

GAMBIT

Beating the Fianchetto Defences



Efstratios Grivas

A challenging repertoire
versus five king's
fianchetto defences

Beating the Fianchetto Defences

Efstratios Grivas

GAMBIT

First published in the UK by Gambit Publications Ltd 2006

Copyright © Efstratios Grivas 2006

The right of Efstratios Grivas to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out or otherwise circulated in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

ISBN-13: 978-1-904600-48-0

ISBN-10: 1-904600-48-4

DISTRIBUTION:

Worldwide (except USA): Central Books Ltd, 99 Wallis Rd, London E9 5LN, England.
Tel +44 (0)20 8986 4854 Fax +44 (0)20 8533 5821. E-mail: orders@Centralbooks.com

Gambit Publications Ltd, 99 Wallis Rd, London E9 5LN, England.

E-mail: info@gambitbooks.com

Website (regularly updated): www.gambitbooks.com

Edited by Graham Burgess

Typeset by John Nunn

Cover image by Wolff Morrow

Printed in Great Britain by The Cromwell Press, Trowbridge, Wilts.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Gambit Publications Ltd

Managing Director: Murray Chandler GM

Chess Director: Dr John Nunn GM

Editorial Director: Graham Burgess FM

German Editor: Petra Nunn WFM

Webmaster: Dr Helen Milligan WFM

Contents

Symbols	5	
Bibliography	5	
Dedication	5	
Introduction	6	
Overview	8	
1	Beating the Grünfeld Defence	10
1.1	Starting Out	10
1.2	Typical Endgames	11
1.3	Early Deviations	16
1.4	The 5...♘e4 Continuation	28
1.5	Black's 12th-Move Deviations	38
1.6	The 12...e5 Central Break	47
1.7	Illustrative Games	51
2	Beating the Benko/Volga Gambit	56
2.1	Starting Out	56
2.2	Typical Endgames	56
2.3	The 4...b4 Variation	58
2.4	The 4...♗b7 Variation	61
2.5	The 4...bxc4 Variation	65
2.6	The 4...g6 Variation	70
2.7	The Blumenfeld Gambit	73
2.8	Illustrative Games	82
3	Beating the Modern Defence	86
3.1	Starting Out	86
3.2	Typical Endgames	86
3.3	Black's 3rd-Move Deviations	88
3.4	The 3...d6 Variation	93
3.5	Illustrative Games	102
4	Beating the Modern Benoni	105
4.1	Starting Out	105
4.2	Typical Endgames	105

4.3	Black Avoids ...exd5	107
4.4	The Snake Benoni	109
4.5	The 8...♗g4 Variation	113
4.6	The Main Line without 9...b5	115
4.7	The Main Line with 9...b5	128
4.8	Illustrative Games	136
5	Beating the King's Indian Defence	139
5.1	Starting Out	139
5.2	Typical Endgames	139
5.3	The Early ...♗bd7 Variation	142
5.4	Black's 5th-Move Deviations	146
5.5	The 5...♗g4 Variation	152
5.6	The Exchange Variation	156
5.7	7 d5: Introduction and 7...♗h5	165
5.8	7 d5 ♗e8	167
5.9	7 d5 ♗a6	169
5.10	The Main Line 7 d5 a5 with ...♗c5	176
5.11	Illustrative Games	185
	Index of Variations	189

Symbols

+	check	Cht	team championship
++	double check	Ct	candidates event
#	checkmate	Wch	world championship
!!	brilliant move	Wcht	world team championship
!	good move	Ech	European championship
!?	interesting move	Echt	European team championship
?!	dubious move	ECC	European Clubs Cup
?	bad move	tt	team event
??	blunder	jr	junior event
+−	White is winning	wom	women's event
±	White has a large advantage	OL	olympiad
±	White is slightly better	rpd	rapidplay game
=	equal position	simul	game from simultaneous display
∞	unclear position	1-0	the game ends in a win for White
∓	Black is slightly better	1/2-1/2	the game ends in a draw
∓	Black has a large advantage	0-1	the game ends in a win for Black
−+	Black is winning	(<i>n</i>)	<i>n</i> th match game
Ch	championship	(<i>D</i>)	see next diagram

Bibliography

The following sources were most frequently consulted:

- Informator 1-93
- New In Chess Yearbooks 1-76
- Encyclopedia of Chess Openings
- ChessBase Mega Database 2005
- New In Chess Database
- Various chess books
- Various chess magazines
- Personal archives

Dedication

This book is dedicated to my family: Sophie, Katerina and Michalis.

Introduction

This book was written with the purpose of offering a complete and detailed repertoire for White against five important openings involving the fianchetto of Black's dark-squared bishop on g7. These openings are the King's Indian Defence, the Grünfeld Defence, the Modern Benoni, the Benko/Volga Gambit and the Modern Defence. Sidelines of these openings and possible transpositions to other opening set-ups were also taken into account.

In each case I have recommended a system in which I have a wealth of experience and have played a significant personal role in its development throughout the years, either as a player or as a trainer – or both! The recommendations are geared towards posing Black unconventional problems. Your opponents will not be able to churn out lengthy memorized variations but will need to solve problems at the board, in positions that are somewhat different in character from those normally reached in the openings under discussion. I have also selected the systems within the repertoire in such a way that they form a seamless whole and are also reachable by an English (1 c4) or Réti (1 ♘f3) move-order in addition to the standard 1 d4.

The book in front of you is the fruit of several years of both practical experience and theoretical research. I have tried to describe the suggested systems in detail, giving my assessments as clearly and responsibly as possible, and have generally aimed to provide useful guidelines.

As I wrote in my last theory book, *A Complete Guide to the Grivas Sicilian*, “many things in chess theory, as in life, are relative and a matter of taste. Actually there are no ‘good’ or ‘bad’ openings. There are openings that you know and understand, and openings that you do not know and do not understand.” Thus, I believe that my recommended systems offer a lot of possibilities, new ideas and practical benefits, aspects that should not be underestimated in modern chess. Among other things, I have tried to make them ‘understandable’ to you.

The book's main purpose is to ‘train’ and educate the reader in territory that is ‘unknown’ to him. We must not forget that this is a theory book, where concrete reaction to the opponent's moves is of primary importance. General principles and plans do merit a place in this project but, in my opinion, move-by-move consideration is most significant.

It is not necessary to memorize all the variations and moves mentioned in the book. That is practically impossible! But then, you may ask, what is the reason for someone to deal with a theory book, one that he does not need to memorize in full? The theory of ‘subconscious education’ will help us answer this question. By playing through the moves and variations in the book, our subconscious processes and stores similar motifs, repeated moves and plans, and also ‘learns’ to avoid traps and unwelcome positions. Such proper ‘subconscious memorization’ will, at the critical moment, enforce the correct choice upon us.

Many of the opening books I have read mainly focus on the general characteristics of the opening or the variation in question and much less so on move-by-move theory. This can lead to unresolved questions in the reader's mind, and the danger that he will mix things up at moments when it is necessary to find one specific concrete move or sequence. The recommended repertoire is that of a grandmaster, without any omissions or hidden secrets. On the contrary, it contains a great number of new, deeply analysed suggestions.

Let us not forget that the basic characteristics of the openings do not frequently undergo radical changes. On the other hand, the development of move-by-move theory is explosive. Every chess-player stands on the shoulders of the chess-player who came before him. Every generation of good chess-players learns from and builds upon the experience and creativity of the previous generations. The chess-player of the year 2005 has encountered more types of positions than the chess-player of

1975 and knows the proper ways to deal with these positions. Therefore, a chess-player today would have a great advantage over a chess-player (even one of equal or greater talent) of 30 years ago, simply because he could play the opening with deeper understanding; this understanding is offered to him by the multitude of deeply analysed variations.

In no occasion do I underestimate the necessity and value of learning the general characteristics and plans of each opening or variation. However, I do strongly believe that move-by-move theory and its (at least) subconscious absorption are necessary in order to survive in the labyrinth of the chess openings.

One question often posed by my students is whether we must simultaneously prepare two or more different systems against an opening. My personal opinion is that only professional grandmasters can afford this luxury. All other chess-players should focus on one specific system every time, so as to specialize in it and reap maximum benefit. Only if this choice eventually proves undesirable should one change his systems. As Ernest Hemingway once wrote: "I guess really good soldiers are really good at very little else."

The massive development of theory in all openings has clarified that White cannot hope for anything more than a slight advantage, but in some cases even this is unattainable! My recommendations are based on a healthy approach to the five openings covered in the book. A common thread running across all these systems is the desire to obtain a spatial advantage and then to make use of it. Although this book is not devoid of sharp, tactical lines, good positional handling is the main requirement of the resulting positions.

I must clarify that I took the liberty of changing the original move-order of many games. In this way it was possible to provide clearer coverage and guidance. Of course, the way you reach a certain position is important, but equally important is to examine how you want to proceed upon reaching it. True value comes from knowing what to keep and what to throw away.

Significant help in the preparation of this book was provided by Sotiris Logothetis. I would like to thank him for his trust and his valuable help.

Efstratios Grivas
Athens, June 2006

Overview

This introduction offers general information regarding the purpose of the suggested repertoire, as well as the reasons why each system was selected. The book is divided into five chapters, each dealing with a separate opening (or set of openings): the King's Indian Defence, the Grünfeld Defence, the Modern Benoni, the Benko/Volga Gambit and the Modern Defence.

Every chapter includes a short introduction under the heading 'Starting Out' (section 1), a selection of games illustrating 'Typical Endgames' (section 2) arising from the selected system and a collection of 'Illustrative Games' (last section) that highlight important motifs and ideas. At the end of the book the reader can find a detailed index of variations, allowing him easily to locate the line he is interested in.

Here is an overview of the structure of the theoretical material within each section:

Grünfeld Defence

The system proposed by the author against the Grünfeld Defence commences with the moves 4 ♖f3 ♗g7 5 ♗g5. Black's main response to this is 5...♘e4, which occupies the largest part of this chapter.

Section 1.3 deals with all of Black's alternative options. Thus, one can find here all other lines employed by Black on the 4th and 5th moves.

Section 1.4 examines all of Black's deviations from the main line, including the critical 7...dxc4.

Sections 1.5 and 1.6 are devoted to the main line. The popular 12...e5 central break is covered in Section 1.6, while Section 1.5 examines all other options for Black on move 12.

Benko/Volga Gambit

The author suggests a system based on 4 ♘f3 against the Benko/Volga Gambit. Black has several options against this move.

Section 2.3 deals with 4...b4 and some rare lines available to Black.

Section 2.4 covers Black's most ambitious response, 4...♗b7.

The submissive 4...bxc4 is the subject of Section 2.5.

Section 2.6 examines the most popular response, 4...g6.

Finally, the move 4...e6 transposes to the Blumenfeld Gambit and is covered in Section 2.7.

Modern Defence

The Modern Defence is a labyrinth of lines and transpositions, due to Black's flexible move-order. White selects his set-up in accordance with the repertoire systems against the King's Indian Defence and the Modern Benoni, to which the game may transpose.

Section 3.3 deals with a variety of Black's options excluding ...d6 on the third move (or later). All lines involving a later ...d6 that cannot be reached with the 3...d6 move-order are also covered here. Among others one can find in this section the Schlechter System of the Slav Defence, which can also arise from the Modern Defence by transposition.

Section 3.4 covers the main lines of the Modern Defence, commencing with 3...d6. In several of these lines a transposition to the King's Indian or Modern Benoni can occur and therefore only independent systems are covered in this section.

Modern Benoni

Against the Modern Benoni this book suggests the system dubbed the 'Modern Main Line', involving the moves e4, ♘f3, h3 and ♙d3.

Section 4.3 deals with all lines where Black refrains from playing ...exd5, the move that characterizes the Modern Benoni.

The subject of Section 4.4 is the Snake Benoni, a system where Black develops his dark-squared bishop via d6 instead of the usual g7-square.

Section 4.5 examines a common move-order by which Black tries to bypass the Modern Main Line and trick White into a different system with the help of the moves 7...a6 8 a4 ♙g4.

The main position of the covered system arises after White's 9th move. It is to this position that Sections 4.6 and 4.7 are devoted. Section 4.6 covers all of Black's options except the theoretically critical 9...b5, which is examined in Section 4.7.

King's Indian Defence

The suggested system against the King's Indian Defence arises after 5 ♘f3 0-0 6 h3 and is the main subject of this chapter.

Section 5.3 covers a line with an early ...♗bd7 by Black. When following the suggested repertoire, this system can only arise as a result of a transposition from the Modern Defence. Still, it is a KID system and is therefore covered in this chapter.

Section 5.4 examines Black's various rare possibilities on the 5th move (apart from the usual 5...0-0 followed by 6...e5), and 5...♙g4, while Section 5.5 covers the 5...♙g4 variation. This line and those in Section 5.4 are usually employed only after 5...0-0 6 ♙e2, which means that one is unlikely to face them if he strictly follows the repertoire in this book. However, all these lines can also be employed on the 5th move, and thus they are also covered in the book. In these two sections the reader can find all lines without a subsequent ...e5, as well as some rare move-orders by which Black tries to avoid the Exchange Variation of Section 5.6.

The subject of Section 5.6 is the Exchange Variation (White plays dxe5 in response to Black's standard ...e5). This neglected system is offered as a solid and reliable alternative to the main lines.

Section 5.7-5.10 deal with the main line, which arises after 6...e5 7 d5. In Section 5.7 the ambitious 7...♗h5 is covered. Section 5.8 deals with the alternative 7...♗e8, while Section 5.9 covers lines starting 7...♗a6 that do not feature a subsequent ...♗c5 and ...a5. By far the most significant part of the chapter is Section 5.10. The starting move for this section is 7...a5, but in fact all systems involving the transfer of this knight to c5 (often arising from 7...♗a6 or 7...♗bd7) are covered here. Since these lines often tend to transpose into one another and lead to very similar positions, all relevant material has been included in Section 5.10.

1 Beating the Grünfeld Defence

1.1 Starting Out

The system involving ♟g5 against the Grünfeld Defence is little explored. It has always stood somewhat in the shadow of the 'main' systems against the Grünfeld, such as 4 cxd5 , 4 ♟f4 , 4 ♞f3 ♟g7 5 ♝b3 , etc.

Yet this nameless system is more dangerous than most people think. It is not aimed at boring positions with a 'less than slight advantage', as has been mentioned in some sources. It is aimed at deep strategic themes and plans, it is aimed at keeping the initiative and, most importantly, it is aimed at gaining the advantage straight out of the opening.


Most of the books that have been written about the Grünfeld Defence take a look at this system only from Black's point of view, mostly proposing wrong or at least irrelevant continuations for White.

The system with ♟g5 is immediately directed against the black d5 -pawn. White wishes to force Black either to support it passively with $\dots \text{c6}$, to surrender the centre with $\dots \text{dxc4}$, or to reinforce White's centre after the standard $\dots \text{♞e4xc3}$ manoeuvre (note that I am advocating 6 ♟h4 for White, not allowing the $\dots \text{♞xg5}$ exchange). In this last case White's centre is a potentially significant factor and Black's dark-squared bishop's power is restrained due to the strongly-protected d4 -pawn. Fundamentally, White's chances lie mainly in positions with the queens exchanged, as the central pawn-majority is for preference and Black finds it difficult to organize concrete activity. On the other hand, Black may achieve play against White's queenside pawns, a typical feature of such Grünfeld positions.

The first time the ♟g5 system appeared in the chess world was back in 1922, against the player who gave his name to the Grünfeld Defence, by future World Champion Alekhine. However, the game was a disaster for White:

Alekhine – E. Grünfeld
Vienna 1922

1 d4 ♞f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♞c3 d5 4 ♟g5 ♞e4 5 cxd5 ♞xc3 6 bxc3 ♝xd5 7 ♞f3 ♟g7 8 e3 c5 9 ♟b5+ ♟d7 10 c4 ♝e4 11 0-0 ♟xb5 12 cxb5 ♞d7 13 ♞c1 b6 14 ♝b3 h6 15 ♟h4 0-0 16 ♞c4 ♝e6 17 ♞d1 ♞fe8 18 d5 ♝d6 19 ♟g3 e5 20 dxe6 ♝xe6 21 ♞d6 ♝e7 22 ♞a4 ♞f8 23 ♝d5 ♞ad8 24 ♞d2 ♞xd6 25 ♟xd6 ♞d8 26 ♞c4 ♞d7 27 h3 ♞e6 28 ♝e4 (D)




$28 \dots \text{♟f8}$ 29 ♟xf8 ♝d1+ 30 ♞h2 ♝xa4 31 ♟e7 ♞e8 32 ♟f6 ♞g7 33 ♝d3 ♝xa2 34 ♟b2 ♞e6 35 ♝c3 f6 36 ♝d3 h5 37 e4 ♝a4 38 ♞d6 ♝b4 39 ♞c4 ♝xb5 40 f4 ♝c6 41 e5 f5 42 ♞d6 ♞e7 43 ♝g3 ♞h7 44 ♝g5 ♝d7 45 ♝g3 ♞e6 46 ♝f3 b5 47 ♝a8 ♝d8 48 ♝d5 b4 49 g3 a5 50 ♝c6 ♝d7 51 ♝a6 a4 52 ♟a1 a3 53 ♝c4 ♝c6 54 ♞g1 ♝f3 55 ♞h2 ♝f2+ 0-1

The following year, White reinforced the system by playing ♞f3 before ♟g5 (a move-order that is also the starting point of my analysis) and scored a fine win. The system started to be taken more seriously.

Prochazka – V. Berger
Pardubice 1923

1 d4 ♞f6 2 ♞f3 g6 3 c4 ♟g7 4 ♞c3 d5 5 ♟g5 c6 6 e3 ♞bd7 7 cxd5 ♞xd5 8 ♞xd5 cxd5 9

♠d3 ♗b6 10 ♗c2 ♖f6 11 0-0 ♠e6 12 ♜ac1
0-0 13 ♠f4 ♜fc8 (D)



14 ♠c7 ♗c6 15 ♗xc6 bxc6 16 ♜xc6 ♖e8 17
♜fc1 ♖xc7 18 ♜xc7 ♜xc7 19 ♜xc7 ♜c8 20
♜xc8+ ♠xc8 21 ♖e5 ♠b7 22 ♖f4 e6 23 ♖f2 ♠f8
24 ♖d7 ♠b4 25 ♖e2 ♠c6 26 ♖c5 ♖f8 27 a3
♠a5 28 b4 ♠b6 29 ♖d2 ♖e7 30 ♖c3 ♖d8 31
♖b3 ♖c8 32 b5 ♠e8 33 ♖b4 ♠d8 34 e4 ♠f6 35
e5 ♠d8 36 a4 ♖b8 37 a5 ♖c8 38 ♠c2 h6 39
♠a4 h5 40 b6 ♠xa4 41 ♖xa4 axb6 42 axb6 g5
43 g3 h4 44 ♖b5 gxf4 45 gxf4 h3 46 ♖c6 1-0

Of course, neither game was a masterpiece and they are only given here to provide a little historical background.

In the late 1960s Russian GM and world championship candidate Mark Taimanov played the system regularly. His ideas were clarified and improved on many occasions. Maybe the system with ♠g5 should be named after him, to honour his efforts and great legacy in the chess world.

1.2 Typical Endgames

The chess-player who wishes to master an opening should know not only how to gain an advantage from the opening or how to increase it in the middlegame, but also how to convert it in the endgame. Knowledge of typical endgames with specific pawn-structures is important, as it helps to evaluate our chances in them and to make decisions that are very difficult to make correctly otherwise.


The endgames that follow are characteristic of the system with ♠g5. You will notice that

some of them arise via other openings or systems, but this is because the endgame structure is nevertheless typical of the lines we shall be discussing. The important thing is not how they arose; it is to understand and master them.

Endgame 1

Karpov – Gelfand
Linares 1991

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♖f3 ♠g7 4 g3 0-0 5 ♠g2 c6
6 ♖c3 d5 7 cxd5 cxd5 8 ♖e5 ♠f5 9 0-0 ♖e4 10
♠e3 ♖xc3 11 bxc3 ♖c6 12 ♗b3 e6 13 ♖xc6
bxc6 14 ♗a3 ♜e8 15 ♠f4 e5 16 ♠xe5 ♠xe5 17
dxe5 ♜xe5 18 e3 ♠e4 19 ♜fd1 ♗f6 20 ♜d4 h5
21 h3 ♜b8 22 ♜ad1 ♠xg2 23 ♖xg2 ♗e7 24
♗xe7 ♜xe7 25 ♜1d2 ♠b6 26 c4 dxc4 27 ♜xc4
♖g7 28 ♜dc2 ♜c7 (D)



White is much better. The 'passed' black c-pawn is actually a target for White, but of course this alone is not enough for the win. White should advance his a-pawn at an appropriate time, activate his king and advance his kingside pawns, trying to obtain a strong outside passed pawn; this will increase his advantage.

29 g4! hxg4 30 hxg4 ♖f6 31 ♖g3 ♖e6 32 a4!

With the idea a5-a6 ±.

32...♖d7

32...♖d6 33 ♜d4+ ♖e6 34 ♜c5! ♜d7 35 ♜e5+.

33 g5 ♜a6 34 ♜d4+ ♖e8?!

Maybe Black should try 34...♖e6!? with the idea 35 ♜c5 ♜d7 36 a5 ♜d5!.

35 ♜c5 ♜b6 36 ♖f4 ♜d7

The exchange of one pair of rooks favours White, because now it is easier for his king to invade.

37 Hxd7 Qxd7 38 Qe5 \pm Qe7 39 f4 Hb4 40 Ha5 Hb7 41 e4 Hc7

41... Hd7 42 Hc5 Hd6 43 f5 gxf5 44 exf5 f6+ 45 gxf6+ Hxf6 46 Ha5 gives White a winning position.

42 Hc5 Hc8 43 Hc3 He8 44 Hc4 Hc8 45 Hb4 Hc7 46 a5 Qd7 47 Hb3 !


Now the battle is over.

47... Qe7 48 a6 Qd7 49 Qf6 Qc8 50 Hh3 Hd7 51 f5 gxf5 52 exf5 c5 53 Hc3 Hc7 54 g6 fxg6 55 fxg6 Qd7 56 g7 Hc8 57 Hg3 1-0

Endgame 2

Kramnik – Lutz
Bundesliga 1993/4

1 Qf3 d5 2 d4 Qf6 3 c4 e6 4 Qc3 Qe7 5 Qg5 h6 6 Qh4 0-0 7 e3 Qe4 8 Qxe7 Qxe7 9 cxd5 Qxc3 10 bxc3 exd5 11 Qb3 Hd8 12 c4 dxc4 13 Qxc4 Qc6 14 Qe2 b6 15 0-0 Qb7 16 Hac1 Qa5 17 Qb2 Hac8 18 h3 c5 19 dxc5 Hxc5 20 Hxc5 Qxc5 21 Hc1 Qe7 22 Qd4 Qg5 23 Qg4 Qd5 24 Qf3 Qd7 25 Qxb7 Qxb7 26 Qc6 Ha8 27 Qd4 Qc5 28 Qxd7 Qxd7 29 Hd1 Qc5 30 g4 g6 (D)



White stands better, as he controls the d-file and his knight is much more active. Moreover, his kingside majority can advance more easily than Black's on the queenside.

31 Qg2 Qg7 32 Hd2 ! a6

32... Qe4 33 Hd7 \pm .

33 Hd6 !

Now that the black kingside has been weakened, the white rook starts attacking it.

33... Hc8 34 Qd4 b5 35 h4 !

With the idea of h5, creating new weaknesses on Black's kingside.

35... b4

35... a5 36 Qxb5 Hb8 37 Qc3 Hb2 38 Hd5 !

+

36 Hb6 a5 37 Hb5

White's strategy is rewarded with material gain.

37... Qd3 38 Hxa5 Qe1+ 39 Qg3 Qc2 40 Qb3 ?!

40 Qf3 ! Hc3 41 Qe5 Qf6 (41... Ha3 42 Hxa3 bxa3 43 Qd3 ! \rightarrow) 42 Qf4 g5+ 43 hxg5+ hxg5+ 44 Qe4 \rightarrow .

40... Qa3 41 Ha4 Hc4 42 Qd4 ! Qc2 43 Qf3 Hc5

43... Hc3 44 Qe5 Qf6 45 Qf4 \rightarrow .

44 Ha7 g5

44... Qa3 45 g5 h5 is more stubborn, although White should win anyway.

45 h5 \rightarrow Qg8 46 Qd2 Qa3 47 Qe4 Hc2

47... Hc6 48 Qf3 with the idea Qg3 .

48 Hb7 Hxa2 49 Hxb4 Hc2 50 Hb6 Qh7

50... Qg7 51 Qd6 .

51 Hb7 !

51 Qd6 ? Qc4 52 Hc6 Qxe3 !

51... Qg8 52 Qd6 Hc6 53 Qxf7 Qc4 54 Hd7

54 Qxh6+ Hxh6 55 Hb5 is also winning.

54... Hf6 55 Hd4 ! 1-0

55... Qxe3 56 Qxh6+ Hxh6 57 fxe3 \rightarrow .

Endgame 3

Grivas – Ki. Georgiev
Plovdiv 1982

1 d4 Qf6 2 c4 g6 3 Qc3 d5 4 Qf3 Qg7 5 Qg5 Qe4 6 Qh4 c5 7 cxd5 Qxc3 8 bxc3 Qxd5 9 e3 Qc6 10 Qe2 0-0 11 0-0 cxd4 12 cxd4 b6 13 Qd2 Qb7 14 Qf3 Qd7



For details on the opening, see Section 1.5, Line J.

15 Qc4 Hac8 16 Hc1 Hfd8 17 Qb3 Qf8 18 Hfd1 Qa5 19 Qxa5 Qxf3 20 gxf3 bxa5 21 Qa3 a4 22 Qg2 Qe8 23 Hxc8 Hxc8 24 Hc1 Hxc1 25 Qxc1 f5 26 Qc4 e6 27 Qg3 Qf6 28 Qb8 Qd8 29 Qc5 a6 30 Qe5 Qe7 31 e4 Qc6 32 d5 exd5 33 exd5 Qf6 34 f4 Qf7 35 h3 Qd8 36 Qa7 g5 37 Qxf6+ Qxf6 38 Qf3 h6 39 Qc5 Qe8 40 Qg3 Qd7 (D)

The endgame is extremely favourable for White, as he is practically a pawn up due to the doubled black a-pawns. Some accuracy is still required though.

41 Qf8 !

The black pawns must be weakened.



41...h5 42 fxg5 ♙xg5 43 ♙c5 a5!?

A correct decision, as Black is lacking waiting moves. His bishop must protect the entry squares of the white king and his h- and f-pawns will be lost if they advance. 43...♖d8 44 ♙e3! or 43...♖c7 44 ♙e3 ♙e7 (44...♙xe3 45 fxg3 ♖d6 46 ♖f4 ±) 45 ♖f4 ♖d6 46 ♖xf5 ♖xd5 47 ♙d2!! +-.

44 ♖f3!

White should be careful, as the mistaken 44 ♙e3? ♙e7 45 ♖f4 ♖d6 46 ♖xf5 ♖xd5 47 ♙d2 ♙b4! is not what he is looking for. But after 43...a5!?, the b5-square has been weakened, so the white king starts his journey towards it.

44...♙d2!? 45 a3!

Another trap set by Black (45 ♖e2? ♙b4!) has been avoided.

45...♙c1 46 ♖e2 ♙f4 47 ♖d3 ♖c7 48 ♖c4 ♖b7 49 ♖b5!

And the black pawns are dropping off.

49...♙d2!? 50 ♙b6! ♙c1 51 d6 ♙xa3 52 d7 ♙e7 53 d8 ♖ ♙xd8 54 ♙xd8 ♖c8 55 ♙xa5 ♖d7 56 ♖c5 ♖e6 57 f4 1-0

Endgame 4

Grivas – Haritakis
Thessaloniki 1988

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♖c3 d5 4 ♖f3 ♙g7 5 ♙g5 ♖e4 6 ♙h4 ♖xc3 7 bxc3 c5 8 cxd5 ♖xd5 9 e3 cxd4 10 cxd4 ♖c6 11 ♙e2 ♖a5+ 12 ♖d2 ♙e6!?

For details on the opening, see Section 1.4, Line B2.

13 ♖xa5 ♖xa5 14 0-0 ♙c4 15 ♙xc4 ♖xc4 16 ♖fc1 ♖c8 17 ♖ab1 b6 18 ♖d2 ♖d6 19 ♖xc8+ ♖xc8 20 ♖f1 ♖d6 21 f3 ♖d7 22 ♖e2 ♖c8 23 ♖d3 e5 24 g4 exd4 25 exd4 h5 26 ♙g3 ♖h8 27 ♖e4 ♖xe4 28 ♖xe4 (D)

Black has achieved an excellent position and should continue 28...♙c8 29 ♖d3 ♙f6 with dynamic equality.

28...♙f8? 29 ♙e5! ♖g8 30 ♖d5

Now White has made use of his chances and improved his king and bishop.

30...♙e7 31 ♖c1 ♙d8

31...♖c8? 32 ♖xc8 ♖xc8 33 ♖c6 +- or 31...f6 32 ♖c7+ ♖d8 33 ♖xa7 +-.


32 ♖c6! hxg4 33 fxg4 ♖f8 34 ♙d6 ♖h8 35 ♖c2! ♖h4 36 ♖f2 f6 37 ♖g2 ♖h3 38 ♙g3 ♖h7 39 ♖f2 ♙e7 40 h4!

Setting up a second passed pawn. White has a clear advantage.

40...♖h8 41 ♖c2 ♙d8 42 ♖h2! ♙e7 43 h5 gxh5 44 gxh5

44 ♖xh5? ♖g8!.

44...♙f8 45 ♖e4! (D)



The white king switches to the other flank. The two white passed pawns are very dangerous and should guarantee White the win.

45...♙h6 46 ♖f5 ♙g5 47 d5 b5 48 d6 a5 49 ♖c2!

A temporary pawn sacrifice, gaining the important e6-square for the white king.

49...♖xh5 50 ♖c7+ ♖d8 51 ♖e6 f5!

The only move because 51...♖h3? 52 ♖a7 is easy.

52 ♖g7! ♖h6+ 53 ♜xf5 ♙d2 54 ♖a7!

White is winning, as the threats of ♙e5-f6+ and ♙f4-g5+ cannot be parried.

54...♙b4


Or 54...♙c3 55 ♙f4 ♖f6+ 56 ♜e4 ♖g6 57 ♜d5 +.

55 ♙f4 ♖xd6 56 ♙xd6 ♙xd6 57 ♖xa5 ♜d7 58 ♖xb5 ♜c6 59 ♖b3 ♙c7 60 ♜e4 ♙b6 61 ♜d3 ♜b7 1-0

Endgame 5

Gheorghiu – Jansa
Sochi 1976

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 ♘f3 ♙g7 5 ♙g5 ♘e4 6 ♙h4 c5 7 cxd5 ♘xc3 8 bxc3 ♜xd5 9 e3 ♘c6 10 ♙e2 cxd4 11 cxd4 e5 12 dxe5 ♜a5+ 13 ♜d2 ♜xd2+ 14 ♜xd2 ♘xe5 15 ♖ab1 0-0 16 ♘d4 ♘c6 17 ♘xc6 bxc6 18 ♖hc1 ♙e6 19 ♙c4 ♖fe8 20 ♖b7 ♙f8 (D)



White has the advantage, due to his better pawn-chain (weak black c-pawn) and the occupation of the 7th rank. But Black can still fight.

21 f4!

Nothing is gained with 21 ♖c7 c5 22 ♙xe6 ♖xe6 23 ♖b1 ♖b6!, so White should activate his kingside pawn-majority.

21...c5 22 e4 ♖eb8! 23 ♖xb8 ♖xb8 24 ♙xe6 fxe6

Black neutralized White's occupation of the 7th rank at the cost of another problem, the weak black e-pawn.

25 ♙f2! ♖b4!

Wrong is 25...♖b2+ 26 ♖c2. Black should keep his rook active.

26 ♜d3 ♖a4 27 ♙xc5!

The only try, as 27 ♖c2 ♖a3+! would achieve the draw due to Black's active rook.

27...♖xa2 28 ♙xf8 ♜xf8 29 ♜d4! ♜e7

29...♖xg2 30 ♜e5! ♖f2! (30...♖xh2 31 ♜f6)

31 ♖c7 h5 32 h4! a5 33 ♖a7 ±.

30 ♖c7+ ♜d6 31 ♖xh7 ♖d2+ 32 ♜e3 ♖xg2 33 ♖xa7?

33 e5+! and then ♖xa7 was the correct continuation.

33...♖xh2?


Returning the favour. 33...e5! is unclear.

34 e5+! +- ♜d5 35 ♖d7+ ♜c5 36 ♖d6 ♖g2 37 ♖xe6 g5 38 f5! ♜d5 39 ♖e7 ♖g3+ 40 ♜f2 ♖g4 41 f6 1-0

Endgame 6

Portisch – Pritchett
Buenos Aires OL 1978

1 c4 ♘f6 2 ♘c3 c5 3 g3 d5 4 cxd5 ♘xd5 5 ♙g2 e6 6 ♘f3 ♘c6 7 0-0 ♙e7 8 d4 0-0 9 ♘d5 exd5 10 dxc5 ♙xc5 11 a3 a5 12 ♘e1 d4 13 ♘d3 ♙e7 14 ♙d2 a4 15 b3 axb3 16 ♜xb3 ♘a5 17 ♙xa5 ♜xa5 18 ♙xb7 ♙xb7 19 ♜xb7 ♙xa3 20 ♖fb1 ♜d8 21 ♘e5 ♜e7 22 ♜d5 ♜d6 23 ♜xd6 ♙xd6 24 ♘c6 g6 25 ♖xa8 ♖xa8 26 ♘xd4 h5 27 ♖b7 ♙e5 28 ♘f3 ♙f6 29 ♜g2 ♖e8 30 e3 (D)



White's advantage is obvious. It is not only the material advantage that counts, but also the fact that with pawns on one side of the board, the knight is a stronger piece than the bishop.

30...♖e7 31 ♖b5

Exchanging rooks will also lead to a white win in the long run, but the cooperation between rook and knight can create more problems and more threats.

31...♜g7 32 ♘d2

White should regroup his knight and advance his pawns.

32...♖e5 33 ♖b4 ♗e7 34 ♖b7 ♗f6 35 ♖f3 ♗e7 36 ♖b3 ♗e6 37 ♗e4 ♗e7 38 ♖b7 ♗e5 39 ♗d7 ♗e6 40 ♗c3 ♗f8 41 ♗e2 ♗e7 42 ♗d3 ♗e5 43 ♗f4 ♗e7 44 ♗d5 ♗c7 45 ♗d3 ♗c6 46 e4

After some tries White is again on the right path.

