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Introduction

The Scandinavian Defence, arising after 1 e4 d5, is in reality two distinct openings under the same heading. In the first we see Black responding to 2 exd5 with 2...\textit{\$}xd5.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{chessboard.png}
\end{center}

At first glance this seems a beginner's error, in that after the natural 3 c3 Black will cede White some time since his prematurely developed queen will have to move again.

But White will not be able to develop a broad centre as his knight now stops the c pawn's advance.

Many of the resultant, stolid middlegames may have a lot in common with those arising from lines of the Caro-Kann Defence.

Secondly there is the line with 2...\textit{\$}f6

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{chessboard2.png}
\end{center}

...a pseudo-gambit (or should White wish it, an authentic and valid one) where the intent is almost always to take the pawn back with the knight. By so doing Black avoids the loss of time associated with 2...\textit{\$}xd5, but permits
White to build up a pawn centre. The middlegames here may allow Black greater fluidity of development, with ...\f5, ...\g4, and also fianchettos of his king's bishop are frequently seen.

This opening was originally known, as indeed it still sometimes is, as the Centre Counter Defence.

It acquired the Nordic soubriquet through the patronage of Larsen, Hansen and other masters from the north of Europe.

James Plaskett
Playa Flamenca
February 2004
Chapter 1

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 $\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{w}xd5}}$ 3 d4 e5

Against this move order Black may, of course, attempt to angle play back into recognised lines.

But he should take his chance for 3...e5!

Akin to the earliest interpretations of the Centre Counter, this riposte was most recently used in Fernandez Garcia – Karpov, Basque Country vs The World, Advanced Chess (as Garry Kasparov calls it).

4 $\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{c}c3}}$

de Firmian – Granda Zuniga Amsterdam 1996 saw White getting it even more wrong, 4 dxe5 $\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{w}xd1+}}$ 5 $\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{w}xd1}}$ $\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{c}c6}}$ 6 $f\text{\textit{f4}}$ $f\text{\textit{f5}}$ 7 $c\text{\textit{c3}}$ 0-0-0+ 8 $e\text{\textit{e1}}$ $f\text{\textit{f6}}$! 9 $b\text{\textit{b5}}$ $fxe5$ 10 $x\text{\textit{xc6}}$ $b\text{\textit{xc6}}$ 11 $fxe5$ $c\text{\textit{c5}}$ 12 $f\text{\textit{f3}}$ $f\text{\textit{f6}}$ 13 $g\text{\textit{g5}}$ $h\text{\textit{h6}}$ 14 $h\text{\textit{h4}}$ $g\text{\textit{g5}}$

15 $f\text{\textit{f2}}$ $xf2+!$ 16 $xf2$ $g\text{\textit{g4+}}$ 17 $g\text{\textit{g3}}$ $h\text{\textit{h5}}$! 18 $h\text{\textit{h4}}$ $gxh4+!$ 19 $x\text{\textit{hx4}}$ $h\text{\textit{h7}}$ 20 $f\text{\textit{f3}}$ $h\text{\textit{hg8}}$ 21 $x\text{\textit{hx5}}$ $f\text{\textit{f6+}}$ 22 $g\text{\textit{g5}}$ $e\text{\textit{e4+}}$ and Black soon won.
4...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}e6} 5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{c}}}}c3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}}b4 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}}d2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}}}xc3 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}}}xc3 e4 8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}}e5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{xe}}5} 9 dxe5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}}7 10 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{w}}}xd5 \textit{\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}}xd5}

Not a very exciting position out of the opening, but the sort Karpov likes.

11 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}}d4

Neither was the board on fire after the 11 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}}d2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{f}}}}f5 12 0-0-0 0-0 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}}}e1 \textit{\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{f}}}}}fe8 14 f4 exf3 15 gxf3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}}e6 16 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}}b1 of Pazos – Granda Zuniga, Yerevan Olympiad 1996, and although the tomato farmer pressed with Black until move 85, ultimately he had to concede the draw.

11...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{b}}}}b4 12 \textit{\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}}}b5+ c6 13 \textit{\texttt{a}}a4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}}e6 14 a3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}}d5 15 c3 \textit{\texttt{f}}f4!? Action!?

16 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}}c2 \textit{\texttt{x}}xg2+ 17 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}}d2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}}_5 18 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}}hg1 \textit{\texttt{f}}_4 19 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{a}}}}e1

19...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}}_6 20 \textit{\texttt{x}}xe4 \textit{\texttt{x}}xe4 21 \textit{\texttt{x}}xe4 0-0-0 22 \textit{\texttt{c}}c2 b6

The knight might yet outclass the bishop in such a setting.

23 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}}_3 \textit{\texttt{d}}d7 24 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}}h4 \textit{\texttt{d}}d5 25 f4 g6 26 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}}h3 \textit{\texttt{g}}_7 27 \textit{\texttt{f}}f2 \textit{\texttt{h}}hd8?!

Allowing a capture.

27...h5 had to be a better try to make something of it.

28 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}}xh7! \textit{\texttt{d}}d2+ 29 \textit{\texttt{b}}b3 \textit{\texttt{e}}e6 30 \textit{\texttt{e}}e3 \textit{\texttt{e}}e2 31 \textit{\texttt{c}}c1 \textit{\texttt{d}}d7 32 h4 \textit{\texttt{f}}f2 33 h5 \textit{\texttt{g}}xh5 34 \textit{\texttt{h}}xh5 \textit{\texttt{x}}xf4 35 \textit{\texttt{xf}}4 Drawn.
Chapter 2: The Main Line

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ♕xd5 3 ♙c3 ♙a5

The traditional and still the most popular interpretation of this opening.

There are some lines, older ones, where Black attempts a rapid ...e5 after 3...♕a5, but these are in disrepute. There are others involving 3...♕a5 and ...

There are some lines, older ones, where Black attempts a rapid ...e5 after 3...♕a5, but these are in disrepute. There are others involving 3...♕a5 and ...

...c6, but as those are viewable as arising from a separate opening – 1 e4 ♛c6 2 ♛f3 d5 3 exd5 ♕xd5 4 ♙c3 – they are not considered in this work.

Bent Larsen brought 3...♕a5 out of mothballs and into the limelight in the late 1970s.

Karpov – Larsen
Montreal 1979

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ♕xd5 3 ♙c3 ♙a5 4 d4 ♛f6 5 ♙d2

Not one of the main lines. People noted of the then World Champion that he was not so comfortable against offbeat openings, which, at that time, the Scandinavian was. This very game helped to salvage it from obscurity.

The next year Miles beat him with 1 e4 a6.

5...♗g4!? 6 ♗e2
New position?
6...\textit{x}e2 7 \textit{c}xe2 \textit{wb}6 8 \textit{rf}3 \textit{bd}7 9 0-0 e6
Grabbing the b2 pawn was not completely out of the question.
10 \textit{c}4 \textit{e}7 11 b4 0-0 12 a4
Trundling.
12...c6 13 \textit{wc}2 \textit{wc}7 14 \textit{fe}1 b6 15 a5
This does not really lead him anywhere.
15...\textit{fb}8 16 a6 b5 17 c5 \textit{d}d5
A nice lodge.
18 \textit{dc}1 \textit{we}8 19 \textit{dd}3 \textit{md}8 20 g3 \textit{ff}6 21 \textit{me}4 \textit{ef}8 22 h4

22...\textit{md}7
Solid as Alcatraz.
23 \textit{gg}2 \textit{md}8 24 g4
He may have felt it incumbent upon him to be about something, since he was World Champion playing with the White pieces. But, ultimately it weakens him.

Kasparov explained to me that in the final game of their 1985 match – the one which made him World Champion – Karpov’s fundamental error was to embark upon an unjustified, overly ambitious and weakening plan of expansion in front of his own king. It started with g2-g4.
14...\text{\textit{\v{c}}}e8 25 \text{g}5 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}d8 26 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}fe5 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}de7 27 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f4 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}c8 28 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}g3 \text{f}6

At last the counter demonstration begins. And it soon starts to tell.

29 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f7 30 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}d2 \text{fxg}5 31 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xg5 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f5 32 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}a3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}g6 33 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}ef8 34 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xe5 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xe5 35 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xe5 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f3

Now it is clear that White only damaged his own king's position through advancing his g pawn, and the consequences are dire.

36 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}a1? \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xh4!

First fruits.

37 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}e2

37 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xh4 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xd3! 38 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xd3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f4+ wins.

37...\text{\textit{\v{c}}}xg3 38 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xg3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}d7! 39 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xf3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xf3 40 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xf3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xb4!

Bent was very tactically alert. Now 41 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xb4 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xd4+ wins easily.

41 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}d1 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xd4 42 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}e4 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}d5

Black now had no difficulty in realising his advantage.

43 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f2 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}h5+ 44 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}g2 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}d5 45 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xe6 \text{h}6 46 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}d3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}h7 47 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f3 \text{b}4 48 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}g4 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}g5 49 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}g3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}c1 50 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}h3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}c4 51 \text{g}5 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}e8 \text{h}4+ 53 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}g2 \text{b}3 54 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}b8 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}e2+ 55 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f2 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}e3+ White resigned.

Larsen beating the world champion with Black. He came last in that event. Later the same year he was to win one in Buenos Aires three points clear of Spassky, Petrosian, Andersson, Miles, etc.

Later in the same tournament he played the Scandinavian again.

\textbf{Spassky – Larsen}

\textit{Montreal 1979}

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}xd5 3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}c3 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}a5 4 d4 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f6 5 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}f3

Boris had had the chance to see what Bent had already done to Anatoly in this event.

5...\text{\textit{\v{c}}}f5 6 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}d2 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}bd7 7 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}c4 c6 8 \text{\textit{\v{c}}}e2 e6?
A serious inaccuracy, permitting White a favourable, line-opening advance. Better 8...\textit{c7}.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

9 d5! cxd5 10 \textit{xd5 c5}
He might have done better to scuttle back to d8.
11 b4!
Creates a bit of gash in the White queenside, but the attacking play it serves to generate more than compensates. 11 \textit{b4} was also strong.
11...\textit{c8} 12 \textit{xf6+ gxf6} 13 \textit{d4 g6} 14 h4 h5 15 f4 \textit{e7} 16 \textit{h3}!

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

Spassky was at his very best in such positions with open piece play and attack.
16...\textit{c7}
On 16...0-0 comes 17 \textit{g3 h7} 18 f5! \textit{xf5} 19 \textit{e3} and curtains. But Boris was soon to train his sights on the Black king as it sought sanctuary on the other side.
17 0-0-0 \textit{b6} 18 \textit{e1 0-0-0} 19 \textit{b5 b8} 20 \textit{xd8+! xd8} 21 \textit{f2 c6} 22 \textit{xa7 d7} 23 a3!
Tidying up.
23...\textit{e4} 24 \textit{e3 f5} 25 \textit{g3 c6} 26 \textit{d4 a4} 27 \textit{xf5 xa3+} 28 \textit{d1 a1+} 29 \textit{c1 xb4} 30 \textit{b5 b6} 31 \textit{e4 a5} and Black resigned.
After that neither Larsen nor any other top GM allowed a d5! to be sprung on them. People were learning fast about what was and was not workable in the Scandinavian, and one concept which developed as a consequence of Spassky’s win in Montreal was that of \ldots\texttt{b4} and \ldots\texttt{xc3}. It became appreciated that the loss of the bishop pair was not so terrible in this formation.

\textbf{Taulbut – Fries Nielsen}

\textbf{Sikeborg 1980}

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \texttt{xd5} 3 \texttt{c3} \texttt{a5} 4 \texttt{f3} \texttt{f6} 5 d4 \texttt{f5}

6 \texttt{d2}

After 6 \texttt{c4} \texttt{bd7} 7 \texttt{e2} e6 8 \texttt{d2} \texttt{b4} 9 0-0 0-0 10 a3 \texttt{xc3} 11 \texttt{xc3} \texttt{b6} 12 \texttt{b3} a5 13 \texttt{a4}?! c6 14 \texttt{d2} h6 (14...\texttt{xb2}?? lost the queen) 15 \texttt{e3} \texttt{fe8} 16 c3 \texttt{g4} 17 \texttt{ab1} \texttt{c7} 18 h3 \texttt{h5} the White bishops were having difficulty in making an impact in Djuric – Larsen, Copenhagen 1979.

6 ... c6 7 \texttt{c4} e6 8 \texttt{e2} \texttt{b4}!?

No d4-d5 trick now.

9 0-0
After the more aggressive 9 0-0-0, 9...\(\mathcal{Q}d6\) is flexible. After Dolmatov’s move 10 \(\mathcal{Q}b1\), Hjartasson – Hansen, Reykjavik Zonal 1995, continued 10...
\(\mathcal{Q}b6\) 11 \(\mathcal{Q}b3 \mathcal{Q}x\_c3!\) 12 \(\mathcal{Q}x\_c3 \mathcal{Q}b5\)!. Often in the Scandinavian Black seeks to increase his control of the light squares. Here he even cedes the bishop pair to achieve it.

13 \(\mathcal{Q}xb5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xb5\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}e5\) a5 15 a3 \(\mathcal{Q}e4\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}he1\) 0-0 17 f3 \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) axd5 19 \(\mathcal{Q}d2\) \(\mathcal{Q}c4\) and Black was the more comfortable, and won.

Following 10 a3 \(\mathcal{Q}xc3\) 11 \(\mathcal{Q}xc3\) \(\mathcal{Q}c7\) the complications in Brynell – Hodgson, Bundesliga 2002 resolved themselves into something not unfavourable to Black after 12 \(\mathcal{Q}e5\) b5 13 \(\mathcal{Q}d3\) 0-0 14 \(\mathcal{Q}xf5\) exf5 15 \(\mathcal{Q}f3\) \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}xf5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xc3\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}xd7\) axd7 18 \(\mathcal{Q}xf8\) axf8 19 \(\mathcal{Q}xd1\) \(\mathcal{Q}xh2\) 20 \(\mathcal{Q}e4\) \(\mathcal{Q}h6\)+, etc. In Zagreb Belny – Danielsen, Petermaennchen, 1999, White had played 13 \(\mathcal{Q}b3\), whereupon 13...
\(\mathcal{Q}e4\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}xd7\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd7\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}b4\) \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}x\_d5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}e5\) a5! 18 \(\mathcal{Q}c5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe5\) 19 dxe5 \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) left an ending where both sides had largely achieved their strategic goals, and after 20 \(\mathcal{Q}d4\) Black ought to have played 20...
\(\mathcal{Q}e4\)! to leave things about balanced.

A major divergence is to take on e5, with 12...
\(\mathcal{Q}xe5\) 13 dxe5 \(\mathcal{Q}d5\),

which has often been seen, e.g in A. Rodriguez – Varas Pamplona Open 1999, 14 \(\mathcal{Q}d2\) 0-0 0-0 15 g4 \(\mathcal{Q}g6\) 16 f4 h5! An important bid for air for the pieces at g6 and h8. 17 h3 \(\mathcal{Q}xg4\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}xg4\) with balanced chances.

9...
\(\mathcal{Q}e5\) 10 a3 \(\mathcal{Q}xc3\) 11 \(\mathcal{Q}xc3\) \(\mathcal{Q}c7\) 12 \(\mathcal{Q}d2\) \(\mathcal{Q}bd7\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}g5\) h6 14 \(\mathcal{Q}h4\) \(\mathcal{Q}f4\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}d3\) \(\mathcal{Q}fe8\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}g3\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd3\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}xd3\) \(\mathcal{Q}e4\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}b3\) b5 and Black’s solid game granted him a draw at move 81.

Karpov – Rogers
BBC Master Game, Bath 1983

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) 3 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\) \(\mathcal{Q}a5\)

In the 1980s Ian Rogers wrote that he really believed that this was a good opening. He certainly has given it many an outing.
4 d4 ∆f6 5 ∆f3 ∆g4 6 h3 ∆h5

The key move of this system. 6...∆xf3 7 ∆xf3 cedes White the bishops and an edge. The critical positions result from White now continuing the chase.

7 g4 ∆g6 8 ∆e5

A move favoured by Alekhine. Black must watch out for ∆c4 embarrassing his queen.

8...e6

9 h4!

White harasses the g6 bishop, gains space and prepares the entry of his king rook into the game via h3. This is much more to the point than 9 ∆g2. Against that Black may try 9...c6, as in the important game Karpov – Larsen, Mar del Plata 1982, 10 h4 ∆bd7 11 ∆c4 ∆a6 12 ∆f1!? b5 13 h5!? ∆xc2 14 ∆xc2 bxc4 15 g5 ∆d5 16 ∆e4 with a double edged position by no means clearly worse for Black, who went on to win from here in Bertona Soppe, San Luis 1990 with 16...∆b4.

Even 9...∆e4!? 10 f3 ∆c6 was not clearly worse for him in Antal – Borsok, Hungarian Championship, 1995: 11 0-0 ∆fd7 12 f4 ∆xg2 13 ∆xg2 14 ∆e3 0-0 15 ∆f3 ∆a6 16 ∆e4 ∆xe5 17 dxe5 ∆c6 Drawn.

9...∆a6 may be a good option too.

9...∆h4

9...∆bd7 has been tried.

10 ∆h3

Avante garde, and spectacularly successful here, but later focus switched to 10 ∆d2.

10...c6

Must always keep an eye out for ∆c4.

11 ∆d2 ∆b6 12 h5 ∆e4 13 ∆e3!
13 ... \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}c3

Unfortunately for Black 13...\textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}xd4 fails to 14 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{d}}}}xe4 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{d}}}}xe4 15 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}xb4 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}xe5 16 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{g}}}}g2 f5 17 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{g}}}}xf5 exf5 18 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{e}}}}e4 fxe4 19 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}g4 and wins.

14 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}xc3 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{d}}}}d5 15 g5 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{e}}}}e4 16 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}g4 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{d}}}}d6 17 0-0-0

White has managed a big build up.

17...\textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{d}}}}d7 18 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{e}}}}e1 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{d}}}}xe5 19 dxe5 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{f}}}}f5 20 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{h}}}}h3 0-0-0 21 c4

Trapping it in broad daylight.

21...\textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}c5 22 b4 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{f}}}}f3 23 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}xd8+ \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}xd8 24 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}xf3 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}xe5 25 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{c}}}}c3 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}d6 26 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}d3 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{d}}}}d4 27 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}xf7 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{f}}}}f5 28 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}xf5 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}f4+ 29 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{e}}}}e3 Black resigned.

Undeterred, Ian went into his workshop and patched the thing up. After which he soon showed, in games with three good Grandmasters that Black may get it together with 10...\textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}xc3+ 11 bxc3 (11 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}xc3? \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{e}}}}e4) 11...\textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}bd7.

Arnason and Timman each continued 12 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}xd7 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{a}}}}xd7 13 h5 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{e}}}}e4, but Black swiftly castled long and stood fine. Lobron took on g6 at move 12 and after 12...hxg6 13 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{b}}}}b1 0-0-0 14 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{b}}}}b5 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}a4 15 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{b}}}}b3 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}c6! 16 g5 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{e}}}}e8 17 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}g4 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{b}}}}b6 18 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{g}}}}2 \textbf{\textit{\underline{\text{w}}}}c4 the Black queen never ran out of squares from which to elude her pursuers, and Black won the game.
As these games illustrated that the denting of White's queenside did not seem to help him, they started to play 10 \$d2, with ideas of h5 and a3. Most games from here featured 10...w6, but I want to look at another move.

**Goldstein – Creasey**  
**Correspondence 1994**

10...\$bd7!? 11 \$c4 \$a6 12 h5  
There are no tactics to exploit the queen at a6.  
12...\$xc3

13 hxg6  
13 \$xc3 \$e4 with counterplay.  
13...\$c6!? 14 \$h4

Or 14 gxf7+ \$xf7 15 f3 \$xd2+ 16 \$xd2 \$xg4! Or 15 \$g1 \$e4+ 16 \$e2 \$xd4, or 15 \$h4 \$e4+ 16 \$e2 \$xd4 17 f3 \$d5 18 g5, with some compensation for the material.

14...\$e4+ 15 \$e2 \$xd2+ 16 \$xd2 \$xg6 17 f4 when White had a little play for his pawn.
Anand – Lautier
Biel 1997

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ♕xd5 3 ♛c3 ♣a5 4 d4 ♞f6 5 ♞f3 c6

5...♕e4? was a silly experiment which actually led to a quick Black win in Groszpeter – Reprintsev, Pardubice, 1998.

6 ♙c4

Quieter ways promise less. In Cherniaev – Speelman, Gibcom Masters, Gibraltar 2003, White played 6 ♙e2. After 6...e6 7 0-0 ♙bd7 8 ♙e1 ♣a5 9 ♙f4 ♙e7 10 ♙bd2 ♢d8 11 ♙h2 h6 12 ♙c4 0-0 13 c3 b5 14 ♙ce5 ♣b6 15 ♙xd7 and they agreed it drawn. Sacha Cherniaev insisted afterwards that 15 a4 would have left him clearly better, but I did not understand why. Putting the bishop outside the pawn chain also makes sense, as in A.Rodriguez – Carlier, Benidorm Open 1991, 6...♕f5 7 0-0 ♙bd7 8 ♙d2 e6 9 ♙e1 ♣c7 10 a3 ♙d6 11 ♙f1 0-0, etc.

6...♕f5 7 ♙e5 e6 8 g4 ♙g6 9 h4! ♙bd7 10 ♙xd7 ♙xd7 11 h5 ♙e4 12 ♙h3 ♙g2

Looks odd to me. Anand got the advantage out of this opening.

13 ♙e3

Some themes from the Karpov – Rogers game are apparent.

13...♕b6 14 ♙d3 ♙d5
15 f3!

An important improvement on the known 15 \textit{gg3}. White offers up his rook, reasoning that the guy at g2 will not get home. Often the White king will walk across and eat it, and it turns out that Black may not inflict sufficient damage elsewhere to compensate him for that.

15...\textit{b4}

The clutch of pawns with which Black emerges from the sequence 15...\textit{xc3} 16 bxc3 \textit{xc3}+ 17 \textit{d2} \textit{xd4} 18 \textit{f2} \textit{xf3} 19 \textit{xf3} \textit{c5} 20 \textit{g2} is not enough to grant him equal chances.

16 \textit{f2}!

The king is a strong piece.

16...\textit{xc3}

After 16...\textit{xc3} 17 bxc3 \textit{xc3} 18 \textit{b1} \textit{xd4} 19 \textit{g2} \textit{xe3} 20 \textit{xe3} the bishops are way better than the rook and the pawns.

17 bxc3 \textit{xc3} 18 \textit{b1} \textit{xd4}

Taking the f pawn also would have left him clearly worse after 18...\textit{xf3} 19 \textit{xf3} \textit{xd4} 20 \textit{xb7}.

19 \textit{xb7}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Diagram}
\end{center}

19...\textit{d8}

Trying to hang on to the bishop for a tad longer with 19...\textit{h3} would allow White some cute and highly disruptive tactics (similar to those we are about to see in the game) based upon the unprotected placing of the Black queen, i.e. 20 \textit{xf7}? c5 21 \textit{f5}!! \textit{xe3} 22 \textit{xe3} \textit{b2} 23 \textit{xc5} 0-0 24 \textit{g3}! and the White king is still pretty safe over there as it, at last, gets the bishop. On 19...\textit{f4} it also is not hanging together for Black after 20 \textit{g3} \textit{d6} 21 \textit{a3} when neither 21...\textit{hx5}+ 22 \textit{g2} \textit{g3}+ 23 \textit{f1}, nor 21...\textit{xa3} 22 \textit{e4}!, with the White pieces now about to pour in, gets him off the hook. Now Anand weaves some magic in order to breach the Frenchman’s defences.

20 h6!! \textit{g6}
Losing, but in the most wonderfully concealed manner. He had to try 20...\(\text{\#e}3\) 21 \(\text{\#xe}3\) \(\text{\#e}5\) 22 \(\text{hxg}7\) \(\text{\#g}8\) 23 \(\text{\#g}1\) \(\text{\#xf}3\) 24 \(\text{\#xf}3\) with White clearly better, but there would still be a game.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
21 \text{\#g}6!!
\end{array}
\]

Fabulous.

21...\(\text{\#e}7\)

The points are that the queen at d4 hangs and taking the White one permitted mate by 22 \(\text{\#xe}6+\) \(\text{\#f}8\) 23 \(\text{\#xh}6+\) \(\text{\#g}8\) 24 \(\text{\#xf7}\) 21...\(\text{\#f}6\) 22 \(\text{\#xf7}\) \(\text{\#xf7}\) 23 \(\text{\#xe}3\) would allow White to finish it off by 24 \(\text{\#xd}8+\) \(\text{\#xd}8\) 25 \(\text{\#xe}3\) and the bishop's still behind bars. 25...\(\text{\#h}3\) 26 \(\text{\#xa}7\) wraps up.

22 \(\text{\#xd}4\) \(\text{\#xd}4\) 23 \(\text{\#d}3\)!

A simple way of bringing things to a close. The scene shifts from one of loose queens and checkmates to the prosaic win of a trapped bishop.

23...\(\text{\#d}8\) 24 \(\text{\#xd}8+\) \(\text{\#xd}8\) 25 \(\text{\#d}3\)

... and as 25...\(\text{\#h}1\) 26 \(\text{\#b}2\) \(\text{\#e}8\) 27 \(\text{\#f}6\) wins easily, Black resigned.

One of the great games.

Kasparov – Anand

PCA World Championship

Match, New York 1995

1 e4 d5

A first at this level.

2 exd5 \(\text{\#xd}5\) 3 \(\text{\#c}3\) \(\text{\#a}5\) 4 d4 \(\text{\#f}6\) 5 \(\text{\#f}3\) c6

A useful structural move, also permitting retreats for his queen.

6 \(\text{\#e}5\)

6 \(\text{\#d}2\) was tried in Timman – Belyavsky, Ubeda 1997 and continued 6...\(\text{\#f}5\) 7 \(\text{\#h}4!?!\) \(\text{\#g}4\) 8 \(\text{\#e}2\) \(\text{\#e}2\) 9 \(\text{\#xe}2\) \(\text{\#a}6!\) 10 \(\text{\#f}3\) e6 11 0-0-0 \(\text{\#bd}7\) 12 \(\text{\#he}1\) 0-0-0 when Black had equalised and later won.

6...\(\text{\#e}6?!\)
The reputation of this move advanced as a consequence of the position Anand reached from the opening of this game. 6...\textit{f5} remains a serious alternative.

7 \textit{d3}

7 \textit{c4}, 7 \textit{c4} and 7 \textit{e2} are alternatives

In Motwani – Gormally, Lichfield 2000 White emerged with a big edge after 7 \textit{c4} \textit{xc4} 8 \textit{xc4} \textit{d8} 9 g5 \textit{bd7} 10 d5!? cxd5 11 \textit{xd5} e6 12 \textit{xe2!} \textit{e7} 13 \textit{xe7} \textit{xc7} 14 0-0-0 0-0 15 \textit{d6}. In Comp WChess – Wolff, Harvard Cup Boston 1995 Patrick preferred the 8...\textit{a6} idea, and after 9 \textit{e2} e6 10 0-0 \textit{d5} 11 \textit{e4} \textit{d7} 12 \textit{cd6+} \textit{xd6} 13 \textit{xd6+} \textit{e7} 14 \textit{xa6} \textit{bxa6} 15 \textit{e4} \textit{f6} 16 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 17 c4 \textit{hd8} 18 \textit{d1} c5 19 \textit{e3} \textit{g4} Black emerged into an ending which he actually went on to win. The animal beat the machine!

7...\textit{bd7}

The fianchetto was seen already in Fedorowicz – Ricardi, Buenos Aires 1991; 7...g6 8 0-0 \textit{g7} 9 \textit{e2} (Heading for \textit{f4} to harass the guy at \textit{e6}.) 9...\textit{bd7} 10 \textit{d2} \textit{wc7} 11 \textit{f4} \textit{xe5} 12 \textit{xe5} \textit{wd7} 13 c3 0-0 14 \textit{g3}. (A less effectual square.) 14...c5 15 \textit{dxc5} \textit{ad8} 16 \textit{d4} and White stood better.

In Minasian – Soppe from the following year’s Olympiad, White continued more directly with 9 \textit{e2} \textit{bd7} 10 \textit{c4} \textit{xc4} 11 \textit{xc4} \textit{wc7} 12 \textit{f3} 0-0 13 \textit{e3} with, again, a slight edge.
8 f4

In my opinion this was a mistaken concept. 8 cxd7 was known, and used in Sax – Simonenko, Saint Vincent 2000. After 8...xd7 9 0-0 g4 (Also 9...e6 10 f4 b6 12 e2 c5 was playable, as in San Segundo – Ricardi, Buenos Aires 1995) 10 f3 h5 11 e1 g6 12 xg6 hxg6 13 e5 d8 (13...b6!?) 14 f4 h5 (14...h5!?) 15 e3 e6 16 e4 e7 Black was solid (1-0 in 44 moves.) In Kaminiski – Van der Wiel, Groningen 1992, White preferred 10 e2 and play was unclear following 10...e6 11 c3 d6 12 c7 13 h5 14 e1 g6 15 g5 h6 16 xf6 xd3 17 xd3 gxf6 18 d3 f5 19 c4 0-0-0 20 d5 e5.

After Kasparov's choice White can easily end up a little less than equal.

But it is better than the stupid 8 c4? of Plaskett – Bertona, Pilar de la Horadada Rapidplay, 2004, after which Black took it and was a clear tempo up on the lines with 7 c4.

8...g6! 9 0-0 g7 10 h1 f5! 11 c4

11...e6 12 e2 h5

Necessary, to hang on to his threatened bishop. But here it is a logical move, and it took a Kasparov to later make anything out of the weakening of a Black kingside which ...h5 must entail.

13 e3 d8!

Shrewd prophylaxis.

14 g1 0-0 15 f3

15...d5

Excellent though this pawn structure-altering move was, he had a still better one, which would have brought the significance of his 13th move into relief, in 15...e5!. Then neither 16 xb7 xe5 17 xe5 g4 nor 16 c1 cxd4 17 xd4 xe5 18 xe5 d7 left White adequately placed.

16 cxd5 exd5
Anand declined a draw offer, a decision justifiable from his situation in the match and on the board.

17 $\text{f2}$ $\text{w}c7$ 18 $\text{e}c1$ f6 19 $\text{d}d3$ $\text{f}e8$ 20 b3 $\text{b}b6$ 21 a4 $\text{c}8$

Towards e4.

22 c4 $\text{f}f7$ 23 a5 $\text{f}b8$ 24 cxd5 cxd5 25 $\text{h}4$ $\text{d}6$ 26 a6 b6?

Just taking it was safer, more natural and much better. Now the a6 pawn has great potential value in many of the endgames.

27 $\text{d}e5$

What’s this?! Garry jumps at a chance to spice things up before Vishy plants a guest on e4.

27...$\text{w}e6$

The critical lines are after the acceptance: 27...fxe5 28 fxe5 $\text{d}e4$ 29 $\text{x}d8$ $\text{x}d8$ 30 g4! hxg4 31 $\text{x}g4$ $\text{x}g4$ 32 $\text{x}g4$ $\text{d}f2+$ 33 $\text{xf2}$ $\text{xf2}$ 34 $\text{x}g6+$ $\text{g}7$ 35 $\text{c}7$ and here if Black would go for the win he must trade the queens and endure the rook on the seventh and the a6 pawn.

Also after 28...$\text{c}8$, intending to swivel the knight nearer to the defence of the king, he would have had to live with an unwelcome seventh rank visitor in a line like 29 $\text{x}d8$ $\text{x}d8$ 30 g4 hxg4 31 $\text{x}g4$ $\text{e}7$ 32 $\text{c}7$, etc.

Nevertheless, it is not at all clear that Black is worse after 27...$\text{w}e6$, notwithstanding the risklessness and his extra material in the lines from 27...fxe5.

How different the game would have been had he captured on a6!

28 g4! hxg4 29 $\text{d}xg4$ $\text{g}7$?!

Time shortage for both men. 29...$\text{d}c7$ was proposed as a better move, and also the occupation of the outpost, with interesting counterchances after 29...$\text{e}4$? 30 $\text{c}7$ b5?!

30 $\text{c}7$

The rook lands on its most efficient square with tempo, as it is now threatening to take the bishop.

30...$\text{e}4$ 31 $\text{e}3$!
31...\textit{h}3  
On 31...\textit{wdx}6 32 \textit{A}xg7+! \textit{Ax}g7 33 \textit{A}xf5+ \textit{gx}f5 34 \textit{A}g1+ and 35 \textit{A}xe4 and the White men pour in on the defenceless Black king.  
32 \textit{A}g1!  
All of White’s kingside pieces are now not only functioning as attackers, but also in the defence of their own king.  
32...\textit{g}5 33 \textit{A}g4! \textit{Ax}g4 34 \textit{W}xg4 \textit{W}xg4 35 \textit{A}xg4 \textit{A}d6 36 \textit{A}f2! \textit{A}b5 37 \textit{A}b7 \textit{A}e4 38 \textit{f}5! \textit{A}xg4 39 \textit{A}xg4  
Landing at a glorious, aggressive, blockading outpost.  
39...\textit{A}c8 40 \textit{A}d7 \textit{A}c2?  
A last time trouble error. He could have put up a bit more resistance with 40...\textit{A}c3.  
41 \textit{A}xd5 Black resigned  
An historic Scandinavian game, if not a great one. Garry escaped again.

“The good player is always lucky.” J. R. Capablanca

\textbf{White defers \textit{d}4 against 3...\textit{wa}5}

A variety of formations where White delays or altogether passes over the advance \textit{d}2-\textit{d}4 have been used. As you might imagine, play tends to be less sharp in these lines.

\textbf{White plays \textit{g}3}

Solid, but quiet. I would recommend a response of fianchettoing one’s own king’s bishop.
Tiviakov – Ricardi,
Najdorf Memorial, Buenos Aires 1996

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 w xd5 3 Q c3 w a5 4 g3

4...Qf6 5 Qg2

Ricardi did alright with the same formation against De las Heras, at the Clarin Junior event, Boca, 1997, after 5 h3 g6 6 Qg2 Qg7 7 Qge2 0-0 8 0-0 e5! Very often they play ...c6, and argue that the White king’s bishop bites on granite. But why not grab yourself some space? If he will not play actively, then let Black. 9 d3 Qc6 10 Qd2 w c7 11 w c1 b6 12 Qh6 Qb7 13 Qxg7 Qxg7 14 w e3 Qfd8, when he had completely equalised.

5...g6!

Very sound, but the strong German GM, M.Wahls showed that the set up with ...Qf5 is well playable too in his game as Black against Mainka from the 1994 German Championships, 5...c6 6 Qf3 Qf5 7 0-0 e6 8 h3 h6 9 d3 Qbd7 11 Wc2 Qe7 11 a3 0-0 12 Qe4 Qh7 13 b4 Wc7 14 Qxf6+ Qxf6 15 Qb1 Qfe8 with full equality.

Also 6 Qge2 Qf5 7 b4!? Wc7! 8 b5 a6 9 bxc6 Qxc6 10 0-0 e5 gave equality in Ashley – Rogers, Saitek US Masters, Hawaii 1998.
Another approach was to take advantage of White’s deferral of d4 and stake one’s own claim in the middle with 5...e5?!, as in Anand – Ivanchuk, London INTEL, 1994. After 6 Qge2 Qd6 7 0-0 0-0 8 d4 Qc6 9 Qg5 exd4 10 Qxf6 dxc3 11 Qxc3 Wh5 12 Qf4 Wxd1 13 Qaxd1 Qf5 chances were even.

6 Qf3

Neither did the earth much move in Keitlinghaus – Waitzkin, Budapest (was Josh looking for Bobby Fischer?) 1997 after, by transposition, 6 h3 c6 7 d3 Qg7 8 Qd2 0-0 9 Qd5 Qd8 10 Qxf6+ Qxf6 11 Qc3 Qd7 12 Qe2 e5 13 0-0 Qb6 with equal chances.

6...Qg7 7 0-0 0-0 8 d3 Wh5?!

Many other deployments suggest themselves in a setting with so little contact, but Ricardi’s is noteworthy.

9 Qd2 Qg4!? 10 f3 Qh3 11 Qxh3 Qxh3 12 Qc4 Qc6 13 Qf4

Uncharacteristically dreary play from Sergei Tiviakov. Ricardi takes advantage.

13...Qh5! 14 Qe3 Qxg3 15 hxg3 Whg3 16 Qh1 b5

A joke.

17 Qxb5 Drawn.

White plays Qc4

Speelman – Summerscale
British Championship, Eastbourne 1990

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qxd5 3 Qc3 Qa5 4 Qf3 Qf6 5 h3

5 Qc4 Qg4 6 h3 Qh5 8 g4 Qg6 9 d3 c6 10 Qd2 Qc7 11 We2 Qbd7 12 0-0-0 was equal in Mascarinas – Rogers, Sydney 1979.

5...Qf5 6 Qc4 e6 7 0-0 Qbd7 8 d3 c6 9 Qe1 0-0-0 10 Qf4 Qb6

11 Qd2
A year before this game, Jonathan Speelman was ranked 5th in the world. Not long after it I asked him to explain some opening eccentricity of his and he replied: “I don’t know anything about the theory of this game!” Got the impression he meant it, too.

11...\(\text{\textit{a}}\text{bd5}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{x}}\text{xd5!}}\) exd5 13 \(\text{\textit{c}}\text{b3 \textit{w}}\text{a6}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{d4 \textit{g}}\text{g6}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{c}}\text{cb5}\)
Whipping up an attack from somewhere.

15...\(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e8}\)

Hastening a defender round to help.

16 a4 \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{d6}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{d2 \textit{d}}\text{d7}\)

18 \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{xe6 fxe6}\) 19 \(\text{\textit{x}}\text{xe6 d4}\)
To take c3 away from his queen, but it’s not enough use.

20 \(\text{\textit{g}}\text{g3 \textit{f}}\text{f7}\) 21 \(\text{\textit{x}}\text{xd6! \textit{x}}\text{xd6}\) 22 \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{xd6+ \textit{x}}\text{xd6}\) 23 \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{f4}\)
...and it’s all over.

23...\(\text{\textit{h}}\text{hd8}\) 24 \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xf7 \textit{e}}\text{e6}\) 25 \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{f5+ \textit{e}}\text{e6}\) 26 \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e1 \textit{d}}\text{de8}\) 27 \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e5}\) Black resigned.

If you have difficulty in following the early middlegame, remember that Speelman played White.

**White plays \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e2}\)**

**Short – Rogers**

Tilburg Rapid 1992

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xd5}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{c}}\text{c3 \textit{w}}\text{a5}\) 4 \(\text{\textit{f}}\text{f3}\)

In Hunt – Houska, British Championship 2000, Black decided that, just as in the g3 lines, here she is so unchallenged by \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e2}\) that she could take time out for a fianchettto and demonstrated comfortable equality after 4 \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e2 g6}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{f}}\text{f3 \textit{g}}\text{g7}\) 6 0-0 \(\text{\textit{f}}\text{f6}\) 7 d4 c6 8 \(\text{\textit{f}}\text{f4}\) 0-0-0 9 a3 \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{bd7}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{d2 \textit{e}}\text{e8}\), and the game was drawn in 38 moves.

4...\(\text{\textit{f}}\text{f6}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{e}}\text{e2}\)
Short seems to have a penchant for home cooked $\text{b}{c}2$ systems, e.g. his 1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 e5 $\text{b}f5$ 4 $\text{c}f3$ e6 5 $\text{b}c2$ against the Caro-Kann.

5...$\text{g}g4$

The fianchetto also worked well in Glek – van der Wiel, Porto San Giorgio Open 1998; 5...g6 6 0-0 $\text{g}7$ 7 $\text{b}e1$ 0-0 8 $\text{c}c4$ $\text{g}4$ 9 h3 $\text{xf3}$ 10 $\text{x}f3$ $\text{c}6$ 11 d3 and Black stood well after 11...$\text{d}d4$, as he would have done after 11...e6, too.

6 h3 $\text{h}5$

7 b4!

The point. 7...$\text{x}b4$? 8 $\text{b}1$ and 9 $\text{x}b7$ is definitely in White’s favour.

7...$\text{b}6$ 8 0-0 $\text{c}6$

It looks like the developing move 8...e6 was superior. In Naiditsch – Kosteniuk, Hoogovens 1996 Black equalised following 9 $\text{b}1$ $\text{e}7$ 10 d4 $\text{c}6$ 11 b5 $\text{bd}7$ 12 bxc6 $\text{xc}6$ 13 $\text{b}3$ 0-0.

9 $\text{b}1$!

Nigel hopes to make something of the b pawn battering ram.

9...e6 10 b5 $\text{c}7$ 11 d4 $\text{d}6$ 12 bxc6 bxc6

12...$\text{xc}6$? 13 $\text{b}5$ wins.

13 $\text{e}5$ $\text{xe}2$

13...$\text{xe}5$ 14 $\text{x}h5$ favoured White.

14 $\text{xe}2$ 0-0 15 $\text{c}4$ $\text{bd}7$ 16 $\text{x}d6$ $\text{xd}6$ 17 $\text{d}1$
White is a little better.

17...\(\text{Bb6}\) 18 \(\text{Ab3}\) \(\text{Ae8}\) 19 \(\text{Wf3}\) \(\text{Abd5}\)

19...e5 20 \(\text{Aa3}\) was also slightly in White’s favour.

20 \(\text{Aa4!}\) \(\text{Wc7}\) 21 c4 \(\text{Ae7}\) 22 \(\text{Cc5}\)

White’s last three moves have gained him central leverage, a knight outpost, and control of the b file.

22...\(\text{Ae5}\) 23 \(\text{Af4}\) \(\text{Aa5}\) 24 \(\text{Ae5}\) \(\text{Wxa2}\)

I cannot believe that Ian made that capture with any great confidence in his game.

25 \(\text{Axdf6}\) \(\text{gxf6}\) 26 \(\text{Ae4}\)

...and the g pawn falls as 26...\(\text{Ag7}\) meets with 27 g4. Short now made short shrift of the weakened Black king.

26...\(\text{Ah8}\) 27 \(\text{Axdf6}\) \(\text{Ag8}\)

On 27...\(\text{Af8}\) 28 \(\text{Ab7}\) is powerful.

