. The more critical 14...\textit{hh}4 will be discussed in Games 61-62.

15 \textit{ff}1 \textit{ff}2

This is the natural follow up to Black’s previous move. The alternative is 15...\textit{hh}4 against which, of course, White does not take the poisoned knight but quietly continues 16 \textit{ff}3 \textit{dd}6 17 \textit{ff}4! \textit{ff}4 18 \textit{xh}4 g5 19 \textit{gg}3 \textit{wh}5 20 \textit{dd}2 \textit{hh}6 21 \textit{ee}4 \textit{gg}6 22 \textit{xg}5, which won for White in Crapulli-Sage, German NATO Championship 1989.

16 \textit{ff}3!
This is the refutation of 14...h2+?. Of course White is not obliged to accept the sacrifice with 16 \( gxf2 \)?, which would have led to a winning attack for Black after 16...\( \mathcal{Wh}+ \) followed by ...\( \mathcal{C}c8xh3 \). Instead White strengthens his kingside and in the meantime a black minor piece will eventually fall. 

16...\( \mathcal{Kh}1 \)

Unfortunately for Black the knight has no better square to go to. If 16...\( \mathcal{D}xh3 \) 17 g\( xh3 \) \( \mathcal{Wh}+ \) 18 \( \mathcal{Ge}4 \) \( \mathcal{Sh}3+ \) 19 \( \mathcal{Ge}2 \) \( \mathcal{W}xe4+ \) 20 \( \mathcal{W}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{Ge}8 \) 21 \( \mathcal{W}xe8 \) \( \mathcal{Sh}e8+ \) 22 \( \mathcal{K}f2 \) (Dudakin-Trofimov, Russian Under-18 Championship 2001) White has a clear advantage in the ending with bishop against two pawns. Although the pawns look dangerous, it is not actually easy to advance them as they are still on their initial squares.

17 \( \mathcal{F}f4 \)

White shouldn’t be greedy and go for material with 17 \( \mathcal{W}xa8? \), which was ruthlessly punished in the game Kamphuis-Berkvens, Hengelo 1996: 17...\( \mathcal{Wh}+ \) 18 \( \mathcal{F}f3 \) \( \mathcal{G}g3+ \) 19 \( \mathcal{K}f2 \) g5! 20 \( \mathcal{E}e3 \) g4 21 \( \mathcal{W}c6 \) g\( xh3 \) 22 \( \mathcal{W}h6 \) \( \mathcal{Ge}4+ ! \) 23 \( \mathcal{W}xe2 \) \( \mathcal{G}g4+ ! \) 24 \( \mathcal{D}d3 \) \( \mathcal{W}xe1 \) 25 \( \mathcal{D}d2 \) \( \mathcal{F}f2+ ! \) 0-1. 

17...\( \mathcal{B}b7 \) 18 \( \mathcal{D}d5 \) \( \mathcal{F}xf4 \) 19 \( \mathcal{W}xf4 \) g5 20 \( \mathcal{W}d6 \) 21 \( \mathcal{G}g1 \) \( \mathcal{A}e8 \) 22 \( \mathcal{D}d2 \) \( \mathcal{G}g3 \) 23 \( \mathcal{F}f2 ! \)

A blunder. Better was 31...\( \mathcal{E}e5+ \).

32 \( \mathcal{E}e2 \) \( \mathcal{F}fe8 \) 33 \( \mathcal{A}a4 ! \) c6 34 \( \mathcal{D}d4 \) \( \mathcal{F}f8 \)

Due to the nasty threat \( \mathcal{W}xe3 \) followed by \( \mathcal{D}d4-f5+ \) winning a piece, Black had no time to defend his c6-pawn.

35 \( \mathcal{A}x\mathcal{c}6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xc6 \) 36 \( \mathcal{A}xc6 \) \( \mathcal{A}e4 \) 37 \( \mathcal{A}e1 \)

38 \( \mathcal{G}g1 \) \( \mathcal{G}c4 \) 39 \( \mathcal{W}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{W}xe4 \) 40 \( \mathcal{W}c2 \) \( \mathcal{W}e5 \) 41 \( \mathcal{W}xe5 \) \( \mathcal{W}xe5 \) 42 \( \mathcal{F}f2 \) \( \mathcal{E}e5 \) 43 \( \mathcal{W}b3 \) \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 44 \( \mathcal{W}e3 \) \( \mathcal{D}d6 \) 45 \( \mathcal{D}d4 \) \( \mathcal{F}f5 \) 46 \( \mathcal{W}e4 \) \( \mathcal{F}f1 \) 47 \( \mathcal{W}e3 \) f5 48 \( \mathcal{A}c4! \) \( \mathcal{E}e1+ \) 49 \( \mathcal{F}f3 \) a5 50 \( \mathcal{A}a4 \) \( \mathcal{E}e5 \) 51 g\( 3 \) \( \mathcal{A}d5 \) 52 \( \mathcal{F}f4 \)

53 \( \mathcal{C}c4 \) \( \mathcal{A}d2 \) 54 \( \mathcal{A}a4 \) \( \mathcal{A}d5 \) 55 h4 h5 56 a3 \( 1 \) \( 0 \)

Game 61

Firt-Cempel

Konik 1995

1 e4 e5 2 \( \mathcal{F}f3 \) \( \mathcal{C}c6 \) 3 \( \mathcal{b}b5 \) a6 4 \( \mathcal{A}a4 \) \( \mathcal{F}f6 \)
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5 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 6 \( \mathcal{A}e1 \) b5 7 \( \mathcal{A}b3 \) 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 \( \mathcal{A}xd5 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A}xe5 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe5 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}xe5 \) \( \mathcal{C}f6 \) 12 d4 \( \mathcal{A}d6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}e1 \) \( \mathcal{A}g4 \) 14 h3 \( \mathcal{W}h4 \)

After 14...\( \mathcal{O}xf2 \) White transposes to the game with 15 \( \mathcal{W}f3 \) (of course taking the knight with 15 \( \mathcal{O}xf2 \) would allow Black a winning attack after 15...\( \mathcal{W}h4+ \) etc.).

15 \( \mathcal{W}f3 \)

White defends the vulnerable f2-square. It is easy to see that the knight on g4 is taboo.

15...\( \mathcal{O}xf2 \)

It was this piece sacrifice that the godfather of the Marshall attack Frank Marshall had in mind when inventing his Gambit.

Very rarely seen are the following continuations:

a) 15...\( \mathcal{A}d7? \) and now:

a1) 16 \( \mathcal{A}d2! \) (White continues with the development of his queenside; once White manages to consolidate he will be a pawn up for nothing) 16...\( \mathcal{W}h8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{C}a3 \) f5 18 \( \mathcal{A}f4! \) \( \mathcal{C}f6 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}xd6 \) exd6 20 \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) and White still has his extra pawn and dominant position in Kubis-Ren.Pokorna, Slovakia 1997.

a2) White also has 16 \( \mathcal{A}e4! \) h8? (this is overoptimistic but after the better 16...h5 White continues with his plan by playing 17 \( \mathcal{A}f4! \), exchanging the dark-squared bishops and retaining a big advantage) 17 \( \mathcal{A}xg4 \) \( \mathcal{A}ae8 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}d2 \) \( \mathcal{A}xg4 \) 19 \( \mathcal{W}xg4 \) \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 20 \( \mathcal{A}a3 \) (preventing mate on the back rank) 20...f5 21 \( \mathcal{W}f3 \) \( \mathcal{A}xa3 \) 22 bxa3 \( \mathcal{W}xa3 \) 23 \( \mathcal{A}f4 \) with a winning position for White in Zaragatski-Sobolevsky, Bad Zwesten 2000.

b) 15...\( \mathcal{A}e6? \) hasn’t yielded good results for Black in tournament play either. White has several strong options at his disposal:

b1) 16 \( \mathcal{A}e4! \)

might be the simplest way for obtaining the advantage: 16...\( \mathcal{W}h3+ \) (or 16...\( \mathcal{A}e8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{A}xe6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe6 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}e3 \) h2+ 19 \( \mathcal{W}f1 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe3+ \) 20 \( \mathcal{A}xe3 \) \( \mathcal{A}f6 \) 21 \( \mathcal{W}e2 \) \( \mathcal{A}g3 \) 22 \( \mathcal{W}f3 \) and White has successfully managed to retain the extra pawn with his king’s position still being safe, Sigurðsson-Morrel, Helsinki Olympiad 1952) 17 \( \mathcal{W}f1 \) \( \mathcal{A}xb3 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}xb3 \) f5 19 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) \( \mathcal{A}d6 \) 20 \( \mathcal{W}f4! \) \( \mathcal{A}ae8 \) 21 \( \mathcal{A}xe8 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe8 \) 22 \( \mathcal{A}d2 \) \( \mathcal{A}xf4 \) 23 \( \mathcal{W}xf4 \) \( \mathcal{A}e6 \) 24 \( \mathcal{A}g1 \) and Black’s attack no longer exists. White has both a positional and material advantage, Grischuk-Gromadin, Moscow 1996.

b2) 16 \( \mathcal{A}f4 \) is not so clear after 16...\( \mathcal{A}xf2! \) 17 \( \mathcal{A}xd6 \) (17 \( \mathcal{W}xf2 \) \( \mathcal{W}xf2+ \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}xf2 \) \( \mathcal{A}xf4 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}x6e6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe6 \) led to an equal ending in Rojas-Vogel, correspondence 1994) 17...\( \mathcal{A}xb3+ \) 18 \( \mathcal{W}f1 \) (obviously forced) 18...\( \mathcal{A}xe8 \) 19 \( \mathcal{W}h6 \) \( \mathcal{A}h6+ \) and the threat of...\( \mathcal{W}h6-c1+ \) followed by taking on b2 gives Black counterchances.

b3) 16 \( \mathcal{W}xg4 \) \( \mathcal{A}h2+ \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}f1 \) \( \mathcal{A}xg4 \) 18 \( \mathcal{W}e4! \) (18 \( \mathcal{W}d5? \) led to disaster in Vleck-Rachela, Zvolen 2000 after 18...\( \mathcal{A}f4 \) 19 g3 \( \mathcal{A}h3+ \) 20 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) \( \mathcal{W}g4+ \) 21 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) \( \mathcal{A}xc1 \) 22 \( \mathcal{A}xc1 \) \( \mathcal{A}e8 \) 23 \( \mathcal{A}f3 \) \( \mathcal{W}g6+ \) 24 \( \mathcal{A}d2 \) \( \mathcal{A}xg3 \) 25 \( \mathcal{A}d1 \) \( \mathcal{W}f4+ \) 0-1, whilst the ending is roughly equal after 18 g3 \( \mathcal{W}h5 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}xf7+ \) \( \mathcal{A}xf7 \) 20 \( \mathcal{A}xa8+ \) \( \mathcal{A}f8 \) 21 \( \mathcal{A}e5 \) \( \mathcal{A}h3+ \) 22 \( \mathcal{A}e1 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe5+ \) 23 dxe5 \( \mathcal{A}xe8 \) 24 \( \mathcal{A}e3 \).
h5, Valcarcel-Pacini, correspondence 1972; White also has at his disposal 18 \( \text{c4} \text{xf4} 19 \text{xf4} \text{f3} 20 \text{gxf3} \text{h1+} 21 \text{e2} \text{fe8} 22 \text{e2} \text{xe4+} 23 \text{fxe4} \text{f5} \) with chances for both sides, Krivic-Deretic correspondence 1980) 18..\( \text{e8} \) 19 \( \text{xe8} \text{d6} 20 \text{xf7+} \text{h8} 21 \text{xf8+} \text{e8} 22 \text{g1} \text{d7} 23 \text{d2} \text{f6} 24 \text{d5} 1-0 Hadzi-Deretic, correspondence 1980.

16 \( \text{e2} \)

An instructive and well-known mistake is 16 \( \text{xf2?} \) because after 16...\( \text{h2+!} \) (16...\( \text{g3??} \) loses on the spot to 17 \( \text{xf7+!} \) \( \text{e8} \) mate so 16...\( \text{h2+!} \) is essential as it prevents the winning sacrifice on f7) 17 \( \text{f1} \text{g3} 18 \text{e2} \) (now 18 \( \text{xf7+??} \) \( \text{f7} \) and the difference with the white king sitting on f1 is that Black takes the queen with check so White has no time to deliver mate on e8) 18..\( \text{gxh3!} \) with a mating attack.

There is, however, another good defence in 16 \( \text{d2!} \). The following complications work in White’s favour: 16..\( \text{b7?!} \) 17 \( \text{xb7} \text{d3} 18 \text{e2} \text{g3} 19 \text{f1} \text{f4} 20 \text{f2!} \text{d3+} 21 \text{g1} \text{e2+} 22 \text{xe2} \text{xe2} 23 \text{f3} \) and according to the Swedish GM Tom Wedberg Black no longer has an attack.

16...\( \text{g4} \)

Black’s attack comes to an end after 16..\( \text{xh3??} \) 17 \( \text{g3} \text{h3} 18 \text{e4!} \text{g3+} \) (obviously tactical attempts like 18...\( \text{h2+} \) or 18...\( \text{g4} \) backfire) 19 \( \text{xe3} \text{xg3} 20 \text{g5!} \) and if 20..\( \text{h6} \), then 21 \( \text{e3} \) gives White a winning ending.

Sometimes Black tries 16...\( \text{g4} \).

In the position above Black has been scoring well, although White’s chances are clearly better (16...\( \text{g4} \) has more often than not been played when Black was the stronger player).

a) 17 \( \text{xa8?} \text{g3!} 18 \text{hgx4} \text{h2+} 19 \text{f1} \text{g3} 20 \text{e3} \) (this is the only playable move for White) 20..\( \text{h1+} 21 \text{g1} \text{h2} 22 \text{xf7+} \text{h8!} \) (but not 22..\( \text{xf7+??} 23 \text{e1} \) with unclear play) with an amusing position where, despite a huge material advantage, it is difficult to find a move for White.

b) White can also play the quiet move 17 \( \text{d4} \) which only leads to equality after 17..\( \text{b7} 18 \text{d5} \text{f6} 19 \text{xd6} \text{cxd6} 20 \text{d2} \text{e8} \) etc.

c) The thematic reply 17 \( \text{e4??} \) was strongly answered by 17..\( \text{h5!} 18 \text{hgx4} \text{b7} 19 \text{d5} \text{e8} \) and White had no defence in Leger-Veille, correspondence 1991.

d) White’s best reply seems to be 17 \( \text{g3!} \) and now Black is in trouble as is demonstrated by the following examples:

d1) 17..\( \text{cxb7} 18 \text{d2} \text{g8} 21 \text{d1} \text{xe2} 22 \text{e2} \text{g8} 23 \text{f1} \text{g6} 24 \text{f3} \text{g6} 25 \text{g5} \) and White is clearly winning with his extra material but in fact actually managed to lose in Sorensen-Hintikka, correspondence 1984.

d2) 17..\( \text{e8} 18 \text{xa8} \text{e8} 19 \text{g2} \) and Black’s attack is not worth the sacrificed
rook.

17 hxg4 \f3

The same position arises after 17...\f2+ 18 \f1 \f3 (18...\h1? is even worse for Black after 19 \e3 \f3+ 20 \e1 \x2+ 21 \xe2 \ae8 22 \d2 h5 23 \e4! hxg4 24 \f5 \d6 25 \f1 \e7 26 \d5 \h7 27 \g5 1-0 Sammalvalvo-Nyusti, Vammala 1995) 19 \xf2 etc.

18 \xf2+ 19 \f1 \h1+ 20 \e2 \xf2

20...\xc1 is seen in the next game.

21 \d2!

Less accurate is 21 \a3?! \ae8+ 22 \d3 \f1+ 23 \c2 \e2+ 24 \d2 \xd2+ 25 \xd2 \xa1 26 \xf2 \xb2+ 27 \c2 c5 with unclear play, Holmsten-Kenton, Finnish Team Championship 1991.

21...\h4 22 \d3

White’s king must run to the queenside in order to find a safe haven, after which his material advantage will prevail.

22 \h3 was the start of an excellent defence in the famous game Capablanca-Marshall, New York 1918 (which we also mentioned in the introduction to this book). The game concluded 22...\ae8+ 23 \d3 \f1+ 24 \c2 \f2 25 \f3 \g1 26 \d5 c5 27 \xc5 \xc5 28 b4 \d6 29 a4! (this brings the rook on a1 into play) 29...a5 (this is a desperate attempt for counterplay as he was losing anyway) 30 \xb5 \xb4 31 \a6 \xc3 32 \xc3 \b4 33 \b6 \xc3 34 \xc3 h6 35 b7

\ec3 36 \xf7+! 1-0.

22...\ad8 23 \c2 c5

Black must open the d-file in order to expose White’s king.

24 \xc5 \xd2+ 25 \xd2 \xa1 26 \b1!

From a material viewpoint Black is not doing badly but in order to free his queen from its prison on a1 he will have to shed some material. Black also has to worry about White’s strong passed e-pawn.

26...a5 27 c6 a4 28 \d5 b4 29 \xb4 \f6 30 \c3 a3 31 \xa3 h6 32 \e3 \g5 33 \c5 \c1+ 34 \b3 \f4 35 c7 \ec8 36 \xf7+!

36...\h8

White is also winning after 36...\xf7 37 \f5+, picking up the rook on c8.

37 \e6 \xc7 38 \f8+ \h7 39 \g8+ 1-0

It’s mate in two.
Game 62
J. Bird-Beckett
Correspondence 1993/94

1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6
5 0-0 e7 6 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 c5 10 xe5 xe5 11 xe5
e6 12 d4 d6 13 e1 g4 14 h3 Wh4
15 f3 xe2 16 xe2 g4 17 hgx4
h2+ 18 f1 g3 19 xf2 Wh1+ 20
xe2 xc1

24...xc3 25 xc3 xc3+ 26 xc3
ad8 27 e2?! This is a bit passive. Stronger was the
more natural 27 d3! and if 27...c5, then 28
d5 with a technically winning position.
27 g6 28 c4 a5 29 f3 g7 30 a3
a8

Maybe a better practical chance was to
sacrifice a pawn by playing 30...f6 but White,
with best play, should still be winning.
31 d5 a7?

The rook has nothing to do on a7 and this
loses easily. The only chance was 31 a6.
32 e3 h6

This move shows the strength of 24 g5!
In order to get rid of this blockading pawn,
Black must play...h7-h6 sooner or later.
33 gxh6+ xh6 34 a3 f5?! 35 f4 xf6
36 h3+ g7

36...g5 37 e6+ is winning for White
because after 37...g4? 38 f3 is actually
mate!
37 e6+ g8 38 xc7+ f8 39 h7
1-0

In short, this move is not much better
than 20...xf2 from the previous game.
21 xg3 xb2+ 22 d3!

This is even stronger than 22 d2, which
was also in White’s favour after 22...xa1 23
xf7 h8 (or 23...xf7 24 xf7+ xf7? 25
f3+, winning the rook on a8) 24 e7 fe8
25 e5 xe7 26 xe7 g1 27 d5, Pletan-
22...xa1 23 c2 b4 24 g5!

In the oncoming ending White’s two
minor pieces will clearly outweigh Black’s rook
and this move will be very useful because it
will hold up Black’s kingside pawn majority.
Summary
With regard to 11...\textit{\&}f4?! and 11...\textit{\&}b6?! such a `quick fix' repertoire could be successful in a single game (one must also count on the effect of surprise!) but in general I do not recommend it. With 11...\textit{\&}b6?! Black does not generate enough play on the kingside (Black’s knight is far away from the scene of the action on the kingside), whilst with 11...\textit{\&}f4?! Black invests in several tempi in order to transfer the knight to g6. Indeed, it is not clear whether the knight is better placed on d5 or on g6.

After 11...\textit{\&}b7 12 \textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}d6, the move 13 \textit{\&}xd5? (Game 54) almost loses by force mainly due to White’s weak back rank which allows Black all sorts of cheapos. Game 55 is food for thought. The first impression is that Black has not been able to demonstrate full equality.

After 11...\textit{\&}b7 12 d4, the move 12...\textit{\&}d7?! (Games 56-57) is currently under a cloud and is definitely not playable for Black if White plays correctly. That is why Black is currently putting all his hopes on 12...\textit{\&}f6. Although from the theoretical point of view the pawn sacrifice might not be perfect, this line is absolutely fine for Black in modern day tournament play.

Marshall’s 11...\textit{\&}f6 was initially popular but in subsequent years White found the method to obtain an advantage in this variation and nowadays this old-fashioned treatment has been replaced by the modern 11...\textit{\&}c6.

The straightforward 14...\textit{\&}h2+? (Game 60) does not work. The cool defence 15 \textit{\&}f1 \textit{\&}xf2 16 \textit{\&}f3! refutes Black’s assault.

In the forcing line 12 d4 \textit{\&}d6 13 \textit{\&}e1 \textit{\&}g4 14 h3 \textit{\&}h4 15 \textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}xf2 16 \textit{\&}e2 \textit{\&}g4 17 hxg4 \textit{\&}g3 18 \textit{\&}xf2 \textit{\&}h2+ 19 \textit{\&}f1 \textit{\&}h1+ 20 \textit{\&}e1, tournament practice has shown that neither 20...\textit{\&}xf2 nor 20...\textit{\&}xc1 are playable for Black. White’s king feels absolutely safe on the queenside since Black hasn’t enough forces left to attack it. In the long run White’s material advantage (often two minor pieces against a rook) should prevail, so the general assessment is that White is clearly better if not close to winning.

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}c6 3 \textit{\&}b5 a6 4 \textit{\&}a4 \textit{\&}f6 5 0-0 \textit{\&}e7 6 \textit{\&}e1 b5 7 \textit{\&}b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9
exd5 \textit{\&}xd5 10 \textit{\&}xe5 \textit{\&}xe5 11 \textit{\&}xe5 \textit{\&}b7

11...\textit{\&}b6?! – Game 53; 11...\textit{\&}f4?! – Game 52
11...\textit{\&}f6 12 d4 \textit{\&}d6 13 \textit{\&}e1 \textit{\&}g4 14 h3

14...\textit{\&}h2+ – Game 60

14...\textit{\&}h4 15 \textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}xf2 16 \textit{\&}e2 \textit{\&}g4 17 hxg4 \textit{\&}g3 18 \textit{\&}xf2 \textit{\&}h2+

19 \textit{\&}f1 \textit{\&}h1+ 20 \textit{\&}e2

20...\textit{\&}xf2 – Game 61; 20...\textit{\&}xc1 – Game 62

12 d4

12 \textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}d6

13 \textit{\&}xd5 – Game 54; 13 \textit{\&}xd5 – Game 55

12...\textit{\&}f6

12...\textit{\&}d7 13 \textit{\&}d2 \textit{\&}f4 14 \textit{\&}e4

14...\textit{\&}g6 – Game 56; 14...\textit{\&}d6 – Game 57

13 \textit{\&}e1 c5 – Game 59

13...\textit{\&}e8 – Game 58
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CHAPTER SIX

The Steiner Variation: 9...e4

1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6
5 0-0 e7 6 b5 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 e4?!

This gambit line was introduced into tournament practice in 1929 by Herman Steiner. However, with best play, as we shall see, White retains a clear advantage. This variation has for a long time been out of fashion and is virtually only seen in correspondence games, although it is occasionally (and only occasionally) used as a surprise.

In Games 63-64 we deal with 10 g5?! which is clearly not White’s best choice. After 10...g4! White has to make an early concession – either to weaken his kingside by playing f3 or to fall even further behind in development by playing 11 c2, which is perhaps the lesser of the two evils.

Better is 10 dxc6 exf3 and now 11 xf3 is seen in games 65-67. Very instructive is the game in which the late Hungarian GM Laszlo Szabo managed to refute White’s plan involving the exchange sacrifice on e5. Yes, Game 65 is well worth playing through.

In Bargel-Valenta (Game 66) we study the critical position arising after 11...g4 12 g3 d6 13 f4 c8 14 d4.

In Fischer-Bernstein (Game 67) the former World Champion rejects playing f2-f4, considering it as an important weakening of his kingside, and settles instead for f2-f3. Finally in this chapter we see the strongest reply against Steiner’s 9...e4?! which is 11 d4!

(Game 68)

Van Linden-S.Bernstein
New York 1974

1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6
5 0-0 b5 6 b3 e7 7 e1 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 exd5 e4?! 10 g5?! g4!

The other continuations are clearly worse:

a) 10...a5?! 11 exe4 exe4 12 exe4
bxc3 13 axb3 b5 14 e5 d3 15 f3
d6 16 c3 c8 17 h3 and Black still has to demonstrate that he has sufficient compensa-
tion for the sacrificed material. However White should, of course, avoid 17 hx8+ 
\( \text{Wh} \times e 8 \) 18 \( \text{W} \times d 3 ? ? \) (better is 18 \( \text{We} \times c 3 \) but after 
18...\( \text{W} \times c 5 ! \) Black is okay) 18...\( \text{W} \times c 1 + \) 19 \( \text{W} \times f 1 \) 
\( \text{Axh} 2 ! \) and Black wins.

b) 10...\( \text{Q} \times e 5 ! \) 11 \( \text{Q} \times e 4 \) \( \text{Q} \times d 3 \) 12 \( \text{Q} \times f 6 + \) 
\( \text{Axh} 6 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \times e 3 \) \( \text{Q} \times f 5 ? \) (better is 13...\( \text{Q} \times x e 1 \) 14 
\( \text{W} \times e 1 \) \( \text{Mb} 7 \) with a clear advantage to White) 
14 \( \text{W} \times b 3 ! \) (wrong is 14 a4? \( \text{Q} \times g 5 \) 15 \( \text{Q} \times e 2 \) \( \text{Q} \times e 8 ! \) 
and White's weak back rank begins to tell) 14...\( \text{W} \times d 7 \) 15 \( \text{Q} \times d 3 \) \( \text{Q} \times e 4 ! ? \) 16 \( \text{W} \times e 2 \) \( \text{W} \times f 5 \) 17 
\( \text{Q} \times e 3 \) \( \text{Q} \times b 1 \) 18 d3 with a decisive advantage for 
White, Fox-Steiner, Bradley Beach 1929.

11 \( f 3 \) \( \text{exf} 3 \) 12 \( g \times f 3 \)

White can play more quietly with 12 \( \text{Q} \times f 3 \) but after 12...\( \text{Q} \times x 5 ! ? \) 13 \( \text{Q} \times e 2 \) \( \text{Q} \times e 8 ! \) 14 d4 
\( \text{Q} \times d 5 \) 15 \( \text{Q} \times d 3 \) \( \text{Q} \times d 6 \) Black's position should 
be preferred due to White's undeveloped 

12...\( \text{Q} \times d 5 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \times x 7 \)

White loses material after 13 \( \text{Q} \times x 7 ? \) \( \text{W} \times e 7 ! \) 
14 \( \text{Q} \times d 5 \) \( \text{W} \times g 5 \) etc.

13...\( \text{Q} \times f 6 ? \) ?

The alternative is 13...\( \text{Q} \times d 6 ? \) 14 \( \text{Q} \times d 5 \) 
\( \text{Q} \times x 2 + \) 15 \( \text{Q} \times x 2 \) \( \text{W} \times h 4 + \) 16 \( \text{Q} \times g 1 \) \( \text{Q} \times g 3 + \) and 
now correct is 17 \( \text{W} \times h 1 \) after which Black has 
no more than a draw. However, in the game 
Pfeiffer-Rothmund, Oberschwenben 1992 
White played 17 \( \text{Q} \times h 1 ? \) and lost after 
17...\( \text{Q} \times h 3 + \) 18 \( \text{Q} \times e 2 \) \( \text{Q} \times e 8 + \) 19 \( \text{Q} \times e 4 \) \( \text{Q} \times e 4 ! ? \) 20 
\( \text{Q} \times e 4 \) \( \text{Q} \times e 4 + \) 21 \( \text{W} \times f 1 \) \( \text{Q} \times d 1 \) 22 \( \text{Q} \times d 1 \) \( \text{W} \times f 3 + \) 23 
\( \text{Q} \times c 1 \) \( \text{W} \times e 4 + \).

14 \( \text{Q} \times f 8 \) \( \text{Q} \times d 3 ! \)

A picturesque position, White is a whole 
rook up but things are not so clear because 
White's entire queenside is frozen and his 
kingside is seriously weakened.

15 \( \text{Q} \times e 4 ? \)

After this White ends up in a lost position. 
No better was 15 a4 due to 15...\( \text{Q} \times f 4 ! \) but the 
following alternatives deserve attention:

a) 15 \( \text{Q} \times g 6 ! \) \( \text{fxg} 6 \) 16 \( f 4 \) intending \( \text{Q} \times d 1-f 3 \), 
when White gets counterplay on the long a2-
g8 diagonal.

b) 15 \( f 4 ! ? \), again intending \( \text{Q} \times f 3 \), with 
unclear play after 15...\( \text{Q} \times f 8 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \times f 3 \). Note that 
16...\( \text{Q} \times h 4 ? \) loses to 17 \( \text{Q} \times g 3 ! . \)

15...\( \text{Q} \times f 8 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \times e 1 \) \( \text{Q} \times g 5 + \) 17 \( \text{Q} \times g 4 \) \( \text{W} \times f 5 \) 18 
\( \text{Q} \times d 5 \) \( \text{Q} \times d 5 \) 19 \( \text{Q} \times e 4 \) \( \text{Q} \times d 8 \) 20 b4 \( \text{Q} \times d 6 ! \)

The rook is heading towards g6, leaving 
White’s monarch virtually without any 
proper defence.

21 \( \text{a} 2 \) \( \text{Q} \times g 6 + \) 22 \( \text{Q} \times f 2 \) \( \text{Q} \times h 5 \) 23 \( \text{Q} \times h 1 \) 
\( \text{Q} \times e 4 \) 24 \( \text{Q} \times e 4 \) \( \text{Q} \times e 5 \) 25 \( \text{Q} \times e 3 \) \( \text{Q} \times g 3 + \) 26 
\( \text{Q} \times f 2 \) \( \text{Q} \times h 3 0-1 \)

Game 64

Frank-Schuchardt

Bruchkoebel 1993

1 e4 \( \text{e} 5 \) 2 \( \text{Q} \times f 3 \) \( \text{c} 6 \) 3 \( \text{b} 5 \) a6 4 \( \text{Q} \times a 4 \) \( \text{Q} \times f 6 \) 
5 0-0 \( \text{Q} \times e 7 \) 6 \( \text{c} 6 \) b5 7 \( \text{b} 3 \) 0-0 8 c3 d5 
9 \( \text{exd} 5 \) e4?! 10 \( \text{Q} \times g 5 ! ? \) \( \text{Q} \times g 4 ! \) 11 \( \text{Q} \times c 2 \)

In contrast to 11 \( f 3 \) where White weakens 
his kingside, here he keeps his kingside solid 
but Black achieves colossal development.
11...\textit{e}5! 12 \textit{d}xe4 \textit{d}xe4 13 \textit{w}xe4 \textit{d}6 14 \textit{f}4

An alternative is 14 \textit{d}4 \textit{f}5 and now White has a choice between the following:

a) 15 \textit{w}c2! \textit{d}f3+ 16 \textit{g}xf3 \textit{w}h4 17 \textit{fxg}4 \textit{wxh}2+ 18 \textit{f}1 \textit{fxg}4 19 \textit{d}e3 \textit{xe}8! 20 \textit{c}2 (the only move because after 20 \textit{d}a3 \textit{g}3! White has no good reply) 20...\textit{xf}2+ 21 \textit{d}3 \textit{xc}2 22 \textit{x}c2 \textit{g}3 23 \textit{e}2 \textit{wh}1 with a clear advantage to Black.

b) 15 \textit{w}e3? \textit{f}4 16 \textit{w}e4 \textit{f}5 17 \textit{w}c2 \textit{d}d3 18 \textit{d}d1 \textit{e}8 19 \textit{wh}5 \textit{g}6 20 \textit{wh}6 \textit{f}8 21 \textit{d}6+ \textit{h}8 22 \textit{dxc}7 \textit{f}6 and White resigned because his queen is trapped, Campbell-Dillinger, US Amateur Team Championship 1990.

c) The queen sacrifice with 15 \textit{w}xe5?! \textit{d}xe5 16 \textit{dxe}5 (D.Popovic-Parament, Yugoslavia Women’s Championship 1993) might be White’s best chance but Black is obviously okay here. For instance, instead of 16...\textit{wh}8 as played in the game, Black can try 16...\textit{f}4 at once.

14...\textit{f}5 15 \textit{w}e3 \textit{g}6 16 \textit{g}3

Worse is 16 \textit{h}3? \textit{wh}4! 17 \textit{hxg}4 \textit{xf}4 18 \textit{w}e6+ \textit{h}8 after which White is defenceless.

16...\textit{e}8 17 \textit{w}f2

Or 17 \textit{w}xe8+ \textit{w}xe8 18 \textit{d}xe8+ \textit{d}xe8 19 \textit{f}1 and now 19...\textit{xc}2+1 is strong.

17...\textit{xe}1+ 18 \textit{w}xe1 \textit{f}8

Overoptimistic is 18...\textit{xf}4? 19 \textit{gx}e4 \textit{xf}4 20 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}2+ 21 \textit{g}2 \textit{d}6 22 \textit{h}3 \textit{g}6 23 \textit{hxg}4 \textit{xg}4+ 25 \textit{h}2 \textit{h}5+ 25 \textit{g}2 \textit{g}6+ 26 \textit{h}2 \textit{d}6+ 27 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}8 and now 28 \textit{g}5! would have refuted Black’s sacrificial play. In the game Virostko-Valenta, Frydek Mistek 1996 White continued 28 \textit{d}d1? \textit{w}g6+ 29 \textit{h}2 \textit{h}5+ 30 \textit{g}2 \textit{g}4+ 31 \textit{h}2 \textit{f}4! 32 \textit{d}4 \textit{f}3 0-1.