46...♗a6 47 ♖e3 ♖g8 48 h3 ♗h6+ 49 f4 ♗a3 50 g4! hxg4 51 hxg4 ♗g7 52 ♗d8+ ♖h7 53 g5!

Preparing to bury the black bishop in a 'golden cage'.

53...♗a1

53...f6 54 gxf6 ♗xf6 55 ♗d7+ ♖g8 56 e5 +-.

54 e5! ♗g1 55 ♗c5!

This winning method involving ♗e4-f6+, simplifying into a winning rook endgame, is simple and worth remembering.

55...♗g3+ 56 ♖f2 ♗a3 57 ♗e4 ♗a2+ 58 ♖f3 ♗a3+ 59 ♖g4 ♗a4 60 ♗f6+ ♗xf6 61 gxf6

Threatening 62 e6!.

61...♗a6 62 ♗f8! ♗a7 63 e6! fxe6 64 ♗e8! ♖h6

64...♗f7 65 ♖g5.

65 ♗h8+ ♗h7 66 ♗xh7+ ♖xh7 67 ♖g5 ♖h8 68 ♖xg6 ♖g8 69 f7+ ♖f8 70 ♖f6 e5 71 ♖xe5 ♖xf7 72 ♖f5 1-0

Endgame 7

Grivas – Kranewetwogl


Munich 1987

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 d5 4 ♗f3 ♗g7 5 ♗g5 ♗e4 6 cxd5 ♗xg5 7 ♗xg5 e6 8 ♗d2 h6 9 ♗h3 exd5 10 ♗f4 0-0 11 e3 ♗e8 12 ♗e2 b6 13 0-0 ♗b7 14 ♗f3 c6 15 b4 ♗d7 16 b5 ♗f6 17 bxc6 ♗xc6 18 ♗fcl ♗f8 19 ♗b2 ♗d7 20 ♗c2 ♗ad8 21 ♗ac1 ♗d6 22 ♗fxd5 ♗xd5 23 ♗xd5 ♗xd5 24 ♗xd5 ♗xh2+ 25 ♖xh2 ♗xd5 26 ♖g1 ♗e4 27 ♗c8 ♗ee8 28 ♗c7 ♗d7 29 ♗b3 ♗xb3 30 axb3 ♗ee7 31 ♗xd7 ♗xd7 (D)

White has some advantage due to his protected passed d-pawn. However, Black has good drawing chances as he can create a passed pawn of his own on either side of the board and can seek counterplay by activating his rook.

32 ♖f1 ♗d5 33 ♖e2 ♗a5!

An important rule in rook endgames: keep your rook active!



34 ♗c2 ♖f8 35 ♖d3 ♖e7 36 e4 ♗a3 37 ♖c3 ♗a1 38 ♖c4 ♖d7 39 g3 h5 40 f4

Forced, as otherwise Black would continue with 40...g5, creating a kingside passed pawn.

40...♗g1 41 ♗c3 h4 42 gxh4 ♗g4 43 ♗f3 ♗xb4 44 ♖d5 ♗h1 45 b4 ♗b1?

The first mistake and a serious one at that. Black could have held the balance with 45...a5! 46 bxa5 bxa5 47 ♗a3 ♗f1 48 ♖e5 ♗el !.

46 ♗a3! a5 47 bxa5 ♗b5+? 48 ♖c4 ♗xa5 49 ♗b3?

After 49 ♗xa5! bxa5 50 e5! (not 50 ♖b5?? f6! 51 e5 a4! 52 ♖xa4 g5! and it is Black who wins) 50...♖e6 51 d5+! ♖f5 52 ♖b5 f6 53 e6 White wins.


49...♖c6 50 d5+ ♖c7 51 ♗b4 ♗a1 52 ♖d4 f6!

Black defends accurately. The attractive-looking 52...♗e1? 53 ♗c4+! (not 53 ♖e5 f5!) 53...♖d7 54 ♗c6 f5 55 e5! (55 exf5? gxf5 56 ♗xb6 ♗e4+) 55...♗e4+ (55...♗d1+ 56 ♖c4 ♗c1+ 57 ♖b5 ♗b1+ 58 ♖a6 ♗f1 59 ♗xg6 ♗xf4 60 ♖xb6) 56 ♖d3 ♗xf4 57 ♗xg6 ♗e4 58 ♗g7+ ♖e8 59 e6 leads to a win for White.

53 ♗c4+! ♖b7

The only move. Not 53...♖d7? 54 ♗c6.

54 ♗c6 (D)



54...♖a4+?

Black's second real mistake. After 54...♗d1+! 55 ♖e3 f5 56 e5 ♗xd5 57 ♜xg6 b5! 58 ♜g5 (58 ♜g2 ♖c6 59 ♜c2+ ♖b6!) 58...b4 59 ♜xf5 b3 60 ♜h5 b2 61 ♜h1 ♜b5 62 ♜b1 ♜b4! the position is drawn, as White can make no progress without help from his now passive rook.

55 ♖e3 ♜a3+ 56 ♖e2 ♜a4 57 ♖f3 ♜a3+ 58 ♖g4 b5!? 59 ♜xf6 b4 60 ♜f7+!

Accurate as after 60 ♜xg6? b3 White cannot win (and even loses after 61 ♜h6? b2 62 ♜h1 ♜al!).

60...♖b6 61 ♜h7 b3 62 ♜h1 ♖c5

62...b2 63 ♜b1 ♜b3 64 ♖g5!?

is winning for White, as his king is well-placed to support his pawns.

63 ♜c1+! ♖d4

63...♖d6 also fails: 64 ♜c6+! ♖d7 65 ♜b6 +-.

64 d6! b2 65 ♜b1 ♖c3


Another option is 65...♖e4 66 ♜xb2 ♜d3 67 ♜b6 ♜d1 68 d7 ♜xd7 (68...♜gl+ 69 ♖h4 ♜d1 70 ♖g5) 69 ♜xg6, with a theoretically won position for White.

66 d7 ♜a8 67 e5 ♖c2 68 ♜xb2+ ♖xb2 69 e6 1-0

1.3 Early Deviations

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♖c3 d5 4 ♖f3

It is preferable to enter the ♗g5 system via the early ♖f3 move-order. White can avoid some extremely lengthy and complicated lines (after 4 ♗g5 ♖e4) and, moreover, Black can answer 4 ♗g5 with Svidler's idea 4...♗g7 (D).



Now White's best is to transpose to our coverage with 5 ♖f3, as the capture of the d5-pawn

(as well as other lines apart from 5 ♖f3) has not proved its merit, although improvements may be possible:

a) 5 ♗xf6 ♗xf6 6 cxd5 (after 6 ♖xd5?! ♗g7 7 e3 c5 8 ♖f3 ♖c6 ♢ Black will regain the sacrificed material, retaining the bishop-pair) 6...c6 (6...0-0 7 e3 ♖d7 8 ♖f3 ♖b6 9 ♗e2 ♖xd5 10 0-0 1/2-1/2 Miladinović-Skembris, Skopje 2002) and now:

a1) 7 dxc6 ♗xd4 (7...♖xc6? 8 e3 0-0 9 ♖f3 e5 10 d5 ♖e7 11 e4 ♗g4 12 ♗e2 ♜b6 13 ♜b1 ♖c8 14 0-0 ± H.Olafsson-M.Carlsen, Reykjavik 2004) 8 cxb7 ♗xb7 and now:

a11) 9 e3 ♗xc3+ 10 bxc3 ♜a5 and then:

a111) 11 ♜c2 0-0 12 ♖e2 ♖d7 13 ♜b1 ♖c5 14 f3 ♜ab8 15 ♖d4 ♗d5 ♢ V.Popov-Svidler, St Petersburg 1993.

a12) 11 ♜b3 0-0 12 ♖f3 (12 ♖e2 ♖a6!? 13 ♜xb7 ♖c5 14 ♜b1 ♜fd8 15 ♖d4 ♜xc3+ 16 ♖e2 e5 17 ♜c1 exd4 18 ♜xc3 dxc3 19 ♜c1 ♜d2+ ♢ Labuckas-Sakalauskas, Polanica Zdroj 1996) 12...♗xf3 13 gxf3 ♖d7 14 ♜b4 ♜c7 15 ♗e2 ♜ab8 16 ♜a3 ♜c5 17 ♜xc5 ♖xc5 18 0-0 ♜b2 19 ♗c4 ♜c8 20 ♜ab1 ♖a4 21 ♗b3 ♜xb1 22 ♜xb1 ♖xc3 23 ♜b2 1/2-1/2 Goltsov-Yandemirov, Kaluga 2003.

a12) 9 ♜a4+ ♖c6 10 e3 ♜b6! 11 ♗b5 ♗xc3+ 12 bxc3 a6 13 ♗d3 ♜b2 14 ♜b1 ♜xc3+ 15 ♖e2 ♜d8 16 ♜c2 ♜xc2+ 17 ♗xc2 ♖a5 = Lyrberg-Kreiman, Medellin jr Wch 1996.

a13) 9 ♖f3 ♗xc3+ 10 bxc3 ♜a5 11 ♜b3 0-0! 12 e3 ♗xf3 13 gxf3 ♖d7 14 ♜b4 ♜f5! (14...♜xb4 transposes to the aforementioned game Goltsov-Yandemirov, Kaluga 2003) 15 ♗e2 ♜ab8 16 ♜e4 ♜xe4 17 fx4 ♜b2 18 ♜d1 ♖c5 19 ♗f3 ♜xa2 20 0-0 a5 21 e5 ♜b8 0-1 Orlinkov-Nayer, Moscow 1996.

a14) 9 ♜b3 ♜c7 10 e3 ♗g7 11 ♖f3 (11 ♗b5+ ♖c6 12 ♖f3 0-0 13 0-0 ♖e5! 14 ♖xe5 ♜xe5 15 e4 ♜ab8 16 ♜a4 ♜c5 17 ♗e2 ♗a8 18 ♜ab1 ♜fd8! ♢ Papaioannou-Svidler, Duisburg U-16 Wch 1992) 11...0-0 12 ♗e2 ♖d7 13 0-0 ♜ab8 14 ♜a3 ♖e5 15 ♜acl ♗xf3 16 gxf3 ♜b7 17 f4 ♖f3+ 18 ♗xf3 ♜xf3 19 ♜xe7 ♜xb2 20 ♖e4 ♜xa2 21 ♖f6+ ♖h8 22 ♖d7 ♜g4+ 1/2-1/2 Crouch-Svidler, London 1991.

a2) 7 ♜c1 0-0 (7...cxd5? 8 ♖xd5!) 8 dxc6 ♗xd4 9 c7 ♗xc3+ 10 ♜xc3 ♜xd1+ 11 ♖xd1 ♖c6 12 g3 ♗e6 13 ♗g2 ♜ac8 14 ♗xc6 bxc6 15 ♖f3 ♜xc7 16 ♖c1 ♜b8 17 b3 a5 18 ♖g5 ♗f5 19 ♜c4 ♜b4 20 ♜b4 axb4 21 ♖f3 c5 22 ♖e5


f6 23 ♖c4 ♜f7 24 ♜b2 1/2-1/2 Dreev-Sakaev, Tripoli FIDE KO 2004.

a3) 7 e3 cxd5 and here:

a31) 8 ♖f3 0-0-9 ♙e2 ♘c6 (9...b6 100-0 e6 11 ♚c1 ♙b7 12 ♚a4 ♘c6 13 ♙a6 ♙xa6 14 ♚xa6 ♚d7 = Zviagintsev-Leko, Wijk aan Zee 1995) 10 0-0 e6 11 ♚d2 ♙d7 12 ♚fd1 ♚c8 = Peker-Golod, Ramat Aviv 2000.

a32) 8 ♙b5+ ♜f8 (8...♙d7? 9 ♙xd7+ ♚xd7 10 ♚f3! ± Groszpeter-Adorjan, Hungarian Cht 1992 but 8...♘c6 9 ♘f3 0-0 10 0-0 ♘a5 11 b4 a6 12 ♙e2 ♘c6 13 ♚b3 e6 = Dreev-Sakaev, Tripoli FIDE KO 2004 is not bad either) 9 ♘ge2 ♜g7 10 ♘f4 (10 ♚b3 e6 11 0-0 a6 12 ♙d3 ♘c6 13 ♚ac1 ♙e7 = Nakamura-McShane, Mallorca 2004) 10...e6 11 0-0 a6 (11...♚d6 12 ♚c1 a6 13 ♙e2 ♘c6 14 ♘d3 ♘a5 also leads to equality, Karasev-Svidler, St Petersburg 1995) 12 ♙e2 ♚d6 13 ♘d3 ♘d7 14 ♚b3 b6 15 f4 ♙b7 16 ♘e5 ♚hd8 = Goldin-Svidler, St Petersburg 1994.

a4) 7 e4 (D) is the most critical line. Black can try:




a41) 7...cxd5 8 ♘d5 ♙g7 9 ♙b5+ ♙d7 (9...♘c6 10 ♘e2 0-0 11 ♙xc6 bxc6 12 ♘d3 ♚b8 13 ♚b1 ♙a6 14 0-0 c5 15 ♚a4 ♙d3 16 ♚bd1 ♙xe2 17 ♘xe2 ♚xb2 18 dxc5 ♚c7 19 ♘c1 ♚fb8 20 ♚d7 ♚c8 21 ♚fd1 ♙h6 22 c6 ♙xc1 23 c7 ♚d2 24 cxb8 ♚ 1-0 Gretarsson-J.Littlewood, British League (4NCL) 1999/00) 10 ♚c1 ♙xb5 (10...♘c6!?) 11 ♘c7+ ♜f8 12 ♘xb5 a6 13 ♘c7 ♚a7 14 ♘f3 e6 15 ♚b3 ♘c6 16 d5 ♚xc7 17 dxc6 bxc6 18 0-0 c5 19 ♚c2 ♜e7 20 ♚e3 ♚c8 21 ♚fc1 ♚a5 22 ♙xc5 ♙xc5 23 ♙xc5 ♚xa2 24 ♚c8 ♚d7 25 ♚c5+ ♚d6 26 g3 1-0 Gretarsson-H.Olafsson, Gentofte 1999.

a42) 7...♚b6 8 e5 (8 ♘ge2 ♚xb2 9 ♚b1 ♚a3 10 g3 0-0 11 ♙g2 ♙g7 12 ♚d2 ♚a5 13 e5

♚d8 14 f4 cxd5 15 ♘d5 ♘c6 16 ♘e3 f6 17 ♚c3 fxe5 18 dxe5 g5 19 0-0 gxf4 20 gxf4 ♜h8 ∞ Mchedlishvili-Sashikiran, Vlissingen 2004) 8...♚xb2 9 ♘ge2 ♙g7 10 g3 0-0 11 ♙g2 cxd5 12 ♚b1 ♚a3 13 ♘d5 ♘c6 14 0-0 ♚b8 15 ♘ec3 ♙e6 16 ♚d2 ♚fd8 17 ♚b3 ♚a6 18 ♚d1 ♚d7 19 ♚b2 ♚a5 20 ♚b5 ♚d8 ∞ I.Sokolov-N.Ristić, Bosnian Cht (Neum) 2002.

b) 5 e3 c5!? (5...♘e4 will transpose to Section 1.4) 6 dxc5 (6 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 7 cxd5 cxd4 8 exd4 0-0 9 ♙c4 ♚b6 10 ♘ge2 ♚xb2 11 ♚b1 ♚a3 12 0-0 ♘d7 13 ♘e4 ♘b6 14 ♙b3 ♙g7 15 ♚e1 ♚d8 16 ♘2c3 ♙f5 ♚ Krasenkow-Svidler, Madrid 1998 or 6 ♘f3 cxd4 7 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 8 ♘d5 dxe3 9 ♘xf6+ exf6 10 ♚xd8+ ♜xd8 11 fxe3 ♘d7 12 ♚d1 ♜e7 13 ♙e2 ♘e5 14 ♘e5 fxe5 15 ♚d5 f6 = Sorin-Panno, Buenos Aires 1999) 6...♚a5 (D) and then:




b1) 7 ♚d2 dxc4 8 ♙xc4 (8 ♘f3 0-0 9 ♘e4 ♘c6 10 ♘xf6+ exf6 11 ♚xa5 ♘xa5 12 ♙f4 f5 13 0-0-0 b6 ♚ Zakharov-San Segundo, Ubuda 2000) and now 8...♘bd7 9 ♚c1 0-0 10 ♘f3 ♘xc5 11 0-0 ♙e6 12 ♙xe6 ♘xe6 = Moskalenko-Adorjan, Alushta 1994, 8...♙xc5 9 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 10 ♘d5 ♚d6 11 ♘xf6+ ♚xf6 12 ♘e2 1/2-1/2 Sharif-Rowson, Schaen 1996 and 8...♘c6 9 ♚c1 ♚xc5 10 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 11 ♘d5 ♚d6 = are all satisfactory for Black.

b2) 7 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 8 ♚c1 dxc4! (8...♘a6 9 cxd5 ♘xc5 10 ♙b5+ ♜f8 11 ♘ge2 ♚b4 12 0-0 a6 13 d6! ± Moskalenko-Svidler, St Petersburg 1993) 9 ♙xc4 0-0 10 ♘f3 ♚xc5 11 ♚e2 ♙g4 12 0-0 ♙xf3 13 gxf3 ♘c6 14 ♘e4 ♚e5 15 ♘xf6+ ♚xf6 1/2-1/2 Sorin-Sorokin, Villa Gesell 1998.

We now return to the main path (after 1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 ♘f3):

4...♙g7 5 ♙g5 (D)




Now, apart from the most popular continuation 5...d4 (which will be examined in the following sections), Black has tried some alternatives:

- A: 5...c6 18
 B: 5...c5 19
 C: 5...dxc4 22

A)

5...c6 6 e3 (D)

6 cxd5 dxd5! 7 d2 (7 e4!?) 7...h6 8 h4 c5 9 e4 dxc3 10 bxc3 cxd4 11 cxd4 dxc6 12 b5 0-0 13 0-0 dxd4 ♣ Averbakh-Korchnoi, Moscow training 1966.



This is a passive system of defence for Black and cannot be recommended. White can build an advantage without any risk. A kind of a Schlechter Slav has appeared on the board but the inclusion of g5 (rather than the bishop being shut in on c1) is favourable for White.

6...0-0

This is considered to be the best continuation. Alternatives:

- a) 6...a5 7 b3 (7 xf6 xf6 8 cxd5 cxd5 9 b3 e6 10 b5+ d7 11 0-0 b6 12 a4 0-0

13 a5 ± Kholmov-A.Zaitsev, USSR Ch (Alma-Ata) 1968/9) 7...d7 8 cxd5 cxd5?! 9 xf6! ± Grivas-Kagambi, Thessaloniki OL 1988.

b) 6...g4 7 h3 xf3 8 xf3 e6 9 cxd5 cxd5 10 d3 d7 11 0-0 0-0 12 b4 b5 13 e4 b6 14 e5 ± d4? 15 xe4? (simply 15 xe4! dx4 16 xe4 gives White a healthy extra pawn) 15...xd4 16 dxd5 cxd5 17 xd5 dx5 18 b3 with an advantage for White due to the bishop-pair, Grivas-Petropoulos, Athens 1986.

c) 6...d4 7 h4 (7 f4!? a5 {7...0-0 8 cxd5 cxd5 9 b3! ±} 8 b3 0-0 9 cxd5 dxc3 10 bxc3 cxd5 11 e2 d6 12 0-0 d8 13 fcl d5 14 b4 b6 15 d2 ± Taimanov-A.Zaitsev, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1969) 7...0-0 8 d3 dxc3 9 bxc3 d7 10 0-0 f6 11 cxd5 cxd5 12 c4 ± (due to the strong centre) Zsu.Polgar-Korchnoi, Brussels 1985.

7 d3

7 b3!? is not bad either: 7...dxc4 8 xc4 b5 (8...b6 9 0-0 f5 10 d5 xb3 11 xb3 h6 12 h4 g5 13 g3 d7 14 dxd7 dxd7 15 acl ± Grivas-Vouros, Athens 1982) 9 e2 e6 10 c2 ± Dzindzichashvili-M.Mukhin, USSR Ch (Baku) 1972.

7...e6

The transposition to the Tarrasch Defence with opposite colours was favourable for White after 7...dxc4 8 xc4 c5 (8...d7 9 h3 ± Grivas-Z.Zahariev, Iraklion 1992 or 8...g4 9 xf6!? xf6 10 h3 xf3 11 xf3 d7 12 0-0 c5 13 ad1 cxd4 14 exd4 c8 15 b3 ± Atalik-Andrianov, Hawaii 1997) 9 0-0! cxd4 10 exd4 d7 11 h3 db6 12 b3 dbd5 13 e1 e6 14 d2 ± in Grivas-Soylu, Elista OL 1998.

8 e2

Also possible is 8 cxd5! dxd5 (8...cxd5 9 0-0 d7 10 cl a6 11 d2 b5 12 b4 ± Vaganian-Katalymov, USSR 1974) 9 0-0 d7 10 h3 f6 11 h4 a5 12 g3 f7 13 dxd5 xd5 14 e4 ± Smyslov-Lutikov, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1969.

8...d7

Now:

a) 9 0-0 h6! 10 h4 g5!? (10...g4?! 11 cxd5 cxd5 12 h3 is much better for White, Kasparov-Smyslov, Vilnius Ct (1) 1984) 11 g3 h5 ∞ Kasparov.

b) 9 h3!? gives White a significant space advantage; his next moves are 0-0, ad1, fel and e4.

B)

5...c5 6 dxc5

Not much is gained by:


a) 6 cxd5 ♘d5 7 e3 cxd4 8 exd4 ♘c6 9 ♙c4 ♘b6 10 ♙b5 0-0 11 ♙xc6 bxc6 12 h3 ♙a6 13 ♚c2 ♘d5 ± Kriakvin-Shipov, Internet 2004.

b) 6 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 7 cxd5 (7 ♘d5? ♙g7 8 e3 ♘c6 9 ♙e2 cxd4 10 exd4 0-0 is slightly better for Black, Cifuentes-I.Sokolov, Amsterdam 1996) 7...♚b6 (7...cxd4?! 8 ♘d4 0-0 9 e3 ♘d7 10 ♙c4 ± Cifuentes-Djurić, San Lorenzo 1996) 8 e3 (8 ♘e4 ♙xd4 9 ♘d4 cxd4 10 ♚d2 ♘a6 11 ♘d1 ♘b4 12 a3 ♘d5 13 ♚xd4 = or 8 e4!? cxd4 9 ♘b5 ♙g4 10 ♙c1 ♘a6 11 ♘bxd4 ♙xf3 12 ♘xf3 ♙xb2 = Burgess-Skjelde, Gausdal 1990) and now:

b1) 8...cxd4 9 ♙b5+ (9 ♘d4 ♚xb2 10 ♙c1 0-0 11 ♙e2 ♙xd4 12 exd4 ♘d7 13 0-0 ♘f6 14 ♙f3 ♙f5 15 ♙e1 ♙ac8 16 ♚b3 ♚xb3 17 axb3 ♙fd8 18 ♙xe7 ♘d5 19 ♙xd5 ♙xd5 20 ♙e8+ ♙xe8 21 ♘d5 ♙d8 22 ♘e7+ ♙f8 23 ♘xf5 gxf5 24 ♙c4! = Van der Sterren-Khalifman, Bundesliga 1996/7) 9...♙d7 10 ♘d4 ♙xb5 11 ♘cxb5 a6 12 ♘c3 ♚xb2 13 ♙c1 ∞.

b2) 8...♚xb2 9 ♚c1 ♚xc1+ 10 ♙xc1 cxd4 11 ♘b5 ♘a6 12 ♘bxd4 b6 13 ♙b5+ ♙f8 14 e4 ♙xd4 15 ♘d4 ♘c5 16 f3 e6 17 ♙c4 exd5 18 ♙xd5 ♙b8 19 0-0 ♙b7 20 ♘b3 ♙xd5 21 ♘xc5 bxc5 22 exd5 1/2-1/2 Zviagintsev-Svidler, Yugoslav Cht (Tivat) 1995.

6...♚a5 (D)



7 cxd5!

Probably the only way to try for advantage, as the alternatives are not helpful:

a) 7 ♘d2 dxc4 8 ♚a4+ ♚xa4 9 ♘xa4 1/2-1/2 Sergienko-Nikolenko, Smolensk 2000.

b) 7 ♙d2 dxc4 8 e4 ♚xc5 9 ♚a4+ ♘c6 10 ♚xc4 ♚xc4 11 ♙xc4 0-0 12 h3 ♙d8 = Nayer-V.Below, Internet 2004.

c) 7 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 8 cxd5 0-0 (8...♙xc3+ 9 bxc3 ♚xc3+ 10 ♘d2 ♚xc5?? 11 ♙c1 +- but 8...♘a6!? 9 e4 ♙xc3+ 10 bxc3 ♚xc3+ 11 ♘d2 ♘xc5 12 ♙b5+ ♙d7 13 ♙c1 ♚a5 14 ♙xd7+ ♘d7 15 0-0 ± is an interesting alternative) 9 ♚d2 ♘a6 10 ♙d1?! (10 ♘e4 and 10 a3 are both playable and much better than the text-move) 10...♘xc5 11 ♘d4 ♘a4 12 e4 ♙d7 13 ♘xa4 ♚xa4 14 b3 ♚a3 15 ♙b5 ♙xb5 16 ♘xb5 ♚c5 17 ♘d4 e6 18 ♘e2 exd5 19 exd5 ♙ad8 20 0-0 ♙fe8 21 ♘g3 ♙g7 22 ♚d3 ♙d7 23 ♚f3 ♙e5 24 d6 f5 25 ♙d3 ♙f8 26 ♙fd1 ♙e6 27 h4 ♙exd6 28 ♙xd6 ♙xd6 29 ♙xd6 ♙xd6 ♚xd6 ± Hernando Rodrigo-Kariakin, Kallithea ECC 2002.


7...♘d5

The standard Grünfeld and Catalan continuation! Other moves do not help:

a) 7...♚xc5? 8 e4 ♘g4 9 ♚d2 0-0 10 h3 ♙xc3 11 bxc3 ♘xf2 12 ♙e3 wins for White, Baila-D.Janssen, Fischbek 1997.

b) 7...♘e4? 8 ♙d2! ♘d2 9 ♚xd2 ♘a6 10 e3 ♘xc5 11 ♙b5+ ♙d7 12 ♙xd7+ ♙xd7 (or 12...♘d7 13 0-0 ♘c5 14 ♙ab1 ♚a6 15 b4 ♘d7 16 ♘e4 ± 0-0 17 ♘c5 ♘xc5 18 bxc5 ♙fd8 19 e4 ♙ac8 20 ♙fc1 ♙c7 21 e5 ♙cd7 22 d6 exd6 23 cxd6 ♙e8 24 ♚d5 h6 25 ♙c7 ♙xc7 26 dxc7 ♙e6 27 ♚xe6 1-0 Zilberman-Gusev, Belgorod 1990) 13 0-0 ♙hd8 14 ♘e4 ♚b6 15 ♘xc5+ ♚xc5 16 ♙ac1 ♙b5 17 e4 ± ♙e8 18 b3 a5 19 ♙f4 ♙a6 20 ♙c7 a4 21 ♚h4 ♙d7 22 ♙c8+ ♙d8 23 ♙xd8+ ♙xd8 24 ♚xh7 ♙b2 25 ♚xf7 axb3 26 axb3 ♚xb3 27 ♘g5 ♙f6 1-0 Zilberman-Teske, Frunze 1989. There follows 28 ♘e6+ +-.

8 ♚xd5 ♙xc3+ 9 ♙d2 (D)



This position can also arise from another variation of the Grünfeld Defence (1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 ♘f3 ♙g7 5 ♙f4), classified under ECO D92. Black has employed two continuations:

B1: 9...♙xd2+ 20

B2: 9...♙e6 20

B1)


9...♙xd2+ 10 ♖xd2 ♗xd2+

10...♗xc5 11 ♖c1 ♗f5 12 ♘d4 (12 h4 h5 {12...♘c6 13 h5 ± Petrosian-Shamkovich, Moscow 1966} 13 ♘d4 ♗d7 14 ♖h3 ± Chatalbashev-Cornette, Calvi 2004) 12...♗d7 13 ♗h6! ♘c6 (13...♗xd4 14 ♖xc8+ ♘d7 15 ♖c3 ± Nogueiras-Moraza, Thessaloniki OL 1984 or 13...♘a6 14 ♗g7 ♖f8 15 e4 ♗d6 16 ♙b5+ ♙d7 17 ♙xd7+ ♗xd7 18 0-0 ♘c7 19 ♗e5 ♖c8 20 ♗c5 b6 21 ♗c4 a6 22 ♖fd1 b5 23 ♗c2 ♖g8 24 ♘c6 ♗g4 25 ♘a7 1-0 Kolas-A.Olsen, Oslo 2002) 14 ♘xc6 bxc6 15 ♗g7 ♖f8 16 e3 ♗d5 17 ♗c3 ♙d7 18 ♖d1 ♗e4 (18...♗g5 19 ♗b4 {19 g3 ♗f6 20 ♗d2 ♙g4 21 ♙e2 ♙e6 22 0-0 ± Burmakin-Vorobiev, Moscow 1996} 19...♖d8 20 h4 ♗e5 21 ♙e2 ± Marin-Pasarelu, Eforie Nord 2002) 19 f3 ♗h4+ 20 g3 ♗h5 21 ♙g2 ♗b5 22 ♘f2 ± Timman-J.Littlewood, London 1969.

11 ♘xd2 ♙e6

11...♘a6? is bad: 12 ♖c1 ♙e6 (12...♙d7 13 e3 ♘c7 14 ♙e2 0-0 15 ♙f3 ♖ab8 16 0-0 ± Abdel Razik-Ak Qadri, Bled OL 2002) 13 a3 ♖c8 14 b4 0-0 15 e3 ♘b8 16 ♙c4 ♙d7 17 ♗e2 is much better for White, Grigore-Pasarelu, Eforie Nord 2002.

12 e3 0-0 (D)



Now:

a) 13 ♙c4 ♙xc4 14 ♘xc4 ♘a6! 15 c6 ♖ac8 16 ♘e5 b6! = Vigh-Piankov, Budapest 1994. The c6-pawn will not go far.

b) 13 ♖c1 ♖c8 and then:

b1) 14 ♙b5 a6! (14...b6?! 15 b3 bxc5 16 ♗e2 ± A.Zaitsev-Szilagy, Albena 1970) 15 ♙a4 (15 ♙c4 ♖xc5 16 ♗e2 ♙xc4+ 17 ♖xc4 {17 ♘xc4 ♘c6 =} 17...♘d7 18 ♖xc5 ♘xc5 19 ♖c1 ♘e6 = or 15 ♙e2 ♘d7 16 c6 ♘e5! 17 c7 ♘c6 18 ♙f3 ♖xc7 19 ♙xc6 ♖ac8!) 15...♙xa2! 16 ♗e2 (16 b3? b5) 16...♙e6 17 ♖hd1 (17 ♖c3 ♘c6 18 ♘b3 ♙xb3 19 ♖xb3 ♘a5 20 ♖c3 = Dževlan-Alqvist, Stockholm 1992) 17...a5 18 ♘e4 f6 = Bagheri-Goormachtigh, Belgium 2003.

b2) 14 a3 a5 (14...b6 is equally good, as now the white b2-pawn will be just as weak on the open b-file) 15 ♖c3 a4 16 ♙d3 ♖a5 17 ♗e2 ♖axc5 18 ♖xc5 ♖xc5 19 ♖d1 f5 20 f4 ♘c6 21 e4 b5 = Alburf-F.Silva, Odessa 1976.


c) 13 ♙e2! ♘d7 (13...♖c8? 14 ♙f3) 14 c6 bxc6 15 0-0-0! (15 0-0 ♖fb8! 16 b3 a5 = Sinkovics-Molnar, Budapest 2001) 15...♖ab8 16 ♗b1 (16 ♙c4 ±) 16...♘b6 17 ♖c1 ♖fd8 18 ♖hd1 and White can claim a small but secure advantage due to the weak black c-pawn. The placement of the white king on the queenside is a significant factor, as it adds valuable protection to it. This is a joint analysis with IM Pavlos Gesos and needs to be tested in practice.

B2)

9...♙e6 10 ♗xb7!

10 ♙xc3 ♗xc3+ 11 ♗d2 (11 bxc3!? is an interesting alternative which needs further tests: 11...♙xd5 12 ♘e5! ♘d7 13 e4! ♙c6 14 ♘d7 ♗xd7 15 f3 ♖hd8 16 0-0-0+ ♗e8 17 ♙c4 gives White a slight advantage, Barbero-T.Lund, Baden-Baden 1987) 11...♗xd2+ (11...♗xc5 12 ♖c1 {12 ♗d4 = Akobian-Khachian, Los Angeles 2002} 12...♗b6 13 h4 h5 14 ♗d4 ♗xd4 15 ♘d4 ♙d7 = Urday-Stillger, Berlin 1997) 12 ♗xd2 (12 ♘xd2 ♘a6 13 e3 ♘xc5 14 ♙b5+ ♗f8 15 ♗e2 ♗g7 16 ♖hc1 ♖ac8 = Sultan-gareev-V.Belov, Vladimir 2002) 12...♘a6 13 e3 ♖d8+ 14 ♘d4 ♘xc5 15 ♙b5+ ♙d7 16 ♙xd7+ ♖xd7 17 ♖ac1 ♘e4+ 18 ♗e2 0-0 19 f3 ♘d6 20 ♖hd1 ♖c8 21 ♖xc8+ ♘xc8 22 ♖c1 ♘b6 23 ♘b3 ♘a4 ½-½ Döttling-M.Schäfer, Böblingen 2000.

10...♙xd2+ 11 ♖xd2 0-0 (D)



12 b4!