28 \(\text{Axg8}\) \(\text{Axg8}\) 29 \(\text{Ab7}\) \(\text{Axc4}\) 30 \(\text{Axdf7}\) a5 31 \(\text{Wh5}\) \(\text{Ag7}\) 32 \(\text{We5}\) \(\text{Wd5}\) 33 \(\text{Ab1}\) h6 34 \(\text{Af6}\) \(\text{Wg5}\) 35 \(\text{Axg5}\) hxg5 36 \(\text{Afb7}\) \(\text{Ah7}\) 37 \(\text{Aa7}\) \(\text{Ag6}\) 38 g4!

A standard way of dealing with Black knights at g7.

38...\(\text{Ae8}\) 39 \(\text{Afe7}\) \(\text{Af6}\) 40 \(\text{Aed7}\) \(\text{Ae6}\) 41 \(\text{Axa5}\) \(\text{Af6}\) 42 \(\text{Ae7}\) \(\text{Ae5}\) 43 \(\text{Ax6f}\) \(\text{Ag7}\) 44 \(\text{Axc6}\) \(\text{Af4}\) 45 \(\text{Aa7}\) and Black resigned.
Chapter 3:
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ♕xd5 3 ♖c3 ♕d8

Stonewalling or what?!

With this move Black either expresses no active ambitions whatsoever in the initial stages of the game, but rather he is aiming to avoid exposing the queen to early harassment from White’s pieces whilst developing his pieces to sensible squares. Or he plays a quite different formation involving a quick fianchetto of the king’s bishop to initiate play against d4.

If the stonewall approach is okay, then, as with the variation 3...♕e5+, this may be telling us that the slight loss of time Black cedes with his two early queen moves really is not so significant at all after White prevents himself from putting up a two pawn centre by 3 ♖c3.

The earliest known Scandinavian game, as reported by Lucena, featured this very retreat.

Castellyi – Vinoles
1485

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ♕xd5 3 ♖c3 ♕d8 4 ♖c4 ♖f6 5 ♖f3 ♖g4 6 h3 ♖xf3 7 ♕xf3 e6?

7...c6 would be the modern interpretation, I am sure.

8 ♕xb7 ♖bd7 9 ♖b5 ♖c8 10 ♖xa7 ♖b6 11 ♖xc8 ♖xc8 12 d4 ♖d6 13 ♖b5+ ♖xb5 14 ♕xb5+ ♕d7
15 d5 exd5 16 ∆e3 ∆d6 17 ∆d1 ∆f6 18 ∆xd5 ∆g6 19 ∆f4 ∆xf4 20 ∆xd7+ ∆f8 21 ∆d8 mate.

Michael Adams liked this opening whenever he was playing with the Black pieces against one of the big boys in Frankfurt 1999.

Svidler – Adams
Frankfurt West Masters 1999

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ∆xd5 3 ∆c3 ∆d8 4 d4 ∆f6

5 ∆c4

After, by transposition, 5 ∆f3 c6 6 ∆g5 Adams chose to defend with ...∆f5 against Leko in the same event. Play continued 7 ∆xf6!? exf6 8 ∆c2 ∆b4 and it was drawn at move 53.

After 5 ∆f3, Kotronias played 5...∆g4 vs Tzermiadianos at Katerini, 1993 and play continued 6 ∆e2 e6 7 h3 ∆h5 8 0-0 ∆e7 9 ∆e5 ∆xe2 10 ∆xe2 0-0 11 ∆b5 ∆c8 with an equality similar to lines of the Alekhine Defence.

In Baklan – Lopez Martinez, Andorra Open 2001 White developed less classically with 5 ∆g5 ∆f5 6 ∆d2 c6 7 ∆ge2, but he could show no edge
after 7...e6 8 ∆g3 ∆g6 9 ∆ce2 ∆bd7 10 0-0-0 ∆d6 11 h4 h6 12 ∆f4 ∆e7
13 ∆c3 ∆a5 14 ∆d3 ∆xd3 15 ∆xd3 0-0-0, and the game was drawn in 42
moves.

In Markovic – Solak, Yugoslav championship 2002, White threw the
kitchen sink at him after 5 ∆g5 c6 6 ∆c4 ∆g4!? 7 f3 ∆f5 8 g4 ∆g6 9 h4
h5 10 ∆ge2!? hxg4 11 ∆f4 ∆f5 12 ∆xf6 gxf6 13 fxg4 ∆d6 14 ∆f3

14...∆xc2!? Cheeky. 15 ∆xh7 16 ∆b5 ∆d7 17 ∆b3 e6 18 d5 cxd5 19
∆xd5 ∆a6 20 ∆xb7 ∆c5 21 ∆xc5 ∆xc5 22 ∆xa8, but later he slipped in
the complications and was to lose.

Arthur Kogan likes 3...∆d8 and used it to equalise and then go on to win
against Salmesuu at the 2001 Nordic Open in Bergen after 5 ∆f4 c6 6 ∆d2
∆f5 7 ∆f3 e6 8 a3 ∆bd7 9 ∆e2 ∆e7 10 h3 0-0 11 0-0 b5.

5...c6 6 ∆f3

6...∆f5

In Fressinet – Miljanic, European Championship, Saint Vincent 2000,
Black kept the bishop behind the pawns with 6..b5 7 ∆b3 e6 8 0-0 ∆e7
and stood slightly worse after 9 ∆e5 0-0 10 ∆e1 a5 11 a4 b4 12 ∆e2 ∆d5
13 ∆f4.

7 ∆e5 e6 8 g4 ∆g6 9 h4

By analogy with lines of 3...∆a5 where Black permits his bishop to be
chased so.
9...\textit{b}d7

Gretarsson – Monell Camarasa, Balagaguer Open 2001 saw quite a different response, 9...\textit{b}b4!? 10 a3 \textit{xc}c3+ 11 bxc3 \textit{e}e4 12 f3 \textit{d}d5. The placing of the bishop at c4 allows time for this extrication manouevre. 13 \textit{e}e2 c5 14 c4 \textit{c}6 15 c3 \textit{c}7 16 \textit{f}4

and Black decided it was time for some fun.

16...\textit{d}xg4 17 fxg4 \textit{x}h1 18 \textit{g}g6 \textit{a}a5 19 \textit{d}xh8 \textit{xc}3+ 20 \textit{f}2 \textit{e}4.

Many adventures lie ahead, but the guy at h8 is out of them, and Black delivered mate in a time scramble at move 39.

10 f3!? is an interesting alternative, which has worked well for White. As 10...0-0 runs into 11 h5 \textit{xc}2 12 \textit{xc}2 \textit{xd}4 and the Black game does not look quite okay after 13 f4 \textit{d}xg4 14 \textit{d}xg4 \textit{xc}4 15 \textit{d}d2, with continuing attacking chances for White, instead in L.Perez – Lopez Martinez Varadero, 2000 we saw splendid adventures after 10...\textit{xc}2 11 \textit{xc}2 \textit{xd}4

12 \textit{e}2! (12 f4 is certainly worth a look) 12...\textit{xc}3+ 13 bxc3 \textit{xc}3+ 14 \textit{f}2 \textit{xa}1 15 \textit{d}1 \textit{c}3 16 \textit{b}2 \textit{b}4 17 \textit{xf}7! 0-0 18 \textit{xf}6! gxf6 19 \textit{xe}6 and the attack triumphed.

10...\textit{d}d5 also fared badly in, e.g. van Wissen – Del Rio Angelis after the blunt reaction of 11 \textit{xd}5! cxd5 12 \textit{e}2 \textit{xc}3+ 13 bxc3 \textit{c}8 14 h5!
\( \text{1 e4 d5 2 exd5 } \text{wx}d5 \text{ 3 } \text{xc}3 \text{ wxd8} \)

\( \text{Wxc3+ 15 } \text{f}2 \text{ wxa1 16 } \text{b}5+ \text{ xc6 17 } \text{xc6 0-0 18 } \text{e7+ } \text{h}8 \text{ 19 } \text{hxg6 h6 20 } \text{b}4 \text{ } \text{ae}8 \text{ 21 } \text{g}2 \text{ and Black resigned.} \)

A sad day for the romantics, as Knowledge beat The River of the Angels.

\( \text{10 } \text{xd7 } \text{xd7} \)

A recapture not possible in the other line.

\( \text{11 h}5 \text{ e4 12 } \text{xe}4 \text{ } \text{xe}4 \)

\( \text{13 c3} \)

Two days later this position occurred again in Lutz – Adams, and White varied successfully with 13 \( \text{e}3 \text{ 0-0-0 14 } \text{f}3 \) as Michael was tempted to take the bait and after 14...\( \text{b}4+ 15 \text{ c}3 \text{ xc}3 \text{ 16 } \text{xc}3 \text{ xc}3+ 17 \text{e}2 \text{ xa1 18 } \text{xa1 f}5 \text{ 19 } \text{gxf5 } \text{exf5 20 d}5! \text{ cxd5 21 } \text{d}3, \text{ Black’s game was too ragged. White was on the way to consolidating after 21... } \text{b}8 \text{ 22 } \text{f}4+ \text{ a}8 \text{ 23 } \text{d}4 \text{ b}6 \text{ 24 a}4 \text{ f}4 \text{ 25 } \text{xf4 } \text{he}8 \text{ 26 } \text{b}5, \text{ and he won at move 63.} \)

\( \text{13...0-0-0 14 } \text{e}2 \text{ f6 15 } \text{d}2 \text{ d}6 \text{ 16 0-0-0 } \text{he}8 \text{ 17 f}4 \text{ c}7 \text{ 18 } \text{f}3 \text{ c}5! \)

The standard bid for counterplay.

\( \text{19 dxc5 } \text{xc5 20 } \text{b}1 \text{ c}6 \text{ 21 } \text{xc6+ } \text{bxc6 22 } \text{e}2 \text{ e}4 \text{ 23 } \text{c}1 \)

Peter must still have hoped to make something of his bishops.

\( \text{23...c7 24 } \text{xd}8 \text{ xd}8 \text{ 25 } \text{d}1 \)
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)xd5 3 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)c3 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d8

I would have kept a rook on the board, following the advice which David Rumens told me he received from Kagan at the 1976-77 Hastings tournament on how to exploit the possession of the bishop pair.

25...\(\text{\textit{e}}\)xd1 26 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)xd1 g6 27 hgx6 hxg6 28 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)f6 29 c4 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d7 30 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c2 e5 31 a3 exf4 32 \(\text{\textit{xf}}\)xf4+ \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d6 33 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e3 a5 34 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d2 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b6 35 b4 axb4 36 axb4 e5!

Shoring it up.

37 b5 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e5 38 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e2 f5 39 gxf5 gxf5 40 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b3 f4! 41 \(\text{\textit{xf}}\)f4 Drawn.

Perhaps Mickey is more ambitious with Black in other German cities? And against weaker players.

Fischer – Robatsch
Varna Olympiad 1962

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)xd5 3 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)c3 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d8 4 d4 g6

The fianchetto treatment.

Marinkovic – Vukovic, Niksic 1996 saw White do it too: 4...c6 5 g3 g6 6 h3 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g7 7 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c6 8 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g2 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c8 9 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e4 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f6 10 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d5 d6 0-0 0-0 12 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c2 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)bd7 and the game was drawn at move 28.

5 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f4!

Playing to neutralise the dark squared bishop. In Dzhindikhhasvili – Comp Fritz, New York rapidplay 1993, Roman went 5 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g7 6 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c4 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)a6 7 h3 0-0 8 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f4 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e5 9 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c2 a6 10 g4 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c8 11 0-0-0 b5 12 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d3 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b7 with a complex situation from which the machine eventually beat the man.

White took on the dragon in different mode in Ziatdinov – Kontic, Niksic, 1991, with 5 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h6 6 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g5 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g7 7 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d2 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f5 8 0-0-0 h6 9 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f4 g5 10 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e5 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xe5 11 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xe5 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d7 12 f4 with an edge, and in yet another manner in Nataf – Payen, Capelle la Grande Open, 2000, with 5 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g7 6 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f4 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h6 7 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d2 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f5 8 0-0-0 a6 9 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c4 0-0 10 h4 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d6 11 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e2 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g4 12 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d5 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xe2 13 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)xe2 and again he had emerged with superiority.
36 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 dc3 wd8

But none of these is superior to Fischer's characteristically direct treatment.
5...dg7
The point of 5 df4 is to cross up the plan with ...dh6, ...df5 and ...dg7 by meeting 5...dh6 with 6 de5!
6 wd2!

Fischer's novelty, and still regarded as a very good one.
6...df6
On 6...xd4 7 xd4 xd4 8 db5! White will emerge with the advantage of the pair of bishops, or even more should Black blunder with 8...xb2? 9 db1. 6...xd4? 7 0-0-0 gives a rampant initiative.
7 0-0-0 e6
On 7...d5 8 dh6?! dxh6 9 wxh6 dc3 would grant Black good counterplay against the weakened White king, but 8 de5! is the correct response, with White on top.
8 dh6
Straight to work
8...0-0?!
Talk about castling into it. 8...dxh6 9 wxh6 df5 was a better chance. Black's game is already critical.
9 h4!
Simplest and best. Bobby went straight for the throat.
9...wa5 10 h5 gxh5
Opening the g line and splitting his pawns, before White peels open the h line.
10...dxh5 11 ae2 df6 12 xg7 exg7 13 wh6+ g8 14 g4! d8 15 g5 dh5 16 dxh5 gxh5 17 xh5 df5 would have seen the first of three curious and important possible pins in this game; 18 g6! and wins.
11 ed3 bd7
11...\( \text{f5} \)? ran into a double bishop pinning in 12 \( \text{g5} \).

12 \( \text{gxe2 d8} \)

13 \( \text{g4!} \)

Black is lost in the face of such a rampant attack. Had Black played 13...\( \text{xg4} \), then after 14 \( \text{dgl} \) the position is mentioned at Tim Krabbe’s Open Chess Diary, Entry 234, on January 4th 2004. He describes it as another kind of double minor piece pinning, as it half pins both the knight at \( \text{e4} \) and the bishop at \( \text{g7} \). Although either might capture the bishop at \( \text{h6} \) it would only be to pin the other by the rook at \( \text{g1} \).

He also includes at that entry a question involving the nature of half pins, pins and non-pins, the solution to which involved a game between myself and the very well-mannered GM, Jonathan Parker.

13...\( \text{f8} \) 14 \( \text{gxh5 e6} \) 15 \( \text{dgl} \)

15...\( \text{h8} \) 16 \( \text{xg7+ xg7} \) 17 \( \text{h6 g8} \) 18 \( \text{g5 d8} \) 19 \( \text{hg1 f5} \) 20 \( \text{xf5} \) Black resigned.

Robert James deemed that one of his 60 Memorable. In his saner days.
Chapter Four:

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \( \text{\textit{\#}} \)xd5 3 \( \text{\textit{\#}} \)c3 \( \text{\textit{\#}} \)d6

It may be that the Bulgarian GM Donchev and ex-World Championship challenger, David Bronstein deserve a lot of the credit for the popularisation of this move, as they started to deploy it with frequency from the end of the 1980s. Its particular appeal has been in conjunction with a swift ...a6, a move that can serve to pave the way for ...b5 or just keep the White knight out of b5.

Lutikov played so against Karpov in 1979, but without success. But since then the idea has acquired some highly ranked GM supporters, so perhaps this serves to give further affirmation to Jan Timman’s comment from an interview in 1980, that there are many viable and untried ideas in the openings, even before the fifth move.

A valid observation even after the coming of the machines!?  

Of the four essayed queen moves at move three for Black, it is fair to observe that, whereas with the others it is more likely to be a safety first approach, in this line, far more often than with the other three, we see Black trying for active counterchances in the opening stages of the game.

With 3...\( \text{\textit{\#}} \)a5 still maintaining its status as most popular choice, it is 3...\( \text{\textit{\#}} \)d6 currently challenging for top spot in the lines stemming from 2...\( \text{\textit{\#}} \)xd5, with still many untapped veins of ideas rich in potential.
White plays \( \text{e}3 \)
White plays g3
White plays \( \text{c}4 \)
White plays \( \text{g}5 \)
White plays \( \text{d}3 \)
Early \( \text{e}5 \) and others

White plays \( \text{e}3 \)

Karpov – Lutikov
USSR Spartakiad, 1979

\[
1 \text{ e}4 \text{ d}5 2 \text{ exd}5 \text{ w}x\text{d}5 3 \text{ c}3 \text{ w}d6 4 \text{ d}4
\]

\[
\text{h}6
\]

4...

\[ \text{ f}6 \]

After the very different approach of 4...c6!? 5 \( \text{ e}3 \) \( \text{ f}6 \) 6 \( \text{ w}d2 \) \( \text{ f}5 \) 7 \( \text{ g}e2 \) e6 8 \( \text{ g}3 \) \( \text{ g}6 \) 9 h4 h6 10 h5 \( \text{ h}7 \) 11 \( \text{ x}d3 \) \( \text{ x}d3 \) 12 \( \text{ w}x\text{d}3 \) Black was equal in Pavlovic – Cicak, Zurich open 2000, and went on to win.

Same story in Jansa – Cicak, Passau, 2000, after 4...c6!? 5 \( \text{ f}3 \) \( \text{ g}4 \) 6 \( \text{ e}3 \) e6 7 h3 \( \text{ x}f3 \) 8 \( \text{ w}x\text{f}3 \) \( \text{ f}6 \) 9 0-0-0 \( \text{ bd}7 \) 10 \( \text{ f}4 \) \( \text{ b}4 \), and 0-1 at move 46.

In Kovacevic – Radibratovic, Yugoslav team Championships 2001, play went 5 \( \text{ f}3 \) \( \text{ g}4 \) 6 \( \text{ e}3 \) \( \text{ d}7 \) 7 \( \text{ e}2 \) \( \text{ g}6 \) 8 \( \text{ w}d2 \) e6 9 \( \text{ f}4 \) \( \text{ b}4 \) 10 a3 \( \text{ a}5 \) 11 0-0 \( \text{ e}7 \) 12 \( \text{ f}e1 \) 0-0 13 h3 \( \text{ h}5 \) 14 b4 \( \text{ w}d8 \) with balanced chances.

5 \( \text{ f}3 \)

If you are ever unsure as Black where to put your queen bishop, bear these episodes in mind: Short – Sulava, European Team Championships, Ohrid 2001, 5 \( \text{ e}3 \) \( \text{ f}5 \)? 6 \( \text{ f}3 \)! Oops! 6...\( \text{ c}8 \) 7 0-0-0 c6 8 \( \text{ f}4 \) \( \text{ b}4 \) 9 \( \text{ g}e2 \) \( \text{ e}6 \)??
10 \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{c7}}}} OOPS!, and 11 a3 came with effect (10...\textit{\textbf{\textit{d5}}} 11 \textit{\textbf{\textit{g3}}} wins).

And then there was Andre – Dobosz, Dortmund, 1976 where after the canny 5 h3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{f5}}}? was also played and swiftly regretted; 6 \textit{\textbf{\textit{f3}}}! \textit{\textbf{\textit{e6+}}} 7 \textit{\textbf{\textit{e3}}} c6 8 0-0-0 \textit{\textbf{\textit{c8}}} 9 \textit{\textbf{\textit{dxe2}}} e6 10 g4 \textit{\textbf{\textit{g6}}} 11 \textit{\textbf{\textit{f4}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{c7}}} 12 h4 \textit{\textbf{\textit{b4}}} 13 h5 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xc3}}} 14 hxg6 \textit{\textbf{\textit{a5}}} 15 g5 and Black resigned.

In Wedberg – J. Fries-Nielsen, Rilton Cup 2003, Tom took a radical approach to the effect of the bishop at b7 by 5 \textit{\textbf{\textit{e3}}} a6 6 \textit{\textbf{\textit{d2}}} b5 7 f3??. Play took a turn for the unusual after 7...\textit{\textbf{\textit{b7}}} 8 \textit{\textbf{\textit{d3}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{bd7}}} 9 \textit{\textbf{\textit{dxe2}}} e6 10 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xe4}}}! \textit{\textbf{\textit{dxe4}}} 11 fxe4 c5 12 c3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{e7}}} 13 0-0 0-0 14 \textit{\textbf{\textit{ad1}}} cxd4 15 cxd4 e5 with unclear chances. White won at move 36.

Alternatively, 7 \textit{\textbf{\textit{f3}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{b7}}} 8 \textit{\textbf{\textit{e2}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{bd7}}} 9 0-0 e6 10 a4 b4 11 \textit{\textbf{\textit{da2}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{e7}}} got him nowhere in Mazi – Sermek, Bled Open, 1999.

5...a6

Black’s treatment was not active enough in Bologan – Muse, Berlin 1995, and after 5...\textit{\textbf{\textit{g4}}} 6 h3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xf3}}} 7 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xf3}}} c6 8 \textit{\textbf{\textit{e3}}} e6 9 0-0-0 \textit{\textbf{\textit{c7}}} 10 \textit{\textbf{\textit{b1}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{bd7}}} 11 \textit{\textbf{\textit{c1}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{b6}}} 12 g4 h6 13 h4 his position was passive and worse and White won at move 48.

An uninspired muse.

6 \textit{\textbf{\textit{e3}}}

6...\textit{\textbf{\textit{d}}}/c6

Zaragatski – Gofshtein, Sauerland Stern Hotel, 2001 saw Black try the fianchetto, and very effectively; 6...b5 7 \textit{\textbf{\textit{d2}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{b7}}} 8 \textit{\textbf{\textit{f4}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{b6}}} 9 \textit{\textbf{\textit{e5}}} e6
10 0-0-0 b4 (10...bd7!?; 10...c5?!?) 11 We3 c5?! 12 dxc5 xc5 13 wg3 \h \h 14 wg5 xf4 15 wxf4 0-0 with a superb type of Sicilian for Black, who won at move 50.

In Fernando – Spraggett, Portuguese Championship, 2001, Black came out of the opening intact after 6...\f5 (here better timed!) 7 wd2 e6 8 0-0-0 c6 9 \h4 \g6 10 f3 b5 11 xg6 hxg6 12 xe4 w8, drawn in 35 moves.

I am at a loss to explain much of the following gamelet to you: Manaca – Sulava, Lido Estensi Open, 2003, 6...\f5 7 xe5 xc6 8 g4 xe5 9 gxf5 xe4 10 f3 c6 11 0-0-0 xh2 12 xh2 w8 13 d5 c8 (13...w7?) 14 dxc6 xc6 15 xa6 w7 16 b5 w8 17 w4 e5 18 fxe6 c8 19 a7 xe6 20 xb7 d6 21 c6+ Black resigned.

But, whatever those guys were on, it was heady stuff.

In Vajda – Boricsev, Eger 2002, he played 6...\g4 and events took a strange turn after 7 h3 \h5 8 g4!? \g6 9 e5

9...d5 10 g2 xe3 11 fxe3 c6 12 a4 f6?! 13 xe6 xg6 14 wd3 g3+ 15 f1 and White’s messed up game was less serious than Black’s, and he went on to win in 48 moves.

Roman Dzhindihikashvili interpreted the opening in a more restrained manner as Black against Nick de Firmian in their game from the USA Championships of 1997, with 6...e6 7 wd2 e7 8 d3 0-0 9 0-0-0 b5 10 g5 b7 11 f4 d8 12 h4
When de Firmian plays White, it's normally not long before the action starts. 12...\(\mathbb{Q}\)bd7 (12...\(\mathbb{Q}\)xg2? would have exposed him to a fearful attack down the g line after 13 \(\mathbb{H}\)g1.) 13 \(\mathbb{W}\)e2. So imposing is the White build up that Dzhindhi understandably reasoned that, rather than making any counter demonstration of his own, it would be smarter to seek simplification. 13...b4! 14 \(\mathbb{Q}\)ce4 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xe4 15 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xe4 \(\mathbb{Q}\)f6 16 \(\mathbb{A}\)e5 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xe4 17 \(\mathbb{A}\)xe4 \(\mathbb{A}\)xe4 18 \(\mathbb{W}\)xe4 \(\mathbb{A}\)d6 and the swaps having brought Black to near equal chances, they agreed it drawn at move 36.

6...\(\mathbb{Q}\)bd7 ought, in principle, to be viable, but in Nijboer – Sulava, Metz Open 2000, Black regretted opening up the centre before his development was complete. 7 \(\mathbb{A}\)e2 e6 8 0-0 c5?! 9 \(\mathbb{W}\)d2 cxd4 10 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xd4 \(\mathbb{W}\)c7 11 \(\mathbb{A}\)f4 \(\mathbb{W}\)b6 12 \(\mathbb{A}\)f3 \(\mathbb{A}\)e7 13 \(\mathbb{A}\)e1 \(\mathbb{A}\)f8 Sad. 14 \(\mathbb{Q}\)a4 \(\mathbb{W}\)d8 15 \(\mathbb{W}\)c3 \(\mathbb{A}\)d6 16 \(\mathbb{A}\)xd6 \(\mathbb{W}\)xd6 17 \(\mathbb{Q}\)f5 and Sulava resigned. An experiment he was not to repeat.

7 \(\mathbb{W}\)d2

7 a3 brought White nothing in Koch – Fressinet, French Championship, 1999, after 7...e6 8 \(\mathbb{A}\)d3 \(\mathbb{A}\)e7 9 0-0 0-0 10 \(\mathbb{W}\)d2 b5 11 \(\mathbb{A}\)g5 \(\mathbb{A}\)d8.

7...\(\mathbb{A}\)g4

In Zhang Zhong – Arencibia, Ubeda Open 2001 Black tried 7...\(\mathbb{Q}\)f5 and met with a Chinese response. 8 \(\mathbb{A}\)h4! g6?! 9 \(\mathbb{A}\)xf5 gx5 10 f3 0-0-0 11 0-0-0 \(\mathbb{A}\)g7 12 \(\mathbb{A}\)c4 e6 13 a3 \(\mathbb{A}\)e7 14 \(\mathbb{A}\)b1 \(\mathbb{A}\)d7 15 \(\mathbb{A}\)b3 \(\mathbb{Q}\)ed5 16 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xd5 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xd5 17 \(\mathbb{Q}\)f2 b5?! Unwise weaker.
18 g4!? fxg4 19 fxg4 c5 20 c4 ćc7 21 ćg3 ćc6 22 d5 exd5 23 cxd5 ćhd8 24 dxc6! ćxd2 25 ćxd2 ćxd2 26 ćc2 b4 27 axb4 cxb4 28 će1 ćd6 29 ćf1 ćf6 30 ćxb4 ćxc6 31 ćxh7 ćb6 32 ća3 ćd7 33 ćf5+ će6 34 ćc2 ćd4 35 ćc5! ćc6 36 ćxd4 and Black resigned. Dazzingly creative play.

But 8...ćd7 has been seen, and White could then think of nothing better than 9 ćf3, so there's perhaps a future for 7...ćf5.

8 ćg5!? e5?!

This is wrong. With 8...e6! Black may well retain equal chances.

9 d5 ćb4 10 f3 ćf5 11 ćge4 ćd7 12 0-0-0

Threatening to strand the knight with 13 a3.

12...0-0-0 13 ćc4 would re-implement the threat, so Black is in some difficulties here.

12...ćc6 13 dxc6 ćxd2+ 14 ćxd2 ćxe4 15 ćxe4 ćxc6 16 ćxf6+ gxf6 17 ćd3

Bishop pair, queenside pawn majority, control of the d line and weakened enemy pawns. Nobody ever handled such advantages better than Anatoly.

17...0-0-0 18 ćhd1 ćc7 19 c3 h5 20 ćf5 ćxd2 21 ćxd2 ćb8 22 h4 ćh6 23 ćxh6 ćxh6 24 a4 ćh8 25 b4 b6 26 b5!

Trussing him.

26...ćg8 27 ćc2 axb5 28 axb5 će8 29 c4

Lutikov was not enjoying it, and so here he resigned.

That game put people off 3...ćd6, but Black had viable options at moves 6, 7 and 8.

Morozevich – Kurajica
Bled Olympiad 2002

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ćxd5 3 ćc3 ćd6 4 d4 ćf6 5 ćf3 a6 6 će3 b5
Fianchettoing early with a vengeance.

7 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 8 \( \text{e}2 \) e6

In Van Dijk – Hasangatin, Olomouc 2003, Black took the relatively unusual step in this opening of a double fianchetto, with 8...g6. He drummed up enough counterplay to demonstrate a viable middlegame after 9 a4 b4 10 \( \text{b}1 \) g7 11 \( \text{bd}2 \) 0-0 12 0-0 \( \text{c}6 \) 13 \( \text{fd}1 \) a5 14 \( \text{c}4 \) xc4 15 \( \text{xc}4 \) g4 16 h3 \( \text{xe}3 \) 17 fxe3 c5 18 c3 \( \text{ac}8 \). The game was drawn at move 71.

9 0-0-0

In his game with Socko, also from the Bled Olympiad, Kurajica had to face 9 a4, Black having substituted ...\( \text{bd}7 \) for ...\( \text{b}7 \). After 9...b4 10 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 11 \( \text{f}4 \) a7 12 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 13 c4 bxc3 14 bxc3 0-0 15 c4 he stuck his queen on Reti’s favoured square.

15...\( \text{a}8 \) 16 \( \text{eg}5 \) d6 He then regrouped accurately in order to repulse.

17 \( \text{e}5 \) h6 18 \( \text{e}4 \) xc5 19 dxe5 \( \text{xe}4 \) 20 \( \text{xe}4 \) xe4 21 \( \text{xe}4 \) b7 22 \( \text{c}2 \) a5 and they agreed to a draw at move 39.

9...b4

Forcing matters. We have yet to see 9...\( \text{bd}7 \) tried out.

10 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 11 \( \text{bd}2 \)

Hastening back on to the pitch.
11...\(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)b6 12 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)b3 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)d5 13 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)b1 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)h5 14 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)hg1
The first shades of attack.
14...\(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)a4 15 g4
This pawn is already an attacking unit, and it was to prove decisive.
15...\(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)d5 16 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)e5 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)e4 17 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)d2 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xd2+ 18 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xd2 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)b6 19 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)e1
The concentration of White’s forces in the centre makes it hard for Black to complete his development and get the king out of there unscathed.
19...\(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)e7 20 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)c5! \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xc5 21 dxc5 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xc5

\begin{center}
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22 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xf7! 0-0
Manful resistance, but his king’s defences are in a bad way, and the second wave of the White attack won’t be long.
23 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)e5 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)e7 24 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)e4 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)d5 25 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)g6!
Moro was nifty with his knights that day.
25...\(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)c3+
Inflicting as much collateral damage as possible.
26 bxc3 hgx6 27 c4
King safety is such an important factor in middlegames. Here, as in so many games, it proved to be the decisive one, for the Black palace was the more easily assailable.
27...\(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xe4 28 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xe4 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)ae8 29 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xg6 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)f6 30 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)e4 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)f7 31 g5! \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)f5 32 h4 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)f4 33 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)c6 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xh4 34 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)de2
Again a concentration of central force forces a concession, this time sufficient to bring the game to a conclusion.
34...\(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)d4 35 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xe6 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)f8 36 g6
See earlier remarks.
36...\(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xf2 37 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)xc7 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)f4 38 \(\text{\textdaggerleft}\)b7
...and Black’s defences cannot stave off the imminent penetration, so he resigned.

Short has observed that Morozevich has a unique style. There you saw what he was getting at.
White plays g3

Not only is the deployment of the bishop in fianchetto logical in itself, but g3 also prepares the possible arrival of the other one at f4 with gain of tempo. Black’s set-ups depend on where he develops his queen bishop. It has gone to f5, g4 and b7.

**Movsesian – Cicak**  
Czech Championship 2001

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 c3 w6 4 d4 c6  
A rarity.  
5 g3 f6 6 g2 f5 7 ge2 e6 8 0-0 w8  
She goes back home, and could have reached this same position via a5.  
9 h3 h5!?  

Hardly a classical treatment, but none of the White pieces is that aggressively posted, and Cicak makes ...h5 work.  
10 b1 a6 11 a3 c7 12 b4 cd5 13 b3 b5 14 e1 w7 15 b1  
A sad sight from a man rated 2661.  
15...e4 16 f1 b6 17 d2 d5
Radiantly centralised.

18 $\text{Ah}1$ a5

Via the most unusual play Black has gained a superiority.

19 bxa5 $\text{Ax}a5$ 20 $\text{Db}3$ $\text{Aa}8$ 21 $\text{Df}4$ $\text{Axa}3$ 22 $\text{Axa}3$ $\text{Axa}3$ 23 $\text{Cc}5$ $\text{Wa}7$

24 $\text{Wc}1$

Some drawbacks of $...\text{h}5$ become apparent. Those, in conjunction with others generated by the entrenched knight at $c5$, make the realisation of Black’s pawn advantage very difficult.

24...0-0 25 $\text{Be}5$ $\text{Aa}8$

Playing it safe.

26 $\text{Dxh}5$ $\text{Dxh}5$ 27 $\text{Axe}5$ $\text{Aa}1$ 28 $\text{Axa}1$ $\text{Wa}1$ 29 $\text{Wf}4$ $\text{Ac}4$ 30 $\text{Ad}3$

$\text{Axd}3$ 31 $\text{Dxd}3$ 32 $\text{Wh}4$ f6 33 $\text{Ah}8+$ $\text{Af}7$ 34 $\text{Wh}5+$ Drawn.

Kharlov – Vokarov

Russian Cup, Moscow 1998

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 $\text{Wxd}5$ 3 $\text{Cc}3$ $\text{Wd}6$ 4 g3 $\text{Df}6$ 5 $\text{Ag}2$ c6 6 $\text{Af}3$ $\text{Af}5$

7 0-0 e6 8 d4 $\text{Ce}7$ 9 $\text{De}5$

A lot to be said for 9 $\text{Af}4$. 
9...h5!?
Wow!
10 h3 Qbd7 11 f4 Qb6

11 Ke3 will now run into 11...Qbd5, so, since he has no constructive queen move, Kharlov does something radical, but his opponent was well up for it.

12 g4!? hxg4 13 hxg4 Qxg4! 14 Qxg4 Qxg4 15 Wxg4 Qxd4 16 Qf2 Qh4 17 Qe4 Qxf2+ 18 Qxf2 0-0-0 19 c3 Qc5 20 Qe2

Obscurity.

20...Qd6

Both sides seem to have difficulty in showing a constructive way forward from here.

21 Wf3 Qc4 22 b4 Qd7 23 Wg3
Starting an odd five move escapade.

23...f5 24 Qg5
Eh?

24...Qhd8 25 a4!
Certainly a functional move, gaining room and enabling the advance h2-h3 to come later. Not sure what all of the other moves of each side hereabouts are for.

25...\textit{Wf3} 26 \textit{Wh5} \textit{Wf6} 27 \textit{Wf3}

Back from her trip around the houses.

27...\textit{Cd2}

Finally things clarify, and we can now see that White has come out well coordinated for defence and attack.

28 \textit{Exd2} \textit{Exd2} 29 b5

Natural, and extremely effective.

29...\textit{Ee2} 30 \textit{We3}

...and Black is in a bad way.

30...\textit{Ead7} 31 \textit{Wxa7!} \textit{Wxc3} 32 \textit{Wa8+ Wc7} 33 b6+! \textit{Bxb6} 34 \textit{Bb1+ Wc5} 35 \textit{Wa7+ Wc4} 36 \textit{Bf1+ Bd3} 37 \textit{Exd3 Exd3} 38 \textit{Bd1} c5 and Black resigned.

Surprising, and in some ways a shame that, after such vigorous and imaginative play in the opening and early middlegame, the Black ideas then dried up and it was White who took over the wheel.

\textbf{Kengis – Belyavsky}

Bled Olympiad 2002

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \textit{Wxd5} 3 \textit{Cc3} \textit{Wd6} 4 d4 \textit{Bf5} 5 \textit{Bf3} a6 6 g3 b5 7 \textit{Bg2} \textit{Bb7} 8 0-0 e6

Black was not careful with his timing in Tringov - Donchev, Bulgarian Championship 1991, with 8...c5?! 9 \textit{Bf4} \textit{Bb6} 10 \textit{We1} \textit{Bbd7}?! 11 d5!? h6 12 a4 b4?
13 \(\text{\texttt{Qd2!! Wb7}}\) (13...bxc3 14 \(\text{\texttt{Qc4}}\) and 15 \(\text{\texttt{Qd6+}}\) would have won.) 14 \(\text{\texttt{Qc4 Qd8}}\) What else? 15 \(\text{\texttt{e4 a5}}\) equivalent to resignation. 16 \(\text{\texttt{Qxf6 Qxf6}}\) 17 \(\text{\texttt{Qe5 Qe8}}\) 18 \(\text{\texttt{Qc6 Wb6}}\) 19 \(\text{\texttt{We2 Qxd5}}\) 20 \(\text{\texttt{Qxd5 Qxc6}}\) 21 \(\text{\texttt{Qxf7+}}\)! A switch in direction ends it all. 21...\(\text{\texttt{Qxf7}}\) 22 \(\text{\texttt{We6+ Qe8}}\) 23 \(\text{\texttt{Qad1}}\) 1-0

One of the late Tringov’s nicest games.

9 \(\text{\texttt{Qf4}}\)

9 \(\text{\texttt{Qe5}}\) has been seen, but 9...\(\text{\texttt{Qxg2}}\) 10 \(\text{\texttt{Qxg2}}\) ought to pose Black no serious problems.

9...\(\text{\texttt{Wb6}}\)

A natural square for her to be shunted off to. But they’ve been known to drop back to base. I cannot fathom why 9...\(\text{\texttt{Qd8}}\) might have been preferred, but it sufficed for draws in these two games; Uribe – Sermek, Istanbul 2000 after 10 \(\text{\texttt{Qe5 Qxg2}}\) 11 \(\text{\texttt{Qxg2 Qb4}}\) (a favourite deployment of Sermek’s) 12 \(\text{\texttt{Wf3 Qxc3!!}}\) 13 \(\text{\texttt{Qxa8 Qxb2}}\) 14 \(\text{\texttt{Qab1 Qc3}}\) 15 \(\text{\texttt{Wf3 Qd5}}\) 16 \(\text{\texttt{Qfd1 Wxf3+}}\) 17 \(\text{\texttt{Qxf3 Qd5}}\) 18 \(\text{\texttt{Qd3 Qd7}}\) and Black stonewalled it out until a draw at move 28. And in Grischuk – Hauchard Ubeda 2000 10 \(\text{\texttt{Qe5 Qxg2}}\) 11 \(\text{\texttt{Qxg2 c5}}\) Black had a less cosy time of it but drew in 52 moves after 12 \(\text{\texttt{Wf3 Qa7}}\) 13 \(\text{\texttt{dxc5 Qxc5}}\) 14 \(\text{\texttt{Qg5 Qe7}}\) 15 \(\text{\texttt{Qe4 Qd5}}\) 16 \(\text{\texttt{Qxf6+ Qxf6}}\) 17 \(\text{\texttt{Qxd5 exd5}}\) 18 \(\text{\texttt{Qe3 Qc7}}\) 19 \(\text{\texttt{Qd3 Qxc2}}\) 20 \(\text{\texttt{Qac1 Qxc1}}\) 21 \(\text{\texttt{Qxc1 Qd7}}\) 22 \(\text{\texttt{Qf4 d4}}\) 23 \(\text{\texttt{Qxd4 Qc6}}\) 24 \(\text{\texttt{Qe3 Qe5}}\) 25 \(\text{\texttt{Qd5 Qd8}}\), but it was not easy.
10 \( \text{\&}e5 \)

Going forward, but the move leads to no real advantage for White. In Beshukov – Hasangatin, MK Cafe Cup, 1999, White also emerged with no superiority after 10 a4 \( \text{\&}d6 \) 11 \( \text{\&}e3 \) \( \text{\&}g4 \)? 12 \( \text{\&}d2 \) \( \text{\&}f6 \) 13 \( \text{\&}e2 \) c6 14 \( \text{\&}g5 \) 0-0 15 \( \text{\&}e4 \) \( \text{\&}e7 \) 16 axb5 cxb5! 17 \( \text{\&}xf6+ \) \( \text{\&}xf6 \) 18 \( \text{\&}e4 \) \( \text{\&}e7 \) 19 \( \text{\&}e3 \) \( \text{\&}d5 \) 20 \( \text{\&}c5 \) \( \text{\&}xg2 \) 21 \( \text{\&}xg2 \) \( \text{\&}d7 \) 22 \( \text{\&}xd7 \) \( \text{\&}b7+ \) 23 \( \text{\&}g1 \) \( \text{\&}xd7 \) 24 b3 \( \text{\&}f6 \) and the game was drawn in 49 moves. Kurajica handled it differently when he faced Almasi, also at the 2002 Bled Olympiad, and opened things up with 11...c5. But after 12 axb5 axb5 13 \( \text{\&}e2 \) \( \text{\&}xa1 \) 14 \( \text{\&}xa1 \) \( \text{\&}xf3 \) 15 \( \text{\&}xc5 \) 16 \( \text{\&}xc5 \) \( \text{\&}xc5 \) 17 \( \text{\&}xf3 \) b4 18 \( \text{\&}e4 \) \( \text{\&}xe4 \) 19 \( \text{\&}xe4 \) 0-0 20 \( \text{\&}a4 \) he had problems due to the vulnerability of his b pawn and lost in 50 moves. Taking on d6 brought White nothing in Satyapragnyan – Sermek, Goodricke Cup, Calcutta 2002 and after 11 \( \text{\&}xd6 \) cxd6 12 axb5 axb5 13 \( \text{\&}d3 \) b4 14 \( \text{\&}a4 \) \( \text{\&}a5 \) 15 c4 bxc3 16 \( \text{\&}xc3 \) \( \text{\&}xc3 \) 17 bxc3 \( \text{\&}bd7 \) Black was comfortable.

10...\( \text{\&}xg2 \) 11 \( \text{\&}xg2 \) \( \text{\&}b7+ \)

Equalising comfortably.