19 \textit{d}3

Also worth considering is 19 \textit{d}4 \textit{e}8 20 \textit{w}f1 \textit{e}7 21 \textit{a}4 \textit{e}8 threatening ...\textit{e}1 with better play for Black.

19...\textit{e}8 20 \textit{w}f1

After 20 \textit{d}c3, 20...\textit{xf}4! 21 \textit{gx}f4 \textit{xf}4 is very strong.

20...\textit{e}2 21 \textit{wh}3?

This loses by force because here White’s queen is too far away from the main battleground. More resilient was 21 \textit{w}f2.

21...\textit{xd}3 22 \textit{d}d2 \textit{e}1+ 23 \textit{d}f1 \textit{e}7 0-1

White is unable to prevent the upcoming mate.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 65}

\textbf{Van den Berg-Szabo}

\textit{Haifa 1958}
\end{center}

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{d}f3 \textit{c}6 3 \textit{b}b5 a6 4 \textit{a}4 \textit{f}6 5 0-0 \textit{e}7 6 \textit{e}1 b5 7 \textit{b}3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 e4?! 10 dxc6 exf3 11 \textit{wx}f3

10 dxc6 exf3 11 \textit{wx}f3 is regarded by modern day opening theory as better than 10 \textit{g}5?! but, as we shall see, Black will obtain just enough compensation in exchange for...
his material deficit largely due to his lead in development. After the text Black will gain important time by attacking White’s queen.

11...g4 12 wg3

Very rarely seen is 12 wf4 d6 13 wd4 xe8 14 c3, after which Black can continue 14...f5! 15 h3 fe4 with very active play.

12...d6

Often Black plays 12...e8, which is just a transposition after 13 d4 d6 14 f4 etc.

13 f4 e8 14 e5?

With this exchange sacrifice White intends to take the initiative away from his opponent. Black’s next move is practically forced otherwise White will play d2-d4 supporting his rook on e5.

14 d4 is the subject of the next game.

14...xe5

Not so convincing is 14...e6, but the well-known game Boleslavsky-Pirc, Saltsjo-

baden 1948 ended in a draw after 15 d4 xe3 16 axb3 xe5 17 fxe5 fe4 18 if3 wh4 19 g3 dg5 20 wf5 we4! 21 xg5 we1+ 22 gh2 we2+ 23 gh1 we1+.

15 fxe5 dh5!

Much better than 15...we7? 16 d4 h5 17 cd2! (not so clear is 17 dg5? ec4! 18 xc7 dh3 etc.) 17...dg4 18 dh5 and White is dominating the whole board.

16 xg4 xe5 17 ca3?

After this mistake White is decidedly lost. A better choice was 17 if3?! although I think that even in this case Black should be better.

17...e1+ 18 if2 ef6!

This is the move that White obviously missed when playing 17 ca3?. Black only draws after the tempting continuation 18...xc1 19 xc1 xd2+ 20 if3 wd3+ 21 if2 xd2+ etc.

19 wf4?

This loses immediately – slightly better was 19 wd4.

19...we7

This wins but even quicker was 19...we4! and if 20 if3 or 20 if5, then 20...dg4+ wins, while if 20 wg3, then 20...dh5! 21 wh3 if6+ is decisive.

20 wf3 wh1 21 ec2 we4+ 22 we2 xc3+ 23 cd3 dh8+ 24 dd4

Or 24 xc3 we5+ with mate on the next move.

24...we2 0-1
1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 e4?! 10 dxc6 exf3 11 wxf3 g4 12 wg3 d6 13 f4 e8 14 d4 xe1+? 15 xe1+?

This move is rare but I checked the arising endgame with the help of Fritz and the move is quite playable – Black achieves an equal ending.

More frequently played is 14...h5 15 xe8+ xe8 16 wxf2 wx6 and now White has a choice between the following:

a) 17 h3 e6 18 c3 e8 19 d2 xb3 20 axb3 g5! (a quite unusual way of regaining back the sacrificed pawn because if 21 fxg5? g3! the bishop on e3 is lost) 21 d3 xf4 22 c5 xe5 23 dx5 wx5 24 xf4 gxf4 25 wxf4 e6 with an equal position, Matanovic-Milic, Beverwijk 1958.

b) 17 c3 e8 18 d2 and here I believe Black should have continued 18...e7! with the hidden idea of playing ...w6-e8 exploiting the unpleasant pin along the e-file. This gives Black sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn due to his active pieces.

15 xe1 wxe8 16 wxe8+ dxe8 17 a3 e1+ 18 wxf2 19 c2 f5 20 e3

After 20 c3 e4! White is kept under serious pressure due to the pin along the first rank.

20...g4+ 21 w3 xh2+ 22 e2 xxa1 23 xxa1 e4

With this move Black restores the balance in material.

24 g3 xxc6 25 d5 d7 26 c2 g4 27 d4 g5! 28 f3?

This is an error which allows Black to create a very dangerous passed h-pawn. Correct is 28 xg5 xg3 29 w3 and the game would most probably end up as a draw.

28...gxf4 29 gxf4 h5 30 e3 dxe3 31 xe3 e3?

But after this last mistake Black’s h-pawn becomes unstoppable. White should have continued 31 dxe3 with reasonable chances of a draw.

31...g4!

Cutting off White’s king from f3 where Black’s passed pawn could be controlled.

32 f6 c5+ 33 e4 f2 34 e5

White saw too late that his intended 34 d8 h4 35 xc7 h3 36 f5 g1! loses because he would be forced to sacrifice his bishop for Black’s h-pawn.

34...h4 35 f5 a3 36 xg3 hxg3 37 e3 g7 38 c2 f6

Even after the exchange of queens Black will continue to dominate the e-file.

With the fall of the pawn on f5 the game is over because Black creates passed f- and g-pawns. The rest needs no explanation.
The Steiner Variation: 9...e4

39 ™e4 ™xf5 40 ™g2 ™e5 41 b4 ™b1 42 a3 f5 43 d6 f4+ 44 ™e2 cxd6 45 ™b7 ™e4 46 ™xa6 f3+ 47 ™f1 ™d3+ 0-1

Game 67
Fischer-S. Bernstein
New York 1959

1 e4 e5 2 ™f3 ™c6 3 d4 a6 4 ™a4 ™f6 5 ™e7 ™e1 b5 7 ™b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 e4?! 10 dxc6 exf3 11 ™xf3 ™g4 12 ™g3 ™d6 13 ™wh4 ™e8 14 f3

After the complications we have a very difficult position to assess. My first impression is that Black should not be worse here due to the pin along the first rank, but with the next move Black goes astray.

20...£d8?

Missing the golden opportunity for 20...£f8!, which after 21 a4 bxa4 22 £xa4 £e8!

White intends to avoid any unnecessary weakening, which is the case when White plays d4 and f4, but after the text White’s lag in development will be obvious. The other question is whether Black is capable of taking advantage of this fact.

14...£f5

There is the funny sacrifice 14...£xh2+!? 15 ™xh2 ™d6+ 16 ™g1 ™xe1+ 17 ™xe1 ™e8 18 ™f2 ™xf3+! 19 gxf3 ™d3 20 £d1 ™h5, which was seen in a 1963 correspondence game Petursson-Johansson. After 21 ™a3 ™e6! Black had a really dangerous attack. No better for White is 21 ™h4 as Black can offer a third piece with 21...£f4!!. Then after 22 ™xf4 ™e1+ and 23...£f1 White is struggling. Instead White could try 22 ™e2? ™e2+ 23 ™g3 (worse is 23 ™xe2? ™xe2+ 24 ™g3 ™e1+ 25 ™g4 f5+ and Black wins) 23...£g2+ 24 ™xf4 and now after the quiet move would have led to a quite promising position for Black according to the analysis of Gutman and Vitomskis. After the text Black virtually loses an important tempo.

21 a4!

Now Black must be careful not to fall prey to a back rank mating cheapo.
21...b4 22 d5 a8 23 d6!
Creating a dangerous passed c-pawn which will decide the issue of the game.
23...cxd6 24 c4 c8 25 xa6 xc6 26 b5 b6 27 c4 d5
A desperate attempt to create some mating threats, but Black just hasn’t got sufficient forces.
28 a5 g5+ 29 xg5
Not fearing any ghosts. Fischer’s greatest virtue, shown in this game, was that he strived for the simplest possible solutions.
29...h6+ 30 g4 b8 31 a6
White has clearly been winning for some time.
31...dxc4 32 a7 a8 33 c6 h5+ 34 g5 xb1 35 xb1 xa7 36 e1 a2 37 xc4 xb2 38 f6 1-0

Game 68
Browne-Bisguier
Oberlin 1975

1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 e4?! 10 dxc6 exf3 11 d4!

This is the strongest continuation, which casts a doubt over the Steiner Variation. White simply continues with his development, thus allowing his kingside to be weakened after Black takes on g2. However, it will transpire that Black’s chances of creating a serious kingside attack are not so great due to the excellently placed and centralised white pieces.
11...fxg2
Alternatives are clearly weaker:
   a) 11...g4? 12 gx3 h5 13 f4 d6 14 g3! completely secures the safety of White’s kingside.
   b) 11...d6 12 g5 hxh2+ 13 xh2 g4+ 14 g1 wg5 15 xfx3 h5 16 a3 f5 17 xc2 xe8 18 xe3 f4 19 wg3 xc6 20 wxc7 xe3 21 wxc6 x8 22 f3 and White keeps his extra pawn. He also has the better position due to his strong light-squared bishop on b3.
12 g5
Not so clear is 12 w3 e6! 13 f4 (very risky is 13 xxe6?! fx6 14 xxe6 xd5 15 wg2 h4! with powerful play along the f-file) 13...d5 14 g3 a5! 15 d2 a4 16 c2 xe8! 17 d3 g6 18 xb5 xb8 followed by...xb8xb2.
12...g4 13 wd3 e8 14 d2 d5
Or 14...h5 15 xe7! xe7 16 h3! (an important move because it is only equal after 16 xe7? xe7 17 xe3 xe8! etc.) 16...e6 17 we3! with a clear advantage to White.

15 xe7
Deserving of attention is 15 f3! xf3 (even worse is 15...xg5? 16 xe8+ xe8 17 xg5 and White wins) 16 xe7 xe7 17 xf3 with nearly a winning advantage for White.
15...xe7 16 xe7 xe7 17 we4 f5
18 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Wf3}}}

Black achieves some counterplay after 18 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Wxg2?! Dg6}}} etc.

18...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Wd6}}} 19 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{De1 Dg6}}} 20 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{De4 Wxc6}}} 21 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df6}+!}}

With this combination White converts into a winning ending:

21...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{gx6}}} 22 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Wxc6 Dxc6}}} 23 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd5 Hb8}}} 24 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxc6 b4}}} 25 c4 b3 26 a3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd3}}} 27 c5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd8}}} 28 d5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Db5}}}

Or 28...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df1}}} 29 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc3}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc4}}} 30 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc3! Dxd5+}}} 31 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd3}}} and Black loses due to the pin along the d-file, while after 28...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc4}}} 29 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc1 Dxd5+}}} 30 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{De1}}} is also decisive for exactly the same reason.

29 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Db5 axb5}}} 30 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Db1 Df8}}} 31 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd3 De7}}}

If Black tries to free himself with 31...c6, White has 32 dxc6! \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxd3}}} 33 c7 and the pawn will queen.

32 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Qxg2}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Qg8+}}} 33 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df3 Dg5}}} 34 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxb3 Dxd5}}} 35 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxb5 Dh5}}} 36 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dg3}?!}}

Stronger was 36 a4! \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxh2}}} 37 a5 and White should win. The sloppy technique shown by White lets his opponent off in what is a lost rook and pawn ending.

36...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dg5+}}} 37 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df1 Df5+}}} 38 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dg2 Dg5+}}} 39 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df1 Dh5}}} 40 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dg2 Dg5+}}} 41 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df1 Dh5}}} 42 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Da5? Dxh2}}} 43 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Da6 Dh6}}} 44 b4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dg6}!}}

It is important to cut off White’s king from the g-file, which means Black’s passed h-pawn will give him some drawing chances.

45 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dh8}}} 46 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dh8 Dg5}}} 47 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{De2}}}

It is not possible to advance the queenside pawn because if 47 a4 Black has 47...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dg4}!}}

47...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f5}}} 48 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df4}?

A decisive mistake which throws away the win for White. With the logical 48 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df3}}} White was still winning.

48...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dg3}}} 49 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxh5 Dxa3}}} 50 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxf5 Df3}}} 51 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxe5+ Dd7}}} 52 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxe4 Dc6}}} 53 f5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd5}}} 54 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxe7 Dxb4}}} 55 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxc7}}} 56 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df3 Df5}}} 57 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df7+ Dxf5}}} 58 c6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc4}}} 59 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c7 Dc3+}}} 60 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Df2 Df4}}}

Now a draw is on the cards.

61 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd2 Dc6}}} 62 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd3 Df5}}} 63 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd4 Dc1}}} 64 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd5 Dd1+}}} 65 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc6 Dc1+}}} 66 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd7 De1+}}} 67 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc8 Dc1}}} 68 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd8 Dg3}}} 69 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dg7+ Df3}}} 70 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dh7 Df4}}} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}

The game could continue 71 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c8}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxc8}}} 72 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dxc8 Dc3}}} 73 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dd7 Df3}}} 74 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc6 Df2}}} 75 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Dc5 De2}}} etc.
Summary
In Game 64 Black is really doing fine after the forceful sequence 11...\(\text{Qe5!}\) 12 \(\text{Qxe4 Qxe4}\) 13 \(\text{Wxe4 d6}\) 14 \(\text{f4 f5}\) 15 \(\text{We3 Qg6}\) etc.

In Game 66 theory regards that Black has enough compensation for the sacrificed pawn but not any more than that. Valenta adopts the very interesting plan with the exchange of queens(\(1\)), which looks illogical but leads to a drawn ending. However, he manages to win the game but only with the help of his opponent.

The ending in Game 67 with White having two minor pieces for a rook is by no means better for White since it is not easy to see how he can disentangle himself from the unpleasant pin along the first rank. Even earlier in the game it is possible that Bernstein could have tried 14...\(\text{Qxh2+?!}\), which may have caused serious problems. Fischer, in any case, only won the game because Bernstein blundered with 20...\(\text{Qe8?}\). He should have played 20...\(\text{Qf8!}\), which would have given him at least a good position, if not more.

11 d4! is the main reason why the world's top players like Adams and Svidler never play the Steiner. In Game 68 the shock value fails as Walter Browne transforms his positional advantage into a clear technically winning ending by playing \(\text{Qe4-f6+!}\). However, later on his sloppy technique lets his opponent off the hook and he fails to win the rook and pawn ending.

1 e4 e5 2 \(\text{Qf3 Qc6}\) 3 \(\text{aB5 a6}\) 4 \(\text{Ha4 Qf6}\) 5 0-0 b5 6 \(\text{ab3 e7}\) 7 \(\text{e1 0-0}\) 8 c3 d5 9 exd5 e4 10 dxc6
10 \(\text{Qg5 Qg4}\) (D)
11 \(\text{Qc2} - \text{Game 64}; 11\) f3 – Game 63

10...\(\text{exf3}\) 11 \(\text{Qxf3}\)
11 d4! (D) – Game 68

11...\(\text{Qg4}\) 12 \(\text{Qg3 d6}\) 13 f4
13 \(\text{Wh4} - \text{Game 67}\)

13...\(\text{Qe8}\) 14 d4 (D) – Game 66
14 \(\text{Qe5} - \text{Game 65}\)

10...\(\text{Qg4}\) 11 d4! 14 d4
CHAPTER SEVEN

Anti-Marshall with 8 h3 d7 9 d3 d6 10 a3

1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 h3 d7 9 d3 d6 10 a3

It is amazing just how quickly the theory of this modern Anti-Marshall set-up has developed. With his tenth move White simply creates an escape square on a2 for the b3-bishop in case of ...b5, but without creating tension on the queenside with a2-a4 (see Chapter 8).

In Game 69 Black avoids the main lines by playing 10...d4. Black can also play in the spirit of the Breyer Variation of the Closed Ruy Lopez if he chooses 10...b8, as seen in Games 70-71.

The speciality of Czech GM Pavel Blatny, 10...d4, is seen in Jansa-P.Blatny (Game 72) and A.Kovacevic-Berzinsh (Game 73).

The popular 10...a5 followed by ...c7-c5 is the subject of Games 74-78. After 10...a5 11 a2 c5 12 c3, Adams chooses 12...h6 in Game 74, while 12...b4?, with the sacrifice ...b4-b3 in mind, is seen in Game 75.

The main continuation for Black after 10...d4 11 a2 c5 12 c3 is 12...c6. In Game 76 Gelfand plays 13 c2? against Adams, while Game 77 sees Kasparov try 13 g5 against the same opponent. In Game 78 White plays the logical 13 d5.

Games 79-83 deal with the line 10...d7 11 c3 d8, after which White has many different possibilities: 12 c3, 12 d5, 12 a2, 12 d2 and 12 a4. These moves are all dealt with in turn.

Finally, in Game 84 Black delays moving his d6-pawn and instead plays 9...e8.

**Game 69**

**Korneev-B.Lalic**

**Seville 2002**

1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 h3 d7 9 d6 10 a3

White creates a pawn chain (d3, c4) against Black’s b7-bishop which might be annoying for the black-sided Marshall player. White often develops his knight to c3 from where it can either be transferred to g3 (via e2) or simply stay put to guard the d5-square. As this system has grown in popularity in the past decade, Black will need some knowledge to counter it.

10...d7!

An interesting idea introduced into tournament play by English Grandmaster Mark Hebden. With the text Black makes it hard
for White to execute his main manoeuvre $\text{Qc3-d5}$ since Black can then simply exchange on d5 to achieve a strong position in the centre. The difference between this, at first glance, strange move and 10...$\text{Qb8}$ is that here Black can quickly play ...c7-c5 and ...$\text{a8-c8}$. However, Black must be wary of his knight being stranded away from the centre.

11 c4

A theoretical novelty played after 45 minutes thought, which shows that 10...$\text{Qa7?!}$ came as a thunderbolt for the usually well prepared Russian Grandmaster Oleg Korneev. Before this White had always been playing 11 $\text{Qc3} c5$ but Black had experienced no problems as can be seen from the following examples:

- a) 12 $\text{Qh2 c8} 13 \text{Qg4 Qc6} 14 \text{Qxf6+ Qxf6} 15 \text{d5 Qc7} 16 \text{e3} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ Lutheran Hebden, Cappelle la Grande 1998.

- b) 12 $\text{g5 Qe8}! 13 \text{xc7 Qxc7} 14 \text{d5} (or 14 $\text{d5 Qd8}$ followed by ...$\text{Qe8-f6}$ and Black has no problems in reaching equality)
14...$\text{Qc6} 15 \text{Qxe2 Qc7} 16 \text{a2 Qh8} 17 \text{Qg3 g6} 18 \text{Qd2 f5} 19 \text{exf5 Qxf5} 20 \text{Qg5 Qxg5} 21 \text{Qxg5 d5}$ and Black had the initiative in Boudre-Hebden, French League 2000.

11...$\text{bxc4} 12 \text{xc4 c5} 13 \text{Qc3 a5}$

Preventing any possibility of White playing b2-b4.

14 $\text{Qg5}?! \text{Qb8}$

Protecting the bishop because the threat was 15 $\text{xf7+ Qxf7} 16 \text{Qxf7 Qxf7} 17 \text{b3+}$ and 18 $\text{Qxb7}$.

15 f4 $\text{Qc6}$

A good defence. Weaker is 15...$\text{exf4?!} 16 \text{Qxf4 h6} 17 \text{Qf3}$ and Black must reckon with the unpleasant threat of e4-c5, when Black’s rook on b8 can easily become a target for White’s bishop on f4.

16 $\text{Qf3}$

The alternative was 16 f5 $\text{Qd4} 17 \text{Qf3 Qd7}$ planning ...$\text{Qd4xf3+}$ followed by ...$\text{Qe7-g5}$ with very complicated play ahead.

16...$\text{exf4} 17 \text{xf4 Qd7} 18 \text{Qd5 Qce5} 19 \text{Qxe5 Qxe5} 20 \text{Qxe5 dxe5} 21 \text{b3 Qxd5} 22 \text{Qxd5 g6} 23 \text{a2 Qg7} 24 \text{Qc4 Qb6} 25 \text{Qf1 Qf6} 26 \text{Qxf6 Qxf6} 27 \text{g3 Qe7} 28 \text{Qd2 Qd4?!}$

The opposite-coloured bishops promise Black an easy draw. However, this is the first inaccuracy. If I wanted to free myself with ...$\text{f7-f5}$ it was more appropriate to do it immediately with 28...$\text{f5?!} 29 \text{exf5 Qxf5}$. We shall see that, with Black’s queen on d4, White’s manoeuvre $\text{Qf2-e2}$ gains in strength because later White can play $\text{Qc2-e4}$ attacking Black’s queen and gaining a tempo.

29 $\text{Qg2 f5?!} 30 \text{exf5 e4?}$

I didn’t like the look of 30...$\text{Qxf5} 31 \text{Qe2!}$, when White is just a tiny bit better. If White plays 31 $\text{Qxf5}$ (instead of 31 $\text{Qe2!}$) 31...$\text{gx5} 32 \text{Wh5}$ Black has an easy draw after 32...$\text{Qb2}+ 33 \text{Qf3 e4+}$ etc.

31 $\text{We1!}$
This is what I overlooked.
31...gx{f}5 32 dxe4 fxe4
Neither is 32...\texttt{wx}e4+ 33 \texttt{wx}e4 fxe4 34 \texttt{ee}2 very pleasant for Black — to defend a pawn down despite the opposite-coloured bishops is not great fun.
33 \texttt{ee}2 \texttt{dd}6 34 \texttt{exe}4 \texttt{wb}2+
Only now did I see that the planned 34...\texttt{fl}2+ loses after the cold-blooded 35 \texttt{hh}1! \texttt{wb}2 36 \texttt{gg}4+! and White mates first!
35 \texttt{ee}2 \texttt{ff}6 36 \texttt{ee}3 \texttt{wb}2+ 37 \texttt{ee}2 \texttt{ff}6
38 \texttt{h}4
Stronger was 38 \texttt{dd}5! \texttt{gg}5 39 \texttt{cc}3+ \texttt{ff}6 40 \texttt{cc}4 etc.
38...\texttt{ff}3+ 39 \texttt{hh}3 \texttt{ff}5+ 40 \texttt{hh}2 \texttt{gg}4
41 \texttt{gg}2 \texttt{ff}3+ 42 \texttt{hh}2 \texttt{gg}4 43 \texttt{ee}7+
After 43 \texttt{ee}4 \texttt{fl}2+ 44 \texttt{xf}2 \texttt{xe}4 45 \texttt{ff}7+ \texttt{hh}6 46 \texttt{ff}6+ \texttt{gg}6 Black just manages to defend the position.
43...\texttt{hh}8 44 \texttt{wc}3+ \texttt{wd}4 45 \texttt{ee}3
Maybe a better winning try was hidden in the ending after 45 \texttt{wd}4+ \texttt{cx}d4 46 \texttt{d}7 \texttt{xa}3 47 \texttt{xd}4 etc. It is difficult to say — probably White’s chances to win this game and Black’s to draw are 50-50. Who knows?

Worse is 56...\texttt{cc}5?! 57 \texttt{dd}5! etc.
57 \texttt{ff}1 \texttt{ee}5 58 \texttt{ff}7+ \texttt{gg}7 59 \texttt{ff}5
\texttt{xd}3+ 60 \texttt{ff}2 \texttt{cc}3 61 \texttt{ee}2
White’s sloppy endgame technique has allowed me to reach a drawn position. I also have an easy draw after 61 \texttt{xe}5 \texttt{xf}7 62 \texttt{hx}5 \texttt{xb}3 63 \texttt{xc}5 \texttt{bb}4 64 \texttt{xa}5 \texttt{xb}4.
61...\texttt{dd}4 62 \texttt{cc}4 \texttt{ee}3+ 63 \texttt{dd}2 \texttt{hh}3 64
\texttt{hx}5 \texttt{gg}6 65 \texttt{gg}5+ \texttt{ff}6 66 \texttt{hh}5 \texttt{gg}6 67
\texttt{gg}5+ \texttt{ff}6 68 \texttt{dd}5 \texttt{xa}4 69 \texttt{dd}3 \texttt{ee}7 70
\texttt{gg}5 \texttt{dd}6 71 \texttt{gg}6+ \texttt{ee}5 72 \texttt{ee}6+ \texttt{ff}5
73 \texttt{ee}6 \texttt{hh}3+ 74 \texttt{ee}2 \texttt{hh}2+ 75 \texttt{ff}3
\texttt{cc}3 76 \texttt{bc}6 \texttt{bb}4 77 \texttt{dd}5+ \texttt{ff}6 78 \texttt{dd}8
\texttt{hh}4 79 \texttt{ee}3 \texttt{dd}4 80 \texttt{xd}4 ½-½

\textbf{Game 70}

\textbf{Ponomariov-Ivanchuk}

\textit{FIDE World Ch., Moscow 2002}

1 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{e}5 2 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{c}6 3 \texttt{b}b\texttt{b} 4 \texttt{a}a\texttt{a} 5 \texttt{f}6
5 0-0 \texttt{ee}7 6 \texttt{ee}1 \texttt{b}5 7 \texttt{bb}3 0-0 8 \texttt{h}3
9 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{d}6 10 \texttt{a}3 \texttt{bb}8 11 \texttt{bb}d2 \texttt{bb}d7
12 \texttt{ff}1 \texttt{ee}8 13 \texttt{gg}3
13 \texttt{ca}2 is discussed in the next game.
13...\texttt{c}6
13...\texttt{d}5 is not enough for equality after
14 \texttt{a}a2 \texttt{cc}6 15 \texttt{gg}5! \texttt{dx}5 16 \texttt{dx}5 \texttt{h}6 17
\texttt{ee}3 \texttt{d}5 18 \texttt{ff}3 \texttt{ff}8 19 \texttt{aad}1 \texttt{dd}6 (Black could have released a tension in the centre by playing 19...\texttt{d}4 but in that case the scope of activity for White’s light-squared bishop would have been increased to the maximum)
20 \texttt{ex}5 \texttt{xd}5 21 \texttt{ee}4 \texttt{xe}4 22 \texttt{dx}4 \texttt{cc}6
23 \texttt{ff}5 \texttt{ee}7 (the seventh rank must be defended because if 23...\texttt{xc}2?, 24 \texttt{dd}7! is very strong) 24 \texttt{c}3 with steady positional advantage for White due to the pair of bishops, Shirov-Svidler, European Club Cup, Halkidiki 2002.

14 \texttt{ff}2 \texttt{d}5 15 \texttt{ff}3
Or 15 \texttt{d}5 \texttt{bb}8 16 \texttt{ff}3 and now instead of the poor reply 16...\texttt{hh}8? 17 \texttt{gg}5 \texttt{h}6 18
\texttt{h}4 \texttt{g}6 19 \texttt{ee}3 \texttt{g}5 20 \texttt{gg}3, when Black’s kingside was seriously weakened in the game Shirov-Adams, Wijk aan Zee 1998, Black should start counterplay in the centre with
16...dxe4 17 dxe4 c5 18 c4 (the only move otherwise black plays ...c5-c4 shutting out the light-squared bishop) 18...\$b6 19 \$g4 \$xg4 20 \$xg4 \$g6 with equality.
15...g6 16 \$a2?!!

This is a prophylactic move against the ...\$d7-c5 manoeuvre attacking White’s bishop. However, more forceful was 16 \$h6 \$c5 17 \$a2 \$d6 18 \$g4 with a small but lasting advantage for White because White’s bishop on h6 is a thorn in Black’s position.

A nice move which prevents White’s attempt at a kingside attack commencing with g4-g5. Black’s dark-squared bishop will emerge into play via the a3-f8 diagonal if necessary.

26 \$f3 c5 26 \$h2 \$d4 27 \$xh4?! It might have been better to play 27 c3, not opening the e-file for Black.

This leaves the a-pawn defenceless. Better was 29 \$xc3 d4 30 \$a2 \$c2 31 \$c1 and Black’s rook will later be ejected from e2 by \$a2-b1. It’s true that in that case Black would maintain the advantage due to having the larger control of space.

White should have tried 31 \$h3?! hoping for 31...\$xa3?! 32 \$h6!! \$xh6 33 \$d7+ \$e7 34 g5 fxg5 35 \$xb7 \$xb7 36 \$xc8 and it is not clear who is better. Of course Black is not obliged to fall into this with 31...\$xa3?!

31...\$xa4 32 \$h3 \$ed6 33 \$f3 \$c7 34 \$c1 \$cd7 35 \$b1 \$we6 36 \$xd7 \$xd7 37 \$c2 \$c6 38 \$d1 \$wa2 39 \$xd7 \$xd7 40 \$wd1 \$b5

Black should keep his dangerous passed a-pawn alive so this is better than 40...\$xg4 41 \$f3 \$e6 42 \$xa4 etc.

41 \$e3 \$c4 42 \$h2 \$c6 43 \$wa1 \$f8 43...\$xe4?! 44 \$xa4 is obviously worse than the text.

44 \$b1 a3?

This grave error lets slip a deserved win for Black. One down with just four games to go in a world title match, it is not just the chess that proves decisive but also chess psychology! After the simple 44...\$xe4 45 \$a2 \$c6 46 \$f3 \$d3 followed by 47...g5-e4 White could resign.

45 \$f3 \$wb3 46 \$wa2 \$a4 47 \$g3 \$g7?

One error causes another, which is often the case. It is really hard to imagine that Black will even lose this game and with it virtually the match! After the correct 47...g5 Black would still preserve some winning chances.

48 \$wd2!

This is what Black had overlooked. Now if 48...\$xb1, then 49 \$xh6+ \$g8 (49...\$f7 50 \$d5+ \$e8 51 \$c6+ \$e7 52 \$c8+ leads to perpetual check) 50 \$xd5+ \$h8 51 \$xf8
a2 52 \texttt{Wf7 We1+} and it is Black who takes the draw by perpetual check.

48...g5

A desperate try to win but, bearing in mind that Black was now in time trouble, a wiser choice would have been to take the draw.

49 \texttt{Aa2 Wb7} 50 \texttt{Wd3}

50 \texttt{Wd5} immediately is also worthy of attention.

50...\texttt{Ae8} 51 \texttt{Wd5 Wxd5} 52 exd5

Now White has dangerous passed c- and d-pawns that make the result uncertain – White is certainly no longer worse!

52...\texttt{a5} 53 \texttt{c4 Ab4} 54 \texttt{c5 Axf8} 55 \texttt{Ae12 Ab5} 56 \texttt{c6 Ae7} 57 \texttt{Aa7 Wd8} 58 \texttt{Ab6+ Ac8} 59 \texttt{We3 A4??}

A final mistake. Black can draw by 59...\texttt{Af1!!} 60 \texttt{g3} (or 60 \texttt{Ae4 Axb2} 61 \texttt{Ae4 Ad6} 62 \texttt{Ad5 Aa5 Ab1} and White can’t win) 60...\texttt{Ae4} 61 \texttt{Ae4 Afc2} 62 \texttt{Axf5 Afx3} 63 \texttt{Ae4 Ad6} 64 \texttt{Ae6 Ac7} 65 \texttt{Ac5 Ae2} 66 \texttt{Axa2} Axa4 67 \texttt{Wf6} e4 68 d6 e3! 69 dxc7 e2 70 \texttt{Ab4 Axc7} 71 \texttt{Ag6 Af3} 72 \texttt{Axe6 Axc6} 73 \texttt{Ae4 Aa2 Ac5} 74 \texttt{Axe2 Ad5} 75 \texttt{Ab1} a3 76 \texttt{Axe5} a2 77 \texttt{Ad6} etc.

60 \texttt{Ae4 Ae2}

Or 50...\texttt{Af1} 61 \texttt{Af5 Axb2} 62 \texttt{Ad6} 63 \texttt{Ae6 Ac7} 64 \texttt{Axc7 Axc7} 65 \texttt{d6+ Axc6} 66 d7 and the passed d-pawn queens.

61 \texttt{Af5 e4} 62 \texttt{Ae6 exf3} 63 d6 Axd6 64 \texttt{Axd6} 1-0

---

**Game 71**

Kasparov-Kramnik

Linares 2003

1 e4 e5 2 \texttt{Af3 Ac6} 3 \texttt{Ab5} a6 4 \texttt{Aa4 Af6} 5 0-0 Aa7 6 \texttt{Aa1} b5 7 Axb3 0-0 8 h3 \texttt{Ab7} 9 d3 d6 10 a3 \texttt{Axd6} 11 \texttt{Ae1} b4 12 \texttt{Ae2} a5 13 \texttt{Aa2} c6 14 \texttt{Ab3} \texttt{Af8} 15 \texttt{Af5} d5 16 d4!?

A very sharp continuation. Black now has to be careful because both White’s bishops can become increasingly active.

---

16...\texttt{c5!}

White’s idea would become transparent after 16...exd4? 17 e5! Aa4 18 Axa4 dxe4 19 Aa5 Axa5 20 Wh5 and Black will soon be mated.

17 dxc5 Axc5 18 exd5 e4 19 Aa3 Axd5 20 Axd5 Wxd5

Also possible was 20...Axd5 21 Ag4 Wf6 22 Ag5 Wg6 etc.

21 Ag5 Afd7

21...Aexd7 22 Aa2 Ae5 also deserves attention.

22 Ag4 Ae5 23 Ag3 Ae6 24 Aa1 Axa5 25 Afx5 Wb7 26 Ag3 Ac4 27 Afd5 Ae6

From this square Black’s rook defends the kingside. 27...Axb2 28 Aa4 f6 29 Ag4 would have been dangerous for Black.