White should be careful as he has entered tactical territory. Other variations risk exposing Black's hidden possibilities:

a) 12 e4? ♘c6! (12...♞d8? 13 b4 ♖a4 14 ♖xa8! ♘c6 15 ♖xd8+ ♘xd8 16 b5!±) 13 ♖a6 (13 ♖xc6 ♞ad8! {13...♞fd8? 14 ♙d3} 14 ♞d1 ♞xd2 15 ♞xd2 ♞d8 →) 13...♖xc5 14 ♖b5 ♖d6 15 ♘c4 ♖d4! 16 ♙e2 (16 ♖xc6 ♞fc8 17 ♖a6 ♖xe4+ 18 ♘e3 ♖b4+ →) 16...♞fc8 17 0-0 ♞ab8 18 ♖a4 ♖xe4 19 ♞fe1 ♘d4 20 ♙f1 ♖f4 21 b3 ♞c5 22 ♖xa7 ♞h5 23 h3 ♞xh3 24 ♖xb8+ ♖xb8 25 gxh3 ♘f3+ 26 ♘g2 ♙d5 0-1 Dreev-Epishin, Tallinn 1986.

b) 12 e3?! ♞d8 13 ♞d1 ♘c6 14 ♖b5 ♖c7 15 ♖a4 ♞ab8 16 ♙b5 ♘e5 ♢ Raetsky-Nedev, Basle 2004.

c) 12 ♖xa8?! ♞d8! and now:

c1) 13 ♞d1? ♙d5 14 b4 ♖a4 15 ♖xd5 ♞xd5 16 e4 ♞d4 ♢.

c2) 13 0-0-0 ♖xc5+ 14 ♘b1 ♞c8! (not 14...♙d5? 15 ♘b3 ♙e4+ 16 ♞d3 ±) 15 ♘a1 ♖a5! (15...♖c2?! 16 ♞b1 ♖a4 {16...♘c6 17 ♖xc8+ ♙xc8 18 ♘b3 ±} 17 a3 {17 b3?? ♖d4+ 18 ♞b2 ♞c1+ 19 ♘b1 ♞xb1+ 20 ♘b1 ♖d1#} 17...♘c6 18 ♖xc8+ ♙xc8 19 ♞c1 ♙e6 20 e3 ♘a5 21 ♙d3 {21 ♘b1 ♘b3 22 ♘xb3 ♖xb3} 21...♖d7 22 ♞c3 ♖d5) 16 ♘c4 (16 a3 ♖xd2 →) 16...♙xc4 17 a3 ♖a4 18 ♞c1 ♖b3 19 ♞xc4 ♞xc4 20 ♘b1 ♞d4 →.

c3) 13 b4! ♖xb4 14 ♞d1 ♞xd2 15 ♞xd2 ♖b1+ 16 ♞d1 ♖b4+ 17 ♞d2 ♖b1+ =.

12...♖a4!

12...♖a3? is wrong: 13 ♖xa8 ♞d8 14 e4! ±.

13 e3!

The greedy 13 ♖xa8? ♘c6! (13...♞d8? 14 e4!) 14 ♖b7 ♘xb4 15 ♞c1 ♘c2+ 16 ♞xc2

♖xc2 17 ♖b1 ♖c3 18 e3 ♞d8 19 ♖d1 ♙xa2 20 c6 ♖xc6 ∞ and 13 a3 ♘c6 14 e3 a6 1/2-1/2 Alterman-Shipov, Belgrade 1999 are not the best ways for White to play. Also, 13 e4 ♘d7! (13...♞d8? 14 ♖xa8 ♘c6 15 ♖xd8+ ♘xd8 16 b5 ±) 14 ♖b5! (14 a3? ♖c2! 15 ♙b5?! ♘e5! ♢ C.Lehmann-Neb.Ristić, Germany tt 1993/4) 14...♖a3 15 c6 ♘f6 was unclear in K.Grigrorian-Tseshkovsky, Baku 1977.

13...♘d7

The alternative 13...♞d8 is not attractive either: 14 ♙c4! (14 a3 ♖c2 15 ♞d1 ♙d5 16 ♖xe7 ♘c6 17 ♖f6 ∞ Akhmetov-Turov, Moscow 2005) 14...♘c6 (14...♙xd2 15 ♙xe6 +→ or 14...♙xc4 15 ♘xc4 ♘c6 16 0-0 ±) 15 ♙xe6 fxe6 (15...♞ab8 16 ♙b3! ±) 16 b5 ♘a5 17 ♖xe7 ♞xd2 (17...♖xb5 18 ♖xe6+ ♘g7 19 ♖e7+ ♘g8 20 ♘e4 ♖b4+ 21 ♞c4+ 22 ♘gl +→ Grigore-Rogozenko, Odorhei Secuiesc 1992) 18 ♖xe6+ ♘g7 19 ♖e7+ ♘g8 20 ♘xd2 ♞f8 21 f4 ♘c4+ 22 ♘d3 ♘b2+ 23 ♘e2 ♖xb5+ 24 ♘f3 ♞e8 25 ♖f6 ♘c4 26 ♞ad1! (26 ♞he1?! ♘d2+) 26...♖xe3+ 27 ♘f2 ♞e2+ 28 ♘g3 ♞e3+ 29 ♘h4 ♖e8 30 ♞d8 1-0 Grigore-Odeev, Romania 1994.

14 a3 ♞fd8 15 ♖a6!

15 ♙b5? ♖c2 16 ♙xd7 ♙xd7 17 ♖e4 ♖a4! ∞ Lukacs-E.Liss, Budapest 1995.

15...♖c2 16 ♖d3 ♖xd3

16...♖a4 17 ♖a6 ♖c2 18 ♖d3 ♖a4 19 ♖c3! a5 and now:

a) 20 ♞b1 axb4 21 axb4 ♖a2! (21...♘f6!?) 22 ♖b2 ♘f6 ∞.

b) 20 b5!? ♘xc5 21 ♖xc5 ♞ac8 22 ♖e5 ♖c2 (22...♞d5? 23 ♖e4! +→) 23 ♞d1 ♞d5 24 ♖a1 ♞cd8 25 ♙e2 ♞xd2 26 0-0 ± Van Wely.

c) 20 ♞c1 axb4 21 axb4 ♘f6 22 ♙c4 ♙xc4 23 ♖xc4 ♘d5 24 0-0 (24 ♞b1? ♖a2 25 c6 ♘xe3 26 ♖xa2 ♞xa2 27 fxe3 {27 c7?!}, Van Wely-Kamsky, Groningen 1995) 27...♞dx2 28 b5 ♞e2+ 29 ♘f1 ♞f2+ 30 ♘e1 1/2-1/2 Kosyrev-Turov, Montreal 2001) 24...♖xb4 25 ♞fd1! ± (this is better than 25 ♖xb4 ♘xb4 ±).


17 ♙xd3 ♘xc5 18 ♙c2

18 ♙xg6?! hxg6 (18...♞xd2? 19 bxc5 ♞ad8 20 ♙e4) 19 bxc5 ♞ac8 ∞.

18...♘d3+ 19 ♙xd3 ♞xd3 (D)

Now:

a) 20 ♘f3?! a5 21 b5 (21 0-0 axb4 22 axb4 ♞xa1 23 ♞xa1 ♞b3 = or 21 ♘e2 ♞b3!) 21...a4! 22 0-0 ♞b8 (22...♙b3?! 23 ♞fc1 ♞b8 24 ♞c5 ±




Riazantsev-Macieja, Moscow 2002) 23 $\text{d}4$ $\text{b}3!$ with equality.

b) 20 $\text{e}2$ $\text{d}5$ 21 $\text{h}c1!$ \pm (21 $\text{f}3?$ $\text{a}5!$ 22 $\text{d}4$ $\text{d}7$ 23 $\text{h}c1$ $\text{e}5$ 24 $\text{b}3$ $\text{a}b4$ 25 $\text{a}b4$ $\text{b}b8$ 26 $\text{c}5$ 1/2-1/2 Mah-Lalić, London 1999).

c) 20 $\text{d}e4!$ $\text{a}5$ (20... $\text{b}3$ 21 $\text{d}c5$ $\text{b}2$ 22 0-0 \pm) 21 $\text{d}c5$ $\text{h}c3$ 22 $\text{d}d2$ $\text{h}c4$ 23 $\text{d}xe6$ $\text{f}xe6$ 24 $\text{h}c1$ $\text{h}4$ 25 $\text{b}5$ with a clear advantage for White.

C)

5... $\text{d}xc4$ (D)



Now we consider:

C1: 6 $\text{e}4$ 22

C2: 6 $\text{a}4+$ 25

Or 6 $\text{e}3$:

a) 6... $\text{c}5?$? 7 $\text{d}xc4$ $\text{c}d4$ 8 $\text{e}d4$ (8 $\text{a}d4$ $\text{a}d4$ 9 $\text{d}d4$ 0-0 10 0-0 $\text{d}d7$ 11 $\text{d}d5$ $\text{d}d5$ 12 $\text{d}d5$ $\text{d}c6$ 13 $\text{d}xc6$ $\text{b}xc6$ 14 $\text{d}xe7$ $\text{f}b8!$ 15 $\text{b}3$ $\text{a}5$ 16 $\text{a}c1$ $\text{d}d4!$ 17 $\text{e}d4$ $\text{a}4$ = Isrutescu-Iordachescu, Tusnad 2005) 8...0-0 9 $\text{h}3$ $\text{d}bd7$ 10 0-0 $\text{d}b6$ 11 $\text{b}b3$ \pm Rajković-Zygoris, Komotini 1993. White is playing a Tarrasch Defence with opposite colours and two extra

tempi (1 $\text{d}4$ $\text{d}5$ 2 $\text{c}4$ $\text{e}6$ 3 $\text{d}c3$ $\text{c}5$ 4 $\text{c}d5$ $\text{e}d5$ 5 $\text{d}f3$ $\text{d}c6$ 6 $\text{g}3$ 7 $\text{d}f6$ 7 $\text{g}2$ $\text{e}e7$ 8 0-0 0-0 9 $\text{d}xc5$ $\text{d}xc5$).

b) 6... $\text{e}6!$? 7 $\text{d}e5$ (7 $\text{e}4$ $\text{c}6!$ 8 $\text{a}4$ 0-0 9 $\text{a}d2$ $\text{a}5$ \mp Ostrowski-Grebionkin, Dos Hermanas 2004) 7... $\text{d}d5!$ (7... $\text{c}5?$? 8 $\text{a}4+$ $\text{d}bd7$ 9 $\text{d}xc4$ $\text{a}b6$ 10 $\text{d}xf6$ $\text{d}xf6$ 11 $\text{d}d5$ $\text{a}d8$ 12 $\text{d}d7$ $\text{d}d7$ 13 $\text{b}b5$ $\text{h}c8$ 14 $\text{d}xf6+$ $\text{e}xf6$ 15 $\text{h}c1$ $\text{b}6$ 16 $\text{d}xc5$ $\text{h}xc5$ 17 $\text{h}xc5$ $\text{b}xc5$ 18 $\text{e}e2$ $\text{a}c7$ 19 $\text{h}c1$ \pm Armas-C.Toth, Matanzas 1993) 8 $\text{d}xc4$ $\text{c}5!$ 9 $\text{d}b5$ (all other tries lead to disaster for White) 9... $\text{f}6$ (9...0-0 10 $\text{d}xc5$ $\text{h}6$ 11 $\text{d}h4$ $\text{d}c6$ ∞ Grivas-N.Ristić, Athens 1993) 10 $\text{e}4$ $\text{d}c7$ 11 $\text{d}xc7+$ $\text{a}xc7$ 12 $\text{d}e3$ $\text{c}d4$ 13 $\text{a}d4$ 0-0 ∞ Halldorsson-Oral, Selfoss 2003.

C1)

6 $\text{e}4$

I do not believe that White can claim an advantage with this move, although the assessment of the sharp variations that arise can easily change.



6... $\text{c}5$

This move leads to especially sharp play. There are two alternatives worth covering:

a) 6... $\text{g}4$ 7 $\text{d}xc4$ $\text{d}xf3$ (the logical follow-up, as 7... $\text{d}f7$ 8 $\text{h}3$ $\text{d}xf3$ 9 $\text{a}xf3$ 0-0 10 $\text{d}d5$ $\text{d}c6$ 11 $\text{d}d1$ $\text{h}6$ 12 $\text{d}e3$ $\text{e}6$ 13 $\text{d}c3$ $\text{d}b6$ 14 $\text{d}b3$ $\text{d}a5?$? {14... $\text{d}d4!$? 15 $\text{d}d4$ $\text{d}d4$ 16 $\text{d}b5$ $\text{c}5$ 17 $\text{d}d4$ $\text{c}d4$ 18 $\text{a}f4$, when White has compensation, looks more critical} 15 0-0 $\text{d}bc4$ 16 $\text{d}xc4$ $\text{d}xc4$ 17 $\text{b}3$ $\text{d}b6$ 18 $\text{a}g3$ was nice for White in Koczko-D.Boros, Hungarian jr Ch (Budapest) 2004) 8 $\text{g}xf3$ 0-0 9 $\text{a}d2$ (9 $\text{h}4?$ $\text{d}h5!$ {9... $\text{d}f7?$ 10 $\text{h}5!$ $\text{d}b6$ 11 $\text{d}b3$ $\text{a}5$ 12 $\text{h}xg6$ $\text{h}xg6$ 13 $\text{a}d2$ $\text{a}4$ 14 $\text{d}xa4!$ \pm Rajković-M.Pavlović, Herceg Novi 2001) 10 $\text{d}d5$ $\text{d}c6$ 11 $\text{d}b5$ $\text{h}6$ 12 $\text{d}e3$ $\text{d}d4!$ {12... $\text{f}5$ 13 $\text{d}xc6$ $\text{b}xc6$ 14 $\text{d}b4$ $\text{f}4$ 15 $\text{d}d2$ $\text{a}d4$ = Bosbach-Nen.Ristić, 2nd Bundesliga 1989/90) 13 $\text{d}d4$ $\text{d}d4$ 14 $\text{a}d4$ $\text{e}f7$ or 9 $\text{d}e3$ $\text{d}f7$ 10 $\text{f}4$ $\text{e}6$ 11 $\text{e}5$ $\text{d}b6$ 12 $\text{d}b3$ $\text{d}c6$ 13 $\text{h}4$ $\text{h}5$ 14 $\text{d}e4$ $\text{d}d5$ 15 $\text{h}c1$ ∞ Zaichik-S.Mohr, Baden-Baden 1990) 9... $\text{d}f7$ (D).

In this interesting position Black intends to continue with ... $\text{d}b6$, ... $\text{d}c6$ - $\text{a}5$, putting pressure on the white centre.

a1) 10 $\text{d}d5!$? $\text{c}6?$? (10... $\text{d}c6!$ is essential, with unclear play) 11 $\text{d}b3$ $\text{d}b6$ 12 0-0-0 $\text{a}c7$ 13 $\text{h}4$ $\text{h}5$ 14 $\text{h}g1$ $\text{d}h7$ 15 $\text{f}4$ $\text{c}5$ 16 $\text{f}5!$ is much



better for White, Rogers-Van de Plassche, Dutch Cht 1994/5.

a2) 100-0-0 ♖b6 11 ♜b3 ♝c6 12 ♞e2 ♞d7 (12...a5 13 a3 ♞d7 14 ♜h6 a4 15 ♜a2 ♞a5 16 ♜xg7 ♜xg7 17 h4 ♞b5 18 h5 ♝bc4 19 ♞c3 ± Banikas-A.Tzermiadanos, Athens 2002) 13 h4 ♞ad8 ∞ Bönsch-Popović, Austria 2001.

a3) 10 ♞d1 ♝c6 and then:

a31) 11 ♜e3 e5! (11...♝b6 12 ♜e2 e6 13 b3 ♞e7 14 ♜b5 ♞fd8 15 ♜xc6 bxc6 16 ♜g5 f6 17 ♜e3 c5 18 d5 exd5 19 ♝xd5 ∞ Bottema-I.Sokolov, Stockholm 1987) 12 dxe5 ♝dxe5 13 ♞xd8 ♞fxd8 ♢ Zivanić-M.Pavlović, Belgrade 2001.

a32) 11 ♞e2 ♝b6 12 ♜b5 ♝b8 (12...♞d6! ∞) 13 ♞b4 ♜f6 14 ♜h6 ♜g7 15 ♜xg7 ♜xg7 16 h4 ± Barsov-Van de Plassche, Dutch Cht 1994/5.

b) 6...0-0 7 ♜xc4 ♜g4 (D) (other moves are worse: 7...c5?! 8 d5 ♜g4 9 0-0 ♝bd7 10 ♜e2 ± O.Rodriguez-Garcia Ilundain, Las Palmas 1994; 7...b6 8 e5 ♝e8 9 ♝d5 ♝c6 10 0-0 ♞d7 11 ♞c1 ± Duong Tuong-Hoang Thai, Hue 2003; or 7...c6 8 0-0 {8 a3 ♜g4 9 ♜e2 ♞c7 10 0-0 ♞d8 11 ♞c1 ♞b6 ∞ S.Müller-Ruchay, Dortmund 2004} 8...♜g4 9 ♜e2 ♞b6 10 e5 ♝d5 11 ♝xd5 cxd5 12 ♜xe7 ♞e8 13 ♜a3 ± Maiko-Dvoretska, Kharkov 2003).

Now Black more or less achieves a fine game, as the following examples show:

b1) 8 ♞d2 ♝c6 9 d5 ♞a5 10 ♜e2 c6 11 0-0 cxd5 12 exd5 ♞c8 13 ♞f4 ♜xf3 14 ♞xf3 ♝c4 15 ♜xc4 ♞xc4 16 ♞ad1 h6 17 ♜xf6 ♜xf6 18 d6 exd6 19 ♞xb7 ♜xc3 1/2-1/2 Auciello-Ricardi, Buenos Aires 1994.

b2) 8 ♜e3 ♝fd7 9 ♜e2 ♝b6 10 0-0 ♝c6 (10...e6?! 11 ♞c1 ♝c6 12 e5 ♜xf3 13 ♜xf3 ♝c4 14 ♜xc6 bxc6 15 ♝e4 ♞d5 16 ♞f3 ♝xb2 17 ♞c5 ♞d7 18 ♞xc6 ♝d3 19 ♞c4 ± Wells-Pein,

London 1985) 11 d5 ♜xf3 12 ♜xf3 ♞e5 13 ♜e2 ♝ec4 14 ♜f4 c6 15 dxc6 ♞xd1 16 ♝xd1 bxc6 17 ♞c1 ♝xb2 18 ♝xb2 ♜xb2 19 ♞c2 ♜a3 20 ♜a6 c5 21 ♞b1 c4 22 ♜c7 ♜d6 23 ♜xb6 ♞ab8 24 ♜xc4 axb6 1/2-1/2 Gheorghiu-Ghinda, Timisoara 1976.

b3) 8 ♜e2 ♝fd7! (8...h6?! 9 ♜e3 c6 10 ♞d2 ♜h7 11 e5 ♝d5 12 ♝g5+ hxg5 13 ♜xg4 ♝xe3 14 ♞xe3 f5 15 exf6 ♜xf6 16 0-0-0 ♞a5 17 ♝e4 ♜g7 18 ♜b1 ♞a6 19 h4 ♝b4 20 ♞a3 ♞b5 21 hxg5 ♜xg5 22 ♝xg5 ♞xg5 23 ♞xb4 ♞xg4 24 ♞xe7+ ♞f7 25 ♞h7+ 1-0 Rajković-Vidić, Bajmok 2001 or 8...♝c6 9 d5 ♜xf3 10 ♜xf3 ♞e5 11 ♜e2 ±) 9 0-0 (9 ♞d2 ♝b6 10 0-0-0 ♝c6 11 e5 ♞d7 12 h3 ♜xf3 13 ♜xf3 ♞fd8 14 ♜e3 ♝c4 15 ♞e2 ♝xe3 16 fxe3 e6 17 h4 h6 18 g4 ♝e7 19 ♝e4 ∞ Dearing-Kreiman, London 1998) 9...♝c6!? (9...♝b6 10 ♝e1 ♜xe2 11 ♝xe2 ♝c6 12 ♝f3 ♞d7 13 ♞b3 h6 14 ♜e3 ♜h7 15 ♞fd1 ♞ad8 16 ♞ac1 ± Krizsany-Szeberenyi, Pecs 1996) 10 d5 (10 e5 ♝b6 = or 10 ♜e3 ♝b6 =) 10...♜xf3 11 ♜xf3 ♝d4 with dynamic equality.

7 d5

Or:

a) 7 dxc5 ♞a5 8 ♝d2 ♜e6 9 ♜xc4 ♜xc4 10 ♝xc4 ♞xc5 11 ♞a4+ ♝c6! (11...♞c6?! 12 ♞xc6+ ♝xc6 13 ♜xf6 ♜xf6 14 ♝d5 ±) 12 ♜e3 ♞b4 13 ♞xb4 ♝xb4 14 ♜e2 ♞c8 15 ♞a3 a6 16 f3 0-0 17 ♞hd1 and now Black should play 17...♞fd8 = rather than 17...b5?! 18 ♞ac1 e6 19 ♝ab1 ♞fd8 20 ♞xd8+ ♞xd8 21 a3 ♝c6 22 ♝xb5 axb5 23 ♞xc6 ♝e8 24 ♝c3 ♝d6 25 ♜b6 ♞d7 26 b3 1-0 Gheorghiu-Kraut, Graz 1987.

b) 7 ♜xc4 and now:

b1) 7...♞a5 and then:

b11) 8 0-0 cxd4 9 ♝d5 ♝xd5 10 exd5 h6 11 ♜h4 g5 12 ♜g3 0-0 13 ♜e5 ♜xe5 14 ♝xe5

♠d7 15 ♗xd4 ♗c5 16 ♗xc5 ♠xc5 17 ♜fe1 ♠f5 18 g4 ♠h7 19 ♜e3 ± Grivas-Skiadopoulos, Corfu 1988.

b12) 8 e5 ♠g4 9 0-0 cxd4 10 ♠d5 ♠c6 and now 11 b4! is strong. 11 ♠xd4 leads to murkier play: 11...♠gxe5 12 ♠b5 ♠d7 (12...0-0!? intends to meet 13 b4 by 13...♠xb4 14 ♠d2 ♗d8!, while 13 ♠xc6 ♠xc6 14 ♠xc6 bxc6 15 ♠xe7+ ♠h8 is not clear either) 13 ♠b3 ♗d8 14 ♠c5 ± Twardon-S.Mohr, Poland 1986.


b2) 7...cxd4 8 ♗xd4 ♗xd4 9 ♠xd4 ♠xe4! (9...♠c6? 10 ♠xc6 bxc6 11 ♜c1 {11 0-0 ± Dorfman-Smyslov, Lvov Z 1978}) 11...♠d7 12 0-0 ♠b6 13 ♠b3 ♠e6 14 ♠xe6 fxe6 15 ♜fd1 ♠f7 16 ♠f1 ± Grivas-Z.Zahariev, Khania 1992) 10 ♠xe4 ♠xd4 11 0-0-0 ♠c6! and then:

b21) 12 ♠h6?! ♠f5! (12...♠e6?! 13 ♠xe6 fxe6 14 ♜xd4 ♠xd4 15 ♠g7 0-0-0 16 ♠xh8 ♜xh8 17 h4 h6 = Zilberman-H.Olafsson, Panormo ECC 2001) 13 ♠g5 e6 14 ♜xd4 ♠xd4 15 ♠g7 ♜c8 16 b3 ♠e7 17 ♠xd4 f6 18 ♠b2 b5 19 ♠xb5 ♜c2+ 20 ♠a3 ♜b8 21 ♠c4 fxe5 ± Husari-Szeberenyi, Budapest 1999.

b22) 12 ♠b5?! ♠b6! 13 ♜d2 ♠e6 ± Grivas-I.Sokolov, Manila OL 1992.

b23) 12 ♠d5 ♠b6! 13 ♜he1 ♠e6 14 ♠xe6 fxe6 15 ♠h6 ♜d8 16 ♜xd8+ ♠xd8 17 f3 ♠f7 18 ♠g7 ♜g8 19 ♠c3 = Kuzubov-Kovchan, Kramatorsk 2002.

b24) 12 ♜he1!? (D).



Although this position looks dangerous for Black, the truth is that White should be careful not to suffer: 12...♠e6! 13 ♠xe6 fxe6 14 ♠e3 0-0-0 (also equal is 14...♜d8 15 ♠xd4 ♜xd4 16 ♜xd4 ♠xd4 17 ♠d2 0-0 18 ♜c1 ♜d8 19 ♠e3 ♠f5+ 20 ♠e2 = Sultangareev-Grebionkin, Bor 2000 or 14...e5 15 ♠xd4 ♠xd4 16 f3 0-0-0 17 ♠g5 ♠c6 18 ♠f7 ♜xd1+ 19 ♠xd1 ♜f8 20

♠xe5 ♠xe5 21 ♜xe5 ♠d7 22 ♠d2 ♜f5 23 ♜xf5 gxf5 24 f4 ♠d6 25 ♠e3 ♠d5 26 ♠d3 ♠c5 27 ♠c3 ♠d5 28 ♠d3 1/2-1/2 Van der Sterren-Lücke, Nettetel 1992) 15 ♠xd4 ♠xd4 16 ♠b1 (16 ♠c3 ♜hf8 17 ♠e4 ♠c6 18 ♜xd8+ ♠xd8 19 f3 = Zviagintsev-I.Sokolov, Moscow OL 1994) 16...h6 17 ♜d3 b6 18 f3 = Zilberman-I.Sokolov, Leeuwarden 1994.

7...b5 8 d6!?

Or:

a) 8 ♠xf6 exf6 9 ♠xb5 f5! 10 e5 ♗a5+ 11 ♠c3 ♠d7 = Genov-Shomoev, Silivri Ech 2003.

b) 8 e5 b4 9 exf6 exf6 10 ♗e2+ ♠f8 11 ♠e3 bxc3 12 ♠xc5+ ♠g8 13 bxc3 ♠d7 14 ♠d4 (14 ♠e7 ♗e8 15 ♠b4 {15 ♠a3?! ♠b7 16 0-0-0 ♗d8 17 ♗xc4 ♠b6 18 ♗b4 ♜c8 ± Hübner-Ehlvest, Bayern-Lyon ECC 1991}) 15...♠b7 16 0-0-0 ♠b6 = Flear-Kouatly, Brussels 1986) 14...♠a6 = Grivas-H.Lehmann, Athens 1986.

8...♗xd6!

Black's best move; the alternatives are experimental at best:

a) 8...exd6? 9 e5! dxe5 10 ♗xd8+ ♠xd8 11 ♜d1+ ♠d7 12 ♠d5 +-.

b) 8...♠c6?! 9 e5 ♠d7 10 ♠xb5 ♗a5+ 11 ♠c3 ♠dxex5 12 ♠xe5 ♠xe5 13 ♗f3 0-0 (not 13...♠d7? 14 dxe7 and White wins) 14 dxe7 ♠xe7! (14...♜e8? 15 ♠xc4 ♠f5 16 0-0 +-) 15 ♠xc4 (15 ♠xe7? ♠g4! is winning for Black) 15...♠e6 (15...♠f5!?) 16 ♠xe6 (16 ♠xe7?! ♠xc4 17 ♠xf8 ♜xf8 gives Black good compensation) 16...fxe6 17 ♗e3 ♠c6 18 0-0 ±±.

c) 8...♠b7?! 9 dxe7! (9 e5? ♠e4 10 ♠xe4 ♠xe4 11 ♠xe7 {11 dxe7 ♗xd1+! 12 ♜xd1 ♠d7! ±}) 11...♗a5+ 12 ♗d2 ♗xd2+ 13 ♠xd2 ♠d5 14 f4 ♠c6 ± Andruet-Kouatly, Marseilles 1988) 9...♗xe7 10 e5! and now:

c1) 10...0-0? 11 ♗e2 ♠xf3 12 gxf3 wins for White.

c2) 10...♠xf3?! 11 ♗xf3 ♗xe5+ and now:

c21) 12 ♠e3 b4 13 ♠b5 0-0 (13...a6? 14 ♠xc4 0-0 15 ♗xa8 axb5 16 ♠xb5 ♠d5 17 0-0 ♠xe3 18 fxe3 ♗xe3+ 19 ♠h1 ± Raetsky-Brendel, Zurich 2003) 14 ♗xa8 ♗xb2 15 ♜d1 a6 16 ♠xc4 axb5 17 ♠xb5 ♗c3+ 18 ♠e2 c4 19 ♗b7 b3 20 axb3 ♗xb3 21 ♜he1 ♠g4 22 ♠c5 ♠c3? (22...♠xh2! cuts off the king's retreat, and makes it hard for White to avoid a perpetual; 23...♜e8+ is a threat, while 23 ♠xf8 ♗b2+ is an immediate draw) 23 ♗e7 ♠g7 24 ♜d8 ♠d7 25 ♗xd7 ♠e5 26 ♗d5 ♗d3+ 27 ♗xd3

cx d3+ 28 ♖xd3 ♜xd3 29 ♙xf8 ♜xe1 30 ♙xg7 1-0 Raetsky-Georges, Biel 1997.

c22) 12 ♙e2! ♖xg5 13 ♗xa8 0-0 14 ♜xb5 ♜d5 15 0-0 +-.


c3) 10...♜bd7 11 ♗e2 ♙xf3 12 exf6 ♙xe2 13 fxg7 and then:

c31) 13...♞g8 14 ♙xe7 ♙xf1 15 0-0-0 ♜xe7 16 ♞hxf1 ♜b6 17 ♞fe1+ ♜f6 18 ♜xb5 ♜xg7 19 ♞e7 ± Raetsky-Robović, Asmach Donau 1995.

c32) 13...♗e5 14 gxh8♗+ ♗xh8 15 ♙xe2 b4 16 ♜a4 (16 ♜d1 ♗e5 17 ♙e3 ♜b6 18 ♞c1 ♞c8 19 0-0 ± Breutigam-Lingnau, Bundesliga 1992/3) 16...♗e5 17 ♙e3 ♜b6 18 ♜xb6 axb6 19 ♙xc4 ♗xb2 20 0-0 0-0-0 21 ♙xf7 ♜b7 22 ♙b3 +- Döttling-Rausis, Germany 1999.

c33) 13...♙xf1+ 14 ♙xe7 ♞g8 15 ♞xf1 ♜xe7 16 0-0-0 ± Nen.Ristić-J.Horvath, Yugoslav Cht (Nikšić) 1997.

We now return to 8...♗xd6! (D):



White has chosen between:

a) 9 e5 ♗xd1+ 10 ♞xd1 ♜fd7 11 ♜xb5 ♜a6 12 ♙xc4 ♜b6 (12...♜xe5?! 13 ♜xe5 ♙xe5 14 ♙d5 ♙d7 15 ♙xa8 ♙xb5 16 a4 ♙xa4 17 ♞a1 ♙b5 18 ♞a5 0-0 19 ♞xb5 ♞xa8 20 ♜e2 ± Barsov-Vrenegoor, Wijk aan Zee 1997) 13 ♙e2 h6 14 ♙e3 0-0 15 ♜c3 ♙b7 16 0-0 1/2-1/2 Oll-I.Sokolov, Pärnu 1996.

b) 9 ♗xd6 exd6 10 e5! dx e5 11 ♜xb5 0-0!?! (11...♜a6 12 ♜d6+ ♜e7 13 0-0-0 ♙e6 14 ♜xe5 h6 15 ♙h4 g5 16 ♙g3 ± ♜h5? 17 ♜c6+ ♜f8 18 ♙xc4 ♜xg3 19 fxg3 ♙xc4 20 ♜xc4 h5 21 ♞hf1 ♞h6 22 ♞d7 ♜g8 23 ♜e7+ ♜f8 24 ♜d5 1-0 Sulava-Chermiaev, Geneva 2004) 12 ♜c7 ♙b7! (not: 12...♜a6? 13 ♜xa8 ♙e6 14 ♞c1 ♞xa8 15 ♙xc4 ± Iotov-Perez Fungueiro, Villagarcia de Arosa 2002; or 12...e4?! 13 ♜d2 ♙b7 {13...c3 14 bxc3 ♙b7 15 ♞b1! ♙c6 16 ♙b5 e3 17 fx e3 ♙xg2 18 ♞g1 ♞c8 19 ♜xa8

♙xa8 20 c4 ±} 14 ♙xc4 ♜bd7 15 ♜xa8 ♞xa8 16 0-0 h6 17 ♙xf6! ♜xf6 18 ♜b3 ♞c8 19 ♞fd1 ♜f8 ±) 13 ♜xa8 e4! 14 ♜d2 c3! 15 bxc3 (15 ♜c7 cxd2+ 16 ♙xd2 ♜c6 ∞) 15...♙xa8 16 ♙e3 ♞c8 17 c4 ♜g4 18 ♞b1 ♜xe3 19 fx e3 ♜d7 20 ♙e2 ♜e5 and Black seems to have ample compensation for the exchange, as in return he has one pawn, the bishop-pair and central control. Of course, some practical tests are needed before we are able to draw a final conclusion.

C2)

6 ♗a4+

In my opinion this is the best try. It should be mentioned that this kind of position can also arise via the move-order 1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♜c3 d5 4 ♜f3 ♙g7 5 ♗b3 dxc4 6 ♗xc4 (ECO D96).

Now, as 6...♗d7? 7 ♗xc4 and 6...♙d7?! 7 ♗xc4 0-0 8 e4 (8 ♞d1 ♜a6 9 e4 b5! ∞ Abollianin-Blees, Gent 1997 or 8 e3 ♙f5 9 ♙xf6?! ♙xf6 10 ♙e2 ♜d7 11 ♜d5 c6 = Gonzales Tasis-Vaquero Pastor, Asturias 1998) give White too much, Black should concentrate on the following:

- C21: 6...♜bd7 25
- C22: 6...♜fd7 26
- C23: 6...♜c6 26
- C24: 6...c6 26

C21)

6...♜bd7 7 e4



Occupation of the centre is the best way to achieve a significant space advantage. Less precise is 7 e3 0-0 8 ♗xc4 ♜b6 (8...a6!? 9 ♙f4 ♜e8 10 ♞d1 ♜d6 11 ♗b4 b5 12 ♙e2 ♙b7 13 0-0 c5 14 dxc5 a5 15 ♗b3 ♜xc5 = Forintos-Fogarasi, Hungarian Cht 1998/9) 9 ♗b3 ♙f5 (9...♙e6 10 ♗c2 ♜bd5 11 ♜xd5 ♗xd5 12 ♙d3 ♗a5+ 13 ♗d2 ♗xd2+ 14 ♜xd2 ♞fd8 15 ♞hc1 1/2-1/2 Kaposztas-Feher, Szekszard 1996) 10 ♙e2 ♜e4 11 ♜xe4 ♙xe4 12 0-0 ♗d7 = Kholmov-P.Ostojić, Havana 1968.

7...0-0 8 ♗xc4 (D)

8...♜b6

Black cannot try the active 8...c5 9 dxc5 ♗c7 10 ♞c1 ♗xc5 11 ♗xc5 ♜xc5 12 e5 ± or the passive 8...a6 9 e5!.