12 \( \text{\&}f3 \) \( \text{\&}xf3+ \) 13 \( \text{\&}xf3 \) \( \text{\&}bd7 \)

13...\( \text{\&}b4 \) did not prove quite so comfy a ride for Black to the shared point, but Sermek, aficionado of 3...\( \text{\&}d6 \), managed it after 14 a4 \( \text{\&}xc3 \) 15 bxc3 bxa4 16 \( \text{\&}xa4 \) \( \text{\&}d5 \) 17 c4 \( \text{\&}xf4 \) 18 \( \text{\&}xf4 \) f6 19 \( \text{\&}d3 \) \( \text{\&}c6 \) 20 d5 exd5 21 cxd5 \( \text{\&}e7 \) 22 c4 \( \text{\&}f7 \) 23 \( \text{\&}fa1 \) \( \text{\&}hd8 \) 24 \( \text{\&}xa6 \) \( \text{\&}xa6 \) 25 \( \text{\&}xa6 \) c6! and drawn at move 31 in Pavalosvic – Sermek, Vidmar Memorial, Portoroz 2001.

14 \( \text{\&}c6 \)

Black had no problems after 14 \( \text{\&}xd7 \) \( \text{\&}xd7 \) in Hossain – Sermek, Dhaka 2002, and even won in 37 moves.

14...\( \text{\&}b6 \) 15 a4 b4 16 \( \text{\&}e4 \) \( \text{\&}fd5 \) 17 a5 \( \text{\&}c4 \) 18 b3 \( \text{\&}a3 \)

A Belyavskykan escapade. He had hopes of stirring up complications.

19 \( \text{\&}fc1 \) \( \text{\&}b5 \) 20 \( \text{\&}d2 \) f5! 21 \( \text{\&}c5 \) e5!
Trying his hardest to wreak a meaningful advantage out of the opening with Black.

22 \text{\textit{He}}1 e4+ 23 \text{\textit{Gg}}2 \text{\textit{Dxd}}4 24 \text{\textit{Dxd}}4 \text{\textit{Axc}}5 25 \text{\textit{Dxf}}5 0-0 26 \text{\textit{Ce}}3 \text{\textit{Ad}}8 27 \text{\textit{He}}2 \text{\textit{Ax}}e3 28 \text{\textit{Ax}}e3 \text{\textit{Dxe}}3+ 29 \text{\textit{Axe}}3 \text{\textit{Dd}}2 30 \text{\textit{Afl}} \text{\textit{Xc}}2 31 \text{\textit{Axe}}4 c5

An active rook on the seventh and the queenside pawn majority leave Black clearly better in this double rook ending.

32 \text{\textit{He}}5 h6 33 h4 \text{\textit{Cc}}3 34 \text{\textit{Md}}1 \text{\textit{Xxb}}3 35 \text{\textit{Axc}}5 \text{\textit{Xb}}2 36 \text{\textit{Dfl}} \text{\textit{Aa}}2 37 g4 b3 38 h5 \text{\textit{Ah}}7 39 \text{\textit{Axd}}5 \text{\textit{Xb}}8 40 \text{\textit{Axb}}1 \text{\textit{Ab}}4 41 \text{\textit{Dg}}3 \text{\textit{Cc}}2!!

White cannot cope.

42 \text{\textit{Ad}}6 b2 43 \text{\textit{Bb}}6 \text{\textit{Cc}}3+ 44 f3 \text{\textit{Xxb}}6 45 axb6 \text{\textit{Bb}}3 White resigned

A powerful game from a great player.

\textbf{Gallagher – Gouret}
France 2002

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \text{\textit{Af}}6 3 \text{\textit{Axf}}3 \text{\textit{Wxd}}5 4 \text{\textit{Cc}}3 \text{\textit{Wd}}6

Via transposition we reach the familiar lines.

5 d4 a6 6 g3 \text{\textit{Ag}}4

In Kundin – Gofshtein, Israeli Championship 2001, Black reached equality with 6...c6 7 \text{\textit{Af}}4 \text{\textit{Dd}}8 8 \text{\textit{Ag}}2 e6 9 0-0 \text{\textit{Se}}7 10 \text{\textit{Wd}}2 0-0 11 \text{\textit{Af}}1
\[ \text{d5. This is an important move order, as games where White has not played } \text{f4 before castling have resulted in mayhem, after Black went 0-0-0.} \]

7 \text{g2}

In Glek – Kekelidze, Boeblingen Open 2000, White changed direction after 7 h3 xf3 8 xf3 c6 9 e3 bd7 10 0-0-0! e6 11 f4 b4 12 a3 wa5 and, after many adventures, they drew at move 39.

7...e6 8 0-0 bd7 9 h3 h5 10 f4 b6 11 d2

11...e7

11...c6 to prepare the way home might have been better.

12 e3

...d5 coming.

12...d5

This is inadequate. Black’s bishop at h5 ends up a bit out of it.

13 xd5 exd5 14 e5 f6 15 f4 e4

Forced.

16 xe4 dxe4 17 g4 g6

18 d5

18 f5 f6 and Black, a trifle fortuitously, escapes.
18...\textit{c5} 19 c4 \textit{x} e3+ 20 \textit{x} e3 \textit{w} xe3+ 21 \textit{d} xe3 \\

Joe has angled play into an ending where the blockading knight outclasses the bishop and where also his pawns are the more mobile. 

21...\textit{f} 6 22 \textit{a} d1 0-0-0 23 c4 c5 24 \textit{d} e1 \textit{h} e8 25 \textit{f} 2 \textit{c} 7 26 \textit{e} e2 b5 \\
Precipitating the crisis.

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

27 b4! \textit{d} 6 

27...\textit{c}xb4 28 \textit{c}xb5 and the White rooks will soon pour in. Or even 28 c5?!. 

28 bxc5+ \textit{x} c5 29 axb5 axb5 30 \textit{c} c2+ \textit{b} 6 31 \textit{f} e1 \\
Now it’s a king hunt. 

31...\textit{d} 7 32 \textit{c} 6+ \textit{a} 5 33 \textit{c} 1c3 \textit{a} 4 34 \textit{a} 6+ \textit{b} 4 35 \textit{d} 1! \\
...and there is nothing to be done about a3 mate, so \textbf{Black resigned.} \\

Bojan Kurajica has used the fianchetto of his own king bishop in response to that of White’s, but with little joy.

\textbf{Sakaev – Kurajica} \\
Istanbul 2003
7 \( \text{f4} \)

Rather a prospectless and dreary middlegame awaits Black here. In \( \text{V} \text{arian-Kurajica from the same event play went 7 \( \text{g2 g7 8 0-0 0-0 9 f4 \( d8 \) 10 d2 c6 and he was just as short of counterplay. 11 f1 g4 12 e5 e6 13 d1 bd7 14 c1 b6 15 h6 c8 16 xg7 xg7 17 e4 h3 18 c5} \)

...and White is clearly on top. Kurajica here blundered with 18...g4 and resigned before White won the pawn.

At the Ljubljana Open of 1999 he developed the knight to c6 versus Nevedichny, but when the position opened up it favoured the better developed party: White. 9 e1 c6 10 f4 d8 11 d5 b4 12 e5 e6 13 xe6 xe6 14 xb7 b8 15 f3 f5 16 c1 e8 17 xd8 bxd8 18 c6 xc2 19 e5! xe5 20 xe5 e8 21 xc7 d7 22 d5 xb2 23 de7+ g7 24 b1 a3 25 xf5+ gxf5 26 d1 f6 27 d4 xd4 28 xd4 and, with the loss of his a pawn imminent, Black resigned that one, too.

7...d8 8 e5 g7 9 g2 0-0 10 0-0 c6 11 d2 e6

There is little Black can undertake. His position is a sort of poor man’s Alekhine Defence.

12 f1 d5 13 h6 xh6 14 xh6 c3 15 bxc3 d5 16 xd5 cxd5 17 e3
A simple and powerful attack.

17...e6 18 g4 wxf6 19 g5 wg7 20 wh4 f6 21 dg4
Already winning.

21...fxg5 22 wg5 dc6 23 xe6 ad8 24 eae1 wh8 25 d1e3 wf7 26
xf6 wg7 27 xf8+ wf8 28 df6 wg7 29 d3 h5 30 f1
Rubbing it in.
Black resigned.

Koch – Fressinet
French Championship 1999

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 dc3 wd6 4 d4 df6 5 g3
Without df3 Black gets presented with the chance to flick in a known, nasty interference move.

5...dg4!

I salute this disruptive probe.

6 f3 df5 7 d3

In Turov – Brustkern, Budapest 2003, White eventually got around to the fianchetto. Play went 7 df4 wb4 8 wd2 c6 9 0-0-0 e6 10 g4 dg6 11 dc7.
Well, at least this move forces the opponent’s queen back to e7. 11...\(\text{\underline{c}a6}\) 12 a3 \(\text{\underline{b}e7}\) 13 \(\text{\underline{g}g3}\) \(\text{\underline{c}c7}\) 14 h4 h6 15 \(\text{\underline{g}g2}\) \(\text{\underline{d}d7}\) 16 h5 \(\text{\underline{h}h7}\). GM Turov was perhaps not satisfied with his game as he now ventured a speculative pawn sacrifice with 17 \(\text{\underline{e}e4}\), but my wife’s ex-boyfriend took it and had few problems, although White won in 59 moves.

7...\(\text{\underline{x}xd3}\) 8 \(\text{\underline{x}xd3}\) \(\text{\underline{c}c6}\)!

Active development is certainly right here.

9 \(\text{\underline{e}e3}\) \(\text{\underline{b}b4}\)! 10 \(\text{\underline{d}d2}\) \(\text{\underline{e}e6}\)!

\[\text{Diagram:} 10\]

Eyeing the a and c pawns.

11 \(\text{\underline{d}d1}\)

Definitely not what you want to play, but on 11 \(\text{\underline{f}f2}\) \(\text{\underline{f}f5}\)!

11...0-0-0 12 \(\text{\underline{c}c1}\) c5 13 \(\text{\underline{g}ge2}\) \(\text{\underline{f}f5}\) 14 a3 \(\text{\underline{c}c6}\) 15 f4 e6

White has scrambled towards a position of sorts, but Fressinet continues to play vigorously.

16 \(\text{\underline{d}d1}\) \(\text{\underline{g}g4}\) 17 h3 \(\text{\underline{x}xe3}\) 18 \(\text{\underline{x}xe3}\) cxd4 19 \(\text{\underline{x}xd4}\)

\[\text{Diagram:} 19\]

19... \(\text{\underline{x}xd4}\)! 20 \(\text{\underline{x}xd4}\) \(\text{\underline{c}c5}\)

Winning.

21 g4 \(\text{\underline{x}xd4}\) 22 \(\text{\underline{x}xd4}\) \(\text{\underline{c}cxd4}\) 23 gxf5 \(\text{\underline{x}xf5}\) 24 a4 \(\text{\underline{d}d8}\) 25 a3 \(\text{\underline{e}e3}\) 26 a2 \(\text{\underline{d}d4}\) 27 a5 a6 28 \(\text{\underline{b}b6}\) \(\text{\underline{xf4}}\) 29 b3 \(\text{\underline{f}f2}\) 30 \(\text{\underline{e}e4}\) \(\text{\underline{x}xc2+}\) 31 \(\text{\underline{b}b1}\) \(\text{\underline{c}c7}\) 32
58 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textbf{x}}}}}}\text{d5} \ 3 \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\text{c3} \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}\text{d6}}

\text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}\text{d6}+ \text{\textit{\textbf{b}}\text{b8} 33 \text{\textit{\textbf{b}}}\text{b4} \text{\textit{\textbf{d}}}\text{d7} 34 \text{\textit{\textbf{c}}}\text{c4} \text{\textit{\textbf{d}}}\text{d5} 35 \text{\textit{\textbf{c}}}\text{c4} \text{\textit{\textbf{d}}}\text{d7} 36 \text{\textit{\textbf{g}}}\text{g5} \text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\text{xc4} 37 \text{\textit{\textbf{b}}}\text{xc4} \text{\textit{\textbf{f}}}\text{f4} 38 \text{\textit{\textbf{c}}}\text{xf7} \text{\textit{\textbf{d}}}\text{xh3} 39 \text{\textit{\textbf{c}}}\text{c2} \text{\textit{\textbf{c}}}\text{c7} 40 \text{\textit{\textbf{d}}}\text{d3} \text{\textit{\textbf{h}}}\text{h6} 41 \text{\textit{\textbf{c}}}\text{c5} \text{\textit{\textbf{g}}}\text{g5} 42 \text{\textit{\textbf{e}}}\text{e5} \text{\textit{\textbf{h}}}\text{h7} 43 \text{\textit{\textbf{g}}}\text{g6} \text{\textit{\textbf{c}}}\text{c6} 44 \text{\textit{\textbf{c}}}\text{c4} \text{\textit{\textbf{f}}}\text{f6} 45 \text{\textit{\textbf{f}}}\text{f8} \text{\textit{\textbf{e}}}\text{e5} 46 \text{\textit{\textbf{g}}}\text{g6} \text{\textit{\textbf{e}}}\text{e4} 47 \text{\textit{\textbf{e}}}\text{e7}+ \text{\textit{\textbf{d}}}\text{d7} 48 \text{\textit{\textbf{c}}}\text{c5} \text{\textit{\textbf{h}}}\text{h5} 49 \text{\textit{\textbf{d}}}\text{d4} \text{\textit{\textbf{g}}}\text{g6} \text{\textit{\textbf{a}}}\text{and \textit{\textbf{White}}, not before time, resigned.}}

And that’s not the only nuance to try out against g3 before \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}\text{f3}.

\textbf{Smirin – Kurajica}

\textbf{Solin 1999}

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}\text{d5} 3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\text{c3} \textit{\textbf{d}}\text{d6} 4 g3 \textit{\textbf{f}}\text{f6} 5 \textit{\textbf{g}}\text{g2} \textit{\textbf{h}}\text{h5}?!?

![Chessboard diagram]

Yeah! Let’s play some chess! By transposition this position was also reached in Bologan – Hauchard, Belfort 1998, and Black chose 5...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\text{c6} 6 \textit{\textbf{g}}\text{ge2} \textit{\textbf{f}}\text{f5}. Perhaps Bologan now decided that he was unhappy with normal formations with the pawn at d4, for he came up with 7 \textit{\textbf{b}}\text{b4}?. Yet after 7...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}b4} 8 d3 c6 9 0-0 \textit{\textbf{d}}\text{d7} he had little to show for it, but managed a draw at move 46.

6 d4 h4

Perhaps, as her boy entered his sixth decade, Bojan’s mum started feeding him on raw meat!?  
7 \textit{\textbf{f}}\text{f4} \textit{\textbf{b}}\text{b6} 8 \textit{\textbf{g}}\text{ge2} c6 9 \textit{\textbf{d}}\text{d3} \textit{\textbf{a}}\text{a6} 10 a3 hxg3 11 f\textit{\textbf{x}}g3 \textit{\textbf{g}}\text{g4} 12 0-0-0 e6

This time he eschewed the tamer fianchetto of his king bishop, and a completely unusual position arose from the opening moves.

13 h3 \textit{\textbf{f}}\text{f5} 14 \textit{\textbf{f}}\text{f3} \textit{\textbf{d}}\text{d5} 15 g4 \textit{\textbf{h}}\text{h7} 16 \textit{\textbf{g}}\text{g3} \textit{\textbf{e}}\text{e7} 17 h4 \textit{\textbf{a}}\text{a5} 18 \textit{\textbf{e}}\text{e1} \textit{\textbf{c}}\text{c7} 19 \textit{\textbf{e}}\text{e4}
19...b5!

Securing the knight's outpost at d5 is of primary importance.

20 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 21 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 22 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e7} \) 23 g5 0-0 24 \( \text{h3} \) f6 25 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{b8} \) 26 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{a8} \)

Safely stowed.

27 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{ac7} \) 28 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{b8} \) 29 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{fxg5} \)

This may not have been best. The White bishops start to show an increased effect and Smirin gets the better of it.

30 \( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 31 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{b6} \) 32 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{cd5} \) 33 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{hf8} \) 34 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 35 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{be8} \) 36 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{c4} \) 37 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 38 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{f1+} \) 40 \( \text{a2} \) \( \text{f2} \)

41 a4??

Yet another bummer at move 41. 41 \( \text{xd5} \) was the move.

41...\( \text{bxa4} \)

And Smirin saw that he had trapped his own rook. Kurajica made no mistake now.

42 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{axb3+} \) 43 \( \text{cb3} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 44 \( \text{bxc4} \) \( \text{dx} \) 45 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 46 d5 \( \text{f5} \) 47 d6 \( \text{c6} \) 48 \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{b5+} \) 49 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 50 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 51 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 52 h5 \( \text{xd6} \) 53 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 54 \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 55 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e4} \) 56 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{f5} \) 57 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{g4} \) 58 h6 \( \text{g6} \) 59 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{h7} \) 60 \( \text{g7} \) g5 61 \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{f3} \) 62 \( \text{xa7} \) g4 63 \( \text{b6} \) g3 64 \( \text{a6} \) g2 65 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{hxh6+} \) and White, at last, resigned.
White plays $\textsf{c4}$

McShane – Lalic
Gibtelecom Masters, Gibraltar 2003

$1 \text{e4} \text{d5} 2 \text{exd5} \text{\textit{wxd5}} 3 \text{c3} \text{\textit{wxd6}} 4 \text{d4} \text{f6} 5 \text{c4}$

$\text{5...a6}$

$5...\text{c6} 6 \text{ge2} \text{f5} 7 \text{f4} \text{d8} 8 \text{g3} \text{g6} 9 0-0 \text{e6} 10 \text{d2} \text{left White a fraction better in Sieberg – Pytel, Biel 1976.}$

$\text{Things were murkier in Al Modiahki – Cicak, Villa de Beansque, 1999 after 7 0-0 e6 8 g3 g6 10 f4 d7, when White later went over the top and lost.}$

$\text{In Oral – Schleifer, Quebec Open, 2001, Black tried the rarer option of the fianchetto. It sufficed to give him equality after 5.g6 6 f3 g7 7 0-0 0-0 8 h3 a6 9 a4 c5 10 dxc5 xc5 11 e2 c6 12 d1 f5, although White won at move 37.}$

$\text{In Galkin – Feoktistov Russian Championship, 1999, Black experimented with 5.c6 6 ge2 e5. After 7 0-0 a6 8 dxe5 xe5 9 b3 xd1 10 xd1 g4 11 e1 d6 he was near equality.}$

$\text{6 ge2}$

$\text{An inspired, and already known, pawn sacrifice.}$
After 6...g6 7 Qge2 Qg7 8 Qf4 Wh8 9 Whd2 0-0 10 Qh6 Viktor Kupreichik, one of the world's most dangerous attacking players, was set to go to work. So his opponent tried to bail out with 10...c5 but after 11 dxc5 Whxd2+ 12 Qxd2 Qd7 13 Qf4 e6 14 0-0-0 Qc6 15 f3 Qbd7 16 Qd3 Qe8 17 Qhe1 Qf8 18 Qg5 h6 19 Qf4 Black was not equal, and lost in 40 moves.

Kurajica handled it better against Vallejo Pons at Villarrobledo in 2001, by 6...e6 7 Qge2 b5 8 Qf4 Whd8 9 d5 c5! 10 dxc6 Whxd1+ 11 Qxd1 Qxc6 12 0-0 Qb7 13 Qg3 Qa5 and Black had no problems at all. He also made 6...e6 7 Qge2 c5 work against Janev at Mondariz, 2000, viz 8 Qf4 Whd8 9 dxc5 Whxd1+ 10 Qxd1 Qxc5 11 0-0 b5 12 Qd6 Qbd7 13 Qe1 Qb7 14 Qf4 0-0-0 15 a4 b4 16 Qa2 Qxd6 17 Whd6 Qc5 18 Whd8+ Whd8 19 Qxb4 Qxb3 20 cxb3

20...Qd4! 21 Qc1+ Wb8 22 Qfd3 a5 23 Qc4 Qd8 and he won a piece and the game.

In Mitkov – Nikolov, Skopje 1998 things got really sharp after Black hit straight back in the centre with 6...Qc6 7 Qge2 e5. Play went 8 d5 Qa5 9 Qe3 Qxb3 (He might have done better to have delayed that: the bishop's not going anywhere.) 10 axb3 Qf5 11 Qg3 Qg6 12 f3 0-0-0 13 Qge4 Wh7 14 Qxf6 gxf6 15 We2 Qb4

16 Qxa6! Whxd5! 17 Qa4 and Black's king was, understandably, never secure. White won in 55 moves. By contrast 8 dxe5 did not lead to much
62 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 w xd5 3 d c3 w d6

after 8...w xd1+ 9 h xd1 a xe5 10 h dc3 a d7 11 h g5 h e7 in Kuczynski –

In Tiviakov – Christiansen, F.I.D.E World Championship Knock Out,
Moscow, 2001, Larry ventured 6...a g4!? After 7 d ge2 e6 8 h f4 w f4!?! 9
a x f4 w x d1 10 w x d1 b b 14 d e2 a bd7 12 a3 a d6 he had equality.

But 6...f f5? is not the brightest of moves as after 7 w f3 Black had to put
it back again in Tiviakov – Boricsev, Golden Cleopatra Open, Cairo, 2002.

In Hall – Gausel, Politiken Cup 1998, White played 6 h f3, yet after 6...b5
chose the hardly consistent 7 a d3. Black developed and quickly equalised,
7...a b7 8 w e2 b bd7 9 a4 b4 (9...c6!?) 10 d e4 d xe4 11 a xe4 a xe4 12
a xe4 c6 13 0-0 e6 14 c4 bxc3 15 bxc3 a f6 and drawn in 33 moves. In
Steivic – Borgo, Leipzig 2002, he played 7 a b3 and met with the direct 7
...c5!?

![Diagram](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

After 8 d xc5 w xd1+ 9 h xd1 e6 10 a4 b4 11 a5 h e4 12 a a4+ a d7 13
h xd7+ h xd7 14 c6 d dc5 15 b3 a c8 16 h e5 f6 17 a c4 a xc6.

Black had at last recovered his pawn. He stood well and won at move 55.

Neither had 8 a 4 gotten White anything in Hamdouchi – Kurajica,
Villaobledo Open, 2000, after 8...b4 9 h e2 e6 10 h f4 w d8 11 a5. Bojan
took it all calmly: 11...a e7 12 a x b8 a x b8 13 d e5 a b 14 a a4+ a f8 15
c6 a x c6 16 a x c6 w c7 17 h f3 g 6 18 d xc5 a xc5 19 0-0 a d8 20 w e1
a g7 with no problems, and a draw agreed at move 48.

7...a b7 was also playable as shown in Pergel – Czebe Hungarian
Championship 2001, after 8 d e5 e6 9 h f4 w b 6 10 a 4!? a b 4 11 0-0 a c6!?
Black was okay, and won at move 46.

White’s play was also somewhat more effective in Lanka – Michaelis,
Nord West Cup 1999, 6...e 6 7 0-0 b 5 8 a b 3 a b 7 9 w e1 a e 7 10 a g 5 0-0
11 w e2 a bd7? 12 d 5! a xd 5 13 a xd 5 and Black resigned.

In Varga – Kalintschew – Budapest 1996, it was Black who crashed
through to a quick victory after 6 h f3 e 6 7 w e 2, aiming to castle long.
7...b 5 8 a b 3 a b 7 9 a e 3 Better to have gone on to g 5, perhaps!? 9...a bd 7
10 0-0-0 a e 7 11 a h g 1 c 5! 12 d xc 5 w c 7
A sort of Sicilian formation materialises, and Black is very comfortably placed. 13 \( \square b1 \) \( \square xc5 \) 14 g4 Not really getting anywhere. 14...\( \square xb3 \) 15 axb3 \( \square d5 \) 16 \( \square xd5 \) \( \square xd5 \) 17 g5 0-0 Black is way ahead in the race, and soon won it. 18 h4 a5 19 \( \square d4 \) a4! 20 \( \square xb5 \) \( \square b7 \) 21 \( \square g3 \) axb3 22 cxb3 \( \square e4+ \) 23 \( \square c1 \) \( \square b4 \) White resigned.

In Crosa – Giaccio, Uruguay Championship 2002, White pulled the bishop back to d3 and he was the swift victor after 8...\( \square b7 \) 9 0-0 \( \square e7 \) 10 a4 b4 11 \( \square e4 \) \( \square d5 \) 12 \( \square xf6+ \) \( \square xf6 \) 13 c4 bxc3 14 bxc3 0-0 15 \( \square b1 \) \( \square c6 \) 15 \( \square c4 \) \( \square h5 \) 17 \( \square e4 \) \( \square g4 \) 18 d5 exd5 19 cxd5 \( \square e8 \) 20 \( \square b4 \) \( \square xd5 \) 21 \( \square xd5 \) and Black resigned. But a couple of swaps at e4 at move eleven would have avoided much trouble.

Kobalija – Kantsler, European Championship, Ohrid 2001 saw White also sidestep any g pawn gambitting with just 6 \( \square b3 \). After 6...e6 7 \( \square f3 \) \( \square e7 \) 8 \( \square g5 \) \( \square bd7 \) White went for a simple and direct attacking posture. 9 \( \square e2 \) \( \square b6 \) 10 0-0 0-0 11 \( \square e4 \) \( \square d8 \) 12 \( \square xf6! \)? Clearing a path. 12...\( \square xf6 \) 13 c3 \( \square d7 \) 14 \( \square c2 \) \( \square b5 \) 15 \( \square e1 \) \( \square d5 \) 16 \( \square b1 \) a5 17 h4 a4 18 a3 \( \square c6 \) 19 \( \square d2 \) \( \square b5 \) 20 g4 \( \square e7 \) 21 \( \square eg5 \) h6

22 \( \square e5! \) and he bashed through to victory by move 36.

Does such a game make you desire to play an early \( ...b5 \) with Black? Does me.

Finally, in Sutovsky – Kudischewitsch, Israeli Championship 2000, White tried to rule out any bishop landing at g4 with 6 h3. Kudischewitsch passed
over 6...\textit{c}6 7 \textit{c}1, which would certainly have pleased many a player of the Black pieces, in favour of 6...c5 7 dxc5 \textit{x}c5 8 \textit{b}3 e6 9 \textit{e}3 \textit{a}5 10 \textit{g}e2 \textit{c}5 11 \textit{d}2 0-0 12 0-0-0 \textit{b}d7 13 g4 \textit{xe}3 14 \textit{xe}3 \textit{c}5. But it turned out that White was doing to his king was just that bit more significant than what he could do to White’s, after 15 \textit{g}3 \textit{xb}3+ 16 \textit{cxb}3 \textit{c}7 17 \textit{b}1 b5 18 \textit{h}5! \textit{d}h5 19 gxh5.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

This position is about king access and safety, not pawn structures. 19...\textit{f}6 20 \textit{h}g1 e5 21 \textit{d}5 \textit{f}7 22 f4 \textit{e}6 23 h6! g6 24 \textit{b}6 exf4 25 \textit{xf}4 \textit{ab}8 26 \textit{d}6 \textit{c}7 27 c1 \textit{f}5+ 28 \textit{a}1 g5 29 \textit{d}2 \textit{f}7 30 \textit{d}7 and the Black defences are breached, 30...\textit{xd}7 31 \textit{xd}7 leading to a decisive penetration. So he tried 30...\textit{bd}8 31 \textit{xf}8 \textit{xf}8 32 h4 g4 33 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}8 34 \textit{xc}8 and 1-0.

6...\textit{c}6

In Parligras – Svetushkin, Ciocaltea Memorial, Bucharest 2002, Black declined and reached equality with 6...b5 7 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}7 8 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}8 (8...\textit{b}6!? 9 0-0 e6 10 \textit{g}3 \textit{d}6 11 \textit{g}5 \textit{c}7 12 \textit{e}1 0-0 13 d5 c5! Aiming to trap the bishop with ...c4. 14 dxc6 \textit{xc}6, etc. In Zeller – Slobodjan, German Championship 200, 9...\textit{bd}7 worked okay after 10 a4 b4 11 \textit{a}2 e6 12 \textit{d}2 a5.
(Note an additional significance to ...a6 – it stops the queen from being pinned!) Bogdan elects to accept. He is known to work extensively in preparation with computers, and they often assess positions with an extra pawn as favourable, even when other factors might lead strong GMs to differ.

He also simultaneously offered a draw.

A complex man.

7  $e_b3$

In Ribshtein – Kantsler, Israeli Championship 2001, White speculated with 7 $d_d3$ $x_d2 8 g1 $h2 9 $f4 $h3 10 $g3. In his notes, Kantsler, who won this game, suggested that with more flair and attacking ideas White might have adequate chances here.

But the cynic in me believes that he just appended that annotation in the hope that some other mug would throw those pawns his way in the future.

7...$x_d2 8 g1 $h3

8...$x_h2 9 $f4 and 10 $c7 obviously grants White a lot of play.

8...$f3!? may be worth a go. In Feletar – Kurajica Pula 1999 Black returned the pawn for swift development and a very involved situation arose after 9 $f4 b5 10 $c7 $b7 11 $d2 $bd7 12 0-0 0 $e8 13 $f4 b4 14 $a4 $d5.

9 $f4

9...$d7

Back home with the booty. Later Lalic suggested 9...c6 as a possible improvement. Certainly 9...$f5? 10 $c7 was disastrous for Black in Ardeleanu – Heim, Romanian Championship, 1990.

10 $d3

Novelty. Previous games had seen 10 d5 and 10 $d2. McShane will meet 10...g6 with 11 $c4, regaining the pawn.
10...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{c}6} 11 a3!
11 d5 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{a}5} is not so clear.

11...e6 12 0-0-0
White’s big development lead grants him mighty compensation.

12...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}7}
Contorting his way out.

13 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}5} \textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}6} 14 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}f6} gxf6 15 d5 e5

Black has a check at h6 to wriggle out of the forthcoming tactic. He returns the pawn to get developed, but is still not well off.

16 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{a}4} b5 17 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}b5} \textcolor{red}{	extsf{h}6+} 18 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{b}1} 0-0 19 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{c}3} \textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}3}
On 19...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{d}8} 20 h4 or 20 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}3} are excellent. Lalic hopes to make a go of it with a splurge on the kingside, but White’s play in the middle proves by far the more significant.

20 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{c}4}
To catch a pawn.

20...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}7} 21 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}c7} \textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}4} 22 d6
The big one.

22...f5 23 d7 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{a}d8} 24 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{d}3}
Overprotection of d7, but 24 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{d}6} was also strong.

24...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}5}!
On 24...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}h2} 25 f3! forces the bishop to a worse square as 25...e4 would be impossible.

25 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}1} \textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}h2}
Now 26 f3 is met by the interference move 26...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{f}2}!, so Black has regained his pawn, but the d7 phenomenon means he is still short of equality.

26 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{c}5} e4 27 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{d}5}
27...\(\mathcal{D}f4\)?

Tactical inaccuracies against McShane rarely go unpunished. Here 27...\(\mathcal{D}e5\) is strongly met by 28 \(\mathcal{D}g3\), e.g. 28...\(\mathcal{D}f3\) 29 \(\mathcal{H}h1\) \(\mathcal{W}g2\) 30 \(\mathcal{A}dd1\) \(\mathcal{D}e5\) 31 \(\mathcal{D}xf5!\) \(\mathcal{A}xf5\) 32 \(\mathcal{H}dg1\) \(\mathcal{W}f3\) 33 \(\mathcal{W}xe5\) \(\mathcal{A}g6\) 34 \(\mathcal{W}h2\) and White wins. But a tougher line was coordinating via 27...\(\mathcal{D}e5!\) when White has nothing immediate but retains a large plus after something like 28 \(\mathcal{A}b3\) \(h5\) 29 \(\mathcal{D}c4\) \(a5\).

Now it ends quickly.

28 \(\mathcal{D}xf4\) \(\mathcal{W}xf4\) 29 \(\mathcal{D}e2!\) \(\mathcal{W}b8\)

29...\(\mathcal{A}xe2\) 30 \(\mathcal{A}xe2\) \(e3\) 31 \(\mathcal{A}b3\) would not help Black.

30 \(\mathcal{D}d4\)

The horse drops in to wreak havoc.

30...\(h5\)

31 \(c3\)

Very cool. The move clears the path back to another action zone and also blocks the long diagonal, liberating the knight to genuinely threaten the Black kingside.

31...\(\mathcal{A}xd4\)

Hence this, but the bishop was a key piece.
32 \textit{\textit{d}d}d4 \textit{\textit{f}f}4 33 \textit{\textit{d}d}d1!
Preparing to kill the last Black defender.
33...h4 34 \textit{x}xg4 \textit{x}xg4 35 f3!
An elegant finale. Black will die down the g line.
1-0

\textbf{Ponomariov – Fressinet}
European Team Championships, Batumi 1999

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \textit{\textit{d}d}xd5 3 c3 \textit{\textit{d}d}d6
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \textit{\textit{d}d}xd5 3 c3 \textit{\textit{d}d}d6 4 f3 f6 5 d4 a6 6 c4 \textit{\textit{d}d}d7 7 0-0
b5 8 b3 b7??
Very unwise. 8...e6!

9 \textit{\textit{g}g}5!
Near decisive.
9...e6 10 e1
No guesses what happened next.
10...e7

11 \textit{\textit{x}x}x6! fxe6 12 \textit{\textit{x}x}x6 \textit{\textit{b}b}4
Resigning was acceptable.
13 a3 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash a}}5} 14 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}2} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash b}}4}
What else?
15 axb4 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}5} 16 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash e}}2} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash g}}8} 17 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash a}}5} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}8} 18 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}5} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}8} 19 b5! \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}6} 20
 bxa6 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash c}}6} 21 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash b}}4} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash b}}8} and now he did pack it in. 1-0

White plays \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash g}}5}

I had two Internet games in late 2003 featuring White meeting 3...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}6}
with \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash g}}5}, in conjunction with \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}2} and 0-0-0, and sacrifices at f7.

\textbf{Plaskett – Tyomkin,}
World Chess Network Internet Masters, September 2003

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}xd5} 3 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash c}}3} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}6} 4 d4 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}6} 5 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash g}}5} a6

Another explorable move is the irritant 5...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}4}!?, here not as much of a
pain as after 5 g3. Gullaksen-Guerrero, Gibtelecom Masters 2003 continued
6 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}3} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}5} 7 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}2} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash c}}6}!? 8 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash b}}5} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash e}}6}+ 9 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}2} 0-0-0 10 c3 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}7} after which a
swift ...e5 left Black excellently placed and he won in 39 moves. I imagine
6 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}2} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash c}}6} 7 h3 is a better line for White. In Conquest – Babaniotis,
Athens Open 1997 we saw another one forget that an unprepared 5...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}5}?
may be met by 6 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}3}!

6 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}2} b5 7 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}3}

In Rudolf – Hassangatin, European Cup 2002, play was unclear after 7
\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash x}}f6} gxf6 8 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash e}}2} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash b}}7} 9 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}3} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash x}}f3} 10 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash x}}f3} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}7} 11 a4 b4 12 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash e}}4} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash d}}5}
13 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash e}}2} f5

7...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash b}}7}

A very dynamic and interesting continuation. Of course one significance
is White now no longer has the most active diagonal for his king’s bishop
available.

8 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textbackslash f}}4}
70 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wXxd5 3 c3 d6

After, by transposition, 8 a3 d6 White really lost the plot in Van den Doel – Kurajica, Bugojno 1999, 9 wXe2?! e6 10 0-0-0 e7 11 h1 d5! 12 e4 xg5+ 13 fxe4 wd7 14 wd2 h6 15 f3 b4 16 f1? xe4! 17 xe4 f6 18 ee1 xa2+ 19 b1 b4 20 e5 0-0 and Kurajica had nicked a nice pawn. 21 g4 d5 22 g5 hxg5 23 wxg5 h7 24 g3 wg5 25 wh3 and a disgusted White resigned.

8...wb6 9 a3 e6 10 0-0-0 11 a4

Everybody on the playing field now.

11...b4 12 a3 e7 13 e4

Starting to steer the men kingwards.

13...d5 14 g5 xg5 15 wxg5 0-0

At move 13 or 14 queenside castling may have been the sounder option. Now I went for him.

16 e5 f6 17 xf6+ xf6 18 e3

Here come the guns.

18...h6 19 wh4 ad8 20 g3 h8 21 c3 c5 22 h3 cxd4 23 f4 g8

24 wxf7! e7 25 xh6+ 1-0

That game was played with each player having just three minutes for all moves, so it may not tell us too much. But I enjoyed it.
The next day, at the European Club Cup, in Crete, this occurred.

**Svidler – Clisak**

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Oc3 wd6 4 d4 c6 5 Ag5 Of6 6 Wd2 Af5 7 0-0-0 e6 8 Of3 Obd7

9 a3

Presumably to deny the queen b4, and so threaten 10 f4.

10...wc7 10 Oe5 Ae7 11 f4 h6 12 xf6 xf6 13 Ad3 Axd3 14 Wxd3 Ad6 15 Wf3 0-0-0

White has conceded the bishop pair but retains a spatial advantage.

His is the freer game and, once again, there are similarities with the Caro-Kann.

16 Ad3 wb8 17 Ab1 a6 18 Ahd1 Ahf8 19 g3

Waiting and strengthening.

19...Ae7 20 We2 Od7 21 Of3

Tacking.

21...Afe8 22 Oe4 f6

Something happens!
23 \textit{f}e3 \textit{g}5?!  
Altogether an unwise adventure. Svidler sights on the softened spots on the e line.

\textbf{24} \textit{c}3 \textit{f}8

Cicak must have hoped to pull back with a snap attack from the back that might nibble at or even hack at the White structure, and make it crack, but...

\textbf{25} \textit{f}5!  
Peter perceptively preferred to part with a pawn for pressure from a powerful pin.

\textbf{25...exf5} \textbf{26} \textit{d}5!  
Threatening \textbf{27} \textit{d}6

\textbf{26...c}5 \textbf{27} \textit{e}1 \textit{g}6 \textbf{28} \textit{e}6  
Reimplementing the threat of \textit{d}6.

\textbf{28...g}4  
Forced.

\textbf{29} \textit{h}4 \textit{e}5  
Again forced, but his position has suffered terribly.

\textbf{30} \textit{xf}5
Now Black’s game quickly falls apart.

30...h5 31 Qxe7 Qxe7 32 Qxf6 Qc6 33 Qf2 Qxe1+ 34 Qxe1 Qd4 35 We4 Qf3 36 Qf5 Qxh2 37 Qf7 Qd6 38 Qh7 Qb6 39 Qa4 Qb5 40 c4! Qb3 41 Qxc5

And defence of b7 is impossible...so 1-0

Also, about a month later...

Plaskett – Zatonskiih
World Chess Network 25 minute game,
October 2003

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qxd5 3 Qc3 Qd6 4 d4 c6
Anna commented that this 4th move is a rarity.
5 Qg5!?  

5...Qf6 6 Qd2
6 Qc4 Qg4!? 7 f3 Qf5 8 Qge2 e6 9 Qd2 Qe7 10 h4 h6 11 Qf4 Qb4 led to equal chances in Turischev – Gubnicki, USSR, 1968.

6...Qf5 7 0-0-0

In Tkachiev – Gerard, Paris Open 1997, Vyecheslav tried 7 Qge2 and play went 7...Qbd7 8 f3 e5?! Unwise to open it up here. 9 0-0-0 Qe7 10 We1!? Qd5 Neither did this attempt to sort things out did not work well. 11 Qxe7 Qxe7 12 g4 Qg6 13 Wg3 f6?! 14 dxe5 Wxe5 15 f4 Wa5 16 Qd4 Qc5 17 Qe3 Qf8 18 Qc4 and, as you can imagine, Black did not last out long.

7...Qbd7 8 Qf3 e6
In Smirin – Ferenc, Croatian Championship 2000, 8...h6? worked out badly after 9 Qf4 Qb4
10 d5! \text{\textit{\textbullet dxd5\textbullet 11 \textit{\textbullet dxd5, \textbullet wxd2+ 12 \textit{\textbullet exd2 cxd5 13 \textit{\textbullet d4 Hitting f5 and b5.}}}}}

13...e5 14 \textit{\textbullet xf5 exf4 15 \textit{\textbullet xd5 0-0-0 16 \textbullet c4 \textbullet c7 17 \textit{\textbullet hd1 a6 18 \textbullet x5d2 g6 19 \textit{\textbullet d4 \textbullet h7 20 \textit{\textbullet e2 f3 21 gxf3 \textbullet e7 22 f4 and Black was short of equality and lost at move 60.}}}}}

9 \textit{\textbullet c4 \textbullet b6 10 \textbullet b3 \textbullet c7 11 \textit{\textbullet he1 0-0-0 12 \textit{\textbullet e5 \textbullet d6 13 \textbullet w2 \textbullet h6?}}}

Missing a trick. 13...\textbullet b8 was better.

14 \textit{\textbullet xf6 gxf6}

15 \textit{\textbullet xf7! \textbullet xf7 16 g4}

Knocking out the prop.

16...

17 \textit{\textbullet b1 \textbullet xc2+}

She had no satisfactory continuation.

18 \textit{\textbullet xc2 \textbullet b8}

On 18...

19 \textit{\textbullet xe6 \textbullet g7 20 h3 \textit{\textbullet h8 21 \textbullet de1 f5 22 gxf5 \textbullet xd4 23 \textbullet d1 \textbullet g7 24 f6 \textbullet xdl+ 25 \textbullet xd1 \textbullet g6+ 26 \textit{\textbullet e4 \textbullet c7 27 \textbullet g4 \textbullet h7?}}}

27...

28 \textit{\textbullet e7 \textbullet h8}

Left some hope. Now another sacrifice brings it all to a close.
29 \textit{xc7!} \textit{xc7} 30 \textit{Wf4+} \textit{d8} 31 \textit{Wd6+} \textit{d7} 32 \textit{c5} \textit{Wh7+} 33 \textit{c2}
\textit{xf6} 34 \textit{xb7+} \textit{c8} 35 \textit{hxh7} \textit{xd6} 36 \textit{xd6+} 1-0

I liked that one, too.

White plays \textit{d3}

\textbf{Kasparov – Rogers}

Europe vs Asia match, (30 minutes each player)
Batumi, 2001
(Ian Rogers a European!?)

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \textit{Wxd5} 3 \textit{c3} \textit{Wd6}

Interesting that long time Scandinavian stalwart Rogers moved on to this modern interpretation when giving his pet opening its toughest test.