28 b3 Axa3 29 Axe4 Axe4

Bad is 29...Aa2? 30 Aa6 fxe6 31 Ah5! exf5 32 Aa6! Wxd7 33 Aa6+ and White wins.

30 Axf6 Wxe4 31 Ah6+ Ah8 32 Aa4 Axf7+ Ag8 33 Aa6+ Ah8 ½-½

---

**Game 72**

Jansa-Blatny

Czech Championship 1998

1 e4 e5 2 Af3 Ac6 3 Ab5 a6 4 Aa4 Af6 5 0-0 Aa7 6 Aa1 b5 7 Ab3 0-0 8 h3 Ab7 9 d3 d6 10 a3 Ad4

---

117
The Marshall Attack

This pet line of the Czech Grandmaster Pavel Blatny surprisingly does not have too many followers even though a refutation has not been found. Probably what deter the black-sided players is that after the exchange on d4 White gets a kingside pawn majority (the e5-pawn has been removed) and thus White has potential attacking chances. However, Black also has his own trump card — by playing ...\(\text{\textit{c6-d4}}\) and ...c5-c4 he keeps White's light-squared bishop out of play for some time.

11 \(\text{\textit{cxd4}}\) \(\text{\textit{exd4}}\) 12 c3 dxc3 13 \(\text{\textit{bxc3}}\) c5 14 \(\text{\textit{d4}}\) d5!

A good pawn sacrifice by which Black frees himself. White will have doubled d-pawns so his extra pawn is rather weak and lacks the support of other pieces. Once Black regains one of them, he will be better.

15 \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) 17 exd5

\(\text{\textit{d6}}\) 18 \(\text{\textit{d2?!}}\)

After 18 \(\text{\textit{xd6}}\) \(\text{\textit{xd6}}\) Black is slightly better, so best was 18 \(\text{\textit{d3!}}\) pressurising the c5-pawn and keeping the game balanced.

18...\(\text{\textit{f6}}\) 19 \(\text{\textit{d3}}\) \(\text{\textit{f5}}\) 20 \(\text{\textit{g4}}\) \(\text{\textit{g4}}\) 21 \(\text{\textit{hxg4}}\) \(\text{\textit{fxd8}}\) 22 \(\text{\textit{a5?!}}\)

White should have realised the forthcoming danger and avoided it by playing 22 d4! c4 23 \(\text{\textit{b4}}\) \(\text{\textit{xb4}}\) 24 axb4 \(f6\) (of course not 24...\(\text{\textit{xd5?!}}\) 25 \(\text{\textit{xa6}}!\) using Black's back rank weakness) 25 \(\text{\textit{c6}}\) \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) 26 \(\text{\textit{xa6}}\) \(\text{\textit{xc6}}\) 27 \(\text{\textit{xc6}}\) \(\text{\textit{xd4}}\) with a probable draw.

22...\(\text{\textit{d7}}\) 23 \(\text{\textit{b4}}\) \(\text{\textit{f8}}\) 24 \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) 25 \(\text{\textit{b4}}\) \(\text{\textit{f8}}\) 26 \(\text{\textit{xf8}}\) \(\text{\textit{xf8}}\) 27 a4?

After this Black will obtain a strong passed b-pawn. Better was 27 \(\text{\textit{ac1}}\) \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) 28 \(\text{\textit{ec3}}\).

27...\(\text{\textit{b4!}}\) 28 a5

Now White will have to worry about his a5-pawn, but this had to be played, otherwise Black would have played ...a6-a5 supporting his strong passed b4-pawn with excellent winning chances.

28...\(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) 29 \(\text{\textit{eb1}}\) \(\text{\textit{b8}}\) 30 \(\text{\textit{b3}}\) \(\text{\textit{d4}}\) 31 \(\text{\textit{f3}}\) \(\text{\textit{e7}}\) 32 \(\text{\textit{d2}}\) \(\text{\textit{d6}}\) 33 \(\text{\textit{a3}}\) \(\text{\textit{d5}}\) 34 \(\text{\textit{d2}}\) \(\text{\textit{c5}}\) 35 \(\text{\textit{h1}}\)

Also after 35 \(\text{\textit{ac1}}+\) \(\text{\textit{b5}}\) 36 \(\text{\textit{e7}}\) \(\text{\textit{f4}}\) White's a5-pawn is doomed.

35...\(\text{\textit{b5}}\) 36 \(\text{\textit{a1}}\) \(\text{\textit{e8}}\) 37 \(\text{\textit{bb1}}\) \(\text{\textit{g6}}\) 38 \(\text{\textit{b3}}\) \(\text{\textit{h5}}\) 39 \(\text{\textit{gxh5}}\) \(\text{\textit{gxh5}}\) 40 \(\text{\textit{h1}}\) \(\text{\textit{e5}}\) 41 \(\text{\textit{a1}}\) f5!

White has to content himself with a waiting policy while Black plans to play ...f5-f4 followed by ...\(\text{\textit{c5-g5}}\) winning White's g2-
pawn. White’s next move is practically forced.
42 g3 f4 43 gxf4 xf4 44 c1 xa5 45 c4 xc4 46 dx4 h4

With the fall of White’s a5-pawn, the game is virtually over. Black’s ‘a’ and ‘b’ connected passed pawns are decisive. The rest needs no explanation.
47 b1 h3 48 d3 h2 49 h1 h5 50 f4
b6 51 f5 c5 52 f6 h7 53 f7 xf7
54 xh2 d7+ 55 c2 xc4 56 h5
d5 57 h4+ b5 0-1

Game 73
A.Kovacevic-Berzinsh
Interlaken 2001

1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6
5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 h3
b7 9 d3 d6 10 a3 d4 11 xd4 exd4
12 d2

A serious positional mistake which both leaves White with a strong passed e-pawn, and weakens Black’s kingside. There was no need for panicking by playing this move because once White’s knight lands on f5 it is not the end of the world. Better instead was 15...c4 16 a2 c5 17 f5 c8 18 f3
xf5 19 xf5 c7 with an approximately equal position as White’s light-squared bishop is away from the main scene of the action.
16 f3 g6

Maybe Black was hoping to continue 16...f4 17 e2 g5 but after the strong reply 18 h4! his kingside would have been left shattered.
17 h6 g7 18 c3 dx3 19 bx3 f7
20 e2 c4 21 dx4 exd4 22 xb7 cxb3
23 ad1 wc8 24 wd5

The consequences of weakening the a2-g8 diagonal by playing 15...f5? have become obvious – White’s queen dominates the board while Black can do very little to stop White’s powerful passed e-pawn.

24...xa3

This loses but 24...b2 in order to confuse the matter would not have saved the game
either.
25 \( \text{\textit{d4!}} \)

25...\( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 26 \( \text{\textit{e6}} \) \( \text{\textit{xf8}} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) \( \text{\textit{e6}} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{wd7}} \) 1-0

Black resigns as if 28...\( \text{\textit{fx8}} \), then 29 \( \text{\textit{f7}}+ \) \( \text{\textit{h8}} \) 30 e7 clearly wins.

---

\textit{Game 74}

\textbf{Murey-Adams}

\textit{European Club Cup, Hilversum 1993}

1 \( \text{\textit{e4}} \) \( \text{\textit{e5}} \) 2 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) 3 \( \text{\textit{b5 a6}} \) 4 \( \text{\textit{a4 d6}} \) 5 0-0 \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 6 \( \text{\textit{e1 b5}} \) 7 \( \text{\textit{b3}} \) 0-0 8 h3 \( \text{\textit{b7}} \) 9 d3 d6 10 a3

Finnish Grandmaster Heikko Westerinen first introduced this innocent-looking system. However, it was only after this game that suddenly many white players started taking it up.

10...\( \text{\textit{a5}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{c2 c5}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \) h6?!

Nowadays this move is regarded as a bit too slow and it doesn’t grant Black full equality.

13 \( \text{\textit{b4}} \)

With the text White aims to seize control over the d5-square. However, recently this move has been replaced by the more ambitious 13 \( \text{\textit{ce2!}} \).

White transfers the knight to the kingside, which seems to undermine 12...h6?!. The point is that once the white knight lands on f5, Black would prefer his pawn to be on h7 rather than on h6, especially as there are unpleasant sacrifices on h6 in the air. Here are a few examples of 13 \( \text{\textit{ce2!}} \):

- a) 13...\( \text{\textit{d5}} \) 14 exd5 \( \text{\textit{xd5}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{xe5 d6}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{xf4}} \) \( \text{\textit{xf4}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{ef4 c7}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{wh5}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{d4}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{he3 c6}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{e4 g3}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{xd5}} \) 23 \( \text{\textit{xd5}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{xf1}} \) 25 \( \text{\textit{wc2}} \) 26 \( \text{\textit{he2}} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{he1}} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{xc7?!}} \) 29 \( \text{\textit{f4}} \) with pressure for White due to his strong light-squared bishop, Berzinsh-Pedersen, Aarhus 1993.

- b) 13...\( \text{\textit{e8?!}} \) (weakening the f7-square) 14 \( \text{\textit{g3}} \) c4 15 \( \text{\textit{d2}} \) exd3 16 \( \text{\textit{xd3 f6}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{he2}} \) \( \text{\textit{h5}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{d4}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{c3 e6}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{e4 g3}} \) and all White’s pieces are attacking the black monarch, Korneev-V.Rodriguez, Mislata 1999.

- c) 13...\( \text{\textit{wc7}} \) 14 \( \text{\textit{g3}} \) \( \text{\textit{h7}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{f5 f6}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{he2}} \) \( \text{\textit{c8}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{f3 c6}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{c3 e7}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{exe7+}} \) \( \text{\textit{xe7}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{g4 g5}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{xe3 e6}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{xd5}} \) \( \text{\textit{dx5}} \) 23 \( \text{\textit{xc1 x1}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{xc1 e8}} \) 25 \( \text{\textit{wc2}} \) 26 \( \text{\textit{a2 fd8}} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{cd1 wc7?!}} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{f4}} \)
d) Apparently never tried in practice is 13...\(\text{Qc}6\) 14 \(\text{Qg3}\) \(\text{Qd}4\) 15 \(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{exd}4\) (or 15...\(\text{exd}4\) 16 \(f4\) with better play for White) 16 \(\text{Qf5}\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 17 \(\text{Qxe}7+\) \(\text{Qxe}7\) 18 \(\text{Qf4}\) \(\text{Qe}6\) 19 \(e5!\) and again White has the better chances due to his pawn structure.

13...\(\text{Qc}6\) 14 \(\text{Qd}5\) \(\text{Qxd}5\)

Worth consideration is 14...\(\text{Qd}4!\)? 15 \(\text{Qxe}7+\) \(\text{Qxe}7\) 16 \(c3\) \(\text{Qxf}3+\) 17 \(\text{Qxf}3\) \(a5!\) 18 \(\text{bxc}5\) \(\text{dxc}5\) 19 \(\text{Qg}3\) \(\text{Qh}8\) and Black appears to be okay.

15 \(\text{Qxd}5\) \(\text{Qc}7\) 16 \(c3\) \(\text{Qd}8\)

Or 16...\(a5\) 17 \(\text{bxc}5\) \(\text{dxc}5\) 18 \(\text{Qb}1\) \(b4\) 19 \(\text{Qd}2\) with a slight but steady advantage for White.

17 \(\text{Wb}3\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 18 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{cxb}4\)

After 18...\(\text{Qxd}5\) 19 \(\text{Qxd}5\) \(\text{Qe}6\) 20 \(a4!\) etc. White retains his pressure on the queenside.

19 \(\text{cxb}4\) \(\text{Qc}3?\)

After defending accurately Black misses White’s strong 21st move. Instead he could have drawn easily with 19...\(\text{Qxd}5\) 20 \(\text{Qxd}5\) \(\text{Qc}6!\) 21 \(\text{Wxc}6\) \(\text{Qxc}6\) 22 \(\text{Qc}1\) \(\text{Qf}6\) 23 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{Qe}7\) followed by exchanges on the c-file.

20 \(\text{Wxc}3\) \(\text{Qxc}3\) 21 \(\text{Qec}1!\)

After this strong move White seizes control of the c-file.

21...\(\text{Qxc}1+\)

21...\(\text{Qxd}3?\) would have lost a piece to 22 \(\text{Qxb}7\) \(\text{Qxb}7\) 23 \(\text{Qc}7\) etc.

22 \(\text{Qxc}1\) \(\text{Qxd}5\) 23 \(\text{exd}5\) \(f5\) 24 \(\text{Qc}7\) \(\text{Qf}6\)

25 \(g4!\)

White secures control of the vital e4-square. Going for a material advantage with 25 \(\text{Qa}7?!\) 26 \(\text{Qxa}6\) \(\text{Qc}8!\) would have been wrong because Black gets counterplay.

25...\(f4\) 26 \(\text{Qb}6\) \(\text{Qf}7\) 27 \(\text{Qc}6\)

Again White prefers to retain an iron grip on the position, which is far stronger than 27 \(\text{Qa}7\) \(\text{Qc}8\) etc.

27...\(\text{Qa}8\) 28 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 29 \(\text{Qe}4\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 30 \(\text{Qc}7\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 31 \(\text{Qa}5\) \(\text{Qa}8\)

After 31...\(\text{Qxc}6\) 32 \(\text{dxc}6\) \(\text{Qe}8\) White continues with 33 \(\text{Qc}3\) followed by \(\text{Qd}5\) with a winning position.

32 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 33 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{bxa}4\) 34 \(\text{Qxa}4\) \(\text{Qg}5\) 35 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(e4\)

As the battle on the queenside is lost for Black (the pawn on \(a6\) is lost), he searches desperately for play elsewhere.

36 \(\text{Qh}4!\) \(\text{Qf}3\) 37 \(\text{dxe}4\) \(\text{Qxh}4+\) 38 \(\text{Qf}1\) \(\text{Qf}3\) 39 \(\text{Qb}6\) \(\text{Qb}8\) 40 \(\text{Qc}4\) \(\text{Qh}2+\) 41 \(\text{Qg}2\)

42 \(\text{Qxg}4\) 43 \(\text{Qxd}6+\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 44 \(\text{Qc}4\) \(\text{Qf}6\)

45 \(\text{Qc}5+\) 46 \(\text{Qxe}5\) \(\text{Qxe}5\) 47 \(\text{Qg}4\) \(\text{Qf}1\)

48 \(\text{Qa}6\) \(\text{Qb}8\) 49 \(d6\) \(g6+\) 50 \(\text{Qxf}4\) \(\text{Qe}6\)

51 \(\text{Qc}7\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 52 \(e5\) \(\text{Qf}8+\) 53 \(\text{Qe}4\) \(\text{Qxe}7\)

54 \(\text{Qa}7\) \(1-0\)

---

**Game 75**

**Bologan-Zaitsev**

*Moscow 1998*

1 \(\text{e4}\) \(5\) \(\text{e5}\) \(2\) \(\text{Qf}3\) \(3\) \(\text{Qc}6\) \(\text{Qb}5\) \(a6\) 4 \(\text{Qa}4\) \(\text{Qf}6\)

5 \(0-0\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 6 \(\text{Qe}1\) \(b5\) 7 \(\text{Qb}3\) 0-0 8 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{Qb}7\) 9 \(\text{d}3\) \(d6\) 10 \(a3\) \(\text{Qa}5\) 11 \(\text{Qa}2\) \(c5\) 12 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(b4?!\)

With this rather impulsive move Black intends, at an early stage, to seize the initiative. Black has in mind, in some lines, to throw in the typical pawn sacrifice ...\(b4-b3\) in order to shut in White’s light-squared bishop. However, as we shall see, White’s chances are still to be preferred.

13 \(\text{Qd}5\)

An alternative which might be even
stronger is 13 axb4 cxb4 14 Qd5 Qxd5 15 Qxd5 Qc6 16 c3. This gave White clearly the better chances in Lanka-Reichwehr, Schwabisch Gmund 1994 after 16...wc7 17 d4 a5 18 Qe3 bxc5 19 bxc5 Rab8 20 Ac1 h6 21 Qh2! Qd8 22 c4 Qc8 23 f4 Qe6 24 dx5 dxe5 25 f5 Qf4 26 Qh1 Qb2 27 Qxf4 exf4 28 Wh5 with strong pressure on the kingside. Obviously this is only an example of what can happen to Black if he treats the opening in a passive manner as in this game.

13...b3!? 14 Qxe7+ Wxe7 15 cxb3 Qc6
16 Aa3 a5

Black has some compensation for the sacrificed pawn because the activity of White’s light-squared bishop has been seriously diminished.

17 Qh4 Ac8 18 f4!? Qxe4?

Tempting, but it turns out to be an error. Correct was 18...Qg4! 19 hxg4 Whxh4 20 f5 Qa6 (but not 20...Qd4?, when 21 b4! cxb4 22 axb4 axb4? 23 Qxf7+! decides the outcome of the game) with Ac6-d4 to follow, giving Black reasonable compensation for the pawn.

19 Qf3 Qf6 20 fx e5 Qxe5

White’s chances are also to be preferred after 20...dx5 21 Ac1 because Black’s c5-pawn is rather weak.

21 Axc5! dx5 22 Axe5 Ae6 23 Ac1 Ad7 24 Ae1 Qd6 25 d4!

Let’s take stock of what is happening. White has managed to clear up the position in the centre, leaving him a safe pawn to the good. Soon White’s pawn majority on the queenside will start rolling forward.

25...Wg3 26 dx5 Axh3 27 Wd2 Ae6 28 Ab1 Qf6 29 b4 axb4 30 axb4 Qfd8 31 Wg5 Wb8

The same reply follows after 31...Qg4, rejecting Black’s ‘attack’.

32 Wh4 Ac4 33 Qg5 Qxb4 34 Qxh7+ Qf8 35 Qxe6+ fxe6 36 Wh3 Ac2 37 Qxe6 f4 38 Qg6 1-0

Game 76

Gelfand-Adams

Wijk aan Zee 2002

1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Ac6 3 Ab5 a6 4 Aa4 Qf6 5 0-0 Qe7 6 Ae1 b5 7 Ab3 0-0 8 h3 Ab7 9 d3 d6 10 a3 Ae5 11 Ae2 c5 12 Ac3 Ae6 13 Ae2?!

White intends to transfer his knight to g3 in order to support his kingside attack but, as we shall see, this plan is rather unconvincing. The fact that White loses control of the d5-square is of utmost importance.

13...Ac8! 14 Qg3 Ae6 15 Qf5?!

After this White will achieve the advantage of having the bishop pair but, more importantly, Black will gain control over the centre. White would have done better by playing simple chess with 15 Axc6! Qxc6 16 c3, although even then Black would have a very pleasant position.
15...xf5 16 exf5 wd7 17 g4 h6 18 c3

Probably after playing 15 Qf5?! White’s first intention was to continue with 18 Qh2 fe8 19 h4, but then he noticed 19...Qh7?! 20 f3 f8 followed by ...d6-d5 and White’s attack grinds to a halt as Black seizes control of the centre.

18...fe8 19 b4 cxb4 20 cxb4

Slightly better was 20 axb4 but White is pinning his hopes on the opening of the a1-h8 diagonal by playing c1-b2 and d3-d4.

20...d8?!

Black seems to forget about the safety of his kingside. Better was 20...a5! with a strong initiative on the queenside.

21 b2?

This is consistent with 20 cxb4 but, as we shall see, White’s dark-squared bishop will play no great role on the long diagonal. Much stronger was 21 c3! a5 22 wd2 and Black has to watch out for a possible sacrifice on h6.

21...a5! 22 bxa5

Black is also much better after 22 d4 e4 23 d5 Qxb4! 24 axb4 exf3.

22...xa5 23 e2 b6 24 wb3?

White overlooks the next move and loses precious time. Better was 24 ec2.

24...wb7?

With the obvious threat of ...c6-a5 winning a piece.

25 wd1 a4

Also deserving attention was 25...b4? with a clear advantage to Black.

26 c2 de7 27 dh2?!

After this White will end up in a position where he is virtually out of moves. After 27 c1?! very promising for Black is the piece sacrifice 27...dxg4! 28 hxg4 exg4+ 29 vf1 xf5 30 b2 f4! So White had to play 27 d4? e4 28 de1 etc.

27...ed5 28 ff3 f4 29 gg2

Or 29 wg3 cg8 30 acc1 xc2 31 xc2 b4! and White is in deep trouble.

29...e4 30 e1

The alternatives are not rosy for White:

a) 30 dx4 exxe4 31 df3 dxf2! 32 xf2 ec2 winning outright for Black.

b) 30 d4 wa7 31 cd1 b4 32 axd5 cd5 33 axb4 wb4 with ...db4-d3 to come and Black will dominate the board.

30...xf2!

31 xf2 ff4 32 wg3 xf2+ 33 xf2 xd3+ 34 ff1 xb2 35 h4

A desperate attempt to avoid inevitable defeat. 35 xd6 cd3 followed by either ...wb7-a7 or ...e8-c8 also leaves White without a decent reply.

35...wd7 36 wg2 cd3 37 e1 e3 38 g5 hxg5 39 hxg5 dd5 0-1

**Game 77**

Kasparov-Adams

Linares 1999

1 e4 e5 2 df3 dc6 3 db5 a6 4 da4 df6

123
\textbf{Anti-Marshall with } 8 \textit{h3 } \textit{\&b7 } 9 \textit{d3 } 10 \textit{a3} \\

\textit{w4 g5?}

A typical time trouble move that weakens the kingside.

36 \textit{\&f3 e4?}

Black's position also becomes fraught with danger after 36...\textit{\&e7} 37 \textit{w5}! but the text is a blunder which loses a pawn.

37 \textit{\&xe4!}

37...\textit{\&xe4} 38 \textit{\&xd7} \textit{d3} \\

Or 38...\textit{\&xc2} 39 \textit{\&xd4+ } \textit{\&g8} 40 \textit{\&d8+ } \textit{\&g7} 41 \textit{\&e7+ } \textit{\&g8} 42 \textit{\&e5 } \textit{\&d1+ } 43 \textit{\&h2} \textit{\&d5} with reasonable drawing chances for Black.

39 \textit{\&xd3} \textit{\&xd3} 40 \textit{\&c8+ } \textit{\&g7} 41 \textit{\&b7+ } \textit{\&g8} 42 \textit{\&xa6 } \textit{\&e2+} \\

White preserves good winning chances after 42...\textit{\&xh3+ } 43 \textit{\&h2! } \textit{\&xf2} 44 \textit{\&e6+ } \textit{\&h8} 45 \textit{\&e5!}

43 \textit{\&h2 } \textit{\&e4} 44 \textit{\&f6 } \textit{\&f4+} 45 \textit{\&xh4} \textit{\&xh4} 46 \textit{\&g4} \textit{\&f3+} 47 \textit{\&xg3 } \textit{\&c3} 48 \textit{\&d4} \textit{\&h5} 49 \textit{\&h4 } \textit{\&f7} 50 \textit{\&h3 } \textit{\&f6} 51 \textit{\&g4} \textit{\&xg4+} 52 \textit{\&xg4 } \textit{\&g6} 53 \textit{\&h5+} \textit{\&h7} \\

A draw was hidden in the line 53...\textit{\&f6!} 54 \textit{\&h4 } \textit{\&f7} 55 \textit{\&g5 } \textit{\&e4+} 56 \textit{\&f4} (or 56 \textit{\&h6} \textit{\&d6} 57 \textit{\&h7} \textit{\&f6} 58 \textit{\&h6} \textit{\&f7} and White cannot win) 56...\textit{\&f6} 57 \textit{\&h6} \textit{b4!} 58 \textit{\&xb4} \textit{\&d5+} 59 \textit{\&f5 } \textit{\&d4} 60 \textit{\&c6 } \textit{\&g8} 61 \textit{\&g6} \textit{\&d5} reaching a theoretical draw. The text leads to a lost king and pawn ending.

54 \textit{\&h4! } \textit{\&g8} 55 \textit{\&h6 } \textit{\&h7} 56 \textit{\&h5 } \textit{\&e4} 57 \textit{\&xb5 } \textit{\&f6+} 58 \textit{\&g5 } \textit{\&e4+} 59 \textit{\&f5} \textit{\&c5} 60 \textit{\&e5 } \textit{\&xh6} 61 \textit{\&d4! } \textit{\&a6} 62 \textit{\&d5 } \textit{\&g6} 63 \textit{\&d4 } \textit{\&f6} 64 \textit{\&d6}! \textit{\&f7} 64...\textit{\&b8} 65 \textit{\&e6} \textit{\&a6} 66 \textit{\&b4} is also in White's favour.

65 \textit{\&e6} 1-0

\textbf{Game 78}

\textbf{Bologan-Peng Xiaomin}

\textbf{Shanghai 2000}

1 \textit{e4 e5} 2 \textit{\&f3 } \textit{\&c6} 3 \textit{\&b5} \textit{a6} 4 \textit{\&a4 } \textit{\&f6} 5 \textit{0-0 } \textit{\&e7} 6 \textit{\&e1} \textit{b5} 7 \textit{\&b3} 0-0 8 \textit{\&h3} \textit{\&b7} 9 \textit{d3} \textit{d6} 10 \textit{a3 } \textit{\&a5} 11 \textit{\&a2} \textit{c5} 12 \textit{\&c3 } \textit{\&c6} 13 \textit{\&d5} \\

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{\&f3 } \textit{\&c6} 3 \textit{\&b5} \textit{a6} 4 \textit{\&a4 } \textit{\&f6} 5 \textit{0-0 } \textit{\&e7} 6 \textit{\&e1} \textit{b5} 7 \textit{\&b3} 0-0 8 \textit{\&h3} \textit{\&b7} 9 \textit{d3} \textit{d6} 10 \textit{a3 } \textit{\&a5} 11 \textit{\&a2} \textit{c5} 12 \textit{\&c3 } \textit{\&c6} 13 \textit{\&d5} \\

This is a far more logical continuation than the 13 \textit{\&e2?!} of Game 76. White immediately seizes control of the vital d5-square and after the imminent exchange on d5 he can start active operations in the centre as well as on the queenside. He can play c2-c3 and later either d3-d4 or b2-b4 according to the circumstances.

13...\textit{\&xd5} \\

Or 13...\textit{\&xd4} 14 \textit{\&xe7+ } \textit{\&xe7} 15 \textit{\&xd4} cxd4 (if 15...\textit{\&xd4}, 16 \textit{\&f4} retains the advantage for White) 16 \textit{\&g5} with a small but lasting positional advantage for White due to his retaining the bishop pair.

14 \textit{\&xd5 } \textit{\&b8} \\

The alternative is 14...\textit{\&d7} and now:

a) 15 \textit{\&c3 } \textit{\&d8} 16 e4 \textit{\&xd5} 17 cxd5 \textit{f5} 18 \textit{b4 } \textit{\&f7} 19 \textit{\&c1 } \textit{\&ac8} 20 \textit{\&b3} \textit{f4?!} (better is 20...\textit{\&xe4} 21 \textit{\&xe4} \textit{\&c4} with at least an equal game) 21 \textit{\&d2 } \textit{h5} 22 \textit{\&d1 } \textit{\&d8} 23 \textit{\&c3 } \textit{\&e8} 24 \textit{\&b2 } \textit{\&b6} 25 \textit{\&c2 } \textit{\&e7} 26 \textit{\&xc5} \textit{dxc5} 27
The Marshall Attack

\[\text{White}\text{a1 c8 e8 28 h4 c7 29 d1 d6 30 g3 f6 31 g2 with some advantage for White in Bologan-Van den Doel, Bastia (rapid) 1999.}\]

b) Practice has shown that Black does not gain full equality after 15 c3!. For example, 15...h8 16 b4 c7 17 b3 d8 18 c3 c8 19 bxc6 dxc6 20 c4 c6? (this loses a pawn; correct was 20...b8 with only a small positional advantage to White) 21 xxc6 dxc6 22 cxb5 b8 23 a4 axb5 24 axb5 d4 25 c4 d6 26 e1 c1 e7 27 a5 b6 28 c4 a1 29 d2 c8?? 30 xxb4! 1-0 Galkin-Ma.Tseitinlin, Biel 2000.

15 c3 f6?!

Maybe Black had to settle for 15...a5 but in that case White also retains a very pleasant initiative. The problem for Black is that he cannot generate any counterplay on the other wing while White has the initiative both in the centre and on the queenside.

16 b4 e7 17 xxb7 xxb7 18 e3 c8 19 b3 c7 20 bxc5 dxc5 21 c4!

This leads to the opening up of the b-file, along which White will take control with his major pieces. Black’s position is very passive and he will have great difficulty in defending his weak a- and c-pawns.

21...bxc4 22 xc4 g6 23 ab1 c6 24 b3 d8 25 eb1 f8 26 d2 e6 27 b7 c8 28 a5!

Just when Black had hopes of achieving some counterplay along the d-file, White deflects Black’s rook from the d-file because the eighth rank must be kept guarded against the intrusion of the white rook to b8.

28...f8 29 b6 xb6 30 xb6 f4 31 d2 d8 32 b3 d6 33 xf4 exf4 34 b7 d8 35 a7 a5 36 e5 b6 37 d7 g5?

Black’s position was very difficult but this is a desperate attempt which weakens his kingside even further and accelerates his defeat. 38 d5 g7 39 e6

Game 79

Nijboer-De Vreugt

Dutch Championship 2001

1 e4 e5 2 f3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 h3 a7 9 d3 d6 10 a3 d7

126
With this move Black connects his rooks and prepares for the manoeuvre ...a8-c8 followed by ...c6-d8-e6. As we can see, there are many purposes to this move. Firstly, Black’s b5-pawn can be defended by the queen if White starts with the usual plan of a2-a4. Black prefers to keep the pawn on b5 rather than to play ...b5-b4 because this would give White control of the important c4-square. Also, later on, after ...c6-d8-e6, Black can play ...c7-e5 denying White spatial advantage in the centre.

11 \(\text{c3} \text{ae8} 12 \text{e3} \)

This move has been popularised by the Spanish super-GM Alexei Shirov, who has had some success with it.

12...\(\text{d8} 13 \text{e2} \text{d5} \)

Black ended up with a passive position after 13...\(\text{e7}! 14 \text{g3} \text{c5} 15 \text{a4} \text{c7} 16 \text{axb5}
\text{axb5} 17 \text{c4} \text{b4} 18 \text{a4} \text{c6} 19 \text{g5} \text{d7} 20
\text{f5} \text{e6} 21 \text{d2} \text{h6} 22 \text{xc6} \text{xc6} 23
\text{xd8} \text{xd8} 24 \text{h2} \text{h8} 25 \text{g4} \text{h7} 26
\text{a6} \) with a strong initiative for White in Shirov-Milos, FIDE World Championship, Las Vegas 1999.

14 \(\text{g3} \text{h6} \)

Black was just a pawn down for nothing in the game Shirov-Onischuk, FIDE World Championship, New Delhi 2000 after 14...d4
15 \(\text{d2} \text{h8} 16 \text{c4} \text{g8} 17 \text{c1} \text{g6?} 18 \text{cxh5}
\text{axb5} 19 \text{c5} \text{i6} 20 \text{xb5} \). The text takes away the g5-square for White’s minor pieces and is therefore a useful preventative move.

15 \(\text{c3} \)

Also deserving of attention is 15 \(\text{f5!?} \)
\text{dxe4} 16 \text{dxe4} \text{xd1} 17 \text{axd1} \text{a5} 18 \text{c5}
\text{xb3} 19 \text{xb3} \text{xe4} 20 \text{xf8} \text{xf8} 21 \text{g3}
\text{xf3} 22 \text{gxf3} \) and White is slightly better due to his minimal material advantage.

15...\(\text{d4} 16 \text{cx4} \text{xd4} 17 \text{xd4} \text{exd4} 18
\text{d2} \text{c5} 19 \text{f3} \)

After 19 f4 Black has a good reply in 19...\(\text{e4}! \), responding to White’s kingside play with play of his own in the centre.

19...\(\text{h7} 20 \text{ac1} \text{b6} 21 \text{f5} \text{c4} 22
\text{g7}?! \)

The battle has reached its decisive stage. This sacrifice only leads to perpetual check but White didn’t have enough attacking chances on the kingside to look for more.

22...\(\text{xg7} 23 \text{h6}+ \text{h6} 24 \text{xf6}+ \text{h7} 25 \text{h4}+ \)

The point is that 25 \(\text{xb6?} \) even leads to a lost position for White after the ingenious 25...\(\text{g8!?} \) (of course not 25...\(\text{xb3?} 26 \text{c7}\) and White wins)

with the following possibilities:

a) 26 \(\text{g3} \text{h3} 27 \text{c7} \text{c8!} \) and White is unable to defend both the bishop on b3 and the g3-square where Black will sacrifice his rook.

b) 26 \(\text{f1} \text{g2}! 27 \text{h2} \text{g8+} 28 \text{h2}
\text{e2} \text{xd3 is mate} \) 28...\(\text{c8!} 29 \text{e3} \text{dxe3}
\text{xc6} \text{xb3 and Black emerges a piece up with a winning position.} \)
25...\textit{g}6 26 \textit{g}3+ \textit{h}7 27 \textit{h}4+ \textit{g}6
28 \textit{g}3+ \textit{h}7 1/2-1/2

\textbf{Game 80}
\textbf{Adams-Kosten}
\textbf{British Championship 1997}

1 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}5 2 \textit{\textit{f}}3 \textit{c}6 3 \textit{b}5 \textit{a}6 4 \textit{a}4 \textit{f}6
5 0-0 \textit{e}7 6 \textit{e}1 \textit{b}5 7 \textit{b}3 0-0 8 \textit{h}3
\textit{b}7 9 \textit{d}3 \textit{d}6 10 \textit{a}3 \textit{w}d7 11 \textit{c}3 \textit{ae}8
12 \textit{d}5

The knight is heading towards f5.