9 ♗d3 c6 10 ♙e2



Delaying castling with 10 ♞d1 ♙e6 11 ♚c2 ♚c7 12 ♙e2 ♞ad8 13 h3 ♙c4 14 0-0 ♙xe2 15 ♚xe2 ♚c8 16 ♞fe1 ♚e6 17 ♙c1 ♚c4 \pm is a fair alternative, as in Malich-Liebert, Löberitz 2001, although White did not seem to appreciate the strength of his position and agreed a draw here.

10...h6

Black can do without this move; for example, 10... ♙e6 11 ♚c2 \pm Jakab-Szeberenyi, Szekszard 1997.

11 ♙h4 ♙e6

Now Grivas-Savva, Limassol 1997 continued 12 0-0 (12 $\text{♚c2}!$?) 12... ♙c4 (12... $\text{g5}!$? 13 ♙g3 ♙h5 14 ♙e5 f6 15 $\text{♙g3}!$? ♙xg3 16 hxg3 f5 17 exf5 ♙xf5 18 ♚e3 \pm) 13 ♚c2 ♙xe2 14 ♚xe2 ♞c8 15 ♞ad1 \pm ♙h5 16 ♙g3 ♙xg3 17 hxg3 ♚c7 18 ♞d3 ♞fd8 19 ♙c1 ♚d7 20 e5 ♙d5 21 ♙e4 b6 22 ♞dd1 ♚g4 23 a3 $\text{♙h7}??$ 1-0 (seeing 24 $\text{♙fg5}+$).

C22)

6... ♙d7 7 e3

7 e4 0-0 8 ♙xc4 ♙b6 9 ♚b3 ♙c6 , as in Dobrev-Grebionkin, Internet 2003, cannot be recommended, but 7 ♚xc4 ♙b6 8 ♚b3 a5 9 e3 0-0 10 ♙e2 ♙e6 11 ♚c2 ♙f5 12 ♚d2 ♙8d7 13 e4 ♙g4 14 0-0 a4 15 ♞ac1 \pm Dekker-Mirumian, Trinec 1998 is not bad.

7...0-0 (D)

8 $\text{♚a3}!$

The point! Less precise is 8 ♚xc4 ♙c6 (8... $\text{♙b6}!$? 9 ♚c5 ♞e8 10 ♙b5 c6 11 ♙e2 ♚d6 12 ♚a5 ♙8d7 13 0-0 e5 14 ♞fd1 = Fochtler-Trettin, Germany tt 1994/5) 9 ♞d1 ♙b6 10 ♚c5 ♚d6 11 ♚xd6 cxd6 12 d5 f6 13 ♙h4 ♙e5 14 ♙xe5 dxe5 15 f3 ♙d7 16 ♙d3 ♞fc8 = Hedman-Mirumian, Khania 1994.

Now (after 8 $\text{♚a3}!$) White obtains an advantage following 8... ♞e8 or 8... ♙f6 9 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 10 ♙xc4 , as the active 8... $\text{c5}!$? 9 dxc5 ♙c6 10 ♙xc4 ♙de5 (10... ♚a5 11 ♚xa5 ♙xa5 12 ♙e2 \pm) 11 ♙xe5 ♙xe5 12 $\text{♙b5}!$ \pm is not satisfactory for Black. This analysis needs to be tested.

C23)

6... ♙c6 7 e3 ♙d7

After 7... $\text{♙d5}!$? 8 ♙xd5 ♚xd5 9 ♙xc4 \pm or 7...0-0 8 ♚a3 ♙d7 9 ♙xc4 ♙b6 10 $\text{♙b5}!$ \pm White can be satisfied.

8 ♚xc4 ♙b6

Or 8...0-0 9 ♙e2 ♙b6 10 ♚c5 ♞e8 11 0-0 ♙f8 12 ♞fd1 f6 13 ♙h4 e6 14 ♚b5 ♚e7 15 ♞ac1 ♙d7 16 ♚b3 a5 17 ♙g3 a4 18 ♚c2 ♙b4 19 ♚d2 ♙c6 20 a3 ♙4d5 21 ♙e4 \pm Emma-Garcia Palermo, Mar del Plata 1976.

9 ♚d3 0-0 10 $\text{h3}!$

10 $\text{♙e2}!$? h6 11 ♙h4 $\text{g5}!$ 12 ♙g3 g4 ∞ .

10... ♙e6

Now 11 ♙e2 ♚d7 (11... ♚d6 12 $\text{♙e4}!$ $\text{♚b4}+$ 13 ♚d2 \pm) 12 $\text{♞d1}!$ gives White a slight advantage according to a joint analysis with GM Suat Atalik and IM Pavlos Gesos. White keeps a spatial advantage and as long as Black cannot succeed in any central break with ... c5 or ... e5 , he will not be able to equalize.


C24)

6... c6 7 ♚xc4 (D)

7...0-0

Or:

a) Black should not be too active at such an early stage with 7... $\text{b5}!$? 8 ♚d3 b4 (8... ♙e6 9 $\text{e4}!$?) 9 $\text{♙xf6}!$ ♙xf6 (9... exf6 10 ♙a4) 10 ♙e4 ♙g7 11 $\text{♚d2}!$ \pm/\pm .



b) 7...e6 is playable: 8 ♖b4 (8 ♗d3!?) 8...♗b6 9 ♗xb6 axb6 10 e3 ♟a6 11 a3 ♟b4 12 ♜c1 with a slight advantage for White, Bardo-Kemeny, Schwabstedt 1994.

c) 7...e6 8 e3 (8 ♖b3 ♗b6 9 e3? {9 ♗xb6} 9...♗xb3 10 axb3 ♟bd7 11 e2 0-0 12 0-0 h6 13 e4 g5 14 e3 g3 ♟h5 15 ♜fc1 ♟xg3 16 hxg3 ♜fd8 ♠ Sherwin-Ftačnik, British League (4NCL) 1999/00) 8...♟bd7 9 e2 0-0 10 0-0 ± Qiang-Pina Sierra, Paris 1998.

d) 7...♗b6 is an interesting and aggressive try. White can reply:

d1) The prophylactic 8 b3 is a careful approach: 8...e6 9 ♗d3 ♟a6 10 ♜c1 ♜d8 11 h3 ♟b4 12 ♗b1 h6 13 e2 ♟bd5 14 ♟a4! ±; e.g., 14...♗c7 15 e4 ♟b6 16 ♟c5 ♗c8 17 d5 e2 18 a4 0-0 19 a5 ♟a8 20 a6 bxa6 21 e4 ♗b8 22 ♟xd7 ♟xd7 23 ♜xc6 ♟e5 24 ♟xe5 ♗xe5 25 0-0 ♟b6 26 ♟h1 ♗b8 1-0 Peek-Pruijssers, Apeldoorn 2001.

d2) 8 e4!? represents an active approach: 8...♗xb2 9 ♗b1 ♗a3 10 e5 e6!? (10...♟fd7 is a viable alternative) 11 ♗d3! (not 11 ♗b4? ♗xb4 12 ♜xb4 ♟d5 13 ♟xd5 e2 14 ♜xb7 ♟d7 ♠ Crouch-Gormally, British League (4NCL) 1998/9) 11...♟d5! (11...e5? 12 ♗d2 e2 13 ♟xb1 13 ♟xb1 ±; 11...♟f7?! 12 ♜xb7 0-0 13 e2 ±) 12 ♟xd5 ♗xd3 13 e2 14 ♜xb7 with an unclear position.

d3) IM Pavlos Gesos proposed 8 ♟a4!? ♗a5+9 e2 ♗f5 10 ♟c5 as an interesting but untested possibility.

8 e4 (D)


The obvious continuation, gaining central control and space. In some games White tried 8 e3:

a) 8...♟a6 9 e2 e6 10 ♗a4 ♟c7 11 0-0 ♟cd5 12 ♜ac1 ♟xc3 13 bxc3 ± Kiss-Blasko, Fuzesabony 2000.

b) 8...♗b6 9 ♗b3 (9 b3) 9...e6 10 ♗a3?! a5! 11 e2 ♗b4 12 0-0 ♟bd7 13 ♜fd1 b5 ♠ Fröschl-J.Horvath, Austria 1992.

c) 8...b5 9 ♗b3 ♗a5 10 e2 d3?! (10 e2) 10...e6 11 ♗c2 ♟d5 12 ♗d2 f6 13 e4 ♟d7 = Solaesa Navalpotro-Gonzalez Somoza, Madrid 2001.

d) 8...♗a5 9 e4 e6 10 e2 ♟d7 11 0-0 e5 12 b4 ♗d8 13 e4 e6 14 ♜fd1 ♗e7 15 ♟c5 exd4 16 ♟xd7 e2 17 ♟xd4 = Liascovich-N.Diaz, Buenos Aires 2001.



White's strong centre and space control guarantee a slight but quite pleasant advantage, as the following examples demonstrate:

a) 8...b6?! 9 ♗b3 e2 10 ♜d1 ♟bd7 11 e4 h6 12 e4 g5 13 e3 g3 ♟h5 14 e5 ♟xg3 15 hxg3 e6 16 e4 ± Panelo Munoz-Kucharski, Buenos Aires 2002.

b) 8...e6 9 ♗d3 ♟a6 10 e2 ♗b6 11 0-0 ♜ad8 12 ♗d2 e4 13 ♜fd1 ♜fe8 14 ♜ac1 ± Manor-Dudakov, Israel 1986.

c) 8...♗b6 9 e2!? e4 (9...♗xb2) 10 0-0 e8 11 ♜fd1 ♟bd7 12 e3 ± Disconzi da Silva-C.Toth, Brazil 1991.

d) 8...♟bd7 9 ♗d3 (9 e2 h6 {9...e8?!} 10 0-0 ♟h8 11 ♜fd1 ± Orozko-Viarengo, Buenos Aires 1999) 10 e4 ♟b6 11 ♗d3 ♟h5 12 e3 ± Borik-Bastian, Baden-Baden 1981) 9...♟b6 10 ♜c1 h6 11 e3 ♟e8 12 ♗d2 ♟h7 13 e2 ♟d6 14 b3 ± Davidov-Rogov, Moscow 1998.

e) 8...b5 9 ♗d3 (9 ♗b3 a5 10 e5 {10 ♗c2?!, Kottke-Lüders, Germany tt 1991} 10...a4 11 ♗c2 e5 12 e2 e3 13 ♗xd3 ± Mascariñas-Mikavica, Zurich 1989) 9...♗a5 10 e5 ♟d5 11 ♗d2 ♟xc3 12 bxc3 f6 13 exf6 exf6 14 e3 e6 15 e2 is slightly better for White, Petran-Trois, Zamardi 1980.

f) 8...♟a6 and then:


f1) 9 ♖b3 ♘c7 (9... ♗a5 10 e5 ♘d5 11 ♙d2 ♘xc3 12 bxc3 b5 13 h4 ♙e6 14 ♖b2 ♗ab8 15 h5 ♗a4 16 hxg6 hxg6 17 ♖c1 ± Kožul-Ivačić, Ljubljana 1994) 10 ♘d1 ♘e6 11 ♙c1 ♖c7 12 h3 ♗d8 13 ♙e3 ♗a5 14 e5 ♘d5 (14... ♘h5 and now 15 g3! is better than 15 ♙e2 ♘hf4 16 ♙c4 ♘xg2+ 17 ♖f1 ♘xe3+ 18 fxe3 b5 ± Butterfield-M.White, e-mail 1994) 15 ♙d2 ♖b6 16 ♘xd5 ♗xd5 17 ♙c4 ♖xb3 18 ♙xb3 ± Lilienthal-Barcza, Budapest 1949.

f2) 9 e5 ♙e6 (9... ♘d7 10 e6 ♘b6 11 exf7+ ♖h8 12 ♖b3 ♘c7 13 ♙c4 ♙g4 14 0-0-0 ± Damjanović-Stupica, Zagreb 1961) 10 ♗a4 ♘d5 11 ♙xa6 bxa6 12 0-0 ± Damjanović-Cuderman, Zagreb 1961.

f3) 9 ♙e2 ♗a5 (9... ♙e6 10 ♗a4 ♖b6 11 0-0 ♖xb2 12 ♙xa6 bxa6 13 ♗fc1 ♖b7 14 ♗ab1 ♖c7 15 ♖xa6 ± Smet-J.Otto, e-mail 1997 or 9...c5 10 d5 h6 11 ♙h4 e6? 12 e5 exd5 13 ♗a4 g5 14 exf6 ♙xf6 15 ♙g3 +- Haselhorst-Darwisch, Münsterland 2002) 10 0-0 ♙e6 11 ♖d3 h6 12 ♙d2 ♖d8 13 ♗ad1 ♘c7 14 h3 ♘d7 15 ♙e3 ♘b6 16 ♖c2 ♙c4 17 ♘e5 ♙xe2 18 ♖xe2 ± Uhlmann-Osmanagić, Sarajevo 1963.

1.4 The 5... ♘e4 Continuation

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 ♘f3 ♙g7 5 ♙g5 ♘e4 (D)




This is the main continuation for Black in response to 5 ♙g5. In this book we shall focus on 6 ♙h4 in reply. I shall just mention that 6 cxd5 and 6 ♙f4 are playable alternatives, but in my opinion they have little in common with the ideas behind the ♙g5 system.

6 ♙h4 ♘xc3

6...c5 7 cxd5 ♘xc3 8 bxc3 ♖xd5 is considered in Line B of the present section, as well as Sections 1.5 and 1.6.

7 bxc3 (D)



Now Black must choose between:

A: 7...dxc4 29

B: 7...c5 35

Other moves are unsatisfactory:


a) 7...0-0? 8 cxd5 ♖xd5 9 ♙xe7 ♗e8 and now:

a1) 10 ♙h4 c5 11 e3 cxd4 12 cxd4 ♗a5+ (12... ♘c6 13 ♙e2 ♗a5+ 14 ♖d2 ♖xd2+ 15 ♖xd2 ♙f5 16 ♗hc1 a6 17 ♙d3 ♙d7 18 ♗ab1 ± Koczó-Lovas, Budapest 2003) 13 ♖d2 ♖xd2+ 14 ♖xd2 ♙e6 15 ♙b5 ♘c6 16 ♗hc1 ± Res-N.Vuković, Pula 2001.

a2) 10 ♙a3 ♘d7 (10... ♙g4 11 e3 ♘a6 12 ♙e2 c5 13 0-0 ♗ad8 14 h3 ♙f5 15 ♙xa6 bxa6 16 ♙xc5 ♙e4 17 ♘e1 ♗c8 18 f3 ♗xc5 19 fxe4 ♖xe4 20 dxc5 ♖xe3+ 21 ♖h1 ♙xc3 22 ♗c1 ♙e5 23 ♖f3 1-0 Oreopoulos-Scholtus, Internet 2004) 11 e3 (11 ♖b3? ♖f5 12 e3 ♘b6 13 ♖b5 c6 14 ♖xf5 ♙xf5 15 ♖d2 ♗ad8 16 ♙d3 ± Pasztor-Molnar, Budapest 1998) 11... ♘b6 12 ♖b3 ♙g4 13 ♖xd5 ♘d5 14 ♖d2 ♗ad8 15 ♙d3 b6 16 h3 ♙c8 17 ♗hd1 ± Mendez Atariga-Gamarrá Cáceres, Buenos Aires 1991.

b) 7...c6?! 8 e3 0-0 (D) (8... ♘d7 9 cxd5 cxd5 10 ♖b3 ♗a5 11 ♙d3 e6 12 0-0-0 13 c4 dxc4 14 ♙xc4 ♘b6 15 ♙b5! ± Sarmiento Alfonso-C.Martinez, Alicante 1989 or 8... ♗a5 9 ♖d2 ♙f5 10 cxd5 cxd5 11 c4 ♖xd2+ 12 ♘d2 dxc4 13 ♙xc4 0-0 14 0-0 e5 15 e4 ♙d7 16 d5 ± Strobel-Karius, Berlin 1996) and now:

b1) 9 cxd5 cxd5 10 ♙e2 ♘c6 11 0-0 ♙f5 12 ♗a4 a6 13 ♖a3 ♗e8 14 c4 dxc4 15 ♙xc4 ♘a5



16 ♙e2 b5 17 ♜acl ♙e4 18 ♞d2 ♙b7 1/2-1/2 Siegmund-Mitter, Feffernitz 2001.

b2) 9 ♜d2 ♞d7 (9...b6 10 cxd5?! cxd5 11 ♙e2 ♙b7 12 0-0 ♞c6 13 ♜acl ♞a5 ∞ Lutter-Hagara, Slovakia 1998) 10 cxd5 cxd5 11 ♜c1 ♞f6 12 ♙d3 ♜a5 13 c4 ♙xd2+ 14 ♞xd2 ± Dickstein-Boldt, Dortmund 1987.

b3) 9 ♙e2 ♜c7 (or: 9... ♙g4 10 $\text{♜b3!$, Brachenko-Kuznetsov, St Petersburg 2000; 9... ♞d7 10 0-0 ♞f6 11 cxd5 ♞xd5 12 ♜b3 {12 ♜c2 ♙g4 13 h3 ♙xf3 14 ♙xf3 ± Radde-Timme, Germany 2002} 12...h6 13 c4 ± Nestorović-Petrenko, Belgrade wom 2002) 10 0-0 ♙f5 11 ♜b3 dxc4 12 ♙xc4 h6 13 ♙g3 ♜b6 14 ♜a3 e6 15 ♞d2 g5 16 e4 ♙g6 17 ♜abl ♜d8 18 ♙xb7 a5 19 ♜fb1 e5 20 d5 cxd5 21 ♙xd5 ♙xe4 22 ♙xe4 ♜xd2 23 ♜7b2 1-0 Granath-C.Gil, Zagan girls U-18 Ech 1995.

b4) 9 ♙d3 ♞d7 10 cxd5 (10 0-0 b6 11 cxd5 cxd5 12 ♜b3 ♞f6 13 ♞e5 ♙b7 14 a4 ± Siebrecht-Oudhof, Zwolle 1996) 10...cxd5 11 0-0 ♙f6 12 ♙g3 ♞b6 13 ♜b3 ♙d7 14 a4 ♙c6 15 ♞d2 ♜e8 16 a5 ± Llopis de Aysa-Alfonso Nogue, Sant Boi 1996.

b5) 9 ♜b3 and then:

b51) 9...b6 10 ♙e2 ♙b7 11 0-0 ♞d7 12 ♜fd1 ± Leutwyler-R.Meier, Zurich 1997.

b52) 9... ♜e8 10 ♙e2 (10 ♙d3 ♜b6 11 cxd5 ♜xb3 12 axb3 cxd5 13 ♙g3 ♞c6 14 0-0 ♙g4 15 ♞d2 1/2-1/2 M.Möller-Gaudenti, Neuwied 1993) 10... ♜d7 (10... ♜a5 11 0-0 ♞d7 12 ♜fd1 ± Bachmayr-M.Schuster, Austria 1995) 11 0-0 e6 12 a4 ♜c7 13 ♜fc1 ♜a5 14 ♞d2 ± Schroter-G.Adam, Hungarian Cht 1993.


b53) 9... ♞a6 10 cxd5 cxd5 11 ♙d3 ♞c7 12 0-0 b6 13 ♞e5 f6 14 ♞f3 ♙e6 15 ♙g3 ♙f7 16 ♜acl ♜d7 17 c4 ♜fc8 18 c5 bxc5 19 ♜xc5 ♜ab8 20 ♜a3 ♞e6 21 ♜a5 ♜a8 22 ♜b1 ♞d8 23 ♞h4 ♙f8 24 ♜b2 ♜g4 25 ♙a6 ♜c6 26 ♙d3

♜b6? 27 ♜xb6 axb6 28 ♜xa8 1-0 Opočensky-Cizek, Harrachov 1970.

A)

7...dxc4 8 ♜a4+ (D)

In my opinion this move is best. The alternative is 8 e3 but after 8... ♙e6 9 ♜b1 b6 10 ♙e2 0-0 11 0-0 ♙d5 12 ♞d2 c5 13 e4 ♙b7 14 d5 ♙xc3 15 ♞xc4 ∞ Lerner-Khuzman, Moscow 1989 or 8...b5 9 a4 c6 10 ♙e2 a6 11 ♞d2 0-0 12 ♙f3 ♜a7 13 0-0 ♙f5 14 ♜e1 ♙d3 15 ♞b3 ♙f5 16 ♞d2 ♙d3 = Sorin-Kasparov, Buenos Aires simul 1997 Black should feel happy. Of course there are many alternatives on the previous moves, but the general conclusion is that Black always achieves complicated positions, where he can seek to win on equal terms with White.



Now Black should choose between:

- A1: 8...c6?! 29
- A2: 8... ♞d7 30
- A3: 8... ♜d7 31

Other moves are not advisable:

- a) 8... $\text{♞c6?!$ 9 e4 ±.
- b) 8... $\text{♙d7?!$ 9 ♜xc4 0-0 (9... ♙c6 10 e3 ♞d7 11 ♙e2 ♞b6 12 ♜b4 a5 13 ♜b3 0-0 14 0-0 ±± Tichy-Banas, Czechoslovakia 1978) 10 e4 ♞c6 11 ♙e2 b6 12 0-0 ♞a5 13 ♜b4 ♜e8 14 ♜ad1 ± Barchanek-Spanhel, Prague 1996.

A1)

8...c6?!

This is a tricky line. Black wants to combine the moves ... ♜a5 , and ... ♞a6-c5 , immediately attacking White's queenside and centre pawns.

9 ♜xc4 ♜a5

The most dangerous plan. 9...♖a6 followed by ...♗a5 is equivalent, but other moves are less precise:

a) 9...0-0 10 e4 (10 e3 ♘d7 11 ♙e2 ♖b6 12 ♗c5 ♙e8 13 a4 ♘d7 14 ♗a3 ± Tzolas-Lymar, Ikaria 2004) 10...♗a5 11 ♙e2 ♖a6 12 0-0 ♙e6 13 ♗d3 f6 14 ♘d2 ♙ad8 15 a4 ♙d7 16 ♘c4 ♗d8 17 ♗c2 ♗e8 18 ♘e3 ♙f7 19 f4 ± Logothetis-Touloumis, Ikaria 1996.

b) 9...♘d7 10 e4 (10 e3 ♖b6 11 ♗b3 0-0 12 ♙e2 ♙e6 13 c4 c5 14 0-0 cxd4 15 exd4 h6 16 ♙ac1 ± Bartos-Studnicka, Znojmo 2004) 10...c5 11 ♙b1 0-0 12 ♙d3 a6 13 0-0 b5 14 ♗d5 ♙a7 15 ♙fd1 c4 16 ♙c2 ± Hort-Gauglitz, Bundesliga 1997/8.

10 e3

As a serious and interesting alternative, White can enter pleasant complications with a pawn sacrifice, as in Grivas-Lputian, Panormo Z 1998: 10 e4!?! ♖a6 11 ♙c1! ♙e6 12 ♗d3 (see Illustrative Games).

10...♖a6

Or 10...♙e6 11 ♗d3 ♘d7 12 ♘d2 c5 13 ♙e2 cxd4 14 cxd4 g5 15 ♙g3 0-0 16 0-0 with a slight advantage for White, Van der Sterren-Konopka, Dortmund 1989.

11 ♗b3 (D)


Or:

a) 11 ♙e2? is a mistake: 11...♙e6! 12 ♗d3 ♘c5! 13 ♗c2 ♙f5 14 ♗b2 ♘d3+ 15 ♙xd3 ♙xd3 ♢ Forintos-Kauranen, corr. 1977.

b) 11 ♘d2 ♙e6 12 ♗d3 0-0 13 ♙e2 (13 ♙xe7? ♙fe8 14 ♙h4 ♙f5 15 ♗c4 b5 is slightly better for Black) 13...♘c5! 14 ♗c2 (not 14 dxc5? ♙ad8 15 ♗c2 ♙xd2! 16 ♗xd2 ♙d8+ 17 ♗c1 ♙xc3 18 ♙b1 ♗a3+ 19 ♙b2 ♙d2 -) 14...♙f5 15 ♖b3! (15 ♗b2? ♖a4 16 ♗b4 ♗xb4 17 cxb4 e5 ♢) 15...♘xb3 (15...♗c7 16 ♗b2 ♘xb3 [16...♘d3+ 17 ♙xd3 ♙xd3 18 ♘c5 ± or 16...♖e4 17 f3 ±] 17 ♗xb3 ±) 16 ♗xb3 e5 17 0-0 is unclear, Engqvist-Rötsägov, Helsinki 1991.

Now (after 11 ♗b3) Black can play:

a) 11...♙e6 12 ♗c2 (12 ♗b2 ♘c7 13 ♙c1 ♖b5 14 ♘d2 ♖d6 15 ♙g3 0-0 16 ♙xd6 exd6 17 ♘c4 ♙xc4 18 ♙xc4 b5 19 ♙e2 d5 20 0-0 1/2-1/2 Netusil-Konopka, Czechoslovakia 1992 or 12 ♙c4? ♘c5! 13 ♗b4 ♗xb4 14 cxb4 ♙xc4 15 bxc5 b5 ♢ Horak-Konopka, Dečín 1995) 12...♘c5 13 ♘d2 ♖a4 14 ♙c1 ♖b6 15 ♖b3 ♙xb3 16 ♗xb3 e5 17 ♙d3 (17 ♙c4 ♘xc4 18



♗xc4 exd4 19 exd4 0-0 20 0-0 = Karayannis-Ghinda, Kavala 1991) 17...exd4 18 exd4 0-0 19 0-0 ±. The bishop-pair seems strong.

b) 11...♘c5 12 ♗b4 ♗xb4 13 cxb4 ♘e4 14 ♙d3 (14 ♙c1 ♘d6 15 ♙e2 a5 16 a3 axb4 17 axb4 ♙f5 18 0-0 ♙a2 ∞ Meduna-Gavrikov, Prague 1988) 14...♙f5 (14...♘d6 15 0-0 a5 16 a3 ♙e6 17 ♙fc1 ± Netusil-Konopka, Czech Republic 2003) and now:

b1) 15 b5 c5! (15...cxb5? 16 g4! ♘c5 17 ♙xb5+ ♙d7 18 ♙b1 1-0 S.Saeed-Stohl, Kiljava jr Wch 1984 or 15...♘f2? 16 ♙xf5 ♘xh1 17 ♙e4 f5 18 ♙d3 h6 19 bxc6 bxc6 20 ♗e2 g5 21 ♙e1 ±) 16 ♙c1 cxd4 17 ♘xd4 ♘xf2! 18 ♗xf2 ♙xd3 19 ♙c7 0-0 ∞.

b2) 15 ♗e2 a5 16 ♙hc1! ♘d6 (16...axb4? 17 g4!) 17 a3 ±. White's pieces seem to be somewhat better placed.

A2)

8...♘d7

This somewhat passive continuation allows White a small but very healthy spatial advantage.

9 e3!

Although playable, 9 e4 0-0 10 ♙xc4 ♖b6 11 ♗b3 ♘xc4 12 ♗xc4 ± Scheeren-Ree, Netherlands 1984 is not to my taste.


9...0-0 10 ♗a3! (D)

Gaining an important tempo in order to be able to recapture with the bishop on c4. 10 ♗xc4 c5 gave White little in Zayats-Matveeva, Antalya 2004.

In this position Black has tried four main continuations, but all of them have failed to equalize:

a) 10...♙e8 11 ♙xc4 ♖b6 and then:

a1) 12 ♙b3 and now:




a1) 12...♖d6 13 ♗a5 (13 ♖c1 ♗e6 14 ♗g3 ♖c6 15 0-0 ♗c4 16 ♗e1 ♘d5 17 ♖b1 ♗xb3 18 ♗xb3 b5 19 ♗a3 a5 20 ♖b2 b4 21 cxb4 axb4 22 a3 bxa3 23 ♗xa3 ♗xa3 24 ♗xa3 ♘c3 25 ♖a5 ♗c8 26 h3 ♗f6 27 ♘e5 ♗xe5 ± 1/2-1/2 Sosnicki-Gritsak, Lubniewice 1998) 13...♗e6 14 ♗g3 ♖c6 15 0-0 ♗c8 16 ♗fd1 ♗g4 17 e4! ♗xf3 18 gxf3 e6 19 ♗ab1 ± Haba-Schlemeyer, Prague 1990.

a12) 12...a5! 13 ♘g5?! (13 0-0 ±) 13...e6 14 ♘f3 ♖d6 15 ♖xd6! ∞ (rather than 15 ♖c1?! c5! ♢ Dorfman-Gulko, Vilnius 1978).

a2) 12 ♗e2 ♖d6 13 ♖b2 ♗e6 14 ♗g3 ♖d7 15 0-0 c6 16 ♘d2 f5 17 a4 ± Shpilker-Modr, Prague 1979.

b) 10...c5 11 ♗xc4 ♖c7 (11...♗e8?! 12 0-0 e5 13 ♗ab1 e4 14 ♘d2 ♗h8 15 ♗d5 f5 16 ♘c4 ± Netusil-Certek, Czechoslovakia 1989) 12 ♗c1 (D) (12 ♗b5?! ♘f6 13 ♗g3 ♖b6 14 ♗d3 [14 ♗b1 ♗f5 15 ♗d3 ♗xd3! ♢] 14...♗f5! ♢ Ivkov-Larsen, Bugojno 1980) and now:



b1) 12...e5 13 0-0 b6 (13...♗b6 14 ♗e2 ♗g4 15 h3 ♗xf3 16 ♗xf3 ♗c8 17 ♗fd1 ± 1/2-1/2 Kazilaris-Smyslov, Siegen OL 1970) 14 ♖b3 ♗b8 15 ♘g5 ♘f6 16 ♗g3! ♘h5 17 ♘xf7! ♗xf7 18 dxe5 ± Knežević-Hjartarson, Grindavik 1984.

b2) 12...e6 13 0-0 b6 14 ♗g3 ♖c6 15 ♗fd1 ♗b7 16 d5 (or 16 ♖b3 ♘f6 17 dxc5 ± Sorin-Konguvel, Erevan OL 1996) 16...exd5 17 ♗xd5 ♖c8 18 c4 ♗e8 19 e4 ♗xd5 20 exd5 ♘e5 21 ♗xe5 ♗xe5 22 ♗e1 ♗f6 23 ♖a4 ♗f8 24 ♖b5 ♗d8 25 a4 ± Meduna-Langner, Prague 1986.

b3) 12...♗e8 13 0-0 ♘b6 14 ♗b5 ♗d7 15 ♗g3 ♖c8 16 ♗e2 ♗e6 17 ♘d2 ± V.Palermo-M.Romero, Mar del Plata 1991.

b4) 12...♘b6 13 ♗b3 c4 14 ♗c2 f6 (14...♗e8 15 0-0 e6 16 e4 ♗d7 17 ♗g3 ♖d8 18 ♘e5 ♗f8 19 ♖a5 f6 20 ♘xd7 ♖xd7 21 ♖b1 ± Foisorfette, Berlin 1987) 15 ♗g3 ♖d8 16 h4 ♗f5 17 h5 ♗xc2 18 ♗xc2 ♗e8 19 hxg6 hxg6 20 e4 ± Dzuban-Nei, USSR Spartakiad (Moscow) 1979.

c) 10...♘f6 11 ♗xc4 b6 (11...♖d6 12 ♖b3 e6 {12...c5 13 ♘e5 e6 14 ♗g3 ± Yanochkin-Rustamov, corr. 1991} 13 0-0 b6 14 ♗g3 ± Bachmayr-Oberst, 2nd Bundesliga 1988/9) 12 0-0 ♗b7 13 ♗a6 (13 ♘e5!? ♖d6 14 ♖b3 ♗d5?! 15 ♗xd5 ♖xd5 16 ♖xd5 ♘xd5 17 ♘c6 ♗fe8 18 c4 ♘f6 19 a4 ± Costescu-Sirbu, Singeorz 1993) 13...♗xa6 14 ♖xa6 ♖c8 15 ♖xc8 ♗axc8 16 ♘e5 c5 17 ♗xf6 exf6 18 ♘d3 ♗fd8 19 a4 ± Gheorghiu-Lutz, Biel 1990.

d) 10...♗f6!? 11 ♗xf6 ♘xf6 12 ♗xc4 b6 13 0-0 ♗b7 and then:

d1) 14 ♗e2 is possible.


d2) 14 ♘e5 c5 15 ♖b3 (15 dxc5?! ♖c7 16 c6 ♖xe5 17 cxb7 ♗ab8 18 ♖xa7 ♘g4 19 g3 ♖h5 20 h4 g5! with good attacking chances) 15...e6 16 ♗fd1 ♖c7 17 ♗ac1 (17 a4 ♗fd8 18 a5 bxa5 19 ♖a3 ♘d7 20 ♘xd7 ♗xd7 21 ♗f1! ∞ Pripis-Vakhidov, USSR 1985) 17...♗ad8 18 a4 ♘d7 19 ♘d3 ♘f6 20 ♘e5 ♘d7 21 ♘d3 1/2-1/2 Passos-Riverol, Uruguay 1988.

d3) 14 ♗a6!? ♗xf3 (after 14...♗xa6 15 ♖xa6 White will continue with a4-a5, pressurizing the queenside) 15 gxf3 ♖d5 16 ♗e2 c5 17 dxc5 ♖xc5?! (17...bxc5 ±) 18 ♖xc5 bxc5 19 ♗ab1 ♗ab8 20 ♗fd1 e6 21 ♗c4 ♗g7 22 ♖b3 ± Grivas-Avrukh, Iraklion 1995 (see Illustrative Games).

A3)

8...♖d7 (D)

This is considered to be the main continuation and one of the most popular in recent years. Black preserves the possibility of placing his bishop on a6, preventing White from castling.



9 ♖xc4 b6

Black's intended follow-up. White retains an advantage after 9...0-0 10 ♔g3 ♘a6 11 e3 c5 12 ♙e2 cxd4 13 cxd4 ♗f5 14 0-0 ♙e6 15 ♖a4 ♗ac8 16 ♗fc1, Atalik-G.Shahade, Los Angeles 2000, or 9...b5 10 ♖b3 ♙b7 11 e3 a6 12 ♗c1 ♗d5 13 c4 ♖h5 14 ♙e2, S.Svensson-P.Larsen, Esbjerg 2004.