4 d4 \textit{f6} 5 \textit{d3}

In Sturua – Ye Rongguang, Groningen 1998, Black successfully played a quick ...c5, viz, 5 \textit{f3} a6 6 h3 Most White players have preferred to stop ...	extit{g4}, so 6...e6 7 \textit{d3} \textit{bd7} 8 0-0 c5 9 \textit{e3} \textit{e7} 10 \textit{e2} 0-0 11 \textit{ed1}
\textit{c7} and he had equalised and won at move 39. In Grunfeld –
Kundischewitsch, Tel Aviv, 2001, he went for a fianchetto instead and after
6...b5 7 ∆d3 ∆b7 8 ♕e2 e6 9 ∆g5 ∆bd7 10 a4 b4 11 ∆e4 ♕d5 12 c4 bxc3 13 ∆xc3 ♕a5 there were chances for both sides.

And in Zelic – Krumpak, Ljubljana Open 2001, he played another formation entirely, with 6...∆c6 7 ∆d3 ∆d7 8 ♕e2!? e5!? 9 dxe5 ∆xe5 10 ∆xe5 ♕xe5 11 ∆f4!? ♕xb2 12 0-0 with unclear play, where White won at move 64.

5...∆g4!?

The familiar probe. After the staid 5..c6 White got a small edge in Stripunsky – Lein, USA Championship, Seattle 2003, 6 ∆ge2 e6 7 0-0 ∆e7 8 ♕e4 ∆xe4 9 ∆xe4 0-0 10 ♕d3 g6 11 ∆h6 ∆e8 12 ∆ad1 ∆d7 13 ∆f1 ∆f6 14 ∆f3, and drawn in 28 moves. Neither man searched his imagination too deeply that afternoon.

6 f3 ∆h5

New ground already.

7 ∆ge2

7...a6

I wonder whether this is quite so significant here?! Perhaps just 7...e6, as in Hracek – Kantorik, Pardubice, 2002, with Black okay after 8 ∆f4 ♕d7 9 g4 ∆g6 10 h4 ∆xd3 11 ♕xd3 ∆c6 12 0-0-0 0-0-0, although White won in 46 moves. In Jurkovic – Sermek, Pula 2002, Black equalised with 7...∆c6! 8 ∆f4 ♕d7 9 ♕d2 e6 10 0-0-0 ∆b4 11 a3 ∆a5 12 g4 ∆g6 13 ∆xg6 hxg6 14 b4 ∆b6 15 d5 ∆xd5 16 ∆xd5 ♕xd5. Neither, in this line, did 9 d5 ∆xd5 10 ∆xd5 ♕xd5 11 ∆xc7 bring White anything in Shevelev – Nadanian, Saint-Vincent, 200 after 11...∆c8 12 ∆g3 ♕a5+, etc.

8 ∆f4 ♕d7 9 d5!?

Garry, as ever, strives to wring the maximum chance of advantage from the position, but Rogers refuses to let himself be rattled.

9...∆g6 10 ♕d2 ∆xd3 11 ♕xd3 g6! 12 0-0-0 ∆g7 13 ♕c4 c6! 14 d6 14 dxc6 ♕xc6 gave nothing.
14...0-0!
Very cool.
15 \text{ \texttt{wb1}}

15 dxe7 e7 16 \text{ \texttt{d6}} did not win the exchange because of the check on e3. Now White has the threat.

15...\text{ \texttt{e8}} 16 \text{ \texttt{g3}} exd6 17 \text{ \texttt{x}d6} e6 18 \text{ \texttt{xe6}} e6 19 \text{ \texttt{ge4}} \text{ \texttt{bd7}} 20 \text{ \texttt{g3}} b5

A Pirc-type setting, with Black equally placed.
21 a3 \text{ \texttt{xe4}} 22 \text{ \texttt{xe4}} b6 23 f2 \text{ \texttt{d}5} 24 \text{ \texttt{d}4}
Sensibly removing one of Black’s best pieces.

24...a5 25 g4 h6 26 h4
Still hoping to get somewhere. Nobody ever won a game by agreeing it drawn.

26...\text{ \texttt{x}d4} 27 \text{ \texttt{xd4}} g7 28 h5

28...b4?!
Probably an inaccuracy. The a5 pawn is now a potential liability.
29 a4 \text{ \texttt{f}6} 30 \text{ \texttt{d}6}
In these endings with rooks and knights the result may hinge on tiny nuances, such as a pawn being slightly the more vulnerable or a knight on a fractionally more effective circuit.

30...\(\text{e}3\) 31 \(\text{f}4\) g5

31...\(\text{a}7\) might have been tougher as then 32 g5 \(\text{d}xh5\) 33 \(\text{g}xh6+\) \(\text{h}xh6\) 34 \(\text{xf}7\) \(\text{xf}7\) 35 \(\text{xf}7+\) \(\text{g}g7\) is certainly not clearly to White's advantage.

There is now an awful hole at f5.

32 \(\text{f}5+\) \(\text{h}7\) 33 \(\text{xe}3\) \(gxf4\) 34 \(\text{e}4\)!

Eyeing the a5 pawn.

34...\(\text{d}5\) 35 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{g}7\) 36 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{f}6\) 37 \(\text{f}5+\) \(\text{e}6\) 38 \(\text{e}5+\) \(\text{f}6\) 39 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{g}5\)

Activating the king.

40 \(\text{e}5!\) \(\text{h}4\) 41 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{g}3\) 42 \(\text{d}4\)

Perfectly placed now as it holds f3 and has central influence.

42...\(\text{d}8\)

Close to a record, as only now does the rook make its first move.

43 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{e}3\) 44 c3 \(\text{bxc}3\) 45 \(\text{bxc}3\) \(\text{e}8\) 46 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{b}8\)

In time pressure, Rogers loses the thread.

47 \(\text{e}2+\) \(\text{xf}3\) 48 \(\text{xf}4+\) and Black resigned.

A shame that after such enterprising and creative play, Ian Rogers could not quite hold the position.

But Garry is Garry...

Mnatsakanian – Utasi
Budapest 1990

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \(\text{w}xd5\) 3 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{w}d6\) 4 d4 \(\text{f}6\) 5 \(\text{f}3\) a6 6 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}6\)

In Movsesian – Kurajica, Sarajevo 2003, Bojan once again showed his penchant for the occasional kingside fianchetto in this system. And, again, it did not serve him well.
6...g6 7 0-0 chodząc 8 g5 c6 9 h3 b4 10 e4 xe4 11 xe4 and he elected to ensure he got the bishop through the weakener 11...f5. White won in 40 moves.

[Chess diagram]

7 0-0

Allowing the pin. Most people have not. After (by transposition) 7 h3 Black went 7...b4 in Torrecillas Martinez – Narcisco Dublan, Linares Open, 2001 and was not at all worse after 8 c4 e6 9 xe6 xe6 10 e3 fd5 11 xd5 xd5 12 w2 g6 13 0-0 xe3 14 fxe3 h6 15 fe1 w4!? 16 c3 0-0.

They agreed to a draw at move 64.

7...g4

He pins. The interpretation of the opening is simple enough; pressure on the d4 pawn.

8 e3

Shirov handled it differently in his game with Romero Holmes from the 1992 Spanish Championship: 8 h3 h5 9 e4!? (Starting his attack!) 9...xe4 10 xe4 e6 11 c3! f6?! 12 wb3 0-0-0 13 e1 f7 14 c4. Black ought now to have attempted a bail out with 14...wb4. Instead his 14...g5? was punished in classic Shirovian manner. 15 c5 wd7

[Chess diagram]
16 $\text{A}xg5!$, and since 16...fxg5 17 $\text{Q}e5$ leaves him splattered he was reduced to grovelling on with 16...$\text{A}g7$, but 17 $\text{A}h4$ left White still with attacking play and the better game but also now an extra pawn, which he soon converted to victory. A better line had been seen in Hadzimanolis – Halkias, Patras open, 2001, with simply 11...$\text{A}e7$.

After 12 $\text{W}b3$ $\text{B}b8$ 13 $\text{Q}e1$ he was ill advised to play 13...$\text{A}xf3$? as 14 $\text{A}xf3$ left him simply worse, despite his ultimate victory at move 47. Better just 13...0-0.

In Kazakov – Ovetchin, Nefteyugansk, 2002, White played similarly but without the interpolation of 8 h3 $\text{A}h5$, i.e. 8 $\text{Q}e4$ $\text{Q}xe4$ 9 $\text{A}xe4$ 0-0-0. Now he took play into a slightly favourable structure via 10 $\text{A}xc6$! $\text{W}xc6$ 11 $\text{Q}e5$ $\text{A}xd1$ 12 $\text{A}xc6$ $\text{bxc6}$ 13 $\text{A}xd1$ $\text{e}6$ 14 $\text{A}f4$, and managed to win at move 51, although Black is only a little worse there. Ulf Andersson, and some others, would certainly have preferred the ending after 12...$\text{A}xc2$!? instead.

Things took a really cute turn in Mortensen – Sermek, Bled Olympiad 2002 with 8...$\text{W}d5$!? 9 h3! $\text{Q}e4$ 10 $\text{hxg4}$ $\text{Q}xd6$ 11 c3 0-0-0 12 $\text{W}e2$ with White and his bishops clearly better.

8...0-0-0 9 h3 $\text{A}xf3$ 10 $\text{W}xf3$ e5?

Taulbut and Harman assess the consequences of 10...$\text{Q}xd4$ 11 $\text{A}xd4$ $\text{W}xd4$ 12 $\text{A}ad1$ as dangerous for Black as they believe that White then has a strong initiative.

I am far from convinced after, say, 12...$\text{W}b6$. I imagine that Mnatsakanian’s idea was 12 $\text{A}xa6$!

...when taking the bishop loses to 13 $\text{W}a8+$ $\text{d}7$ 14 $\text{W}xa6$ and Black has no satisfactory defence to the threat of 15 $\text{A}ad1$, e.g. 14...$\text{Q}e8$ 15 $\text{A}ad1$ $\text{W}b6$ 16 $\text{A}xd8+$ $\text{A}xd8$ 17 $\text{A}d1+$ $\text{d}7$ 18 $\text{W}a8+$ $\text{b}8$ 19 $\text{W}xb8$ mate.

Still, Black could decline with 12...$\text{W}b6$! and it is not clear to me that his chances there are any the worse. Certainly it would have been far better than what now befalls him.

11 $\text{Q}e4!$ $\text{Q}xe4$ 12 $\text{A}xe4$ exd4 13 $\text{A}ad1$

Vicious initiative.
13...\texttt{w}c5 14 \texttt{a}xe6 bxe6

The ending after 14...\texttt{w}xc6 15 \texttt{w}xc6 bxc6 17 \texttt{a}xd4 is pretty ghastly. Dreadful queenside pawns and still a development lag.

\texttt{15 wxf7! we5}

15...dxe3 16 \texttt{e}6+ won the rook.

16 \texttt{a}f4 \texttt{e}7 17 \texttt{c}4

Black is up the creek.

17...\texttt{w}f6

17...\texttt{b}7 18 \texttt{a}xd4 was dreadful, too.

18 \texttt{w}xa6+ \texttt{d}7 19 \texttt{w}a7! \texttt{w}xf4

19...\texttt{d}6 and 20 \texttt{a}xd4 would also have won for White.

20 \texttt{a}xd4+ \texttt{d}6 21 \texttt{f}d1 \texttt{e}8 22 \texttt{c}4 and Black resigned.

\texttt{Early} \texttt{e}5 \texttt{and others}

Ponomariov – Hauchard
Belfort 1998

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \texttt{w}xd5 3 \texttt{c}c3 \texttt{w}d6 4 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{f}6 5 d4 a6 6 \texttt{e}5!?
By analogy with lines after 3...\textit{\$aw}a5, White tries this early knight advance.

6...\textit{\$ac}6

6...c5? worked badly in Palac – Fressinet, Cannes, 1998. Palac sighted on the holes in the queenside, and after 7 \textit{\$ad}c4! \textit{\$aw}e6+ (7...\textit{\$aw}xd4? 8 \textit{\$ah}b6 wins) 8 \textit{\$ae}2 \textit{\$ax}d4 9 \textit{\$aw}xd4 \textit{\$ac}6 10 \textit{\$aw}f4 b5 11 \textit{\$ab}6 \textit{\$bb}8 12 \textit{\$ae}3 g6 13 \textit{\$wc}7 \textit{\$ab}7 14 \textit{\$af}3 and the pressure caused Black to concede a structural weakness with 14...\textit{\$aw}d6 15 \textit{\$aw}xd6 exd6. White continued 16 0-0-0 and won in 64 moves.

7 \textit{\$ad}xc6

7 \textit{\$af}4? made little sense in Kostenk – Ovetchin Samara, 2002 and Black just played 7...\textit{\$ax}d4 and won a pawn and the game.

7...\textit{\$aw}xc6

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

8 \textit{\$af}4

8 d5 \textit{\$aw}d6 9 \textit{\$ac}4 ought not to have caused problems for Black in Spasov – Panbukchian, Bulgarian championship, 1996, after 9...b5 10 \textit{\$ah}b3 \textit{\$ab}7 with 0-0-0 to follow. And in Pavicic – Zelcic, Croatian Championship 2001 after 10 \textit{\$ae}2 \textit{\$ab}7 11 0-0 Black ought just to have castled queenside with a comfortable game.

In Golubev – Kekelidze, Neckar Open, 1997, 9 \textit{\$ae}3 b5 10 \textit{\$aw}d4 e6 11 dxe6 \textit{\$aw}xe6?! 12 0-0-0 \textit{\$ad}6 13 \textit{\$af}4 \textit{\$xf}4 14 \textit{\$xf}4 led to a White advantage, but Black could just have taken back at e6 with his bishop.

8 \textit{\$aw}d3 g6 9 d5 \textit{\$aw}d6 10 \textit{\$ae}3 \textit{\$ag}7 11 0-0-0 0-0 12 \textit{\$ae}2 \textit{\$af}5 13 \textit{\$wd}2 b5 was balanced in Slobodjan – Sulava, Arco Open 1999. In Yemelin – Keskeli, Tallinn Open 2001, White produced the speculative gambit 8 \textit{\$ae}2?! Play went 8...\textit{\$aw}xg2 9 \textit{\$af}3 \textit{\$wh}3 10 \textit{\$af}4... ‘...with play for the pawn.’; 10...c6 11 \textit{\$ag}1 h5 12 d5 \textit{\$ag}4 13 \textit{\$ag}3 \textit{\$xf}3 14 \textit{\$xf}3 \textit{\$wd}7 15 0-0-0 \textit{\$ad}x5
16 $\text{Bxd5!}?$ cxd5 17 $\text{Bxd5}$ $\text{Bc8}$ 18 $\text{Bb6}$ $\text{Bc6}$ 19 $\text{Bxc8}$ $\text{Bxc8}$ 20 $\text{Be4}$ and White had a great initiative.

8...$\text{Bg4}$ 9 f3 $\text{Be6}$ 10 $\text{Bd2}$

10 $\text{Bd3}$ brought no advantage in Zelic – Horvath, Split, 2000, after 10...g6 11 $\text{Be2}$ $\text{Bg7}$ 12 0-0-0 0-0 13 $\text{Bb1}$ $\text{Bd5}$, and Black won at move 37.

10...0-0-0 11 $\text{Be5}$

Odd move. 11...g6 would now be fine, but Hauchard completed development in another way.

11...$\text{Bc4}$ 12 $\text{Bd3}$ e6 13 $\text{Bc2}$ $\text{d6}$

White has zilch out of the opening.

14 $\text{Bxf6}$ gxf6 15 0-0 $\text{Bhg8}$ 16 $\text{Bf2}$ f5 17 $\text{Bxc4}$ $\text{Bxc4}$ 18 b3 $\text{Bc6}$ 19 $\text{Bd3}$ $\text{Bg6}$ 20 $\text{Bd1}$ $\text{Bh6}$ 21 h3 $\text{Bg8}$ 22 $\text{Bf1}$ $\text{Bhg6}$ 23 c4 $\text{Bd7}$ 24 a4 h5

White has insufficient pieces to continue the attacking build up, so he just sits tight instead.

25 $\text{c5}$ $\text{Be7}$ 26 $\text{Bc3}$

Getting out of the way so the f2 rook can dodge the bishop’s prod.

26...$\text{Bh4}$ 27 $\text{Be2}$ c6 28 $\text{Bf3}$ $\text{c7}$ 29 $\text{Be5}$ $\text{Bc5}$ 30 $\text{Bd3}$ $\text{Bg3}$ 31 f4 $\text{Bh4}$ 32 $\text{Bd2}$ $\text{Bf6}$ 33 $\text{Bc5}$ $\text{c7}$ 34 $\text{Bf3}$ h4 35 $\text{Be3}$ $\text{Bf3}$ 36 $\text{Bf2}$ $\text{Bc5}$ 37 $\text{Bxg3}$ $\text{Bxg3}$ 38 $\text{Bf3}$ $\text{Bxf3}$+ 39 gxf3 $\text{Bf4}$ 40 $\text{Be2}$
No way in.

40...d7 41 f2 a3 42 c3 a2 43 a5 b1 44 c1 g7 45 b4 h6 46 e2 g7 47 c1 e8 48 e3 f8 49 f2 g8 50 e3 h6 51 e1 g7 52 d3 b3 53 xh4 d5

Forcing repetition.

54 e5 b3+ Drawn.

Podlesnik – Pavasovic
Ljubljana 2002

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 xd5 3 c3 d6 4 d4 f6

In Gallagher – Cicak, Bundesliga, 2000, Black put up the shutters and emerged with a draw at move 65 after 4...c6 5 f3 g4 6 e2 f6 7 h3 xf3 8 xf3 e6 9 0-0 bd7 10 e1 0-0-0 11 e3 c7 12 e2 d6, etc. A tough carapace to crack.

Moberg – Cicak, Swedish Team Championships, 2002, continued 7 0-0 bd7 8 g5 e6 9 d2 c7 Must get out of the way before f4 comes. 10 f4 d6 11 g3 xg3 12 hxg3 xf3!? 13 xf3 0-0-0!? with interesting play. Black won in 51 moves.
In Rogers – Leong, Singapore 1998, after 4...c6, White played in a more restrained way but came out of the opening clearly better after 5 f3 g4 6 e2 xf3 7 xf3 e6 8 0-0 f6 9 e1 c7

10 b5! d8 11 a3 0-0 12 c4, and went on to win in 39 moves.

Neither was Black’s interpretation of this opening, with ...g4 against e2, a complete success in Glinert – Spraggett, Canadian Championship, Richmond 2002, 4...a6 5 f3 g4 6 e2 c6 7 0-0 f6 8 h3 h5 9 e3 d8!? 10 w2 e6 11 e1 c7 12 f4 d7 13 e3! 0-0 14 e5 e8 15 g4 g6 16 xg6 hxg6 17 xc7 c8 18 g3 and Black was lucky to draw.

A rich and complex struggle occurred in Kozakov – Hauchard, French Team Championships 1999 after 7 h3 h5 8 g4 g6 9 e2 c6 10 xc6 xc6 11 f3 e6 12 e3+ 0-0 0 13 e2 h5!? 14 0-0-0 h4 15 hxg4 xh1 16 xh1 d6 17 g5 d7 18 g2 b8!? 19 f3 c6 20 d1 e5!? 21 g4+ e6 22 xe6+ fxe6 23 xc6 exd4! 24 xb7+ (24 f3 dxe3 25 xb7+ ? xh7 26 xd8 exf2 27 f8 f5 or 27 d1 c5 28 f1 f5 and ...h3.) 24...xb7 25 xd4 xd4 26 xd4 d6, and it was drawn at move 42. Imaginative guy that Hauchard...

5 ge2!?

In Dervishi – Perez, St Vincent, 2002, Black put the knight on d7; 5 f3 a6 6 e2 bd7 7 0-0 e6
8 ∆g5 ∆c7 9 ∆d2 b5 10 ∆f4 ∆b6 11 a4 b4 with equality. This quiet approach also brought White little in Damljanovic – Kurajica, Sarajevo 2003 after 8 ∆e1 ∆e7 9 ∆g5 0-0 10 ∆d3 b5 11 a4 b4 12 ∆e4 ∆xe4 13 ∆xe4 ∆b8 14 ∆d3 h6 15 ∆xe7 ∆xe7 16 a5 ∆f6 17 ∠c6 ∆d6 when Black had equalised.

Neither did 8 g3 lead to a White edge in Grischuk – Sermek, Porto San Giorgio Open, 1999 after 8...∆e7 9 ∆f4 ∆b6 10 a3!? 0-0 11 b4 ∆d5 12 ∆xd5 exd5 13 c4 and 13...dxc4 can be met by 14 d5 followed by ∆xc4 (14...∆b5 15 ∆d4). The game was drawn at move 44.

8 ∆g5!? was tried in Ljubicic – Sermek, Croatian Championship 1999 and Black equalised with 8...c5 9 ∆e3 cxd4 10 ∆xd4 ∆e7 11 ∆ce4 ∆xe4 12 ∆xe4 ∆f4 13 ∆d3 0-0 14 ∆e1 e5, and drew at move 31.

One of the games that set this fashion ball rolling was J.Polgar – Donchev, European Team championships, 1989, where Judit also could not show an edge after 8 ∆e3 c5 9 dxc5 ∆xd1 10 ∆axd1 ∆xc5 11 ∆xc5 ∆xc5 12 ∆e5 ∆e7 13 ∆f3 ∆cd7 14 ∆c4 ∆a7! 15 a4 b6 16 ∆a2 ∆c7 and Black had successfully got it together. 17 b3 a5 18 ∆c3 ∆a6 19 ∆b5 ∆e5 20 ∆ca3 ∆e5 21 ∆e2 g5 and they drew at move 41.

Rozentalis is known for superb technique, but also for dreary White openings. He got zilch against David Bronstein at the Reykjavik Open 1996 with 6 ∆e2 e6 7 0-0 ∆e7 8 ∆e5 ∆c6 9 ∆xc6 ∆xc6 10 ∆f3 ∆d6 11 g3 0-0 12 ∆f4 ∆d8 13 ∆d2 ∆d5 14 ∆e1 ∆xf4 15 ∆xf4 ∆b8 16 ∆ad1 b5 17 ∆e4 ∆d6 18 ∆e3 b4 19 ∆c5 a5 and drawn in 28 moves.

Black mixed his systems in Aseev – Pridorozhni, Petrov Memorial, 2002, with 6...∆c6 7 0-0 ∆f5 8 ∆e3 g6 9 ∆c1 ∆g7 10 ∆f4 ∆d8 11 ∆d1 0-0 12 d5 ∆b4.
Aseev now hit upon the most remarkable plan of a slow motion win of a piece; 13 \( \text{c}1 \text{e1!} \text{d}7 \) (13...a5) 14 a3 \( \text{b}x\text{d}5 \) 15 \( \text{b}x\text{d}5 \text{e}5 \) 16 \( \text{f}3 \text{c}6 \) 17 c4 e5 18 h6 h6 19 xh6 e6 20 c2 f5 21 cxd5 cxd5 22 xd5! xd5 23 \( \text{e}3 \) and White won.

An entirely different approach is to immediately rush out ...c7-c5, as Black did in Hinks-Edwards - Hauchard, French Team Championships 1999; 6 h3 c5!? 7 dx\text{c}5 \text{w}x\text{c}5 8 x\text{d}3 \text{b}d7 9 0-0 e6 10 x\text{e}1 x\text{e}7, and they agreed it drawn at move 76.

In Rosandic – Zelic, Budapest 2003, White continued with a kind of 19th century fianchetto; 5 x\text{e}2 a6 6 x\text{f}3 x\text{c}6 7 x\text{g}e2 x\text{f}5 8 x\text{f}4 x\text{d}7 9 x\text{d}2 0-0 10 x\text{d}1 e6 11 a3 h6 12 h3 g5 13 xg3 x\text{d}6 with equality. In this line 7...e5?! did not work so well in Brodsky – Koller, Oberwart 1995, viz, 8 x\text{xc}6+ x\text{xc}6 9 0-0 x\text{f}5 10 dx\text{e}5 x\text{d}x\text{d}1 11 x\text{d}1 x\text{g}4 12 x\text{d}4 x\text{d}7 13 x\text{f}4 and White won in 29 moves. But Black did win with it in Rezonja – Sermek, Ljubljana open, 2000 after 8 x\text{xc}6 9 dx\text{e}5 x\text{g}4 10 x\text{d}5 x\text{b}6 11 0-0 x\text{e}6 12 x\text{e}4 x\text{c}5 13 x\text{a}4+ x\text{x}d7 14 x\text{f}4 x\text{w}e6. But I find it all a bit fishy. Black’s response was most creative in Solak – Nadanian, Saint-Vincent, 2000; 6...h6!? 7 x\text{g}e2 g5 8 x\text{c}3 x\text{c}6 9 xg3 g4 10 x\text{c}2 x\text{g}7 11 x\text{d}2 x\text{e}6 12 0-0 0-0-0 with chances for both sides.

\[5...a6\]
The odd game Landa – Koenig, Deizisau, 2001 went 5...c6 6 f4 b4 7 c7! e6 Forced. 8 a3 e7 9 e5 d7 10 d3 b6 11 g3 b7 12 ce4 xe4 13 xe4 xe5 14 dxe5 d7 15 g3 0-0-0 16 d3 f5?! 17 exf6 gxf6 18 0-0-0 h6+ 19 b1 e7 20 c4 and Black realised that his soft spots at f6, e6 and, above all d6 are indefensible, e.g. 20...e5 21 h3+ wins a bishop, so here he resigned.

Kuporosov – Voss, Seefeld Open 1998 turned into a species of Caro-Kann after 5...f5 6 f4 d8 7 g3 g6 8 h4 h6 9 h5 h7 10 d3 xd3 11 xd3 c6 12 0-0-0 a6 13 e1 b4 15 f3 e6. White won it at move 49.

6 f4 d8 7 g3 e6 8 e2 c6

I might have preferred going for a swift ...c5 here. In this game Black did a good job of stifling White’s ambitions.

9 e3 d6 10 e4 e7 11 0-0 0-0 12 f4

Aggression...but it leads nowhere. In fact he was never to get a unit even as far advanced as the e pawn reached at the second move.

12...d5 13 c1 b6 14 f3 b7 15 e2 a5 16 2g3 d7 17 a3 d8

Mobilisation now complete. Black is under no threat here.

18 e1 h4!? 19 h1 f5!?

20 f2 xg3 21 hxg3 f6 22 d2 xf3 23 gxf3 c4 24 b4 e6 25 d3 e8 26 b3 Draw

3...d6!? Currently, where it's at in The Scandinavian!?
Chapter 5: The Patzer Variation

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ♕xd5 3 ♞c3 ♕e5+

How audacious! If this works then we might ask what could not be a viable treatment!? But English Candidate Grandmaster, Andrew Martin argues that the move is worth a look.

In principle, as with 3...♕d8, Black is going to stonewall it, and challenge White to show that his extra moves really count in a setting where there is not yet much direct contact between the two armies. The known route of the queen to c7 takes four moves via d5-a5-c7, allowing for ...c6, and it also takes four this way.

In the 19th century a guy called Preston Ware played the move a few times, but he seems to have lost all of those games.

Perhaps he was a patzer!?

Personally, I find the idea ridiculous...but, then, where’s the sense in 3...♕d8 (?)

Ask Adams. I have heard that he considers himself to have an understanding of this game superior to mine.

Black can reply 4 ♝e2 and 4 ♕ge2.

4 ♕e2 does not leave White better, as you might imagine.

4 ♝e2
A healthy developing move, but neither as dynamic as to d3 nor to c4.

4...c6 5 \&f3

In Zhao Jun – S. Buckley, Oropesa del Mar 2001, White experimented with 5 d4 \&c7 6 \&f3 \&f5 7 \&ge2 e6 8 0-0 \&d7 9 \&b1!? 

9...\&gf6 10 \&e1 \&d6 11 \&g3 \&g6 12 \&ce4 \&xe4 13 \&xe4 \&xe4 14 \&xe4? and still nobody understands why Black did not now safely capture the h2 pawn.

5...\&c7 6 d4 \&f5

How ought White to proceed?
7 \( \text{c4} \) was played in Rendle – Rogers, England 2003 and Black interpreted it much as a ...\( \text{Wa5} \) line, 7...e6 8 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 9 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qb4} \)? 10 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) 11 0-0-0 \( \text{Qxc3} \)? 12 \( \text{Qxc3} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 13 \( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) 14 \( \text{Qd2} \) 0-0-0 15 g4 \( \text{Qg6} \) 16 f4 h5!

With counterplay. In Cheparinov – Garcia Ortega, Andorra la Vella, 2002, White developed calmly, 7 0-0 e6 8 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 9 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qgf6} \) 10 h3 \( \text{Qg6} \) (10...h6!? might have even been better here.) 11 \( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 12 \( \text{Qxg6} \) \( \text{hxg6} \) 13 a3 with equality.

These middlegames tend to be turning into ...\( \text{Qf5} \) Caro-Kann types where White may nominally be a move or two ahead in getting his men off the back line, but there’s not that much for them to be doing.

White tried to force the pace, but without success, in...

R. Webb – S. Buckley
Portsmouth 2003

7 d5

Early contact, but not of the most threatening sort.

7...\( \text{Qf6} \) 8 dxe6 \( \text{Qxc6} \) 9 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Wb8} \) 10 \( \text{Qbd4} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 11 0-0 e5

Black has an extra central pawn and is probably already slightly better. White’s seventh move served only to accelerate Black’s development.
12 \(\text{Qxc6} \text{Qxc6} 13 \text{Qe1} \text{d6} 14 \text{Qd3} 0-0 15 \text{Qg5} \text{Qc7} 16 \text{Qe4} \text{Qxe4} 17 \text{Qxe4 Qad8} 18 \text{We2} \text{Qxe4} 19 \text{We4} f5 20 \text{We2} e4

Black is emerging on top.

21 h3 \(\text{Qde8} 22 b3 f4

Intending to do serious damage with \(...f3\).

23 \(\text{Wc4+}

Forced, but it splits his pawns so dreadfully that he is already close to lost, if not over the edge.

23...\(\text{Wxc4} 24 bxc4 \text{Qc5} 25 a4 \text{Qf5}

Buckley handles the technical phase smoothly.

26 \text{b3} e3 27 \text{Qx5} \text{dxc5} 28 \text{fxe3} \text{Qxe3} 29 \text{Qxe3} fxe3

The rook ending is lost..

30 \text{Qe1} \text{Qxc3} 31 \text{Qxe3} \text{Qxa4} 32 \text{Qe7} \text{Qb4} 33 c3

Another losing line was 33 \text{f2} a5 34 \text{e3} a4 35 \text{d2} \text{b1} 36 \text{c3} a3 37 \text{e8+} \text{Qf7} 38 \text{a8} b5!, etc.

33...\text{b6} 34 c4 a5 35 e5 \text{b5} 36 \text{e7} a4 37 \text{c8+} \text{f7} 38 \text{c7+} \text{e6} 39 c6 \text{d6}! 40 \text{Qxg7} \text{Qxc6} and White resigned.

**Rauch – Goldstern**

Germany 2001,

Here White developed quietly...for the next few moves anyway.

7 0-0 e6 8 \text{Qe1} \text{Qd7}
9 \textit{\texttt{g5 ggf6?!}}

9...\textit{\texttt{e7}} would have been safe as houses,

Now White seized a chance to complicate, but I am not 100% convinced by it.

10 d5!? cxd5 11 \textit{\texttt{x6}} gxf6 12 \textit{\texttt{d4 g6}} 13 \textit{\texttt{db5 wc5}} 14 b4 \textit{\texttt{c6}} 15 \textit{\texttt{f3 d8}} 16 \textit{\texttt{e2 xb4}} 17 \textit{\texttt{ad1 xc3}} 18 \textit{\texttt{xd5 wc5}} 19 \textit{\texttt{xe6 xe6}} 20 \textit{\texttt{xd7+ e8}} 21 \textit{\texttt{xe6+ f8}} 22 \textit{\texttt{xc3 e8}} 23 \textit{\texttt{xf6+ and Black resigned.}}

Well, that escapade may have been sound, but I am not going to dissect it in any detail.

To avoid such stuff, just play 9...\textit{\texttt{e7!}}, and Black is quite equal.

\textit{Conquest – Spain}

\textit{New Zealand 1999}

5 d4 \textit{\texttt{wc7}}

...saw Stuart developing more actively.

6 \textit{\texttt{g5?! f6}}

6...\textit{\texttt{f5}}, with ...\textit{\texttt{d7}} and only then ...\textit{\texttt{gf6}} to follow was, of course, another way.
7 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}d2} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{A}}}f5} 8 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}f3} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{E}}}e6} 9 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{A}}}xf6} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{G}}}xf6} 10 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}h4} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{A}}}g6} 11 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{F}}}f4}

11...f5

Martin's proposed 11...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}d6 could be better here, and I concur that after 12 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{G}}}d3} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{D}}}d7} chances would be about equal.

Still, Spain's treatment continues by analogy with formation arising from the 1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{E}}}e4 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{C}}}c6} 2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{D}}}d4 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{D}}}d5} 3 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}d2} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{D}}}xe4} 4 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}xc4} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}f6} 5 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{H}}}xf6+} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{G}}}xf6} line of the Caro-Kann, and there is something to be said for it.

12 0-0 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}d7} 13 \text{i3} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{A}}}g7} 14 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{D}}}ad1} 0-0 15 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}}}h1} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{D}}}ad8} 16 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}e3} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}b6}

I would have kept it nearer my king.

17 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}f3} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{H}}}h5} 18 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{D}}}e5} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{D}}}xe2} 19 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}xe2} \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{D}}}d7}

Right.

20 b4

Trundling.

20...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{A}}}xe5?!

Changing the structure. Might have done better to have sat and waited. Conquest soon reduces Black's role to that of a spectator.

21 fxe5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}h8 22 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}h6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{A}}}g8 23 \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}f4}

A very natural and very effective place for the horse. The attack shapes up.
23...\textit{G}g7 24 \textit{H}d3 \textit{H}dg8 25 \textit{H}b1
Planning queenside expansion, or just a lift to the third rank?

25...a6 26 c4 b6 27 c5
More space. Black is trussed.

27...b5 28 \textit{B}bb3 a5 29 \textit{H}h3 a4 30 \textit{B}bd3 \textit{W}d8 31 \textit{H}h5 \textit{C}f8
Necessary, for after the third White major piece gets to the h file mate via \textit{W}h7! will be threatened.

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

32 d5!
Cute. Just as in the previous game, the White d pawn experiences an unexpected Nimzowitschian lust to expand.

32...exd5
On 32...exd5 33 \textit{W}xc6.

33 \textit{B}dh3

The gain of a passed d pawn will not prevent Black from soon being forced into a total zugzwang.

33...\textit{W}e7 34 c6 \textit{W}d8 35 \textit{W}f6! \textit{W}xf6 36 exf6 \textit{H}g4 37 g3 and Black, movebound, \textit{resigned}.

37...d4 38 c7 d3 39 \textit{B}xd3 \textit{H}c4 40 \textit{B}c5 will kill him quickly.

\textbf{Schripchenko – Tolhuizen}
\textit{Aosta 2003}

5...\textit{W}c7 6 d4 \textit{B}f5
Here White’s 7 \textit{D}e5 was rational.
White aims for $\textbf{\textit{Q}}f4$ which will pinpoint the exposed position of the Black queen. That cannot be effectively anticipated by placing the bishop at d6 as the preparatory 7...e6 leaves the other one up the creek, e.g. 7...e6? 8 $\textbf{\textit{g}}g4$ $\textbf{\textit{g}}g6$ 9 h4 $\textbf{\textit{b}}b4$ 10 $\textbf{\textit{f}}f4$ $\textbf{\textit{d}}d8$ 11 a3 $\textbf{\textit{x}}c3+$ 12 bxc3 $\textbf{\textit{d}}d5$ 13 $\textbf{\textit{f}}f3$ and Black cannot adequately cope with the threat of 14 h5.

So the counter 7...$\textbf{\textit{d}}d7$ was a better move, when 8 $\textbf{\textit{c}}xd7$ $\textbf{\textit{xd}}d7$ 9 0-0 e6 is quite equal, so the sharper

8 $\textbf{\textit{f}}f4$

was played.

8...$\textbf{\textit{xe}}5$ 9 $\textbf{\textit{xe}}5$ $\textbf{\textit{wb}}6$

Now 10 $\textbf{\textit{wd}}2$ e6 is solid, so Almira experimented with...

10 $\textbf{\textit{a}}a4$?}

Now Black ought to have mixed it with 10...$\textbf{\textit{wa}}5$ 11 c3 f6!? with sharp play. Instead he grovelled before her with...

10...$\textbf{\textit{wd}}8$

and White soon showed a clear edge.

11 $\textbf{\textit{c}}c5$ $\textbf{\textit{wb}}6$ 12 0-0 e6 13 $\textbf{\textit{b}}4$! $\textbf{\textit{f}}f6$ 14 $\textbf{\textit{b}}b1$ a6 15 a4 $\textbf{\textit{x}}c5$

After this concession he will not last long.

16 bxc5 $\textbf{\textit{wa}}5$ 17 $\textbf{\textit{xb}}7$
17...\[\text{\texttt{wa4}\ 18\ \texttt{\texttt{xa4}}\ \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xd3}}}\ 19\ \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xd3}}\ 0-0\ 20\ \texttt{\texttt{f3b1}}}]

Black's queen is right out of it and he is in a dreadful mess.

Black resigned.

4 \[\texttt{\texttt{gge2}}\]

Lipman – Sarkar
Foxwoods Open, Connecticut 2003

4...c6

4 ...\[\texttt{\texttt{f6}}\] is healthy, e.g. 5 d4 wa5 5 g3 c6 6 \[\texttt{\texttt{g2}}\ \texttt{\texttt{f5}}\ 7 0-0 e6. A position unknown in practice, but sound as a pound. Could it prove that White's extra tempo, as Black takes three moves rather than the usual two to get the queen to a5, is of little authentic value here!?

5 d4 wc7 6 \[\texttt{\texttt{f4}}\ \texttt{\texttt{wb6}}\]

Ought not to take four moves to get to there, and White has been gaining time in shifting her about. But still, may White show anything?

7 \[\texttt{\texttt{d2!!}}\ \texttt{\texttt{f6}}\ 8 g3 \[\texttt{\texttt{g4!!}}\]?
I imagine that 8...\textit{\$}xb2 would really be asking for it and that after 9 \textit{b1} \textit{a3} White ought to continue with 10 \textit{xb8} \textit{xb8} 11 \textit{g2} intending \textit{xc6} or even the speculative 10 \textit{d5}!?. But neither is 100% clearly nonviable for Black. Given that development is non-committal, Black preferred that.

9 \textit{g2} e6 10 0-0
10 0-0-0!?
10...\textit{bd7} 11 \textit{c1}

Something of an admission that the knight on e2 was not well placed.

11...\textit{e7} 12 \textit{b3} \textit{f5} 13 \textit{fe1} h6
Not strictly necessary: there was no threat to the f5 bishop.
14 \textit{we2} 0-0

Black is fine. White lacks a constructive plan and has made nothing of any time gained through 3...\textit{we5+}.

15 \textit{e4} \textit{xe4} 16 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 17 \textit{we4} a5!? 18 a4 \textit{b4}!? 19 \textit{e2} \textit{a6}
Sarkar conceives a plan of queenside action.

20 \textit{d1} b5 21 axb5 cxb5
Progress. A kind of minority attack scenario.
22 \textit{f3} a4 23 \textit{c1} \textit{d6} 24 \textit{d3} b4
Simple chess. The a pawn is going home.

25 \textit{\textit{Qe}}5 \textit{\textit{Qe}}5 26 dxe5 \textit{\textit{Lc}}5 27 \textit{\textit{Re}}4 \textit{\textit{Fd}}8

Swapping off a potential attacker. Black need only fend off any last ditch attack to have a decisive advantage on the queenside.

28 \textit{\textit{Kx}}d8+ \textit{\textit{Kx}}d8

29 \textit{\textit{Kxh}}6

Insufficient.

29...\textit{\textit{Gxh}}6 30 \textit{\textit{Wh}}5 \textit{\textit{Ff}}8!

Scarpering to victory.

31 \textit{\textit{Wxh}}6+ \textit{\textit{Le}}8 32 \textit{\textit{Gg}}2 \textit{\textit{Ld}}1 33 \textit{\textit{Wh}}8+ \textit{\textit{Ld}}7 34 \textit{\textit{Wb}}8

And now Black attacks.

33...\textit{\textit{Wf1+ 35 Lf3 Wxf2+ 36 Gg4 Wf5+}} White resigned.

An impressive defensive game.

Still little theory, but nobody yet seems to have found a route to a clear advantage.

Will the Patzer, like 3...\textit{\textit{Wd}}6, become a respected addition to the arsenal of the modern Scandinavian...or is it a load of crap? Watch this space...
Chapter 6: The Modern
Scandinavian 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \( \triangle f6 \)

In fact in the first decades of the 20th century the world’s strongest players were already trying this out. It featured in the games of such as Rubinstein, Marshall and Bogolyubov, and also those of future world champions.

Here is one early experiment.

Michelson – Capablanca
New York 1915

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \( \triangle f6 \) 3 d4

3 \( \triangle c3 \) leads play back into an anodyne variation of the Alekhine’s Defence where Black has shown little difficulty in demonstrating equality, e.g. 3...\( \triangle x d 5 \) 4 \( \triangle c 4 \) \( \triangle b 6 \) (4...\( \triangle e 6 \) is also okay.) 5 \( \triangle b 3 \) \( \triangle c 6 \) 6 \( \triangle f 3 \) \( \triangle f 5 \) 7 d4 e6 8 0-0 \( \triangle c 7 \) 9 \( \triangle f 4 \)
...and here 9...0-0 would have been fine. Instead, in Mok Tze Meng – Wohl, Jakarta 1993 Black went after a bishop with 9...a5 10 w2e2 xb3 11 axb3 0-0 and stood equal after 12 fd1 c6 13 e4 d5 14 e5 h6.

3...xd5 4 f3 g4 5 e2 e6 6 0-0 d7 7 c4 f6

Better here than at b6.