15...\textit{c}6

Little different is 15...\textit{c}8 16 \textit{g}5 \textit{c}6 17
\textit{f}5 \textit{x}f5 18 \textit{exf5} and White's bishop pair grants him an indisputable advantage.
16 \textit{c}3 \textit{c}8 17 \textit{g}5 \textit{h}8

Black should avoid his kingside pawn structure being damaged by 17...\textit{e}6 18 \textit{f}5
\textit{x}f5 19 \textit{exf5} \textit{db}8 followed by ...\textit{bd}7, which was probably a better choice.
18 \textit{d}5 \textit{d}8

Or if instead 18...\textit{db}8 then 19 \textit{e}3! \textit{h}6 20
\textit{x}f6 \textit{xf6} 21 \textit{wh}5 with multiple threats against f7.
19 \textit{f}5 \textit{we}7?

Black misses the last chance to free himself with 19...\textit{x}f5 20 \textit{exf5} \textit{h}6 21 \textit{h}4 \textit{g}5! 22
\textit{fxg6} \textit{fg6} 23 \textit{b}3 \textit{e}6 24 \textit{wh}2 \textit{g}5 25 \textit{we}3 \textit{g}6 26 \textit{a}4!

It is useful to open up the a-file in order to

White immediately seizes control of the d5-square, simultaneously freeing a path for his c-pawn. White can thus later on play both in the centre (after c2-c3 followed by d3-d4) or on the queenside (b2-b4 followed by a2-a4).

12...\textit{a}5?

White retains a small advantage after another possibility for Black is 12...\textit{d}8 and now:

a) 13 \textit{d}2 is given by Adams as slightly better for White after 13...\textit{d}4 14 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 15 \textit{xd}4 \textit{exd}4 16 \textit{g}4, but also deserving of attention is 13 ...\textit{e}3?! and, in the event of Black playing 13...\textit{a}5 14 \textit{a}2
\textit{xd}5? 15 \textit{exd}5 \textit{a}8 16 \textit{b}4 \textit{b}7 17 \textit{c}4 \textit{f}5 18
\textit{c}1, he would end up in a horrible position with the badly placed pieces on b7 and a8.

b) The game Deseatnicov-Khruschev, Minsk 2000 continued 13 \textit{a}2 \textit{wh}8 14
\textit{e}3?! \textit{e}7 15 \textit{h}2 \textit{d}5 16 \textit{exd}5 \textit{fxd}5 17
\textit{hg}4 \textit{f}6 18 \textit{g}3? (weakening the a8-h1 diagonal is an error) 18...\textit{b}6 19 \textit{f}3 \textit{g}6 20 \textit{h}4 \textit{f}5
(White must have regretted playing 18 \textit{g}3?) 21 \textit{h}5 \textit{fxg}4 22 \textit{hxg}6 \textit{xf}3 23 \textit{wh}2 \textit{wc}6 24
\textit{xc}4 and White resigned because of the obvious 24...\textit{c}2+! and White is mated.
13 \textit{xe}7+ \textit{xe}7

Or 13...\textit{x}e7 14 \textit{a}2 \textit{d}5 15 \textit{g}5! with an unpleasant pin on the h4-d8 diagonal.
14 \textit{a}2 \textit{c}5 15 \textit{h}4!
attack the various pawn weaknesses in Black’s camp.

25...bxa4 26 £xa4 £g8 27 £a1 £e6
28 £h4 £g5 29 £f3 £e7 30 £f5 £f8
31 £xa6!

31...£c7

Black was in time trouble but the game was already lost. Also losing for Black was 31...£xa6 32 £xa6 £c7 33 £xd6! £xd5 34 exd5.

32 £xd6!

32...£xd5

Or 32...£xa6 33 £xf6+ £g7 (forced) 34 £xf7+ £xf7 35 £xf7 £f8 36 £xe5 £f1+ 37 £e8+ and White wins.

33 £xc8 £xc8 34 exd5

White is winning both materially and positionally. Little more needs to be said.

34...£f5 35 £e2 £d8 36 £c4 £f8 37 £a8 £h6 38 £d6 1-0

---

**Game 81**

**Short-I. Sokolov**

**Wijk aan Zee 1997**

1 e4 e5 2 £f3 £c6 3 £b5 a6 4 £a4 £f6
5 0-0 £e7 6 £e1 b5 7 £b3 0-0 8 h3
£b7 9 d3 d6 10 a3 £d7 11 £c3 £ae8
12 £a2

This prophylactic move has the aim of preventing both ...£c6-a5 and ...£c6-d8 manoeuvres.

Harmless for Black is 12 £g5 £d8 (also good here is 12...£d4) 13 a4 £e6 14 £xf6 £xf6 15 axb5 axb5 16 £d5 £d8 17 £e3 £h8 18 c4 £f4! 19 £h2 (very dangerous for White is 19 exb5? f5! 20 £xf5 £xf5 21 exf5 £xf5 22 £e3 £f8 23 £a7 £g6 and now 24 £e1 loses to 24...£xg2 25 £g3 £hx5+ 26 £h2 £h6! etc.) 19...f5? 20 £xf5 £xf5 21 exf5 £xf5 22 £e3 £f8 23 £a7 £c6 24 £a6 (or 24 exb5 £xb5 25 £c4 £c6 and Black has enough compensation for the sacrificed exchange due to strong pressure on the a8-h1 diagonal) 24...£b7 25 £a7 £c6 26 £a6 ½-½ Kunte-Van den Doel, London 1999.

White sometimes tries to transfer his knight to the kingside with 12 £e2, against which Black equalises by 12...d5 (Black played passively in the game Acs-Heidenfeld, Bundesliga 1999 after 12...£h8 13 £g3 £d8 14 £c3 £g8 15 £a2 g6 16 d4 £c8 17 a4 £f6 18 axb5 axb5 19 £b1 £ce7 20 £a7 £c6 21
The Marshall Attack

\[ \text{a8} \text{ b7} 22 \text{ a1} \text{ b8} 23 \text{ b3} \text{ f7} 24 \text{ c4} \text{ bxc4} 25 \text{ bxc4} \text{ exd4} 26 \text{ fd4}, \text{ for example: 13 exd5 exd5 14 g3 d4?! 15 dxd4 (after taking the pawn with 15 dx5 f8 16 a2 d6 Black gets excellent attacking chances thanks to his superior development) 15...exd4 16 d2 c5 17 a4 h4 18 axb5 axb5 19 g4 xg4 20 fxg4 xg3 21 fxg3 xxe1+ 22 xex1 h6 23 e5 } \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \text{ Shirov-Isokolov, Wijk aan Zee 1996.} \]

12...d8?! 

The strongest reply. Weaker is 12...d8 13 d4! exd4 14 dx5 c5 15 dx5 xe4 16 h6+ gxh6 17 dx6 with advantage to White.

13 d2 

Worthy of attention is 13 d5 d5 14 xd5 e8 (after 14...a5?! very unpleasant for Black is 15 b4!) 15 c3 b8 16 a2 c5 17 a4 and in this position a draw was agreed in Bakre-Heidenfeld, York 2000.

13...e7 

Also possible is 13...d4?! 14 dx5 exd4 15 e2 c5 (I prefer this to 15...d5 16 b4 a7 17 c5 bx4 18 axb4 ex5 19 dx5 with a small advantage to White) 16 f4 b6 with chances for both sides.

14 h4 h8 

It is too early for play in the centre with 14...d5?! because of 15 g5! with advantage to White.

15 f4? 

White is trying to create a kingside attack but this will only make weaknesses in his own camp. Better was 15 g5! but even after that Black stands well after the rather odd-looking 15...g8? 

15...xf4 16 xf4 g6 17 xg6 h6 18 d2 

Or 18 a4 b4 19 de2 d5! with a promising position for Black.

18...h5 

Another possibility is 18...d5! 19 e5 de5 20 h2 h4 21 h1 d4 etc.

19 h2 

After 19 e3 play can proceed 19...d4 20 f1 f5 etc., which is similar to the text.

19...h4 20 f1 i5 21 d5 xd5 22 xd5 

Weaker is 22 xd5?! e7! followed by ...h4-g3 with advantage to Black due to the poor position of White's light-squared bishop.

22...c6 23 b3 d5 24 exd5 cxd5 25 f3 g5!

Black has carefully calculated all the consequences and now starts a strong kingside attack. The role of the powerful bishop on h4 will soon be made clear.

26 g3 g4 27 h4 xh4 xh4 28 xf8+ xf8 29 g2 

Relatively the best move because after 29 gh4 g3 Black regains the sacrificed piece with a near winning attack.

29...f6 30 c3? 

Maybe the best chance of surviving was
30 \text{\textit{d}}x\text{\textit{d}}5 \text{\textit{d}}x\text{\textit{d}}4 + 31 \text{\textit{b}}h1 \text{\textit{d}}x\text{\textit{d}}5 + 32 \text{\textit{d}}x\text{\textit{d}}5 \text{\textit{d}}x\text{\textit{b}}2, \text{although Black still retains an extra pawn and good winning chances. However, after the text White should lose by force. 30...d4 31 c4 \text{\textit{g}}5 32 cxb5 axb5 33 \text{\textit{f}}1 \text{\textit{e}}3+ 34 \text{\textit{h}}1 \text{\textit{f}}xf1+ 35 \text{\textit{f}}xf1 \text{\textit{c}}6+ 36 \text{\textit{w}}g2 \text{\textit{w}}c1+ 37 \text{\textit{g}}1 \text{\textit{x}}g1}

Black misses a forced win with 37...\text{\textit{h}}7?, which prevents all White’s counterplay by improving the position of his king. After 38 \text{\textit{f}}7 g6 White can resign.

38 \text{\textit{w}}x\text{\textit{g}}1 \text{\textit{w}}x\text{\textit{b}}2

White has counterplay despite being a pawn down after 38...\text{\textit{x}}x\text{\textit{g}}3+ 39 \text{\textit{g}}2 \text{\textit{w}}x\text{\textit{g}}1+ 40 \text{\textit{w}}x\text{\textit{g}}1 \text{\textit{e}}2+ 41 \text{\textit{f}}2 \text{\textit{d}}f4 42 \text{\textit{c}}2 followed by \text{\textit{w}}f2-g3! etc.

39 \text{\textit{f}}7! \text{\textit{f}}6 40 \text{\textit{w}}h2+ \text{\textit{w}}xh2+41 \text{\textit{w}}xh2

The ending is a draw despite Black having an extra pawn as his g4-pawn is very weak.

41...g5 42 \text{\textit{e}}6 \text{\textit{g}}7 43 \text{\textit{e}}8 \text{\textit{d}}5 44 \text{\textit{x}}g4 \text{\textit{f}}6 45 \text{\textit{d}}7 b4 46 axb4 ½-½

\textbf{Game 82}

\textbf{Shirov-Kamsky}

\textbf{Dos Hermanas 1996}

1 e4 e5 2 \text{\textit{f}}3 \text{\textit{c}}6 3 \text{\textit{b}}b5 a6 4 \text{\textit{a}}4 \text{\textit{f}}6 5 0-0 \text{\textit{e}}7 6 \text{\textit{e}}1 b5 7 \text{\textit{b}}3 0-0 8 h3 \text{\textit{b}}7 9 d3 d6 10 a3 \text{\textit{w}}d7 11 \text{\textit{c}}3 \text{\textit{a}}8 12 \text{\textit{d}}2

An important move. Black is preparing to dislodge the bishop from h6.

21 b4 \text{\textit{g}}8 22 bxc5 dxc5 23 \text{\textit{e}}3 \text{\textit{e}}6 24 cxb5 axb5 25 \text{\textit{b}}3 \text{\textit{d}}4 26 \text{\textit{x}}d4 cxd4 27 \text{\textit{e}}c1 \text{\textit{d}}6 28 \text{\textit{w}}a2 \text{\textit{g}}7 29 a4 \text{\textit{f}}6 30 \text{\textit{w}}d2 h6 31 axb5 \text{\textit{x}}b5 32 \text{\textit{c}}4 \text{\textit{xc}}4 33 \text{\textit{x}}c4 \text{\textit{a}}8 34 \text{\textit{a}}c1 \text{\textit{f}}c8 35 \text{\textit{w}}c2 \text{\textit{x}}c4 36 \text{\textit{w}}x\text{\textit{c}}4 \text{\textit{a}}5

With the obvious threat of ...\text{\textit{a}}5-c5! winning material.

37 \text{\textit{b}}1 \text{\textit{w}}a7 38 \text{\textit{w}}c6 \text{\textit{a}}6 39 \text{\textit{w}}c8 \text{\textit{w}}a8
40 \text{wxa8 xa8} 41 \text{d2 d7}

This ending is somewhat drawish due to the symmetrical pawn structure. If anyone is better in this position then it is probably Black but only very slightly due to his control of more squares. However, White will place his knights on good squares and any winning attempt by Black would have an element of risk. The only real weakness in the position is the pawn on d3 but this is not enough to be of a decisive nature.

12...b4

After 12...\text{a5?} White has the devil of a trap with 13 \text{xf7+}! (although in Korneev-Kovalev, Minsk 1998 the game went along peacefully after 13 \text{a2? b4 14 c2 c5 15 g3 d8 16 g5 h8 17 h2 g8 18 xd8 xd8 19 b6 20 cxb4 cxb4})

13...\text{xf7} 14 axb5 and White regains his sacrificed piece with a great positional advantage.

Black can also try 12...\text{d4 13 xd4 exd4 14 e2 c5 15 g5 b4 16 f4 a5 17 xf6 xf6 18 d5 with only a tiny advantage for White, who is likely to be able to post a strong knight on d5.}
13 \( \text{Qxd5} \text{Qxd5} 14 \text{Qxd5} \text{Qd8} \)

Passive is 14...\( \text{Qf6} \) 15 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{b8} \) 16 \( \text{a5}! \) \( \text{Qd4} \) 17 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qxf3+} \) 18 \( \text{Qxf3} \) c5 19 c3 \( \text{bxc3} \) 20 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 21 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 22 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 23 \( \text{Qa3} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 24 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qbe8} \) 25 \( \text{Qd8} \) 26 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 27 \( \text{Qb1} \) d5 28 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 29 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 30 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 31 c4 \( \text{Qd7} \) 32 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 33 \( \text{Qb6} \) \( \text{Qa7} \) 34 \( \text{Qxc5}! \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 35 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qxb6} \) 36 \( \text{axb6} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) 37 c5 (White's queenside pawns are unstoppable) 37...\( \text{Qg8} \) 38 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 39 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 40 \( \text{Qe4} \) f6 41 \( \text{Qxa6} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 42 c6 1-0 Grünfeld-Bizansky, Israel 1999.

15 \( \text{Qxb7} \) \( \text{Qxb7} \) 16 d4 \( \text{Qxd4} \)

Or 16...\( \text{Qf6} \) 17 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 18 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 19 b3 \( \text{Qc5} \) 20 \( \text{Qb2} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 21 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 22 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 23 \( \text{Qxb4} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 24 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 25 \( \text{Qd1} \) with a positional advantage to White because the bishop is stronger than the knight in an open position such as this, J.Polgar-Adams, Wijk aan Zee 1998.

17 \( \text{Qxd4} \) a5 18 \( \text{Qd5}! \)

The alternative is 18 b3 c6 and here the game was prematurely agreed drawn in Galkin-Van der Wiel, Essent 1999. After 19 \( \text{Qb2} \) White appears to be better since 19...\( \text{Qf6} \) is strongly answered by 20 e5! etc.

18...\( \text{Qc8} \)

The point behind White's excellent eighteenth move is that after 18...c6?! White has 19 \( \text{Qe5}! \)

19...\( \text{Qxh3} \) (virtually the only move) 20 \( \text{Qxc6} \) with a clear advantage for White.

19 \( \text{Qf4} \) c6

Or 19...\( \text{Qf6} \) 20 e5 \( \text{Qxe5} \) 21 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) (White is also slightly better after 21...\( \text{Qc6} \) 22 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 23 \( \text{Qxe5} \) etc.) 22 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5}! \) (after this Black's position goes downhill; better was the alternative 22...\( \text{Qc6} \) 23 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) 24 g4?! \( \text{Qg5} \) (after this Black ends up in a lost position; the only move was 24...\( \text{Qe6} \) 25 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 26 \( \text{Qd7} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 27 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qa8} \) 28 \( \text{Qc5} \) \( \text{Qa7} \) 29 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 30 \( \text{Qc6} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) 31 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 32 \( \text{Qxb4} \) axb4 33 \( \text{Qxb7} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 34 \( \text{Qxb4} \) \( \text{Qxc2} \) 35 \( \text{Qg2} \) and the rook and pawn ending is winning for White, Adams-De Vreugt, Dutch League 1999.

20 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 21 \( \text{Qad1} \) \( \text{Qe6}?! \)

This was a good moment for Black to free himself with 21...\( \text{Qd5} \) 22 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 23 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxb2} \) 24 \( \text{Qxe8} \) \( \text{Qxe8} \) 25 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 26 \( \text{Qd3} \) g6 and Black is okay. Considering...d5 is so thematic, he should not have missed it.

22 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qxd4} \) 23 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 24 \( \text{Qh2}?! \) d5 25 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 26 \( \text{Qb6} \) \( \text{Qxd1} \) 27 \( \text{Qxd1} \) h6 28 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 29 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qf5}?! \)

Black overlooks a strong tactical resource. Better was 29...c5 30 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 31 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) with good chances of survival.

30 \( \text{Qxe6} \)

Taking the bishop with 30...\( \text{Qxh6?!} \) quickly loses to 31 \( \text{Qg3}+ \) and in the case of 30...\( \text{Qe5}+ \) 31 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 32 \( \text{Qg3} \) wins.

31 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{We6} \) 32 \( \text{b3} \) c5 33 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qf1} \) 34 \( \text{h4} \)

With an extra pawn and a strong bishop.
against a weaker knight, White is guaranteed the win.

34...\texttt{\textipa{e}8} 35 \texttt{\textipa{w}f3} \texttt{\textipa{w}e8} 36 \texttt{\textipa{f}4} \texttt{\textipa{d}8} 37 \texttt{\textipa{w}h5+} 1-0

\textbf{Game 84}

\textbf{Anand-Ivanchuk}

\textit{Monaco (rapid) 2003}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
1 \texttt{e4} e5 2 \texttt{\textipa{d}f3} \texttt{\textipa{c}6} 3 \texttt{\textipa{b}b5} a6 4 \texttt{\textipa{a}4} \texttt{\textipa{f}6} 5 0-0 \texttt{\textipa{e}7} 6 \texttt{\textipa{e}1} b5 7 \texttt{\textipa{b}3} 0-0 8 h3 \texttt{\textipa{b}7} 9 d3 \texttt{\textipa{e}8} \\
Black delays moving his d-pawn. Perhaps it can move to d5 in one go? 10 \texttt{a3} d6 11 \texttt{\textipa{c}3} \texttt{\textipa{f}8}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

An alternative, 11...\texttt{\textipa{d}d4}, was seen in Karjakin-Campora, Dos Hermanas 2003. Play continued 12 \texttt{\textipa{d}xd4} exd4 13 \texttt{\textipa{d}d5} \texttt{\textipa{d}xd5} 14 exd5 (Black has not achieved equality as his light-squared bishop is restricted by White's pawn on d5) 14...\texttt{\textipa{f}6} 15 \texttt{\textipa{x}e8+} \texttt{\textipa{x}e8} 16 \texttt{\textipa{d}d2} c6 (Black has to play this to free his position) 17 \texttt{\textipa{x}c6} \texttt{\textipa{w}xc6} 18 \texttt{\textipa{g}4} \texttt{\textipa{e}8} 19 \texttt{\textipa{e}1} \texttt{\textipa{x}e1+} 20 \texttt{\textipa{x}e1} \texttt{\textipa{f}8} 21 f3 d5 22 \texttt{\textipa{t}4} g5?! (an unnecessary weakening of the kingside) 23 \texttt{\textipa{b}8+} (not 23 \texttt{\textipa{f}5}?! \texttt{\textipa{w}6} when White has to exchange queens) 23...\texttt{\textipa{e}7} 24 \texttt{\textipa{b}4+} \texttt{\textipa{d}7} and now with 25 \texttt{\textipa{f}1}?! White began to drift and eventually lost. Instead 25 a4! would have left Black in deep trouble.

12 \texttt{\textipa{a}2} \texttt{\textipa{d}d4} 13 \texttt{\textipa{h}2}?! \\
White is planning the manoeuvre \texttt{\textipa{h}2-g4} with the idea of exchanging Black’s knight on f6, which might enable him to control the vital d5-square.

13...d5 14 exd5 \texttt{\textipa{x}d5} 15 \texttt{\textipa{g}4} \texttt{\textipa{f}4}

Also possible was a modest 15...\texttt{\textipa{d}6} with approximate equality.

16 \texttt{\textipa{d}4}

Weaker is 16 \texttt{\textipa{f}xf4?!} exf4 because later White must be wary of...f4-f3 with an initiative against White’s monarch.

16...\texttt{\textipa{g}6} 17 c3 \texttt{\textipa{e}6} 18 \texttt{\textipa{f}3} \texttt{\textipa{b}8} 19 g3! h5

Black could have avoided the weakening of his kingside by playing 19...\texttt{\textipa{c}7}!.

20 \texttt{\textipa{h}2}

The tempting sacrifice 20 \texttt{\textipa{g}gf6+} leads only to a draw after 20...\texttt{\textipa{g}xf6} 21 \texttt{\textipa{xf}6+} \texttt{\textipa{g}7} 22 \texttt{\textipa{h}xh5+} \texttt{\textipa{g}8} 23 \texttt{\textipa{f}6+} \texttt{\textipa{g}7} and now if 24 \texttt{\textipa{x}e8+} \texttt{\textipa{x}e8} 25 \texttt{\textipa{d}5} \texttt{\textipa{x}d5} 26 \texttt{\textipa{x}d5} \texttt{\textipa{d}8} Black stands well.

20...\texttt{\textipa{h}4} 21 \texttt{\textipa{f}5} \texttt{\textipa{d}5} 22 \texttt{\textipa{x}d5} \texttt{\textipa{x}d5} 23 \texttt{\textipa{f}3} \texttt{\textipa{b}d8} 24 \texttt{\textipa{g}h4}!?

White sacrifices the d3-pawn in order to achieve a kingside initiative.

24...\texttt{\textipa{w}xd3} 25 \texttt{\textipa{g}4} \texttt{\textipa{c}5}!?

Much stronger was 25...\texttt{\textipa{e}f4!}, preventing h4-h5, because if 26 h5? \texttt{\textipa{f}5}! and Black wins.

26 \texttt{\textipa{g}5}!

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
26...\texttt{\textipa{e}4} \\
The move 26...f6? loses immediately to 27 \texttt{\textipa{xf}6}!

27 \texttt{\textipa{e}4} \\
Less strong is 27 \texttt{\textipa{x}d8}?! \texttt{\textipa{f}4}! (threatening...\texttt{\textipa{f}4-c2+} and there is no way White can avoid a draw. Also interesting is 27...\texttt{\textipa{f}xf2}! 28 \texttt{\textipa{x}f2} \texttt{\textipa{c}5} followed by taking on d8 with promising compensation for the sacrificed exchange.

27...\texttt{\textipa{d}6}?

This loses. Black had to play 27...\texttt{\textipa{e}7} 28 \texttt{\textipa{x}e5} \texttt{\textipa{x}d5} with chances for survival.

28 h5 \texttt{\textipa{f}4} 29 \texttt{\textipa{e}3} f5 30 \texttt{\textipa{w}4} \texttt{\textipa{e}2}+ 31 \texttt{\textipa{f}1} \texttt{\textipa{w}d5} 32 \texttt{\textipa{x}e2} f4 33 \texttt{\textipa{x}f4} \texttt{\textipa{f}4} 34 \texttt{\textipa{x}e8} \texttt{\textipa{w}d3}+ 35 \texttt{\textipa{e}1} \texttt{\textipa{w}f3} 36 \texttt{\textipa{w}e}?

Now the game is decided.

36...\texttt{\textipa{f}6} 37 h6! \texttt{\textipa{g}2} 38 \texttt{\textipa{x}g7}+ 1-0
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
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Summary

10...\text{\textcopyright}a7!? leads to a small but lasting advantage to White, with no winning chances whatsoever for Black. 10...\text{\textcopyright}b8 usually leads to a patient manoeuvring game where White remains slightly better. However, in Game 70 Ivanchuk managed to outplay his fellow countryman and reached a winning position, only to blunder more than once and end up losing.

White maintains a positional grip after 10...\text{\textcopyright}d4 11 \text{\textcopyright}xd4 exd4 12 \text{\textcopyright}d2 (Game 73), which is much stronger than Jansa’s 12 c3.

Game 74 saw excellent positional play by Murey against Adams, where White’s domination on the queenside using the c-file was crowned with success. Black should avoid such uncomfortable positions without any counterplay at all costs – this game demonstrates that 12...h6?! is too slow. The conclusion of Game 75 is that Zaitsev failed to obtain sufficient compensation for the pawn and that 12...b4 is dubious.

Gelfand’s 13 \text{\textcopyright}e2?! (Game 76) is not great for White – his kingside attack never got off the ground due to Adams’ resourceful play over both the queenside and in the centre. Kasparov’s 13 \text{\textcopyright}g5 (Game 77) also fails to grant White any opening advantage. More to the point is Bogdan’s 13 \text{\textcopyright}d5 (Game 78), which is the main problem for Black if he chooses the system 10...\text{\textcopyright}a5 11 \text{\textcopyright}a2 c5 12 \text{\textcopyright}c3 \text{\textcopyright}c6. The control of the d5-square grants White a lasting advantage.

After 10...\text{\textcopyright}d7 11 \text{\textcopyright}c3 \text{\textcopyright}ae8, Nijboer’s 12 \text{\textcopyright}e3 (Game 79) allowed Black to obtain a roughly equal position after 12...\text{\textcopyright}d8! 13 \text{\textcopyright}e2 d5 14 \text{\textcopyright}g3 h6 15 c3 d4 16 exd4 \text{\textcopyright}xd4 17 \text{\textcopyright}xd4 exd4 18 \text{\textcopyright}d2 c5. In Game 80, instead of Kosten’s 12...\text{\textcopyright}a5, Black should play as in the previous game with 12...\text{\textcopyright}d8. Short-Sokolov (Game 81) is quite sophisticated but Black managed to get a playable position, while Shirov’s 12 \text{\textcopyright}d2 against the now retired Gata Kamsky gave Black no opening problems in Game 82.

The move 12 a4 (Game 83) might look illogical because this is the second time White moves the same flank pawn in the opening, but there is an explanation behind it. After ...\text{\textcopyright}d8-d7 and ...\text{\textcopyright}a8-e8 Black concentrates his forces in the centre – Black is ready for White’s possible kingside attack. Therefore White switches his intentions and challenges Black on the queenside, namely on his b5 stranglehold, by playing 12 a4!?. It looks like a good idea.

\begin{tabular}{l}
1 e4 e5 2 \text{\textcopyright}f3 \text{\textcopyright}c6 3 \text{\textcopyright}b5 a6 4 \text{\textcopyright}a4 \text{\textcopyright}f6 5 0-0 \text{\textcopyright}e7 6 \text{\textcopyright}e1 b5 7 \text{\textcopyright}b3 0-0 8 h3 \text{\textcopyright}b7 9 d3 d6
\end{tabular}

9...\text{\textcopyright}e8 – Game 84

10 a3 \text{\textcopyright}a5

10...\text{\textcopyright}a7?! – Game 69
10...\text{\textcopyright}b8 11 \text{\textcopyright}bd2 \text{\textcopyright}bd7 12 \text{\textcopyright}f1 \text{\textcopyright}e8
13 \text{\textcopyright}g3 – Game 70; 13 \text{\textcopyright}a2 – Game 71
10...\text{\textcopyright}d4 11 \text{\textcopyright}xd4 exd4 12 c3 – Game 72
12 \text{\textcopyright}d2 – Game 73
10...\text{\textcopyright}d7 11 \text{\textcopyright}c3 \text{\textcopyright}ae8
12 \text{\textcopyright}c3 – Game 79; 12 \text{\textcopyright}d5 – Game 80; 12 \text{\textcopyright}a2 – Game 81; 12 \text{\textcopyright}d2 – Game 82;
12 a4 – Game 83
11 \text{\textcopyright}a2 c5 12 \text{\textcopyright}c3 \text{\textcopyright}c6
12...b4?! – Game 75; 12...h6 – Game 74
13 \text{\textcopyright}d5 – Game 78
13 \text{\textcopyright}g5 – Game 77; 13 \text{\textcopyright}c2 – Game 76
CHAPTER EIGHT

Anti-Marshall with 8 a4

1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 e7 6 c1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 a4

Against the old Main Line Anti-Marshall, 8 a4, I’m recommending that black-sided players should play the system with 8...b7 9 d3 c8?!, the main subject of this chapter. I prefer this line to the main move 9...d6 for a couple of reasons. Firstly, by playing 8...b7 9 d3 c8, it is no longer necessary to memorise some of the forcing lines that arise after 8...b7 9 d3 d6 and 8...b4. For example, after 8...b7 9 d3 d6 White can choose between several possibilities including the positional plan with 10 d2, sharper lines after 10 c3 c5 11 a2 b4 12 c2, or Kasparov’s favourite 10 c2 (see Games 90-91). The second reason for choosing 8...b7 9 d3 c8 is that it contains an ambitious idea of playing ...d7-d5 in one go. Game 92 is a very instructive example of what can happen after 8...b4. White quickly obtains the excellent e4-square for his knight and Black must be careful as his queenside is rather weak.

In Mainka-Blatny (Game 85) Black succeeds in freeing himself by playing ...d6-d5.

The next ‘all Nikolaidis’ encounter (Game 86) sees White playing the very straightforward 10 g5, hitting f7. The rare continuation 10 a3 was seen in the super-GM game Ivanchuk-Adams (Game 87). White puts pressure on the b5-pawn but Adams finds a simple solution to his problems.

Yurtaev-Lau (Game 88) sees 10 d2 followed by b1-a3 in order to challenge Black’s b5 stronghold. Yurtaev plays e7-c5, which leads to a position similar to the Archangel Variation of the Ruy Lopez.

The main continuation against 9...c8? is 10 c3 (Game 89).

**Game 85**

R.Mainka-P.Blatny

**Munich 1992**

1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 e7 6 c1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 a4 d7 b7 9 d3 c8?!
The move 9...\textit{c}e8!? has been championed in the past by John Nunn.

10 c3 h6

This move is very important because before playing ...\textit{c}e8 Black must cover the g5-square. Thus after 10...\textit{c}e8 Black must reckon with 11 \textit{g}5\textdagger, retaining control over the d5-square.

11 \textit{d}a2 \textit{f}8 12 b4

Seizing the space on the queenside, but Black will obtain counterplay in the centre.

12...d6 13 \textit{c}a3 \textit{w}d7 14 \textit{c}d2 \textit{e}e7

The knight is heading towards the kingside, allowing the move ...c7-c5 and clearing a diagonal for Black's light-squared bishop.

15 \textit{e}c2 \textit{g}6

Taking the pawn with 15...\textit{b}xa4, conceding the c4-square, is inferior.

16 \textit{e}e3 d5 17 exd5 \textit{e}xd5 18 \textit{d}xd5 \textit{x}d5 19 \textit{e}e3 \textit{a}d8 20 \textit{a}xb5 \textit{a}xb5 21 \textit{a}xd5 \textit{w}xd5 22 \textit{a}a7?

White should have sensed danger and played 22 d4! e4 23 \textit{e}xd2 f5 24 f3!, thus forcing further exchanges and heading for the draw. With the text White forgets about the safety of his first rank.

22...e4! 23 \textit{d}d4 \textit{e}xd3 24 \textit{w}xd3 c5

Or 24...\textit{e}xb4! 25 \textit{c}xb4 \textit{w}xd4 winning a pawn because the queen is taboo.

25 \textit{b}xc5 \textit{a}xc5 26 \textit{a}a5 b4! 27 \textit{w}b5 \textit{a}f4 28 \textit{w}c6 \textit{b}xc3

Black could have won the exchange after 28...\textit{e}c8?! 29 \textit{w}xd5 \textit{e}xd5 30 \textit{c}xb4 \textit{a}xb4 31 \textit{x}d5 \textit{e}xe1 but, due to all the pawns being on the same side, a black win would have been doubtful.

29 \textit{e}xc5 \textit{w}xd4 30 \textit{c}c4 \textit{e}e5 31 h3 \textit{d}d5 32 \textit{e}c5 \textit{w}e4 33 \textit{c}c4 \textit{w}d3 34 \textit{h}h2 \textit{e}e7!?

35 \textit{w}e4 \textit{d}f5 36 \textit{w}xd3 \textit{e}xd3 37 \textit{c}c1?

The final mistake. After the correct 37 \textit{f}f1! \textit{e}xe3 (or 37...\textit{d}xe3 38 fxe3 \textit{d}xe3 39 \textit{e}e1 \textit{g}4+ 40 \textit{h}xg4 \textit{e}xe1 41 \textit{e}xc3 and the endgame is drawn as all the pawns are on the same side) 38 fxe3 the attack on the f7-pawn gives White a vital tempo for defence. For example:

a) 38...\textit{d}xe3 39 \textit{c}c1 and White will capture the c3-pawn reaching a drawn rook endgame.

b) 38...\textit{e}xe3 is met by 39 \textit{c}c8+ \textit{h}h7 40 \textit{f}xf7 with excellent drawing chances for White.

c) 38...\textit{e}7 39 e4 and it is very difficult for Black to realise the advantage of the extra pawn.

The text loses a second pawn – the rest needs no further commentary.

37...\textit{e}xe3 38 fxe3 \textit{e}xe3 39 \textit{c}c2 g6 40 \textit{g}1 \textit{g}7 41 \textit{f}f2 \textit{g}3 42 \textit{c}c6 h5 43 \textit{c}c5 \textit{e}e3 44 \textit{a}a2 \textit{a}a6 45 \textit{e}e6 46 \textit{e}a4 \textit{e}d2+ 47 \textit{f}f3 \textit{e}e2 48 g4 \textit{h}h2 49 \textit{a}a6+ \textit{g}7 50 \textit{g}3 \textit{e}g2+ 51 \textit{f}f3 h4!