10 e3

Or:

a) 10 ♖b3 ♙a6 11 e3 is just a transposition to the main line.

b) 10 ♘e5? ♙xe5 11 dx5 ♙a6 12 ♖e4 ♗c6 13 ♗d4 0-0 14 ♙xe7 ♗e8 15 ♙f6 ♘d7 16 ♗d1 ♘xf6 17 exf6 ♙e6 18 h4 ♗d6 19 ♖f4? ♖xc3+ 0-1 Sielicki-Bobras, Internet 2003.

c) 10 ♔g3 (D) is inadvisable:




c1) 10...c6 11 ♖a4 c5 12 ♖xd7+ ♘xd7 13 e3 ♙b7 14 ♙b5 a6 15 ♙e2 0-0 16 0-0 ± Trikaliotis-Natsis, Athens 1980.

c2) 10...♘c6 11 e3 (11 e4 ♙b7 12 ♖a4 0-0 13 ♙a6 ♙xa6 14 ♖xa6 ± Siebrecht-Holzke, Bundesliga 2003/4) 11...0-0 12 ♙e2 ♙b7 13 0-0 ± Delemarre-Golod, Antwerp 1999.

c3) 10...c5! 11 ♘e5 ♙xe5! (11...♖e6?! 12 ♖a4+ ♙d7 13 ♘d7 ♖xd7 14 ♖xd7+ ♘xd7

15 e3 ± Siebrecht-C.Ekeberg, Gausdal 2003) 12 ♙xe5 ♙a6 (12...f6 13 ♙xb8 ♖xb8 14 e4 cxd4 15 cxd4 ♙b7 16 d5 ♗c8 17 ♖b4 ♗d6 18 ♖a4+ ♘f7 19 ♙b5 a6 20 ♙d7 b5 21 ♙e6+ ♘g7 22 ♖a5 ♗c4 23 0-0 ♙c8 24 ♙xc8 ♗hxc8 ♖ Grivas-D.Roos, Thessaloniki 1983) 13 ♖b3 f6 (13...0-0 14 ♙xb8 ♗axb8 15 e3 ♙xf1 16 ♘xf1 cxd4 17 cxd4 ♗fc8 = Aliferenko-Nedilko, Alushta 2005) 14 ♙xb8 ♗xb8 15 e3 ♙xf1 16 ♘xf1 cxd4 17 cxd4 ♗c8 18 f3 ♖c6 19 ♘f2 ♖c2+ 20 ♔g3 ♖xb3 21 axb3 a5 22 ♗hcl ♘d7 23 ♘f2 ♗xc1 24 ♗xc1 ♗c8 25 ♗xc8 ♘xc8 26 ♘e2 b5 27 ♘d3 ♘c7 28 e4 e6 29 g4 ♘d6 30 h4 h5 31 gxh5 gxh5 32 ♘c3 ♘c6 33 ♘d3 a4 34 b4 1/2-1/2 Timman-Kasparov, Brussels blitz 1987.

Now we return to 10 e3 (D):




10...♙a6

Or:

a) 10...0-0?! 11 ♖b3 ♘c6 (11...c5 12 ♙b5 ♖b7 and now instead of 13 0-0 ± Grivas-Zigouris, Nikiti 1990, I recommend 13 ♗d1! ±) 12 ♙b5 a6 13 ♙e2 e5 (13...♘a5 14 ♖b4 ♗e8 15 0-0 ♙b7 16 ♗fd1 ♙e4 17 ♗ac1 ♘b7 18 c4 a5 19 ♖a3 ♘d6 20 ♘e5 ± Lysy-Wen Yang, Khalikidhiki U-16 Wch 2003) 14 ♔g3 ♗e8 15 0-0 ♙b7 16 ♗fd1 e4 17 ♘d2 ♘e7 18 a4 ± Grivas-E.Liss, Budapest 1993.

b) 10...♙b7, although giving only a slight advantage to White, deviates from the battle that Black is seeking with his 9th move: 11 ♖b3 ♘c6 (11...0-0 12 ♙e2 ♘c6 13 0-0 ♗ac8 14 ♗fd1 ♘a5 15 ♖a3 ± T.Meier-Papa, Pfullendorf 2003) 12 ♙b5! (12 ♙e2 ♘a5 with the idea ...c5 ∞ Plachetka – Brinck-Claussen, Copenhagen 1980) 12...a6 13 ♙e2 0-0 14 0-0 e5 15 ♗fd1 exd4 16 cxd4 ♗fe8 17 ♗ac1 ♗ac8 18 ♔g3 ± Grivas-Tsiamis, Athens 1999.

11 ♖b3 ♙xf1 12 ♘xf1 (D)



This is better than 12 ♖xf1 as the white king will anyway end up on e2, but in some continuations the rook will be misplaced on f1.

White has lost the right to castle, but his king will not be badly placed on e2. On the other hand he has obtained a strong centre and a possible initiative on the queenside. Now Black has three possibilities:

- A31: 12...♟c6 33
- A32: 12...c5 33
- A33: 12...0-0 34

A31)

12...♟c6 13 ♖e2 e5

13...♟a5?! 14 ♖b4! e6 15 a4! (15 ♟e5?! ♟d6! 16 ♟g3 0-0! 17 ♟xg6 ♟xb4 18 cxb4 hxg6 19 bxa5 c5! 20 ♟e5 cxd4 21 ♟xd4 ♟xd4 22 exd4 ♟fd8 23 ♖e3 ♟d5 24 axb6 axb6 25 ♟hb1 1/2-1/2 Beliavsky-Ivanchuk, Linares 1991) 15...♟f8 16 ♟b5 c6 17 ♟a6 ♟d5 18 ♟hb1! ♟e7! 19 ♟xe7 ♖xe7 20 ♟d3 with such ideas as ♖f1, ♟d2 and c4 or directly e4, gives White a more than pleasant position.

14 ♟g3!


This is much better than 14 dxe5 ♟xe5 15 ♟hd1 ♟c6 16 ♟xe5 ♟xe5 17 ♟d5 (17 ♟d5 ♟xd5 18 ♟xd5 ♟d6 19 ♟ad1 ♖d7! 20 ♟g3 ♟hd8 21 ♟xd6 ♖c6! = Grivas-Shengelia, Panormo Z 1998) and now 17...♟d6! = Meduna-Plachetka, Trnava 1981 (but not 17...♟g7?! 18 ♟b4 ♟e6 19 ♟ad1 ± Zayats-Matveeva, Kazan 2004).

14...e4

After 14...exd4 15 cxd4 Black will face problems along the semi-open c-file. 14...♟a5 is also bad: 15 ♟b4! (15 ♟b1?! ♟d5 16 ♟xe5 ♟xe5 17 ♟xe5 f6 18 ♟g3 ♟xg2 ∞ Grivas-K.Nikolaidis, Nikiti 1990) 15...exd4 16 cxd4 c5

17 dxc5! ♟xa1 18 ♟e4+ ♖f8 19 ♟xa8+ ♖g7 20 ♟e4 ♟b5+ 21 ♟d3 ♟b2+ 22 ♟d2 ♟xa2 23 ♟b1! ±.

15 ♟d2 ♟a5 16 ♟b2 f5 17 a4 0-0 18 h4! (D)



Discouraging a future pawn advance on the kingside with ...g5.

18...♟ac8 19 ♟a2+! ♟f7

Forced, as after 19...♖h8 20 ♟c4! ♟xc4 21 ♟xc4 ± White would control the centre (if 21...c5?! then 22 d5!) and could start operations on the queenside.

20 ♟xf7+ ♟xf7 21 ♟ac1 c5

The only way to stop White's intended advance c4-c5. The passed white d-pawn is not dangerous at the present moment.

22 ♟hd1 ♟d7 23 f3!

Strengthening the centre and reinforcing the position of the white king. White has the advantage.

23...exf3+ 24 gxf3 ♟e8 25 ♖d3

± Grivas-Vakhidov, Khania 2000 (see Illustrative Games).

A32)

12...c5 13 d5!

The only way to fight for the advantage. Only equality is offered by 13 ♖e2 cxd4 (13...♟c6 14 dxc5 0-0 15 ♟hd1 ♟c8 16 ♟ab1 ♟a6+ 17 c4 ♟fc8 18 a4 bxc5 19 ♟b5 ♟xb5 20 axb5 ♟b4 21 ♟d7 ♟a2 22 ♖f1 e6 = Meduna-Ftačnik, Baile Herculane Z 1982) 14 cxd4 ♟c6 15 ♟hd1 0-0 16 ♟ac1 ♟ac8, O.Foisor-W.Schmidt, Polanica Zdroj 1982.

13...0-0 14 ♟d1!


The only move, as 14 ♖e2?! c4! is fine for Black.

14...e5

Worse is 14...♙f6?! 15 ♙xf6 exf6 16 c4 ♞e8 17 h4 h5 18 g3 ♖g4 19 ♜g2 ♝d7 20 a4 ♞ab8 21 ♖c2 ± Grivas-Colović, Budapest 2001 (see Illustrative Games).

15 dxe6 ♖xe6 16 ♖xe6 fxe6 17 c4 ♝c6

18 ♜e2 (18 ♝d6?! ♞a5 19 ♝d2 ♙c3) 18...♞a5 19 ♞c1 h6 20 g4! (20 ♝d2 g5 21 ♙g3 ♞ad8 22 h4 ± Grivas-W.Schmidt, Novi Sad OL 1990) and White enjoys a small but healthy advantage, with ideas like ♝d2-e4, ♙g3 and h4.

A33)**12...0-0 13 ♜e2 (D)**

Black can choose from:

A331: 13...c5 34

A332: 13...♝c6 34

Black should avoid 13...♞c8 14 ♞hd1 ♖e8?! 15 ♞ac1 ± Van der Sterren-Kindermann, Munich 1990.

A331)**13...c5 14 dxc5!**

Not much is achieved with 14 ♞hd1 cxd4 15 cxd4 ♝c6 16 ♞ac1 ♞a5 17 ♖b4 e6 18 a4 ♞fc8 = Gheorghiu-Sundararajan, Biel 1999 or (even worse) 14 d5? c4! 15 ♖xc4 ♞c8 ♯.

14...♞a6

Or 14...bxc5?! 15 ♞hd1 ♖c7 16 ♞ab1 ±.

15 ♞ad1!

The best, as 15 cxb6 ♝c5! and 15 c6 ♖c7, with the idea ...♝c5, are inadvisable. Also nothing is gained by 15 ♞hd1?! ♖c7 (15...♖b7?! 16 c6! ♖xc6 17 ♙xe7 ♞fe8 18 ♙a3 ♞ad8 19 ♞ac1 ♝c7 20 c4 ♝e6 21 ♜f1 ♖e4 22 ♞d5 ♞c8 23


♖d3 ♖xd3+ 24 ♞xd3 is much better for White, Grivas-Leko, Dortmund 1992) 16 cxb6 (16 c6 ♝c5 17 ♖c4 e6 18 ♝d4 ♖xh2 19 ♙e7 ♞fc8 20 ♙xc5 bxc5 21 ♖xc5 ♖xg2, Haba-Ilinčić, Prague 1989) 16...axb6 17 ♙g3 (17 a4? ♝c5 18 ♖b4 ♞a5 19 ♙g3 e5 20 ♝d2 ♞fa8 21 ♝c4 ♞xa4 22 ♜f1 ♙f8 23 ♝d6 ♝xc3 24 ♞ac1 ♞c5 25 ♞d3 ♝e4 0-1 Lautier-Ivanchuk, Terrassa 1991 or 17 ♞ab1 ♝c5 18 ♖xb6 ♖xb6 19 ♞xb6 ♞a4 20 ♞b3 ♝xc3+ 21 ♞xc3 ♙xc3 22 ♙xe7 ♯) 17...♖xc3 (17...e5? 18 ♜f1 ♝c5 19 ♖d5 ♞fd8 20 ♙xe5 ± I.Nikolaidis-W.Schmidt, Koszalin 1999) 18 ♖xc3 ♙xc3 19 ♞ac1 1/2-1/2 Ibragimov-Volzhin, Ubeda 1996.

15...♖c7 16 c6 ♝c5

16...♖xc6 17 ♙xe7 ♞fe8 (17...♞fc8 18 ♞d3) 18 ♙a3! (18 ♙b4 ♖b5+ 19 ♞d3 ♞ad8 20 ♞hd1 ♞xd3 21 ♞xd3 ♞d8 22 ♞e1 ♞xd3 23 ♝xd3 ♖h5+ 24 ♜d2 ♖xh2 25 ♖d5 ♝xb4 26 cxb4 ♖c7 =) 18...♖xc3 19 ♞d7! is slightly better for White.

17 ♖c4

Now 17...e6 (17...♞fe8!? is an alternative) 18 ♝d4 e5?! (18...♞fc8 19 ♙g3! e5 20 ♝f3 ±) 19 ♝b3 ♖xc6 (19...♝xb3 20 axb3 ♞ac8 21 ♞d7! ♖xd7 {21...♖xc6 22 ♖xc6 ♞xc6 23 c4 a5 24 ♞a7 ±} 22 cxd7 ♞xc4 23 bxc4 g5 {23...f6 24 ♞al a5 25 c5 +-} 24 ♙xg5 f6 25 ♙h4 ♞d8 26 ♞d1 ♜f7 27 f4! exf4 28 exf4 ♜e7 29 c5! ±) 20 ♝xc5 bxc5 21 ♞d5 ♞ab8 22 ♞hd1 gave White an overwhelming advantage in Grivas-Kondou, Athens 1995, as both control of the d-file and light squares and the pressure against the weak black pawns are important positional factors.

A332)**13...♝c6 14 ♞hd1 (D)**

White enjoys a stronger centre and more space, but if Black succeeds in playing ...c5 under favourable circumstances, then he will achieve equality.

14...fxc8

The other main paths for Black are:

a) 14...e5?! 15 g3! (not much is achieved with 15 dxe5 f5 16 g3 dxe5 17 xe5 xe5 18 d5 ae8 19 ad1 wf6 20 dxe5 xe5 21 c4 {21 xe5 xe5 22 h3 e8 23 a4 g7 24 d4 wf6 25 wf6+ 1/2-1/2 Alterman-Greenfeld, Tel Aviv 1999} 21...xd5 22 xd5 e6 23 d4 e8 24 xe6 xe6 1/2-1/2 Gheorghiu-de la Villa, New York 1989) 15...e4 16 d2 ae8 17 a4! h8 18 b5 ±.

b) 14...a5 15 b4! and then:

b1) 15...e6 16 ac1 c5 17 dxc5 b7 18 cxb6 (18 b1 a6+ 19 ab5 ± Belivsky) 18...axb6 19 c4! (19 f1!?, Belivsky-Kindermann, Munich 1990) 19...fxc8 20 c2 a6 21 dcl ±.

b2) 15...c5 16 dxc5 b7 17 cxb6 a6+ 18 el axb6 19 d4! e5 20 b5 fxc8 21 d7! f8 22 b2 d4 23 b3 c5 24 d7 a4 25 xa4 xa4 26 d8 d6 27 d1 e4 28 d5 xa2 29 d6+ dxf6 30 xf6 a8 31 d8 cc8 32 xc8 xc8 33 xe5 ± Grivas-Odeev, Elista OL 1998.

b3) 15...fe8 16 ac1 (16 d3 ac8 17 ad1 d5 18 a4 f8 19 b1 c6 20 f1 c4 ∞ Cifuentes-Rodriguez Guerrero, Dos Hermanas 2005) 16...ac8 and then:


b31) 17 f1 wf5 (17...xf8?! 18 c4 wg4 {18...e5 19 b5 c6 20 dxe5} 19 b5 we4 20 wd5! {20 g3 ± Øgaard-Smejkal, Reykjavik 1978} 20...xd5 21 cxd5 ed8 22 e4 f5 23 xf5 gxf5 24 g3 d7 25 c2 ±) 18 g3 c5 19 b5 1/2-1/2 Muco-Popović, Nea Makri 1990.

b32) 17 c4! ± wg4?! (17...c5! 18 dxc5 wg4 19 cxb6 axb6 20 xb6 dxc4 21 a6! b2! 22 h3! we4 23 d2! is an untested possibility, where White retains the edge) 18 h3! (18 f1 c5 19 b5 cxd4 20 exd4 we4 21 c5 wd5 22 a4 e6 23 cxb6 xb5+ 24 axb5 axb6 = Grivas-Ruck, Panormo rpd Ech 2002) 18...wg2? 19 h1! c5 20 b1! ±. Black loses his queen after 21 cgl.

We now return to 14...fxc8 (D).

This is probably the most resilient line for Black, but there are not many examples:

a) 15 a4 a5 16 a2 c5 17 ac1 cxd4 18 cxd4 e6 19 f1 xc1 20 xc1 c8 21 c2 c6



22 d2 c8 23 xc6 xc6 24 e7 f8 25 xf8 xf8 26 a3+ g8 = I.Nikolaidis-Nauermann, Corfu 1999.

b) 15 ac1 a5 16 b4 c5 17 dxc5 e6 18 cxb6 axb6 19 f1 (19 a4? b3! 20 c2 d2 c5 ±; but 19 c2?! c7 will have to be tested in the future – White is a pawn up, but Black can seek counterplay with his well-placed pieces) 19...xa2 20 xe7 (20 xb6? b3! 21 b1 ab8 →) 20...b3! (20...c4+!? 21 g1 b3 22 c2?! b5 23 xf6? e8 24 a2 ac8 25 d6 e6 26 wd8+ xd8 27 xd8+ f8 28 e5 we4 0-1 Van der Sterren-Groszpeter, Budapest 1989) 21 b1 xc3 and White should settle for 22 f6! = instead of 22 g1? b5! 23 e5 d2 ± Maksimenko-Khuzman, Vrnjačka Banja 1991.

c) 15 a3!? (winning a tempo compared to the previous lines) 15...e6 (15...f8 16 a4!) 16 ac1 a5 17 c4 c5 18 d5! and White can claim the advantage, as 18...exd5 19 xd5! dxc4? 20 wd3! is not tactically justified. This line is my suggestion.

d) I believe that 15 a4!? is also perfectly playable.

B)

7...c5 (D)


8 cxd5

A wise decision, as White should clarify things as early as possible.

8...xd5 9 e3 d6 10 e2 cxd4

The immediate 10...e5?! is not advisable, since White can obtain an advantage in two ways:

a) 11 c4 wd7 (11...wd6 12 d5 d7 13 e4 d7 14 0-0 d8 15 d1 c7 16 f3 d6 17 a4 f6 18 a5 ± Enklaar-Van der Plassche, Eindhoven




1987) 12 d5 ♗a5 13 e4 (or 13 ♗cl 0-0 14 0-0 b6 15 ♗g3 ♗e8 16 ♔d2 ± Kargl-Raffalt, Austria 1979) 13...b6 14 ♗g3 f6 15 h4 ♗b7 16 h5 ♔d6 17 ♗c2 ♗b7 18 a4 ♗a6 19 a5 ± Lieb-R.Grünberg, German Cht 1975/6.

b) 11 dxe5 ♗e6 (11...♗xd1+ 12 ♗xd1 ♗g4 { 12...♗d7 13 ♗f6 } 13 h3! ♗xf3 14 ♗xf3 ♗xe5 15 ♗xc6+ bxc6 16 c4 ±) 12 0-0 0-0 13 ♗d6 ♔xe5 14 ♗xc5 (or 14 ♗e7 ♗e8 15 ♗xe6 ♗xe6 16 ♗xc5 ♔c6 17 ♔d4 b6 18 ♗a3 ± De Lange-Van der Hauw, Oostvoorne 1972) 14...b6 15 ♗e7 (15 ♗c7 ♗d7 16 ♗xd7 ♗xd7 17 ♔d4 is also much better for White, Wallinger-Kosmol, corr. 1996) 15...♗e8 16 ♗xe6 ♗xe6 17 ♔d4 ♗ac8 18 ♗b5 ♗d7 19 ♗ad1 ± Minev-Forintos, Baja 1971.

Sometimes Black refrains from exchanging on d4. In general he cannot do this for a long time, as he has no central break and always in those cases, after a possible ...e5, White can continue with c4 and d5. Some conclusions can be drawn from the following example: 10...b6 11 0-0 0-0 12 ♗b3 ♗b3 13 axb3 e6 14 ♔d2 ♗d7 15 ♗f3 ♗fc8 16 ♔c4 b5 17 ♔d6 ♗cb8 18 ♗a6 ♗b6 19 ♗fal ♗ab8 20 dxc5 1-0 Van der Sterren-Michelakis, Canberra 1991.

11 cxd4 (D)



Now 11...0-0 12 0-0 is the subject of Sections 1.5 and 1.6.

In this section we shall examine Black's alternatives:

B1: 11...e5 36

B2: 11...♗a5+ 37

B1)

11...e5 12 dxe5 ♗a5+ 13 ♗d2

This is best, although 13 ♔d2!? ♔xe5 14 0-0 0-0 15 ♔b3 ♗a4 16 ♔d4 ♗xd1 17 ♗fxd1, as in Staniszewski-Schandorff, Oslo 1983, deserves attention.

13...♗xd2+ 14 ♗xd2


Nothing is gained with 14 ♔xd2 ♔xe5 15 0-0 0-0 16 ♗ab1 b6 17 f4 ♗g4 18 ♗a6 ♔d7 19 h3 ♗e6 20 ♔b3 ♔c5 21 ♔xc5 bxc5 22 ♗e7 ♗fb8 23 ♗xc5 ♗xa2 24 ♗bd1 ♗b2 25 ♗f2 ♗xf2 26 ♗xf2 ♗e6 = Yin Hao-Qin Kanying, Shanghai 2000.

14...♔xe5 15 ♗ab1 (D)

Alternatives:

a) 15 ♔d4 ♔c6 16 ♗b5 ♗d7 17 ♗ab1 ♔xd4 18 exd4 ♗xb5 19 ♗he1+ ♗f8 20 ♗xb5 ♗xd4 21 ♗xb7 ♗g7 22 ♗ee7 ♗hf8 23 ♗ed7 ♗c5 24 ♗e7 ♗xe7 25 ♗xe7 a5 26 ♗c3 ♗a6 27 ♗b3 ♗f6 = Schranz-Voloshin, Hungarian Cht 1998/9.

b) 15 ♔xe5 ♗xe5 16 ♗ab1 0-0 (16...b6 17 ♗b5 ♗d6 18 ♗f6 0-0 19 ♗f3 ♗a6 20 ♗xa8 ♗xb5 21 ♗d5 1/2-1/2 Sutter-Hugentobler, Zurich 1989) 17 ♗f3 ♗b8 18 ♗b5 ♗d6 19 ♗hb1 b6 = Gelashvili-V.Belov, Korinthos 2004.



In this position Black has tried:

a) 15...h6 17 ♗hc1! (17 f4?! g5! 18 fxg5

♔g6 19 ♗g3 hxg5 20 ♗c7 g4 was equal in

Meduna-J.Přibyl, Trnava 1981) 17...g5 18 ♖g3 ± Arkhipov-Brandics, Kecskemet 1984.

a2) 16...a6 17 ♜hcl ♞e8 (17...b5 18 f4 ♘c4+ 19 ♙xc4 bxc4 20 ♜xc4 ♙xd4 21 ♜xd4 ♙e6 22 a3 ♞ab8 23 ♜xb8 ♜xb8 24 ♙f6 ± Dumitrache-Tripoteau, Guingamp 2005) 18 f4 ♘d7 19 ♙f3 ♞b8 20 ♜c7 ♙f8 21 ♙xb7 ± Forintos-Honfi, Kecskemet 1975.

a3) 16...♘c6 17 ♘xc6 bxc6 18 ♜hcl and here:

a31) 18...♙e6 19 ♙c4 ± Gheorghiu-Jansa, Sochi 1976 – see Typical Endgames.

a32) 18...h6 19 ♜xc6 g5 20 ♙g3 ♙f5 21 ♙d3 ♜fd8 22 ♞d6 ♙f8 23 ♞d4 ♙e6 24 a4 ♙c5 25 ♜xd8+ ♜xd8 26 ♞b8 ♜xb8 27 ♙xb8 ± Lukov-Dausch, Cappelle la Grande 1995.

a33) 18...h5 19 ♜xc6 ♙e6 20 ♙c4 ♙f5 21 ♙d3 ♙e6 22 ♜c2 ♞ab8 23 ♜xb8 ♜xb8 24 ♙e7 ♞b7 25 ♙c5 ± Koczó-J.Bernard, Budapest 2004.

a34) 18...♙f5 19 ♙d3 ♙e6 20 ♙c4 ♞fe8 (20...♙f5 21 ♞b7 ♙e5 22 ♙g3 ♞ad8+ 23 ♖e2 ♙xg3 24 hxg3 ♞d7 25 ♜xd7 ♙xd7 26 ♞b1 ♙e6 27 ♙xe6 fxe6 28 g4 h5 29 gxh5 gxh5 30 ♜c1 ♜c8 31 ♜c5 h4 32 ♙c4 h3 33 gxh3 ♖f7 34 ♖f3 ♖e7 35 h4 e5 36 h5 ♖d6 37 ♞h4 ♞f8+ 38 ♖e2 1-0 O.Foisor-Xu Jun, Timisoara 1987) 21 ♞b7 a5 22 ♙xe6 ♞xe6 23 ♜c4 ± K.Pytel-Beliavsky, Le Havre 1977.

b) 15...♘c6!? 16 ♜hcl 0-0 17 ♙c4 h6 18 ♖e2! ♙f5! (18...g5 19 ♙g3 g4 20 ♘d2 ± or 18...♞e8 19 ♙d5 ±) 19 ♜xb7 ♘a5 20 ♜xf7! (20 ♜c7? ♘c4 21 ♞1xc4 ♞fb8 ∞ Lputian-Svidler, Moscow 2004) 20...♙xf7 21 ♙xf7+ ♖xf7 22 ♜c5! ♞b8! 23 e4! ♙xe4 24 ♞xa5 ♞b7 25 ♖e3 ± Svidler. White has a material advantage that is partly compensated by the black bishop-pair.


B2)

11...♞a5+ 12 ♞d2 (D)

The endgame after an exchange of queens is favourable for White. 12 ♘d2?! is bad due to 12...e5! 13 dxe5 ♙xe5, R.Levit-Lonoff, Illinois 1992.

12...♙e6!?

This is the only acceptable move. Instead, 12...♙d7 is well met by 13 ♞b1! (rather than 13 ♞xa5 ♘xa5 14 0-0 f6 15 ♙g3 ♖f7 16 ♘d2 ♞hc8 17 ♙f3 ♙c6 = Berczes-R.Pert, Budapest



2002), while 12...♞xd2+?! 13 ♖xd2 (13 ♘d2 e5 { 13...h6 14 0-0 g5 15 ♙g3 0-0 16 ♞fc1 ♙f5 17 ♙f3 ♞ac8 ∞ Beth-Rettieck, Schleswig Holstein 1991 or 13...0-0 14 ♞b1 e6 15 0-0 b6 16 ♘e4 f6 17 ♞fc1 ± Pohl-Lechler, Schwäbisch Gmünd 1998) 14 dxe5 ♘xe5 15 0-0 0-0 16 ♞ab1 b6 17 ♞bc1 ♙e6 18 ♜c7 ♞fc8 19 ♞fc1 ♜xc7 20 ♜xc7 ♞c8 21 ♜xc8+ ♙xc8 = Svenn-Carlhammar, Gothenburg 1989) gives White a very pleasant game:

a) 13...a6 14 ♞ab1 e6 15 ♜hcl h6 16 ♘e1 0-0 17 ♘d3 ♞e8 18 ♙f3 ± Grivas-Himmel, Corfu 1991.

b) 13...♙g4 14 ♞ab1 ♘a5 15 ♜hcl f6 16 ♜c7 ♜c8 17 ♞bc1 ♜xc7 18 ♜xc7 ♙e6 19 ♜c5 b6 20 ♜c7 ♙xa2 21 ♞xa7 ♖f7 22 ♙g3 ♜c8 23 ♜c7 ♜xc7 24 ♙xc7 ♙d5 25 ♖c3 e6 26 ♙xb6 ± Grivas-Pilalis, Corfu 1993.

c) 13...e6 14 ♜hcl ♙f8 15 ♙b5 ♙d7 16 ♞ab1 ♙d6 17 ♙f6 ± Lechtynsky-Wienkeller, Prague 1985.

d) 13...e5 14 dxe5 0-0 15 ♞ab1 b6 16 ♜hcl ♙f5 17 ♞b5 ± Raisky-Begun, Minsk 1988.

e) 13...♙f5 14 ♜hcl (14 ♙d3 ♙xd3 15 ♖xd3 ♜c8 16 ♞ab1 b6 17 a3 e6 18 ♜hcl ♖d7 = Kingso-Satici, corr. 1997 or 14 ♞acl ♜c8 15 ♞hd1 e6 16 ♙b5 ♙e4 17 a4 0-0 ∞ P.Karlsson-Barreras, Graz 1972) 14...♜c8 15 ♜c5 ♙d7 16 ♞b1 b6 17 ♞cc1 ♘a5 18 ♜xc8+ ♙xc8 19 ♞cl ♙b7 20 ♙b5+ ♖f8 21 d5 ± Forintos-Suetin, Dubna 1979.

f) 13...0-0 14 ♞ab1 and now:

f1) 14...b6 15 ♙b5 ♙b7 16 ♜hcl ♞fc8 17 ♙xc6 ♙xc6 18 ♙xe7 ± Papa-M.Carlsen, Lausanne 2004.

f2) 14...h6 15 ♙b5 g5 16 ♙g3 ♞d8 17 ♜hcl ♙e6 18 a4 ♙d7 19 ♖e2 e6 20 ♘d2 f5 21 ♙c7 ♞dc8 22 ♙d6 ♙f8 23 ♘c4 ± Lukov-Gamundi Salamanca, Olot 1996.

f3) 14...e6 15 ♖hcl f6 16 ♗d3 ♜d8 17 ♗e4 g5 18 ♗g3 e5 19 ♗xc6 bxc6 20 ♜xc6 g4 21 ♜h4 exd4 22 e4 ♗d7 23 ♜f5 ± Zayats-Sazonova, Serpukhov 2001.

f4) 14...♗d8 15 ♖hcl h6 16 ♗b5 g5 17 ♗xc6 bxc6 18 ♗g3 ± Schranz-M.Horvath, Hungarian Cht 1992/3.

13 ♖b1!

White cannot be happy with 13 0-0 ♗xd2 14 ♜xd2 ♗d5 15 ♗b5 f5 16 ♜b1 a6 17 ♜c3 ♗xg2 18 ♗xg2 axb5 19 ♜xb5 ♗f7 = Ristić-Kyhle, Stockholm 1987 or 13 ♗xa5 ♜xa5 14 0-0 (14 ♗b5+ ♗d7 15 ♖b1 ♜c8 16 ♗d2 ♗xb5 17 ♖xb5 ♜c4+ 18 ♗d3 ♜d6 19 ♖bb1 1/2-1/2 Wallinger-Eichenseer, Abensberg 1987) 14...♗c4 15 ♗xc4 ♜xc4 16 ♖fc1 ♜c8 17 ♖abl b6 18 ♖b4 (18 ♜d2 ♜d6 19 ♗xc8+ ♜xc8 20 ♗f1 = Grivas-Haritakis, Thessaloniki 1988 – see Typical Endgames) 18...♜d6 19 ♗xc8+ ♜xc8 20 ♜c4 ♗d7 21 ♗g3 ♜d6 22 ♗xd6 exd6 23 ♗f1 d5 24 ♜c2 f6 25 ♗e2 ♜c8 1/2-1/2 Bagirov-Neverov, Baku 1986.

13...♗xa2

Other moves are not helpful: 13...b6 14 ♗b5 ♗d7 15 0-0 ♗xd2 16 ♜xd2 ♜a5 17 ♗a6 ♗c6 18 ♖fc1 ♗d7 19 ♜b3 ♗e4 20 ♗b5+ ♗e6 21 ♜xa5 bxa5 22 ♗c4+ ♗d6 23 ♗b5 ♖hc8 24 ♖xa5 e6 25 ♖a6+ ♜c6 26 ♗g3+ ♗e7 27 ♗xc6 ♗xc6 28 ♗xe6 1-0 Sorin-Rivero, Buenos Aires 1994 or 13...♗xd2+ 14 ♗xd2 ♜a5 15 ♗b5+ ♗d7 16 ♖hcl a6 17 ♗xd7+ ♗xd7 18 ♜c5 b5 19 a4 ♜c4+ 20 ♗d3 ♜a3 21 ♖b3 ± Grivas-Quesada, Internet 2004.

14 ♗xa2 ♗xa2 15 ♖xb7 ♗d5 16 ♗b5

Now:

a) 16...e6? 17 ♖e7+! (not 17 ♜c7? ♖b8!) 17...♗f8 18 ♜c7 ±.

b) 16...0-0 17 ♖d7! (17 ♗xc6 ♗xc6 18 ♖xe7 ♖fc8 with idea ...a5 and ...♗f8 ∞) and then:

b1) 17...e6? 18 ♖xd5 exd5 19 ♗xc6 ♖ac8 20 ♗a4 ±.


b2) 17...♗e4? 18 0-0! (18 ♜d2 ♗xg2 19 ♖gl ♖ab8 20 ♗a4 ♖b4) 18...♖ab8 19 ♗a4 ±.

b3) 17...♗xf3 18 gxf3 ♖ab8 19 ♗d3 e6 20 0-0 ♜b4 21 ♗e2 (21 ♗e4? f5 and ...♖f7) 21...a5 22 ♖a1! ± ♜c2 (22...♖a8 23 ♖b7! ♖fc8 24 ♖b5 ♜c2 25 ♖axa5 ♖xa5 26 ♖xa5 ♗xd4 {26...♖xe2 27 ♖a8+ ♗f8 28 ♗e7 +-} 27 exd4 ♖xe2 28 ♗f6! ♖a2 29 ♖b5 ♜a6 {29...♜c6 30 ♖b6 ♜c2 31 ♖a6 +-} 30 d5! +-} 23 ♖xa5? (23 ♖a2! ♜e1 24 h3 ♖b1 25 ♗h2 ♖a8 26 ♖d8+ wins for

White) 23...♖b1+ 24 ♗g2 ♖b2 25 ♗f1 ♖b1+ 26 ♗g2 ♖b2 1/2-1/2 Grivas-Malishauskas, Debrecen Echt 1992.

1.5 Black's 12th-Move Deviations

1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♜c3 d5 4 ♜f3 ♗g7 5 ♗g5 ♜e4 6 ♗h4 ♜xc3 7 bxc3 e5 8 cxd5 ♗xd5 9 e3 ♜c6 10 ♗e2 cxd4 11 cxd4 0-0 12 0-0 (D)



This is considered to be an important position for the ♗g5 system. The main line, 12...e5, will be examined in Section 1.6. Black has tried a lot of other moves, as follows:

- A: 12...♗a5?! 38
- B: 12...♗d8?! 39
- C: 12...e6 39
- D: 12...a6 39
- E: 12...♗d7 39
- F: 12...♖e8 40
- G: 12...h6 40
- H: 12...♗g4 41
- I: 12...♗f5 42
- J: 12...b6 44

A)

12...♗a5?!

This move lacks any sensible idea.

13 ♜d2!

This typical knight regrouping allows White to strengthen the mobility of his pieces.