8 c3 c6 9 d5 b4 10 dxc6 bxc6 11 a4 xc3 12 bxc3 0-0! 13 xc6 e8 14 a6 c5 15 a3 e4 16 e3 c6 17 fd1 c7 18 xc5 xc5 19 d4 xf3 20 xf3 a5 21 b2 c5 22 ad1 a6 23 d2 h6 24 g4 h7 25 d4 b8 26 g4 e7 27 h4?

That did not help.

27...xh4

Gracias.

28 g2 g5 29 e2 g6 30 d7 xd7 31 xd7 f6

And the c pawn can be dealt with.

32 c5 a3 33 b7 xc3 34 c6 d8 35 d1 xd7 36 cxd7 d8 37 d6 c4 38 f3 c2+ 39 g3 a5! 40 d8= w e1+ 41 f4 g5+ 42 xg5 hxg5+ 43 xg5 g7 44 d4+ e5 45 a4 c1+ 46 f4 c4 and White resigned.

José Raoul rarely misassessed the value of a gambit, and so such high class patronage made people sit up and pay attention.
Chapter 7:
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ♘f6 3 ♘b5+

One of the most traditional responses to the Modern Scandinavian, and a favourite of e.g. ex-World Champion Spassky. It cuts down on the amount of theory a player of the White pieces need know.

a) 3...♗bd7
b) 3...♗d7

a) 3...♗bd7

Despite its patronage from some class players, this move does not convince me. After 4 c4 a6 5 ♘a4 b5 (otherwise he just stays a clear pawn behind) 6 cxb5 ♘xd5 7 ♗c3 ♘b7 8 ♗f3 e6 9 bxa6 ♘xa6 10 0-0 ♗e7 11 ♗e5 ♘5f6 12 d4 and White is simply better.
Alternatively, Thorhallsson – Rocha, Istanbul Olympiad 2000 also saw Black fail to get it together with 7...\(\mathcal{Q}\)b6 8 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c2 e5 9 d4 axb5 10 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xb5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a6 11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c3 exd4 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c5? 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xg7 \(\mathcal{Q}\)h4 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xh8+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)e7 15 g3! \(\mathcal{Q}\)g4 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xh7+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)b7 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 18 f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e6 19 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a5 20 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xf6+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)xf6 21 \(\mathcal{Q}\)h4 1-0

3...c6? is silly, so

b) 3...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d7 it has to be.

Now:

b1) 4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2

b2) 4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c4

4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd7+? \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd7 is just accelerating Black’s development and so making the gambit after 5 c4 c6 6 dxc6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc6 all the more effective, e.g. 7 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f3 e5 8 0-0 e4 9 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e1 0-0-0 10 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f5! 11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xf7 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c5 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f1 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g4 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xh8 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xf2 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e1 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f8 15 d4, and here, in De Riviere—Dubois, Paris 1858, Black should have capped off his swashbuckling 19th century escape with 15...exd3! 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f7 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xf7 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)h3+ 18 gxh3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe3+ 19 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g2 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g6+ 20 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e4+ 21 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e5 and Black wins.

8...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c5 was another natural way of getting a great game in this line.

b1) 4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2
104 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 b5+

A bit limp. White ought not to emerge with a plus, e.g.

Sedina – Ye Rongguang
Groningen Open 1998

4...Qxd5 5 d4 g6!

Of course 5...Qf5 was playable, but I prefer the dynamism of the fianchetto. After 5...Qf5 6 Qf3 e6 (6...c5 7 dxc5 Qa5+ 8 c3 Qxc5 9 0-0 Qc6 may well be worth a go, despite the result of Dgebadze – Wismeijer, Haalem Open 2000, where Black resigned at move 16.) 7 0-0 Qe7

On 8 c4 Qb6, but I would prefer 8...Qb4!?, even, as in R.Bellin – V.Georgiev, Linares Open 1997 and Lanka – Prokopchuk, Russian Cup, Krasnodar 1997, and Black ought to have a variety of satisfactory methods of chiselling away against the White centre.

8 c3 0-0 9 Qe1 c5 10 Qb3 Qc7 11 Qc4 Qb6 12 Qf1 Qc6 13 Qa3 a6 14 dxc5 Qxc5 15 Qc4 Qxc4 16 Qxc4 Qd6 17 Qe3 e5 18 Qad1 Qe6 equalised in Degraeve – Rausis, French Team Championships, 1998.

8 a3 0-0 9 c4 Qb6 10 Qc3 Qf6 11 Qe3 Qc6 12 b3 Qe7 13 c5 Qd5 14 Qxd5 exd5 15 b4 a6 16 Qe1 Qf8 17 Qd2 Qe4 with a healthy equality for Black in Svidler – Tereshkin, St Petersburg Open 1994.

He was less adequately placed in the early middlegame of A.Ivanov – Strenzwilk, Foxwoods Open, Connecticut 2001 after 10...Qc6 11 Qe3 Qf6 12 h3 a5 13 Qc1 Qd7 14 c5 Qd5 15 Qb5 h6 16 Qa4 Qfd8 17 Qcd1 Qde7 18 Qf4, with White exerting pressure.

6 Qf3 Qg7

A more testing move order is 6 c4 Qb6 7 Qc3 as in Bronstein- Lutikov, Leningrad 1960, when Black must watch out for 7...Qg7 8 c5! Qc8 9 d5 with advantage.

7 0-0 0-0 8 c4 Qb6 9 h3 c5!? 10 dxc5 Qa4
Making imaginative use of the positioning of the bishop at d7. This is another reason why I like the fianchetto for Black.

11 \textbf{wb}3 \textbf{a}6!? 12 \textbf{xd}1

On 12 \textbf{xb}7 \textbf{xc}c5 and b2 will drop.

12...\textbf{6xc}5 13 \textbf{a}3 \textbf{c}7 14 \textbf{d}4

Attempting to reduce some of the pressure on his queenside.

14...\textbf{fd}8 15 \textbf{e}3 \textbf{f}5!? 16 \textbf{c}3 \textbf{xc}3 17 \textbf{bxc}3 \textbf{b}6

The structural damage has been inflicted, and Ye now sets about increasing his position.

18 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{ac}8 19 \textbf{b}5 \textbf{xb}5! 20 \textbf{xb}5 \textbf{d}3

Transformation of advantage. This piece is really a giant octopus.

21 \textbf{c}6 \textbf{e}5 22 \textbf{g}5 \textbf{d}6 23 \textbf{ab}1 \textbf{e}4!

Perceptively appreciating that here the piece at c6 is really only a cosmetic and that the Black bishop will be at least as effective as a White rook.

Fiendishly clever these Chinese.

24 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{f}8 25 \textbf{b}3+ \textbf{g}7 26 \textbf{xd}6 \textbf{xd}6 27 \textbf{c}2 \textbf{d}8
28 \textit{\textbf{W}}e2 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{A}}}c5 29 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f1 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}g3
Curtains.
30 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xe4
Despair.
31...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{F}}}xe4 32 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xf2 32 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}b7+ \textbf{\textit{\textbf{C}}}h6 33 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xf2 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xf2+ 34 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{O}}}h1 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{E}}}e8 and White resigned.

b2) 4 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{A}}}c4

More challenging.

Now:
b21) 4...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{A}}}g4 and
b22) 4...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{B}}}b5

b21) 4...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{A}}}g4

4...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{A}}}f5? 5 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{C}}}c3 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{D}}}bd7 6 d3 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}b6 7 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{W}}}f3! is the problem if Black does not play \ldots \textbf{\textit{\textbf{A}}}g4 first. White often does not want to play \textit{f}2-\textit{f}3.
Spassky – Kudinov
Russia 1960

5 f3

5...\hfill f5

Retreating to c8 is certainly an option. In Spassky – Ulmanis, Moscow 1972 White was better after 6 \d3 \bd7 7 \ge2 \b6 8 \b3 g6?! 9 \f4 \g7 10 d4 0-0 11 h4 and Boris went to work with one of his attacks. But 8...\bxd5 is viable, but perhaps most noteworthy is 8...a5!?,

...as in Esplana – Vescovi, Rio de Janeiro Open 1998. After 9 a3 \bxd5 10 \xd5 \xd5 11 c4 \f6 12 d4 e6 13 \e3 \e7 14 0-0 0-0 15 \c3 b6 16 \e1 \a6 17 \d1 \e8!? 18 \e4 \d6 Black had equalised and later won.

6 \c3 \bd7 7 \ge2

A big alternative in this line is 7 \e2, but an analysis by Anderson suggests that it has been drawn of its poison.
108 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 3 b5+

7...b6 8 b3 d7 9 d6!? (This tricky move used to be thought of as a headache for Black.) 9...xd6 10 b5 d7 11 e5

Black may repulse White’s pawn-grabbing trickery effectively with 11...0-0-0 12 xa7+ b8 13 b5 fd5 14 a4 e6!? First suggested by John Emms. The position is pretty uncharted, although Black won in the 1990 Correspondence game Casey – Wright, after 15 e2 f6 Now the natural retreat square of e2 is denied her, Black nudges the queen away to an inferior one. 16 g3

16...e5!? 17 d4 b4 and Black had the advantage and won after 18 d1 c5 19 d2 exd4 20 xb4 xb4 21 xd4 c5 22 c3 d3 when the White king was none the happiest.

There is also 16 b4 17 ed4 c5 18 xf5 exf5, with the White king again forced to live in the central streets, or 17 d3 c5 18 ec3 d6 19 e4 b6 20 d4 h7! and White had best scamp whilst he can with 21 0-0 exd4 22 a5 xb5 23 axb6 xb6, as 21 dxe5 h8 would leave him in the line of terrific fire.

Black has here an important American resource against 7 e2 and 9 d6.

Against 7 g4 b6! 8 e2 c8 9 d3 insists upon the retention of the extra pawn, but at the cost of a somewhat uncomfortable placing of forces for White. In Aronin – Shamkovich, USSR 1959, Black came out well after
9...g6 10 b3 g7 11 b2 0-0 12 0-0-0 a6 13 e2 xc4!? 14 bxc4 b5!
when he started a characteristic and nimble Shamkovich attack.

7...b6 8 d3!? fxd5 9 xd5 xd5 10 g3 g6
Against Boris in Vancouver 1971 Banks preferred 10...wd7, and White still developed a superiority after 11 0-0 h5?! 12 d4 0-0-0 13 b3 h4 14 e4 e6 15 e2 f6 16 c4 b6 17 e3, etc.

11 f4

Spassky always liked to advance this pawn.

11...e6 12 0-0 c5+
Here regrouping with 12...e7!? certainly had a lot to be said for it.

13 d4 e7 15 f5 exf5 16 xf5 xf5 17 xf5 f6 18 e3 and White had the bishops and pressure and realised the advantage at move 41

b22) 4...b5 5 b3
5...Ng4

The structural weaknesses with which Black emerged from the opening after 5...a5 6 a4 bxa4 7 Bxa4 Bxa4 8 Bxa4 Wxd5 9 d3 Wf6+ 10 We2 Wxe2+ 11 Bxe2 in Blehm – Strenzwilk, Atlantic Open, Washington 2002, left him compromised, although he did succeed in holding his much higher rated opponent to a draw. In Losev – Maljutin Moscow 1990 he preferred 7... Wxd5 8 d3 e6 9 0-0 Be7 10 Bc5 Bxa4 11 Bxa4 0-0 with unclear play.

6 f3 Ng8

7 Bd3

7 We2 is an attempt to exploit the early ...b5. After 7...a6 8 a4 b4 9 Wc4 Wd6!? (9...e6? 10 dxe6 Nxe6 would fail to 11 Wxe2) 10 d3 e6 White players have been known to decline the destruction of their structures which would follow 11 dxe6 Nxe6 and 12...Bxb3, in favour of 11 Bf4 e5. Markiewicz – Pakleza, Polish Championship 2000 went 12 Bh5 Bb7 13 Bxf6 gxf6 14 Wg4 Bd7 15 Bd2 Bxd5 16 Bxe4 Bxe4 17 Wxe4 Ka7 and was drawn at move 32. The Black route to a comfy life was even smoother in Grechihin – Pavlenko, Belavenets Memorial, 1991 after 12 Bh3 Bg5 13 Bd2 f5 14 Wh4 Bxg3 15 Wxg3 Wf6 16 Bc4 Bd6, etc.

7...Bb4 8 Bc4 Bxd5 9 d4 e6 10 Bg5 Be7 11 c4! Bxc3 12 Bxc3

White is slightly better.
Chapter 8: Main Lines
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 e5 3 d4 e5 4 c4

Hastening to erect the broad pawn centre afforded him by Black’s 2nd move...

a) 4...\textit{b}6
b) 4...\textit{f}6

4...\textit{b}4 is called the Kiel variation, but is a very silly move.

a) 4...\textit{b}6
By far the more popular move.
a1) 5  $\textit{\&}c3$

a2) 5  $\textit{\&}f3$

a1) 5  $\textit{\&}c3$

Black equalised comfortably in Upton – Smagin, Cappelle la Grande Open, 1995 after 5  $\textit{\&}e3$ e5!? 6 d5 $\textit{\&}b4+$ 7  $\textit{\&}c3$ 0-0 8 $\textit{\&}b3$  $\textit{\&}a6$ 9 0-0-0 $\textit{\&}e7$ 10 $\textit{\&}f3$  $\textit{\&}f5$ 11 $\textit{\&}a4$  $\textit{\&}d7$ 12 $\textit{\&}xb6$ axb6 Terentiev – Reshko USSR 1962

5...e5!

An excellent and long known gambit! It is the principal reason why 5  $\textit{\&}c3$ is not often seen.

6 $\textit{\&}e2$

Neither do the alternatives seem to lead to any advantage; 6 $\textit{\&}e3$ exd4 7 $\textit{\&}xd4$  $\textit{\&}c6$ 8 $\textit{\&}e3$  $\textit{\&}e6$ and, naturally, Black was doing fine in Paoli – Commons, Lublin 1978.

Accepting the gambit with 6 dxe5 gives Black great play after 6...$\textit{\&}xd1+$ 7 $\textit{\&}xd1$  $\textit{\&}c6$, e.g. 8 $\textit{\&}f3$  $\textit{\&}g4$ 9  $\textit{\&}e2$ 0-0-0 10 $\textit{\&}f4$  $\textit{\&}b4$ 11  $\textit{\&}c3$  $\textit{\&}a4$, as in Gronau – Prizant, Hastings 1976, or 10 $\textit{\&}g5$  $\textit{\&}e8$ 11  $\textit{\&}e3$  $\textit{\&}xf3$ 12  $\textit{\&}xf3$  $\textit{\&}b4+$ 13  $\textit{\&}f1$  $\textit{\&}xe5$, in Afek – Veinger, Israeli championship 1986. Akiba Rubinstein was one of the first to take on e5, but even he got no edge against Walter, Moravská Ostrava, 1923, after 8  $\textit{\&}f4$  $\textit{\&}f6$ (8...$\textit{\&}e6$ is also good here.) 9  $\textit{\&}xf6$  $\textit{\&}b4+$ 10  $\textit{\&}f2$  $\textit{\&}xf6$ 11  $\textit{\&}e3$  $\textit{\&}e6$.

In Hubner – Dzhindhikashvili, Chicago, 1982, White got no edge with 6 d5 after 6...c6! 7 $\textit{\&}f3$ cxd5 8 cxd5  $\textit{\&}b4$ 9  $\textit{\&}b5+$  $\textit{\&}d7$ 10 $\textit{\&}b3$  $\textit{\&}xc3+$. Also 8...$\textit{\&}d6$ equalised in Pappalardo – Zlochevski, Celle Ligure Open, 1995 after 9  $\textit{\&}g5$  $\textit{\&}f6$ 10  $\textit{\&}e3$ 0-0.

6 $\textit{\&}f3$ may be adequately countered by the exchange on d4, e.g. 6...exd4 7 $\textit{\&}xd4$  $\textit{\&}c6$ 8  $\textit{\&}xd8+$  $\textit{\&}xd8$ 9  $\textit{\&}d4$  $\textit{\&}c6$ 10  $\textit{\&}c2$  $\textit{\&}g6$ 11 b3  $\textit{\&}g7$ 12  $\textit{\&}b2$  $\textit{\&}d7$ with equality in Karpov – Didishko, Moscow 1966.
6...\text{\textit{\texttt{\textasciicircum}}}e7!?

In Sax – Piskur, Ljubljana Open, 2001 we saw the experimental 6...\textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}e7 and play carried on in novel vein with 7 d5. Play through a bunch of Gyula Sax games, and you will soon gather that this is a man more dangerous when he gives a pawn than when he takes it. 7...\textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}a6 8 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}e3 g6 9 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}d2 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}g7 10 0-0-0 0-0 11 d6!? cxd6 12 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xd6 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xd6 13 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xd6 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}d7 14 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}f3 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}dc5 15 b4 e4 16 bxc5 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xc3 17 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}g5 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}e8

18 c6 bxc6 19 c5 h6 20 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xe4 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xe4 21 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}d8+ \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}g7 22 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xa6 with White on top.

But 6...\textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xd4 has been seen to work better, e.g. 7 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}f3 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}c5 8 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xe5 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}e6 9 f4 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}e7! 10 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}e3 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}a5 with good play for Black. Reshko’s choice leads to hair-raising play.

7 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}xe5 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}c6 8 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}e3

8 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}f3 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}f5 might have been better.

8...\textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}f5 9 g4 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}g6 10 \textit{\texttt{\textasciicirci}}}d1

Forcing him further back?
10...\textit{b}4!
No way, José!
11 \textit{x}b6 axb6 12 \textit{x}d8+ \textit{x}d8
With plans to pay him a visit at c2 or d3.
13 \textit{e}4 \textit{d}4!
And the rest was all great fun.
14 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}3+ 15 \textit{d}1 \textit{x}b2+ 16 \textit{c}1 \textit{a}3 17 \textit{b}1 \textit{d}3+ 18 \textit{c}2 \textit{c}1+ 19 \textit{c}3 \textit{x}e2+ 20 \textit{x}e2 \textit{c}5 21 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}7 22 \textit{h}4

22...\textit{b}4+!
Another sacrifice to start another mating attack!
23 \textit{x}d4 \textit{x}d2 24 c5 b5 25 c6 \textit{d}8+ 26 \textit{e}5 \textit{e}4 and White resigned.
Not so staid an opening this Scandinavian, eh?

a2) 5 \textit{f}3
5...g6
The fianchetto is very natural here.

6 \( \textit{\texttt{a3}} \textit{\texttt{c7}} \textit{\texttt{h3}} \)

\( \textit{\texttt{\ldots g4}} \textit{\texttt{is not desired.}} \)

7\( \textit{\texttt{\ldots 0-0}} \) 8 \( \textit{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{c3}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{c6}}}} \textit{\texttt{9 \textit{\texttt{w2}}}} \)

The most principled: White lines up to take on the fianchettoed king’s fortress. Quieter lines promise less, e.g. 9 \( \textit{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{e2}}}} \textit{\texttt{e5 10 \textit{\texttt{d5}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{g7}} 11 \textit{\texttt{0-0 h6}}} \) and \( \textit{\texttt{\ldots f5}} \) to follow. Knocking out the e3 bishop solves a lot of Black’s problems.

9\( \textit{\texttt{\ldots e5}} \)

Both sides have played very logically, and Black plays the consequent counter in the centre.

10 \( \textit{\texttt{d5}} \)

The key parting of the ways in this variation.

a21) 10\( \textit{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{d7}}}} \)

a22) 10\( \textit{\texttt{\textit{a5}}}} \)

a21) 10\( \textit{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{d7}}}} \) The older treatment. But the traditional view has always been that 11 \( \textit{\texttt{g4}} \) gives White the edge. To justify his piece placement, Black
must break out with 11...f5, but he is left loosened and 12 \textit{h6} seems to lead to a White edge, as in...

\begin{center}
\textbf{Smagin – Basagic}
\textbf{Hartberg Open 1991}
\end{center}

12...fxg4 13 \textit{xg7} \textit{h7} 14 \textit{xe5} and the lines are opening around the Black king, to White’s advantage. Black tried the sacrifice 14...\textit{exd5}?, but it is quite unconvincing and after 15 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} 16 0-0-0! \textit{df6} 17 \textit{xd5} \textit{f4+} 18 \textit{d2} \textit{gxh3} 19 \textit{d4} \textit{xd4} 20 \textit{xd4} \textit{xf2} 21 \textit{nh3} \textit{nh3} 22 \textit{xh3} \textit{e8} 23 \textit{d7+} \textit{g8} 24 \textit{d3} \textbf{White} soon consolidated and won.

a22) 10...\textit{a5} Forcing White’s next. The knight is right out of it at a5, it seems, but the Black game contains surprising resources, including possible sacrifice at c4 to generate counterplay.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Grischuk – Malakhov}
\textbf{Lausanne 2000}
\end{center}

11 \textit{b3}

White could not win a piece with 11 \textit{xb6}? as 11...\textit{xb6} 12 \textit{b4}? allows Black the escape hatch of 12...\textit{b3}!, and meantime he will soon open fire with his now unopposed dark square bishop with an ...\textit{e4}!.
11...e4

A big alternative is 11...f5, as in e.g. S.Nikolic – Stefansson, Komotini 1993, where White did not make the natural decision to exchange off the dark squared bishops with 12 \( \text{h}6 \), but preferred 12 \( \text{c}5 \text{e}8 \) 13 \( \text{e}2 \text{d}7 \) Of course he regroups with tempo. 14 \( \text{a}3 \) c5?! An interesting plan: he will swivel the knight back into things via b7, and the blocking square at d6 beckons. 15 \( \text{g}5 \text{h}6 \) 16 h4 b6 17 \( \text{b}2 \) and Black could have played ...\( \text{b}7 \) with a good game.

White swapped in Mackic – Smagin Yugoslav Championship 1994 and 12 \( \text{h}6 \) e4 13 \( \text{x}g7 \text{x}g7 \) 14 \( \text{d}4 \) c5

...led to a characteristic structure. ...c5 is, as in the last game, is paving the way back for the man at a5. 15 \( \text{c}2 \) (15 dxc6 \( \text{x}c6 \) 16 0-0-0 \( \text{f}6 \) was equal in Suetin – Smagin, Moscow 1984.) 15...\( \text{d}7 \) 16 \( \text{e}2 \) b6 17 0-0 \( \text{b}7 \) 18 \( \text{f}3 \)! Opening the e line make sense. 18...exf3 19 \( \text{x}f3 \text{d}6 \) 20 \( \text{f}1 \text{f}6 \) 21 \( \text{f}4 \) h6 and there was little in it. 11...f5 may be Black’s safest.

12 \( \text{d}4 \) f5

Others do not look better. In Feher – Kiss, Hungarian Championship 1999, 12...c6 was met as 12...c5 ought to be: 13 dxc6 \( \text{x}c6 \) 14 \( \text{d}1 \text{e}7 \) 15 \( \text{x}c6 \text{bxc6} \) 16 \( \text{e}2 \text{b}7 \) 17 0-0 \( \text{fd}8 \) 18 \( \text{c}1 \text{e}5 \) and White, correctly, relied on his structural superiority on the queenside to bring him the advantage, and so sought exchanges. 19 \( \text{x}d8+ \text{x}d8 \) 20 \( \text{d}1 \text{d}1+ \) 21 \( \text{xd}1 \text{f}8 \) 22 \( \text{d}2 \) c5 23 \( \text{a}5 \) and 1-0 in 56 moves.

13 \( \text{g}5 \text{e}8 \) 14 0-0-0

The White pieces assume the attack posture.

14...c5 15 \( \text{de}2! \)

A novelty, but I find that odd. 15 dxc6? \( \text{x}c6 \) is just helping Black and upon 15 \( \text{db}5 \) Black can get great dark square play for the exchange with 15...a6 16 \( \text{c}7 \text{e}5 \). Now Black is not developing activity quite quickly enough neither with 15...\( \text{d}7 \) 16 \( \text{f}3 \) nor 15...\( \text{d}7 \) 16 \( \text{f}3 \)!, although neither is 100% clear. So the proper annotation to Black’s next has really to be...
15...\(\text{aaxc4}\)

No!s or ?s for this. It’s just necessary.

16 bxc4 \(\text{aaxc4}\) 17 \(\text{wxc2}\) \(\text{e5!}\)

Better than 17...b5 when 18 d6! leaves White on top.

18 d6

Here he ought to have played 18...c4! 19 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{d3+}\) 20 \(\text{xd3}\) exd3 21 \(\text{wxa4}\) \(\text{wxa4}\) 22 \(\text{xa4}\) \(\text{e5}\) 23 \(\text{b2}\) \(\text{d7}\) 24 \(\text{d5}\) b5 and Black has dynamic compensation. In such situations, the initiative is all.

18...\(\text{d3+}\)?? 19 \(\text{xd3}\) exd3 20 \(\text{wdx3}\) f4 21 \(\text{e7}\) \(\text{f7}\) and here 22 \(\text{d5}\) \(\text{f5}\) 23 \(\text{d2}\) intending to follow up with \(\text{ec3}\) was the securest way to demonstrate a White edge.

Another sensible approach to 5 \(\text{f3}\) is 5...\(\text{g4}\).

Lasker – Alekhine
St Petersburg 1914

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \(\text{f6}\) 3 d4 \(\text{xd5}\) 4 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{g4}\) 5 c4 \(\text{b6}\)
By transposition. There are, as you may gather, a lot of opportunities for transposition in these \( \text{c3/c4} \) set ups.

6 \( \text{c3?!} \)

Opening theory from so long ago is unlikely to be critical in a computer era. Lasker, superb tactician though he was, proved more often reliant on tactics and psychology than extensive pre-game preparations.

He was also not averse to deliberately smoking low quality cigars at the board and blowing the smoke directly into the other man's face, or even, in lost positions, repeatedly jumping to his feet and shouting at the spectators to be quieter, a tactic which once did his chances no harm in a lost ending against Maroczy, as he managed to draw it.

In fact the then World Champion's handling of this opening has been inaccurate, and the man whose achievements in chess were said by Mikhail Botvinnik to be the greatest ever, straightaway seizes his chance. 6 c5 or 6 \( \text{e2} \) were better. After 6 c5 \( \text{d6} \) is really the only good response, as 6...\( \text{d5} \) 7 \( \text{b3!} \) and 6...\( \text{xf3} \) 7 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 8 \( \text{b3!} \) b6 9 \( \text{g5!} \) have both long been known to favour White. After 7 \( \text{c4} \) e6 8 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 9 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 10 h3 Black has fair counterplay either with 10...\( \text{xf3} \) 11 \( \text{xf3} \) 0-0 or 10...\( \text{h5?!} \) 11 a3 e5!? 12 d5 \( \text{d4?!} \) which led on to a Black victory in Guyot – Goldenburg, Belfort 1987.

6...\( \text{e5!} \)
A finely conceived gambit, and an idea we shall be seeing more of in similar lines. If now 7 dxe5 \textit{W}xd1 + 8 \textit{Q}xd1 \textit{Q}c6 and Black has easy development and all the chances in a line such as 9 \textit{A}f4 0-0-0 10 \textit{A}e2 \textit{A}b4+ 11 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{A}he8. Emanuel wisely declined and sought a way out in complications.

7 c5 exd4?!

7...\textit{Q}d6d7 was probably better.

8 \textit{Q}e4 \textit{Q}d6d7 9 \textit{W}xd4 \textit{W}e7? 

Too clever. He should just have taken it with 9 ...\textit{Q}xc5 10 \textit{W}e5+ \textit{Q}e6 11 \textit{W}b5+ and an approximately equal position results. White now looks to be busted, but Lasker, who won this tournament well ahead of all the young pretenders, shows the only way out.

10 \textit{A}b5!

Tricky guy! If now 10...f5 White gets out of trouble with 11 \textit{Q}e5, when 11...c6? even loses to 12 \textit{Q}d6+ \textit{Q}d8 13 \textit{Q}g5. On 10...\textit{Q}xf3 11 gxf3 f5 White has 12 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{W}e6 and he can turn it into a 19th century wild gambit scenario with 13 0-0-0 fxe4 14 \textit{A}he1 with a raging attack.

Alekhine must have regretted his ninth move, and now himself had to improvise...

10...\textit{Q}c6 11 \textit{Q}xc6 bxc6 12 0-0 \textit{Q}xf3 13 gxf3 0-0-0 14 \textit{W}a4 \textit{Q}e5 15 \textit{Q}g2
15...\textit{We6}

...and improvise. He decides to sacrifice much to generate tactical counterplay.

16 \textit{Wxa7 Wf5!} 17 \textit{Wa8+ Dd7} 18 \textit{Dd1+ We6} 19 \textit{Wxd8 Wxf3+} 20 \textit{Dg1 De7!} 21 \textit{Dd4 Wg4+} 22 \textit{Dh1}

Trying for more with 22 \textit{De1?} failed to 22...\textit{Wh3+} 23 \textit{Df2 Wh5+} 24 \textit{Df3 Wf3+} 25 \textit{Dd2 Dd8}.

22...\textit{Wf3+} 23 \textit{Dg1 Wg4+} 24 \textit{Dh1 Wf3} Drawn.

A flawed but still classic game.

4...\textit{Df6}

A comparative rarity.

\textbf{Dochev – Popchev}

Bulgarian Championship 2001

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

5 \textit{Df3}

5 \textit{Dc3}, by analogy with 4...\textit{Db6} 5 \textit{Dc3}, also here runs into 5...\textit{e5!}, e.g. 6 \textit{dxе5 Wxd1+} 7 \textit{Dxd1 Dg4} 8 f4 \textit{Db4+} 9 \textit{Dd2 Dc6} 10 h3 \textit{Dh6} 11 \textit{De3 Df5} 12 \textit{Dxf5 Dxf5} 13 \textit{Df3} 0-0-0 with good play for the pawn in Yanofsky – Dreman, 1941, or 8...\textit{Dc6} 9 h3 \textit{Dh6} 10 \textit{Dc3 De6} 11 \textit{Dd2} 0-0-0 12 0-0-0 \textit{De5} 13 \textit{Df3} \textit{Dxe3} 14 \textit{Dxe3 Df5} 15 \textit{Dxd8+} \textit{Dxd8} 16 \textit{Df2 Db4} 17 g4 \textit{Dxa2+} 18 \textit{Dc2 Dh6} and drawn in 37 moves in Duras – Tartakower, Vienna 1908.

5...\textit{e6}

5...\textit{Df5} 6 \textit{Dc3} \textit{e6} 7 \textit{De3 Db4} 8 \textit{Wb3 Dxc3+} 9 bxc3 \textit{De4} 10 \textit{Dd2 Dc6} was equal in Morphy – Anderssen, Paris 1858. 5...\textit{Dg4} 6 \textit{Dc2} e6 7 0-0 \textit{Dc7} 8 \textit{Dc3} 0-0 9 h3 \textit{Dh5} 10 \textit{Dc3 Db7} was solid but equal in Rimawi – Hameed, Asian Cities Cup 1990.

The fianchetto is less well-known, but may be worth a go, e.g. 5...g6 6 \textit{Dc3 Dg7} 7 \textit{De2} 0-0 8 0-0 c6 9 \textit{Dd1 Dg4} 10 h3 \textit{Df3} 11 \textit{Df3 Db7} 12 \textit{Wb3}

6 ♂c3 ♦f5

A comfy spot. 6...♗g4 7 ♤e3 e6 8 ♦b3 ♦b6 was equal in Reti – Tartakower, Vienna 1920.

7 ♤e2 e6 8 0-0 ♤e7 9 ♦h4!? ♤e4 10 ♤xe4 ♤xe4 11 ♦f3 0-0 12 ♦c2 ♦f6 13 b3 ♦bd7 14 ♤b2 ♦c7 15 ♤d3 ♦fe8 16 ♤e5 Drawn

1  e4 d5 2 exd5 ♦f6 3 ♤f3

White adopts a flexible move order.

3...♗xd5 4 d4 g6

4 ...♕f5 is worth an outing. In Lerner – Golubev, Donetsk Zonal 1998, Black equalised after 5 ♤d3 ♤xd3 6 ♦xd3 e6 7 0-0 ♤d7 8 c4 ♤f6 9 c3 ♤e7 10 ♤f4 0-0 11 ♤ad1 c6 12 ♤e5 ♤e8 13 ♦f3 ♦b6, etc.

5 ♤e2

This set up leaves the centre, for the moment, no man’s land. It also does not set the world on fire.

Kotronias – Thorhallsson
Rekyavik Open 1988
5...g7 6 0-0 0-0 7 e1

With this move White intends to monitor both Black central breaks of ...c5 and ...e5.

7...c5!

But this critical response works anyway, as 8 dxc5 b4! 9 a3 a4 a6 will regain the c pawn. Preparing ...c5 may also work, e.g. 7...c6 8 a3 c7 9 c3 d7 10 c4 c5 11 f1 cxd4 12 exd4 was equal in Hebden – Hodgson, Lloyds Bank 1991.

8 c4

So, instead this try for advantage.

8...b6 9 d5 e5!?

9...e6 10 g5 d6 11 c3 exd5 12 cxd5 h6 13 e3 a6 14 d2 h7 15 ad1 f5 16 f4 d8 17 h4 was also in White’s favour in Bojkovic – Lakos, Rijeka 1997.

10 c3 f5 11 g5 f6

There was no good square for his queen to have shifted to, so he offers the trade.

12 xf6 xf6 13 c1

White is better developed and has a slight edge.

13...a6 14 h6 d7 15 g5 g7 16 xg7+ xg7 17 a3 c8 18 ed1 and White is still a little better

(1-0 in 60 moves.)

4...g4, again, by comparison with an Alekhine’s Defence, is one of the main treatments.

Wolter – Gipslis
Germany 1995

5 h3 h5 6 g4 g6 7 e5
7...\( \text{d} \text{c} \text{6} \)!

A dynamic interpretation, and more worthy of note than the automatic 7...\( \text{d} \text{d} \text{7} \). Black seeks active counterplay and is less concerned with his structure.

8 \( \text{d} \text{x} \text{g} \text{6} \)

7 \( \text{d} \text{x} \text{c} \text{6} \) bxc6 8 \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{2} \) \( \text{w} \text{d} \text{6} \), with unbalanced play.

7...hxg6 9 \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{2} \) \( \text{w} \text{d} \text{6} \) 10 0-0 \( \text{d} \text{f} \text{4} \)

A nice square.

11 \( \text{d} \text{x} \text{f} \text{4} \) \( \text{w} \text{x} \text{f} \text{4} \) 12 \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{3} \) e6 13 \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{2} \) \( \text{w} \text{d} \text{6} \) 14 c3 \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{7} \) 15 f4 0-0-0 16 \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{3} \) f5 17 \( \text{w} \text{f} \text{3} \) \( \text{h} \text{h} \text{4} \) 18 \( \text{e} \text{a} \text{e} \text{1} \) \( \text{d} \text{h} \text{8} \) and Black’s chances were none the worse. He won at move 62.

5 \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{2} \) forces less of a crisis. In Leko – Kamsky, Groningen 1995

\[
\begin{array}{c}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\text{W}</th>
<th>\text{B}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\text{W}</td>
<td>\text{B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{W}</td>
<td>\text{B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{W}</td>
<td>\text{B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{W}</td>
<td>\text{B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{W}</td>
<td>\text{B}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{array}
\]

White was a little better, and the only guy with active possibilities, after 5...e6 6 0-0 \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{7} \) 7 \( \text{d} \text{e} \text{5}! \) \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{2} \) 8 \( \text{w} \text{x} \text{e} \text{2} \) 0-0 9 \( \text{d} \text{d} \text{1} \) \( \text{d} \text{d} \text{7} \) 10 c4 \( \text{d} \text{f} \text{6} \) 11 \( \text{f} \text{f} \text{4} \) c6 12 \( \text{d} \text{c} \text{3} \), and they drew at move 21. In Cafferty – Bonner, Oxford 1967, Black stood just slightly worse after 6...\( \text{d} \text{c} \text{6} \) 7 h3 \( \text{h} \text{h} \text{5} \) 8 c4 \( \text{b} \text{b} \text{6} \) 9 \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{3} \) \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{7} \) 10 b3 0-0 11 \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{3} \) \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{6} \) 12 \( \text{w} \text{d} \text{2} \) \( \text{f} \text{f} \text{6} \) 13 \( \text{e} \text{a} \text{d} \text{1} \).

One of the most intriguing games of modern times in this line was...
5...\textit{c6}!?

\textbf{6 c4 \textit{db}6 7 d5}

Chasing. Dzhindhi treats it all very simply, with shades of the Alekhine Defence.

\textbf{7...\textit{xf}3 8 \textit{xf}3}

In Kirilov – Gipslis, Katowice Open 1993 White took with the pawn and Black did fine after \textbf{8...\textit{e}5 9 f4 \textit{ed}7 10 \textit{c}3 \textit{f}6 11 \textit{e}3 g6 12 \textit{c}2 c6?! 13 dxc6 bxc6 14 \textit{d}1 \textit{c}7 15 f5 \textit{g}7 16 b3 \textit{bd}7 17 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}8 18 \textit{f}1 0-0 19 h4 e6!, etc.}

\textbf{8...\textit{e}5 9 \textit{e}2 c6 10 \textit{d}4 \textit{g}6 11 \textit{c}3 e5}

\textbf{12 \textit{e}4 cxd5 13 cxd5 \textit{d}6 14 \textit{b}5+ \textit{d}7 15 0-0 0-0 16 \textit{f}5 \textit{c}5 17 b4 \textit{a}6 18 a3 \textit{e}7 19 \textit{h}3 \textit{c}7 Bringing it back into circulation, but he also had a good move in 19...f5.}

\textbf{20 \textit{d}3 f5}

Expanding.
21 \( \text{g5} \) e4 22 \( \text{c4} \) h6 23 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 24 f3

Ferdinand Hellers is an aggressor. Finding himself stymied of active possibilities, he starts to flounder.

24...exf3 25 gxf3 \( \text{f6} \) 26 \( \text{e2} \) b5 27 \( \text{c3} \)

27...\( \text{f4}! \)

27...\( \text{e7} \) was also good.

28 \( \text{g3} \) bxc4 and White, having seen very simple and natural moves take over the board, resigned.
Chapter 9: The Scandinavian
Gambit 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ;!f6 3 c4 c6

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ;!f6 3 c4 c6

Of the three gambit treatments of the Modern Scandinavian, this one certainly has the best reputation and should definitely not be accepted by those in pursuit of an opening edge with the White pieces.

White’s best here is to take play back into the Panov-Botvinnik variation of the Caro-Kann Defence (1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4) with 4 !c3 or 4 d4. That lies outside the scope of this volume. Taking the gambit is not smart.

Chandler – Adams
Hastings 1990/91

4 dxc6?! !xc6
The development lead and the backward White d pawn seem to grant Black at least equal chances here.

5 \( \mathcal{c}f3 \) e5 6 d3

In Kosulejeva – Gaprindashvili, USSR 1990, Black soon got the better game after 6 \( \mathcal{c}c3 \) e4 7 \( \mathcal{g}g5 \) \( \mathcal{f}f5 \) 8 \( \mathcal{e}e2 \) \( \mathcal{h}h6 \) 9 \( \mathcal{h}h3 \) g5 10 g4 \( \mathcal{g}g6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{a}a4 \) \( \mathcal{d}d6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{c}c5 \) 0-0. She had splendid gambit play.

6...e4!?  

Adams heads for a healthy development lead and good squares for his pieces as his compensation for the pawn. The man loves classical chess.

But, \textit{en passant}, we note that Black gets good play with either 6 ...\( \mathcal{c}c5 \) or 6...\( \mathcal{f}f5 \).

In Hoen – Bergraser, Varna Olympiad 1962, after 6...\( \mathcal{c}c5 \) 7 \( \mathcal{e}e3 \) \( \mathcal{b}b6 \) 8 \( \mathcal{x}xc5 \) \( \mathcal{w}xc5 \) 9 \( \mathcal{c}c3 \) \( \mathcal{f}f5 \) 10 \( \mathcal{e}e2 \) \( \mathcal{d}d8 \) 11 0-0 e4 12 \( \mathcal{e}e1 \) 0-0 13 \( \mathcal{b}b1 \) exd3 14 \( \mathcal{x}xd3 \) \( \mathcal{d}d3 \) 15 \( \mathcal{x}xd3 \) \( \mathcal{w}xc4 \) Black was winning.

After 6...\( \mathcal{f}f5 \) he got an excellent position in Soutlanbeiff – Jerole, Tel Aviv, 1968, 7 \( \mathcal{g}g5 \) \( \mathcal{b}b4 \) 8 \( \mathcal{c}c3 \) \( \mathcal{d}d7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{xf}6 \) \( \mathcal{gxf}6 \) 10 \( \mathcal{h}h4 \) 0-0 0-11 \( \mathcal{xf}5 \) \( \mathcal{w}xf5 \) 12 \( \mathcal{e}e2 \) \( \mathcal{h}hg8 \).

7 dxe4 \( \mathcal{w}xd1+ \) 8 \( \mathcal{xd}1 \) \( \mathcal{xe}4 \) 9 \( \mathcal{e}e3 \)

9...\( \mathcal{f}f5 \)
Possibly a novelty. Certainly the known 9...\texttt{g4} had an excellent reputation, e.g. 10 \texttt{e2} 0-0-0+ 11 \texttt{c1} \texttt{c5} 12 \texttt{xc5} \texttt{xc5} 13 \texttt{c3} \texttt{b4} 14 \texttt{d1} \texttt{f5}! (threatening mate via 15...\texttt{xa2}! and 16...\texttt{b3}) and Black is on top.

10 \texttt{h4} 0-0-0+ 11 \texttt{c1}

In Holzmann – Kaspar, correspondence game, 1980, White did even worse with 11 \texttt{e2} \texttt{e6} 12 \texttt{f3} \texttt{f5} 13 \texttt{g4}

![Chessboard diagram]

and now Black launched a mating attack. 13...\texttt{e5+} 14 \texttt{f4} \texttt{g5+}! 15 \texttt{xe5} \texttt{d6+} 16 \texttt{d4} (16 \texttt{xe6} \texttt{h8+} 17 \texttt{f7} \texttt{e7} was mate.) 16...\texttt{c7} mate.