52 \textit{a}a7 \textit{e}f2+ 53 \textit{a}a3 \textit{f}f6 54 \textit{e}e4 \textit{e}h3

55 \textit{g}5 \textit{a}f5 56 \textit{e}xf5 \textit{g}xf5+ 57 \textit{h}h5 \textit{g}3

58 \textit{f}f4 c2 59 \textit{c}c7 \textit{g}2 60 \textit{f}f5 h3 61 \textit{g}6 \textit{f}f2+ 0-1

\textit{Game 86}

\textbf{K.Nikolaides-I.Nikolaides}

\textit{Ano Liosis 1996}

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{d}f3 \textit{c}c6 3 \textit{b}b5 a6 4 \textit{a}a4 \textit{d}f6

5 0-0 \textit{e}e7 6 \textit{e}e1 b5 7 \textit{b}b3 0-0 8 a4

8 \textit{b}b7 9 d3 \textit{e}e8? 10 \textit{d}f5

With his last move Black left his f7-pawn defenceless and White immediately tries to take advantage of this. Most monographs assess 10 \textit{g}5 as dubious, which I consider to be a slight exaggeration.
10...d5 11 exd5 Qd4 12 a2

Bad is the line 12 d6? Qxb3 13 dxe7 and now the strong 13...Wd5! immediately wins for Black.

Although it has yet to be tried in competitive play, 12 Qxe5? Qxb3 13 cxb3 Qxd5 14 Qc3 Qxg5 15 Qxg5 Wd7 16 Qxe8+ Qxe8 17 Qe4 comes seriously into consideration – Black might have just enough compensation for the pawn.

White can only try to retain his extra pawn by the continuation 12 c4. After 12...Qxb3 13 Wxb3 Black has the choice between the following:

a) 13...Qxd5 14 Qxf7 Wxf7 15 cxd5 Qxd5 16 Wc2 is roughly even – Black’s pair of bishops are compensated by White’s better pawn structure.

b) 13...c6? deserves a closer look – 14 cxb5 cxd5 15 bxa6 (worse is 15 Qc3?! Qg4! 16 Qh3 d4 17 Qe4 axb5 18 Wxb5 Qd5 19 a5 Qb8 20 W4 f5 21 Qd2 Qc7 22 Qc4 Qb4 23 Qd1 Qxc4 24 dxc4 e4 25 Qf4 Qd6 26 g3 Qf4 27 Qxf4 e3 with an initiative for Black, Hitzergerova-Jackova, Jutland 2000) 15...Qxa6 16 Qxe5 Qd6 (of course not 16...Qg4? 17 Qxf7! Wxf7 18 Qxd5 with a decisive double check to follow) 17 Qxe8+ Wxe8 18 Wd1 Qxd3 with an excellent position for Black because the bishop on d3 is taboo (19 Wxd3?? Wf1+ 20 Wf1 Qxh2+ wins).

12...Qxd5

The main variation is considered to be 12...Qxd5 and now:

a) Risky is 13 Qxe5? Qxg5 14 Qxg5 Wd7 15 Wxe8+ (or 15 Qxd5 Qxd5 16 Wxe8+ Qxe8 17 Qc3 Qf3! with the idea that if 18 Qxf3, then 18...Qh3 19 Qxf3 20 Qh4 Qh4 21 Wf1 Qf3+ 22 Qg1 Qxf4 wins outright for Black) 15...Qxe8 16 Qd2 Qb4 17 Qb1?? (this loses by force which is no surprise because White has lost control of his first rank; the only move was 17 Qb3 but after 17...Qxb3 18 Qxb3 – forced because after 18 Qxb3? Qd5! White loses material – 18...Qxd3 and to play this position as White is no great fun!) 17...Qe2+ 18 Qf1 Qxg2+ 19 Qxg2 Wg4+ 20 Qh1 Qg3+ 0-1 Zapata-Nunn, Dubai Olympiad 1986.

b) 13 Qf3 Qb4! 14 Qxd4 Qxa2 15 Qf5 Qxc1 16 Qxe7+ Qxe7 17 Wxc1 Qe8 ½-½ Tal-Planinac, Moscow 1975. However, instead of 14...Qxa2, Black can also play 14...Qxd4 15 Qb3 Qd6, which John Nunn assesses as slightly better for Black.

13 Qxe5?

After this White’s rook will be the target of various tactical tricks. Better was 13 Qxd5 Qxd5 (stronger than 13...Wxd5?! 14 Qc3, which just helps White’s development) 14 Qxe5 Qxg5 15 Qxg5 Wd7 16 Qxe8+ Qxe8 17 Qa3 h6 18 Qd2 Qe6!, planning ...Qe6-g6 with strong kingside pressure.

13...Qxa2 14 Qxa2 Qg4!

15 Qxf7!?

The best practical chance because after 15 Wxg4 Qxg5 White loses material due to his weak back rank.

15...Wd7!

Perhaps White missed this subtle move? Of course Black is not obliged to play 15...Qxf7? 16 Wxg4 when White is more than okay.

16 Qe4 Qh4! 17 Qh6+

When playing the move 15...Wd7, Black had to calculate the variation 17 Wg4 Qxf7! (but not 17...Wxg4? falling for the cheapo 18 Qh6+!
turning the position around) 18 \( \text{wxh4} \) \( \text{wx}a2 \) 19 \( \text{c}c3 \) \( \text{wa1} \) 20 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{bxa4} \) followed by ...a4-a3 and Black wins.
17...\( \text{dxh6} \) 18 \( \text{hxh6} \) \( \text{exe4} \) 19 \( \text{dx}e4 \) \( \text{f8} \)

The threat of ...\( \text{d}d4-f3+ \) winning White’s queen grants Black the decisive tempo for the attack along the f-file.
20 \( \text{d}c3 \) \( \text{xc}f2 \) 21 \( \text{g}3 \)

A sad reply but there is no time for 21 \( \text{ec}3? \) due to 21...\( \text{e}2+ \) mating.
21...\( \text{xc}c2 \) 22 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{wh}3 \) 23 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{xc}g3! \)
24 \( \text{hx}g3 \) \( \text{c}c1 \)

Even stronger was 24...\( \text{d}d2! \), which would have forced immediate resignation.
25 \( \text{xd}d4 \) \( \text{wx}g3+ \) 26 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{wd}3+ \) 0-1

with an unpleasant pin along the h4-d8 diagonal. One example is 11...\( \text{a}a5 \) 12 \( \text{a}a2 \) b4 13 \( \text{c}c4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 14 c3 h6 15 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 16 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{bxc3?!} \) 17 \( \text{bxc3} \) d6 18 \( \text{e}e3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) (a blunder but Black is already struggling) 19 \( \text{wb}3 \) hitting both f7 and b7, Hechlinger-olson, Philadelphia 1995. A second example after 11 \( \text{g}5 \) is 11...\( \text{d}d4 \) 12 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 13 c3 \( \text{b}6 \) 14 \( \text{f}3! \) \( \text{c}6 \) 15 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{bxa4} \) 16 \( \text{xa4} \) \( \text{a}4 \) 17 \( \text{xa4} \) \( \text{e}6 \) 18 d4 h6 19 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 20 d5 \( \text{d}d6 \) 21 \( \text{a}3! \) \( \text{h}7 \) 22 \( \text{c}4 \) with an obvious positional advantage to White due to the weak pawn on a6, Kupreichik-Dueball, Germany 1993.
11 \( \text{bxa3?!} \)

Black easily equalises after 11 \( \text{xa}3 \) b4 12 \( \text{a}1 \) d5 13 \( \text{g}5 \) dxe4 14 dxe4 \( \text{a}5 \) etc.
11...\( \text{d}5 \) 12 \( \text{ex}d5 \)

After 12 \( \text{g}5 \) Black has a good reply in 12...d4, seizing some space in the centre.
12...\( \text{xd}5 \) 13 \( \text{b}2? \)

It will transpire that this is an important loss of time. Better is 13 \( \text{d}2 \), while Black is fine after 13 \( \text{g}5 \) f6! 14 axb5 axb5 15 \( \text{e}4 \) (the overly optimistic 15 c4? runs into 15...\( \text{f}xg5 \) 16 \( \text{exe} \) 17 d6+ \( \text{h}8 \) 18 \( \text{dxc7} \) \( \text{xc7} \) 19 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{c}6 \) 20 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) and White has trouble along the g-file) 15...\( \text{exe} \) 16 \( \text{cb3} \) 17 \( \text{xb} \) 18 c4 \( \text{bxc} \) 19 \( \text{dx}c \) (Black also equalises after 19 \( \text{wc} \) 20 \( \text{cc} \) 20 \( \text{xf} \) 20 \( \text{xf} \) 4, exf4.
13...\( \text{f}4 \) 14 \( \text{c}1 \)

White admits his mistake of the previous

---

**Game 87**

**Ivanchuk-Adams**

**Linares 2002**

1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 3 \( \text{b}5 \) a6 4 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 5 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 6 \( \text{e}1 \) b5 7 \( \text{b}3 \) 0-0 8 a4

This rarely used continuation can be played occasionally as a surprise weapon. White attacks Black’s stronghold on b5 and hopes for ...b5-b4, after which White’s knight would obtain the dream square c4.

10...\( \text{xa}3 \)

Tournament practice has shown that 10...\( \text{c}5?! \), although it may look attractive at first glance, doesn’t promise Black a good position after 11 \( \text{g}5 \)!
move. The following variation shows that he had to be careful because his kingside is vulnerable: 14 \(\text{Wd2}\) \(\text{Wf6}\) 15 \(\text{We3}\) \(\text{Wf5}\) 16 \(\text{We4}\) (losing) 16...\(\text{Wg4}\) 17 \(\text{Qxe5}\) \(\text{Qxe5}\) 18 \(\text{Wxb7}\) c6 19 g3 \(\text{Wh3}\)! 20 \(\text{Qxf7+}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) with the inevitable mate to follow.

14...\(\text{Qxg2}\)!

Black doesn’t wait for White to exchange the dark-squared bishop for the knight on f4 and immediately sacrifices to destroy White’s kingside. Still, even stronger may have been 14...\(\text{Qd4}\)!, for example: 15 \(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qxg2}\) 16 \(\text{Wh5}\) (after 16 \(\text{Qc2}\) \(\text{Wh4}\)! 17 \(\text{Qg3}\) \(\text{Wh3}\) White can no longer defend his king 16...g6! (stronger than 16...\(\text{Qxe1}\)! 17 \(\text{Qxf7+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) – forced because if 17...\(\text{Qh8}\)! 18 \(\text{Qg6}\) etc. – 18 \(\text{Qb3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) and now 19 \(\text{Qd2}\) with the idea of \(\text{Qd2-b4}\) gives White excellent counterplay) and White is in deep trouble, as 17 \(\text{Qxf7+}\) \(\text{Qxf7}\) 18 \(\text{Wh7+}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 19 \(\text{Qh6}\) \(\text{Wxd4}\) 20 \(\text{Qg7+}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 21 \(\text{Qh3+}\) \(\text{Qg4}\) demonstrates.

15 \(\text{Qg5}\)!

Clearly White needs counterplay because the acceptance of the piece on g2 loses: 15 \(\text{Qxg2}\)? \(\text{Qd4}\) 16 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qg5}\) 17 \(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Wh5}\) and Black regains his piece with a mating attack to follow.

15...\(\text{Qxe1}\)!

Great complications arise after 15...\(\text{Qd4}\)!

and now:

a) 16 \(\text{Qxf7+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) (but not 16...\(\text{Qh8}\)? 17 \(\text{Qxe8}\) \(\text{Qxe8}\) 18 \(\text{Qxe5}\) and if 18...\(\text{Qxe5}\), 19 \(\text{Qf7+}\) wins) 17 \(\text{Wh5}\)! \(\text{Qf3+}\) 18 \(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Qxf3}\) transposes to note ‘b1’. If White continues 17 \(\text{Qa2}\) it gives Black a fantastic attack after 17...\(\text{g6}\) 18 \(\text{Qf7}\) \(\text{Wh4}\) 19 \(\text{Qh6+}\) \(\text{Whx6}\) 20 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qxe1}\) and, despite the fact that White is materially well ahead, Black’s cavalry will do White a lot of harm, especially around the f3-square. I am not convinced that White can survive the coming onslaught.

b) 16 \(\text{Wh5}\) \(\text{Qf3}\) 17 \(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Qxe3}\) 18 \(\text{Qxf7+}\) (Black obtains a strong initiative after 18 \(\text{Qxf7+}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 19 \(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Qxe1}\) 20 \(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Qd4}\) 21 \(\text{Qb1}\) \(\text{bxa4}\) 22 \(\text{Qa2}\) \(\text{e4}\) etc.) and now Black has the choice between the following:

b1) 18...\(\text{Qh8}\) leads to a roughly equal ending after 19 \(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Qxe1}\) 20 \(\text{Qf5}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 21 \(\text{Qxf6}\) \(\text{Qxf6}\) 22 \(\text{Qxe8}\) \(\text{Qxe8}\) 23 \(\text{Qb2}\) etc.

b2) Black can play for a win with the more ambitious 18...\(\text{Qh8}\)!. For instance, if 19 \(\text{Qxe5}\), then comes the astonishing reply 19...\(\text{Wh6}\)!!

16 \(\text{Wh5}\) \(\text{Wd7}\)!

It is very difficult to be critical of this move, which rejects a forced draw. However, it was not easy to calculate the consequences of further complications so maybe it was safer to settle for half a point with 16...\(\text{h6}\) 17 \(\text{Qxf7}\) (White loses after 17 \(\text{Qxf7}\)? \(\text{Wh8}\) 18 \(\text{Qg6}\) \(\text{Qf4}\) 19 \(\text{Qxf3}\) \(\text{Qf1}\) – White’s attack has failed and Black’s material advantage decides) 17...\(\text{Wh6}\) 18 \(\text{Qg5}\) (White also loses after 18 \(\text{Qxb6}\)? \(\text{Qf8}\) 19 \(\text{Qg4}\) \(\text{Qf1}\) 20 \(\text{Qh8}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 21 \(\text{Qg7}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) etc., or 19 \(\text{Qf5}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 20
\text{\textit{Anti-Marshall with 8 a4}}

\text{x6} \text{\textit{xf6} 21 \textit{h8}+ \textit{g8} and Black has an extra piece) 18...\textit{h8} 19 \textit{f7}+ \textit{h7} 20 \textit{g5}+ etc.}

17 \textit{xf7}+ \textit{f8} 18 \textit{e3}!

White can try to hunt down the black king with 18 \textit{dxh7}+? \textit{e7} 19 \textit{g5}+ \textit{d6} 20 \textit{xe1} \textit{xd4} 21 \textit{e3}, but after 21...\textit{xc6} 22 \textit{g6}+ \textit{e6}! 23 \textit{c4} \textit{xe4} 24 \textit{dxe4} \textit{h8}! 25 \textit{xc6} \textit{xc6} Black wins as the knight on h7 is doomed.

18...\textit{d4} 19 \textit{xe1}

Bad is 19 \textit{xd4}? \textit{f3}+! 20 \textit{xf3} \textit{xf7}, while Black emerges in the ending with a strong bishop versus bad knight after 19 \textit{xc8} \textit{xc8} 20 \textit{xc8}+ \textit{xc8} 21 \textit{xc8} \textit{xc8} 22 \textit{xc1} \textit{xc3} 23 \textit{xc7} \textit{xc8}! 24 \textit{xc8}+ \textit{xc8} 25 \textit{xc3} bxa4 etc.

19...\textit{f3}+

White has a dangerous attack after 19...\textit{g6}?! 20 \textit{h6}+ \textit{e7} 21 \textit{h4}! \textit{c6} 22 \textit{c4}+? (also good was the simple 22 \textit{f3}) 22...\textit{xf7} 23 \textit{hx7}+ \textit{e6} 24 \textit{xd4} exd4 25 \textit{xf1}! with multiple threats. Note that 25...\textit{xc2} loses to 26 \textit{xc6}+ \textit{d5} 27 \textit{xf6}+ \textit{c5} 28 \textit{xc6} etc.

20 \textit{xf1}! \textit{g5} 21 \textit{c5}+ \textit{e7} 22 \textit{xe5}!

The key position, which White must have calculated before playing 18 \textit{e3}!. He will regain most of the sacrificed material as well as retaining the initiative.

22...\textit{xf7} 23 \textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 24 \textit{xe7}+ \textit{xe7} 25 \textit{wc5}+

For his lost queen, Black has plenty of material but he needs to play correctly to achieve a draw. So wasn’t it better to have played 16...\textit{h6} instead of 16...\textit{wd7}?

25...\textit{wd7}

Also playable is 25...\textit{e6} 26 \textit{xc7} \textit{d5} 27 \textit{b6}+ \textit{d6} 28 \textit{e3}+ \textit{d7} 29 \textit{e5} \textit{f7} 30 \textit{xg7} \textit{e8} and Black has managed to coordinate his pieces but at the cost of a couple of pawns.

26 \textit{wd4}+ \textit{e7} 27 \textit{wg7} bxa4?

Black loses a stronghold for his bishop after this move. Correct is 27...\textit{d5} 28 \textit{xc7} \textit{e8} 29 \textit{f5} \textit{e6} with chances for a draw.

28 \textit{wc3}! \textit{d7} 29 \textit{wd4}+ \textit{d6} 30 \textit{wa4}+ \textit{e6} 31 \textit{wg4}+ \textit{f5}

If 31...\textit{f6}, then 32 \textit{wd7} etc.

32 \textit{wc4}+ \textit{d5}

Or 32...\textit{d7} 33 \textit{f7}+ \textit{e8} 34 \textit{wa7} with a technically winning ending for White.

33 \textit{xc7} h5 34 c4! \textit{h1}

Or 34...\textit{f3} 35 \textit{wa4}! \textit{b7} 36 d4 \textit{f8} 37 \textit{c5}+ \textit{d7} 38 d5 and White’s central pawns are irresistible.

35 \textit{f4} \textit{f8} 36 \textit{wb6}+ \textit{f7} 37 \textit{wa7}+ \textit{e8} 38 \textit{wa6}

White has both a material and positional advantage. There is nothing Black can do against the march of the white pawns.

38...\textit{xb8} 39 d4 \textit{b1}+ 40 \textit{e2} \textit{b2}+ 41 \textit{d3} \textit{b3}+ 42 \textit{e2} \textit{e3} 43 d6! \textit{h2}+ 44 \textit{d3} \textit{xd5} 45 exd5 \textit{xd5} 46 f5 \textit{a2}

47 \textit{wa7}+ \textit{f6} 48 \textit{wd4}+ \textit{g5} 49 \textit{wd5} \textit{xa3}+ 50 \textit{e4} 1-0
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Game 88
Lau-Yurtav
European Club Cup, Solingen 1991

1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 d5 a6 4 d4 f6 5 0-0 6 e7 6 d1 b5 7 h3 0-0 8 a4 6 e5 9 d3 e8 10 d2 c5

b) 11 g5 a5 12 a2 d6 13 c3 b4 14 d5 cxd5 15 0-0 16 a2 h6 17 h4 e8 18 c3 b3

(it is important to remember this motif – the a1-rook and the b1-bishop will temporarily be out of the game) 19 b1 a7 20 d4 c5 and Black can boldly look forward to future events.

c) 11 c3 a5 12 a2 b4 13 c2 d5 or
13 d5 14 exd5 14 exd5 and now:

c1) 14...g4 15 c2 d6 is unclear.

c2) It looks rather risky to open up the game with 14...e4 because then White’s pair of bishops spring into life, but it certainly deserves a closer look: 15 d5 exd5 16 xe8+ xe8 17 cxe8+ xe2 18 xe2 dxe2 19 dxe7 (after 19 ef7+ ef8 White has to lose a vital tempo due to the unpleasant threat of...h7-h6 winning a piece) 19...d5 20 f1 c8 21 f4 b6 22 xec2 xec7 and again we reach a position with roughly equal chances.

11...b4 12 d4 h6 13 c3 d6 14 a5 d8 15 a4 d7 16 e2 a8 17 ab1 a7 18 c1 e6!

We’ve had a manoeuvring sequence of moves in which Black was retaining his stronghold on b4 and not exchanging on c3. This would have been wrong because the open b-file would favour White – he would have had various weaknesses in Black’s camp to target. Also it is important to note how Black has had to keep an eye open over the d4-square to prevent White from playing d3-
d4.

19 b3?!

White saw that after 19 ¤xc6 Black has the intermediary move 19...bxc3! but the text seriously weakens the key b4-square.

19...bxc3 20 ¤xc3 dxe6?!

Black was afraid to play the obvious 20...¤b4 21 ¤xb4 ¤xb4 because of 22 ¤xd6? when both 22...cxd6? 23 ¤c8! and 22... ¤xd6?! 23 ¤c7 turn out in White’s favour, but he missed the fantastic reply 22...¤c5!!.

After 23 ¤c4 ¤xd3 Black is dominant and White has a poorly placed bishop on a4.

21 b4 ¤f8 22 ¤e3 ¤e6 23 ¤f5

Again the tactics favour Black after 23 ¤xc6? ¤xc6 24 ¤xe5 dxe5 25 ¤xc6 ¤d4 26 ¤xd4 exd4 27 ¤c7 dxe3 28 ¤xa7 e2+ 29 ¤h1 ¤xb4! – White’s position has collapsed.

23...¤e7 24 dxe7+?!

Better was 24 ¤e3 ¤f4 25 ¤b3, intending ¤b3-c4, with approximately equal play.

24...¤xe7 25 ¤d2 d5

Once Black plays this move, activating his light-squared bishop, it is obvious that Black has solved all his opening problems. The exchange sacrifice 25...¤xf3 26 gxf3 ¤f6 27 ¤d1 ¤e6+ 28 ¤f1 ¤h5 29 ¤g2 leads only to a draw because the tempting 29...¤xf2?? is refuted by the cold-blooded 30 ¤b3!, intending ¤b3xc6 and ¤c1xc7.

26 ¤b3 dxe4

White holds on after 26...¤xf3 27 gxf3 ¤d4 28 ¤d1 etc.

27 dxe4 ¤d4 28 ¤xd4 ¤xd4 29 ¤e1?

This loses a pawn by force. Better was 29 ¤f1, keeping the game balanced.

29...¤c6

This wins a pawn but also worthy of consideration was 29...¤f4!? 30 ¤c7 ¤c7 31 ¤xc7 ¤xe4 with some initiative for Black.

30 ¤e2 ¤xc1 31 ¤xc1 c5

White is in trouble due to the pin along the b-file.

32 ¤d2 cxb4 33 ¤xa6 ¤xe4 34 ¤c8+ ¤xc8 35 ¤xc8+ ¤h7 36 ¤c4 ¤g6?

Black misses a nice win with 36...¤f6! 37 ¤e1 ¤g6 38 g3 ¤f5 39 ¤xf7 ¤xf7 40 ¤xf7 ¤c3 41 f3 (otherwise White has to give up a piece for Black’s passed c-pawn) 41...¤xf3 42 ¤xf3 d1 43 ¤xc3 bxc3 44 ¤c3 c2 45 ¤d2 c4 and Black is winning the race in the bishop and pawn ending. Now the game fizzes out into a draw.

37 ¤xb4 ¤h4 38 ¤e1 ¤e4 39 ¤c1 ¤b7 40 ¤c2 e4 41 ¤d2 ¤b5 42 ¤e1 f5 43 ¤d1 f4 44 ¤e2 ¤e5 45 ¤c1 ½-½

Game 89

Herrera-N. Mitkov

Cienfuegos 1996

1 e4 e5 2 ¤f3 ¤c6 3 ¤b5 a6 4 ¤a4 ¤f6
5 0-0 ¤e7 6 ¤e1 b5 7 ¤b3 0-0 8 a4
¤b7 9 d3 ¤e8 10 ¤c3 b4 11 ¤d5
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11 \( \text{Qe}2 \) allows Black very comfortable play after 11...\( \text{d}5! \). 12 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 13 \( \text{Qg}3 \) \( \text{f}8 \) etc.

11...\( \text{Qa}5 \) 12 \( \text{Qxe}7+ \)

Sometimes White tries to keep the tension with 12 \( \text{Qa}2 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) and now:

a) 13 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \) 14 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 15 \( \text{dx}c6 \) \( \text{Qxc}6 \) 16 \( \text{Qb}3 \) \( \text{Qe}7 \) 17 \( \text{Qd}2 \) \( \text{bxc}3?! \) 18 \( \text{bx}c3 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 19 \( \text{Qab}1 \) \( \text{Qab}8 \) 20 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) (Conquest-P.Blatny, Alma Ata 1989). Black did not manage to prove the correctness of the pawn sacrifice because after 20...\( \text{Qd}4 \), White has 21 \( \text{Qxf}7+! \). Instead of 17...\( \text{bxc}3?! \), correct was 17...\( \text{a}5 \) with a good position for Black.

b) 13 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 14 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \) (worse is 14...\( \text{d}6?! \) because of 15 \( \text{d}4! \) and White gets control of the centre) 15 \( \text{Qd}2 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 16 \( \text{Qf}3 \) with a further split:

b1) 16...\( \text{Qg}5?! \) 17 \( \text{Qb}3! \) \( \text{Qxc}1 \) 18 \( \text{Qxc}1 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \) (a sad retreat, but after 18...\( \text{Qxb}3 \) 19 \( \text{cx}b3 \) Black’s queenside pawn weaknesses would be difficult, if not impossible, to defend) 19 \( \text{Qg}4 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 20 \( \text{c}3 \) with a clear positional advantage to White, Kotronias-I.Sokolov, European Team Championship, Haifa 1989.

b2) 16...\( \text{c}6! \) 17 \( \text{dx}c6 \) \( \text{d}5 \) or 17 \( \text{Qe}4 \) \( \text{c}7 \) and Black, having managed to free himself from the bind on the d5-square, has now equalised.

12...\( \text{Qxe}7 \) 13 \( \text{Qa}2 \) \( \text{d}5! \)

The strongest continuation, with which Black obtains more space in the centre. Czech Grandmaster Pavel Blatny used to like the move 13...\( \text{Qab}8?! \) with the idea of ...b4-b3, but the following game cast doubts upon that idea: 14 \( \text{Qg}5 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 15 \( \text{Qh}4 \) c5 16 \( \text{Qd}2! \) (White frees the way for his f-pawn) 16...\( \text{Qbd}8 \) 17 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 18 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{Qh}7 \) 19 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 20 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 21 c3 with a clear advantage to White, who has excellent prospects for a kingside attack (Kholmov-Blatny, Brno 1991).

14 \( \text{exd}5 \)

Or 14 \( \text{Qg}5 \) \( \text{dx}e4 \) 15 \( \text{dx}e4 \) and now:

a) 15...\( \text{Qad}8 \) 16 \( \text{Qc}2 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 17 \( \text{Qxf}6 \) (after 17 \( \text{Qh}4 \) I recommend 17...\( \text{Qd}6 \) with equality) 17...\( \text{Qxf}6 \) 18 \( \text{Qad}1 \) \( \text{Qe}7 \) 19 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 20 \( \text{Qc}3 \) \( \text{Qg}7 \) 21 \( \text{Qd}5 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 22 \( \text{ex}d5 \) \( \text{Qc}4 \) 23 \( \text{Qb}3 \) \( \text{Qa}5 \) 24 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Qec}4 \) 25 \( \text{Qb}3 \) \( \text{Qa}5 \) ½-½ Shirov-Adams, Linares 2002.

b) 15...\( \text{h}6 \) 16 \( \text{Qh}4 \) \( \text{Qad}8 \) 17 \( \text{Qe}2 \) and now, instead of 17...\( \text{b}3?! \) 18 \( \text{Qxf}6 \) \( \text{Qxf}6 \) 19 \( \text{Qxb}3 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 20 \( \text{cx}b3 \) \( \text{Qb}6 \) 21 \( \text{Qc}2 \), when White has both a positional and material advantage (Hübner-Z.Polgar, Biel 1987), the quiet move 17...\( \text{Qd}6 \) grants Black an equal position.

14...\( \text{Qd}6! \)

After this move Black regains his sacrificed pawn.

15 \( \text{Qd}2 \)

15 \( \text{c}4 \) is known to be harmless for Black. One example is 15 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{bxc}3 \) 16 \( \text{bxc}3 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 17 \( \text{Qa}3 \) (or 17 \( \text{Qg}5 \) \( \text{Qxa}2 \) 18 \( \text{Qxa}2 \) \( \text{Qd}5 \) 19 \( \text{Qc}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 20 \( \text{Qc}1 \) \( \text{Qad}8 \) with a good position for Black, who has play against the d3-pawn in Short-Nikolic, Naestved 1985) 17...\( \text{c}5 \) 18 \( \text{Qxd}5 \) \( \text{Qxd}5 \) 19 \( \text{Qc}2 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 20 \( \text{Qad}1 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 21
dxc4 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}c4 \) 22 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}2 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}4? \) 23 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}7+! \) (Black's tactical idea is revealed after 23 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}2 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}2+ 24 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}1? - better is 24 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}1 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}3! \) with a draw by perpetual check - 24...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}4! \), threatening mate) 23...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}h7 \) 24 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}c4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}2 \) 25 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}2 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}8 \) 26 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}c2 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}c4 \) 27 a5 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{a}8 \) Black regains his pawn and the game was eventually drawn, Onischuk-Wahls, Bundesliga 1996.

15...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}d5 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}d5 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}d5 \)

17 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}2 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}6 \)

Black re-routes his knight towards the centre. The alternative is 17...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}5 \), which doesn’t look bad either. For example, Adams-Conquest, British Championship 1986 continued 18 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}5 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}6 \) 19 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}3 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}8 \) 20 h4? \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}6 \) 21 h5 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}6 \) 22 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}6 \) 23 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}4! \) 24 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}4 \) (or 24...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}c5 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}h5! \) with ...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}6-g6 \) to follow and Black will have strong play along the g-file) 24...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}5 \) 25 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}3 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}7 \) 26 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}5 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}8 \) 27 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}6 \) with a very complicated position ahead. However, White then blundered with 28 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}c5? \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}c5 \) 29 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}c5 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}6 \) 30 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}g5 \), but even stronger was 28...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}8! \) 29 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}d5 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{x}c5 \) followed by ...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}4xc2 \) with an immediate win for Black.

18 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}8 \) 19 b3?!

This creates a weak square in c3. Better was 19 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}5 \), although after 19...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}6 \) 20 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}6 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}6 \) 21 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}3 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}6 \) the resulting endgame position is somewhat drawish.

19...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}6 \)

Controlling g5 and also giving the black king air, which is useful in some variations.

20 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{ac}1 \)

This move indicates that White has no clear plan. The position is probably still balanced but somehow Black has more options.

20...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}6 \) 21 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}3 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{ce}7! \)

Black’s knight heads towards the kingside in order to launch an initiative on that side of the board. The manoeuvring which follows is natural but it is clear than only Black can improve his position. It looks equal but it is not!

22 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}6 \) 23 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}1 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}7 \) 24 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}6 \) 25 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{bc}1 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}8 \) 26 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}2 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}5 \) 27 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}6 \) 28 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}3 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}8 \) 29 a5 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}8 \) 30 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}4? \)

This bad move decisively weakens White’s kingside.

30...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}4! \) 31 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}4? \)

White had to try 31 dxe4 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}4 \) 32 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}5? \), but after 32...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}6! \) 33 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}4 \) 34 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}4 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}7! \) White is probably still lost due to his weakened kingside.

31...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}3 \) 32 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}3 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}5 \)

Trapping the white queen!

33 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}6 \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}6 \) 31 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}6 \) 32 dxe4 \f4 0-1

---

**Game 90**

**Kasparov-Tkachiev**

*Cannes (rapid) 2001*

1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}3 \) 3 d4 3 d4 4 a6 4 a6 5 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}5 \) 6 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}7 \) 7 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}5 \) 8 0-0 8 a4

---
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\( \textsf{Obl7 \ d3 \ d6 \ 10 \ \textup{O}bd2} \)

10 \( \textup{O}bd2 \) was popularised by Kasparov when he used it with success in his 1993 World Championship match with Nigel Short, and it has now replaced 10 \( \textup{O}c3 \) as the main move.

10...\( \textup{O}e8 \)

Black intends to bolster his kingside and e5-pawn with the typical ...h7-h6 and ...\( \textup{O}f8 \) plan. 10...\( \textup{O}a5 \) is the subject of Game 91.

11 \( \textup{O}f1 \ h6 \ 12 \ \textup{O}d2?! \)

Again Kasparov’s invention, this move has presented Black with some fresh problems in the a4 Anti-Marshall. White prevents the typical ...\( \textup{O}a5 \) plan and prepares c2-c4.

Alternatives include the following possibilities:

a) 12 c3 \( \textup{O}f8 \) 13 \( \textup{O}e3 \) \( \textup{O}a5 \) 14 \( \textup{O}a2 \) c5 15 b4 \( \textup{O}xb4 \) 16 \( \textup{O}xb4 \) \( \textup{O}c6 \) 17 \( \textup{O}d5 \) \( \textup{O}xd5 \) 18 \( \textup{O}xd5 \) \( \textup{O}d7 \) with perhaps a tiny edge for White, Kindermann-Adams, Garmisch 1994.

b) 12 \( \textup{O}c3 \) \( \textup{O}f8 \) 13 \( \textup{O}d2 \) \( \textup{O}e7?! \) (now Black has time to answer c2-c4 with ...c7-c6) 14 c4 c6 15 \( \textup{O}c2 \) \( \textup{O}g6 \) 16 \( \textup{O}f5 \) \( \textup{O}xc4 \) 17 \( \textup{O}xc4 \) d5 with equality, Svidler-Adams, European Team Championship, Pula 1997.