13...e5 14 ♜c4

White can also try 14 ♜b3 ♗b6 15 d5 obtaining a healthy advantage.

14...♗d5 15 dxe5

White holds the advantage after 15...♖xd1
16 ♜fxd1 ♜xe5 17 ♜ab1 or 17 ♜d6 (1/2-1/2
Sapi-Szekeres, Gyongyos 1995).

B)

12...♜d8?!

Self-pinning the e7-pawn is not very smart.

13 ♖b3


Alternatives such as 13 ♖a4!? or 13 ♜d2
(intending 14 ♜f3) should be tried in the future.
After the latter there could follow 13...♜xd4!?
14 exd4 (14 ♜c4 ♜e2+! 15 ♖xe2 ♖xd2 16
♜ad1 ♖a5) 14...♖xd4 15 ♜f3 (15 ♜xe7? ♜e8!)
15...♖b6 16 ♖c1 ♜xal 17 ♖xal f6 ±.

**13...♜e6 14 ♖a3 ♖d6 15 ♖xd6 ♜xd6 16
♜ab1 ♜d7 17 a4 ♜d5 18 ♜fcl**

White's pressure on the queenside is strong.
Now 18...e5?! is a premature central break
seeking to reduce the pressure: 19 dxe5 ♜xe5
20 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 21 f4 ♜g7 22 ♜d1! (with the
idea 23 ♜f3 or 23 ♜b5) 22...♜c6 23 ♜xd7
♜xd7 24 ♜xb7 ♜xa4 25 ♜f3! a5 26 ♜e1!
♜e8!? (26...♜f8 27 ♜xf7 ♜xf7 28 ♜xa8 ♜b4
29 ♜f2 ♜e6 30 ♜e4 ♜b5 31 ♜xb4 axb4 32
♜e1 ♜c4 33 ♜d2 ♜f6 34 g3 ♜e6 35 ♜d3 ♜b3
36 ♜c1 ♜f6 37 ♜b2 ♜g8 38 e4 ♜e6 39 e5+
♜g7 40 ♜c2 ♜d5 41 ♜b3 ♜f3 42 ♜c4 ♜d1
43 ♜d3 ♜f7 44 ♜c2 ♜f3 45 ♜b3 h5 46 ♜xb4
h4 47 ♜c5 hxg3 48 hxg3 g5 49 ♜d6 g4 50 f5
1-0 Groszpeter-Mann, Berlin 1988) 27 ♜e7
♜b8 28 ♜xa5 ±/±. A typical example of the
♜g5 system!

C)

12...e6 (D)



13 ♖b3

13 ♜d2 ♜xd4!? 14 exd4 ♖xd4 15 ♜e7 ♜e8
16 ♜b3 ♖d7 (16...♖xd1? 17 ♜axd1 ♜xe7 18
♜d8+ ♜f8 19 ♜c1 ±) 17 ♜g5 ♜xal 18 ♖xal
was evaluated as unclear in M.Taylor-Pyke,
England 1995 although I prefer White.

13...♖xb3 14 axb3 ♜d7 15 ♜d2 f5

16 b4!? (16 ♜c4!?) 16...♜fc8 (16...♜xb4!?)
17 ♜e7 ♜d5 18 ♜xf8 ±) 17 ♜f3 b5 18 ♜b3
♜f8 19 ♜c5 ♜xc5 20 dxc5 ± Sorin-Alterman,
Moscow OL 1994.

D)

12...a6

Trying to gain space on the queenside, but in
fact this move just weakens it.

13 ♜d2


White can also play 13 a4 ♜d8 14 ♜b1 ±
Leutwyler-Zollbrecht, Biel 2002.

13...♖d8 14 ♜f3 ♜d7

15 ♜b1 (15 ♜e4 and 15 ♖b3 are decent alter-
natives, giving White an edge) 15...♖a7 16 ♖c1
♜e8 17 ♖c5 ♖a5 18 ♜b3 ♖xc5 19 ♜xc5 ♜c8
20 ♜fcl ♜a5 21 a4 e5 22 d5 ♜f8 23 ♜e4 1-0
Arbakov-M.Bauer, Schwäbisch Gmünd 1999.

E)

12...♜d7 (D)



A modest continuation.

13 ♜d2! e6

White held the advantage after 13...♜fe8 14
♜f3 ♖a5 15 ♜b3 ♖d8 16 ♜c5 b6 17 ♜xd7
♖xd7 18 ♖a4 in Schirm-Ludwig, Kassel 1992.


14 ♜f3 ♖d6 15 ♜e4 ♖c7 16 ♜c1

White has a pleasant space advantage and
good control of the dark squares. 16...♖a5 17
♜c5 ♖xa2 18 ♜f6+ ♜xf6 19 ♜xf6 ♜fc8 20

♖e4 ♜b4 21 ♙xb7 ♞d5 22 ♜xc8+ ♜xc8 23
 ♙xc8 ♙xc8 24 ♙e5 f6 25 ♙g3 ♞c3 26 ♚a1
 ♚c4 27 ♜h1 ♙b7 28 ♜c1 ♚d5 29 f3 ♞e2 30
 ♜f1 ♚h5 31 ♙b8 ♚g5 32 ♙f4 ♚d5 33 ♚xa7
 ♚b5 34 ♚a1 ♜g7 35 ♚a5 1-0 Gostiša-Mali-
 shauskas, Budapest 1990.

F)

12...♙e8 (D)



A sensible continuation, strengthening the ...e5 push.

13 ♞d2

13 ♙g3 is a decent alternative for White: 13...♚a5 (13...♙e6?! 14 ♞d2 ♚d7 15 ♞e4 b6 16 a4 ± Grivas-Giannadis, Athens 1991) 14 ♚b3 ♚b4 15 ♚ab1 ♚xb3 16 ♜xb3 ± ♙e6? 17 ♜xb7 ♙xa2 18 ♙b5 ♙d5 19 ♞d7 ♞ad8? (or 19...♞b4 20 ♚b1 a6 21 ♙a4 ♞ec8 22 h3 ±) 20 ♞xd5 1-0 Servaty-F.Müller, Ruhrgebiet 1996.

13...e5

White stood better after 13...♙e6 14 ♞b3 ♙f5 15 ♜c1 e5 16 ♙f3 in D.Bischoff-Pirosca, Krynica 1999. It should be mentioned that Black's typical 'sacrifice' on d4 does not work: 13...♞xd4 14 exd4 ♚xd4 15 ♙b5!.

14 ♙f3 e4 15 ♙e2 ♞a5 16 ♚b1 ♙d7 17 ♜c1

White has an advantage, Krizsany-Z.Szabo, Szekszard 1997.


G)

12...h6 (D)

A speciality of the Serbian GM Petar Popović. White should choose between:

G1: 13 ♙g3 40

G2: 13 ♞d2 40



Black seems fine after other moves:

a) 13 ♜c1 ♚xa2 14 ♞d2 ♙e6 15 ♞c4 ♙xc4 16 ♙xc4 ♚a3 17 ♙d5 e6 18 ♙xc6 bxc6 19 ♜xc6 a5, Lein-Popović, Hastings 1980/1.

b) 13 h3 ♙f5 14 ♚a4 a6 15 ♚ac1 ♚d7 16 ♜fd1 b5 17 ♚b3 e6 18 ♞d2 g5 19 ♙g3 ♜ac8, Pohl Kümmel-Prüfer, Bavaria tt 2000.

G1)

13 ♙g3 ♞d8

An untested alternative is 13...b6!?, as recommended by Plachetka.

14 ♚a4! ♙d7 15 ♚a3 ♞dc8

Or 15...♙f8 16 ♚b2!.

16 ♞fc1

Another try is 16 ♚ac1 ♚a5 17 ♚b2 with a slight advantage for White, Sorin-J.Fernandez, Palma de Mallorca 1992.

16...♚a5 17 ♚b3 b6

White obtains a clear plus after 17...♚b6?! 18 ♚xb6 axb6 19 ♚cb1 ♙e6 20 ♚xb6 due to the weak b7-pawn.

18 ♙c4 e6

Now:

a) After 19 d5 ♞d8 20 ♞e5 Black should play 20...♙e8!, and not 20...♙a4 21 ♚d3 ±.

b) 19 ♚ab1 ♞d8 20 ♙d6 ♙f8 21 ♙xf8 ♜xf8 22 ♞e5 ♙e8 23 ♚b2! ± (due to the weak a1-h8 diagonal) Plachetka-Popović, Zemun 1980.

G2)


13 ♞d2 e5

13...♚d8!? is passive but playable: 14 ♞b3 b6 15 ♜c1 ♙b7 ± Meduna-Popović, Wrocław 1981.

14 ♙f3!

The consequences of 14 ♖c4 ♜d7 15 d5 ♘a5 16 e4 ♘xc4 17 ♘xc4 f5 18 f3 b6! with the idea 19... ♗a6 are unclear.

14... ♜d7 (D)



15 d5!

An equal endgame arises after 15 ♖xc6 ♜xc6 16 dxe5 ♗xe5 17 ♖c1 ♜e6 18 ♘c4 ♗g7 19 ♘d6 b6 20 ♘xc8 ♜fxc8 21 ♜a4 a5 22 ♗g3 ♜d5 23 ♖cd1 ♜c5 24 ♖b1 ♜c2 25 ♜xc2 ♜xc2 26 a3 ♖c6, Xu Jun-Popović, Subotica IZ 1987.

15... ♘a5

White would also hold the advantage after 15... ♘e7 16 e4 f5 17 ♗xe7! ♜xe7 18 ♜b3 or 15... ♘d8 16 e4 f5 17 exf5 gxf5 18 ♖c1.

16 e4 f5

Forced, as 16... b6?! 17 ♗e2 f5 18 f3 gives White a clear advantage.

17 exf5 gxf5 18 ♖b1 b6

The alternative is 18... e4 19 ♗e2 ♜xd5 20 ♘c4! (20 ♖b5? ♜xa2 21 ♗e7 ♗d7!) 20... ♜xd1 21 ♜fxd1 ♘xc4 (21... ♘c6? 22 ♘d6! ±) 22 ♗xc4+ ♗h8 23 ♗d5 a5! 24 ♗xb7 ±.

19 d6! e4

Forced, as 19... ♗b7 20 ♗e7 ♜f7 21 ♗xb7 ♘b7 22 ♘f3! e4 23 ♘h4 ♗f8 24 ♘g6 gives White a clear advantage due to the weak black king.

20 ♘xe4!

For this positional sacrifice of a minor piece, White obtains two pawns, a weakened enemy king, a passed d6-pawn, the initiative and the more harmoniously placed pieces.

20... ♜xe4 21 ♗xe4!

The 'obvious' 21 ♜d5+? is wrong: 21... ♗h8 22 ♜xa8 exf3 ♚.

21... ♗b7 22 ♖e1 ♖ae8!

White obtained a clear advantage after the faulty 22... ♖fe8? 23 ♗e7 ♗xe4 24 ♜xe4 ♘c6


25 ♜d5+! ♗h8 26 ♖be1, as in Grivas-Popović, Athens 1990 (see Illustrative Games).

23 ♗e7 ♗xe4 24 ♖xe4 ♜f7 25 ♜d5 ♘c6 26 ♖be1!

White has the initiative and enough compensation for the material.

H)

12... ♗g4 (D)



Not one of Black's best options.

13 h3!

Nothing is gained by 13 ♘d2 ♗xe2 14 ♜xe2 ♜fe8 15 ♜fd1 ♖ac8 with equality, Tobin-Carta, e-mail 1995.

13... ♗f5 14 ♘d2!

Black is fine after 14 ♜b3 ♗e4 15 ♖ac1 e6 16 ♜xd5 ♗xd5 17 a3 ♖fc8 = Masek-Hlavac, Czech Republic 2000.

14... ♖ac8

Other moves have led to a disaster for Black:

a) 14... e5 15 ♗f3 ♜d7? 16 d5 e4 17 dxc6 bxc6 18 ♘xe4 ♗xa1 19 ♜xa1 ♗xe4 20 ♗xe4 ♜e6 21 ♗f3 ♖ab8 22 ♖c1 ♖b6 23 ♗e2 ♖fb8 24 ♗f6 ♜f5 25 e4 ♜c8 26 ♗h8 ♜f8 27 ♗d4 ♖b7 28 ♗e5 1-0 Grivas-Kaminellis, Kavala 1991.

b) 14... b5 15 ♗f3 ♜d7 16 ♗xc6 ♜xc6 17 ♗xe7 ♖fe8 18 ♗c5 a5 19 ♜f3 ♜xf3 20 ♘xf3 ± Narain-Scalfaro, Vitinia 1996.


c) 14... ♘d4 15 ♗c4! ♜d7 16 exd4 ♜xd4 17 ♗xe7 ♖fe8 18 ♗g5 h6 19 ♗e3 ♖xe3 20 fxe3 ♜xe3+ 21 ♖f2 +- Porth-Krasenkova, Germany 2000.

15 g4! ♗d7 16 ♗f3 ♜a5 17 ♘b3 ♜d8

Now White can choose between 18 ♖c1 ± Maiko-Kochet, Kiev 2001 and 18 ♘c5! b6 19 ♘xd7 ♜xd7 20 ♜a4 ±.

I)


12...♙f5 (D)



W

22 ♙d3 ♞c3 23 ♙e2 ♞c2 1/2-1/2 Gelashvili-Ki.Georgiev, Dubai 2005.

d) 13 ♚a4 (D) and here:



B

This line results in positions very similar to the previous one (12...♙g4). I do not think that Black can be happy with this version either.

13 ♖d2!

There are four alternatives for White, but they don't offer much:

a) 13 ♙d3 ♙xd3 14 ♚xd3 = Van Beek-Van Hengel, Leiden 1998.

b) 13 ♙g3 ♞ac8 14 ♚a4 and then:

b1) 14...♚a5 15 ♚xa5 ♖xa5 16 ♞fc1 ♞c6 17 ♙b5 ♞b6 18 ♞c5 a6 19 ♙a4 ♖c6 20 ♙xc6 ♞xc6 21 ♞xc6 bxc6 22 ♖c1 ♞c8 23 h3 ± Hort-Nijboer, Hoogeveen 2002.

b2) 14...♞fd8 15 ♞ac1 a6 16 ♚a3 e6 17 ♚b2 ♚d7 18 ♞fd1 ♙e4 19 h3 ♙d5 20 ♖d2 ♖e7 21 ♖c4 ♙xc4 22 ♙xc4 b5 23 ♙e2 1/2-1/2 Szucs-Sipos, Slovakia 2004.

c) 13 ♚b3 and here:

c1) The immediate 13...♚xb3 is not best: 14 axb3 e5 (14...h6?! 15 ♞ac1 g5 16 ♙g3 ♞fd8 17 ♞fd1 ± Moseamed-Rust, Durban 1995 or 14...a6? 15 ♖d2 ♞fe8 16 ♖c4 ♙c2 17 ♖b6 ♞ad8 18 ♖f3 ± Gheorghiu-Kohler, St Jean 2002) 15 dxe5 (15 d5 e4 16 dxc6 exf3 17 ♙xf3 bxc6 18 ♞a3 ♞fc8 19 ♙g3 a5 20 h3 ♙c2 21 ♙d6 a4 22 bxa4 ♞xa4 23 ♖c1 ♞xa3 24 ♙xa3 ♙a4 = Topalov-Pereda de Pablo, Tenerife 1997) 15...♖xe5 16 ♖xe5 (16 ♖d4 ♙d3 17 ♙xd3 ♖xd3 18 ♞ad1 ♖c5 19 ♙e7 ♞fc8 = Köster-Stutz, Essen 2002) 16...♙xe5 17 ♞a4 ♙d7 18 ♞a2 ♙e6 19 ♞b1 ♞fc8 = Lange-Waldschläger, Germany tt 1992/3.

c2) 13...♙e4! is more accurate: 14 ♙g3 ♚xb3 15 axb3 ♞fd8 16 ♖d2 ♙d5 17 ♖c4 ♞ac8 18 h3 f5 19 ♖a5 ♖xa5 20 ♞xa5 a6 21 b4 ♞c2

d1) 13...h6?! 14 ♚b5 ♚d7 15 ♞ac1 g5 16 ♙g3 ♞fc8 17 d5 ♖b8 18 ♖e5 ♙xe5 19 ♙xe5 ♚xb5 20 ♞xc8+ ♙xc8 21 ♙xb5 ± Wrinn-Alderden, Netherlands 1985.

d2) 13...♙d7?! 14 ♚a3 ♞fe8 15 ♞ac1 ♞ac8 16 ♙c4 ♚h5 17 ♙g3 e6 18 ♚d6 ± Mirzoev-Molina Mansilla, Banyoles 2004.

d3) 13...♙e4?! 14 ♞ac1 ♚d7 15 ♖d2 ♙f5 16 ♙b5 ♞fc8 17 ♖b3 a6 18 ♙xc6 bxc6 19 ♞fd1 ± Barwinski-Sarwinski, Lublin 1999.

d4) 13...a6?! 14 ♞ac1 (better than 14 ♞fc1 e5 15 dxe5 ♖xe5 16 ♖d4 ♚e4 17 ♙g3 ± Tonn-Hoehmann, Hermannen 1997) and now:

d41) 14...h6?! 15 ♞fd1 ♞fe8 16 ♚a3 ♙f8 17 ♚b2 b5 18 ♖d2 ♞ac8 19 ♙f3 ♚d7 20 ♖b3 ± P.Jansen-Jacquet, Dieren 1991.

d42) 14...b5?! 15 ♚a3 ♞fc8 16 ♞c5 ♚d7 (16...♚d6 17 ♞fc1 ♙f8 18 ♙g3 e5 19 ♚b2 f6 20 dxe5 ♚xc5 21 ♞xc5 ♙xc5 22 exf6 ± Piankov-Starostits, Leutersdorf 2005) 17 d5 ♖a7 18 ♞fc1 ♞xc5 19 ♞xc5 ± Lyot-Fister, France 1993.

d43) 14...♚d7?! 15 ♚a3 ♞fc8 16 ♖d2 ♙f8 17 ♖c4 ♙d8 18 d5 ♖a7 19 d6 ♖c6 20 ♞fd1 ♙d7 21 ♙f3 ± Maksimenko-Karasev, Leningrad 1989.

d44) 14...♞ac8 15 ♞c5 ♚e4 (15...♚d7!? 16 ♚b3 b5 17 ♞fc1 ± Pohl-Koppenhöfer, Württemberg 1999) and now White should prefer 16 ♞fc1 ± over 16 ♚b3 ♖xd4! ∞ Georgievski-V.Mikhalevski, Baile Herculane 1994.


d5) 13...♞ac8 14 ♞ac1 ♙d7 15 ♚a3 ♙e6 16 ♙c4 ♚f5 17 ♙d3 ♚d5 18 ♞c2 ♚d7 19 ♞fc1 ± Siegmund-Born, Seefeld 1999.

d6) 13...♞fc8 14 ♞ac1 e5 (14...a6 15 ♞c5 ♚d7 16 ♞fc1 ± Koutsin-Kalod, Hlohovec 1996)

15 ♖c4 ♗d7 16 ♜g5 ♜d8 17 ♖b5 ♗d6 18 e4 ±
Berezina-Kalod, Sydney 1999.

d7) 13...e5 14 dxe5 (14 ♖c4 ♗a5 15 ♗xa5
♜xa5 16 ♖d5 exd4 17 ♜xd4 ♜c6 18 ♖ad1
♜xd4 19 exd4 ♖ab8 20 ♖fe1 ♖fe8 21 ♖xe8+
♖xe8 22 h3 ♖e6 23 ♖xb7 ♖b8 24 ♖c6 ♖b4 25
d5 ♖xd5 26 ♖xd5 ♖xh4 1/2-1/2 I.Sokolov-Nij-
boer, Leeuwarden 2002) 14...♜xe5 15 ♖ad1
♗e4 16 ♖d4 ♗c2 (16...♗c6 17 ♗a3 ♗c2 18
♜d2 ± Manor-Ribshtein, Ramat Aviv 1998) 17
♗xc2 ♖xc2 18 ♜xe5 ♖xe5 19 ♖d5 ♖g7 20
♖f3 ♖fe8 21 ♖d7 ♖e4 = Dudas-Dembo, Buda-
pest 1998.

We now return to 13 ♜d2! (D):



Now Black has several possibilities, of which
two deserve main-line treatment:

I1: 13...♖ac8 43

I2: 13...e5 44

Minor tries:

a) 13...♖ad8?! 14 ♖f3 ♗d7 15 ♜b3 ♗e8 16
♖xc6 bxc6 17 ♜c5 ♖c8?! 18 ♗a4 ± Banusz-
Csapo, Budapest 2001.

b) 13...♖fd8?! 14 ♖f3 ♗d7 15 ♜b3 ♗e8 16
♖c1 (16 ♖xc6 ±) 16...♖ac8 17 ♗e2 b6?! 18
♖xc6 ♖xc6 19 ♖xc6 ♖xc6 20 ♖xe7 +- Bar-
tos-Peniska, Liberec 2004.

c) 13...♗d7?! 14 ♜b3 (also playable is 14
♖c1 h6 {14...e5 15 e4 g5 16 ♖xg5 ♖g6 17
dxe5 ± Wallinger-Sewerin, Germany 1990}) 15
♜b3 g5 16 ♖g3 e6 17 ♜c5 ♗e7 18 ♗a4 ±
Gagarin-Krivosnogov, Moscow 1996) 14...e5 15
g4! (Kengis-Dvoirys, USSR 1984) 15...♖e6 16
♜c5 ♗d6 17 ♜xb7 ♗d5 18 dxe5 ♜xe5 19 ♜d6
♗a5 20 ♜e4 f5 21 ♗d6! ± Sirkia-Nobrega,
Siegen OL 1970.

d) 13...♖fe8 14 ♖f3 ♗d8 (14...♗b5 15
♖c1?! {15 ♗b3! ±} 15...♖d3 16 ♖e1 e5 =

Eidemüller-Wolff, Philadelphia 1990) 15 ♜b3
♖c8 16 ♖c1 ♜a5 17 ♜xa5 ♖xc1 18 ♗xc1
♗xa5 19 ♖xb7 ♗xa2 20 ♗a1! ± Grivas-Zy-
gouris, Corfu 1989.

e) 13...♖fc8 14 ♖f3 ♗d6 15 ♜b3 (15 ♗a4
with the idea ♜e4 appears to be a better op-
tion) 15...e5 16 e4 ♖d7 17 dxe5?! (17 d5 ±)
17...♗xd1 18 ♖fxd1 ♜xe5 19 ♖e2 1/2-1/2 Zai-
chik-Yermolinsky, Philadelphia 1995.

I1)

13...♖ac8 14 ♖f3

14 ♗b3 also seems fine: 14...♗d7 (14...♗xb3
can be met by 15 ♜xb3 with the idea ♜c5, or
15 axb3 a6 ±) 15 ♖ad1! (15 ♖ac1 ♖e6 16 ♗a3
♖d5 17 ♖fd1 e5 18 dxe5 ♜xe5 19 ♜b3 ♖xc1
20 ♗xc1 ♗e6 21 ♜d4 1/2-1/2 Vilela-Tompa,
Graz 1972) 15...h6 (15...♖c2 16 ♗xc2 ♜xd4
17 ♜c4! +- {not 17 ♗d3? ♖c3 18 exd4 ♖xd3
19 ♖xd3 ♗xd4 20 ♜f3 ∞} or 15...♜xd4 16
exd4 ♖c2 17 ♗a3! ♖xd1 18 ♖xd1 ±) 16 d5
♜e5?! (16...♜a5 17 ♗a3 b6 18 ♖xe7 ♖c3 19
♖xf8 ♖xa3 20 ♖xa3 ±) 17 e4 ± Enklaar-Krnić,
Wijk aan Zee 1972.

14...♗d8

Or:

a) 14...♗b5? is not recommended: 15 ♖xc6
(not 15 e4? ♖d7 16 ♖b1 ♗a6 17 ♖e2 ♗xa2
18 ♖xb7 ♜xd4! ∞ Averkin-Krogius, USSR
1970) 15...♖xc6 16 ♖xe7 +-.

b) Black's alternative is 14...♗d7 15 ♜b3,
and now:



b1) 15...♗d6 16 ♖c1 e5 17 ♖g3 ♗a3 18 e4!
(18 dxe5? ♜xe5 19 ♖xb7 ♖cd8 20 ♜d4 ♗xa2
21 ♖a1? ♗b2 22 ♖xa7 ♖d7! 23 ♖a5 ♜c4 24
♖b5 ♖xd4 25 ♗a4 ♜xe3 26 ♗a5 ♗xb5 27
♗xb5 ♜xf1 28 ♖xf1 ♖a4 0-1 Logothetis-Jere-
mić, Kavala 2004) 18...♖d7 19 dxe5 ±.

b2) 15...♗e8 16 ♖c1 e5 17 e4 ♖d7 18 d5
♜d4 19 ♜xd4 exd4 20 ♗b3 (20 ♖xc8 ♗xc8 21
♗b3, Dejkalo-Tomaszewski, Naleczow 1985)
20...b6 21 ♖g3! ± (rather than 21 ♗a3?! ♖b5
22 ♖xc8 ♗xc8 23 ♖c1 ♗d7 = Bagirov-K.Gri-
gorian, Baku 1972).

15 ♖c1 (D)

Nothing is gained by 15 e4 ♖xd4 16 exf5?
♖xal 17 ♗xal ♗xd2.

White has a small but stable advantage due
to his better space control and pressure on the
queenside. Some examples:



a) 15...h6 16 Qb3 g5 17 Qg3 Bb6 18 Nc5 Qd7 19 h4 f5 20 hxg5 hxg5 21 Bb1 e6 22 Nf1 Bb8 23 d5 exd5 24 Nxd5 Qb4 25 Nxc8 Bxc8 26 Nc5 Bb8 27 Qd4 Qc6 28 Qxf5 1-0 Rath-Nikontović, Denmark tt 1999.

b) 15...Qe8 16 Bb4 Qd7 17 Qxc6 bxc6 18 e4 Qg4 19 Qb3 e5 20 f3 Qe6 21 d5? (21 dxe5 ±) 21...cxd5 22 Bxd7 Qxd7 23 exd5 Qh6 24 Nxc8 Nxc8 25 Qf2 Qf8 26 Nd1 1/2-1/2 Heino-Narbel, Haifa 1970.

c) 15...Qd7 16 Qc4 h6 17 Bb3 b5 18 Qd6 Qa5 19 Nxc8 Qxc8 20 Bb4 Bxd6 21 Bxa5 g5 22 Qg3 Bb6 23 Bxa6 Qxa6 24 Qe2 Nc8 25 a4 Nc2 26 Qe1 Bb2 27 Qf1 f5 28 Qc7 f4 29 Na1 Qb7 30 axb5 fxe3 31 fxe3 Qxg2+ 32 Qe1 Qd5 33 Qd3 e5 34 dxe5 Qf8 35 Qd6 Nxf2 36 Nxa7 Nf1+ 37 Qd2 Nf2+ 38 Qc3 Qg7 39 b6 g4 40 Qc4 1-0 Ftačnik-Popović, Trnava 1980.

I2)

13...e5 14 Qf3!

Unacceptable is 14 Qc4?! Qd6 (or 14...Qd7 15 d5 Qa5 16 f3 e4!, Akimov-Marinin, St Petersburg 2002) 15 d5 Qa5 16 Nc1 Qxc4 17 Qxc4 Bb6, Sidorova-Sameeh, Tanta 2001.

14...e4

Black's alternatives are 14...Bb5 15 d5 Qa5 16 e4 ± M.Taylor-D.Phillips, England 1993 and 14...Bb5 15 d5 (15 Qc4 Bb4 16 Nc1 exd4 17 Qxc6 bxc6 18 exd4 Qe6 = Servaty-Pragua, Langenwang 1993) 15...e4 16 Qxe4 Qxe4 17 Qxe4 Nae8 18 Qf3 Qxa1 19 dxc6 Qe5 20 cxb7 Bxa2 21 Qg3 Bb5 22 Qd5 Nd8 23 e4 Qxg3 24 hxg3 Nd7 25 Bb1 Bxa1 26 Nxa1 Bb8 27 Nxa7 ± Comas Fabrego-Paramos Dominguez, Palencia 1999.

15 Qe2 (D)

White holds a slight but very pleasant advantage due to his passed d4-pawn and pressure on the queenside. Black has tried:


a) 15...Qf8 16 Bb1 (16 Qc4 Qd7 17 Bb1 a6 18 Qb3 b6 19 Qd2 Qf8 20 Bb2 Qb4 21 Nf1 Nac8 = Koczó-Z.Kovacs, Hungary tt 2003) 16...Qd7 17 Bb3 Qe6 18 Bxb7 Bxb7 19 Nxb7 Qxa2 20 Qb5 Qd5 21 Nd7 Qb4 22 Nxd5 Qxd5 23 Qxe8 Nxe8 24 Na1 Na8 25 Qxe4 ± Bartos-Philipp, Liberec 2004.

b) 15...Qa5 16 Bb4 Nfc8 17 Nf1 Qe6 18 Qe7 Nxc1+ 19 Nxc1 Bxa2 20 Bxa2 Qxa2 21 Na1 Qc6 22 Nxa2 Qxe7 23 Qxe4 Qc6 24 Qd6 b6 25 Qf3 Nd8 26 Qxf7 Qxf7 27 Qxc6 a5 28 f4 Qe6 29 Qf2 Qd6 30 d5 Qc5 31 e4 Nf8 32 Qe3 Qh6 33 g3 g5 34 Nc2+ Qb4 35 fxg5 Qxg5+ 36 Qd4 Qb3 37 Nc3+ Qb4 38 Nc4+ Qb3 39 Qa4+ Qa3 40 e5 Bb8 41 Qb5 1-0 Sanguinetti-Garcia Palermo, Mar del Plata 1976.

c) 15...Nac8 16 Bb3 Qd7 17 Nacl Qe6 18 Qc4 Qxc4 19 Qxc4 ± Donner-Timman, Wijk aan Zee 1972.

J)

12...b6 (D)



A sensible continuation, trying to solve the problem of the c8-bishop by developing it on the long diagonal.

13 ♖b3

This is best. Other moves:

a) White has tried 13 ♖a4, but without much success: 13... ♗b7 14 ♖ab1 ♖fe8 (14...e5 15 dxe5 ♖xe5 16 ♖fd1 ♖c6 17 ♖xc6 ♖xc6 18 ♖d4 ♖e4 19 ♖bc1 ♖fc8 20 ♖a6 ♖xc1 21 ♖xc1 ♖d5 = Jovičić-Lazarević, Belgrade 2005) 15 ♖fd1 ♖a5 16 ♖b5 ♖xa4 17 ♖xa4 e6 = Servaty-Gottschlich, Bad Bertrich 1994.

b) Not much is gained by 13 ♖c1 ♖b7:

b1) 14 ♖c4 and then:

b11) 14... ♖e4 15 ♖d3 (15 ♖e2 ♖ac8 16 ♖a6 ♖b4 17 ♖xb7 ♖xb7 18 a3 ♖d5 ∞ Clement-Charrasse, Belgium 1993) 15... ♖d5 16 e4 ♖d8 17 d5 ♖a5 18 ♖e2 ♖d6 19 ♖fd1 ♖fc8 ∞ Ivkov-Padevsky, Majdanpek 1976.

b12) 14... ♖d6 15 ♖g3 (15 ♖e2 ♖fc8 16 ♖a6 ♖d7 17 ♖xb7 ♖xb7 18 ♖b5 e6 = Nasobin-Suder, Istanbul blind Wch 2002) 15... ♖b4 (15... ♖a3!? 16 ♖d5 ♖ac8 ∞ Seres-Mester, Hungarian Cht 1997/8) 16 ♖d5 ♖ac8 17 ♖e5 ♖b5 18 ♖c4 ♖a5 19 ♖xc6 ♖xc6 20 ♖b3 e6 21 ♖b5 ♖xc1 22 ♖xc1 ♖d5 23 ♖b2 a6 24 ♖f1 b5 25 a3 1/2-1/2 Beliaevsky-K.Grigrorian, Baku 1977.

b13) 14... ♖d7 15 ♖a4 (15 ♖g3 ♖a5 16 ♖e2 ♖d5 17 ♖a4 ♖ac8 = D.Levin-Biriukov, Simferopol 1989) 15...a6 16 ♖a3 e6 1/2-1/2 Perkins-Hartston, British Ch (Blackpool) 1971.


b2) 14 ♖a4 and then:

b21) 14...a6 15 ♖b3 (15 ♖fd1 b5 16 ♖a3 e6 17 ♖e1 ♖fc8 = Kahn-Amin, Cairo 1997) 15... ♖xb3 16 axb3 ♖fc8 17 ♖d2 b5 18 ♖f3 ♖f8 19 ♖g3 a5 20 ♖e2 a4 21 ♖xb5 a3 22 ♖c4 ♖b4 23 ♖al a2 24 ♖fc1 ♖e4 25 ♖d7 ♖d8 26 ♖a4 ♖dc8 27 ♖d7 ♖d8 28 ♖a4 ♖dc8 1/2-1/2 Lambert-Cummings, British Ch (Brighton) 1977.

b22) 14...e6 15 ♖fd1 (15 ♖c2 a6 16 ♖fc1 ♖fc8 17 ♖d2 {17 ♖a3 ♖f8 18 ♖b2 ♖b4 = Hultin-Stone, Gausdal 1991}) 17...b5 18 ♖b3 ♖xb3 19 axb3 ♖b4 20 ♖xc8+ ♖xc8 21 ♖xc8+ ♖xc8 = Høi-D.Roos, Berlin 1980) 15... ♖fc8 16 ♖c4 ♖a5 17 ♖b3 ♖h5 ∞ 18 ♖xe6!? fxe6 (18... ♖xd4? 19 exd4 ♖xc1 20 ♖xf7+ ♖f8 21 ♖xc1 ♖xf3 22 ♖g8 g5 23 ♖g3 ♖d8 24 gxf3 ♖xd4 25 ♖e6 ♖e8 26 ♖c7 1-0 Seul-Beutel, Wittlich 1985) 19 ♖xe6+ ♖h8 (19... ♖f8? 20 ♖g3!) 20 ♖f7 ♖a5 21 ♖f6 ♖h6! 22 ♖g5 ♖h5 23 ♖f6 =.

b23) 14... ♖ac8 15 ♖fd1 (15 ♖b5 e5 16 ♖xc6 ♖xc6 17 ♖xa7 g5 18 ♖g3 g4 19 ♖xc6 ♖xc6 20 ♖xe5 ♖xe5 21 ♖xe5 f6 22 ♖f4 ♖a8 23 ♖c7 ♖fc8 24 ♖e7 b5 25 a3 ♖e8 26 ♖d6 ♖e6 27 ♖b4 ∞ Mikhailchishin-Vaganian, Rome 1977) 15...e6 16 ♖a6 ♖a5 17 ♖xb7 ♖xb7 18 h3 ♖xc1 19 ♖xc1 ♖c8 20 ♖xc8+ ♖xc8 21 ♖e5 f6 22 ♖d3 ♖c6 23 ♖xc6 ♖xc6 24 ♖f1 ♖f7 25 ♖e2 ♖f8 26 ♖g3 ♖a3 1/2-1/2 Poutiainen-W.Schmidt, Erevan 1976.

c) 13 ♖d2 is an interesting alternative. 13... ♖b7 14 ♖f3 ♖d7 (D) and now:



c1) 15 ♖a4 ♖fd8 16 ♖a3 (16 ♖h1 ♖a5 17 ♖xd7 ♖xd7 18 ♖xb7 ♖xb7 19 ♖b3 ♖d6 20 ♖ac1 ♖c8 1/2-1/2 Grigrorian-Vaganian, Moscow 1976 or 16 ♖ac1? ♖xd4 17 ♖xd7 ♖xf3+ 18 ♖xf3 ♖xd7 † Mungyereza-Thipsay, Thessaloniki OL 1984 and J.Grigrorov-Radev, Bulgarian Ch (Sofia) 1981) 16... ♖dc8 (or: 16... ♖f8!? 17 ♖b2 ♖a5 18 ♖fc1 ♖ac8 19 h3 ♖xc1+ 20 ♖xc1 ♖c8 21 ♖xc8 ♖xc8 = Acosta-Foguelman, Pinamar 1975; 16... ♖e8 17 ♖ac1 ♖a5 18 ♖fd1 ♖ac8 19 ♖xc8 ♖xc8 ∞ M.Mukhin-Banas, Luhačovice 1973) 17 ♖fd1 ♖f8 18 ♖a4 ♖c7 ∞ Sorin-Grushka, Buenos Aires 1985.

c2) 15 ♖c1 and now:

c21) 15... ♖ac8 16 ♖a4 e6 17 ♖fd1 (17 ♖e4!? ♖e5? 18 ♖xd7 ♖xd7 19 ♖xc8 ♖xc8 20 ♖d6 ± Munschi-Equey, Metz 1994) 17...a6 18 ♖e4 ♖e5 19 ♖xd7 ♖xd7 20 ♖d6 ♖xf3 21 gxf3 ♖xc1 22 ♖xc1 ♖f6 23 ♖c7 ± Gostiša-I.Sokolov, Portorož 1987.


c22) 15...e5 16 ♖a4 ♖fc8 17 d5 ♖b8 18 ♖xc8+ ♖xc8 19 ♖e4 ± Zilberman-K.Grigrorian, Cheliabinsk 1972.

c23) 15... ♖a5! 16 ♖xb7 (16 ♖c4 ♖xc4 17 ♖xb7 ♖xb7 18 ♖xc4 ♖ac8 19 ♖c2 ♖xc4 20 ♖xc4 ♖c8 = Sütterlin-Wüst, Hockenheim 1994)

16...♖xb7 (16...♗xb7 17 ♗e2 e5 18 dxe5 ♕xe5 19 ♖f3 ♕g7 = Pflumm-Boll, corr. 1978) 17 ♗f3 (17 ♕g3 ♗fc8 18 ♗f3 ♖xc1 19 ♖xc1 ♗c8 = Bareev-Dvoirys, USSR Ch (Kiev) 1986) 17...♗a5 (17...♗d6 18 ♗c6 ♖fd8 19 ♗xd7 ♖xd7 20 g4 f5 21 f3 f4 22 exf4 ♕xd4+ 23 ♕f2 ♕xf2+ 24 ♖xf2 ♖f8 1/2-1/2 Garcia Gonzales-Atanasov, Leipzig 1973) 18 ♗e4 e5 19 ♖f3 exd4 20 exd4 ♖fe8 = Khenkin-Dvoirys, Sevastopol 1986.

c3) 15 ♗c4!? ♖ac8 16 ♖c1 ♖fd8 17 ♗b3 ♖f8 18 ♖fd1 ± Grivas-Ki.Georgiev, Plovdiv 1982 – see Typical Endgames.