11...\texttt{e6} 12 \texttt{c3} \texttt{xc3} 13 \texttt{bxc3} \texttt{b6} 14 \texttt{f3} \texttt{c5} 15 \texttt{xc5} \texttt{bxc5}

White has his pawn, but still some development problems and the doubled c isolanis as well.

16 \texttt{b1} \texttt{h8} 17 \texttt{e2} \texttt{h3}!

Like Dvoretzky says, it is rarely a bad idea to damage the opponent's pawns.

18 \texttt{gxh3} \texttt{xe2}

Things are now looking very bad for Chandler.

19 \texttt{b2} \texttt{xb2} 20 \texttt{xb2} \texttt{d3} 21 \texttt{g5} \texttt{d2+} 22 \texttt{a3} \texttt{xf2} 23 \texttt{d1} \texttt{h6} 24 \texttt{e4} \texttt{hxh2} 25 \texttt{g1} \texttt{e2} 26 \texttt{xc5} \texttt{g6}
Cool, calm and collected, Adams’ technique kicks in.

27 \(\text{Ng}3\) \(\text{De}5\) 28 \(\text{Db}3\) \(\text{Cc}7\) 29 \(\text{Da}6+\) \(\text{Db}6\) 30 \(\text{Db}4\) \(\text{Re}4\) 31 \(\text{Gg}1\) a5 32 \(\text{Dd}5+\) \(\text{Cc}5\)

The weak pawn now falls.

33 \(\text{Dd}1\) \(\text{Dxc}4\) 34 \(\text{Ff}6\) \(\text{Hf}4\) 35 \(\text{Dd}7+\) \(\text{Cc}6\) 36 a4 g5 37 \(\text{Db}8+\) \(\text{Cc}7\) 38 \(\text{Dd}7\) \(\text{Dd}6\) 39 \(\text{De}5\) \(\text{Hf}5\) 40 \(\text{Gg}4\) h5 41 \(\text{De}3\) \(\text{Hf}3\) 42 \(\text{Dd}5+\) \(\text{Cc}6\) 43 h4 gxh4 44 \(\text{De}7+\) \(\text{Dd}7\) 45 \(\text{Cc}8\) \(\text{xc}8\) 46 \(\text{Xd}6\) h3

There are too many of them for White to cope with.

47 \(\text{Dd}4\) h2 48 \(\text{Hh}4\) h2 49 \(\text{Xh}5\) f5 50 \(\text{Cc}4\) \(\text{Ff}2\) 51 \(\text{Cc}5\) f4 52 \(\text{Cc}6\) \(\text{Dd}8\) 53 c4 f3 54 c5 \(\text{Gg}2\) 55 \(\text{Gb}6\) \(\text{Gb}2+\) 56 \(\text{Cc}6\) f2 and White resigned.
Chapter 10: The Icelandic Gambit

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \( \text{\#f6} \) 3 c4 e6?!

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \( \text{\#f6} \) 3 c4 e6?!

This move caused a flurry of interest when Black scored successes with it after its introduction in the late 1980s. However, the modern view is that it is insufficient for equality.

It is certainly a better chance than 3...b5?, with which the talented German master, Richter, concerned himself in a few games of the 1930s.

I shall not be following him.

4 dx e6

No other move could hope for advantage. 4 d4 exd5 takes us into a non-demanding sideline of the Exchange French, or Queen’s Gambit Accepted. Navarro – C.Santos, Novi Sad Olympiad 1990 saw 4 \( \text{\#a4} \) but White got nothing after 4...\( \text{\#d7} \) 5 \( \text{\#b3} \) \( \text{\#a6!} \) 6 d4 exd5 7 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#b4+} \).

4...\( \text{\#xe6} \)

So begins the Icelandic. Black argues that he has a two piece lead in development and that the advance c2-c4 was less than constructive for White in that it has weakened squares on the d file.

White may point out that he is a pawn ahead.

It might have been dubbed The Mexican, had the opening of this game been paid more attention:

Acevdo – Kupfer Mexico Championship 1963, 5 d4 \( \text{\#b4+} \) 6 \( \text{\#d2} \) \( \text{\#xd2+?!} \) 7 \( \text{\#xd2} \) 0-0 8 \( \text{\#c3} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) 9 0-0-0 c6 10 \( \text{\#d3} \), but since White was already well on top and went on to score a comfortable victory, the apellation moved northwards.
Also not rendering necessary possible alteration of the title of a later Brad Pitt film.

After some early spectacular successes, the machines have now scanned the critical positions of this opening, particularly in what may be properly regarded as the main line following 5 Qxf3! We7 6 We2 Qc6 7 d4 0-0 8 d5, and nowadays the piece sacrifice is not looking convincing.

However, unfortunately for Black, this precipitate treatment which involves him in the sacrifice of a piece already by the seventh move, looks necessary, as quieter lines just leave clearly insufficient play for his gambit.

Here is one of the first examples of the damage the opening could inflict upon the unwary.

A. Sokolov – Speelman
Madrid Active Chess 1988

5 d4

In 1981 IMs Jeremy Silman and John Grefe here opined that Black had nothing to show for his pawn. But by the decade’s end that view had much transformed.

5...b4+!
6 $d2

More or less forced. On 6 $c3 $e4 7 $d3 $f5

(This is the kind of rapid, natural, open piece play you want from a classical gambit.) Whites lost very quickly in both Ruxton – Hsu, Tunja 1989 with 8 $f3 $xd4 9 $ge2 $d7 10 a3 $c6! 11 $f4 (Otherwise 11...$e5 – d3.) 11...$e5! Anyway! 12 $e3 $d3+ 13 $d1 $c5, and also in Thirion – Berend, Eupen 1995 after 8 $e3 0-0 9 $ge2 $e8 10 $f3 $xc3 11 $xc3 $xd4!

John Emms tried to patch things up with the suggestion 8 $ge2, but here still Black is doing wonderfully after 8...$c6! 9 a3 $xc3+ 10 $xc3 $e5 11 $d1 $g4! 12 $e3 $xe3 13 fxe3 $h4+ 14 g3 $h6 15 $c1 $c6!, etc.

In a stem game, Klinger – Thorhallsson Gausdal 1986, White even managed to win with 8 a3 $xc3+ 9 $xc3 0-0 10 $f3 $e8 11 $e2 $d7 12 h3, but nobody else had any confidence in that approach. I suspect that, at the time, neither did Josef.

A curio was Velimirovic – Kalezic, Yugoslav Championship 2000 with 6 $c3 $e4 7 $c2 $xd4 8 $f3 $f6 9 $d3 $xc3 10 0-0 $c6! 11 $g5

11...$xf3! 12 gxf3 $d4 13 $xc3 $xc2 14 $xc2 $e7 15 $xe7 $xe7 16 $e4 $ab8 and Black exploited the battered White pawns to win at move 39.
6...\textbf{\textit{We7}}

6...\textbf{\textit{Exd2+}}!? 7 \textbf{\textit{Wxd2 We7}} looks okay, too. Romilly – Martin, Aberdeen 1991 continued 8 \textbf{\textit{We3 Cc6!}} 9 \textbf{\textit{Df3}} (9 d5? \textbf{\textit{Qg4!}}) 9...\textbf{\textit{0-0-0}} 10 \textbf{\textit{Dxe2}} Again, 10 d5? is no good, here because of 10...\textbf{\textit{He8}} and neither 11 dxc6 \textbf{\textit{Dg4}} 12 cxb7+ \textbf{\textit{Db8}} nor 11 dxe6 \textbf{\textit{Dg4}} 12 \textbf{\textit{We2 Wb4+}} is acceptable. 10...\textbf{\textit{He8}} 11 0-0?! and Black’s superior development gave him a clear advantage after 11...\textbf{\textit{Dg4!}} 12 \textbf{\textit{Cc3 Xxf3}} 13 \textbf{\textit{Xxf3 Wb4}} 14 \textbf{\textit{Gg5 Exd4}}.

But 11 d5 \textbf{\textit{Db4}} 12 0-0 (12 \textbf{\textit{Dd4 c5}} 13 dxc6 \textbf{\textit{Xxd4!}}) 12...\textbf{\textit{Exd5}}!? 13 cxd5 \textbf{\textit{We3}} 14 fxe3 \textbf{\textit{Cc2}} 15 \textbf{\textit{Cc3 Xxa1}} 16 \textbf{\textit{Xxa1 Exd5}} would have left an equal ending.

7 \textbf{\textit{Dxb4}}

A major parting of the ways.

a) 7 \textbf{\textit{We2}} and

b) 7 \textbf{\textit{Dxe2}} have also been played.

After 7 \textbf{\textit{We2 Cc6!}} 8 \textbf{\textit{Df3}} 0-0-0!? In this gambit this is a quite thematic offering of a piece through the pawn fork d4-d5. It is also an improvement over the limp 8...\textbf{\textit{Exd2+}} 9 \textbf{\textit{Dxb2}} 0-0-0 of Vajda – Conlon, Bratislava, 1993, when taking the challenge 10 d5! \textbf{\textit{Dxb4}} 11 \textbf{\textit{Dxb3 He8}} 12 dxe6 \textbf{\textit{We6}}
13 \( \text{Wxe6+ } \text{Axe6} \) 14 \( \text{Ae2} \text{Cc2+} \) 15 \( \text{Af1} \text{Axa1} \) 16 \( \text{Axa1} \) would have left White well ahead. 9 d5 \( \text{Ahe8} \)

The analysis indicates that here this appears to be a perfectly sound offer, of either minor piece,

e.g.

a1) 10 \( \text{Dxc6} \text{Wc5!} \) 11 cxb7+ \( \text{Wxb7} \) 12 \( \text{Dc3} \text{Axc4} \) 13 \( \text{Be3! Axc2} \) 14 \( \text{Bxc5 Axf1+} \) 15 \( \text{Wxf1 Axc5} \) with a continuing initiative. Also, in Cossins – Evans, 1970 12 \( \text{Bxe5} \) did not work after 12...\( \text{Ag4!} \) 13 \( \text{Dxg4 Dxg4} \) 14 \( \text{Wxe8 Wxf2+} \) with mate three moves later.

a2) 10 \( \text{Dxe6 Wc5} \) 11 \( \text{Dc3} \) The attempt to slip the bishop to h3, perhaps with a helpful pin, by 11 g3 ought to be met by 11...\( \text{g5!} \) and then 12 \( \text{Dc3 Aexe6} \) 13 \( \text{Be3 Wc5} \) 14 \( \text{We2 g4} \) 15 \( \text{Dd2 Dd4} \) 16 \( \text{Wc1 Wf5!} \) and it’s curtains, e.g. 17 \( \text{Dd1 Aexe3!} \) 18 \( \text{f3} \text{e3} \text{Df3} \). In this line, Black’s use of the g pawn reminds me of Kasparov’s in the 16th game of the 1985 World Championship match.

11...\( \text{Axd2}! \) So often in the Icelandic and Portuguese Gambits Black gives up a rook for the White queen’s bishop. 12 \( \text{Wxd2} \) (12 \( \text{Dxd2 Aexe6} \) wins the queen, and 12 \( \text{Dxd2 Aexe6} \) 13 \( \text{Dd1 Dxe4+} \) is overwhelming.) 12...\( \text{Axe6+} \) 13 \( \text{Be2 Dc4} \) Forcing entry. 14 \( \text{Cc2 Wxf2+} \) 15 \( \text{Dd1 Axc3} \) 16 bxc3 \( \text{We3} \) and
the attack looks too strong, e.g. 17 \( \text{\textit{f1 e1 xc3}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{f1 e4}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{e1 xd6}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{f1}} \) and Black can bring the last man into it with 20...\( \text{\textit{b4}}, \) and he wins.

Or b) 7 \( \text{\textit{e2}}. \) This was tried in Ioselani – Gurieli, Tbilisi 1987. Black promptly invested a piece with 7...\( \text{\textit{c6}}! ? \) 8 d5 \( \text{\textit{xd5}} \) 9 cxd5 \( \text{\textit{xd5}} \)

![Diagram 1](image1)

Threats galore. To cope with that to g2, she tried 10 \( \text{\textit{f1 0-0-0}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{e1}}, \) but the other lady kept the kettle boiling nicely with 11...\( \text{\textit{xd2}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{xd2 b8!}}\). A cute move when a piece down! 13 \( \text{\textit{xf3}}. \) (Neither does 13 \( \text{\textit{xc4}} \) clarify things as 13...\( \text{\textit{d4}} \) 14 \( \text{\textit{e3 c6}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{d1 f5}} \) maintains the Black initiative, 16 \( \text{\textit{c3 xe2}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{xe2 xd1+}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{xd1 d8}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{e1 g5}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) \( \text{\textit{d2}} \) with excellent activity for compensation.) 13...\( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 14 \( \text{\textit{xd5 xd5}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{gf3 he8}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{c1 wd3+}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{g1 xe2}} \) and Black seems to have enough because of her rampant pieces. Play continued 18 a4 \( \text{\textit{xd2}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{xd2 xd2}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \) and here 20...\( \text{\textit{xc3}} \) 21 bx3 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) 22 g3 \( \text{\textit{xc3}} \) was fine.

7...\( \text{\textit{xb4+}} \) 8 \( \text{\textit{d2 c6}} \)

![Diagram 2](image2)

9 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \)

9 d5 0-0-0 10 dxc6 \( \text{\textit{xe8}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{e2 e4}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{f3 xc4}} \) and White must emerge material down.

Or here 10 dxe6 \( \text{\textit{xe8}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{e2 xe6}} \) with an overpowering initiative and compensation.

10 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) would take us back to the game.
9...0-0-0 10 d5 \textit{g4}?

A much better move was 10...\textit{\textcopyright}xd5! 11 cxd5 \textit{\textcopyright}xd5 with terrific pressure down the open central files, e.g. 12 \textit{\textcopyright}e2 \textit{\textcopyright}xf3 13 gxf3 \textit{\textcopyright}he8 14 a3 \textit{\textcopyright}f4! and White would be helpless against the coming 15...\textit{\textcopyright}d4.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard1.png}
\end{center}

11 \textit{\textcopyright}e2?

Missing 11 dxc6 \textit{\textcopyright}he8+ (11...\textit{\textcopyright}e4 12 \textit{\textcopyright}b3!) 12 \textit{\textcopyright}e2 and Black has no convincing line, e.g. 12...bxc6 13 \textit{\textcopyright}c2! \textit{\textcopyright}d7 (13...\textit{\textcopyright}h5 14 h3!) 14 \textit{\textcopyright}f1 \textit{\textcopyright}xd2 15 \textit{\textcopyright}xd2 \textit{\textcopyright}xd2 16 \textit{\textcopyright}xd2 \textit{\textcopyright}xe2+ 17 \textit{\textcopyright}g1 and White ought to win it.

11...\textit{\textcopyright}xf3 12 \textit{\textcopyright}xf3 \textit{\textcopyright}he8+ 13 \textit{\textcopyright}f1 \textit{\textcopyright}d4

Clearly Black dominates in return for his pawn.

14 \textit{\textcopyright}c1 \textit{\textcopyright}xf3 15 \textit{\textcopyright}xf3 \textit{\textcopyright}e4 16 b3 \textit{\textcopyright}de8 17 h3 \textit{\textcopyright}h5 18 g3

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard2.png}
\end{center}

18...\textit{\textcopyright}xg3+!

Typical Speelman.

19 fxg3 \textit{\textcopyright}e3 20 \textit{\textcopyright}g1 \textit{\textcopyright}d6 21 \textit{\textcopyright}h2 \textit{\textcopyright}xg3 22 \textit{\textcopyright}b2 \textit{\textcopyright}g6 23 \textit{\textcopyright}f2 \textit{\textcopyright}e3

The Black major units have flooded down and the White king gets flushed into the streets.

24 \textit{\textcopyright}e2 \textit{\textcopyright}f3+ 25 \textit{\textcopyright}e1 \textit{\textcopyright}g1+ 26 \textit{\textcopyright}d2 \textit{\textcopyright}xh2 27 \textit{\textcopyright}e1 and White resigned.
Here’s another dazzler from that period.

Kulijf – Hodgson
Wijk aan Zee 1989

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 c4 e6 4 dxe6 Qxe6 5 d4 Qb4+ 6 Qd2 Qe7 7
Qxb4 Qxb4+ 8 Qd2 Qc6

Same stuff, and same good play. But there is also the intriguing 8...Qe7!? to be contemplated here.

9 Qc3

Neither have others led to advantage. 9 Qxb4 Qxb4 10 Qa3 0-0-0 11 d5
Qf5 12 f3 Qhe8+ 13 Qf2 c6 and Black had splendid gambit piece play in
Bauer – Klein, Germany 1994, a game which concluded 14 g4 Qg6 15 g5
Qh5 16 Qh3 cxd5 17 Qe2 Qf5 18 Qg1 d4 19 Qe1 d3 and a disgusted
White resigned. Wilder and woolier was Metz – Hauke, Germany 1989: 9
d5 0-0-0 10 Qa3 Qf5 11 f3 Qhe8+ 12 Qe2 Qc5 13 Qf1 A sorry
consequence of Black’s bind. 13...Qb4 14 g4

14...Qfxd5!? He had also 14...Qg6!? Play continued 15 cxd5 Qxd5 16
Qc1 Qe3+ 17 Qe1 Qc2!? 18 Qxc2 Qxc2+ 19 Qf1 Qd5 20 Qb1 Qe3+ and
they, sportingly, called it a draw here.
In Meijere – Ye Rongguang, Dieren Open 1998 White fared badly with 9 d5 0-0-0 10 d3 \(\text{Ng8}\) 11 \(\text{Be2}\) \(\text{Be5}\) 12 \(\text{Bbc3}\) \(\text{Bxc4}\) 13 \(\text{Bxc4}\) \(\text{Wxc4}\) 14 0-0 \(\text{Bxd5}\). However, the neglected game Sherman – Evans, British Championship 1970 may be worth a look, as after 9 d5 0-0-0 10 \(\text{Bxc3}\)!? \(\text{Bhe8}\) 11 0-0-0 White had put most of his problems behind him, and later won. He also won in Horvath – Dupsky Zalakaros open, 1992 after 10...\(\text{Bf5}\) 11 0-0-0 \(\text{Bxa5}\) 12 \(\text{Bf3}\) \(\text{Bxc4}\) 13 \(\text{Bxc4}\) \(\text{Wxc4}\) 14 \(\text{Bxe5}\) \(\text{Bc5}\), but Black was okay at that moment.

9...0-0-0

9...\(\text{Bxc4}\) was fine, too, as in Davie – Evans, Coventry 1970 and Dohri – Galego, Algarve, 1995.

10 d5 \(\text{Bg4}\) 11 f3 \(\text{Bhe8}\)\+ 12 \(\text{Be2}\) \(\text{Bf5}\) 13 0-0-0 \(\text{Bxa5}\)

Now he chooses to eye the earlier nabbable c4 pawn.

14 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{Bg6}\) 15 \(\text{Bh3}\)

15 b3 c6 is good for Black, e.g. 16 \(\text{Bd3}\) \(\text{Bxd3}\) 17 \(\text{Wxd3}\) b5! 18 cxb5 \(\text{Bxd5}\) 19 \(\text{Wf5}\)\+ \(\text{Bb8}\) with a great game.

15...\(\text{Bd7}\)??

An intriguing and very Hodgson-esque move, as the knight hops round to c5, and stares at b3. But probably simpler and better was just 15...\(\text{Bxc4}\)! 16 \(\text{Bxc4}\) \(\text{Wxc4}\) because then White has pawn weaknesses.
16 \( \Box b1 \)?

He had reasonable hopes with 16 \( \Diamond e4 \) \( \Box a4 \) 17 b3 \( \Box a3+ \) 18 \( \Box b2 \) \( \Box xb2+ \) 19 \( \Box xb2 \) \( \Box xe4 \) 20 fxe4 \( \Box xe4 \) 21 \( \Box he1 \) \( \Box de8 \) 22 \( \Box g1 \).

16...\( \Box b3! \) 17 \( \Box d3 \) \( \Box xa2 \) 18 \( \Box b4 \) \( \Box e2! \) 19 \( \Box xe2 \) \( \Box b3+ \) 20 \( \Box xb3 \) \( \Box xb3 \) 21 \( \Box d2 \) \( \Box e3 \) and White resigned.

Games like those made people realise that Silman and Grefe might not have come to the right conclusions about Black’s chances against 5 \( d4 \), and attention shifted to the move which today is regarded as the one to pose the greatest theoretical problems for the Icelandic...

5 \( \Box f3! \)

Black has now tried 5...\( \Box c6 \) and 5...\( \Box e7 \).

Against 5...\( \Box c6 \) 6 \( d4 \) is the most natural and the strongest move. Now 6...\( \Box b4+ \) should be met with 7 \( \Box c3 \), against which Black has never been able to demonstrate equality.

7...\( \Box e4 \) failed in Hennigan – Stefansson, Oakham 1988: 8 \( \Box d2 \) \( \Box xd2 \) 9 \( \Box xd2 \) \( \Box e7 \) 10 0-0-0 0-0-0 (Neither was 10...0-0 any better in Dolmatov – Boissonet, Buenos Aires 1991, after 11 a3 \( \Box a5 \) 12 \( \Box b1 \) \( \Box f5+ \) 13 \( \Box a2 \) \( \Box xc3 \) 14 \( \Box xc3 \).) 11 a3 \( \Box c5 \) 12 d5 \( \Box g4 \) 13 \( \Box e1 \) \( \Box f8 \) 14 b4! \( \Box xf3 \) 15 bxc5
\( \text{h5} 16 \text{We3!} \text{Da5} 17 \text{Wh3+} \text{b8} 18 \text{Wxh5 Wxc5} 19 \text{We2} \) and the extra piece told.

But neither is 7...\text{We7} sufficient after 8 \text{De3}, e.g. 8...0-0-0 9 \text{Dd3! Dg4} 10 0-0 \text{Dxf3} 11 \text{Wxf3 Dxd4} 12 \text{Dxd4 Dxd4} 13 \text{Db5 Ddd8} 14 a3 a6 15 \text{Dxc7}! as in Arkell - D.Olafsson, Rekyavik 1990.

White also emerged with a huge plus from the opening of Korneev – Madrid Sole, Foment Open 1994 after 9 \text{De2 Dd4} 10 \text{Cc1 Dhe8} 11 0-0 \text{Df5} 12 \text{Dxe4 Dxe4} 13 d5.

Or 8...\text{Dg4} 9 \text{De2} 0-0-0 10 0-0 \text{Cc5}

\[ \begin{array}{c}
11 \text{Dd5! Dxd5} 12 \text{cxd5 Dxd5} 13 \text{Wb3 Dxf3} 14 \text{Dxf3 Dxd4} 15 \text{Dxd4 Dxd4} 16 \text{Dxc6} \text{and wins, Skripchenko – Lukasiewicz, Cannes Open 1997.}
\end{array} \]

So, they tried 5...\text{We7}.

For some strange reason several White players have allowed their c pawn to be taken, with, e.g. 6 \text{De2?}, but Black is at least equal after the capture. So the alternative 6 \text{We2!} must be made, but the evidence is much in its favour. After 6...\text{Cc6} 7 d4

\textbf{Minasian – Tu Hoang Thai}
Erevan Olympiad, 1996

7...0-0-0
Spicing it up, but just a touch too much Asian spice. Neither do the alternatives of 7...\textit{w}b4 8 \textit{c}c3, after which Black has nothing better than transposition back into the game with 8...0-0-0, nor 7...\textit{g}g4 and 7...\textit{f}f5 look quite adequate.

7...\textit{g}g4 8 \textit{e}e3!?

A suggestion of the American Master, Norton. After 8...0-0-0 9 d5 \textit{e}e5 10 \textit{c}c3 White is on the way to consolidation. Here, as in unfavourable comparison of many lines stemming from 5 d4 \textit{b}b4, it is the blocking in of the Black bishop by the queen at e7 which renders this form of the gambit not fully viable. Norton suggests 10...\textit{e}e8 11 0-0-0 \textit{w}b4 12 \textit{w}c2!, exploiting the tactical trick of a check at f5 to prevent Black from taking twice on f3, and if 12...\textit{x}xc4 13 \textit{xc}c4 \textit{xc}c4 14 \textit{d}d4! \textit{w}a6 15 \textit{a}a4 is winning. Interesting stuff.

Against 7...\textit{f}f5 there is simply 8 \textit{x}xe7+ \textit{x}xe7 9 a3!, depriving Black of b4. This greatly helps in the process of consolidation, which we may see proceeding apace in lines like 9...0-0-0 10 \textit{e}e3 \textit{h}he8 11 \textit{bd}2 \textit{g}g4 12 h3 \textit{xe}3 13 fxe3 \textit{f}f6 14 \textit{f}f2. This happened, via the different move order 10...\textit{g}g4 11 \textit{bd}2 \textit{f}f6 12 h3 \textit{xe}3 13 fxe3 \textit{h}he8 14 \textit{f}f2 in Ellingsen – Tonning, Bergen 1999.

8 d5

Bull by the horns, but that’s the way to do it here. There have been several games, e.g. Cherniaiev – Schwartz, Biel 2001, where Black also did not make it to equality after 8 \textit{e}e3 \textit{g}g4 9 d5.

8...\textit{w}b4+ 9 \textit{c}c3

![Chessboard Diagram]

9...\textit{f}f5

In Miezis – Kveinys, Bonn 1995, Black played 9...\textit{c}c5, and instead of taking the knight White played the dreadful 10 \textit{w}c2? and Black went to work with 10...\textit{g}g4 11 \textit{e}e2 \textit{f}f2 12 \textit{f}f1 \textit{d}d4 13 \textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}4 14 \textit{e}e4 \textit{xc}3 15 dxe6 f5! 16 \textit{w}f3 \textit{d}d2 and he soon won.

Here the actual game finished...

10 \textit{e}e3 \textit{e}e4
At the same event Black was also successful with a quite different approach. Isaev – Magai went 10...\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c5}}} 11 0-0-0 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{h}}e8 and now a whopping blunder, 12 dxc6??

\textit{\textbf{Diagram 1}}

12...\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}c3+! 13 bxc3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}a3+ 14 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}b2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}b2+ 15 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{xb}}}2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{x}}d1 and Black won. It would have been better to play 12 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}d2 with some obscurity still in a main branch, e.g. 12...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}e3 13 fxe3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}a5 14 e4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}e4!? 15 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xe4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}a4 16 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}5 (16 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}3? \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{b}}}3+ wins) 16...\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xa2 17 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}c3 b6.

11 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}c1 g6!

\textit{\textbf{Diagram 2}}

12 a3? ...

The radical 12 g4!? ought to have been tried here, with the line 12...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}g4 13 dxc6 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}7 14 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}c3+ 15 bxc3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{xc}}}3 16 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}c2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xa2+ 17 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{e}}}2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{xc}}}1+ 18 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{xc}}}1 leaving White with a clear advantage.

12...\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}a5 13 dxc6 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}7

A rare fianchetto in this Gambit.

14 cxb7+ \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{b}}}8 15 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}c3 16 bxc3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d2 17 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{h}}}e8 18 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{e}}}3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xa3 19 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}2
And here Black ought to have played 19...\textbullet_{e6}! 20 \textbullet_{d2} \textbullet_{xc3} 21 \textbullet_{d1} \textbullet_{a6}! 22 \textbullet_{e2} \textbullet_{a1} 23 0-0 \textbullet_{xd1} 24 \textbullet_{xd1} \textbullet_{xd2} 25 \textbullet_{xd2} \textbullet_{e4} and wins. Instead he slipped with 19...\textbullet_{e4}? and White promptly returned the favour with, instead of the accurate 20 \textbullet_{d2}!, which would have now held, 20 \textbullet_{xa7+?} \textbullet_{xa7} 21 \textbullet_{a2}

21...\textbullet_{c2}! White resigned.

A strong GM blown away in 21 moves with the White pieces. People sat up and paid attention.

But the better tenth move for White was 10 \textbullet_{xc6}!
The clearest refutation. In the game Adams – Partington, England 1999, which saw now 10...c5 11 cxb7+ axb7 12 e3 h8 13 d1

![Chess Diagram]

White plans, for instance, an unravelling with h3 and g4. Here Black chose 13...c8. If that is his best then I just do not believe that he may sustain a deficit of a piece and a pawn: It's too quiet. 14 d2 b6 15 d5 xdx5 16 xd5+ c6 17 xfx5 xe3 and White consolidated with 18 e2! xf2+ 19 xf1 c7 20 d3 g6 21 f6 a8 22 d8+ xd8 23 xd8+ b7 24 wd3 and he won.

Tu Hoang Thai produced hopeful analysis to support the attempt to refute his brilliancy with (the surprisingly rarely played) 10 dxe6!, but it does not convince. He gave 10...c5 11 cxb7+ b8 A nuance. 12 e3 g4 13 d1 xe3 14 xd8+ xd8 15 fxe3 e8 16 a3

![Chess Diagram]

No satisfactory way now for Black. On 16...b3 17 e4! xa3 18 d4! wins, or Tu's 16...b6 meets with 17 d5 b3 18 d2! c6 19 c3 and White has done the job of consolidation.

Fewer people play the Icelandic these days. In my view, anyone venturing this pawn sacrifice in future needs to speculate after 5 f3! with the dubious 5...c5 or the untried 5...g4.

Failing these, and perhaps even taking them into account, I think that by now the Icelandic gambit has had its (cod and) chips.
Chapter 11:
The Portuguese Variation
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ¤f6 3 d4 ¤g4!? 

The Portuguese Variation arises after 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 ¤f6 3 d4 ¤g4!? This line can get VERY sharp.

The move was popularised and the ideas behind it particularly developed in the early 1990s by Portuguese Masters such as Luis Galego, Carlos P. Santos and Rui Damaso. Hence the soubriquet.

Since then bigger names have given it outings, e.g. Hebden, Hodgson, Adorjan, Shirov, and even the surrogate Portuguese, Kevin Spraggett (he married a lady of that country and now makes his home there).

Forty years ago, Fischer said that the old style gambits (by which he meant those of the 19th century) could never come back.

But some of the games in this section suggest to me that he may not have been right.

a) 4 ¤e2
b) 4 ¤f3
c) 4 f3
d) 4 ¤b5+

a) 4 ¤e2
Avoiding the flames, but too modest a move to promise much. After 4...\textit{\textbf{x}}e2 5 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}e2 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d5 Black is comfortable enough, e.g.

\textbf{Zulfugarli – Forster}  
World Collegiate Championships 1996

6 \textit{\textbf{f}}3 \textit{\textbf{e}}6 7 0-0 \textit{\textbf{c}}c6 8 \textit{\textbf{d}}1

8...0-0-0  
Fun!

9 \textit{\textbf{c}}4

Or 9 \textit{\textbf{c}}c3 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}}}5 10 \textit{\textbf{f}}4 \textit{\textbf{d}}6 11 \textit{\textbf{x}}xd6 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xd6 12 \textit{\textbf{d}}2 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}}}d8 13 \textit{\textbf{ad}}1 a6 14 h3 g5 15 \textit{\textbf{w}}e3 h6 with equality in Campora – Spraggett, Spain 1996

9...\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}h5 10 \textit{\textbf{c}}c3 \textit{\textbf{d}}d6 11 c5

11 a3?! e5! 12 d5 e4 13 \textit{\textbf{x}}xe4 \textit{\textbf{h}}2+ was already to Black’s advantage in Kouwenhoven – Hodgson 1996.

11...\textit{\textbf{e}}7 12 b4 e5?!

A speculative try, which sufficed to draw.

13 dxe5 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xd1+ 14 \textit{\textbf{x}}xd1 \textit{\textbf{g}}4 15 \textit{\textbf{f}}4 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}f5 16 \textit{\textbf{g}}3 \textit{\textbf{d}}8 17 h3 \textit{\textbf{h}}6 18 b5 \textit{\textbf{b}}4 19 \textit{\textbf{w}}c4 \textit{\textbf{w}}c2 20 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xc2 \textit{\textbf{c}}c2 21 \textit{\textbf{a}}c1 \textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}5 Drawn.
b) 4 \( \Box f3 \)

Now 4...\( \Box xd5 \) leads us back to play considered in Chapter Eight.

4...\( \Box xd5 \)? is the distinctive Portuguese treatment.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Diagram 1}
\end{array}
\]

Black’s best results from this position have come when he has placed his shifted queen to f5, e.g. 5 \( \Box c3 \) \( \Box f5 \)? 6 \( \Box d3 \) \( \Box xf3 \)! 7 gxf3 (7 \( \Box xf5 \) \( \Box xd1 \) 8 \( \Box xd1 \) e6 9 \( \Box d3 \) \( \Box bd7 \) with approximate equality.) 7...\( \Box d7 \) 8 \( \Box e3 \) \( \Box c6 \) 9 \( \Box b5 \) e6 10 \( \Box d3 \) a6 11 \( \Box a4 \) \( \Box b4 \) 12 0-0-0 \( \Box xc3 \) 13 \( \Box xc3 \) b5 with Black no worse in Prie – Galego, Linares Zonal 1995.

5 \( \Box e2 \) \( \Box c6 \) 6 \( \Box c3 \) \( \Box f5 \)? and now White’s best is not something like 7 \( \Box e3 \) 0-0-0 8 0-0 when 8...\( e5 \) gives excellent play, nor 7 h3 \( \Box xf3 \) 8 \( \Box xf3 \) 0-0-0 9 \( \Box xc6 \) \( \Box e6+ \)., but rather the sharp pawn sacrifice 7 d5!? \( \Box b4 \) 8 \( \Box d4 \) \( \Box xe2 \) 9 \( \Box xe2 \) \( \Box d7 \) 10 0-0 \( \Box bx d5 \) 11 \( \Box dx d5 \) \( \Box dx d5 \) 12 \( \Box d1 \) when White has a dangerous initiative and Black should tread carefully, 12...\( e6 \) 13 c4 \( \Box b4 \) 14 a3 \( \Box a6 \), etc.

c) 4 \( f3 \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Diagram 2}
\end{array}
\]

Thus White hangs on to his pawn, but \( f2-f3 \) can constitute a significant weakening of \( f2 \) and \( e3 \) as well as taking away from the White king’s knight its most natural square.
4...\f5

Invariably played.

Now:

c1) 5 c4

c2) 5 b5

5 g4 is rarely seen, but not out of the question. After 5...g6 a line like 6 c4 e6 7 dxe6 b4+ 8 d2 xd2+ 9 xd2 0-0 10 g5 h5 11 h3 c6 12 xe2 fxe6 13 xex6+ h8 14 0-0 b1! 15 axb1 f4 16 xf4 xg5+, with Black retaining good compensation for the pawn, might not be unrealistic.

Others do not keep the extra pawn.

c1) 5 c4 e6

5...c6 is another rarity, which got an outing in Nataf – Dias, Szeged 1994. After 6 dxc6 xc6 White continued 7 d5. I believe that was consequent as 7 e3 e5! would have given Black excellent gambit play. 7...e5 and now I am intrigued by 8 g4!?. Since 8 fxg4 9 fxg4 e4 loses to 10 d4, Black must retreat, and I mistrust his game.

But it may not be 100% out of the question.

6 dxe6

Kasparov chose 6 c3 exd5 7 c5 in an Internet blitz game against TALPA from 1998. Black did not play the simple 7...c6, but instead emerged without equality after 7 b6 8 e3 bxc5 9 dxc5 e7 10 c2 0-0 11 b4.

As an indication of how little explored the gambit still is, there is a novel interference move to be examined here. In Sulskis – Rocha, Capelle La Grande, 1997, play went 6 a4+!? c6 7 dxe6!? xd4 8 e2 e5 9 b3!? and here the only truly consistent way for Black was 9 xe6 10 xb7 c5 11 xa8 0-0 ‘...with compensation for the material’, and a maze of complications and tactical minefields lying ahead for White and the extra rook.
The game continued 9...b6 10 We3! and Sulskis could claim a very small edge.

But the escapade may have been misguided, and he himself later drew attention to 7 dxc6!? Qxc6 8 Ke3, and the follow up is to be Qc3, Kd1, Kf2 and hang on to the pawn.

But Black could still continue with, e.g. 8...Kd6, a rapid 0-0, and maybe...Wc7 with...e5 to follow.

In Borvik – Bruned, Mondariz Open, 2000 he tried 8...Kb4+!? 9 Qc3 0-0 10 a3 Ke7 (10...Kd6!?) 11 Kd1 Qd7 12 c5 e5 13 Kb5 Qxd4 14 Kxd4 exd4 15 Kxd4 Kxc5

16 Qxd7 Kxd4 17 Qxf5 We7+ 18 Kge2 Qxc3+ 19 bxc3 Kf8 20 Wc2 Wxa3 21 Kf2 g6 22 Kd3 Wc5+ 23 Kd4 Kac8 24 Kc1 Kg5 25 g3 We3+ 26 Wf1 a6 27 We4 Ke7 28 Kge2 Kd7 29 Kd1 Kcd8 30 Kxd7 Kxd7 31 Qd4 Ke7 32 Qe2 Kd7 33 Qd4 and they called it a draw. It worked even better in Campello – Pimentel Brasil Open 1998 with 10 Kd1 a6!? 11 Kge2 Kd6 (why not have gone there straight away?) 12 Kg3 Wc7 13 Kece2 b5! 14 cxb5 axb5 15 Wb3 Qa5 16 Wc3 Qc4 17 Qxf5 Qd5! 18 Wc1 exf5 19 Kg5 Kxh2 20 Wf2 Kf8 21 f4 f6! and each had trapped the other’s bishop, but Black came out on top after 22 Kxh2 fxg5 23 b3 Kxa2! 24 bxc4 Qxf4 25 Wb1 Wxc4 26 Wxf5 g6 27 Wd7 Wxe2+ 28 Kgl h5 and he won at move 42.

We would benefit from some more practical examples.
6...\textit{$\mathcal{D}$}c6!

![Chess Diagram]

This second pawn offer is one of the main ideas behind the Portuguese.

White now has:

cl\ a) 7 exf7+?
cl\ b) 7 d5?
cl\ c) 7 \textit{$\mathcal{D}$}e2?
cl\ d) 7 \textit{$\mathcal{D}$}e3

cl\ a) 7 exf7+?
7...\textit{$\mathcal{B}$}xf7

All of the evidence suggests that Black’s development lead is now so great that, two pawns up or not, White is already lost, e.g.

R. Hess – Chalker
Houston, 1995

8 \textit{$\mathcal{A}$}e3
Stoianowski – Ribeiro, Baile Herculane, 1994 saw 8 \( \text{d}3 \text{b}4+9 \text{c}3 \text{e}8+10 \text{e}2 \text{x}d3 11 \text{w}xd3 and Black here had a trivial win with 11...\text{x}d4 12 \text{f}2 \text{xe}2 13 \text{w}xd8 \text{c}5+!, etc.

On 8 \( \text{d}5 \text{a}3 \text{c}5+! and White has few moves. Meyer – Young, Texas Open 1995 continued 10 \text{e}2 \text{e}8 11 \text{f}1 \text{e}7 12 \text{g}5 \text{h}6 13 \text{xf}6. (Or 13 \text{h}4 \text{e}3 intending ...g5 and ...\text{h}5.) 13...\text{xf}6 14 \text{d}2 \text{e}7 15 \text{g}4 Despair. 15...\text{x}g4 16 \text{b}5 and now he had a simple win with 16...\text{e}3 17 \text{e}1 \text{c}2 18 \text{g}3 \text{f}4, etc.

In Bilic – Ljubicic, Croatian Championship 2000, Black won with the rather obscurer 11...\text{d}6 12 \text{g}4 \text{g}6 13 \text{f}4 \text{xe}2 14 \text{xe}2 \text{xe}4 15 \text{g}3 \text{d}3 16 \text{f}3 0-1

8...\text{b}4+9 \text{f}2

Or 9 \text{c}3 \text{e}8 10 \text{f}2 \text{xe}3! 11 \text{xe}3 \text{xd}4! with a raging attack, e.g. 12 \text{xd}4 \text{e}7+ 13 \text{f}4 (13 \text{d}2 \text{d}8; 13 \text{f}2 \text{c}5) 13...\text{h}5+! 14 \text{xf}5 \text{e}6+ 15 \text{g}5 \text{e}7+ 16 \text{hx}5 \text{g}6 mate.

9...\text{e}8

10 \text{c}3

Neither did 10 \text{e}2 stop Black from ripping his way in, in Dimitrov – Rivera, Lalin 1994, viz, 10...\text{xe}3! 11 \text{xe}3 \text{e}7+ 12 \text{f}2 \text{e}8 13 \text{c}1 \text{xd}4! 14 \text{xd}4 \text{e}1+ 15 \text{g}1 \text{c}5 16 \text{d}1 \text{c}2 and White had seen enough, 0-1.

10...\text{xe}3!

Getting at the White king at all costs, and a most thematic sac.

11 \text{xe}3 \text{e}7+ 12 \text{f}2 \text{xd}4!

Blasting open the key a7-g1 diagonal.

13 \text{e}1 \text{c}5 14 \text{g}3 (14 \text{e}3 \text{c}2 wins.) 14...\text{h}5+, and as 15 \text{h}4 \text{e}7+ will lead to mate, White here resigned.

Vicious, eh?

c1b) 7 \text{d}5?
No time for this, either, as the knight leaps into action in reply.

In Topalov – Schmidt, Simul, Frankfurt 1997 Black chose 7...\texttt{b}4+, and play careered on madly to a draw at move 30. But after the natural 7...\texttt{b}4! White does not look to be really on the board, e.g. 8 \texttt{a}4+ b5! (Isn’t it great to be able to play such moves knowing that they are natural and winning!?)

9 \texttt{x}b5+ c6 10 exf7+ (10 dx\texttt{c}6 \texttt{c}2+ 11 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{d}4+ 12 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{d}3+ etc)

10...\texttt{x}f7 11 \texttt{b}7+ \texttt{e}7 12 \texttt{a}3 \texttt{e}8 13 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{b}8! 14 \texttt{x}a7 \texttt{a}8 15 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{x}a3! 16 bxa3 \texttt{c}2+ 17 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{x}a1 18 g4 \texttt{x}g4! and the attack still fiercely burns.