12...\( \textup{O}f8 \) 13 c4!

This advance is not typical for the 8 a4 Anti-Marshall, but here it causes Black headaches because a concession of some sort must be made on the queenside.

13...\( \textup{O}xc4 \)

13...b4 keeps the queenside closed, but after 14 a5! Black’s b4-pawn is seriously weakened. One practical example is 14...\( \textup{O}d7 \) 15 \( \textup{O}a4 \) \( \textup{O}b8 \) 16 b3 \( \textup{O}c5 \) 17 \( \textup{O}c2 \) \( \textup{O}xa4 \) 18 \( \textup{O}xa4 \) with an edge to White, Berelovich-Jenni, Bundesliga 2002.

14 \( \textup{O}xc4 \) \( \textup{O}b8 \)

Or 14...\( \textup{O}c8 \) 15 \( \textup{O}c3 \) \( \textup{O}e6 \) 16 \( \textup{O}e3 \) \( \textup{O}xc4 \) 17 \( \textup{O}xc4 \) \( \textup{O}b8 \) 18 \( \textup{O}d5 \) \( \textup{O}xd5 \) 19 \( \textup{O}xd5 \) \( \textup{O}b4 \) 20 \( \textup{O}e2 \) a5 21 \( \textup{O}ed1 \) \( \textup{O}d7 \) 22 \( \textup{O}e1! \) c6 23 \( \textup{O}c2 \) \( \textup{O}xc2 \) 24 \( \textup{O}xc2 \) and White’s bishop on c3 is far superior to its opposite number on f8, Zatonskih-Reg.Pokorna, Warsaw 2001.

15 \( \textup{O}c3 \)

Planning the natural d3-d4 advance. White has come out of the opening with a substantial edge.

15...\( \textup{O}e7 \) 16 \( \textup{O}g3 \) \( \textup{O}g6 \) 17 d4 \( \textup{O}xd4 \) 18 \( \textup{O}xd4 \) d5
Instead of remaining passive, Black tries to simplify the position.

19 exd5 \(\text{ex}e1+\) 20 \(\text{ex}e1\) \(\text{Qxd}5\) 21 \(\text{Qd}1\) \(\text{Qf}4\) 22 \(\text{Qf}5\) \(\text{Qf}6\) 23 \(\text{Qxf}6\) \(\text{gx}f6\)

The queens have come off the board but Black is still clearly worse due to his shocking pawn structure.

24 \(\text{Qd}4\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 25 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Qxe}3\) 26 \(\text{fxe}3!\) \(\text{Qe}6\) 27 \(\text{Qxf}6\) \(\text{Qg}7\) 28 \(\text{Qxg}7\) \(\text{Qxg}7\) 29 \(\text{b}3\)

Black has lost one of his weak pawns, but he still has four left to go! The game doesn't last much longer.

29...\(\text{Qf}6\) 30 \(\text{Qf}1\) \(\text{Qb}6\) 31 \(\text{Qd}4+\) \(\text{Qg}7\)
32 \(\text{Qf}5+\) \(\text{Qh}7\) 33 \(\text{Qe}7\) 1-0

**Game 91**

**Kasparov-Leko**

**Linares 2001**

1 \(e4\) \(e5\) 2 \(\text{Qf}3\) \(\text{Qc}6\) 3 \(\text{b}5\) a6 4 \(\text{Qa}4\) \(\text{Qf}6\)
5 0-0 \(\text{Qe}7\) 6 \(\text{Qe}1\) b5 7 \(\text{Qb}3\) 0-0 8 a4 \(\text{Qb}7\) 9 d3 d6 10 \(\text{Qbd}2\) \(\text{Qa}5\)

Planning typical queenside expansion with ...c7-c5.

11 \(\text{Qa}2\) c5 12 \(\text{Qf}1\) \(\text{Qa}8!\)?

Black can block the queenside with 12...b4, after which White probably keeps a slight edge after 13 \(\text{Qc}3\).

13 \(\text{Qe}3!\)

Eyeing up the tempting d5- and f5-squares.

13...h6

Or 13...g6 14 \(\text{Qd}2\) b4 15 \(\text{Qg}5!\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 16 \(\text{Qg}4\) \(\text{Qx}g4\) 17 \(\text{Wh}xg4\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 18 \(\text{Wh}h4\) h5 19 \(\text{Wh}g3\) with a strong attack, Kasparov-Vladimirov, Batumi 2001. The rest of this game is quite instructive: 19...\(\text{Qg}7\) 20 \(\text{Qd}5!\) \(\text{Qb}8\) 21 b4 \(\text{Qd}7\) 22 \(\text{Qe}3!\) \(\text{Qb}7\) 23 \(\text{Qh}7!\) \(\text{Qxd}5\) (23...\(\text{Qxh}7\) 24 \(\text{Wh}h6+\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 25 \(\text{Qxg}6+\) \(\text{Qh}8\) 26 \(\text{Wh}h5+\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 27 \(\text{Qe}3\) wins) 24 \(\text{Wh}h6+\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 25 \(\text{Qg}5\) and now Black played 25...\(\text{Qxe}4\) and resigned immediately. After the more tenacious 25...\(\text{Qd}8\) White wins with 26 \(\text{cx}d5\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 27 \(\text{Qe}3!\) followed by the move \(\text{Qf}5\).

14 \(\text{Qd}2\)

14...c4?!

A committal move. Using a counterattack on the c4-pawn, Black tries to block the long a2-g8 diagonal in order to minimise the influence of the a2-bishop.

14...b4 15 \(\text{Qh}4!\) \(\text{Qxe}4\) 16 \(\text{dx}e4\) \(\text{Qx}h4\) 17 \(\text{Wh}5\) (Kasparov) gives White an awesome attack. Relatively best for Black was 14...\(\text{Qc}6\) with just a small advantage for White.

15 \(\text{Qc}3!\)

White can probably keep an edge with 15 \(\text{b}4\) cxb3 16 cxb3 planning \(\text{b}3-b4\).

15...\(\text{Qb}6\)

After 15...\(\text{cx}d3?!\) 16 \(\text{cx}d3\) Black's plan has failed miserably – the a2-bishop is as active as ever.

16 \(\text{Qd}2!\)

Adding further pressure to c4. Leko must have been hoping for 16 \(\text{dx}c4?\) b4 17 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qx}e4\), when suddenly it is Black who has the advantage.

16...\(\text{Qc}6?!\)

Now White is able to establish a clear advantage. 16...\(\text{cx}d3?!\) 17 \(\text{cx}d3\) b4 18 \(\text{Qd}4\) \(\text{Qx}c4\) 19 \(\text{Qxc}4\) followed by \(\text{Qd}2\) is also bad for Black, but the best chance is 16...\(\text{Qe}c8\) 17 \(\text{Qxa}5\) \(\text{Qxa}5\) 18 \(\text{Qxb}5\) \(\text{Qxb}5\) 19 \(\text{Qc}4\) b4 (Kasparov), when Black has some compensation for the pawn, although I still prefer White.

17 \(\text{Qd}5!\) \(\text{Qxd}5\) 18 \(\text{ex}d5\) \(\text{Qa}5\) 19 \(\text{Qxa}5?\)

A slip by the world number one. 19 \(\text{dx}c4?\) b4 20 c5! \(\text{Qxc}5\) 21 \(\text{Qe}4\) \(\text{Qb}6\) 22 \(\text{Qd}2\) (Kasparov) would have kept White on top.
26...\textit{h7} 27 \textit{g5}! \textit{g6} 28 \textit{f7}+! \textit{f6} 29 \textit{h5} and Black is quickly mated.
27 \textit{c5} \textit{c6} 28 \textit{d3} \textit{xc3} 29 \textit{xe5} \textit{xe4} 30 \textit{f7}+ \textit{h7}

31 \textit{g5}+ 1-0
31...\textit{h8} 32 \textit{xe4} \textit{fxe4} 33 \textit{d5} is not worth playing on for Black.

\textit{Game 92}
\textit{Anand-Ivanchuk}
\textit{Monaco (rapid) 2001}

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{f3} \textit{c6} 3 \textit{b5} a6 4 \textit{a4} \textit{f6} 5 0-0 \textit{e7} 6 \textit{e1} b5 7 \textit{b3} 0-0 8 a4 b4
This advance is much less popular than 8...\textit{b7}. Black can certainly reach playable positions but, as this game shows, it’s quite easy to drift into slightly passive ones too.

9 d3 d6 10 a5!

After this move White is already winning and the rest is easy for Kasparov.

22...\textit{Wxb2}
Or 22...\textit{dxc5} 23 c3 \textit{Wxb2} 24 \textit{e2} \textit{a3} 25 \textit{d6} with a double threat of \textit{dxe7} and \textit{xf7+}.

23 \textit{cxd6} \textit{f8} 24 \textit{c3}
Threatening to trap the queen with 25 \textit{e2} \textit{a3} 26 \textit{b3}.

24...\textit{f5} 25 d7 \textit{ed8} 26 d6+ \textit{h8}

The critical continuation. White prevents
...QA5 and, more importantly, isolates the a6- and b4-pawns. The only negative feature of this move is that the a5-pawn could become a target itself.

10...Ae6 11 Qbd2 Axe3

An alternative is 11...Ab8 12 Ac4? (12 Ac4 Ac8 13 Af1 is a more common continuation, with White having a slight edge) 12...Ag4 13 Ae3 Ad7 14 h3 Axh3 15 Whf3 Ag5 16 Aa4 Aexe3 17 Wxe3 and again White has a slight pull, Kasparov-Grischuk, Moscow (rapid) 2002.

12 Acxb3

At first glance it looks as though Black shouldn't have any problems here, but he doesn't really have an active plan and the weaknesses on the queenside will eventually become important. Not many black-sided Marshall players have the necessary patience to defend such a position, which probably explains why 8...Ab7 is so much more popular than 8...b4.

12...Ae8

Or 12...d5 13 Ag5 Ac8 14 We2 h6 15 Axh6 Axf6 16 exh5 Wxd5 17 Wc4 Wad8 18 Adf2 g6 19 Wxd5 Exd5 20 Ae4 Ag5 21 Ae4 and White converted his small advantage in this ending, Grischuk-Tkachiev, Prague 2002. Black has weaknesses at b4, a6 and c7.

13 h3

There is no need for White to rush – his advantage is of a long-lasting nature. That said, 13 d4 Exd4 14 fxd4 exd4 15 Qxd4 Ab8 16 f3 c5 17 Ag5 Bc6 18 Ag5 h6 19 Ah4 g6 20 Ac3 also left Black grovelling in Short-Sokolov, Linares 1995.

13...Wd7 14 Ag5 h6 15 Ah4 Ab7 16 Axe7 Aexe7 17 d4 exd4 18 ffxd4 Ac6 19 f3 Axd4 20 Wxd4 Bb5 21 Wd3 Ag5 22 Wd2 Wxd2 23 Axd2 Axe8 24 Ab3

A few exchanges have been made but if anything these have simply emphasised the pawn weaknesses on the queenside. Note that 24...d5 can simply be met by 25 Ac5!.

24...c5 25 Ad1 Ae6 26 Ad2 Ab8 27 Ad1 Ae7 28 Ac1 Ad8 29 Ac3 Ad7 30 b3

Objectively White is still only 'slightly better' but defending this type of ending is not really what one plays the Marshall for!

30...g5 31 Ab2 Ab5 32 Aa4 Ae8 34 e5!

Impressive play from Anand. A temporary pawn sacrifice allows White's rooks to penetrate down the d-file.

34...dxe5 35 Ad7+ Ab6 36 Ab7 Ag6 37 Add7 f6 38 Ad8 h5 39 Ad8

The a6-pawn goes, leaving White with an unstoppable runner on a5.

39...h4 40 Axa6 Aa7 41 Axe6 Aexe6 42 Aa6 Ac7 43 Ac7 1-0

43...Ad5 44 Bb7 is winning for White.
Summary
Game 86 confirms the widespread opinion that the crude 10 \( \text{Q}g5 \) gives Black a promising position. White goes down after he embarks on the greedy pawn-grabbing 13 \( \text{hx}e5? \) at the too great a cost of leaving his pieces uncoordinated. In Game 87 Adams's 10...\( \text{h}x\text{a}3 \) 11 \( \text{b}x\text{a}3 \) d5 etc. looks like it equalises easily. In Game 88, although White forces Black to play 10...\( \text{b}5\text{b}4 \) conceding the c4-square to White's knight, Black keeps the position in the balance as long as White is prevented from playing d3-d4.

In Game 89 the reader should remember the freeing sequence 13...\( \text{d}5! \) and 14...\( \text{W}d6! \), with which Black achieves an equal position. Later on White plays poorly and apparently without a plan. He then weakens the c3-square after which Black obtains a great spatial advantage culminating in a successful kingside attack. This was a good example of Black's chances in a so-called balanced position.

Finally, Kasparov's powerful opening play in Games 90-91 has certainly put the ball back in Black's court in the line 8...\( \text{b}7\text{b}7 \) 9 d3 d6 10 \( \text{Q}bd2 \). Black also had an unhappy experience in Game 92 with the committal 8...\( \text{b}4 \).

1 e4 e5 2 \( \text{Q}f3 \) c6 3 \( \text{b}5 \) a6 4 \( \text{a}4 \) f6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 a4 \( \text{b}7 \)
8...\( \text{b}4 \) – Game 92
9 d3 \( \text{e}8 \) (D)
9...d6 10 \( \text{Q}bd2 \)
10...\( \text{a}5 \) (D) – Game 91; 10...\( \text{e}8 \) – Game 90
10 \( \text{c}3 \) (D) – Game 89
10 \( \text{d}2 \) – Game 88; 10 \( \text{a}3 \) – Game 87; 10 \( \text{g}5 \) – Game 86; 10 c3 – Game 85

\[ ...\begin{array}{c}
\text{Diagram 1:} 9...\text{e}8 \\
\text{Diagram 2:} 10...\text{a}5 \\
\text{Diagram 3:} 10 \text{c}3
\end{array} \]
CHAPTER NINE

Anti-Marshall with 8 d4!?

1 e4 e5 2 d4 f3 d6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 d4? 

By playing 8 d4! White intends to seize control of the centre and this might lead to positions where it is White and not Black who sacrifices a pawn. In return, White succeeds in pushing away Black’s knight from f6 by playing e4-e5 – this grants the first player a lasting initiative. However, with accurate play Black’s chances are by no means worse.

Of course after 8 d4! Black can chicken out by playing 8...d6, after which 9 c3 g4 leads to the Closed Ruy Lopez variation where White doesn’t play 9 h3 but plays 9 d4, allowing Black to play ...e8-g4. This line is considered quite harmless for Black but in this chapter I will only deal with games where Black accepts the gauntlet by capturing on d4.

In Belotti-Ara.Minasian (Game 93) White embarks on the suspicious pawn-grabbing 8...exd4 9 xf7+ ! , after which the pair of bishops gives Black a long lasting initiative.

In Games 94-95, after 8 d4? exd4 9 xd4 exd4 10 c5 xe8 it is White who sacrifices a pawn this time with 11 c3!? . In return he obtains strong control over the vital d5-square. Also his light-squared bishop exerts strong pressure on the a2-g8 diagonal. In short, Black must be very careful not to crumble under White’s kingside attack.

Instead of the ambitious 11 c3!, White can simply recapture on d4 with 11 xd4 (Games 96-97).

Game 93
Belotti-Ara.Minasian
European Championship, Ohrid 2001

1 e4 e5 2 d4 f3 d6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 d4 exd4!

8...d6 9 c3 g4 is by no means a bad choice for Black because theory considers that Black is fine in that line. However, from the psychological point of view I suggest that against 8 d4 Black should be brave enough and take the bull by the horns by playing 8...xd4!.

9 xf7+! 

Giving a dubious sign after White’s ninth move can only be justified after meticulous analysis and seeing a great number of games. The move by itself is not bad. White wins a pawn but in return Black gets a long-lasting initiative, excellent development and a powerful pair of bishops. In particular, his light-squared bishop will be very strong.

9...xf7 10 xe5 f8!

The natural move 10...c5? surprisingly
loses to 11 \( \text{xf7} \text{xf7} \) 12 e5 \( \text{de8} \) 13 c3 \( \text{dc6} \)
14 \( \text{wd5} + \) \( \text{f8} \) 15 \( \text{c3} \) g6 16 \( \text{f3} + \) g7 17
\( \text{f7} + \) h8 18 \( \text{h6} \)

with the inevitable mate to follow. This is an example where two minor pieces are not a
match for a rook as the minor pieces have no
safe outposts and the side with the rook has
the initiative. I am not sure that the late
World Champion Mikhail Tal would have
enjoyed that variation!

11 \( \text{wx} \text{d4} \) c5

I prefer this to the alternative 11...\( \text{b7} \). White must decide on which square to place
his queen.

12 \( \text{wd3} \)

Black gets excellent compensation for the
sacrificed pawn after 12 \( \text{wd2} \) w7 13 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 14 \( \text{c3} \) ae8 15 e5 b4! etc.

12...c4

I prefer this to 12...\( \text{wc7} \) from the game
Vinolins-Ozlin, Riga 1985, which continued
13 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 14 \( \text{g5} \) c4 15 \( \text{d1} \) c5 16
\( \text{xf6} \) (this knight has to be eliminated as 16
\( \text{d3} \)? \( \text{g4} \), hitting both the f2- and h2-
squares, is clearly bad for White) 16...\( \text{xf6} \) 17
\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 18 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{a5} \) 19 \( \text{b3} \)? (also possible
is 19 c3 - I think that with best play Black
hasn't enough compensation for the
sacrificed pawn) 19...\( \text{e8} \) (after 19...\( \text{b4} \) a strong
reply is 20 a3! and if 20...\( \text{xc1} \), then 21
\( \text{c7} \) followed by \( \text{xd6} \) etc. is in White's
favour) 20 bxc4 bxc4 21 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{c6} \) 22 \( \text{g5} \)
g6 23 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{d8} \)? (Black had to be brave and

play 23...\( \text{xa2} \) 24 \( \text{d2} \) h6 25 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{h7} \) with
roughly equal play) 24 h4 h6 25 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 26
\( \text{d2} \) g7? (a blunder, losing a second pawn;
necessary was 26...\( \text{h7} \) 27 \( \text{c3} + \) \( \text{h7} \) 28
\( \text{xc4} \) d6 29 \( \text{d3} \) 1-0.

13 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{b7} \) 14 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c7} \) 15 \( \text{g4} \) b4 16
\( \text{d5} \)

Stronger than 16 \( \text{xf6} + \) ? \( \text{xf6} \) 17 \( \text{d5} \)
\( \text{xd5} \) 18 exd5 \( \text{d4} \) 19 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xb2} \) and
Black has regained the sacrificed pawn with
advantage because he now has the better
pawn structure.

16...\( \text{xd5} \) 17 exd5 \( \text{e8} \) 18 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xd5} \)
19 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f4} \) 20 \( \text{we5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 21 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{e6} \)

By exchanging queens, White has
managed to diminish Black's initiative. However,
Black still maintains some advantage in the
ending due to his pair of bishops, which can
be strong in this type of open position.

22 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{xe4} \)

I don't think that Black should have
parted with his pair of bishops so easily.
Worth a try was 22...\( \text{h4} \)? 23 \( \text{a5} \) h5!, hoping for 24 \( \text{hxh5} \)? \( \text{xe4} \) 25 \( \text{xe8} \) \( \text{xe5} \) and
Black emerges a piece up.

23 \( \text{hg4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 24 \( \text{xe8} \) \( \text{xe8} \) 25 \( \text{xf6} \)
\( \text{gxf6} \) 26 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{e5} \) 27 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 28 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{f7} \)
29 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{e5} + \) 30 \( \text{d2} \)

Simpler was 30 \( \text{f3} \)! and the ending
should be drawn.

30...\( \text{g5} \) 31 \( \text{f3} ? \)

White errs again. This time the correct
continuation was 31 \( \text{h1} \) in order, after
31...g6, to respond with 32 f3. Then ...f6-f5 has no effect since White takes on f5 with check.

31...h5!

Of course! Black wins a pawn since 32 gxh5? hxg2+ is hopeless for White.

32...e3 hxg4 33 d4 gxh3 34 gxh3 d5 35 c3 b3?! Black reckons that his b3-pawn will be strong (nobody denies it) and that this will decide the game, but what is more important is that with this move Black loses time which could have been better used for bringing his king towards the centre. The following variation shows that Black has excellent winning chances: 35...bxc3 36 bxc3 f5 37 e1 c6 38 a5 d6! (stronger than 38...d7 39 b1! fx3 40 xd5 xc3 41 b7+ d8 42 b6 after which White can claim the old saying ‘all rook and pawn endgames are drawn’) 39 b1 f4+! (less accurate is 39...fx3?! 40 b6+ c7 41 xd5 with a draw) 40 c3 h4 41 b6+ c5 42 xa6 f5 and White is in a difficult situation because 43 f4+? x4 44 e6+ x6 45 x4 d4! leads to a lost king and pawn ending by one single tempo.

36 e1!

It is important to cut off the black king from the e-file.

36...e6 37 e3 a5 38 c5 g6 39 e2 g5 40 b5 d4?!

This ending is difficult to play from both sides. Maybe a better winning try was the move 40...e5?. Black seems to be quicker by a split second after 41 h2 f4 42 xa5 x3 43 b6 f5 44 c5 f4 45 a5 e3 46 a6 f3 47 a7 c8 48 xd5 f2 49 h1 c8l. 41 cxd4 f4 42 c6 x3 43 e1 h5 44 d5

White’s passed d-pawn grants him sufficient counterplay and Black has no more winning chances.

44...h2 45 b1 c2 46 d6 c3 47 bxc3 xc3+ 48 b6 d3 47 c7 c3+ 48 b6 d3 49 c7 d6 50 a8 e2 51 d7 d2 52 e7 e3 53 x6 d3 54 x3 d7 55 b5 c3 56 x5a ½-½

Game 94

Tseshkovsky-Malaniuk

USSR Championship 1987

1 e4 e5 2 c3 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 e7 6 d1 b5 7 a3 0-0 8 d4 x3 9 d4 exd4 10 e5 a8 11 c3?!

This sharp gambit continuation requires very careful play from Black, especially as White has pressure on the a2-g8 diagonal. This continuation might be psychologically unpleasant for the Marshall player, who expects to attack and not, as in this case, defend.

11...dxc3 12 xc3 d6 13 x1 a6

Too slow is 13...b8?!), after which White gets a lasting initiative with 14 f4 and now:

a) 14...e5 15 xe5 b7 16 wh5 c5 17 ad1 c8 18 d3! (starting a kingside attack when the majority of the black pieces are still on the eighth rank) 18...xe5 19 xe5 c6 20 xg5 xg4 21 wxg4 xg4 22 e7 c5 23 x7d7 c4 24 xc4 bxc4 25 x3b7 with clear advantage for White in the ending due to his total domination of the seventh rank, McShane-D.Pedersen, Abihome (rapid) 2000.

b) 14...b7 15 d5 xd5 16 xd5 dxe5 17 xe5 d6 18 ad1 wh8 (no better is the alternative 18...wh4 as White will still retain a strong initiative) 19 e7 wh7 (obviously the
 knight on c7 is taboo) 20 \text{\textsf{W}}h5 \text{\textsf{Q}}d8? (the last chance to defend was 20...b4?! with the idea of 21 \text{\textsf{Q}}e3 \text{\textsf{Q}}b5! with the unpleasant pin along the fifth rank; 22 \text{\textsf{Q}}h3?? \text{\textsf{Q}}f6 covers the mate on h7 and wins a piece) 21 \text{\textsf{Q}}e3! \text{\textsf{W}}xc7 22 \text{\textsf{Q}}h3 \text{\textsf{Q}}f6 (the only defence but...) 23 \text{\textsf{Q}}xf6 \text{\textsf{W}}e4 24 \text{\textsf{Q}}xd8 \text{\textsf{Q}}xd8 25 \text{\textsf{W}}xf7 and White won material in Vogt-Goldberg, East German Championship 1986.

14 \text{\textsf{Q}}d5 \text{\textsf{Q}}c8

The rook on a8 has been in danger from the white queen on f3.

15 \text{\textsf{Q}}f4 \text{\textsf{Q}}g5 16 \text{\textsf{Q}}xd1

Weaker is 16 \text{\textsf{Q}}g3?! c6 17 \text{\textsf{Q}}b4? c5! 18 \text{\textsf{Q}}xa6 d5!, trapping the knight.

16...\text{\textsf{Q}}h8?!

Black removes his king from the a2-g8 diagonal, planning to free himself with ...f7-f5 in some variations.

Bad was 16...\text{\textsf{Q}}xf4 17 \text{\textsf{Q}}xf4 \text{\textsf{Q}}xb3 18 \text{\textsf{W}}xb3 \text{\textsf{Q}}h8 19 e6! and Black is in a mess. Deserving attention, however, is 16...c6?! with the idea after 17 \text{\textsf{Q}}xg5 \text{\textsf{W}}xg5 18 \text{\textsf{Q}}b6 \text{\textsf{Q}}xb3 19 axb3 \text{\textsf{Q}}c7 20 exd6 to continue with 20...\text{\textsf{Q}}xd6! 21 \text{\textsf{Q}}xd6 \text{\textsf{W}}c5! and Black regains his piece with at least an equal position. Indeed, I think that this would be superior to the text, which seems to be a bit too slow.

17 \text{\textsf{Q}}g3

It was later found that the alternative 17 \text{\textsf{Q}}c2! was stronger.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Diagram after 17 \text{\textsf{Q}}c2}
\end{figure}

After 17 \text{\textsf{Q}}c2 White retains pressure. For example, 17...f5?! (Black had to play 17...g6 although after 18 \text{\textsf{Q}}g3! it is not easy to play this position for Black – quite simply he is very passive and White has too much pressure) 18 \text{\textsf{Q}}h5! h6? (this is a blunder but it was difficult to find anything better anyway, for instance 18...\text{\textsf{Q}}xd5 19 \text{\textsf{Q}}xg5 \text{\textsf{Q}}f7 20 \text{\textsf{W}}h4! \text{\textsf{W}}d7 21 g4! \text{\textsf{Q}}e6 22 \text{\textsf{Q}}xf5 \text{\textsf{Q}}xf5 23 e6 \text{\textsf{W}}c6 24 \text{\textsf{Q}}e7 \text{\textsf{Q}}f6 25 \text{\textsf{Q}}b3! \text{\textsf{Q}}g6 26 \text{\textsf{Q}}f7 \text{\textsf{Q}}h3 27 \text{\textsf{Q}}g3! and White emerges the exchange up with a technically winning position, or 18...\text{\textsf{Q}}xf4 19 \text{\textsf{Q}}xf4 \text{\textsf{Q}}f7 20 \text{\textsf{W}}xf5 g6 21 \text{\textsf{Q}}h3 and White has regained his sacrificed pawn with a dominant position) 19 \text{\textsf{Q}}xg5 \text{\textsf{Q}}xg5 20 \text{\textsf{W}}xg5 hxg5 21 \text{\textsf{Q}}e7!, attacking the rook on c8 and threatening a check on g6, I.Gurevich-Nunn, Hastings 1992/93.

17...c6 18 exd6 \text{\textsf{Q}}xd5

Of course 18...\text{\textsf{Q}}xd5? is met strongly by 19 \text{\textsf{Q}}xe6! etc.

19 \text{\textsf{Q}}xd5 cxd5 20 \text{\textsf{W}}xd5

White’s strong passed pawn more than compensates for his piece deficit.

20...\text{\textsf{Q}}e2 21 d7 \text{\textsf{Q}}c7 22 \text{\textsf{Q}}xc7 \text{\textsf{Q}}xc7 23 \text{\textsf{W}}d6 \text{\textsf{Q}}a7?

The best defence. The back rank is vulnerable, as can be seen in the following variation: 23...\text{\textsf{Q}}c2? 24 h4! (White’s first rank is also vulnerable!) 24...\text{\textsf{Q}}xh4 25 \text{\textsf{W}}xf8+! \text{\textsf{Q}}xf8 26 \text{\textsf{Q}}e8 \text{\textsf{Q}}g8 27 d8\text{\textsf{W}} and White wins.

24 \text{\textsf{W}}xf8+ \text{\textsf{Q}}xf8 25 \text{\textsf{Q}}xe8 \text{\textsf{Q}}a8 ½-½

White has nothing better than 26 d8\text{\textsf{W}} \text{\textsf{W}}xe8 27 \text{\textsf{W}}xg5 h6, which is completely equal.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
1 & e4 & e5 & 2 & \text{\textsf{Q}}f3 & \text{\textsf{Q}}c6
\hline
3 & \text{\textsf{Q}}b5 & a6 & 4 & \text{\textsf{Q}}a4 & \text{\textsf{Q}}f6
\hline
5 & 0-0 & \text{\textsf{Q}}e7 & 6 & \text{\textsf{Q}}e1 & b5
\hline
7 & \text{\textsf{Q}}b3 & 0-0 & 8 & d4 & \text{\textsf{Q}}xd4
\hline
9 & \text{\textsf{Q}}xd4 & exd4 & 10 & e5 & \text{\textsf{Q}}e8
\hline
11 & \text{\textsf{Q}}c3 & dxc3 & & & \text{\textsf{Q}}b7
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Game 95 Sznapik-Pytel Polanica Zdroj 1984}
\end{table}

This move is playable, although modern day theory considers 12...d6 almost compulsory. With the text Black immediately deploys his bishop on the long diagonal, thus
preventing White from playing \( \text{Qd}1\text{-f3} \). However, White’s queen has other useful squares available, namely \( \text{g4} \) and \( \text{h5} \), from where he can commence a serious kingside attack. Note that, due to the pawn on \( e5 \), White is ideally placed to attack, so Black must be very careful and should initially defend before later making use of his extra pawn.

13 \( \text{Qd5} \)

A straightforward continuation but other moves here are also possible:

a) 13 \( \text{Qf4 d6} \) (too passive is 13...\( \text{Qh8} \)!) 14 \( \text{Qh5 g6} 15 \text{Qh6 Qg7} 16 \text{Qd1 Qh4}! 17 \text{Qc2 Qe6 18 Qd3} – correct is 18 \( \text{Qc1} – 18...\text{Qxf4} 19 \text{Qxf4 Qg5} 20 \text{Qd4 f6 21 f4 fxe5 22 fxe5 Qf4 23 Qxd7 Qf8 24 Qxc7 Qf7 25 Qb6 Qe7! and suddenly White was unable to meet the threat of ...Qc7-c5+, Panchagesan-Santon, London 1993) 14 \( \text{Qh5 dxe5 15 Qad1 Qd6}! \) (stronger than 15...\( \text{Qd6} \)?) 16 \( \text{Qxe5 Qd7} 17 \text{Qc3 Qc6} 18 \text{Qd5 Qc5 19 Qc3} – even better was the immediate 19 \( \text{Qd4} – 19...\text{Qd8 20 Qd4! with multiple threats, Polzin-Montavon, Dresden 1998) 16 Qxe5 Qf6 17 Qd5 Qxe5 18 Qxe5 Qxd5 19 Qxd5 Qb8 20 Qd3 Qf6 21 Qh3 Qg6 22 Qxg6 hxg6 23 Qc3 Qc8 (inferior is 23...Qf8?! 24 f4!, which only helps White) 24 Qe7 c5 25 Qf3 (weaker is 25 Qd7?! Qd8 26 Qxd8+ Qxd8 27 Qxc5? because of 27...Qe4! and White’s back rank weakness suddenly decides the game in Black’s favour) 25...Qf8

26 Qd7 Qb6 (or 26...Qbd8 27 Qxf7+! Qxf7 28 Qxf7 and, although the rook and pawn endgame is still most probably a draw, it is White who is slightly better) 27 Qf1 Qc4 with a possible draw in the ending. White’s activity is sufficient compensation for the pawn, but not more.

b) 13 \( \text{Qd3} \) c5 14 \( \text{Qc2} \) (better than 14 \( \text{Qd5} \)?) \( \text{Qxd5} 15 \text{Qxd5 Qc7} 16 \text{Qb6 Qa7} 17 \text{Qc3 d5} 18 Qxd6 Qc6! 19 Qad1 Qxb6 20 Qxe7 Qxe7 21 b4 and White was struggling to justify his pawn sacrifice in Romanishin-Tsekhovskiy, USSR Team Championship 1978) 14...f5 15 Qh3 g6 16 Qh6 Qf7 17 Qad1 d5 18 e6 Qf6 19 Qg5 Qxe6 (naturally forced because after 19...Qf8?! 20 Qxe7 Qxe7 21 Qxd5 Qxd5 22 Qxd5 Qdf6) White would be clearly better thanks to the strong e6-pawn, which is a thorn in Black’s side) 20 Qxe6 Qxg5 21 Qg3 d4 22 a4?! and although this position is difficult to assess, my gut feeling is that it is probably equal.

c) 13 \( \text{Qh5}! \) yields nothing for White after 13...d5! 14 Qxd6 Qxd6 15 Qg5 Qf6 16 Qh4 Qh6 17 Qxh6? (overoptimistically played – it was better to settle for 17 Qxf6 Qxf6 18 Qxf6 Qxf6 and Black is only slightly better) 17...gxh6 18 Qxh6 Qh7! 19 Qc2 f5 20 Qxf5 Qxf5 21 Qg6+ Qh8 22 Qxf5 Qh4 23 g3 Qg5 with a clear advantage to Black in Rigo-Pinter, Hungarian Championship 1978.