We now return to 13 ♗b3 (D):



13...♗xb3

Other moves:

a) 13...♗d8? cannot be recommended: 14 ♖ac1 ♕b7 15 ♖fd1 ± Grivas-A.Kofidis, Komotini 1992.

b) 13...♗e4 14 ♕d3 ♗g4 15 h3 ♗h5 and instead of 16 ♕e4 ♕d7 17 ♖ac1 ± Chabanon-Anić, Montpellier 1991, White should prefer 16 ♗b5! ± Forintos-Krnić, Vršac 1975.

c) 13...e6 14 ♗d2 ♕b7 15 ♗xd5 exd5 16 ♕f3 ♗a5 ± 1/2-1/2 Groszpeter-Lalić, Copenhagen 1989.

d) 13...♗h5 14 ♗b5! ♗xb5 (14...♕g4 15 ♗xh5 gxh5 16 h3 ♕d7 17 ♖abl ♖fe8 18 ♗d2 e5 19 d5 ♗e7 20 ♕xe7 ♖xe7 21 ♕xh5 ± Forintos – Brinck-Claussen, Esbjerg 1978) 15 ♕xb5 ♕b7 16 ♕xc6 ♕xc6 17 ♕xe7 ♖fc8 18 ♖fc1 ♕d5 19 a3 ± Šahović-Timman, Bled 1979. Black has some compensation thanks to his bishop-pair.

e) 13...♗d6 14 ♕g3 (14 ♖fd1 ♕b7 15 ♕g3 ♗d7 16 ♖ac1 ♗a5 17 ♗a3 ♖fc8 18 ♗e5 ± Kluger-Novak, Rimavska Sobota 1977) 14...♗d8 15 ♖fc1 (15 ♖ac1 ♕b7 16 ♖fd1 ♖c8 17 d5 ♗a5


18 ♖xc8 ♗xc8 19 ♗b4 ♗c2 20 ♖d2 ♗c1+ 21 ♖d1 ♗c2 22 ♖d2 1/2-1/2 Trois-Cosić, Stary Smokovec 1980) 15...♕b7 16 ♗a3 ♖c8 17 ♕b5 ♗a5 18 ♖xc8 ♕xc8 19 ♕h4 ♕f6 20 ♕xf6 exf6 21 ♕e2 with a slight advantage for White, Atalik-Rogulj, Bled 2000.

f) 13...♕e6 and then:

f1) 14 ♗a3 ♖fe8 (14...♗d7 15 ♖fd1 ♕d5 16 ♖ac1 a6 17 ♗d2 ♖fc8 18 ♕f1 ♗g4 19 ♕g3 ♗a5 20 h3 ♗d7 21 e4 ♕b7 22 d5 e6 23 ♗c4 ♗xc4 24 ♕xc4 exd5 25 ♕xd5 ♖xc1 26 ♗xc1 b5 27 ♗f4 ± Casafus-Ricardi, Buenos Aires 1988) 15 ♖fc1 ♕d7 16 ♗d2 (16 ♗g5 ♗a5 17 ♗b3 e6 18 ♕f3 ♖ac8 19 ♗e4 ± Forintos-Barreras, Cienfuegos 1979 or 16 ♕a6!? ♕f8? {16...♖ad8} 17 ♗b3? {17 ♕b7 ♖ab8 18 ♗xa7 wins a pawn} 17...♗xb3 18 axb3 ♗a5 19 ♖c7 ♗xb3 20 ♖a3 = Sorin-Guerra, Seville 1989) 16...e5 17 ♕c4 ♗a5 18 ♗d6! ± Lengyel-Sax, Hungarian Ch (Budapest) 1973.

f2) 14 ♖ac1 ♗d7 15 ♗a3 a6 (15...♕d5 16 ♕b5 ♖fc8 17 ♕a6 ♖e8 18 ♖fe1 ♕xf3 19 gxf3 ♗a5 20 ♖ed1 e5 21 d5 ♕f8 22 ♗d3 ♗h3 23 ♕g3 ♕d6 24 ♗e4 ± Krzsany-Keatinge Clay, Koszeg 2000) 16 ♗d2 ♕d5 17 ♕d3 f5 18 ♕c4 b5 19 ♕xd5+ ♗xd5 20 ♗c5 ♗xc5 21 ♖xc5 ± Forintos-I.Polgar, Hungarian Ch (Budapest) 1972.

14 axb3 (D)



The pressure along the a-file, the possibility of launching a minority attack on the queenside, plus the space advantage give White a pleasant position.

14...♕b7

Or 14...e6, and now:

a) 15 ♗d2 is an attractive option: 15...♕b7 (15...f6 16 ♕f3 ♕b7 17 ♗c4 ♖fd8 18 ♖fc1 ± Grivas-Lhagvasuren, Moscow OL 1994) 16

♘c4 ♖ab8 17 ♙g3 ♜bd8 18 ♙f3 ♞d7 19 ♜fc1 ± Groszpeter-Plachetka, Kecskemet 1983.

b) 15 b4 ♙b7 (15...♘xb4 16 ♙e7 ♘c6 17 ♙xf8 ♙xf8 18 ♜fc1 ♙b7 19 ♘e5 ± L.Schmidt-Carless, Novi Sad OL 1990) 16 b5 ♘a5 17 ♙e7 ♜fc8 18 ♙b4 ♘c4 (or: 18...♙f8 19 ♙xa5 bxa5 20 ♙xa5 ± Bagirov-Veingold, Sverdlovsk 1984; 18...a6 19 ♙xa5 bxa5 20 ♙xa5 axb5 21 ♜xb5 ± Groszpeter-Banas, Trnava 1983) 19 ♜fc1 a5 20 bxa6 ♙xa6 21 ♖ab1 b5 22 ♙c5 ♙c6 23 ♙xc4 bxc4 24 ♙xc4 (24 ♘d2 e5 25 ♙xc4 ♙a2 26 ♙b4 exd4 27 exd4 ♜b8 28 ♙xc6 ♙xd2 29 ♙c8+ 1/2-1/2 I.Nikolaidis-Fish, Iraklion 1996) 24...♙xf3 25 gxf3 ♙f8 26 f4 ± Gheorghiu-Timmer, Berne 1988.

15 b4!

White's most natural idea in this kind of position. Instead, 15 ♙a6? is naïve: 15...♙xa6 16 ♙xa6 ♜fc8 = V.Small-Korchnoi, Thessaloniki OL 1988. However, 15 ♘d2 is a playable alternative: 15...♜fc8 16 ♙f3 ± Timman-Van der Vliet, Leeuwarden 1980.

Black has not managed to equalize from the position after the text-move (15 b4):

a) 15...♙f6 16 b5 ♘a5 17 ♙xf6 exf6 18 ♘d2 ♜fc8 19 ♜fc1 ♙xc1+ 20 ♙xc1 ♜c8 21 ♙xc8+ ♙xc8 22 f3 ♘f8 23 ♘f2 ± Forintos-Gereben, Mladenovac 1975.

b) 15...a6 and then:

b1) 16 b5 axb5 17 ♙xb5 e6 18 ♖ab1 ♜fc8 19 h3 (19 ♜fc1 ♙f8 20 ♘d2 ♘b4 21 ♙d7 ♙xc1+ 22 ♙xc1 ♙a2 23 ♘c4 ♘d5 24 h3 ♙a6 25 ♘e5 1/2-1/2 Knežević-Zeizulkin, Győr 1990) 19...♙a6 20 ♙g3 ♙f8 21 ♙xa6 ♙xa6 22 ♜fc1 ♘a7 23 ♙xc8 ♘xc8 24 ♘e5 ♙d6 25 ♘h2 ♘a7 26 ♘d7 ♙xg3+ 27 ♘xg3 1-0 Vekshenkov-F.Levin, Novosibirsk 1989.

b2) 16 ♖ab1! e6 17 ♘d2! ♘a7 18 ♜fc1! ± Grivas-R.Simić, Athens 1991 (see Illustrative Games).


1.6 The 12...e5 Central Break

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 ♘f3 ♙g7 5 ♙g5 ♘e4 6 ♙h4 ♘xc3 7 bxc3 c5 8 cxd5 ♙xd5 9 e3 ♘c6 10 ♙e2 cxd4 11 cxd4 0-0 12 0-0 e5

This is considered to be Black's main path to equality. *ECO* and most of the books dealing

with the ♙g5 system do not dig deep enough to uncover the truth. White succeeds in maintaining a slight but very pleasant and secure advantage.

13 dxe5 (D)



Now Black has two main continuations:

A: 13...♙xd1 47

B: 13...♙a5 49

Instead, 13...♙e6?! 14 ♘d4 (14 ♙c2 ♘xe5 15 ♘d4 ♙d5 16 ♖ad1 ± Forintos-Langeweg, Wijk aan Zee 1974) 14...♙xe5 15 ♘xc6 bxc6 16 ♜c1 ♙e6 17 ♙c4 ♙d5 18 ♙d3 ♜fe8 19 ♜fd1 gave White an overwhelming advantage in Gheorghiu-V.Small, Thessaloniki OL 1988.

A)

13...♙xd1 14 ♜fxd1

The capture with the other rook is less precise: 14 ♖axd1?! ♘xe5 15 ♘xe5 ♙xe5 16 ♙f3 ♜b8 (16...♙e6? 17 ♙xb7 ♖ab8 18 ♙d5 ♙d7 19 ♜d2 ♙a4 20 f4 ♙c7 21 ♙f6 ± Brüggemann-Hammes, Niederrhein 2001) 17 ♜d5 f6 18 ♖a5 a6 (or 18...♙e6 19 ♖xa7 ♖a8 20 ♖xa8 ♖xa8 21 ♙xb7 ♖xa2 22 f4 ♙c3 23 ♙e1 ♙b2 24 ♙b4 ♖a7 25 ♙f3 ♖a4 26 ♙d2 ♘f7 27 h3 f5 28 ♜e1 ♖a1 29 ♖xa1 ♙xa1 = C.Harmon-Fairbairn, Vancouver 2001) 19 ♙d5+ ♘g7 20 f4 ♙c7 21 ♖a3 b5 22 ♙c1 ♙b6 23 ♙f2 b4 24 ♜b3 a5 25 e4 ♙b7 26 ♙xb7 ♙xb7 27 a3 ♙xf2+ 28 ♘xf2 ♜fb8 29 axb4 ♙xb4 30 ♙xb4 axb4 31 ♖b1 b3 32 ♜b2 h5 1/2-1/2 Gostiša-Ig.Jelen, Slovenian Ch (Vrhnika) 1995.

14...♘xe5 15 ♘d4

White has tried two other moves. Especially the second one gives winning chances without any risk at all:

a) 15 ♖xe5 ♗xe5 16 ♖ab1 ♗e6 (or 16...b6 17 f4 ♗g7 18 ♗f3 ♗f5 19 e4 ♗e6 20 e5 ♖ac8 = Herries-McLardy, England 1986) 17 a4 b6 = Pottornyai-Zdrzil, Bratislava 1979.

b) 15 ♖ab1 ♗e6 (or: 15...b6 16 ♖d4 ♗d7 transposes to the main line; 15...a6 16 ♖xe5 ♗xe5 17 f4 ♗g7 18 ♗f3 ♗e6 19 a4 ♖ab8 20 a5 ♗c3 21 ♗e7 ♖fe8 22 ♗b4 ♗xb4 23 ♖xb4 is slightly better for White, Ibragimov-Poseck, Berlin 1995) 16 ♖xb7 (16 a4 b6 17 ♖d4 ♗c4 18 ♗xc4 ♖xc4 19 g4 h6 20 ♖g2 ♖ac8 21 ♖b5 a6 22 ♖d6 ♖xd6 23 ♖xd6 ♖c4 1/2-1/2 Csiszar-Hirsch, Harkany 1994) 16...♗xa2 17 ♖xe5 ♗xe5 and now:

b1) 18 ♖b5 ♗g7 19 ♖a5 ♗b3 20 ♖d7 ♖ac8 21 h3 ♖c2 22 ♗f3 a6 23 ♗g3 ♖c1+ 24 ♖h2 ♗e6 25 ♖a7 ♗c8 26 ♗e2 ♖d8 27 ♖a8 ♗f6 28 ♗xa6 ♗xa6 29 ♖xd8+ ♗xd8 30 ♖xa6 ± Kaabi-Aboutail, Cairo 1996.

b2) 18 ♗f3 ♖ab8 (18...a6 19 ♖e7 ♖ae8 20 ♖a7 ♗e6 21 ♗e2 h6 22 ♗g3 ♗xg3 23 hxg3 ♖b8 24 ♗xa6 ♖eb6 25 ♗e2 ♗e6 26 ♗f3 ♖b1 27 ♖a1 ♖xd1+ 28 ♖xd1 ± Groszpeter-Kaposztas, Harkany 1993) 19 ♖xa7 ♗b3 20 ♖b1 ♗c2 21 ♖xb8 ♖xb8 22 ♖a8 ♖xa8 23 ♗xa8 ± S.de Vries-P.Jansen, Dieren 1991.

15...♗d7

Other moves have proved unsound:

a) 15...a6?! 16 ♖ac1 ♗d7 17 ♖c7 ♗a4 18 ♖b1 ♖c6 19 ♖bx7 ♖xd4 20 exd4 ♖fe8 21 ♖f1 ♗b5 22 ♗xb5 axb5 23 d5 ♖xa2 24 g4 ♗e5 25 ♖xf7 b4 26 d6 b3 27 d7 1-0 Høi – Brinck-Claussen, Danish Ch 1988.

b) 15...♖c6?! 16 ♖xc6! bxc6 17 ♖ac1 ±.


c) 15...♗g4 16 f3 ♗d7 17 ♖ab1! and then:

c1) 17...b6 18 ♗a6! (18 ♖b5, Juhasz-S.Horvath, Gyongyos 1999) 18...♗c8 19 ♗f1 ♗b7 20 e4! (20 ♖b5? ♗xf3! ♢) 20...♖fc8 21 ♖b5 ♖c4 22 ♗xc4 ♖xc4 23 ♖d6 ♖c7 24 f4 ♗c6 25 e5 h6 26 ♖bc1 ±.

c2) 17...♗a4 18 ♖d2 (or 18 ♖dc1 ♖c6 19 ♖b5 ♗xb5 20 ♖xb5 ♖fe8 21 ♖xb7 ♖a5 22 ♖e7 ♗h6 23 f4 ± Gagarin-Abramov, Moscow 1996) 18...♖c6 19 ♖xb7 ♖xd4 20 exd4 ♖fb8 21 ♖xb8+ ♖xb8 22 ♗g5 ± Bokor-Olah, Hungarian Cht 1993.

16 ♖ab1 b6 (D)

16...♗a4 17 ♖dc1 ♖c6 18 ♖b5 ♗e5 19 ♖c3 ♗xc3 20 ♖c3 ♖ac8 21 ♖a3 ♗c2 22 ♖b2 ♗e4 23 f3 ♗d5 24 e4 ♗e6 25 ♖xb7 didn't help either in P.Kiss-Meszáros, Eger 1996.



17 ♗a6!

By keeping the c-file under control, White achieves a pleasant game. Other moves aren't as effective:

a) 17 h3 ♖fc8 (17...♖ac8 18 ♗a6 ♗a4 19 ♖dc1 ♖xc1+ 20 ♖xc1 ♖d7 21 ♖c7 ♗e5 22 ♖xa7 ± Evans-Dubeck, Ventura 1971) 18 ♗a6 ♖e8 19 ♖bc1 ♗a4 20 ♖d2 ♗f8 21 ♖b5 ♗xb5 22 ♗xb5 ♖ec8 23 ♖xc8 ♖xc8 24 ♗f6 ♗g7 25 ♖d8+ ♖xd8 26 ♗xd8 f6 = Høi-Yrjölä, Gausdal Z 1987.

b) 17 ♖dc1 ♖fc8 18 ♗a6 ♖c5 (18...♖xc1+ 19 ♖xc1 ♗f8 20 ♗g3 ♗d6 21 ♖d1 ♖f8 22 ♖e2 ♖e7 23 ♗h4+ f6 24 ♗xf6+ ♖xf6 25 ♖xd6+ ♖e7 26 ♖d2 ± Schleifer-Masse, Quebec 2001) 19 ♖b3 (19 ♗e7 ♖a5 20 ♗b7 ♖e8 21 ♗h4 ♗f8 22 ♖c7 ♗d6 23 ♖c2 ♖c5 = D.Bischoff-Gerold, Brno blind Wch 1998) 19...♖xc1+ (19...♗f5?! 20 ♖xc5 ♗xb1 21 ♖xb1 bxc5 22 ♖b7 c4 23 f4 ± ♖g4 24 ♗xc4 ♖c8 25 h3 ♖xc4 26 hxg4 g5 27 ♗xg5 f6 28 ♗h4 ♖a4 29 ♖b2 f5 30 ♖b8+ ♖f7 31 gxf5 ♖xa2 32 ♖b7+ ♖g8 33 g4 1-0 De Lange-Van Dijk, Oostvoorne 1972) 20 ♖xc1 ♗e6 and Black seems to be fine, as the following two examples confirm:

b1) 21 ♖f1 ♖d4 22 ♖e2 ♖f6 23 f3 ♖d5 24 ♗e1 f5 25 ♗d2 ♖d8 26 ♖c2 ♗f7 27 g3 h6 28 h3 ♖e8 29 ♖f2 h5 30 ♗b5 ♖e7 31 ♖d4 ♗h6 32 f4 ♖c7 33 ♗d3 ♖xc2 34 ♗xc2 = Beliavsky-Kamsky, Linares 1991.

b2) 21 h3 ♗f8 22 ♗g3 f6 23 ♖c2 ♖d8 24 ♖d4 ♗d5 25 f4 ♖d7 26 ♖c7 ♗d6 27 ♖c2 ♖c5 28 ♗c4 ♗xc4 29 ♖xc4 ∞ Sorin-Gamarra Caceres, Junin 1987.

c) 17 ♖b5 ♗e6 18 a4 ♖fc8 19 f4 ♗c4 20 ♖b2 ♗xe2 21 ♖xe2 ♖c4 22 ♖d7 a6 23 ♖d4 ♖ab8 24 ♖f2 b5 25 axb5 axb5 26 ♖a2 ♖b6 27 ♖d6 ♖c4 28 ♖d7 ♖b6 29 ♖d6 ♖c4 1/2-1/2 Krutti-Beaumont, Lichfield 2000.

17...♠a4 18 ♠dc1 ♖d7 19 ♠b7! ♠ae8 20 ♠f3 ♖c5 21 ♖c6 ♠xc6 22 ♠xc6 ♠e6 23 ♠d5 ♠e5 24 ♠f3 ♖e4 25 ♠b4

White has a pleasant and secure advantage due to his bishop-pair, Grivas-Biro, Budapest 2001.

B)

13...♞a5 14 ♠f6! ♠xf6

The other try is 14...♖xe5 15 ♠xg7 ♖xf3+ (15...♞xg7 16 ♞d4 f6 17 ♖xe5 ±) 16 ♠xf3 ♞xg7 17 ♞d4+ ♞g8, when Black faces development problems with his c8-bishop. White has obtained an overwhelming advantage in two games: 18 ♠fd1 ♠b8 19 ♠d5 b5 20 ♞f4 ♞b6 21 ♠ac1 ♠d7 22 ♠b3 is much better for White, Filgueira-Rivero, Buenos Aires 1991 and 18 ♠fc1 ♠e6 19 ♠xb7 ♠ab8 20 ♞e4 ♠fd8 21 h4 ♠d2 22 a3 ♠b2 23 ♠c6 ♠b3 24 ♠d1 ♠d2 25 ♠xd2 ♞xd2 26 a4 ♠b4 27 ♞e5 ♠b2 28 ♞f4 ♠b4 29 ♞f6 ♠b6 30 ♠b5 ♠c4 31 ♞e5 ♠xb5 32 axb5 ♞d7 33 ♠a5, Krizsany-Bruns, Feffermitz 1998.


15 exf6 ♞f5 16 ♖d4! (D)

It is highly important to open the h1-a8 diagonal for White's light-squared bishop. Other tries do not trouble Black: 16 ♞d6 ♠d8 17 ♞c7 ♠d7 (17...♞xf6? 18 ♠fd1?! {18 ♠ad1! ±} 18...♠d7! 19 ♠xd7 ♞xa1+ 20 ♠d1 ♞xa2 21 ♖g5 ♠e6 22 ♞xb7 ♠b8 23 ♞xc6 ♞xe2 24 ♠d6 ♠b6 25 ♞d4 ♠a2 = Antonsen-Falchetta, Forli 1991) 18 ♞g3 ♞xf6 19 ♠b5 (19 ♠ac1 ♠e7 20 ♠b5 ♠d7 21 ♠fd1 a6 22 ♠a4 ♠e8 23 ♠b3 ♠d8 24 ♠xd8 ♖xd8 = Burwick-Moberg, Swedish Ch (Lindesberg) 1993) 19...♠e7! (19...♠d5?! 20 ♠xc6 ♞xc6 21 ♞h4 ♠d6 22 ♖g5 h5 23 e4 ♠d3 24 e5 ♞d4 25 ♖e4 ♠f5? 26 ♖f6+ ♞g7? 27 ♖h5+ gxh5 28 ♞f6+ ♞g8 29 ♞xf5 ♠e8 30 ♠ael h4 31 ♠e4 ♠d5 32 ♠hx4 ♠xe5 33 ♞f6 1-0 Kaabik-Kukel, Slovakian Ch (Nove Zamky) 1999) 20 ♠xc6 ♞xc6 21 ♞g5 ♞e6 22 ♠ac1 f6 23 ♞f4 ♞f5 24 ♞b4 ♠f7 25 ♖d4 (25 ♠fd1!?) 25...♠d5 26 ♠fd1 ♠e6 27 ♠d2 ♞e4 28 ♞c3 ♠e7 29 ♖e2 ♞g7 30 ♖f4 ♠f7 = Lutz-Vadasz, Budapest 1990.

16...♞xf6 17 ♖xc6 ♞xc6 18 ♠f3

The logical follow-up. Other moves:

- a) 18 ♠d3?! ♠d6 19 ♞b3 1/2-1/2 Rashkovsky-Adorjan, Sochi 1977.
- b) 18 ♠c1 ♞f6 and then:



b1) 19 ♠f3 ♠b8? (19...♠d8 20 ♞a4 transposes to line 'b2') 20 ♞a4 a6 21 ♠c7 ♞b6 22 ♠fc1 ♠e6 23 h4! ± h5 24 ♠xh5 gxh5 25 ♠lc5 ♠f5 26 g4 ♠h7 27 ♞f4 ♠be8 28 ♠g5+ ♞h8 29 ♠xb7 ♞d8 30 ♠hx5 1-0 Sorin-Pierrot, Buenos Aires 1998.

b2) 19 ♞a4 ♠d8 20 ♠f3 ♠d7 21 ♞a5 ♠c6 22 ♠xc6 bxc6 23 ♞c7 ♞b2 24 a4 ♠dc8 25 ♞d7 ♞b4 26 ♠xc6 ♠d8 27 ♞c7 ♞xa4 = Van der Werf-Vanheste, Dieren 1988.

c) 18 ♞d4! ♠e6 and then:

c1) 19 h4?! ♠fd8 20 ♞b2 ♠d5 with dynamic equality, Banusz-Sipos, Budapest 2002.

c2) 19 ♠f3 ♞a6 transposes to the note to Black's 19th move, and so may well be a significant move-order improvement.

18...♞a6 (D)

Black has also tried 18...♞f6?! 19 ♞a4 (Andrianov suggests 19 ♠c1! ♞a6 20 ♠c7 with the initiative) 19...a6 and now:


a) 20 ♠ad1 b5 21 ♞b4 ♠a7 22 ♠d6 ♞e7 23 ♞d4 ♠c7 24 ♠d5 ♠d7 25 ♠xd7 ♞xd7 26 h4 ♞g4 27 ♞f6 ♞f5 28 ♠d6 ♠d7 29 ♞c5 ♠b7 30 ♠xb7 ♞xb7 31 h5 ± Atalik-Zadrima, Ankara 1995.

b) 20 ♠ac1 b5 21 ♞b4! (21 ♞a5?! ♠b8 22 ♠c6 ♠d8 is equal, Petran-Okhotnik, Eger 1984) 21...♠b8 22 ♠d5 (or 22 ♠c6!?) ♞e5 23 ♠c5 ♞e7 24 ♠fc1 ♠b7 25 ♠xb7 ±) 22...♠e6 23 ♠c6 ±±.

19 ♞d4!

The white queen dominates the dark squares from a highly important central post. In my opinion this is the best try for an advantage (found by the Greek IM Nikolaos Gavrillakis back in 1988), although of the following alternatives, line 'b3' also deserves attention:

a) 19 a4 ♠e6 20 ♞b1 ♠ab8 21 h4 ♠fd8 22 h5 ♞a5 23 ♞b5 b6 24 ♠fc1 ♠dc8 25 ♠xc8+ ♠xc8 1/2-1/2 F.Olafsson-Ribli, Reykjavik 1975.



b) 19 ♖b3 ♜b8 and now:

b1) 20 ♜fc1 ♙e6 21 ♖b4 b6 22 ♜c3 b5 23 ♜c6 1/2-1/2 Comas Fabrego-Valdes, Ubeda 2001.

b2) 20 ♙d5 ♙e6 21 ♙xe6 ♖xe6 (1/2-1/2 Bagirov-Mikhalchishin, Baku 1983) 22 ♖xe6 fxe6 23 ♜fd1 ♜fd8 24 g4 ♟f7 (24...♜bc8 25 ♜ac1 ♜xd1 + 26 ♜xd1 ♜c7 1/2-1/2 Sukharisingh-Forchert, Bad Godesberg 1991) 25 ♜ac1 ♜xd1 + 26 ♜xd1 ♟e7 27 a4 ♜c8 28 ♜d4 b6 29 ♟g2 e5 30 ♜e4 ♟d6 31 f4 exf4 32 exf4 ♜c3 33 h4 ♜d3 34 ♜b4 1/2-1/2 Velikov-Blees, Khania 1991.

b3) 20 ♜fd1! ♙e6 (although this seems like a nice move, Black should focus on 20...b5!? with the idea ...♙b7) 21 ♖b2 (21 ♙d5?! can be met by 21...♙xd5 1/2-1/2 Belozarov-Ruck, Zagan U-18 Ech 1995 or 21...♜fd8 22 e4 ♙xd5 23 exd5 ♜d7 24 ♜d4 ♜bd8 25 ♜ad1 ♖f6 26 a4 b6 27 h4 h5 28 g3 = Kahn-Albrecht, Balatonbereny 1997). Black hasn't managed to equalize, as White's pressure on the dark squares and on the kingside is quite strong. Some examples:

b31) 21...♖a5 22 h4! h5 23 ♙e4 ♜bd8 24 ♖f6! ♙c8 25 ♜ac1 ♜xd1 + 26 ♜xd1 ♖a4 27 ♜d4 ♖xa2 28 ♙d5 ♖b1 + 29 ♟h2 ♖b6 30 ♙xf7+ ♙xf7 31 ♜d8+ ♖xd8 32 ♖xd8+ ♜f8 33 ♖c7 a6 34 e4 b5 35 ♙c6 ♟f7 36 ♟g3 ♜e8 37 ♖c7+ ♙f6 38 f4 ♙g4 39 e5+ ♙e6 40 ♖d6+ ♟f5 41 ♖f6+ 1-0 Meduna-Ghinda, Lvov 1981.

b32) 21...♜fd8 22 ♜xd8+ ♜xd8 23 h4! (23 ♙xb7 ♖xa2! 24 ♖xa2 ♙xa2 25 h4 ♜b8! =) 23...h5 24 ♖xb7 ♖a5 25 ♖e7 ♜b8 26 a3 ♖c3 27 ♜d1 ± Kahn-Castelfranchi, Budapest 1996.

19...♙f5

It seems best for Black to retain control of the important f6-square. The other try is 19...♙e6?!

a) 20 ♜fb1?! ♜ad8 21 ♖b2 ♙d5 22 ♖b5 ♖xb5 23 ♜xb5 ♙xf3 24 gxf3 ♜d7 = Østendstad-L.B.Hansen, Gausdal 1992.

b) 20 ♜fd1 and here:

b1) 20...♖a5 21 h4 ♜ad8 22 ♖f6 ♜xd1 + 23 ♜xd1 h5 (or: 23...♖xa2 24 h5 gxh5 25 ♙e4! ♖e2 26 ♜d5! ♙xd5 27 ♖g5+ ♟h8 28 ♖h6 +--; 23...b6 24 h5 ♖f5 25 ♖e7! ♙xa2 26 ♖xa7 ♙b3 27 ♖al!! gxh5 {27...♙xd1? 28 h6 f6 29 ♖a7 ♜f7 30 ♖a8+ ♜f8 31 ♙d5+} 28 ♜d6! {with the idea ♜h6} 28...♙e6 29 ♜xb6 is clearly advantageous for White) 24 ♙e4! ♖xa2 (24...♙xa2 25 ♙xg6 fvg6 26 ♖xg6+ ♟h8 27 ♜d7 ♙f7 28 ♜xf7 ♜xf7 29 ♖xf7 +) 25 g4!! and now:

b11) 25...♙xg4 26 ♙d5! ♖c2 27 ♙xf7+! ♟h7 28 ♜d6! +--.

b12) 25...♖a4 26 ♜d4 ♖al+ 27 ♟g2 hxg4 28 ♖g5!! (28 ♙xg6? ♙d5+ 29 e4 ♙e6! ∞; after the text-move, the threats of ♙xg6 and h5 are strong) 28...♟g7 (28...g3 29 ♙xg6 ♙h3+ 30 ♟xh3 ♖f1+ 31 ♟g4 fxg6 32 ♖xg6+ ♟h8 33 ♖b6+ ♟g8 34 ♖e6+ ♟h8 35 ♖e5+ ♟g8 36 ♜d7 ♖c4+ 37 ♟xg3 +--) 29 h5 ♖a6 30 hxg6 f6 31 ♖c5 ±.

b13) 25...hxg4 26 h5 g3 27 ♜f1!! and White is winning as 27...♟h7 28 hxg6+ ♟g8 29 g7 ♜e8 30 fxg3 ♖e2 31 ♖h6 f5 32 ♙xf5 and 27...gxf2+ 28 ♜xf2 followed by 29 h6 seem easy.


b14) 25...♖b3 26 ♜d3! ♖b1+ (26...♖b5 27 ♙xg6 hxg4 28 ♜d4! ♖c5 29 ♙xf7+ ♜xf7 30 ♜d8+ ♜f8 31 ♖xe6+ ♟h8 32 ♜d7! ♖c1+ 33 ♟g2 ♖c6+ 34 ♖xc6 bxc6 35 ♖xa7 +--) 27 ♟h2 (27 ♟g2? ♙d5!) 27...hxg4 (27...♖f1 28 ♜d6! ♜e8 29 ♙xg6 ♖c4 30 ♙xh5 ±) 28 h5 ♖f1 (28...♖b5 29 ♜d5! ♖f1 30 ♜g5) 29 ♙g2! ♖e2 (29...g3+ 30 ♟xg3 ♖e2 31 ♜d4 gxh5 {31...♖xh5 32 ♜h4} 32 ♖g5+ ♟h8 33 ♙f1!! ♖c2 34 ♖e5+ +--) 30 ♜d4 gxh5 (30...♖b5 31 ♜d5) 31 ♖g5+ ♟h8 32 ♖xh5+ ♟g7 33 ♖g5+ ♟h8 34 ♜f4! +--.

b2) 20...♜ac8 21 h4 h5 22 ♖f6 b6 23 ♙e4 ♜fe8 24 ♙xg6 fxg6 25 ♖xg6+ ♟f8 (25...♟h8 26 ♜d6! ♖c4! 27 ♜ad1! {threatening 28 ♜d7} 27...♖g4 {27...♙f7 28 ♖h6+ ♟g8 29 ♖g5+ ♟f8 30 ♜h6 ♖c3 31 ♜d4 +--} 28 ♖h6+ ♟g8 29 ♜d4 ♜c1+ 30 ♟h2 +--) 26 ♜d6 ♖c4 27 ♜d4 ♖e2 28 ♜f4+ ♟e7 29 ♖g7+ ♟d6 30 ♜d4+ ♟c6 31 ♜c1+ ♟b5 32 ♜b1+ ♟c6 33 ♖xa7 b5 34 ♖a6+ ♟c7 35 ♜xb5 1-0 Krizsany-Hiermann, Finkenstein 1999.