Or something like 8 \texttt{a}3 \texttt{c}5 9 \texttt{a}4+ c6 10 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{e}7 11 dx\texttt{c}6 bxc6 12 \texttt{xc}5 \texttt{xc}5 13 exf7+ \texttt{x}f7 and Black has total domination, and lots of natural moves in contrast to White’s none, for the pawns. In Trnovec – Adam, Zalakaros Open, 2000, White hardly did better by losing a tempo with 8 \texttt{a}3 fx\texttt{e}6 9 \texttt{a}4+ c6 10 \texttt{d}2 a5 11 dx\texttt{c}6 bxc6 and only now 12 \texttt{e}3. Adam continued 12...\texttt{c}7 13 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{e}7 14 g3 0-0 15 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{g}4!? and won at move 26. The White queen was right out of it. Black also won quickly in Nielsen – Furu, Politiken Cup, Copenhagen 2001 with 9...\texttt{f}7 10 \texttt{d}2 exd5! 11 \texttt{xb}4 \texttt{e}8+ 12 \texttt{x}e8+ \texttt{x}e8+ 13 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{xb}4 14 g4 \texttt{c}5+ 15 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{g}6 16 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{x}g4! 17 \texttt{g}5+ \texttt{f}6 18 fx\texttt{g}4 \texttt{gx}g5 19 \texttt{h}4+ \texttt{gx}g4 20 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{hf}8 21 \texttt{h}3+ \texttt{hx}h4 and White resigned.

Black smashed through with a quick win in Goerlinger – Bergez, Paris Open 1994 after 8 exf7+ \texttt{xf}7 9 \texttt{a}3 \texttt{c}5 10 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{e}8 11 \texttt{f}1 c6 12 g4 \texttt{g}6 13 \texttt{h}4 \texttt{d}6! 14 h5
14...\textbf{\textit{d}3!} 15 \textbf{\textit{d}xd3} \textbf{\textit{g}g3} 16 \textbf{\textit{g}g6+}

Despair.

16...\textbf{\textit{hxg6} 17 \textbf{\textit{hxg6+} \textbf{\textit{g}g8} 19 \textbf{\textit{h}h3} and White resigned.}

In Powell – Martin, UECC e mail 1998, Black just brought the bishop out with 8...\textbf{\textit{c}c5}

... and won after 9 \textbf{\textit{wa4+} c6 10 g4 \textbf{\textit{d}xd4} 11 fxd4 \textbf{\textit{wh4+}}, 0-1. In Trefny –
Cisler, Czech Team Championships 1997, White struggled on with 11 h4
but after 11...\textbf{\textit{f}f2} 12 \textbf{\textit{h}h2} \textbf{\textit{wh6}} the Black queen wended her way in. 13 \textbf{\textit{e}e2}
\textbf{\textit{wd4} 14 \textbf{\textit{g}g2} \textbf{\textit{wxh4} 15 \textbf{\textit{g}g5} \textbf{\textit{wh1} 16 \textbf{\textit{f}f1} \textbf{\textit{fd3+} 17 \textbf{\textit{d}d2} \textbf{\textit{gxg1} 18 \textbf{\textit{e}e2}
\textbf{\textit{c}c5 19 e7 f6 and Black soon won.}}}

GM Radulov handled it a bit better with White against Mevel at the 1994
Maromme Open with 9 \textbf{\textit{h}h3}, but he was still fortunate to escape with a
draw after 9...\textbf{\textit{xh3} 10 gxh3 \textbf{\textit{h}h5}! 11 \textbf{\textit{we2} \textbf{\textit{wh4+ 12 \textbf{\textit{d}d1 0-0-0 13 \textbf{\textit{d}d2}
\textbf{\textit{he8} 14 \textbf{\textit{c}c2 \textbf{\textit{xc2} 15 \textbf{\textit{xc2} fxe6 16 \textbf{\textit{we4} \textbf{\textit{xf2} 17 \textbf{\textit{d}d3 \textbf{\textit{f}f6} 18 \textbf{\textit{we1} \textbf{\textit{xf3}
19 \textbf{\textit{g}g3 \textbf{\textit{xg3} 20 hxg3 exd5 when Black was a good pawn up.}}}

c1c) 7 \textbf{\textit{de2}? Neither will this one do, as was demonstrated in sparkling
fashion by the game...}

\textbf{Burovic – Monange}
\textbf{Torcy 1991}
7...\textit{\textblacksquare}b4!

Strangely, it was the wonder tactician Shirov who passed over this chance in favour of the inferior 7...f\textit{x}e6? against Bologan in 1997, a game we shall be seeing later on in the 7 \textit{\textblacksquare}e3 section.

8 \textit{\textblacksquare}g3

No other move to cope with the threats to c2 and d3.

8...\textit{\textblacksquare}c2+ 9 \textit{\textblacksquare}f2 \textit{\textblacksquare}g6 10 \textit{\textblacksquare}e3

10...\textit{\textblacksquare}c5!

Far superior to taking the rook. Black correctly interprets the situation as one to favour dynamics and attack over materialism, and sets his sights on the White king.

11 \textit{\textblacksquare}a3 \textit{\textblacksquare}xe3 12 \textit{\textblacksquare}xe3 \textit{\textblacksquare}g4+! 13 fxg4

13 \textit{\textblacksquare}e2 allowed 13...\textit{\textwhitesquare}g5, like the game, or even 13...\textit{\textwhitesquare}xd4 14 \textit{\textwhitesquare}xd4 \textit{\textblacksquare}xd4 15 fxg4 \textit{\textblacksquare}xb2 with a splendid game.

13...\textit{\textwhitesquare}g5+ 14 \textit{\textblacksquare}f3

14 \textit{\textblacksquare}e2 \textit{\textwhitesquare}xg4+ 15 \textit{\textblacksquare}e1 \textit{\textblacksquare}b4+ 16 \textit{\textblacksquare}f2 \textit{\textblacksquare}f4+ 17 \textit{\textblacksquare}e2 0-0! and the attack kills him, or 14 \textit{\textblacksquare}f2 \textit{\textblacksquare}f4+ 15 \textit{\textblacksquare}f3 \textit{\textwhitesquare}xd4+ 16 \textit{\textblacksquare}e1 \textit{\textblacksquare}b4+ 17 \textit{\textblacksquare}e2 \textit{\textwhitesquare}xb2+ and Black wins.

14...f\textit{x}e6!

Open f file now.

15 \textit{\textblacksquare}d3 0-0+ 16 \textit{\textblacksquare}f5

Or 16 \textit{\textblacksquare}e2 \textit{\textwhitesquare}xg4+ 17 \textit{\textblacksquare}d2 \textit{\textwhitesquare}xd4 and wins.

16...exf5

Only a pawn behind, now!

17 dxc5 \textit{\textblacksquare}xg4+ 18 \textit{\textblacksquare}g3

On 18 \textit{\textblacksquare}e2 \textit{\textblacksquare}ae8+ is curtains.

18...h5! 19 h3

Nothing better.
19...h4+ 20 ♗h2 g3+ 21 ♗g1 ♗e3 mate

Some advert.

c1d) 7 ♗e3

This has become established as the almost necessary line. From what you have just seen happen to the other White seventh moves, that may not surprise you.

Now these moves have been tried:

c1d1) 7...♗b4!?
c1d2) 7...♗e7!?
c1d3) 7...fxe6!?
c1d4) 7...♗b4!?

Although the fourth alternative has become the most popular, it is by no means out of the question that each of the others is worth a go.
c1d1) 7...\(\square_b4!!\)

This move has the virtue of forcing the White knight to the bum a3 square. In the main variation, Black will have to rely on long term gambits and weaknesses to have any chance of rendering this approach viable.

Kovalev – Meyer
1996

\[ 8 \square_a3 \]

The acid test must be 8 exf7+ \(\text{\text Captures}f7\) 9 \(\square a3 \text{\text Dd6}, \text{\text when Black, two full pawns in arrears, intends ...\text{\text Be8}}\), ...\(\text{\text Bd7}, \text{\text ...Be7} and a swift doubling on the e file. The knight at b4, in conjunction with the bishop at f5, is exerting a powerful grip on the White queenside. But White is well up in material here.

Never yet seen, it needs to be tested out.

Do not, as White, follow the lead of Mr Sarkar in his 2000 game with Taghian from the Saratoga Springs: 9 \(\square c3\)? \(\text{\text Dc2+} 10 \text{\text Ff2 Wf7!!} 11 \text{\text Ff4 Ed8!!} 12 \text{\text Ge2 Gh5!!} 13 \text{\text Be5

\[ \text{\text 13...Wxe5!} 14 \text{\text Wxc2} (14 \text{\text dxe5 \text Axc5+ splatters}) 14...\text{\text Axc5!} 15 \text{\text De4} \]

Desperation. 15...Axd4! 16 \(\text{\text Ae1 Axb4+} 17 \text{\text Dc3 Axe4} 18 \text{\text fxe4 Ac4+} 19 \text{\text Ad1 Be1+} and White resigned.
In Mazi – Wallner, St Veit Open 2000 White threw in the check; 8 ♜a4+ c6 and then 9 ♜a3. Instead of the consistent 9...fxe6, play went 9...♗d6 10 exf7+ ♜xf7 11 ♖b3 ♕e8+ 12 ♜f2 and Black went nuts with 12...♗d3+, and soon lost. He could perhaps have made a game of it with 12...a5.

8...fxe6

Black has no better move, but 8...♕e7 would lead to a note considered in 7...♕e7. Now he’s only one pawn behind for the bind.

9 g4

Weakening, but it serves to get his pieces out. In Solozhenkin – Gouret, French Team Championships 1997, White moved the knight straight out with 9 ♗h3 and the Swiss lopped it off; 9...♖xh3 10 gxh3 ♕e7 11 ♖d2 0-0 12 ♖e2 c6 13 0-0 ♔e8. With his doubled, isolated pawns, White’s extra means little here. 14 ♖h1 ♕d8 15 ♔e1 ♗d6 16 ♖g1 ♗h5 17 f4 a5 18 ♖g4 ♖xf4 19 ♖xf4 ♖xf4 20 ♖xe6+ ♖h8 21 ♕e4 ♕e7 22 ♕ae1 ♖b8 23 ♕e2 ♖f4 24 ♕g2 ♕xf4 25 ♕f5 ♕f8 26 ♕g5 ♕d1 and they agreed it drawn.

9...♗g6 10 ♕h3 ♖d6

Now 12 c5 ♖bd5 neatly hits e3.

11 ♕a4+

In Volosin – Donka, Hungarian Championship 1999 White dispensed with the check and after 11 ♕b3!? a5! 12 c5 Black experienced a rush of
blood to the head and played 12...<f4>bd5?? leaving him with insufficient compensation after 13 cxd6 0-0 14 <f4>f2 a4 15 <f4>d1. By analogy with the line suggested at move 12 of Kovalev – Meyer, he ought to have preferred 12...<f4>e7!

11...<f4>c6 12 <f4>b3!?

![Chessboard Diagram]

12...<f4>a5?

Now White soon developed a winning game with 13 <f4>d2 c5 14 <f4>b5 0-0-0 15 a3 <f4>b8 16 <f4>c1 and the knight was won.

Instead, the as yet untried 12...a5!? is much more consequent, with Black maintaining his dominant b4 knight and, it would not surprise me, reasonable chances in the complex middlegame which lies ahead.

Black may have rejected that because of the critical line 13 c5 <f4>e7 14 <f4>x e6 but after 14...<f4>f7 15 <f4>e5 0-0 rather remarkably, White’s queen is in a bit of a pickle.

Meantime, he is undeveloped, has lost time with his queen’s adventures and his king is still in the centre. Plus, the tandem of the b4 knight and the g6 bishop are keeping the a3 knight right out of it.

Black, through accuracy, may yet hope to demonstrate excellent gambit play, e.g. 16 <f4>g5 <f4>d7! 17 <f4>f5 <f4>e6 18 <f4>e6+ <f4>h8. Here if White goes for the throat he could end up regretting it, i.e.19 h4 <f4>d5! 20 h5 <f4>e8 and his escapades have left him hamstrung, e.g. 21 f4 <f4>xg5 22 fxg5 <f4>f7 and wins.

Since the immediate grab at e6 at move 14 was not advantageous, we might look at 14 <f4>g5!??. But 14...<f4>fd5! is a powerful reply as 15 <f4>x e6 <f4>d7 16 <f4>xg7+ (retreats allow the killer nudge 16...a4, and the e3 bishop drops.) 16...<f4>f7 17 <f4>f5 a4 18 <f4>c4 <f4>e6 and White must lose a piece.

If White declines the critical 13 c5, then Black has by far the better co-ordinated game, in return for a pawn.

But, yes it’s a mess.

c1d2) 7...<f4>e7!?
Black hopes to expedite rapid queenside castling.

Clearly, the drawback, as in the $5 \text{d}f3 \text{we}7$ line of the Icelandic Gambit, is the blocking in of his king bishop, a problem which he would not experience had he first played $\text{d}b4+$.

Andreev – Kasakov, Russian Championship 1996, continued $8 \text{exf7+ wxf7 9 d}d3$ but after $9...wg6! 10 xf5 \text{wxf5 11 d}5 \text{e}e7$ Black would have had interesting counterchances.

A suggested line instead is $9 \text{c}c3 0-0-0 10 \text{d}d3$ when attempts by Black to force the pace through sacrifices look not quite sufficient, e.g. $10...\text{xd}3 11 \text{xd}3 \text{b}8$, planning $...\text{e}5. 12 \text{d}5 \text{b}4 13 \text{w}d2 \text{g}6 14 0-0-0$ and the attack with $14...\text{fxd}5$ may be beaten off, viz, $15 \text{cxd}5 \text{xd}5 16 \text{w}f2 \text{xd}1+ 17 \text{xd}1 \text{e}7 18 \text{e}2 \text{d}8+ 19 \text{e}1$.

But why not play $8...\text{xf7}$ (?)

Dworakowski – Moll
Groningen Open 1997

The game continued...

$9 \text{f}2 \text{e}8$

In Nemec – Cisler, Czech Team Championships 1997 Black tried $9...\text{d}8$, with some success after $10 \text{g}4 \text{xg}4+! 11 \text{fxg}4 \text{w}h4+ 12 \text{e}2 \text{xg}4+$
13 \( \textit{\textbf{f3}} \text{xf3+} \) 14 \( \textit{\textbf{xf3}} \text{wh5+} \) 15 \( \textit{\textbf{f2}} \text{xd1} \) etc. But there are many unanswered questions re alternative tenth moves for White.

10 \( \textit{\textbf{wd2}} \text{wd7} \)

Stepping aside. In Jelen – Mora Herrera, ICCF e mail 1998 Black was less successful with 10...\( \textit{\textbf{db4}} \) 11 \( \textit{\textbf{a3}} \text{g8} \) 12 c5!? \( \textit{\textbf{bd5}} \) 13 \( \textit{\textbf{c4}} \text{we6} \) 14 \( \textit{\textbf{e1}} \text{b6} \) 15 \( \textit{\textbf{e2}} \text{bx5} \) 16 \( \textit{\textbf{g3}} \text{xd4} \) 17 \( \textit{\textbf{xd4}} \text{xe1+} \) 18 \( \textit{\textbf{xe1}} \text{xe1} \) 19 \( \textit{\textbf{xe1}} \text{xb1} \) 20 a3 and he had insufficient compensation for the pawn.

11 \( \textit{\textbf{c3}} \)

11...\( \textit{\textbf{xe3!}} \)

Yet another such sac!

12 \( \textit{\textbf{xe3}} \)

12 \( \textit{\textbf{xe3}} \text{xd4} \) and the threats of ...\( \textit{\textbf{c2}} \) and the imminent ...\( \textit{\textbf{c5}} \) leaves White up the creek, e.g. 13 \( \textit{\textbf{d1}} \text{c5} \) 14 b4 \( \textit{\textbf{e8}} \).

12...\( \textit{\textbf{c5!}} \)

...\( \textit{\textbf{e8}} \) is coming.

13 \( \textit{\textbf{dx5}} \text{g4+!} \) 14 \( \textit{\textbf{e2}} \)

14 f3g4 \( \textit{\textbf{e8+}} \) and the queen goes.

14...\( \textit{\textbf{we6+}} \) 15 \( \textit{\textbf{d1}} \text{e3+} \) 16 \( \textit{\textbf{e1}} \text{d8} \)

Not 16...\( \textit{\textbf{xf1?}} \) 17 \( \textit{\textbf{d5}} \).

17 \( \textit{\textbf{d5}} \text{xf1} \) 18 \( \textit{\textbf{e2}} \text{wh6+} \) 19 f4 \( \textit{\textbf{xd5!}} \) 20 \( \textit{\textbf{xf1}} \text{d4} \)

The king hunt continues. If now 21 g3 then, e.g. 21...\( \textit{\textbf{we6}} \)

21 \( \textit{\textbf{e2}} \text{xc4+} \) 22 \( \textit{\textbf{d1}} \text{g4} \) 23 h3 \( \textit{\textbf{d4+}} \) 24 \( \textit{\textbf{e1}} \text{xe2} \) 25 \( \textit{\textbf{xe2}} \text{g6} \) 26 f5 \( \textit{\textbf{g3+}} \) 27 \( \textit{\textbf{f1}} \text{f4} \) 28 \( \textit{\textbf{g1}} \text{d4} \) 29 \( \textit{\textbf{h5+}} \text{f8} \) 30 \( \textit{\textbf{e1}} \)

Almost getting his act together, but not quite.

30...\( \textit{\textbf{wh4!}} \) 31 \( \textit{\textbf{d1}} \text{xe4!} \) 32 \( \textit{\textbf{f2}} \text{xe1}+! \)

Black finishes sweetly.

33 \( \textit{\textbf{xe1}} \text{f3+} \) 34 \( \textit{\textbf{f1}} \text{xe1} \) 35 \( \textit{\textbf{xe1}} \text{we3+} \) 36 \( \textit{\textbf{e2}} \text{c1+} \) 0-1
At move 8 White has tried others. 8 a3?! 0-0-0 9 w.d2 Qxd4! 10 Qxd4 wxe6+ 11 Qc2 c5 12 Qe3 cxd4 13 wxe6+ Qxe6 was much in Black’s favour in Borge – Martin, Iceland 1995.

8 Qd3, gives Black good play for a pawn after 8...wxe6 9 Qxf5 wxe3+! 10 w.e2 Qxe2+ 11 Qxe2 g6 12 Qc2 0-0-0.

In Malmstrom – Bailen, E mail Teams event 1998, White did well after 8 d5 0-0-0 9 g4 Qxe6 10 w.e2 Qxd5 11 cxd5 Qxd5 12 Qd2 wh4+ 13 Qf2 Qxf2+ 14 Qxf2 Qc5+ 15 Qg3 h5 16 Qc3 when the Black initiative was insufficient for the piece. But just 9...Qg6, with ...Qb4 or ...wb4 to follow was well worth a go. I note that he had 8...Qb4. I do not advocate it, but after 9 Qa3 0-0-0 that too might work [see note to c1d1] 7...Qb4!!). In Frehen – Krivoshey, Oberwart Open 2000, White played 9 wa4 and 9...wb4+ 10 wxb4 Qxb4 11 Qa3 fxe6 12 dxe6 Qxe6 13 Qf2 Qd3+ 14 Qxd3 Qxd3 15 Qb5 Qxc4 16 Qc3 Qb4 17 Qge2 Qe8 18 Qd4 Qd2 and White resigned.

In Jelic – Stadler, Croatian Women’s Championships 1998 White played 8 Qf2 0-0-0 9 wa4 when 9...fxe6 was perhaps best. Play continued 9...wb4 10 wxb4 Qxb4 11 Qa3 fxe6 12 g4 Qg6 13 h4 Qd3+ 14 Qxd3 Qxd3 15 Qd1 Qxa3 16 Qxd3 Qxb2 17 g5 Qh5 18 Qe2 with White better. She won at move 36.

Mainka – Sariego, Bayamo 1995 saw 8 Qc3 0-0-0

9 Qf2

On 9 w.d2 not 9...Qxd4? of Varga – von Alversleben, Balatonbereny Open 1997, but rather 9...Qb4! is tactically justified as 10 0-0-0 wxe6 leaves Black neatly placed, e.g. 11 a3 Qc2 12 Qe4 Qxe4, or 11 g4 Qxg4! 12 fxg4 Qe4 and we get the h1 trinket. 13 Qg5 Qxh1 14 Qxd8 Qxd8 15 h3 Qe7 with equality, being a sample line.

Lastly, 11 d5 Qxa2+! 12 Qxa2 wa6 and 13 b4? will lose the e3 bishop to 13...wa3+.

In Winiwarter – Krivoshey, Oberwart Open 2000 Black did alright with 9...fxe6 10 0-0-0 wb4 11 g4 Qg6 12 h4 Qxd4! 13 Qxd4 e5 and he regained the piece with great effect and won at move 21. In Schiestl –
Feistenerauer Austria 2000, Black tried 9...\textbf{b}4 10 g4 \textbf{x}xe6 and a draw resulted after sharp play: 11 d5 \textbf{a}a5 12 b3 c6 13 0-0-0 exd5 14 g5 \textbf{h}h5 15 \textbf{d}d5 \textbf{a}a3+ 16 \textbf{b}b2 \textbf{c}c6 17 \textbf{h}h3 \textbf{a}a5 18 \textbf{b}b1 \textbf{c}c5 19 \textbf{x}xc5 \textbf{x}xc5.

9...\textbf{b}4!?

Threatening more the d pawn, through the threat to capture twice on d4, than the b pawn. Jelica and Stadler had played each other before in the 1997 Croatian Womens Championship, and there, via the move order 8 \textbf{f}2 0-0-0 9 \textbf{c}c3 they reached this position.

After 9...fxe6!? 10 \textbf{a}a4 play went 10...\textbf{b}8 (10...a6) 11 \textbf{d}d1 \textbf{f}f7! 12 d5 \textbf{g}g4+ (12...exd5!) 13 \textbf{e}e2 (13 fxg4 \textbf{c}c2+) 13...\textbf{x}xe3 14 dxc6

14...\textbf{x}xd1?? (14...\textbf{c}5! was the move.) 15 \textbf{b}5! \textbf{c}c3+ 16 bxc3 b6 17 \textbf{a}a6 \textbf{d}d3+ 1-0. Black had clear improvements at moves 12 and 14, and I would have preferred 10...\textbf{f}7! immediately.

10 \textbf{g}e2

In Gajsin – Krivoshey MK Cafe Cup, 1998, White chose 10 a3,

but 10...\textbf{x}xb2+ 11 \textbf{g}e2 fxe6 12 g4 \textbf{c}c2 13 \textbf{c}c1 \textbf{x}c1 14 \textbf{x}xc1 \textbf{d}d3 15 g5 \textbf{d}d7 left a middlegame with Black’s chances by no means the worse. 16 c5 e5 17 d5 \textbf{d}d4 18 c6 bxc6 19 \textbf{d}d1 \textbf{x}xe2 20 \textbf{x}xe2 c5 21 f4 \textbf{d}d6 was how it went, and Black won at move 57.

10...\textbf{x}xe6
Leading to romantic adventures. For the record, 10...fxe6 looks interesting. In Zozulia – Tolkachova, Alusha 1999 White played 11 \textit{wb3} and after 11...\textit{wb3} 12 axb3 \textit{ac2} 13 \textit{g4}, Black ought now to have played 13...\textit{h6}, to put a cork on any \textit{White} activity. Instead her 13...\textit{xb3} let \textit{White} get on top with 14 \textit{g5 \textit{h5}} 15 \textit{c1}! A move she may have underestimated. 15...\textit{ac2} 16 d5 exd5 17 \textit{h3+ \textit{b8}} 18 exd5 and the knight had to let a7 be taken with check and \textit{Black} lost at move 45.

Also 10...\textit{xc4} 11 \textit{ag3} \textit{exe6} 12 d5 \textit{xd5} 13 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} (13...\textit{xd5} 14 \textit{ac4!}) 14 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} 15 \textit{ac4} \textit{e5} 16 \textit{f4} \textit{xe3} gives \textit{Black} good play for his slight material deficit.

11 b3 \textit{a5}

Off on a journey.

12 a3 \textit{e7} 13 \textit{d2}

Gunning after her still.

13...\textit{f5} 14 b4 \textit{wb6} 15 c5 \textit{wc6} 16 b5 \textit{we8} 17 \textit{wa4 \textit{xc5}} 18 dxc5 \textit{xd2} 19 \textit{xa7 \textit{xc4}} 20 c6 bxc6 21 \textit{wa8+ \textit{d7}} 22 \textit{xc6+ \textit{e8}} 23 \textit{wa8+ \textit{d7}}

\textit{Drawn}

I am not at all sure that I believe \textit{Black}'s position towards the end of that, and would recommend an alternative at move 10.

\textit{c1d3}) 7...\textit{fxe6}!?

\textit{Black} cuts his losses with this natural recapture.

8 \textit{c3 \textit{wd7}}

In fact, as earlier mentioned, the following position arose via the move order 7 \textit{e2? \textit{fxe6}?! but after 8 \textit{bc3 \textit{wd7}} we arrive back at the position we here assume to have been reached by 7 \textit{xe3 \textit{fxe6} 8 \textit{c3 \textit{wd7}}.}

\textit{Bologan – Shirov}
\textit{Dresden Cup 1997}

Bologan chose 9 a3. A useful move for both attack and defence. Alternatives do not look better, e.g. 9 \textit{d3 \textit{xd4} 10 \textit{xf5 \textit{xf5}} 11 \textit{xd7+ \textit{xd7} 12 0-0-0+ \textit{c6} and \textit{Black} was fine in Tindall – West, Australian
Championship 1997, or 9 \( \text{dxe2} \ \text{f4} \ 10 \text{f2} \text{f5} \ 11 \text{c1} \text{xe3} \ 12 \text{xe3} \text{e5}\) with excellent play.

The weakening 9 \( g4 \text{g6} \) was tried in Krabbe – Geuss, Correspondence 1998 10 \( g5? \text{h5} \ 11 \text{ge2} \text{d4} \ (11...\text{d4} 12 \text{e4}) \ 12 \text{h3} \text{f7} \ 13 0-0 \text{e5} \ 14 \text{b3} \text{f5} \ 15 \text{xf5} \ (15 \text{g2} \) might have been better.) \ 15...\text{xf5} \ 16 \text{d5} \text{e5}\)!

17 \( f4 \) (17 \( \text{xf4} \text{xf3}+\ 18 \text{h1} \text{h3} \ 19 \text{f2} \text{h4} \) would be disastrous for White. Other 18th moves will grant Black a return of material and active play.) 17...\text{g4}+ \ 18 \text{h1} \text{xc3} \ 19 \text{xc3} \text{g6} \) and Black’s active and co-ordinated pieces were quite sufficient to give him equal chances.

Alternatively, White could have played 11 \( \text{h3} \). Then Black, in view of the response d4-d5 to his ...0-0-0, would have to shift his plans to ...0-0, but the weaknesses in the White kingside ought to help him much, e.g. 11...\text{f7} \ 12 \text{a3}. To stop the irritant ...\text{b4s}. 12 \text{ge2} \) would transpose back to Krabbe – Geuss. 12...\text{f4} \ 13 \text{e4} \text{d8} \ 14 \text{fl}. How else to complete development? 14...\text{e7} 15 \text{h3} \text{h3} 16 \text{h3} 0-0 \ 17 0-0 \text{xe4}! \ 18 \text{xe4} \text{e5} \) and Black is doing fine.

10 \( \text{d3} \) looks better, as in Videki – Ljubicic, Split 1999, when Black chose 10...\text{f7}, and went on to lose.

9...0-0-0 10 \( \text{ge2} \)
Here 10...\(\text{\textit{we}}8!\) is probably best, to tee up the ...\(\text{e}5\) advance at its most effective: when the d pawn is pinned against the White queen. We have only one theoretical example, Batsanin – Saulin, Russia 1996 11 \(w_4 a4\) \(d_7?!\), but much more consequent was 11...\(e5!\), e.g. 12 d5 \(d_4!\) and a forcing line leads to great Black advantage. 13 \(x_8 e8\) \(c_2+\) 14 \(f_2\) \(x_8 e8\) 15 \(c_1\) \(x_3 e3\) 16 \(x_3 e3\) \(e4!\) Even without queens Black has a strong initiative. 17 \(f_4\) \(g_4+\) 18 \(d_2\) \(e3+\) 19 \(e_1\) \(f_2\), etc.

10...\(g_5\)

Not really recommendable...but right up Alexei’s street! White ought really now to have taken on \(g_5\) and Black, even with Shirov handling the pieces, would be struggling to justify a two pawn investment there. Instead came...

11 \(w_4 a4\) \(w_7 g 7\) 12 0-0-0 \(d_7\) 13 \(b_4\) \(b_6\) 14 \(w_3 b 3\) \(e 7\)

with a bizarre setting – something of a druggie’s Four Pawns Attack against the Alekhine Defence – which White went on to win.

c1d4) 7...\(b_4+?!\) The usual treatment. Black hurries his pieces out into the world.

After some early spectacular successes, I must say that it is not clear to me that this is definitely Black’s best option.
c1d41) 8 ćc3

c1d42) 8 ćd2

After 8 ćf2 fxe6 the White king is a tad vulnerable on the newly opened f file, as White perhaps underestimated when continuing with 9 g4? in Timoschenko – Damasao, EU Cup, Panormo 2001.

![Chessboard diagram]

The Portuguese took him apart with his Portuguese—9...ćxg4+! Since 10 fxg4 ćh4+ is devastating, the GM struggled on with 10 će2 ćxe3 11 ćxe3 e5! 13 će2 exd4+ 13 ćf2 d3 when he could have already resigned, and did at move 22.

8 ćc3

Wang – Damasao
China – Portugal Match, Macao, 1996

![Chessboard diagram]

8...će7 9 d5?!
Later this move was frowned upon. See why.
9...0-0-0 10 ća4
10...\(\texttt{\&xd5}!\)

Very efficient. Chucking a rook at him here was the interpretation in two other games, viz Solomon – Gluzman, Australian Championship 1998, 10...\(\texttt{\&xd5}\) 11 cxd5 \(\texttt{\&xd5}\) and White fought him off with 12 \(\texttt{\&d2} \texttt{\&xe6+ 13} \texttt{\&c2} \texttt{\&e3} 14 \texttt{\&xe3} \texttt{\&xe3} 15 \texttt{\&f1} \texttt{\&d8} 16 \texttt{\&d1} \texttt{\&xd1+ 17} \texttt{\&xd1} \texttt{\&c5} 18 \texttt{\&e1} \texttt{\&d4} 19 \texttt{\&d1} \texttt{\&e6} 20 \texttt{\&e3} \texttt{\&d6} 21 \texttt{\&d3} and 1-0 in 38 moves.

In Feijoo Novoa – Milla de Marco Burgas Open 1998, Black varied with 12...\(\texttt{\&b6} 13 \texttt{\&d1} \texttt{\&d8} 14 \texttt{\&e2} \texttt{\&xe6} 15 \texttt{\&f1} \texttt{\&c4} 16 \texttt{\&xc4} \texttt{\&xc4+ 17} \texttt{\&xe2} \texttt{\&d4} 18 \texttt{\&c1} \texttt{\&d3} 19 \texttt{\&f2} \texttt{\&c5} 20 \texttt{\&e4} \texttt{\&c2+ 21} \texttt{\&f1} \texttt{\&xe4} 22 \texttt{\&xe4} 23 \texttt{\&e1} \texttt{\&xg2+ 24} \texttt{\&f1} \texttt{\&e3+ 25} \texttt{\&e1} \texttt{\&xe4} 26 \texttt{\&g3} \texttt{\&c2+ 27} \texttt{\&f1} \texttt{\&e3+ Drawn.}

Detailed analysis of neither game is warranted, as 10...\(\texttt{\&d5}!\) is overwhelming.

11 cxd5 \(\texttt{\&h4+} 12 \texttt{\&d1}\)

In Pita Romero – Moreno Tejera, Spanish under 14 Championships 1999, White did not hold out long after 12 \(\texttt{\&e2} (12 \texttt{\&g3} \texttt{\&xc3+ 13} \texttt{\&xc3} \texttt{\&xa4} 12...\(\texttt{\&d4+} 13 \texttt{\&xd4} (13 \texttt{\&d2} \texttt{\&xc3+ 14} \texttt{\&xc3} \texttt{\&xe2+ 15} \texttt{\&b3} \texttt{\&c2+ wins}) 13...\(\texttt{\&xd4} 14 \texttt{\&g4} (14 \texttt{\&b3} \texttt{\&c5} 15 \texttt{\&h3} \texttt{\&he8} 16 \texttt{\&e1} \texttt{\&xh3} 17 \texttt{\&g3} \texttt{\&f2+ 18 \texttt{\&f1} \texttt{\&xf3+ wins}) 14...\(\texttt{\&d3+ 15} \texttt{\&e1} \texttt{\&xc3+ 16} \texttt{\&xc3} \texttt{\&xa4}.\)

12...\(\texttt{\&xd5+!} 13 \texttt{\&xd5} \texttt{\&e1 mate.}\)
An emphatic reminder, from a bygone century, that leased colonies are not always happily relinquished.

9 a3 was not successful in Himdan – West, Elista Olympiad 1998: 9...\texttt{txc3+} 10 bxc3 0-0 11 \texttt{ld3 xe6} 12 \texttt{xf5 xf5} 13 \texttt{wb1 e6} 14 \texttt{d3 fe8} 15 \texttt{f2 a5} 16 \texttt{g5 d7} 17 \texttt{f4 xec4} 18 \texttt{h3 xed5}, although White managed to draw. In Grischuk – Chow, Menorca 1996 there were weird developments after 9 a3 xed6 10 f2 xc3 11 d5 xed6 12 bxc3 e5 13 wa4+ d7 14 wb4 b6 15 a4 0-0 16 xd6 cxd6 17 xex5 dxex5 18 d3 aac8 19 de2 fe8 20 e3 e4! 21 fxe4 xed4 22 xed4 f5 23 g3 xed4 24 xex4 xex4 25 xhd1 and they too called it a draw.

9 wa4 was tried in Dutreeuw – Rocha, European Championships Batumi 1999. Not at all clear to me why she should belong on a4, and after 9...\texttt{hx6} 10 f2 0-0-0 (10...\texttt{txc3}? 11 bxc3 was an inferior choice in Hadzimanolis – Paylogianni, Aegean Open 2000) 11 xe1

Black decided it was fun time. 11...\texttt{xex4!} 12 xed4 xex4 13 g4. Desperation, but 13 wa7 xac5 14 wa8+ d7 15 xex8 xec2+ was terminal. 13...xex4+! 14 fxg4 wh4+ 15 gh2 xg4+ 16 f2 wh4+ 17 g2 xe1 18 xa7 xac3 19 bxc3 xf5 20 xec2 xd8 Last gun out. 21 wa8+ xd7 22 xb7 xed3+ 23 f3 xfl 24 b5+ xed7 25 eg5+ xe8 26 xd4 xd2+ 27 g2 xe4+ 28 g1 xd4+ and White resigned.

9 xd2 has scored well.
After 9...0-0-0 10 0-0-0 fxe6 11 \( \text{Q} \text{ge}2 \) Black got nowhere near to equality in Varga – Liardet, Lenk Open 2000 with 11...\( \text{Q} \text{g}6 \) 12 \( \text{W} \text{e}1 \) e5 13 d5 \( \text{Q} \text{a}5 \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{g}3 \) \( \text{B} \text{he}8 \) 15 \( \text{K} \text{d}2 \) b6 16 h4 h6 17 h5 \( \text{Q} \text{h}7 \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{ge}4 \) c6 19 \( \text{K} \text{d}3! \) cxd5 20 \( \text{Q} \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{g} \text{xf}6 \) 21 \( \text{K} \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{K} \text{xd}2+ \) 22 \( \text{W} \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{W} \text{c}5 \) 23 \( \text{K} \text{h}7 \) \( \text{O} \text{xc}4 \) 24 \( \text{W} \text{c}3 \) \( \text{K} \text{xd}5 \) 25 \( \text{K} \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{W} \text{xd}5 \) 26 b3 and Black resigned.

He did better in Stefansson – Carrasco Las Palmas Open 1999: 11...h6 12 g4 \( \text{K} \text{h}7 \) 13 \( \text{W} \text{e}1 \) \( \text{b} \text{b}8 \) 14 h4 \( \text{f} \text{f}8 \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{g}3 \) \( \text{K} \text{d}7 \). But the convert from the Black cause was not the best choice of opponent for this opening, and after 16 c5! \( \text{Q} \text{a}5 \) 17 \( \text{W} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{W} \text{f}6 \) 18 \( \text{O} \text{ce}4 \) \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{f}3 \) 19 \( \text{K} \text{g}2 \) \( \text{K} \text{x} \text{e}2 \) 20 \( \text{Q} \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{O} \text{c}4 \) 21 \( \text{K} \text{g}1 \) the bishop at b4 was a real problem. Black set about retrieving it with 21...c6 22 \( \text{K} \text{h}3 \) e5 23 \( \text{K} \text{h}2 \) \( \text{K} \text{a}8 \) 24 a3 \( \text{K} \text{a}5 \) 25 b4 \( \text{K} \text{c}7 \) 26 \( \text{O} \text{xc}3 \) \( \text{K} \text{b}8 \) 27 d5 cxd5 28 \( \text{O} \text{xd}5 \) and White's superior piece placement and structure led him to victory at move 46.

\[ \text{c1d411} \) 9 \( \text{K} \text{d}3 \) has been by far the most usual move.

Campora – Ribeiro, Cordoba Open 1994 went 9...\( \text{K} \text{xd}3 \) 10 \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{d}3 \) 0-0-0 11 0-0-0 \( \text{Q} \text{e}5 \) whereupon Daniel decided to give his queen for assorted Black units. Still, after 12 dxe5 \( \text{K} \text{x} \text{d}3 \) 13 \( \text{K} \text{x} \text{d}3 \) \( \text{K} \text{xc}3 \) 14 \( \text{K} \text{c}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{g}8 \) 15 exf7 \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{f}7 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e}7 \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{f}5 \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{f}5 \) 19 f4 \( \text{K} \text{d}8 \) he never looked like being the winner, and they drew in 47 moves. In Smith – Bennett, New Zealand Championship 1993 White avoided the effectiveness of the ...\( \text{Q} \text{e}5 \)
trick by varying with 11 h3 and after 11...\textit{xe6} 12 g5 \textit{d7} 13 0-0-0 \textit{h8} 14 f2 e5 the acceptance was now good for White 15 dxe5 \textit{xd3} 16 xxd3 xdx3 17 exf6 xc3 18 bxc3 gxf6 19 c2 ed8 20 d4, etc.

In De Firmian – Vescovi, Bermuda Triangle 1996 Black took not the bishop but the pawn,

9...\textit{xe6} 10 f2

10 \textit{e2} 0-0-0 11 a3, as in Almasi – Adorjan, Zalakaros 1992, ought to lose to 11...\textit{xd4}! 12 xdx4 xdx4 13 axb4 xdx3! 14 xxa7 b8 15 a4 xe8 16 b5 xc4!.

After 10 \textit{d2} 0-0-0 11 g2 xe8 12 f2 c5! 13 0-0-0, as in Ellis – Simpson Correspondence 1999, Black ought to have been okay with 13...\textit{xd4} 14 xdx4 xdx4 15 h1 c5. If 13 dxc5 then 13...e5 would have advantageously regained the piece.

10...0-0-0 11 ge2 xe8

12 \textit{c1}!

This is probably best. 12 \textit{d2}, as in Bouard – Eliet, French Team Championships 1993, ought to be met by 12...g5! This is untried but analysis indicates Black’s use of the g pawn as an attacking unit, or bait, generates good attacking play, viz:

a) 13 a3 xc3 14 xc3 g4 15 h1 gxg3 16 xg3 h5 17 xh7 xc4! wins.

b) 13 xg5 xc4 14 xdx4 xdx4 15 e3 dd8 16 e2 c5 with strong pressure, or here 14 f4 c5 15 f1 xe2 16 xe2 xc3 17 bxc3 h5 with more than enough compensation for the pawn.

c) 13 d5 e5 14 xg5 xdx3+ 15 xd3 xg4+! 16 fxg4 xg5 17 h3 c5+ and the initiative is fearsome, e.g. 18 f1 f5 19 a4 e3 20 h4 xg4! 21 xe3 xdx5 22 f2 xe2 wins, or 18 e1 f5 19 f1 c6 Blowing all lines open!. 20 gxf5 f7 and White, three pawns ahead, is getting strafed. 21 g4 xe3 22 d2 cxd5! Must get at that king! 23 cxd5 d4+ 24 d1 xh3 25 c2 xdx5! 26 f4 e4+ 27 xe4 xdx2+ 28 xd2 b4+ 29 c3 g3 and the Black bombardment triumphs.
Nick de Firmian’s uncharacteristically restrained handling here proved apposite.

12...\textit{c}5 13 \textit{e}e1 \textit{xd}4 14 \textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}4 15 \textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}4 16 \textit{we}3 \textit{ed}8 17 \textit{ad}1 \textit{wd}7 18 \textit{c}2 \textit{c}6 Drawn.

After 8...\textit{we}7 9 \textit{d}3 I know of no game where the entirely plausible 9...\textit{xe}6 was played, and think that the theory of the gambit would benefit from some,
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\noindent e.g. 9 \textit{f}2 \textit{xd}3 10 \textit{xd}3 0-0-0 with ...\textit{e}5 in the offing or 9 \textit{xf}5 \textit{xf}5 with a rapid ...0-0-0 to follow.

Lastly, Black has tried
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\begin{center}
\textit{c}1d412) 8...\textit{xe}6, as in...
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textit{Sanchez – Benedetto}
\text{USA Correspondence 1995}
\end{center}
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9 \textit{ge}2

In Renner-Kraft Black responded to 9 \textit{wd}2 with 9...\textit{e}5 10 \textit{d}5 \textit{dd}4, but that looks over the top to me, although he managed to draw.
9...0-0

Black did not succeed in Dyce – O’Driscoll, Glorney Cup 1996 with 9...\text{\textit{W}}d7 10 \text{\textit{W}}b3 a5 and went on to lose after 11 a3 a4 12 \text{\textit{W}}d1 \text{\textit{A}}a5 13 \text{\textit{f}}f2 0-0 14 h3 \text{\textit{A}}xc3 15 \text{\textit{A}}xc3 \text{\textit{A}}a5 16 \text{\textit{A}}xa4 \text{\textit{A}}xc4 17 \text{\textit{A}}xc4 \text{\textit{A}}xa4 18 \text{\textit{W}}b3.