13...Qxd5

Alternatively:

a) 13...d6 14 e6! f5 15 Qf4 Qf6 16 Qxe7+?! (White should have kept up the pressure and played 16 Qc1! retaining the initiative) 16...Qxe7 17 Qc1 Qae8 18 Qd4 Qe4 19 Qa7 c5 20 Qxe4? (better was 20 f3 but in any case Black has a clear advantage after 20...c4 21 fxe4 fxe4! attacking both bishops and regaining the sacrificed piece) 20...fxe4 21 Qxd6 Qxd6 22 e7+ c4! 23 Qxh8+ Qxh8 24 Qd1 (24 Qxb7 is no better due to 24...c3! 25 Qxc3 Qd2! and if the white rook moves, then Qf2+ leads to mate) 24...Qf6 25 Qc2 Qxb2 with a winning posi-

b) 13...c6 14 ∆xc7+ ∆xe7 15 ∆h5 ∆f6 16 ∆h4 (also worthy of consideration is 16 ∆g5? ∆xh5 17 ∆xc7 ∆f8 18 ∆d6 with a blockade on the dark squares which compensates for the pawn deficit) 16...d5 17 ∆g5 ∆c6 18 ∆c2 h6 19 ∆d2 c5 20 ∆g3 f5 with an unclear position in Fedorowicz-Chudinovsky, US Open 1996.

14 ∆xd5

Or 14 ∆xd5!? c6 15 ∆b3 ∆h8 16 ∆h5 g6 17 ∆f3 f6 18 ∆h6 (the alternative is 18 e6 d5 19 ∆h6 ∆g7 20 ∆ac1 ∆e8 21 ∆c3 ∆c8 22 ∆a5 ∆d6 23 ∆xa6 ∆e5 – White has managed to regain his sacrificed pawn but in the meantime Black has succeeded in activating his pieces – 24 a4 bxa4 25 ∆xa4 ∆xe6 26 ∆xe6 ∆d6 27 ∆a3 ∆xh2+ 28 ∆f1 ∆xa3 29 bxa3 ∆d6 30 a4 ∆a3 31 ∆c2 ∆f8 32 ∆c3 ∆f5 33 ∆xa3 ∆d4! and Black regains a piece and should at least draw) 18...∆g7 19 ∆c3? (correct is 19 e6! dxe6 20 ∆xg7+ ∆xg7 21 ∆xe6 c5 22 ∆d1 – after 22 ∆ae1 Black can defend with 22...∆a7! – 22...∆c7 23 ∆d5 ∆ad8 24 ∆xa6 ∆d6 with equal play) 19...fxe5 20 ∆xe5 ∆f6 21 ∆d6 ∆xb2 22 ∆d1 ∆h4 23 ∆xg7+ ∆xg7 24 g3 ∆f6 25 ∆xf6+ ∆xf6 26 ∆xd7 c5 and Black has an extra pawn in Nunez-Bandres, Madrid 2000.

14...∆h8

Black intends to free himself by ...f7-f5. Observe how White’s e-pawn continues to

15 a4

Deserving of attention is 15 ∆c2!? which I regard as more logical since White’s chances lie on the kingside and not on the opposite wing.

15...c6 16 ∆f3 f5 17 exf6?

This error allows Black to completely free himself. More to the point was 17 ∆d3!, keeping the tension in the centre as well as on the kingside.

17...∆xf6 18 ∆c2 g6 19 ∆a3 ∆g7 20 ∆g4 ∆e8 21 ∆d1 ∆e6!

The rook is ideally placed on e6 – it defends the vulnerable kingside as well as giving the option of doubling on the e-file.

22 h4

After 22 ∆h3 ∆e8 23 ∆d2 ∆xb2 24 ∆h4 ∆h5! White’s attack reaches a dead end.

22...∆e8 23 ∆h6 ∆xb2 24 ∆a2?

Here White’s rook will be misplaced. Correct was 24 ∆e3, although it is doubtful whether this would have changed the result of the game.

24...∆e1+ 25 ∆h2 ∆xd1 26 ∆xd1 d5

White has nothing to show for his material deficit and Black advances his central pawns. Black still has to be careful to prevent a possible kingside attack. However, the position can be assessed as winning for Black.

27 f4

The bishop was taboo – 27 ∆xb2 ∆c5+ and Black wins.
27...Af6 28 g4 Ae6 29 h5 g5 30 axb5
Afxf4 31 bxa6 We3

With the invasion of the black queen, the
game is decided.
32 Wf1 Aa5 33 Ah1 Ae2 34 Axa5
Ag3+ 35 Wg2 Wxf1 0-1

Game 96
Marco-Schlechter
Trebic 1915

1 e4 e5 2 Af3 Ac6 3 Ab5 a6 4 a4 Aa5
5 0-0 Ac7 6 d4 exd4 7 Ae1 0-0 8 e5
Ae8 9 Axd4 Axd4 10 Wxd4

White’s dark-squared bishop is compared to
Black’s knight after the exchange) 15 Axc4
Ab7? (better was 15...d6!? 16 Wg4 d5 17
exd6 Axd6 18 Ag5 Wc8 19 Wxc8 Axc8
(unfortunately for Black 19...Axc8 is no
better due to 20 Ac7! Axf4 21 Aad1 with
unbearable pressure) 20 Aed1 Ab6 and now
in the ancient game Passmore-Leonhardt,
London 1904 White missed the chance for
21 Ae4 Ae5 22 Axc5 Ab2 23 Ac7 Ae8 24
Ad8!

This wins a piece due to the weakness of
Black’s back rank.
14 Ac2!

The text is stronger than 13 Axc4?! d5! 14
exd6 Axd6 15 Ae3 Ae8 with a good posi-
tion for Black.
14...g6 15 Ah6?!

White maintains a strong initiative after 15
Ac3! Ab8 16 Ae4 Ab6 (a natural blunder
here is 16...d5? 17 exd6 Axd6 18 Ah6, win-
ing the exchange) and now, instead of 17
Wxc4?! d5! 18 exd6 Axd6 with equality, as
was seen in Van der Wiel-Ki.Georgiev, Wijk
aan Zee 1988, White could have obtained
great positional pressure by 17 Aed1 Ae6 18
Af4 etc.
15...Ee8 16 Wxc4

Another possibility here is 16 Ac3 Ab8
and now:

a) 17 Aed1? Ab2 18 Ae4 Ag5 19 Axc5
Wg5 20 Axd7 Axd7 21 Aed7 Ab5 22 e6
Axe6 23 Wa8+ Wg7 24 Axc6 Wxf5!

Strange by transposition of moves, we
have reached a position arising from the 6 d4
Ruy Lopez, which is classified under another
code in ECO – C84.
10...b5 11 Ab3 c5?!

We shall see the stronger continuation
11...Ab7 in Game 97. The text doesn’t solve
all the opening problems for Black.
12 We4 Ac7 13 c4!

Black easily equalises after 13 c3 d5! 14
exd6 Ad6 etc.
13...bxc4

ECO stated that 13...Ab8 is an improve-
ment for Black but in fact it doesn’t change
the position much. For example, 13...Ab8 14
Ac3 bxc4 (or 14...Ab7 15 Ad5 d6 16 Ac2
g6 17 Axc7+ Wxe7 18 exd6 Wxd6 19 Wf4
with a clear advantage to White due to his
dominant pair of bishops – note how strong
25 h4 \textit{w}xe6 and White must lose material and the game, Blazova-S.Vajda, European Girls Under 18 Championship 1996.

b) 17 \textit{w}xc4 \textit{b}b4! 18 \textit{w}d3 \textit{h}4! 19 \textit{e}e3 d5 20 exd6 \textit{b}xb6 21 h3? (necessary was 21 g3 although Black still retains good attacking chances) 21...\textit{x}h3! 22 gxh3 \textit{b}xb3 with a strong attack against the white king, Brooks-Kaidanov, New York 1990.

16...\textit{b}7

Also good was the natural 16...d5!? etc.

17 f4?

An ugly move that unnecessarily weakens White’s kingside. Better was 17 \textit{c}c3 \textit{g}5 18 \textit{c}c4! (maybe White did not see this defence?) 18...\textit{x}h6 19 \textit{xb}7 \textit{b}b8 20 \textit{f}3 \textit{g}7 21 \textit{w}xc5 \textit{xe}5! 22 \textit{w}xe5 d6 23 \textit{e}e8+! (otherwise Black is better) 23...\textit{xe}8 24 \textit{w}a3 \textit{c}c7 with an approximately equal position.

17...d5 18 exd6 \textit{xd}6 19 \textit{xe}8+ \textit{xe}8 20 \textit{w}c3 \textit{f}8

Possibly even stronger is 20...\textit{e}6 followed by...\textit{a}8-d8 etc.

21 \textit{xf}8 \textit{xf}8 22 \textit{d}d2 \textit{e}8 23 \textit{f}3 \textit{b}5 24 \textit{w}b3?

This loses by force, although White’s chances of saving the game are very slim even after 24 \textit{w}d3. For instance, 24...c4 25 \textit{f}1 \textit{c}5+ (or 25...\textit{xf}3 26 \textit{xf}3 \textit{d}d4 27 \textit{f}2 and for the moment White is holding his own) 26 \textit{f}2 etc.

24...c4!
The strongest reply. Black doesn’t fall behind in development as after 11...c5?! Here Black simply develops the bishop on the long diagonal.

12 c4

The alternative is 12 c3 d6 13  \( \texttt{a}4 \) dxe5 and now:

a) 14  \texttt{wx}e5 \texttt{xd}6 15  \texttt{w}g5 h6 16  \texttt{w}g3  \texttt{xf}6 17  \texttt{xd}xd6  \texttt{xd}xd6 18  \texttt{xd}xd8 19  \texttt{xd}ad1 \texttt{d}f5 20  \texttt{w}g4  \texttt{d}d6 21  \texttt{c}c2  \texttt{e}e8 with a roughly equal position, Navarro-Peng Xiaomin, Moscow Olympiad 1994.

b) It is interesting to follow the old game Steiner-Marshall, Bradley Beach 1929 to see how the godfather of the Marshall gambit met 8 d4, That game continued 14  \texttt{xe}5 \texttt{d}d6 15  \texttt{f}h4 16  \texttt{c}e2  \texttt{d}8 17  \texttt{a}7  \texttt{a}8 18  \texttt{d}d2  \texttt{f}7 19  \texttt{f}f1  \texttt{c}e5 20  \texttt{w}xa6  \texttt{h}4 21  \texttt{w}xb5 \texttt{e}3 22  \texttt{w}xe3 \texttt{xd}2 23  \texttt{c}e2  \texttt{xh}2 24  \texttt{xd}2  \texttt{wh}1+ 25  \texttt{w}e2  \texttt{wa}1 26  \texttt{w}f2  \texttt{wh}1 with unclear play.

After 12 c3, instead of 12...d6 Black also has the possibility of 12...c5 13  \texttt{w}g4 d5 14  \texttt{d}d2  \texttt{wb}6 15  \texttt{c}c2  \texttt{c}8 16  \texttt{w}c2 (a possible improvement for White is 16  \texttt{h}3? \texttt{c}c7 17  \texttt{b}3 etc.) 16...\texttt{g}6 17  \texttt{a}4 \texttt{ba}4\texttt{f}? 18  \texttt{xa}4  \texttt{g}7 19  \texttt{d}d2  \texttt{d}e6 20  \texttt{h}3  \texttt{d}d8 21  \texttt{c}c2  \texttt{b}7 and here the game was agreed drawn, Xie Jun-Hort, Amsterdam 2001.

12...\texttt{xc}4

Or 12...c5 13  \texttt{w}g4 d6 14  \texttt{a}4! dxe5 15  \texttt{xe}5  \texttt{d}f6 (after 15...\texttt{d}d6 16  \texttt{c}c3  \texttt{xc}5 17  \texttt{xc}5 b4 18  \texttt{xa}4 Black’s c-pawn is very weak) 16  \texttt{w}g3  \texttt{c}8 17  \texttt{c}c2  \texttt{dh}5 18  \texttt{d}d3  \texttt{g}6 19  \texttt{c}c3  \texttt{d}8 20  \texttt{w}e2  \texttt{e}8 21  \texttt{d}d2  \texttt{g}4 22  \texttt{d}d5  \texttt{g}5 23  \texttt{w}d1  \texttt{w}c4 24  \texttt{lb}6  \texttt{c}6 25  \texttt{xa}8  \texttt{xa}8 26  \texttt{a}4  \texttt{w}f6 27  \texttt{d}xg5  \texttt{xg}5 28  \texttt{c}e4 with material advantage to White, Pernutz-Kienast, Germany 1994.

13  \texttt{xc}4  \texttt{d}5 14  \texttt{ex}d6

White can try to keep his strong e5-pawn alive by playing 14  \texttt{w}d3 but Black is absolutely fine after 14...c5 15  \texttt{c}c2  \texttt{f}5! 16  \texttt{ex}f6  \texttt{xf}6 etc.

14...\texttt{xd}6 15  \texttt{w}g4  \texttt{af}6 16  \texttt{dc}3  \texttt{db}5!

Less to the point was 16...\texttt{b}8 17  \texttt{f}4  \texttt{c}6 18  \texttt{ad}1  \texttt{ab}4 19  \texttt{w}g3  \texttt{ad}4 20  \texttt{c}5  \texttt{xd}1 21  \texttt{xd}1  \texttt{e}8 22  \texttt{f}4!  \texttt{w}e7 23  \texttt{d}d5  \texttt{xd}5 24  \texttt{xd}5 with a small but lasting advantage to White, Nijboer-I.Sokolov, Dutch Championship 1996.

17  \texttt{xb}5

White has to exchange the knights, thus improving Black’s pawn structure, otherwise Black will plant his knight on d4 with an excellent position.

17...\texttt{xb}5 18  \texttt{f}4  \texttt{c}5

It’s risky to take the hot pawn on b2: 18...\texttt{xb}2?! 19  \texttt{ad}1  \texttt{w}f6 (or 19...\texttt{c}8 20  \texttt{xc}8  \texttt{xc}8 21  \texttt{d}d7 etc.) 20  \texttt{d}d7 and now 20...\texttt{c}8? loses on the spot to 21  \texttt{xf}7!.

19  \texttt{ad}1  \texttt{wc}8 20  \texttt{xc}8  \texttt{xc}8 21  \texttt{d}d6  \texttt{fd}8 22  \texttt{xc}5  \texttt{xd}1 23  \texttt{xd}1  \texttt{xb}2 24  \texttt{b}3  \texttt{g}6 25  \texttt{ae}3  \texttt{g}7 26  \texttt{d}d1  \texttt{c}6 27  \texttt{f}3  \texttt{c}7 28  \texttt{f}4  \texttt{d}7 29  \texttt{d}6  \texttt{f}6 30  \texttt{f}2  \texttt{h}5 31  \texttt{f}4  \texttt{h}4 32  \texttt{g}4  \texttt{hxg}3+  \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}
The Marshall Attack

Summary
After 8 d4 Qxd4 9 Qxd4 exd4 10 e5 Qe8 11 c3!? I prefer Pyl'ts 12...Qb7 (Game 95) to the previous game's 12...d6. However, White's main error in Game 95 is 17 exf6?, which frees Black's position on the kingside. White should have instead kept his e5-pawn, which both assists in his attack as well as restricting Black's pieces.

Although Black won the game after 11...c5?! 12 We4 Qc7 13 c4! bxc4 14 Qc2! in Game 96, I would not recommend 11...c5?! because White could have played better on various occasions later on in the game. Stronger is the logical developing move 11...Qb7 (Game 97), which gives Black approximately equal chances.

1 e4 e5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 Qb5 a6 4 Qa4 Qf6 5 0-0 Qe7 6 Qe1 b5 7 Qb3 0-0 8 d4 Qxd4!
(D) 9 Qxd4
   9 Qxf7+?! – Game 93
9...exd4 10 e5 Qe8 (D) 11 Wxd4
11 c3!? dxc3 12 Qxc3 (D)
   12...Qb7 – Game 95; 2...d6 – Game 94
11...Qb7 – Game 97
11...c5?! – Game 96

8...Qxd4! 10...Qe8 12 Qxc3
CHAPTER TEN

Other Anti-Marshalls

1 e4 e5 2 d3f3 d6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 d7 6 d1 b5 7 b3 0-0

In this final chapter we shall be dealing with two more Anti-Marshall systems:

1) 8 d3 d6 9 c3
2) 8 c3 d5 9 d4

1) With 8 d3 White adopts a slow set up which is an Anti-Marshall despite being classified under the Closed Ruy Lopez opening code C90 (the same position can be reached after 8 c3 d6 9 d3).

9...b8, as in Game 98, leads to a kind of Breyer Variation of the Closed Ruy Lopez, with White keeping a small but lasting advantage.

Games 99-100 see the main line of 9...d5 10 c2 c5. Now I recommend for Black the plan of transferring the knight from f6 to the queenside, leading to positions with rich counterplay.

2) Here White does not hesitate to grasp the initiative away from Black and quickly counterattacks in the centre with 9 d4!? This line first became popular after the famous encounter Botvinnik-Kan (Game 102) and it has now embarked on its second life. From a psychological point of view, 9 d4!? is an unpleasant move for a Marshall devotee to meet as he usually prefers to attack rather than to be put under pressure.

Basically Black now is faced with a difficult choice between three lines: 9...dxe4?!, 9...dxe4 and 9...exd4.

We begin our study with 9...dxe4? (Game 101). This cannot be recommended since White enjoys domination of the centre due to his powerful knight on e5.

In Games 102-104 we see the so-called Breslau Variation of the Open Ruy Lopez, arising after 8...dxc4 10 dxc5 e6 11...d4! Note that the move order via the Open Lopez would be 1 e4 c5 2 d3f3 d6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 dxc4 6 d4 b5 7 b3 d5 8 dxe5 c6 9 c3 d7 10 e1 0-0 11...d4. This is perfectly playable for Black. However, from the psychological viewpoint I believe it's not suitable for Marshall players because the positions are very different to normal Marshall positions.

In Game 105 Black plays 9...exd4, which I believe is the critical move.

Game 98

Arakhamia Grant-B.Lalić

Port Erin 2001

1 e4 e5 2 d3f3 d6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d6 5 0-0 d7 6 d1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 d3 d6
Black tries to transpose play into the Breyer Variation of the Closed Spanish. However this line is somewhat passive and doesn't grant Black full equality.

10...\(\text{Qd}8\) 11...\(\text{Qf}1\) 12...\(\text{Qc}5\) 12...\(\text{Qc}2\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 13...\(\text{Qd}4\) 14...\(\text{Qd}7\) 15...\(\text{Qb}7\) 15...\(\text{b}3\)

In the old game Nikitin-Bebchuk, Moscow Championship 1963 the continuation was 15...\(\text{Qf}8\) (also deserving attention is 15...\(\text{a}5\)!, looking for counterplay on the queenside) 16...\(\text{a}4\) 17...\(\text{d}3\) 16 18...\(\text{Qg}7\) 19...\(\text{dxe}5\) \(\text{dxe}5\) 20...\(\text{axb}5\) \(\text{axb}5\) 21...\(\text{Qxa}8\) 22...\(\text{xa}8\) 22...\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{Qb}8\) 23...\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{bxc}4\) 24...\(\text{c}6\) \(\text{Qf}7\) 25...\(\text{Qg}5\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 26...\(\text{Qa}2\) \(\text{Qb}6\) and now, instead of 27...\(\text{Qb}3\)!, White missed a direct win with 23...\(\text{xf}7\) 28...\(\text{Qe}3\) 29...\(\text{Qf}7\) 30...\(\text{Qf}7\) \(\text{Qa}5\) and Black loses material.

15...\(\text{Qf}8\) 16...\(\text{d}5\) 17...\(\text{Qc}7\) 18...\(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qec}8\) 19...\(\text{Qc}1\) 20...\(\text{bx}c4\) 21...\(\text{Qf}5\)

Here White is actively placed and if Black ever plays ...\(g7\)-\(g6\), then \(\text{Qf}5\)-\(\text{h}6\)+ is rather awkward to meet.

21...\(\text{cx}d5\) 22...\(\text{cx}d5\) \(\text{Qd}8\) 23...\(\text{h}3\)

A traditional Ruy Lopez plan – the knight is heading to h2 and later g4. White’s queen will go to f3 with mounting pressure on the kingside.

23...\(\text{Qc}5\) 24...\(\text{Qh}2\) \(\text{Qc}8\)!

The best move. This enables the manoeuvre ...\(\text{Qb}7\)-c8 to give Black the option of exchanging on f5, as well as giving Black further counterplay on the b-file.

Thematic! White will need the f-file for her kingside attack. If Black exchanges on f4, White will get possession of the important d4-square.

25...\(\text{Qc}8\) 26...\(\text{fxe}5\) \(\text{dxe}5\) 27...\(\text{Qxf}3\) 28...\(\text{Qxf}5\) \(\text{Qb}2\)!

I didn’t want to play 28...\(\text{Qd}7\), which allows 29...\(\text{Qa}4\) 30...\(\text{Qb}2\) 30...\(\text{Qg}5\) \(\text{Qxa}2\) 31...\(\text{Qc}6\), but this was better than the text.

29...\(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{Qxa}2\) 30...\(\text{Qb}1\)

This is stronger than 30...\(\text{Qxe}5\) \(\text{Qcd}7\) etc.

30...\(\text{Qa}3\) 31...\(\text{Qxe}5\) \(\text{a}4\) 32...\(\text{Qf}1\)!

Dark clouds are gathering over Black’s kingside.

32...\(\text{Qd}7\)!

Offering a pawn in order to diminish the pressure and reach a playable ending, but White prefers to continue with her attack.

33...\(\text{Qf}4\) 34...\(\text{Qh}5\) 35...\(\text{Qh}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 35...\(\text{Qc}3\)

Deserving serious attention was 35...\(\text{Qh}5\) \(\text{fxe}5\) 36...\(\text{Qg}4\), but White was already getting short of time.

35...\(\text{Qd}3\)!

Playing for tricks. I didn’t want to play 35...\(\text{g}6\) because of 36...\(\text{Qg}4\) with deadly threats. However, much better instead was 35...\(\text{Qe}8\)! 36...\(\text{e}5\)! \(\text{Qxc}3\) (forced) 37...\(\text{Qxe}3\) 38...\(\text{Qc}3\) 39...\(\text{Qd}6\) 40...\(\text{Qg}4\) \(\text{Qxd}5\) 40...\(\text{Qh}6\) 41...\(\text{Qf}5\) \(\text{Qe}5\) 42...\(\text{Qh}5\) \(\text{a}3\) and Black’s passed a-pawn will save him from defeat.

36...\(\text{Qc}2\)!
Avoiding 36 \( \mathbb{W} \)xh5? \( \mathbb{Q} \)xc1 37 \( \mathbb{Q} \)xc1 \( \mathbb{Q} \)c8 38 e5 g6 39 \( \mathbb{W} \)f3 \( \mathbb{Q} \)h6 40 \( \mathbb{Q} \)g4 \( \mathbb{W} \)a7+! followed by ...\( \mathbb{Q} \)xc1 and Black wins.

36...\( \mathbb{W} \)e8

The intended 36...\( \mathbb{Q} \)a1?! 37 \( \mathbb{Q} \)xa1 \( \mathbb{W} \)a7+ 38 \( \mathbb{Q} \)c2 \( \mathbb{Q} \)g3 loses to 39 \( \mathbb{Q} \)f3! \( \mathbb{Q} \)xf1 40 \( \mathbb{Q} \)d4 \( \mathbb{Q} \)c5 41 c5! h6 42 \( \mathbb{W} \)e4! \( \mathbb{Q} \)g3 43 \( \mathbb{W} \)h7+ \( \mathbb{Q} \)f7 44 e6+ etc.

37 \( \mathbb{Q} \)g4?!

Time trouble. After the game Ketevan said that she didn’t know why she played this move – probably she considered this move in many variations earlier on in the game so she played it automatically. The simple 37 \( \mathbb{Q} \)b2 would have won easily as it traps the rook on a3.

37...\( \mathbb{Q} \)c5+

I was aware that the position had changed in my favour but at this point I offered a draw. However, probably from inertia White continues to play for a win although obviously she should have taken the half-point.

38 \( \mathbb{Q} \)h1? \( \mathbb{Q} \)d4 39 \( \mathbb{Q} \)xd4 \( \mathbb{Q} \)xd4 40 \( \mathbb{Q} \)f3

Or 40 \( \mathbb{Q} \)fc1 \( \mathbb{Q} \)g3+ 41 \( \mathbb{Q} \)h2 h5 42 \( \mathbb{Q} \)c7 \( \mathbb{Q} \)e2!, avoiding all tricks and winning for Black.

40...\( \mathbb{Q} \)a1 41 \( \mathbb{Q} \)f1 \( \mathbb{W} \)b8 42 \( \mathbb{W} \)xh5 \( \mathbb{Q} \)xb1 43 \( \mathbb{Q} \)c1 \( \mathbb{Q} \)xc1 44 \( \mathbb{Q} \)xc1 a3 45 e5 a2 46 exf6 \( \mathbb{W} \)f4! 0-1

The last trick was hidden in 46...a1\( \mathbb{W} \)?? 47 \( \mathbb{Q} \)h6+! with a draw by perpetual after 47...\( \mathbb{Q} \)h8 48 \( \mathbb{Q} \)f7+ etc. Note that 47...\( \mathbb{Q} \)xh6??

allows mate after 48 \( \mathbb{W} \)g4+.

---

**Game 99**

**Benjamin-Timman**

**Amsterdam 1994**

1 e4 e5 2 \( \mathbb{Q} \)f3 \( \mathbb{Q} \)c6 3 \( \mathbb{Q} \)b5 a6 4 \( \mathbb{Q} \)a4 \( \mathbb{Q} \)f6 5 0-0 \( \mathbb{Q} \)e7 6 \( \mathbb{Q} \)e1 b5 7 \( \mathbb{Q} \)b3 d6 8 c3 0-0 9 d3 \( \mathbb{Q} \)a5

This is most frequently played by Black – he will follow up with the traditional plan of ...c7-c5 The arising position is similar to the Chigorin Variation of the Ruy Lopez. The only difference is that White delays playing d3-d4 until a more convenient moment.

The alternative 9...\( \mathbb{Q} \)e6 leads to a slow manoeuvring game after 10 \( \mathbb{Q} \)bd2 followed by \( \mathbb{Q} \)f1 etc, whilst also deserving attention is 10 a4?, attacking Black’s stronghold on b5.

10 \( \mathbb{Q} \)c2 c5 11 \( \mathbb{Q} \)bd2 \( \mathbb{Q} \)d7!

This is the key move, which resembles Keres’s ...\( \mathbb{Q} \)f6-d7 in the Closed Ruy Lopez. As well as freeing the f6-square for his bishop, the knight is heading towards b6 from where it supports queenside play. Should White continue with d3-d4, Black is then ready to play ...\( \mathbb{Q} \)xd4 followed by ...\( \mathbb{Q} \)f6.

12 \( \mathbb{Q} \)f1 \( \mathbb{Q} \)b6 13 \( \mathbb{Q} \)g3 \( \mathbb{Q} \)c6

The knight has done his job on a5 (enabling him to play ...c7-c5) and now returns to the scene of the battle.

14 h3

This is a common manoeuvre in the Ruy Lopez. White prepares \( \mathbb{Q} \)f3-h2-g4, which is
effective if Black decides to go for ...d6-d5.
14...\( \text{He}6 \) 15 \( \text{Hf}2 \) \( \text{He}8 \) 16 \( \text{Hg}4 \) \( \text{Hg}5 \) 17
\( \text{Hf}5 \) \( \text{Hxc}1 \) 18 \( \text{Wxc}1 \) \( \text{Hxf}5 \)

This was not forced. 18...f6 was an alternative, after which White can try 19 \( \text{Hxg}7+ \) \( \text{Hxg}7 \) 20 \( \text{We}6+ \) \( \text{Hh}8 \) 21 \( \text{Hxf}6 \) \( \text{He}c7 \) 22 \( \text{Hxh}7 \) \( \text{Hxh}7 \) 23 \( \text{Wxe}6 \) \( \text{Wg}5 \) 24 \( \text{He}3 \) (not 24 \( \text{Wxd}6? \) \( \text{Hg}8 \) 25 g3 \( \text{Hxh}3 \) with a winning attack for Black) 24...\( \text{He}6 \) 25 \( \text{Hg}3 \) with approximately equal chances.

19 \( \text{Hxf}5 \) f6

Black would like to play 19...d5 but then
20 f6 is very unpleasant for Black. Deserving
attention is the recommendation of \textit{Friz} 7, 19...\textit{h}5?!, followed by ...d6-d5 – the weakening
of the kingside might not be so relevant
as it seems at first glance!

20 f4 \( \text{Wc}7 \) 21 \( \text{f}xe5 \) \( \text{Hxe}5 \) 22 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{Wh}8 \)
23 \( \text{He}d1 \) \( \text{Wf}7 \) 24 \( \text{Wf}4 \) \( \text{Hd}5 \) 25 \( \text{Wh}4 \) \( \text{g}5 \)!

Black needs some breathing space on the
kingside otherwise White would play 26
\( \text{He}h5 \) with advantage.

26 \( \text{fxg}6 \) \( \text{Hxg}6 \) 27 \( \text{He}8+ \) \( \text{Hxe}8 \) 28 \( \text{He}h5 \)

Practically forced due to the threat of
...\( \text{Hc}1+ \) with an unpleasant pin along the first
rank.

28...\( \text{Hxe}2 \) 29 \( \text{We}3 \) \( \text{He}5 \) 30 \( \text{f}3?! \)

Better was 30 \( \text{Hxg}6 \) with an equal position.
Now Black takes over the initiative.

30...\( \text{Hd}4 \) 31 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{cxd}4 \) 32 \( \text{cxd}4 \) \( \text{Hg}5 \)

Also promising for Black appears to be
30...\( \text{He}2?! \) etc.

33 \( \text{Wh}2 \) \( \text{Hxg}2 \)!

Black had this in mind when playing
32...\( \text{He}5 \).

34 \( \text{He}4 \)

On 34 \( \text{Hxg}2 \) \( \text{He}4 \) Black regains the piece
with advantage.

34...\( \text{He}4+ \) 35 \( \text{Hxg}5 \) \( \text{fxg}5 \) 36 \( \text{He}1 \) \( \text{Hf}4 \)
37 \( \text{He}1 \) \( \text{Wf}5 \) 38 \( \text{Wg}3 \) \( \text{Hxh}3+ \) 39 \( \text{Hh}2 \)
40 \( \text{He}8+ \) \( \text{He}7 \) 41 \( \text{He}4 \)?

White misses the draw with 41 \( \text{He}7+ \) \( \text{He}8 \)
42 \( \text{He}4 \) \( \text{Wf}6 \) 43 \( \text{Hxe}7 \) \( \text{Wxd}4 \) 44 \( \text{Wxg}5 \) \( \text{He}2+ \)
45 \( \text{He}1 \) and Black has nothing more than
perpetual check.

41...\( \text{He}6 \) 42 \( \text{Wg}4 \) \( \text{He}6 \)!

On h6 Black’s king feels absolutely safe.

43 \( \text{Wd}7 \) \( \text{Wf}6 \) 44 \( \text{He}6 \) \( \text{Wf}4+ \)

Even stronger was 44...\( \text{Wf}2+ \) 45 \( \text{He}1 \) \( \text{g}4 \),
threatening ...\( \text{g}3 \), which is an immediate win
for Black.

45 \( \text{He}1 \) \( \text{Wc}1+ \) 46 \( \text{He}2 \) \( \text{Wxb}2+ \) 47 \( \text{He}3 \)
48 \( \text{Wd}2 \) \( \text{Wxa}2+ \) 49 \( \text{He}1 \) \( \text{Wc}4+ \) 50
\( \text{He}1 \) \( \text{Wb}3+ \) 51 \( \text{He}1 \) \( \text{He}3+ \) 52 \( \text{He}1 \) \( \text{Wxd}4 \)

53 \( \text{Wxd}6 \) \( \text{Wxd}6 \) 54 \( \text{Hxd}6 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 55 \( \text{Wxa}6 \)
56 \( \text{He}5 \) \( \text{He}6 \) 57 \( \text{Wxb}5+ \) 58 \( \text{He}4 \) 59 \( \text{He}7 \)

This is a very difficult ending, where
White’s drawing chances are very high. The
other possibility was 58 \( \text{Hxg}6 \) \( \text{hxg}6 \) 59 \( \text{Hd}4+ \)
with a likely draw.

58...\( \text{Hg}5 \) 59 \( \text{He}4+ \) \( \text{He}3 \) 60 \( \text{He}5 \) \( \text{h}5 \)!

A nice trap because if 61 \( \text{He}3? \), then
61...\( \text{Hgx}3 \) 62 \( \text{Hxe}5 \) f2 63 \( \text{Hf}5 \) h4 64 \( \text{He}2 \) h3 65
\( \text{He}2 \) h2 and Black wins.

61 \( \text{He}8 \) ! \( \text{He}2 \) 62 \( \text{Hxg}4 \) \( \text{Hxg}4 \) 63 \( \text{He}8 \)

With two knights unable to deliver mate,
White ‘only’ needs to give up his rook
for the g-pawn to reach a book draw.

63...\( \text{Hg}5 \) 64 \( \text{He}5 \) \( \text{He}6 \) 65 \( \text{He}4 \) 66 \( \text{He}2 \)

Of course not 66 \( \text{Hxe}4?? \) \( \text{He}3 \) and Black
wins.

66...\( \text{Hg}5 \) 67 \( \text{He}3 \) \( \text{He}2 \) 68 \( \text{He}3 \) \( \text{He}2 \) 69
\( \text{He}3 \) \( \text{He}3 \) 70 \( \text{He}4 \) \( \text{He}4 \) 71 \( \text{He}5 \) \( \text{He}3 \) 72
\( \text{He}4 \) \( \text{He}4 \) 73 \( \text{He}3 \) \( \text{He}3 \) 74

Perhaps a better winning try was with
73...\( \text{He}1? \) 74 \( \text{He}d3 \) \( \text{He}c3 \) etc.

74 \( \text{He}4 \) \( \text{He}2 \) 75 \( \text{He}5 \) \( \text{He}3 \) 76 \( \text{He}4 \) \( \text{He}5 \)
77 \( \text{He}3 \) \( \text{He}6 \) 78 \( \text{He}d6 \) \( \text{He}e4+ \) 79 \( \text{He}e6 \)
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**Game 100**

**Korchnoi-Petrosian**

**Curacao 1962**

1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 f6 5 0-0 e7 6 e1 b5 7 b3 0-0 8 c3 d6 9 d3 d7 10 bd2 b6 11 f1 a5 12 c2 c5 13 c3

From e3 the knight controls not only the f5-square but also the vital d5-square, which means that Black's ...d6-d5 break has virtually been prevented once and for all.

13...c6 14 h3?!

This seems a bit slow. White should have played 14 d4! at once, leading to interesting play after 14...cxd4 15 cxd4 f6 16 d5 b4 (better than 16...d4? 17 exd4 exd4 18 f1!, after which Black's pawn on d4 is really weak, Bologan-Savon, Nikolaev 1993) 17 b1 a5 18 e2 d7 19 d2 a4 20 a3 a6 21 b4 axb4 22 axb4 b6 23 c1 f8 24 d3 b2!, Koc-Shamkovich, Leningrad 1957.

14...e6 15 d4 cxd4 16 cxd4 d4 17 exd4 exd4 18 xd4 xd4 19 xd4 c8 19 xd3 g6 20 b3 d4 21 d5 xd5 22 xd5 f6 23 b1 e8

Black has obtained the more promising position due to his active rooks and minor pieces. In particular, his knight on c4 is strong.

24 d1 e7 25 xxc4 xxc4 26 xxd6 xxe4 27 e3 e6

Despite the symmetrical pawn structure, Black's advantage is indisputable due to his excellently placed centralised pieces.

28 b8+ g7 29 b3 xc2 30 xc1 xe6

Black keeps things under control, not allowing White any counterplay like in the case of 30...xa2?? 31 e8! with a mating attack to follow.

31 xc2 xc2 32 a3 xc3 33 xd6 e5! 34 xd2

There is no time for pawn grabbing with 34 xa6? xc3! 35 xc3 xc3+ 36 h1 (forced as 36 f1? xg3 is an immediate win for Black) 36...xb3 37 f1 g3 38 g1 h2+ and Black should be winning.

34...h5! 35 e1 f5 36 d1 d3 37
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The only move because 37 \text{W}c2?? \text{Exe}3! is curtains.

37...\text{W}d7 38 \text{W}c1 \text{a}c3 39 \text{f}1 \text{W}d5 40 \text{b}4 \text{W}b3 41 \text{L}c5 \text{f}6 42 \text{f}4 \text{W}e6! 43 \text{W}c1 \text{a}c3

Black’s initiative has finally borne some fruit – he is winning a pawn.

44 \text{W}d2 \text{xa}3 45 \text{e}e1 \text{W}xe1+

This was the simplest way – converting to a winning bishop ending with an extra pawn.

46 \text{W}xe1 \text{a}a1 47 \text{f}f1 \text{xe}1+ 48 \text{xe}1 \text{a}5 49 \text{bxa}5 \text{c}c3+ 50 \text{d}d1 \text{xa}5 51 \text{d}d4+ \text{f}f8 52 \text{c}c2 \text{e}e7 53 \text{f}3 \text{d}d6 54 \text{e}e3 \text{d}d5 55 \text{b}b3 \text{c}c6 56 \text{d}d4 \text{b}6 57 \text{f}6 \text{c}c5 58 \text{b}b2 \text{d}d5 59 \text{e}e3 \text{e}e6 60 \text{g}4 \text{d}d5 61 \text{f}f6 \text{d}d6 62 \text{b}b2 \text{f}5 63 \text{g}xf5 \text{g}xf5 64 \text{c}c3 \text{f}4 65 \text{b}b2 \text{b}4

White is in zugzwang – there is no way of him preventing the intrusion of Black’s king to the kingside.

66 \text{f}6 \text{e}e5 67 \text{g}5 \text{d}d4 68 \text{xb}4 \text{e}e3 69 \text{c}c4 \text{xf}3 0-1

Game 101

Khalifman-Adams

\textit{Wijk aan Zee 2002}

1 e4 e5 2 \text{f}f3 \text{c}c6 3 \text{b}b5 a6 4 \text{a}a4 \text{f}f6 5 0-0 \text{e}e7 6 \text{e}e1 \text{b}5 7 \text{b}b3 0-0 8 \text{c}c3 \text{d}5 9 \text{d}d4!?

This old continuation has just become popular again. White refuses to be the defending party and declines to accept the pawn sacrifice. He accelerates the development of his own queenside and commences the struggle for the centre.

I would like to add that this continuation was at its peak in the middle of the last century due to the efforts of the late World Champion Mikhail Botvinnik (an example of a Botvinnik game follows this one).

White can avoid the Marshall Gambit by playing the quiet move 9 d3 which theory, with very good reason, gives as harmless for Black. One such example is 9...\text{dxe}4 10 \text{dxe}4 \text{xd}d1 11 \text{xd}d1 \text{b}7 12 \text{xd}d2 \text{x}d7! 13 \text{c}c2 (or 13 \text{d}d3 a5 14 \text{d}d3 a4 15 \text{d}d3 \text{xb}8 16 \text{b}b3 \text{c}c8 17 \text{c}c2 \text{c}c5 18 \text{e}e1 \text{f}6 19 \text{d}d1 \text{e}6 20 \text{h}h4 \text{a}5 21 \text{f}f5 \text{f}8 22 \text{xc}5?! \text{xc}5 23 \text{d}d5 \text{c}6 24 \text{h}h3 \text{f}f7 25 \text{d}d2 \text{g}6 26 \text{e}e1 \text{h}5 27 \text{c}c2 \text{c}5 28 \text{f}f2 \text{c}c6 29 \text{h}h1 \text{e}e7 with advantage for Black, who has the bishop pair, Damljanovic-Franzen, \textit{Trnava 1982), 13...\text{d}d8 14 \text{f}f1 \text{c}c5 15 \text{d}d3 \text{d}d3 16 \text{d}d1 \text{xc}1 17 \text{d}d1 \text{c}c8 18 \text{a}4 \text{f}6 19 \text{c}c4 \text{e}e4 20 \text{xd}1 \text{d}d8 21 \text{h}h1 \text{e}6 22 \text{d}d7 \text{d}d7 23 \text{f}f3 \text{c}5 24 \text{f}f2 \text{c}c6 25 \text{d}d1 \text{e}e6 26 \text{xb}5 1/2-1/2 Yudasin-Tseshkovsky, Simferopol 1989.

9...\text{dxe}4?! 10 \text{c}c5 \text{b}7

Black couldn’t manage to solve his opening problems after 10...\text{c}ce5?! 11 \text{dxe}5 \text{d}g4 12 \text{xd}d1+ 13 \text{d}d1 \text{d}8 14 \text{d}d2 \text{d}g5 15 \text{d}d3 \text{h}xg4 16 \text{d}xg4 \text{x}d1 17 \text{d}d4 and White had an extra pawn in the rook ending, Del Rio-Illescas, Dos Hermanas 2002.
11 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{d}6\) 12 \(f4!\)

The computer engine \textit{Nimzo} 8 suggests 12 \(\text{d}xf7\) as much better for White but I prefer the text - why play the position with rook and two pawns versus two minor pieces if White can reach a simple position with an extra pawn? Note that after the text White’s e5-knight has been reinforced and Black has no choice but to play what he does.

12...\(\text{e}xf3\) 13 \(\text{d}xf3\) \(\text{e}xe5\) 14 \(\text{d}xe5\) \(\text{e}xe5\) 15 \(\text{d}xe5\)

White is also better after 15 \(\text{e}xe5\), but the line played is more forcing.

15...\(\text{w}xd1\) 16 \(\text{d}xd1\) \(\text{d}e4\) 17 \(\text{e}e3??\)

Much stronger is 17 \(\text{d}d7!\) \(\text{d}c5\) 18 \(\text{d}xc7\) \(\text{d}xb3\) 19 \(\text{axb3}\) and, despite opposite-coloured bishops, White has excellent winning chances with his extra pawn. With the text White lets Black off the hook.

17...\(\text{a}e8\) 18 \(\text{d}d7\) \(\text{d}xe5\) 19 \(\text{d}xc7\) \(\text{d}d5\)

20 \(\text{d}d4\) \(\text{f}f5\) 21 \(\text{e}e1\) \(\text{xb3}\) 22 \(\text{axb3}\) \(\text{d}d2\)

23 \(\text{c}c5\) \(\text{d}d8\) 24 \(b4\) \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\)

\textit{Game 102}

\textit{Botvinnik-Kan}

\textit{Training Game, USSR 1952}

1 \(e4\) \(e5\) 2 \(\text{c}f3\) \(\text{c}6\) 3 \(\text{b}b5\) a6 4 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{f}6\)

5 0-0 \(\text{e}7\) 6 \(\text{e}e1\) b5 7 \(\text{d}b3\) 0-0 8 c3 d5

9 \(\text{d}4??\) \(\text{c}c4\)

This move leads to the Breslau Variation of the Open Spanish, where White has played c2-c3 and Black, ...\(\text{f}8-e7\). Maybe such positions do not suit the player on the black side of the Marshall but I still think the reader should play through these next three games because it leads to sharp tactical play where both sides have their trumps.

10 \(\text{d}xe5\) \(\text{e}e6\) 11 \(\text{d}d4\)

The most straightforward continuation. White prepares to play \(f2-f3\) to drive away the enemy knight from e4.

11...\(\text{d}xe5??\)

This sharp continuation is the start of a planned piece sacrifice by Black in which he hopes to gain a dangerous attack. However, we shall see that 11\(\text{d}xd4\) is more accurate.

However, 11...\(\text{d}a5??\) cannot be recommended. Play continues 12 \(\text{c}c2\) and now:

a) 12...\(c5\) 13 \(\text{d}xe6\) \(\text{xe6}\) 14 \(\text{g}g4\) \(\text{xf2}\) 15 \(\text{g}xe6+\) \(\text{h}h8\) 16 \(\text{e}e3\) \(\text{d}d4\) 17 \(\text{d}d2\) with a big positional advantage to White, Botvinnik-Ragozin, USSR 1951, because after 17...\(\text{d}g5\) 18 \(\text{d}xg5!\) \(\text{d}xg5\) 19 \(\text{d}a1\) Black has to worry about defending his vulnerable d-pawn.

b) Even worse is the move 12...\(\text{d}d7??\), which simply loses a pawn after 13 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}g5\) 14 \(\text{h}4\) c5 15 h5g5 \(\text{cxd4}\) 16 \(\text{cxd4}\) \(\text{e}8\) 17 \(\text{e}e3\), as in the very old game Mackenzie-Taubenhaus, Frankfurt 1887 (!!).

Black also failed to equalise after 11...\(\text{c}e8\)

12 \(\text{c}c2\) \(\text{d}d8\) 13 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{d}d7\) 14 \(\text{axb5}\) \(\text{axb5}\) 15 \(\text{f}3\)

16 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{d}xd4\) 17 \(\text{cxd4}\) \(\text{a}4\) 18 \(\text{d}xa4\) \(\text{d}a8\)

19 \(\text{d}c3\) \(\text{bxa4}\) 20 \(\text{d}a3\) \(\text{c}c6\) 21 \(\text{d}d3\) \(\text{d}b7\) 22

\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{d}xa3\) 23 \(\text{d}xa3\) \(\text{d}f8\) 24 \(\text{d}b1\) \(\text{g}6\) 25 \(\text{d}b4\)
because of the weakness of his dark squares,
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Sulsks-Svidler, FIDE World Championship, Moscow 2001.

Finally, 11...\textit{Wd}7?? is a blunder: 12 \textit{Qxe}6 \textit{fxe}6 13 \textit{Qxe}4 wins a piece, Tarrasch-Zukertort, Frankfurt 1888.

\textbf{12 f3 \textit{Ld}6}

Due to the pin along the e-file, Black had no means of saving his piece. Possibly untested but possibly much better for White is 12...\textit{Lh}4 13 \textit{g3} c5 14 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{fxe}6 15 \textit{fxe}4 \textit{Qf}3+ 16 \textit{Qg}2 \textit{Lxe}1+ 17 \textit{Lxe}1 etc.

\textbf{13 fxe4 \textit{Qg}4}

13...\textit{Wh}4 is discussed in the next game.

\textbf{14 \textit{Wd}2}

From d2 the white queen defends the rook on c1, which is important in some lines. Weaker is 14 \textit{Wc}2 c5! 15 \textit{Lxd}5 \textit{cx}d4 16 \textit{Lxa}8 \textit{Wh}4+ 17 \textit{Qf}1 d3 with complications that favour Black.

\textbf{14...\textit{Wh}4 15 \textit{h}3}

Or 15 \textit{g}3 \textit{Wh}5 and now White has a choice between the following:

a) 16 \textit{Lxd}5? c5! 17 \textit{Lxa}8 \textit{cx}d4 18 \textit{Qf}1 d3 19 \textit{Qd}5 \textit{c}5+ 0-1 B.Parker-Melody, correspondence 1996.

b) 16 \textit{ex}d5 \textit{Lae}8 17 \textit{Qf}1 \textit{Lc}5 18 \textit{Wg}5 \textit{Wh}3 19 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qf}3+ 20 \textit{Qxf}3 \textit{Lxf}3 21 \textit{Wd}2 \textit{Lc}2 with advantage to Black because, in order to avoid being mated, White had to sacrifice his queen with 20 \textit{Wxe}2 in Szabo-Balogh, Budapest 1937.

c) 16 \textit{Wg}5 might be White’s best choice and now, according to Dutch IM Leon Piester, Black should continue 16...\textit{Wh}3! 17 \textit{Wh}4 \textit{Wh}xh4 18 \textit{gxh}4 c5 19 \textit{Qf}5 \textit{Lxf}5 20 \textit{exf}5 \textit{Qf}3+ 21 \textit{Qf}2 \textit{Qxe}1 22 \textit{Lxe}1 c4 23 \textit{Lc}2 \textit{Lxh}2 with an unclear position.

\textbf{15...c5}

This is Black’s only move because all others are virtually losing:

a) 15...\textit{Ld}7! 16 \textit{Lxd}5 c6 17 \textit{Lb}3 c5 18 \textit{Qf}5 \textit{Lxf}5 19 \textit{exf}5 \textit{Qd}3 20 \textit{Lc}3 c4 21 \textit{Lc}2 \textit{Lc}5 22 \textit{Lxd}3 \textit{cx}d3 23 \textit{Wf}2, Wolf-Tarrasch, Teplitz-Schoenau 1922.

b) 15...\textit{Lae}8? and now:

b1) 16 \textit{Lxd}5 c6! (but not 16...c5? 17 \textit{hxg}4

\textit{cxd}4 18 \textit{Wf}2 \textit{Wxg}4 19 \textit{Qf}1 \textit{dx}c3 20 \textit{Qxc}3 and Black had nothing to show for the material deficit, although he managed to draw after errors by his opponent in Loman-Euwe, Dutch Cup 1925) 17 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{Qxc}6 18 \textit{Lxc}6 \textit{Lc}5+ 19 \textit{Wh}2 \textit{Qe}6! with a strong attack, Teichmann-John, Breslau 1913.

b2) The alternative 16 \textit{Lc}3! is far stronger. Now 16...\textit{Lc}6? is an original manoeuvre by which Black quickly redevelops the rook. White should not capture on \textit{c}6 as it opens the f-file and assists the Black attack. The refutation of Black’s play is hidden in the strong 17 \textit{Qe}1! after which Black’s attack reaches a dead end.

\textbf{16 \textit{Qf}1!}

Although this was a training game, Botvinnik finds an important improvement that refutes the brave but risky 11...\textit{Qxe}5?.

Other continuations are clearly weaker:

a) 16 \textit{Qe}2?? loses very quickly after 16...\textit{Qf}3+! 17 \textit{gx}f3 \textit{Lh}2+

\textbf{as was played in Hessmer-Negulescu, correspondence 1997.}

b) Against 16 \textit{Wf}2 the simplest continuation for Black is 16...\textit{Qxf}2+ 17 \textit{Qxf}2 \textit{Ld}7 18 \textit{Lxd}5 \textit{Qxd}+ 19 \textit{Qf}1 \textit{Qxe}1 20 \textit{Qxe}1 \textit{cx}d4 21 \textit{Lxa}8 \textit{Qxa}8 22 \textit{cx}d4 \textit{Qe}8 23 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Lc}6 24 \textit{Wf}2 (even worse is 24 \textit{e}5?! \textit{f}6, when Black regains the sacrificed pawn and emerges with a strong pair of roking bishops – these are very useful in endings where there are pawns on both sides of the board) 24...\textit{Qxe}4 25...\textit{Qxe}4 26...\textit{Qxe}4 27...\textit{Qxe}4...
\( \text{Qxe4 } \text{Qxe4} \text{ 26 } \text{Ae3 f5 with the better ending for Black.} \)

\( c \) 16 hgx4 was successfully met by 16...cxd4 17 \text{Wf2} \text{Wxg4} 18 \text{Ad1} \text{Wg6} 19 \text{Wxd4 Axc7!} 20 \text{Ae3 dxe4} 21 \text{Qd2 f5} 22 \text{We5 Aec8} 23 \text{Af1} \text{Qd3} 24 \text{Wd5+ Aeh8} 25 \text{Ee2} \text{Exf2 Efd8, when Black's pieces clearly dominate, Wolf-Tarrasch, Carlsbad 1923. This variation was very popular in the early part of the last century, with Tarrasch being one of its strongest followers.} \)

\text{16...cxd4}

Other continuations are no better:

\( a \) 16...dxe4 17 \text{Af5! is very difficult to meet.} \)

\( b \) 16...\text{Wg3} 17 \text{Wf4} \text{Af3+ 18 Axf3 Axf4} 19 \text{Exg3 Axc1} 20 \text{Ac2! Ah5} 21 \text{Axd5 Aed8} 22 \text{Aa4 Af4} 23 \text{Ec3} \text{and White is winning.} \)

\text{17 cxd4 dxe4?!}

Slightly better was 17...\text{Af3+? 18 gxh3 Aeh3} 19 \text{Wg5! Aexe5+ 20 Aexe5 Axf1} 21 \text{Axf1 and, with two minor pieces against rook and pawn, White is still clearly better.} \)

\text{18 Wg5}

Also deserving of attention is 18 dxe5 Aexe5 19 \text{We1! with excellent winning chances for White due to his material superiority.} \)

\text{18...Af3+ 19 Axf3 Wxg5 20 Aexe5 exf3 21 hxg4}

Although Black is not doing too badly from the material point of view, White’s position is clearly better because of the activity of his minor pieces, while Black’s bishop on d6 is not a very active piece. Botvinnik later used these advantages to claim the full point.

\text{21...Aae8 2 Aa3 b4 23 Aed5 fxg2 24 Aexe2 Ae2+ 25 Aa3 Axb2 26 Aeh7+ Ah8 27 Aif5 Ab8 28 Ae7! Ac8 29 Axb4 h6 30 Ac5 Ah7 31 Ae1 g6 32 Aa7 Ac7 33 Afx7 Ag7 34 Ab3 Ae7 35 Aed6 Ac3+ 36 Ae4 Ag2 37 Ae5+ Af8 38 Aexe6+ Ae8 39 Ae6 1-0}

\text{Game 103}

\text{Jaracz-Krasenkow}

\text{Glogow 2001}

1 e4 e5 2 Af3 Aa6 3 Ab5 a6 4 Ae4 Af6 5 0-0 Aexe4 6 d4 b5 7 Ab3 d5 8 dxe5 Aexe6 9 c3 Ae7 10 Ae1 0-0 11 Aa4 Aexe5? 12 f3 Aa6 13 fxe4 Wh4 14 f1?!

The old analysis of Dr Tarrasch shows that Black gets excellent compensation for the sacrificed material after 14 \text{Wd2 c5} 15 \text{Af5 Axf5} 16 exf5 Aae8 17 Ae2 Aec4 18 Axc4 Axb2+ 19 Aa1 Ag3 20 Ae3 dxc4, but Black can play even more strongly after 14 \text{Wd2} with 14...Aec4 15 \text{Af3 Axb2?!} 16 \text{Aa1} (or 16 Axb2 Axb2 17 Axd2 dxe4 with a near winning position for Black) 16...Axd2 17 Axb4 Aa3 18 Axb3 Aa3 19 exd5 Axe1 (not so clear is 19...Axd5?! 20 Aa1 Axb3 21 Aa4 c5 22 Ae4 or 19...Axb4?! 20 Ae4!) 20 Aa3 Aa5 21 Aexe1 Axb3. White has survived the worst but Black is better in the forthcoming ending.

The correct way of defending the vulnerable h2-square is by playing 14 g3! \text{Wh3} 15 exd5 \text{Ag4} 16 \text{Wd2 Aae8} 17 \text{Ad1}. Although Black, as before, has pressure, my gut feeling is that the first wave of attack has been repelled. White is close to consolidating and he can look forward to the future with his material advantage.

\text{14...Ag4 15 h3 Wh3! 16 hxg4 dxe4!}

Black stops his opponent from running his monarch out via f3. Although White is well ahead in material, Black’s attack is so
strong that there is no adequate defence.

That, note that Black will opt for playing ...c7-c5 to free his position.

2) White is going for a kingside attack and, at the same time, expel Black’s knight from the centre by playing f2-f3-f4. In order to prevent White from starting a kingside attack Black will, sooner or later, play ...f7-f5, which will leave White with a strong protected passed e-pawn.

Although 11...\textit{d}xd4 is better than the 11...\textit{e}xe5? from the previous games, it gives White the better long-term position with practically no winning chances for Black.

17 \textit{d}f3

Or 17 \textit{d}f5 \textit{h}h2+ 18 \textit{f}f2 \textit{x}xf5 19 gxf5 \textit{c}5+ 20 \textit{c}3 \textit{f}+ and Black picks up a piece as well as maintaining a deadly attack.

17...\textit{e}xf3 18 \textit{x}xf3 \textit{h}h2+ 19 \textit{f}f1 \textit{a}xb3 20 axb3 \textit{h}h1+ 21 \textit{e}2 \textit{x}g2+ 22 \textit{d}3 \textit{a}d8 23 \textit{c}d2 \textit{f}4+ 24 \textit{c}2 \textit{a}xd2 25 \textit{a}xd2 \textit{a}xd2+ 26 \textit{x}d2 \textit{x}f3

White’s king has managed to run away to safety. However, the cost is too great. Black has regained all his sacrificed material with interest. The fight has been decided.

27 \textit{x}xa6 \textit{x}g4 28 \textit{d}d5 \textit{h}5 29 \textit{b}1 \textit{h}4 0-1

\textbf{Game 104}

\textbf{Hübner-Piket}

\textit{Dortmund 1992}

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{f}f3 \textit{c}6 3 \textit{b}b5 a6 4 \textit{a}a4 \textit{f}f6 5 0-0 \textit{x}xe4 6 d4 \textit{e}7 7 \textit{e}e1 b5 8 \textit{b}3 d5 9 dx\textit{e}5 \textit{e}6 10 c3 0-0 11 \textit{d}d4 \textit{x}d4 12 \textit{c}xd4

Of course out of the question is 12 \textit{w}xd4?? \textit{c}5 etc.

After the exchange of knights White gets a small but lasting advantage due to the following reasons:

1) Black’s backward c-pawn needs constant attention, which means that Black’s queenside pawn majority is not as effective as White’s kingside pawn majority. Having said

12...h6

In view of the imminent 13 \textit{f}3, Black vacates the h7-square for his knight. White kept the advantage after 12...\textit{b}b4 13 \textit{e}e2 \textit{h}h4 14 a3 \textit{a}5 15 \textit{c}c2 \textit{b}6 16 \textit{f}3 \textit{g}5 17 \textit{e}e3 \textit{f}6 18 \textit{d}d2 \textit{x}e8 19 exf6 gxf6 20 \textit{x}c3 in Engels-Bogoljubow, Stuttgart 1939. The move 12...f5? is clearly a mistake, as was demonstrated in Abbasov-Saidov, Bratislava 1993 which continued 13 exf6 \textit{x}xf6 14 \textit{f}3 \textit{x}d6 15 \textit{e}e6! \textit{e}xe6 16 \textit{a}xd5 and the weakness on the long diagonal led to decisive material losses for Black.

13 \textit{f}3 \textit{g}5 14 \textit{c}c3

Even stronger was 14 \textit{e}e3! preventing Black from playing ...c7-c5. The old game Chalupetzky-Exner, Gyor 1922 continued 14...f5 15 \textit{w}d2 \textit{f}7 16 \textit{c}c1 \textit{w}d7 17 \textit{c}c3 \textit{d}h7 18 a4l, when White enjoyed a queenside initiative.
14...c5 15 f4
Stronger than 15 dxc5?! \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xe5+} \text{\textit{\&}}\text{h1} \text{d4, when Black obtains counterplay.}\)

15...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd4}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e2}!\)
White avoids 16 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd4}! \text{\textit{\&}}\text{e8}!\) with the idea of ...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{c5}\) etc.

16...d3
Black tries to make the game messy because the natural continuation 16...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e4}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd4}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{c5}\) 18 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e3}\) leads to a huge advantage for White – he has a strong grip over the d4-square whilst Black’s isolated d-pawn is a big weakness.

17 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd3}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{c5+}\) 18 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{d4}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f5}\) 19 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xf5}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e6}?!\) 20 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e3}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd4}\) 21 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{d3}\)

White had a very interesting alternative, as mentioned by Robert Hübner. He can paradoxically enter an opposite-coloured bishop position a pawn down but with a promising attack, against which it would be very difficult to defend. The critical continuation was 21 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd4!}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd4+} \text{\textit{\&}}\text{h1} \text{\textit{\&}}\text{xb2} \text{23} \text{\textit{\&}}\text{ad1} \text{d4} \text{24} \text{\textit{\&}}\text{d3}\) etc.

21...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xb3}\) 22 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xb3}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{d4}\) 23 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f2}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{d5}\) 24 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{h3}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f6}\) 25 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{h2}?!\)

White loses all his advantage with this superficial move. Better was 25 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{ec1}!!\) followed by the doubling of the rooks along the c-file with some advantage.

25...a5 26 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{ec1}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{b6}\) 27 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{c2}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{ec8}\) 28 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{ac1}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xc2}\) 29 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xc2}\) a4 30 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xa4}\) bxa4 31 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e1}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{b3}!\) 32 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xb3}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xb3}\) 33 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{c6}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{a5}\)

After this move we reach a drawn rook and pawn ending.

34 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xa5}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xa5}\) 35 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{b6}\) d3 36 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{d6}\)

Of course not 36 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xb3}\)? \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{d5}\) when Black’s passed d-pawn is unstoppable.

36...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{a2}\) 37 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd3}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xb2}\) 38 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{g3}\) g5 39 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f5}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e2}\) 40 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xb3}\) \(1/2-1/2\)

**Game 105**

**Kruppa-Vladimirov**

**Franz 1988**

1 e4 e5 2 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f3}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{c6}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{b5}\) a6 4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{a4}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f6}\)
5 0-0 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e7}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e1}\) b5 7 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{b3}\) 0-0 8 c3 d5
9 d4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd4}\) 10 e5

Of course this is more logical than 10 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd5}\)! because White gains space both in the centre and on the kingside.

10...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e4}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd4}\)

An alternative is 11 cxd4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{g4}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{c3}\).
Now the simplest way for Black to get a good position is 12...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xf3}\) 13 gxf3 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xc3}\) (I don’t trust 13...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xf2}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xf2}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{h4}+\) etc.) 14 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xc3}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{a5}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e2}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{c4}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{h6}\)? \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{e8}\) (bad is 16...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{gxh6}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd3}\) f5 18 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xf5}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f7}\) 19 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xf7}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xe7}\) etc. when Black’s kingside has been seriously damaged) 17 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{d3}\) g6 18 e6 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{g5}\) 19 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xf7}\)+ \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xf7}\) 20 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xe8}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xe8}\)

and, with a strong knight on c4, Black can boldly look to the future.

11...\(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xe5}\) 12 f3?!

More critical is 12 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f4}\) c5 13 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xe5}\) cxd4 14 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{xd4}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{b7}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{d2}\) \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f6}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\text{f4}\) and White has a small but lasting advantage be-
cause of the isolated pawn on d5. Instead of 12...c5, I prefer 12...f6! which transposes to our game after 13 f3 c5 etc. White can also try, after 12...f6!? 13 xe5 xe5 14 f3 g4 and now:

a) 15 wxd5 xf3 16 gxf3 (or 16 xe5 Wh4! with an irresistible attack) 16...xh2+! 17 g2 g5+ 18 wxg5 hxg5 with material advantage to Black. Note that the bishop is taboo on h2 because of ...g5xf3+ winning the rook on c1.

b) 15 xd5 xf3 16 gxf3 xh2+ 17 f1 xf2 18 wd4 (the only move because if 18 xf2?, 18...h4+ with a mating attack) 18...g3 19 xa8 xa8 20 g2 xd8! and White’s queen has no great square to retreat. The position can be assessed as almost winning for Black.

Or 14 fxe4 cxd4 15 xd5 (after 14 wxd4 wc7! has the unpleasant threat of ...e7-c5 winning the queen) 14...dxc3 15 xe8? (safer is 15 xxc3) 15...c5+ 16 h1 x3 17 e2 g4 18 f1 h4 19 xxc3 f2+ 20 g1 e2! and, regardless of how White takes the

12...c5 13 f4

Or 13 fxe4 cxd4 14 xd5 (after 14 wxd4 wc7! has the unpleasant threat of ...e7-c5 winning the queen) 14...dxc3 15 xe8? (safer is 15 xxc3) 15...c5+ 16 h1 x3 17 e2 g4 18 f1 h4 19 xxc3 f2+ 20 g1 e2! and, regardless of how White takes the bishop, ...f2-g4+ and mate follows.

13...f6 14 xe5

Or 14 fxe4 cxd4 15 xe5 xe5 16 cxd4 wb6! with a clear advantage to Black.

14...xe5 15 c6 xh2+!

16 xh2 w4+ 17 g1 wf2+ 18 h2 wg3+ 19 g1 dg5!

The attack continues. This strong move shows that Black is not interested in a draw.

20 h1

No better is 20 e2 xf3+ 21 xf3 xe1+ and Black wins, or 20 f1 hxh3! 21 gxh3 hxh3 22 e2 f2+ 23 d3 c4+ 24 xc4 bxc4 mate.

20...w4+ 21 g1 h3+! 22 gh3 xh3 23 e7+

White must close the e-file for the time being because if 23 he2, 23...e8 wins.

23...h8 24 e2 e8 25 e1 wg5+ 26 h2 xe7 27 xh3 e6!

Opening the f-file has devastating effects. Black’s attack is decisive as White’s queenside pieces are out of play.

28 xe6 xe6 29 wg3 wc1! 30 wh2 wf1+ 31 h4 wf3 32 e3 g5+ 0-1
Summary
Games 102–104 confirm that White retains the better chances due to his strong e5-pawn. White gains a spacious advantage on the kingside in Game 104, while if Black sacrifices a piece with 11...\(\Delta x e 5?\), the compensation obtained is insufficient against accurate defence, as demonstrated in both Game 102 and 103.

So after 9 d4!? Black should play 9...exd4 10 c5 \(\Delta c 4\) (Game 105), yielding sufficient counterplay. That game saw complications with minor pieces being mutually attacked in the centre by pawns. At the end of the day, Black’s attack managed to break through despite initially looking like there was nothing more than a draw by perpetual check.

1 e4 e5 2 \(\Delta f 3\) \(\Delta c 6\) 3 \(\Delta b 5\) a6 4 \(\Delta a 4\) \(\Delta f 6\) 5 0-0 \(\Delta e 7\) 6 \(\Delta e 1\) b5 7 \(\Delta b 3\) 0-0 8 c3
8 d3 d6 9 d3
  9...\(\Delta b 8\) – Game 98
  9...\(\Delta a 5\) c5 11 \(\Delta b d 2\) \(\Delta d 7\) 12 \(\Delta f 1\) \(\Delta b 6\) (D)
  13 \(\Delta g 3\) – Game 99; 13 \(\Delta e 3\) – Game 100
8...d5 9 d4!? (D) \(\Delta x e 4\)
  9...\(\Delta x e 4\) – Game 101; ...exd4 – Game 105
10 dxe5 \(\Delta e 6\) 11 \(\Delta d 4\) \(\Delta x e 5?\)
  11...\(\Delta x d 4\) – Game 104
12 f3 \(\Delta d 6\) 13 fxe4 (D) \(\Delta g 4\) – Game 102
  13...\(\Delta x h 4\) – Game 103
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The Marshall Attack is one of the oldest and most important openings in the history of chess. Black sacrifices a pawn against the Ruy Lopez in exchange for a long-lasting attack. Generations of the world’s top players have fought on the Marshall battleground, but the final verdict on its soundness has not yet been reached. However, of one thing you can be sure: Black certainly has a lot of fun in trying to checkmate the white king! It is perhaps because of this reason that as White, many Grandmasters, including the world number one Garry Kasparov, have decided to avoid the issue altogether, preferring the more tranquil waters of Anti-Marshall systems. The ideas and strategies of both approaches are studied in depth here by a renowned openings theoretician.

- An ideal weapon at all levels
- Written by a leading openings expert
- Full and up-to-date coverage of all the fashionable lines

**Bogdan Lalić** is one of the most prominent figures on the international tournament circuit. Originally from Croatia (he has represented Croatia in numerous team events), the industrious Grandmaster has now been living in England for a number of years. His experience in playing at the highest levels has given him many insights into how the game should be played and he has rightly earned a reputation as a leading openings theoretician. Earlier works include *Classical Nimzo-Indian* and *Queen’s Gambit Declined: Bg5 Systems.*