10 a3 \text{\textit{A}}e7 11 g4 \text{\textit{A}}g6 12 \text{\textit{A}}g2 e5 13 d5 \text{\textit{A}}a5 14 b3 c6! 15 0-0 \text{\textit{A}}xd5 16 \text{\textit{A}}xd5 \text{\textit{A}}xd5 17 \text{\textit{A}}xd5 \text{\textit{A}}e8

Good piece co-ordination and control of the c line and b1-h7 diagonal furnish Black here with good compensation. g3-g4 was also a bit of a weaker.

18 \text{\textit{A}}a2 \text{\textit{W}}c7 19 b4 \text{\textit{A}}c4 20 \text{\textit{W}}b3 \text{\textit{W}}d7 21 \text{\textit{A}}d1 a5! 22 \text{\textit{A}}f2 a4 23 \text{\textit{W}}c3 \text{\textit{A}}fd8 24 \text{\textit{W}}e1 \text{\textit{A}}f7 25 \text{\textit{A}}f1 \text{\textit{A}}xd5 26 \text{\textit{A}}c3 \text{\textit{W}}e6 27 \text{\textit{A}}xd5 Drawn.

c1d42) 8 \text{\textit{A}}d2

A rarer choice. Now, instead of 8...\text{\textit{W}}e7 which led to a White advantage in Pinha – Carvalho World Junior Championship 1996 after 9 a3 \text{\textit{W}}xe6 10 \text{\textit{f}}f2 \text{\textit{A}}xd2 11 \text{\textit{W}}xd2 0-0-0 12 \text{\textit{W}}c3, American Master Selby Anderson has advocated 8...0-0!? (8...\text{\textit{A}}xd4? 9 \text{\textit{A}}xd4 \text{\textit{W}}xd4 10 \text{\textit{W}}a4+ wins a bishop.) He supports his invention thus –
9 a3 \( \square \)xd4! 10 \( \square \)xd4 \( \blacksquare \)xd4 11 axb4 \( \blacksquare \)xb2 and now...

\[
\begin{array}{c}
9 a3 \( \square \)xd4! 10 \( \square \)xd4 \( \blacksquare \)xd4 11 axb4 \( \blacksquare \)xb2 and now...
\end{array}
\]

a) 12 exf7+ \( \blacksquare \)xf7 13 \( \blacksquare \)a4 \( \blacksquare \)e5+ 14 \( \blacksquare \)e2 \( \blacksquare \)d3 15 \( \blacksquare \)a3 \( \blacksquare \)d8 16 \( \blacksquare \)xa7 \( \blacksquare \)e7 17 \( \blacksquare \)c5 \( \blacksquare \)e6 18 \( \blacksquare \)f2 \( \blacksquare \)e5 19 \( \blacksquare \)a2 \( \blacksquare \)e3 20 \( \blacksquare \)d1 \( \blacksquare \)xe2+ 21 \( \blacksquare \)xe2 \( \blacksquare \)e3!, with the idea of 22...\( \blacksquare \)b3 and Black wins.

b) 12 b5 \( \blacksquare \)ae8! 13 \( \blacksquare \)c1 (Not 13 \( \blacksquare \)xa7 \( \blacksquare \)a8! wins) 13...\( \blacksquare \)xe6+ 14 \( \blacksquare \)e2 \( \blacksquare \)e5 15 \( \blacksquare \)b3! (The best chance. On 15 \( \blacksquare \)xa7 \( \blacksquare \)d3 16 \( \blacksquare \)a1 \( \blacksquare \)g5! 17 \( \blacksquare \)f4 \( \blacksquare \)g4 18 \( \blacksquare \)h3 \( \blacksquare \)g3+ 19 \( \blacksquare \)d1 \( \blacksquare \)f2 and Black dominates.) 15...\( \blacksquare \)d3 16 \( \blacksquare \)f4 \( \blacksquare \)d6 17 \( \blacksquare \)a3 (Black would also be better after 17 \( \blacksquare \)c5 \( \blacksquare \)d5 18 \( \blacksquare \)d1 \( \blacksquare \)g4! 19 \( \blacksquare \)a4! \( \blacksquare \)e3 20 \( \blacksquare \)d4 \( \blacksquare \)xe2 21 \( \blacksquare \)xd5 \( \blacksquare \)xd1 22 \( \blacksquare \)xd1 \( \blacksquare \)xd1+ 23 \( \blacksquare \)xd1 \( \blacksquare \)d8+ 24 \( \blacksquare \)c2 \( \blacksquare \)e1) 17...\( \blacksquare \)xf4 18 \( \blacksquare \)c5 \( \blacksquare \)e2+ 19 \( \blacksquare \)xe2 \( \blacksquare \)xe2 20 \( \blacksquare \)xe2 \( \blacksquare \)e8+ 21 \( \blacksquare \)d1 \( \blacksquare \)g4! 22 \( \blacksquare \)c2 \( \blacksquare \)xc4+ 23 \( \blacksquare \)b1 \( \blacksquare \)xb5+ 24 \( \blacksquare \)c1 (Or 24 \( \blacksquare \)b3 \( \blacksquare \)e3) 24...\( \blacksquare \)f2 25 \( \blacksquare \)g1 \( \blacksquare \)xc5+! with big superiority.

Or if White allows the fork at c2 with 10 axb4 \( \blacksquare \)c2+ 11 \( \blacksquare \)f2 Black’s best is now 11...\( \blacksquare \)e8!

With best play chances may be equal from here:

a) 12 \( \blacksquare \)c1? \( \blacksquare \)xe3 13 \( \blacksquare \)xe3 \( \blacksquare \)xe6+ 14 \( \blacksquare \)e4 \( \blacksquare \)e7 15 \( \blacksquare \)d3 \( \blacksquare \)d8 16 \( \blacksquare \)c2 \( \blacksquare \)xe4 17 \( \blacksquare \)xe4 \( \blacksquare \)xd3+ 18 \( \blacksquare \)xd3 \( \blacksquare \)xe4 19 \( \blacksquare \)c3 \( \blacksquare \)g5+ and wins, or if in this line 17 \( \blacksquare \)xe4 \( \blacksquare \)xe4 18 \( \blacksquare \)xe4 \( \blacksquare \)g5+ wins.

b) 12 exf7+? \( \blacksquare \)xf7 13 \( \blacksquare \)a3 \( \blacksquare \)xe3 14 \( \blacksquare \)xe3 \( \blacksquare \)d4 15 \( \blacksquare \)e2 \( \blacksquare \)f4! 16 \( \blacksquare \)g3 Nothing better. 16...\( \blacksquare \)g4+ 17 \( \blacksquare \)e1 \( \blacksquare \)xe3 18 \( \blacksquare \)xe3 \( \blacksquare \)g4 19 \( \blacksquare \)d4 19 \( \blacksquare \)gxf5 \( \blacksquare \)xe2+ 20 \( \blacksquare \)xe2 \( \blacksquare \)xb2 and Black is well on top.
c) 12 a3! Best, for it brings up an important extra defender 12...e6 13 e2 (There was also the defence of 13 e2 e3 14 d4 e4 15 xc4 e5 with unclear play.) 13...e3 14 e3 e3 15 e3 e7+ 16 f2 d8 A piece behind, Black can still keep White quite tied up. 17 c5 d7! 18 e1 d4 19 c1 d5 20 g4 g6 21 h3 e8 22 f2 b4! 23 e4 e4 24 x4 e4 25 c2 e2+! 26 e2 xg4+ and it is a perpetual check.

9 d5

...and there is only the one consistent response.
9...e8!

He proffers “...some grisly possibilities”.

a) 10 dxc6 e6 11 e2 e7 12 f2 e3 13 e3 c5 wins. Or 11 e2 e3 12 e3 c5+ 13 e2 (13 h4 d6+ 15 xf5 e3 and mate.) 13...e7+ 14 e4 e4 15 x4 e4+ 16 d2 e3 mate.

b) 10 g4 x6! 11 dxc6 d5! 12 cxd5 xd5 and the threats are mountainous.

c) 10 f2 e5 Ideas now of a juicy check at g4. 11 g4 f4+ 12 xg4 e6! 14 dxe6 d3+ 15 f3 e3+ 16 g2 f2+ 17 h3 xh2+ 18 g4 xg4 mate.

d) 10 e2
Again the developing option is the best move, and the least grisly possibility.

10...\(\text{\&}e5\)

Threatening mate.

11 \(\text{\&}d4\) \(fxe6\) 12 a3 \(\text{\&}f8\)!

Preservation rather than abandonment is, for once in this line, the order of the day.

13 \(dxe6\)

(Here 13 \(g4\)? runs into a typically violent refutation: 13...\(\text{\&}xg4\)! 14 \(fxg4\) \(\text{\&}xg4\) and ...\(exd5\) to follow).

Now Anderson suggests that the consequences of 13...\(\text{\&}g6\) 14 \(\text{\&}b3\) \(c5\) 15 \(dxc2\) \(\text{\&}xe6\) 16 0-0-0 \(\text{\&}e7\) 17 \(\text{\&}c2\) \(\text{\&}d8\) are excellent, with Black showing great piece co-ordination and initiative for his gambit pawn.

I find the opening of the centre rather obliging on White's part, and would advocate 13 \(\text{\&}b3\), instead.

d) 5 \(\text{\&}b5+\)

5...\(\text{\&}bd7\)

Can 5...\(c6\) be completely ruled out? Consider these two games:
6 dxc6 \textbf{w}a5+ (6...\textbf{d}xc6 is unplayed.) 7 \textbf{d}xc3 \textbf{d}xc6 8 \textbf{d}ge2

8 \textbf{d}d3 looks good. In Kadlec – Hrcka, Prievidza, 1998 White was a pawn ahead after 8...\textbf{d}xd3 9 \textbf{w}xd3 e6 10 \textbf{d}d2 \textbf{d}bd7 11 \textbf{d}ge2 \textbf{w}c7 12 \textbf{f}f4 \textbf{d}d6 13 \textbf{d}xd6 \textbf{w}xd6 14 0-0.

8...0-0-0 9 \textbf{d}xc6 bxc6 10 \textbf{d}d2 e5

In Adu – Schneider Donald Byrne Memorial 2002, they stopped the theoretical debate with 10...\textbf{w}b6 11 \textbf{a}a4 \textbf{w}a6 12 \textbf{c}c5 \textbf{w}b6 13 \textbf{a}a4 \textbf{a}a6 14 \textbf{c}c5 \textbf{w}b6 Drawn.

11 \textbf{e}e4

In Milgram – Vedrunes, 1992 Black won after 11 0-0 exd4 12 \textbf{e}e4 \textbf{w}b6 13 \textbf{d}2g3 \textbf{d}xe4 14 fxe4 \textbf{a}e6 15 \textbf{f}f4 h5! 16 \textbf{w}d3 h4 17 \textbf{e}e2 \textbf{g}4 18 \textbf{c}c1 h3 19 g3 \textbf{d}d7 20 \textbf{w}b3 f6.

11...\textbf{w}b6

In the 1994 French Correspondence game, Remise – Dournes Black chose 11...\textbf{w}b5 and play careered on wildly 12 \textbf{d}2c3 \textbf{w}xb2 13 \textbf{b}b1 \textbf{a}a3 14 \textbf{b}b3 \textbf{w}a5 15 \textbf{w}b1 \textbf{w}c7 16 \textbf{d}b5 \textbf{w}d7 17 \textbf{c}c3 \textbf{b}b8 18 \textbf{d}xa7 \textbf{d}xa7 19 \textbf{c}c5 \textbf{d}xc5 20 \textbf{d}xc5 \textbf{w}b7 21 \textbf{d}a5+ \textbf{d}b8 22 0-0, but Black won at move 42!

12 \textbf{d}4g3 \textbf{g}6 13 dxe5 \textbf{d}d5 13 \textbf{w}c1 \textbf{c}c5 15 \textbf{e}e4 \textbf{d}xe4 16 fxe4 \textbf{e}e3

An unwelcome guest.

17 \textbf{f}f4 \textbf{g}4 18 \textbf{d}d3 \textbf{g}1 19 \textbf{e}e2 \textbf{xd}3 20 \textbf{w}xg1 \textbf{d}d4 21 \textbf{c}c3 \textbf{w}b5+ 22 \textbf{e}e1 \textbf{d}xe4+ 23 \textbf{d}d2 \textbf{w}e2+ 24 \textbf{c}c1 \textbf{e}e3 25 \textbf{w}xe3 \textbf{x}e3 26 a3 \textbf{d}d8 White resigned.

Lovely gambit play.

And Pedersen – Rewitz, Denmark 1996, 8 \textbf{d}d2 0-0-0 9 a4!?
...threatening 10 ♕d5 to trap his queen.

9...♗c7

Black played 9...♗b6 in Camper – Flockhart, ICCF e mail, 1997, but he could have tried 9...e5!? to meet 10 ♕d5 with 10...♗b4.

10 ♖xc6 bxc6 (10...♗xc6!? 11 ♕g5) 11 f4 ♕xd4 12 ♕f3 ♕d8 13 ♕e5 e6 14 ♕e2 ♖b7 15 g4! ♖g6 16 ♕h4! ♕b4 17 0-0-0 ♕d4

17...♖xc3 and 18...♖e4 may have been a better chance.

18 ♕h5 ♖e4 19 ♖xe4 ♖xe4 20 ♕f3 with structural advantage and threats. White won at move 44.

You will not see 5...c6 at World Championship level, but lower down it might be worth a shot.

5...♖d7 6 ♖c4 leads us to lines similar to those considered after 3 ♖b5+ ♖d7 4 ♖c4, except that White has two extra moves.

So 5...♖bd7 they play.

This position may also arise from the move order 4 ♖b5+ ♖bd7 5 ♕f3 ♖f5.
d1) 6 Ʌc3

d2) 6 c4

d1) 6 Ʌc3

Georgiev – Gouret
Saint Quentin Open, 1998

6...a6 7 Ʌa4 b5 8 Ʌb3 Ʌb6
Reacquiring it.
10 Ʌge2 Ʌbd5 10 Ʌxd5 Ʌxd5 11 Ʌg3

Here 11...Ʌg6 has been seen, and the American Master Pickard’s suggestion of 11...g6!? is certainly worthy of attention too. Gouret chose...

11...Ʌc8!?

Novel idea. Black’s pieces later gradually clambered out.

12 a4 b4 13 0-0 e6 14 a5 Ʌe7 15 Ʌe4 0-0 16 Ʌd3 Ʌd7 17 Ʌc4 Ʌc8 18 Ʌe1 Ʌb7 19 Ʌg5 Ʌd6 20 Ʌd2 Ʌb5 21 Ʌb3 Ʌc6 with balanced chances.
d2) 6 c4 Currently this way of tackling the Portuguese has the best theoretical reputation.

\[ 
\]

\[ 
\]

After the follow up 7...b5 8 cxb5 some believe that Black has good activity for the pawn. In my opinion it is insufficient.

After 8...\( \Box d5 \) (8...\( \Box b6 \) 9 bxa6+ \( \Box xa4 \) 10 \( \Box xa4+ \) \( \Box d7 \) 11 \( \Box xd7+ \) \( \Box xd7 \) 12 \( \Box c3 \) \( \Box xa6 \) 13 \( \Box ge2 \) e6 14 g4 \( \Box d3 \) 15 dxe6+ \( \Box xe6 \) 16 \( \Box f2 \) and Black had little to show for his two pawn deficit in Stepanov – Boudier, Capelle la Grande 1995, and neither was he equal after 10...\( \Box d7 \) 11 \( \Box c4 \) e6 12 dxe6 \( \Box xe6 \) 13 \( \Box c6+ \) \( \Box d7 \) 14 \( \Box c2 \) \( \Box b4+ \) 15 \( \Box c3 \) 0-0 16 \( \Box ge2 \) \( \Box b5 \) 17 0-0 \( \Box xa6 \) 18 \( \Box g5 \) in Sax – Scavo, Montecatini Open 1998.)
9 \( \text{dxe2} \)! is my recommendation, although 9 \( \text{bxa6} \) brought victory in Howell – Martin, Isle of Lewis Open 1995 after 9...e5 10 \( \text{dxe2} \text{dxa6} \) 11 0-0 \( \text{dxb4} \) 12 \( \text{dxc3} \text{dxa4} \)? 13 \( \text{dxa4} \text{c2} \) 14 \( \text{dxb1} \text{dxd4} \) 15 \( \text{dxh4} \text{c5} \) 16 \( \text{dxe3} \) 17 \( \text{dxb1} \text{dxd4} \) 0-0 19 \( \text{dxd1} \text{c7} \) 20 \( \text{dxe4} \) and all of Martin’s ingenuity was insufficient. It also worked in Tiviakov – Goodger, Monarch Assurance Open, 1995: 9 \( \text{bxa6} \text{dxa6} \) 10 \( \text{dxe2} \text{e6} \) 11 0-0 \( \text{dxe7} \) 12 \( \text{dxc3} \text{dxc3} \) 13 \( \text{dxc3} \) 0-0 14 \( \text{dxe2} \text{a5} \) 15 \( \text{dxe3} \text{f6} \) 16 \( \text{dxb3} \text{e8} \) 17 \( \text{dxc1} \text{b8} \) 18 \( \text{dxf2} \) 19 \( \text{dxd6} \) and White won.

9...e6 10 0-0 \( \text{dxe6} \) 11 \( \text{dxc3} \) 0-0 was Yewdokimov – Alvarez Ibarra, San Sebastian 1993 when 12 \( \text{dxd5} \text{exd5} \) 13 \( \text{bxa6} \text{dxa6} \) 14 \( \text{dxc4} \text{xf4} \) 15 \( \text{dxf4} \text{wg5} \) 16 \( \text{dxd5} \text{h3} \) 17 \( \text{dxf2} \text{hxg2} \) 18 \( \text{hxg2} \text{xd5} \) 19 \( \text{dxb3} \text{d6} \) 20 \( \text{c1} \) would have worked well for him.

d22) 6...e6

Anagnostopoulos – Santos
European Team Championships, Pula 1997

7 dxe6 \( \text{dxe6} \) 8 d5!

Certainly the most accurate. There have been many games with 8 \( \text{dxe3} \), but the possibilities 8 d5! allows for other placements of the Black bishop than to b4 do not help him. 8 c5 has been tried, but 8 d5! currently looks best.
8...\(\text{\textit{xf5}}\) 9 \(\text{\textit{c3}}\) \(\text{\textit{b4}}\)

Alternatively 9...\(\text{\textit{e7}}\) is passive and failed in J.Polgar – Damasao, Oviedo 1992 to the characteristically straightforward Polgar response of 10 \(\text{\textit{g4}}\) \(\text{\textit{g6}}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{f4}}\) \(\text{\textit{h6}}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{f5}}\) \(\text{\textit{h7}}\) 13 h3 0-0 14 \(\text{\textit{f4}}\) and h7 held on.

9...\(\text{\textit{c5}}\) is disruptively countered by 10 \(\text{\textit{we2}}\), e.g. 10...\(\text{\textit{we7}}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{g4}}\) \(\text{\textit{d3}}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{wxc7+}}\) \(\text{\textit{xc7}}\) 13 \(\text{\textit{f4}}\) 0-0 0-0 14 0-0-0 \(\text{\textit{g6}}\) and here retreating the bishop with 15 \(\text{\textit{a4}}\) ought to have left White clearly better in Renet – Galego, European Cup 1994.

10 \(\text{\textit{ge2}}\) 0-0

Black’s inferior queenside position prohibits castling long. In Yasan – Ribeiro, Yerevan Olympiad 1995 10...\(\text{\textit{we7}}\) 11 0-0 0-0 12 \(\text{\textit{d4}}\) \(\text{\textit{g6}}\) 13 h4!? \(\text{\textit{h5}}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{e1}}\) \(\text{\textit{f8}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{f5?!}}\) \(\text{\textit{xc3}}\) 16 bxc3 \(\text{\textit{b8}}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{wb3}}\) \(\text{\textit{a8}}\) 18 \(\text{\textit{a3}}\) \(\text{\textit{c5}}\) 19 \(\text{\textit{h1}}\) left Black short of equality.

11 \(\text{\textit{xd7}}\!\)

Time to swap his now stranded bishop.

11...\(\text{\textit{xd7}}\) 12 0-0

\[\text{Diagram}\]

Black has not yet shown that he may get it together from here.

12...\(\text{\textit{c5}}\)

The alternative is 12...\(\text{\textit{e5}}\), but, despite some early successes with it, Blanks found out that just 13 \(\text{\textit{g3}}\)! is very strong, e.g. 13...\(\text{\textit{d3}}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{e1}}\) and wins, or 13...\(\text{\textit{d7}}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{d4}}\) \(\text{\textit{e7}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{ge4}}\) c5 16 dxc6 \(\text{\textit{xc6}}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{d5}}\) \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) 18 cxd5 as in Plomp – Rufenacht, Korning Memorial, 1998 when White soon won.

13 \(\text{\textit{f4}}\)

And Black did not fare well after...

13...\(\text{\textit{e8}}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{ce2}}\) \(\text{\textit{f6}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{g3}}\) \(\text{\textit{d7}}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{h1}}\) \(\text{\textit{d6}}\)

...which occurred in both Alonzo Sanz – Santos, Louros 1997, and Anagnostopoulos – Santos, European Team Championship, Pula 1997.

White won both games, the latter concluding 17 \(\text{\textit{gh5}}\) \(\text{\textit{we5}}\) 18 \(\text{\textit{g4}}\) \(\text{\textit{g6}}\) 19 \(\text{\textit{g3}}\) \(\text{\textit{c5}}\) 20 \(\text{\textit{xg6}}\) hgx6 21 f4 \(\text{\textit{we7}}\) 22 \(\text{\textit{g2}}\) a5 23 \(\text{\textit{d2}}\) \(\text{\textit{wh4}}\) 24 \(\text{\textit{f3}}\) and Black had no authentic compensation and resigned at move 40.
The Portuguese Variation 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4!? 183

SUMMARY

The Portuguese Gambit may be in good stead after 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe3, not only with 7...Qb4+ but also, perhaps, with the three other candidate moves of 7...Qe7, 7...fxe6 and 7...Qb4. But most players of the White pieces have wised up now from the early days when their nonchalance led to the entertaining sacrificial attacking wins scattered throughout this chapter. The crust of the theory has not yet formed and there are sure to be plenty of important ideas surfacing in the years ahead. But in the line 5 Qb5+ Qbd7 6 c4 things are not looking so rosy for Black, and he has yet to demonstrate clear equality.
Chapter 12: In Conclusion

If White declines to capture on d5 at move two, then he may have himself a Blackmar-Diemer Gambit with 2 d4, or something less known with 2 \( \text{c3} \).

2 d3 and 2 \( \text{d3} \) are not considered in this treatise, although Romanishin might glance at the latter option.

Plaskett – Speelman
Gibtelecom Masters, Gibraltar, 2003

1 e4 d5 2 \( \text{c3} \)!

\[ \text{Diagram showing the position after 1 e4 d5 2 c3!} \]

2...dxe4

2...c6 is a Caro-Kann, 2...e6, a French, 2...\( \text{f6} \) a form of declined Alekhine's, and 2...d4 is unnamed but certainly playable. If you want to play 2...\( \text{xe6} \), then I am sorry.

3 \( \text{dxe4} \)

\[ \text{Diagram showing the position after 1 e4 d5 2 c3! dxe4 3 dxe4} \]
3...\text{\textit{\text{\text{\textbf{c}}}}{6}}

3...\text{\textit{\text{\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}}{5}}!? 4 \textit{\text{\textbf{c}}}{3} \textit{\text{\textbf{a}}}{5}, as Hodgson once played against me in a rapid game, is a route back to the main lines, but Speelman’s choice is fine.

3...e5 4 \textit{\text{\textbf{c}}}{4} \textit{\text{\textbf{c}}}{6} 5 \textit{\text{\textbf{d}}}{3} \textit{\text{\textbf{g}}}{7}! 6 \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{3} is leading us into a restrained type of Italian Game where Black has few problems. Keast – Franzen, Correspondence 1993 continued 6...\textit{\text{\textbf{g}}}{4} 7 \textit{\text{\textbf{h}}}{3} \textit{\text{\textbf{h}}}{5} 8 \textit{\text{\textbf{g}}}{3} \textit{\text{\textbf{g}}}{6} 9 0-0 \textit{\text{\textbf{d}}}{6} 10 \textit{\text{\textbf{e}}}{1} \textit{\text{\textbf{g}}}{7} 11 \textit{\text{\textbf{d}}}{2} \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{6}! 12 \textit{\text{\textbf{h}}}{4} \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{7} and now White began to overpress, 13 \textit{\text{\textbf{g}}}{4} \textit{\text{\textbf{x}}}{c}4 14 \textit{\text{\textbf{d}}}{xc}4?! \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{7}! A neat way to solve all problems. 15 \textit{\text{\textbf{a}}}{d}1 \textit{\text{\textbf{c}}}{8} 16 \textit{\text{\textbf{e}}}{4} \textit{\text{\textbf{e}}}{6} 17 \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}?! \textit{\text{\textbf{a}}}{d}8 18 \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{5} \textit{\text{\textbf{c}}}{5}+ 19 \textit{\text{\textbf{h}}}{2} \textit{\text{\textbf{c}}}{8} and Black’s unweakened position was now the superior.

Paul Kelly has asked me to mention his idea of meeting 3...\textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{5} with 4 \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{3}.

4 \textit{\text{\textbf{b}}}{5}?

This move GM Conquest sardonically dubbed ‘The Gibraltar Variation’ in the tournament bulletin. 4 \textit{\text{\textbf{c}}}{4} was better.

4...\text{\textit{\text{\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}}{5}}

Probably already there is no objective route to equality for White. Note that 4...e5 5 \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{3} \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{5} 6 \textit{\text{\textbf{x}}}{e}5 fxe4 7 \textit{\text{\textbf{d}}}{xc}6 would have taken us into the Schliemann variation of the Spanish!

5 \textit{\text{\textbf{e}}}{2} \textit{\text{\textbf{f}}}{5}! 6 \textit{\text{\textbf{g}}}{3}

Any better ideas?
6...\( \text{w}xg2?! \)
6...\( \text{\textit{xc}} \text{c2!} \) was the better grab as after 7 \( \text{\textit{d}}f3 \) 0-0-0 Black clearly has the upper hand.

7 \( \text{\textit{we}}5 \)
My counter raid. I hoped to take his queenside.

7...\( \text{e6}?? \)
Strangely enough, this natural move turns out to be a decisive error! It is now White’s queen infiltration that should have proved the more relevant. 7...\( \text{\textit{d}}7 \) 8 \( \text{\textit{xc}}7 \) \( \text{\textit{wd}}5 \) 9 c4 \( \text{\textit{we}}5+ \) 10 \( \text{\textit{xe}}5 \) \( \text{\textit{xe}}5 \) 11 \( \text{\textit{xd}}7+ \) \( \text{\textit{xd}}7 \) 12 b3 would have led to approximate equality. But best was activity with 7...\( \text{\textit{h}}6! \) 8 \( \text{\textit{xc}}7 \) \( \text{\textit{g}}4! \) 9 \( \text{\textit{h}}3 \) (Not 9 \( \text{\textit{xb}}7? \) \( \text{\textit{xf}}2+ \) 10 \( \text{\textit{d}}1 \) \( \text{\textit{e}}3+! \) 11 dxe3 \( \text{\textit{xc}}2 \) mate.) and now 9...\( \text{\textit{c}}8! \) would leave Black slightly better.

8 \( \text{\textit{xc}}7 \) \( \text{\textit{c}}5 \)

The only consistent move here, and the point of his last.
I began to appreciate that my intended 9 \( \text{\textit{xb}}7 \) fails now to 9...\( \text{\textit{xf}}2+ \) 10 \( \text{\textit{d}}1 \) \( \text{\textit{g}}4+ \) 11 \( \text{\textit{e}}1e2 \) \( \text{\textit{xe}}2+! \) 12 \( \text{\textit{xe}}2 \) \( \text{\textit{e}}b8 \) 13 \( \text{\textit{wa}}6 \) \( \text{\textit{xb}}3. \) If then 14 \( \text{\textit{xf}}1 \) (with the nasty idea of 15 \( \text{\textit{f}}3 \) ) Black has the efficient plug of 14...\( \text{\textit{f}}2! \) when 15 \( \text{\textit{xf}}2 \) \( \text{\textit{xf}}2 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{xc}}6+ \) \( \text{\textit{e}}7 \) 17 \( \text{\textit{c}}7+ \) \( \text{\textit{f}}6 \) still leaves the threat of
mate by 18 ...♛g1 19 ♦f1 ♦xf1, and so White comes out of it all material down for insufficient compensation.

This so shook me that I sank into a despondent thought, and only pulled out of it the best part of an hour later with...

9 ♦f4??

A pathetic retreat.

Psychology plays such a big part in chess. I stumbled into a position with the White pieces which was already critical at move four. I kept trying, although I assumed that I might already be over the precipice, and quite possibly deserved to be through such shoddy opening play. And then there was my track record against this guy. Between December 1984 and August 1986 I played with Black against him three times. In his opinion, by move twenty in all three games I had decisive advantage. I lost them all.

In the late 1990s I failed to win a rook ending two pawns ahead against him. The fear factor ... But the game is about facts, not what ‘ought’ to be going on.

I could have played 9 ♦f5!!

![Chess Diagram]

It looks quite unfeasible to remove from my king the only active defender, but it is a position of two halves, and it turns out that Black’s problems at the other end are the greater.

9...♛xh1?

9...♛xf2+? 10 ♦d1 or 9...♕xf2+? 10 ♦d1 both leave White winning; b7 will fall.

10 ♦f1!

Such a cool defence! The knight at g1 is covered and now it is Black’s turn to try to cope with what the other guy is doing to him. He has no satisfactory way. 10...exf5 11 ♩xb7 and it’s over. 10...♕f6 (10...♕f8 11 ♩xb7 ♕b8 looks like a way out, until the magnificent 12 ♩c7!!
...is spotted. Since Black then gets mated if he takes on b5, he is scuppered.) 11 \( \Box_g3! \) So athletic a knight! 11...\( \Box_d5 \) (or 11...\( \Box_xh2 \) 12 \( \Box_xc6 \) wins.) 12 \( \Box_xb7 \) 0-0 13 \( \Box_xc6 \) and White makes decisive material gains.

Best is to carry on developing: 9...\( \Box_f6!! \)

But White may yet thread his way successfully through the complications.

10 \( \Box_xc6+! \)

It is incorrect to go after another piece with 10 \( \Box_xb7? \) 0-0 and White will get away with neither 11 \( \Box_xc6 \) because of 11...\( \Box_f2+ \) with the idea of 12...\( \Box_d5 \) with attack, or even the direct 11...\( \Box_e4 \), with attack, nor 11 \( \Box_e7+ \) \( \Box_h8 \) 12 \( \Box_xc6 \) \( \Box_f2+ \) with the follow-up of 13...\( \Box_d5 \) with an attack, or, again, even 12...\( \Box_e4 \). White's men are either unplayed or too remote for him to mount a defence. Of course 11 \( \Box_xc6?? \) \( \Box_xf2+ \) 12 \( \Box_d1 \) \( \Box_f1 \) is mate.

10...\( \Boxxc6 \) 11 \( \Box_xg7+! \) \( \Boxxf8 \)
11...\( \Box_xg7 \) 12 \( \Box_xc6+ \) is hopeless.

12 \( \Boxxe6+! \) \( \Boxxe6 \)
12...\( \Box_g8 \) 13 \( \Box_g3+ \) or 12...\( \Box_e8 \) 13 \( \Boxxc5 \) both win for White.

13 \( \Box_f4! \)
and she gets back in time to play a crucial part in the defence as Black is still unable to take the h1 rook, for after 13...\( \text{Wh} x h1 14 \text{W} x f 6 + \text{G} g 8 15 \text{W} x e 6 + \text{G} g 7 16 \text{W} g 4 + \text{F} f 7 17 \text{W} f 3 + \) is one way to exchange and win. After 13...\( \text{G} e 7 14 \text{W} f 3 \text{G} x f 2 + 15 \text{G} e 2 \text{G} h 8 16 \text{W} x g 2 \text{G} x g 2 17 \text{F} f 3 \) there is a winning advantage for White.

This illustrates the accuracy of Dr John Nunn’s comment after his victory against Adam Kuligowski at the 1983 Wijk aan Zee tournament:

“In complicated positions one must examine every possible move.” Indeed, for 9 \( \text{G} f 5 ! \) does seem to win.

Would I have missed it against a weaker player!?

9...0-0-0

With development advantage, initiative and attack. I did not last long.

10 \( \text{G} x e 6 \text{W} x e 6 11 d 3 \text{G} f 6 12 \text{W} f 3 \text{G} b 4 + \) 13 \( \text{G} d 2 \text{W} x c 2 ! \)

And as 14 \( \text{G} x b 4 \text{W} x b 2 \) leaves me splattered, I threw in the towel.

White resigned

In a game between two GMs, White was worse at move four, close to lost at move six, winning at move seven, and resigned at move thirteen.

In 2003, chess was still a rich game.
Index of Variations

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 d4 e5 4 Qf3 [4 dxe5] 7-8
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wa5 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qf3 Qf5 6 Qd2 Qbd7 7 Qc4 c6 11-12
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wa5 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qf3 Qf5 6 Qd2 c6 7 Qc4 e6 8 We2
Qb4 9 0-0 [9 0-0-0] 13-14
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wa5 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qf3 Qg4 6 h3 Qh5 [6...Qxf3 7
Wxf3] 7 Qg4 Qg6 8 Qe5 e6 9 h4 Qb4 10 Qh3 15-17
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wa5 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qf3 c6 6 Qc4 [6 Qe2] 6...Qf5 7
Qe5 e6 8 g4 Qg6 9 h4 18-20
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wa5 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qf3 c6 6 Qe5 [6 Qd2 Qf5 7 Qh4]
20-24
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wa5 4 g3 Qf6 5 Qg2 [5 h3 g6 6 Qg2 Qg7 7 Qge2]
5...g6 [5...c6] 6 Qf3 [6 Qge2] 6...Qg7 7 0-0 0-0 8 d3 Wh5 25-26
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wa5 4 Qf3 Qf6 5 h3 [5 Qc4] 5...Qf5 6 Qc4 e6 7 0-0
26-27
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wa5 4 Qf3 [4 6e2 g6 5 Qf3 Qg7] 4...Qf6 5 6e2
Qg4 [5...g6] 27-29
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd8 4 Qc4 30-31
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd8 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qc4 [5 Qf3 5...c6 6 Qf3 Qf5 [6...b5
7 Qb3 e6 8 0-0 Qe7 9 Qe5 0-0 10 Qe1 a5 11 a4 b4 12 Qe2 Qd5 13 Qf4] 7 Qe5 e6
8 g4 Qg6 9 h4 Qbd7 [9...Qb4] 31-35
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd8 4 d4 g6 [4...c6] 5 Qf4 [5 Qf3] 5...Qg7 6 Wd2
Qf6 7 0-0-0 c6 35-37
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 d4 Qf6 [4...c6] 5 Qf3 [5 6e3] 5...e6 [5...Qg4]
6 6e3 Qc6 [6...b5; 6...Qf5; 6...Qg4; 6...e6; 6...Qbd7] 7 Wd2 38-45
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 d4 c6 5 Qg3 Qf6 6 Qg2 Qf5 46-47
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 d4 c6 5 Qg3 Qf6 6 Qg2 c6 6 Qf3 Qf5 47-49
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qf3 a6 6 g3 b5 49-52
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qf3 a6 6 g3 Qg4 [6...Qc6] 52-54
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qf3 a6 6 g3 Qg4 54-56
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 d4 Qf6 5 g3 Qg4 6 f3 56-58
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 d4 Qf6 5 g3 Qg4 58-59
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 d4 Qf6 5 Qc4 a6 [5...c6; 5...g6; 5...Qc6] 6
Qge2 [6 Qb3; 6 Qf3; 6 h3] 6...Wc6 [6...b5] 7 Qb3 [7 Wd3 Wxg2 8 Qg1 Wxh2 9
Qf4 Wh3 10 Qg3] 7...Wxg2 8 Qg1 60-68
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 wxd5 3 Qc3 Wd6 4 Qf3 Qf6 5 d4 a6 6 Qc4 68-69
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[c3 \[d5 \[e6 \[f6 4 d4 \[f6 5 \[g5 69-70
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[c3 \[d6 \[d6 4 d4 c6 5 \[g5 \[f6 71-73
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[d6 \[f6 4 d4 c6 5 \[g5 \[f6 6 \[d2 [6 \[c4] 73-75
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[c3 \[d6 \[f6 4 d4 \[f6 5 \[d3 [5 \[f3 a6 6 h3] 5...\[d4 [5...c6] 6
5 \[e5 7 \[g2 75-78
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[d6 \[d6 4 d4 \[f6 5 \[f3 a6 6 \[d3 \[c6 [6...g6] 7 0-0 [7
h3] 7...\[d4 78-80
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[d6 \[f6 4 d4 \[f6 5 \[f3 a6 6 \[c6 \[d6 [6...c5] 81-84
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[d6 \[f6 4 d4 \[f6 [4...c6; 4...a6 5 \[f3 \[g5 5...c6] 6
[\[e2] 5 \[g2 [5 \[f3; 5 \[d2] 84-88
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[e2 c6 5 \[f3 [5 d4] 5...\[c7 6 d4 \[f5 7 d5
[7 0-0] 89-95
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[e2 c6 5 \[f3 \[c7 6 d4 \[f5 7 \[d5 95-97
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 97-99
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 100-101
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 102-106
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 107-108
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 109-110
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 111-114
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 114-118
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 118-121
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 121-122
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 122-123
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 123-124
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5+ 4 \[g2 c6 5 d4 \[c7 124-126
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5 6 d3 127-130
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5 6 d3 131-137
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5 6 d3 138-140
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5 6 d3 140-141
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 \[d5 \[c3 \[e5 6 d3 141-142
1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 c4 e6 4 dxe6 Qxe6 5 Qf3 Wd7 6 Wf2 Qc6 7 d4 0-0 0-0 8 d5 Wb4+ 9 Qc3 142-145

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 Qc2 Qxe2 5 Wxe2 Wxd5 146-147

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 Qf3 Wxd5 [4...Qxd5] 5 Qc3 [5 Qc2] 148

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 [5 g4] 5...6e6 [5...c6] 6 dxe6 [6 Qc3; 6 Wf4+] 6...Qc6 7 exf7+ Qxf7 8 Qe3 [8 Qd3; 8 d5] 8...Qb4+ 9 Qf2 [9 Qc3] 148-152

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe2 Qb4 8 Qg3 Qc2+ 154-155

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe2 Qb4 8 Qg3 Qc2+ 154-155

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe2 Qb4 8 Qa3 [8 exf7+] 8...Qxe5 9 g4 [9 Qh3] 156-159

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe3 Qb4 8 Qc3 Qc2+ 159-160

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe3 Qb4+ 8 Qc3 [8 Qf2] 8...Qxe5 9 d5 0-0 166-168

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe3 Qb4+ 8 Qc3 Qc7 9 Wd2 [9 Qa4; 9 Wd2] 169-170

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe3 Qb4+ 8 Qc3 Qc7 9 Qe3 Qxe6 [9...Qxe6] 10 Qf2 [10 Wc2; 10 Wd2] 10...0-0 11 Qge2 Qhe8 12 Wc1 [12 Wd2] 170-172

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe3 Qb4+ 8 Qc3 Qxe6 172-173

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe3 Qb4+ 8 Qd2 0-0 [8...Qd7; 8...Qxd4] 9 Qd7 Qxd4 10 Qxd4 [10 axb4 Qc2+] 10...Qxd4 11 axb4 Wxb2 12 exf7+ [12 b5] 173-174

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c4 e6 6 dxe6 Qc6 7 Qe3 Qb4+ 8 Qd2 0-0 9 Qe2 [10 dxc6; 10 g4; 10 Qf2] 175-176

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 c6 6 dxe6 Wd7 7 Qe4 [6...Qc6] 176-178

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 Qb5+ Qb7 6 Qc3 178-179

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 Qb5+ Qb7 6 Qc4 a6 7 Qa4 b5 8 axb5 Qxd5 [8...Qc6] 9 Qc2 [9 bx6] 9...Qc6 180

1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qf6 3 d4 Qg4 4 f3 Qf5 5 Qb5+ Qb7 6 Qc4 e6 7 dxe6 Qxe6 8 d5 Qf5 9 Qc3 Qb4 [9...Qc7; 9...Qc5] 181-182

1 e4 d5 2 Qc3 dxe4 3 Qxe4 Qc6 [3...Qd5; 3...c5] 4 Qb5 Wd5 [4...c5 5 Qf3 f5 6 Qxe5 fxe4 7 Qxc6] 5 Qe2 Qf5 6 Qg3 Wxg2 [6...Qxc2] 7 Wf5 184-187
The Scandinavian Defence, previously thought to be a rather primitive and sub-standard response to 1 e4, has now emerged from the doldrums and been employed with success by some of the world’s strongest Grandmasters, including Bent Larsen, Curt Hansen, Ian Rogers, Alexei Shirov and Visishy Anand.

The traditional form of the opening is 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Qxd5 3 Nc3 Qa5, with a subsequent deployment of Black’s queen’s bishop at f5 or g4, and indeed the current theoretical status of this line remains good. However, in recent years, many alternative schemes have been tried. There has, for example, been a marked increase in the popularity of 3...Qd6!? in conjunction with a swift ...a6 and ...b5, or ...Bg4, ...Nc6 and ...0-0-0, and sometimes even a radically different middlegame from the stonewalling so frequently associated with the older type of Scandinavian middlegames. Recent play also suggests that 3...Qe5, cheekily dubbed ‘The Patzer Variation’, might also not be so naive.

Equally important are the latest lines arising from 1 e4 d5 2 exd5 Nf6, including the dangerous Icelandic Gambit and the aggressive Portuguese Variation, which is currently at the cutting edge of chess theory.
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