20 ♜fd1 ♜ac8 (D)

This seems to be a better choice for Black than 20...♙e6?!. In my opinion the untested 20...♜ad8 21 ♖xd8 (21 ♖b2 b6 22 ♙d5 ±)

21...♖xd8 22 ♖xd8+ ♔g7 23 ♖d4 b5 24 ♕d5 is good for White.



Now White can choose from:

a) 21 h4 ♖c4 22 ♕xb7 ♖xd4 23 ♕xa6 ♖xh4 24 f4 ♖b8 25 ♖d2 ♕e6 26 ♕e2 g5 27 ♖f1 gxf4 28 exf4 ♕g4 29 ♕c4 ♖h5 = Kiriakov-Elianov, Moscow 1999.

b) 21 e4 ♕e6 (21...♖c4? 22 ♖e3! and ♕e2) 22 ♖f6 ♖a5 23 e5 ♖c5! 24 ♖e1 ∞.

c) 21 a4 ♖c7 22 ♖f4 ♖d7 23 h4 ♕d3 24 ♖ac1 ± b5? 25 ♕c6 ♖dd8 26 ♖xd3 ♖xd3 27 ♕xb5 ♖d6 28 ♕xd3 ♖xd3 29 ♖c7 ± Kotronias-Ghinda, Athens 1988.

d) 21 ♖b4!? ♖c7 (21...b6 22 ♕d5! ±) 22 ♖d6! b6 23 ♕d5! (23 ♖ad1 ♖c4!) 23...♖c8 24 h4 ♖e2 25 ♖d4! and White can claim a pleasant and secure advantage, due to his better-centralized pieces and the weak dark squares around the enemy king. Of course, untested possibilities such as this offer a lot of food for thought but need testing.

1.7 Illustrative Games

In this section there are some interesting games played by the author. The selection of games was carefully made in order to present ideas, plans, and attacking and defensive possibilities that characterize the ♕g5 system in the Grünfeld Defence.

Game 1

Grivas – Colović
Budapest 2001

1 d4 ♔f6 2 ♔f3 g6 3 c4 ♕g7 4 ♔c3 d5 5 ♕g5 ♔e4 6 ♕h4 ♔xc3 7 bxc3 dxc4 8 ♖a4+ ♖d7 9

♖xc4 b6 10 ♖b3 ♕a6 11 e3 ♕xf1 12 ♔xf1 c5 13 d5! 0-0 14 ♖d1! ♕f6?!

For details on the opening, see Section 1.4, Line A32.


15 ♕xf6 exf6 16 c4!

White protects his passed pawn that was gifted by Black's unfortunate 14th move.

16...♖e8 17 h4!

White must place his king in a safe post. As Black suffers from positional disadvantages, he must seek counterplay against the opponent's king and thus White should be prepared for this.

17...h5 18 g3 ♖g4 19 ♔g2 ♔d7 20 a4! (D)



White cannot benefit from the immediate advance of his passed pawn. So, in the meantime he must try to open a second front on the queenside, trying to create new weaknesses in Black's position.

20...♖ab8 21 ♖c2 ♔e5?!

The minor-piece exchange cannot favour the defender in a position where a protected passed pawn exists. Black should exchange queens with 21...♖e4 and move his king to the centre.

22 ♔xe5 ♖xe5

Worse would be 22...fxe5 23 e4 ♖d7 24 ♖hf1 f5 25 f4!.

23 ♖d2 ♖be8 24 ♖d3!

The e3-square is the only possible target for counterplay by Black (e.g., 24 ♖b1 ♖xe3!?), so White protects it.

24...♖d7

Now Black had no chance in the rook ending after 24...♖e4+ 25 ♖xe4 ♖xe4 26 ♖c1.

25 a5! ♖e4?!

Black should focus on a laborious defence with 25...♖d6, as now material will be lost.

26 axb6 axb6 27 ♖b2! f5

As the b6-pawn is lost anyway (27...♚d6 28 ♖hb1) Black seeks counterplay, praying for White's help!

28 ♖xb6 f4 29 exf4 ♖d4 30 ♚b3! ♚f5 31 ♖b8!

Exchanging more pieces will help White to benefit from his material superiority.

31...♚e4+ 32 ♜h2 ♖xb8 33 ♚xb8+ ♜h7

Or 33...♜g7 34 ♚e5+! ♚xe5 35 fxe5 ♖xc4 36 ♖d1.

34 ♚c7! ♜g8 35 ♖a1!

Finally the defending rook has completed its mission and now finds a better one, that of being an attacking rook!

35...♖d2

Or 35...♖xc4 36 ♖a8+ ♜g7 37 ♚d8.

36 ♚xc5 ♖c2 37 d6 ♖xc4 38 ♚e5 ♚f3 39 d7! ♚xf2+ 40 ♜h3 ♜h7 41 d8♚ 1-0

The passed pawn has accomplished its mission.

Game 2

Grivas – Vakhidov

Khania 2000

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 ♘f3 ♙g7 5 ♙g5 ♘e4 6 ♙h4 ♘xc3 7 bxc3 dxc4 8 ♚a4+ ♚d7 9 ♚xc4 b6 10 ♚b3 ♙a6 11 e3 ♙xf1 12 ♜xf1 ♘c6 13 ♜e2 e5 14 ♙g3! e4 15 ♘d2 ♘a5 16 ♚b2 f5 17 a4 0-0 18 h4! ♖ac8 19 ♚a2+! ♚f7 20 ♚xf7+ ♖xf7 21 ♖ac1 c5 22 ♖hd1 ♖d7 23 f3! exf3+ 24 gxf3 ♖e8 25 ♘d3

For details on the opening, see Section 1.4, Line A31.

25...♘c6 26 ♖e1 cxd4 27 exd4

27 cxd4?! ♘xd4!! 28 exd4 ♖xd4+ 29 ♜c2 ♖c8+ 30 ♜d1 ♖cd8 31 ♖c2 ♖xa4 is unclear.

27...♖c8 28 ♘b3 ♘e7 29 ♙e5!

29 c4? is a serious mistake due to 29...♘c6! 30 d5 ♘b4+ 31 ♜d2 ♘a2! 32 ♖c2 ♘b4 with a draw.


29...♙xe5 30 ♖xe5 ♘d5 31 c4! ♘b4+ 32 ♜e3 ♘c6 33 ♖e6 ♘d8 34 ♖e5 ♘c6 35 ♖e6 ♜f8

White repeated the position trying to gain time on the clock. If Black plays 35...♘d8 then 36 ♖e5 ♘c6 37 f4! ♘xe5 38 fxe5 gives a clear advantage to White.

36 f4 ♖dc7 37 c5

Forced, as 37...♘d8 was threatened.

37...♘d8 38 ♖e5 ♘c6 39 ♖e6 ♘d8 40 ♖e5 ♘c6 41 cxb6 axb6 42 ♖b5 ♘e7 43 ♖xc7 ♖xc7 44 d5! (D)



At last the passed pawn has advanced!

44...♖a7 45 a5! bxa5 46 ♘xa5 ♘c8 47 ♘c4 ♖e7+ 48 ♘d3 ♖e8 49 ♖b7 ♘e7 50 ♘d4

White has a won position due to his passed pawn and the better placement of his pieces. Black decides to sacrifice the knight, hoping to eliminate the last white pawn and get the desired draw.

50...♘xd5!? 51 ♘xd5 ♖e4 52 ♘e5 ♖xf4 53 ♖xh7 ♜g8 54 ♖h6 ♜g7 55 ♖xg6+ ♜h7 56 h5 ♖h4 57 ♖g5 ♜h6 58 ♘f7+ ♜h7 59 ♖xf5

The game is over, but Black continues as White was in serious time-trouble.

59...♖a4 60 ♜e6 ♖a6+ 61 ♜e7 ♖b6 62 ♘e5 ♜h6 63 ♘g4+ ♜g7 64 ♖g5+ ♜h8 65 ♜f7 ♖b7+ 66 ♜g6 ♖b6+ 67 ♘f6 ♖b5 68 ♘g4 ♖b6+ 69 ♜f5 ♜h7 70 ♘f6+ 1-0

Game 3

Grivas – Lputian

Panormo Z 1998

1 ♘f3 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 d4 ♙g7 5 ♙g5 ♘e4 6 ♙h4 ♘xc3 7 bxc3 dxc4 8 ♚a4+ c6?!

For details on the opening, see Section 1.4, Line A1.

9 ♚xc4 ♘a6 10 e4!? ♚a5 11 ♖c1!

The only move, as 11 ♙e2? ♙e6 12 ♚d3 ♘c5! 13 ♚c2 ♘xe4! would be catastrophic for White.

11...♙e6

Black can deviate with 11...♙g4!?

12 ♚d3 ♙h6

Taking the pawn is not as easy as it looks. After 12...♙xa2? 13 ♖a1 or 12...♚xa2 13 ♙e2

♖a5 (13...♙h6 14 ♙g5!) 14 0-0 ♜c7 15 ♜g5!
♙c8 16 f4 White enjoys the advantage.

13 ♜b1!

Best, as 13 ♜c2? ♙xa2!, with ...♙b1 to follow, or 13 ♜d1 ♜xa2 14 ♙e2? ♙b3 or 13 ♜a1 ♙g7 = was not what White had wished for.

13...0-0-0

An interesting try as 13...♜xa2? 14 ♜xb7 ♙b3 15 ♙e2! ♜a1+ 16 ♙d1 ♙xd1 (16...♜xd1+ 17 ♜xd1 ♙xd1 18 ♜xd1 ±) 17 0-0! ± did not appeal to Black.

14 ♜c2!

A fine move. Wrong would be 14 ♙e2? ♜c5! or 14 ♙xe7?! ♜d7 15 ♙f6 ♜e8 ∞.

14...f6!?

A good idea, preparing ...♙f4 and ...g5 together with ...h5. White would be better after 14...♜xa2?! 15 ♜xa2 ♙xa2 16 ♜a1 ♙e6 17 ♙xe7.


15 ♙g3! f5!

Again 15...♜xa2 16 ♜xa2 ♙xa2 17 ♜b2! ♙e6 18 ♙xa6 bxa6 19 ♜b8+ was unfavourable for Black.

16 exf5 gxf5

The right path as after 16...♙xf5 17 ♙d3! ♙xd3 18 ♜xd3 ♜c5 19 ♜c2 White retains a stable advantage.

17 ♙e5 ♜hg8 18 ♙d3! (D)



18...♜df8?

A serious mistake. White had to enter the 18...♜xg2 19 ♜h4! ♜gg8 20 ♜xf5 ♙f8 21 ♜e2! variation, where White is better but due to his unprotected king Black has counterplay.

19 0-0


Now the white king is safe, in contrast to the black one, which will sooner or later come under fire.

19...♙d5 20 ♜h4!

Even better than 20 ♙xf5+!? e6 21 ♙e4 (21 ♙h3!? ♙xf3 22 ♜b3!) 21...♜xf3 22 ♙xf3 ♙xf3 23 ♙g3.

20...b5 (D)

Black didn't have anything better: 20...♜g4? 21 ♙xf5+, 20...♙g5 21 ♜xf5! or 20...♜g5 21 c4.



21 a4!

The pawn that was offered to Black for so many moves delivers the final blow!

21...♜c7 22 axb5 cxb5 23 ♙xc7 ♜xc7 24 ♜xb5 ♙c6 25 ♜c5 ♜b8 26 ♜b1+!

26 ♙b5 ♙xb5 and 26 d5 ♜f4 are less convincing.

26...♜a8 27 ♙b5 1-0

Black resigned due to 27...♜f6 28 d5 ♜f4 29 ♜xc6 ♜xh4 30 ♜xf6 ♜xf6 31 ♙c6+.

Game 4

**Grivas – R. Simić
Athens 1991**

1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♜c3 d5 4 ♜f3 ♙g7 5 ♙g5 ♜e4 6 ♙h4 ♜xc3 7 bxc3 c5 8 cxd5 ♜xd5 9 e3 ♜c6 10 ♙e2 cxd4 11 cxd4 b6 12 0-0 ♙b7 13 ♜b3! ♜xb3 14 axb3 0-0 15 b4! a6

For details on the opening, see Section 1.5, Line J.

16 ♜ab1! e6 17 ♜d2!

With the threat of 18 ♜c4, putting pressure on the squares d6 and b6.

17...♜a7

17...b5 18 ♜b3!.

18 ♜fc1! e5!?

18...♜fc8 19 ♜c4! would be unacceptable for Black, so he tries to complicate matters in the centre.

19 ♜c7 ♙c6 20 d5!!

This strong move stops any kind of counterplay and guarantees occupation of the 7th rank.

20...♙xd5 21 ♖xa6 ♘c8 22 b5!!

Another good move that seals Black's fate, as his pieces are forced to passive positions and, in general, rendered inactive.


22...f6 23 e4 ♙f7 24 f3!

The bishop is not useful any more on the h4-d8 diagonal, so he changes to the now important g1-a7 one.

24...♙h6 25 ♖f1 f5 26 ♖d1 ♙e6 27 ♙f2 fxe4 28 fxe4 ♙f7 29 ♖d8+! ♖f8 30 ♖d3 ♙f7 31 ♖c6!

White's positional advantage is clear and soon a material advantage will come.

31...♙g4 32 ♖d8+ ♖f8 33 ♖xf8+ ♙xf8 34 ♘e3 ♙d7 35 ♖c7 ♙e6 36 ♘d5 ♙xd5 37 exd5 ♘e7 38 ♖d7! ♖b8 39 g4!! (D)



A kind of zugzwang! Black is lacking a useful move (even after 39...h5 40 h3 hxg4 41 hxg4) and material will be lost after either ♖b7 or ♙g3.

39...♙f7 40 d6 1-0

40...♙e8 41 dxe7 ♙xd7 42 exf8 ♖ ♖xf8 43 ♙xb6.

Game 5

Grivas – Popovic

Nea Makri 1990

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 ♘f3 ♙g7 5 ♙g5 ♘e4 6 ♙h4 c5 7 cxd5 ♘xc3 8 bxc3 ♖xd5 9 e3 cxd4 10 cxd4 ♘c6 11 ♙e2 0-0 12 0-0 h6 13 ♘d2 e5 14 ♙f3! ♖d7 15 d5! ♘a5 16 e4 f5 17 exf5 gxf5 18 ♖b1 b6 19 d6! e4 20 ♘xe4! fxe4 21 ♙xe4 ♙b7 22 ♖e1! ♖fe8?

A serious mistake. Black should continue with 22...♖ae8! – for details on the opening, see Section 1.5, Line G2.

23 ♙e7 ♙xe4 24 ♖xe4 ♘c6 25 ♖d5+! ♙h8 26 ♖be1 ♖ac8 27 g3

Maybe 27 h3 was better, but during the game it was very hard to foresee matters.

27...♘b8

Threatening 28...♖c5. The other try was 27...♘xe7 28 ♖xe7 ♖xe7 29 ♖xe7 ♖h3 30 ♖d1! ♙f6 31 ♖xa7 ±.


28 ♖e6?!

Much easier was 28 ♖h4! ♘c6 (28...♖c5 29 ♖f7 ♖f5 30 ♖g6 and ♖e6) 29 ♖f7 ♘xe7 30 dxe7 b5 (30...♖c6 31 ♖g4!) 31 ♖e6! ♖d2 32 ♖g6 ♖g8 33 ♖e4.

28...♖c5 29 ♖f3!

With threats such as 30 ♖f7 and ♖xh6+.

29...♙g8 30 ♖g4! ♖ec8 (D)



31 ♙f6?

Throwing away the win. Correct was 31 ♙g2! ♖c1 (31...h5 32 ♖g6 ♖e8 33 d7! ♘xd7 34 ♙xc5 ♖xg6 35 ♖xg6 and 36 ♖e7) 32 ♖1e4! ♖b5 33 ♙h3! ♖f1+ 34 ♙h4 ♖xf2 35 h3 and White's threats, such as ♖f4, ♖g6 and ♙f6, are difficult to meet.

31...♖c1 32 ♖xc1??

A second consecutive fatal mistake, and now White is lost! 32 ♖e4! is unclear.

32...♖xc1+ 33 ♙g2 ♖e1!

The move that White overlooked. Game over!

34 ♖e4 ♖xe4 35 ♖xe4 ♙xf6 36 ♖c4+ ♙h8 37 ♖c7 ♖d8 38 f4 a5 39 h4 ♘d7 40 h5 ♖e8 41 ♖c4 ♘c5 0-1

Game 6

Grivas – Avrukh

Iraklion 1995

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 ♘f3 ♙g7 5 ♙g5 ♘e4 6 ♙h4 ♘xc3 7 bxc3 dxc4 8 ♖a4+ ♘d7 9

e3! 0-0 10 ♖a3! ♕f6!? 11 ♗xf6 ♜xf6 12 ♗xc4 b6 13 0-0 ♗b7 14 ♗a6!? ♗xf3!? 15 gxf3 ♖d5 16 ♗e2 c5 17 dxc5

For details on the opening, see Section 1.5, Line A2.

17...♖xc5?!

Without queens Black cannot create counterplay against the white king that has been weakened after 14...♗xf3. The coming endgame will always be better for White, so Black should play 17...bxc5 ±.


18 ♖xc5 bxc5 19 ♖ab1! ♖ab8 20 ♖fd1 e6 21 ♗c4

Stopping a possible 21...♜d5.

21...♙g7 22 ♖b3! ♖xb3?!

This wasn't necessary yet; 22...♖b6!? ±.

23 axb3 ♗c8 24 ♗f1 ♗f8 25 ♖a1 ♗c7 26 ♗e2 ♗e7 (D)



White stands better. His bishop is stronger than the black knight as the pawn-chain favours it and the a7-pawn is weak. Of course White has a lot of work to convert the advantage but on the other hand he cannot possibly lose. As a first priority White has to open a second front to invade with his rook.

27 ♗d2 ♜d7 28 ♗c2 ♜b6 29 ♗e2 ♗d6 30 f4 ♗e7 31 h4! ♗d6

If 31...h5? then White will prepare the f5 break, creating new targets for his bishop.

32 h5 ♗e7 33 ♗f3 ♗d6 34 c4! ♗e7 35 ♗c3 ♗d6 36 ♗e2 gxf3?!

Black had to sit and wait passively with 36...♗e7.

37 ♖h1 f5 38 ♖xh5 ♗g7 39 b4! ♖b7

After 39...cxb4+ 40 ♗xb4 ♜d7 41 ♗f3 ♜c5 42 ♖h1! Black faces serious problems (42...♜d3+ 43 ♗b5!).

40 b5!

Now this is forced (40 bxc5+ ♗xc5 with the idea 41...♜a4+) but also good, as the weakness on a7 is fixed and Black will not have any more counterplay against the white b-pawn.


40...♗g7 41 ♗d3 ♜d7 42 ♖h6 ♖f7 43 f3!

Preparing the next break with e4, which will increase the power of the white bishop.

43...♗e7 44 ♖h1 ♜b6 45 ♖h4 ♜d7 46 ♖h2 ♜b6 47 ♗d2 ♜d7 48 ♗e2 ♗f8 49 ♖h6 ♗e7 50 ♖h1 ♜b6 51 ♖h5 ♜d7 52 ♖h4 ♗g7 53 e4! fxe4 54 ♗xe4!

White should be careful. The 'logical' 54 fxe4?! e5! would only help the black knight.

54...♜f6 55 ♗f2 (D)



55...♗d8

Even after 55...♜xe4+ 56 fxe4 ♗d6 57 ♖h6 ♗e7 58 ♗f3 ♗f7 59 f5 exf5 60 exf5 the threats of 61 ♖c6, 61 ♖a6 and 61 ♗e4 followed by ♗d5 are very strong.

56 ♖h6 ♖f7 57 ♗e3 ♗e8 58 f5! exf5

58...♜xe4? 59 ♖xe6+ or 58...e5 59 ♖h4! ♗e7 60 ♗c6 and 61 f4 ±.

59 ♗xf5 ♗e7 60 ♗d3 ♗f8 61 ♖h1 ♖e7+ 62 ♗f2 ♖d7 63 ♗e3 ♖e7+ 64 ♗e4! ♖c7

Black will not be saved even after 64...♜xe4 65 fxe4 and 66 ♖h5 or 66 ♗f4.

65 ♗f4 h5 66 ♗f5 ♖f7 67 ♗e6 ♜e8 68 ♗e5 ♖e7+ 69 ♗f4

69 ♗d5 ±.

69...♜g7 70 ♗d5 ♖c7 71 ♗e5

Black is lost. The white bishop is still much stronger than the black knight, and White's other pieces are better placed and/or more active than their black counterparts. The rest of the game was not difficult at all.

71...♗e7 72 f4 ♖c8 73 ♖a1 ♖c7 74 f5 ♜e8 75 ♖a6 ♗f8 76 ♖h6 ♖e7+ 77 ♗e6 ♗g7 78 ♖xh5 ♖c7 79 ♗g5+ ♗h6 80 ♗g8 ♜g7 81 f6 1-0

2 Beating the Benko/Volga Gambit

2.1 Starting Out

The Benko/Volga Gambit (1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5) is a dangerous weapon in Black's hands, especially when the player with White does not know how to handle it. If White accepts the pawn sacrifice he will have to combat Black's harmonious development and natural queenside play.

The founding father of the Benko Gambit is the 78-year-old Hungarian/American GM Pal Benko (twice a World Championship Candidate). In Russia it is called the Volga Gambit, probably on Cold War grounds! It is interesting to note how GM Pal Benko recollects the early history of his gambit: "When I lived in America, I worked out a new opening. In the beginning, I used to call it the Benoni Counter-gambit. In the 1950s, some players – especially the Swedish elite: Ståhlberg, Stoltz and Lundin – played ...b5 only after Black had castled, and White closed the centre with d5 as a reaction to their pawn move ...c5. As I pushed the b-pawn already on move 3 in an attempt to undermine the centre, a new system appeared in tournament practice. When my book *The Benko Gambit* was published in 1973, I toured the United States in order to popularize it. In my simuls, I let all my opponents have White if they were willing to play against the Benko Gambit. I beat all of them. If I remember correctly, I lost only two games with this opening, but in those I had to play against my own weapon as White..."

I strongly believe that White should not be in a hurry to 'win' the offered pawn immediately! Thus, my suggestion is to aim for a slow fight with 4 ♘f3. In most cases White achieves a healthy spatial advantage and good piece-play. Of course things are not that easy, but, at least, if White knows what to do he has no cause for worry! Here is the debut game of this opening:

R. Grau – Guerra Boneo
Buenos Aires 1924

1 d4 ♘f6 2 ♘f3 c5 3 d5 b5 4 c4 bxc4 5 ♘c3 d6
6 e4 g6 7 ♗xc4 ♘f7 8 ♗f4 ♗g7 9 ♖d2 0-0 10
0-0 ♘b6 11 ♗e2 ♘8d7 12 ♗h6 a5 13 ♗xg7
♜xg7 14 ♖fe1 ♖c7 15 ♖ac1 ♖b8 16 ♘d1 ♖d8
17 ♖c3+ f6 18 ♘e3 ♘f8 19 ♗d1 ♖d7 20 ♘g5
♖b7 21 f4 a4 22 ♘f3 ♘bd7 23 ♘c4 ♘b6 24
♘xb6 ♖xb6 25 e5 ♖a7 26 exf6+ exf6 27 ♗xa4
♖b4 28 ♗b3 ♖xf4 29 ♖e8 ♖b7 30 ♖ce1 ♖b4
31 ♖xf8 1-0

2.2 Typical Endgames

In this section I shall present two interesting and characteristic endgames of the 4 ♘f3 variation against the Benko/Volga Gambit.

Endgame 1

Dobosz – Trauth
Zurich 1997

1 d4 ♘f6 2 ♘f3 c5 3 d5 b5 4 c4 bxc4 5 ♘c3 g6
6 e4 d6 7 ♘d2 ♗g7 8 ♘xc4 0-0 9 ♗e2 ♗a6 10
♘e3 ♖a5


For more information on the opening play, see Section 2.6, Line B.

11 ♗d2 ♗xe2 12 ♖xe2 ♖a6 13 ♖xa6 ♘xa6
14 ♗e2 ♖ab8 15 ♖ab1 ♘d7 16 g4 ♘c7 17
♖hc1 ♘b5?!

Black should not exchange knights. Better is 17...♖b7 ±.

18 ♘xb5 ♖xb5 19 b3 ♖fb8 20 ♘c4 ♘e5 21
h3 ♘xc4 22 ♖xc4 ♖5b7 (D)

This is the kind of endgame that White dreams of. Better pawn-structure (because the a7-pawn is weak and most of the black pawns can be targeted by the white bishop), better bishop, more space and, most important: lack of an active plan for Black. Considering the above we can evaluate the position as advantageous for White. Of course there is still work



to be done to convert this advantage into victory.

23 ♖a4 ♗d4

Seeking counterplay with 23...e6 is not that easy as the black d6-pawn becomes weak, but Black should try this sooner or later.

24 ♗h6!? f6 25 h4! ♖f7

25...♗e8 26 ♗e3!? ♗xe3 27 ♖xe3 e6 28 dxe6 ♗xe6 29 ♖f4 is also clearly better for White.

26 ♗c1

26 ♖a6 c4!

26...♗b4!?

Maybe it was time for 26...e6.


27 ♗c4

White correctly avoids 27 ♗xa7 c4 28 ♗d7! ♖e8 29 ♗c7 cxb3 30 axb3 ♗xb3, which would surrender part of his advantage.

27...♗xc4 28 ♗xc4 e6

If Black stays passive then White will make considerable progress with f3, ♗d2, ♖d3-c4, ♖a4 and b4-b5.

29 ♖a4 ♗b7 30 ♗f4 (D)



30...e5?!

An absolutely mistaken idea. Black had to try 30...exd5 31 exd5 ♗e5 32 ♗e3 f5 33 f4 ♗g7

34 g5 where, although White stands better, there still lies a fight ahead. Now the d4-bishop is a 'tall pawn'.

31 ♗h6 g5?

This loses quickly, but the passive 31...♖e7 32 f3 ♖f7 33 ♖a6 ♖e7 34 ♖d3 ♗b2 35 ♗d2 ♗d4 36 ♖c4 ♖d7 37 b4 was hopeless anyway.

32 hxg5 ♖g6 33 ♖a6! ♗d7 34 ♗f8

Winning the house!

34...♖xg5 35 f3 c4 36 ♗xd6 cxb3 37 axb3 h5 38 gxh5 f5 39 h6 fxe4 40 fxe4 ♗f7 41 ♗b4 ♖f4 42 ♖d3 ♗e3 43 ♖a1 1-0

Endgame 2


Sveshnikov – Mikhailchishin

USSR Ch, Frunze 1981

1 d4 ♗f6 2 ♖f3 c5 3 d5 b5 4 c4 bxc4 5 ♖c3 g6 6 e4 d6 7 ♖d2 ♗g7 8 ♖xc4 0-0 9 ♗e2 ♖bd7

For more information on this line, see Section 2.6, Line B.

10 ♗g5 h6 11 ♗d2 ♖b6 12 0-0 e6 13 dxe6 ♗xe6 14 ♗e3 d5 15 exd5 ♖fxd5 16 ♖exd5 ♖xd5 17 ♖c1 ♖xc3 18 ♗xc3 ♗xc3 19 ♖xc3 ♖b6 20 ♗fc1 ♗fd8 21 b3 ♗ac8 (D)



White's advantage is obvious, although not that significant. His pawn-structure is much better as the black queenside pawns are weak, but on the other hand Black's pieces are well placed and he has some small tactics at his disposal.

22 ♖e3! h5

Black could also play 22...♖g7 23 ♗c4 but his king on g7 might prove exposed in the future, as a check on the long diagonal would be useful for White in certain variations.

23 ♗c4

Nothing is gained by 23 ♖h6 ♖a5!.

23...♞c6

This is better than 23...♙xc4 24 ♞xc4 ♞d4 25 ♞ac1 ♞cd8 26 h3 with a comfortable advantage for White.

24 h3

Sooner or later White had to deal with his back-rank problems.

24...♞d4!

Black correctly seeks activity.

25 ♙e2

Unfortunately the planned 25 ♙xe6 ♞xe6 26 ♖c3 (26 ♖g5 ♞e2! 27 ♞xc5 ♞dd2 28 ♞f1 ♞xa2 => 26...♞e2 27 ♞c2 ♙xc2 28 ♖xc2 ♖d6! only leads to equality. White could continue with 25 ♙f1!? a5 26 ♞c3.

25...♞cd6!

Preferring activity to the passive defence of his weaknesses!

26 ♖g5?!

Throwing away his small advantage. With 26 ♞c3! White could retain some pressure, as the active 26...♞d2? 27 ♙d3! is not playable for Black.

26...♞d4 27 ♖e3 ♞d4?!

27...♖b4! is OK for Black.


28 ♖g5?!

White shouldn't have accepted the draw by threefold repetition. 28 ♞c3 was called for.

28...♞d4 29 ♖e3 ♞d4 1/2-1/2

2.3 The 4...b4 Variation

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♘f3 b4 (D)



Black closes the queenside, planning to concentrate on the other side of the board. Also it should be mentioned that the black b4-pawn takes away the c3-square from the white knight,

at the same time gaining space on the queenside. On the other hand, White's centre is not under pressure any more.

5 a3!

Probably best. Other moves are harmless; e.g., 5 b3 d6 6 ♘bd2 e5! 7 e4 g6 was fine for Black in Cebalo-Barlov, Vršac 1985.

Black can now choose between:

A: 5...♘a6 59

B: 5...a5 59

C: 5...g6 60

Or:

a) 5...♖b6?! (not the best square for the black queen) 6 axb4 ♖xb4+ 7 ♘c3 ♘e4 8 ♙d2 ♘xd2 9 ♖xd2 ♙a6 (9...♖xc4? 10 e3 ♖b4 11 ♘b5! ♖xd2+ 12 ♘xd2 ♘d8 13 ♘g5 ±) 10 ♘b5 ♖xd2+ 11 ♘xd2 ♙xb5 12 cxb5 g6 13 ♘e5 ♙g7 14 ♘c4 ± Antić-Nestorović, Dimitrovgrad 2003. The c4-knight is a really strong piece and the open a-file an important asset.

b) 5...bxa3?! (relinquishing control of the c3-square so early can hardly suit Black) 6 ♞xa3 g6 7 ♘c3 ♙g7 8 e4 d6 9 ♙d3 0-0 10 h3 ♘a6 11 0-0 ♘b4 12 ♙b1 ♞e8 13 ♙f4 ± M.Kopylov-Lange, Kiel 2003. White controls more space and can apply pressure either down the a-file or in the centre with the e5 advance.

c) 5...e6 and now:


c1) 6 ♙g5 h6 7 ♙h4! (7 ♙xf6 ♖xf6 8 ♖c2 ♘a6 9 e4 ♙d6 10 ♘bd2 ♞b8 11 ♞b1 0-0 12 ♙d3 e5 13 0-0 ♙c7 14 ♘e1 d6 15 g3 bxa3 16 bxa3 ♙a5 is unclear, Chapman-Henri, corr. 1987) 7...♖b6 8 ♙xf6 gxf6 9 e4 ♘a6 10 ♘bd2 ♙g7 11 ♞b1 bxa3 12 bxa3 ♖a5 13 ♖c1 0-0 14 ♙d3 d6 15 0-0 ± Magerramov-Nikolaev, Budapest 1990.

c2) 6 ♖c2?! exd5? (6...d6 7 e4 ±) 7 cxd5 ♙b7 8 e4 ♖e7 9 ♙d3 ♙xd5 (9...♘xe4 10 0-0 with compensation) 10 0-0 b3 (10...♘xe4 11 ♞e1 f5 12 ♘bd2 ±) 11 ♖d1 ♙e6 12 e5 ♘g4 13 h3 ♘h6 14 ♘c3 ♖d8 15 ♙e4 ♘c6 16 ♘d5 ♘f5 17 ♖xb3 ± Gual Pascual-Castro Molero, Manresa 1995.

c3) 6 dxe6! (the most precise, as Black's centre is much less flexible and dangerous than in the Blumenfeld Gambit) 6...fxe6 (6...dxe6 7 ♖xd8+ ♘xd8 8 ♘e5! ♘e8 9 axb4 cxb4 10 ♘d2! ♙d6 11 ♘d3 ±) 7 axb4 cxb4 8 ♙f4 ♖b6 9 ♘bd2 ♙c5 10 e3 0-0 11 ♙d3 ♙b7 12 0-0 ± Glaser-Henri, corr. 1987.

A)

5...♘a6 (D)



6 axb4

Although the text-move clarifies matters regarding the pawn-structure, White has some equally viable alternatives:

a) 6 ♖bd2 g6 7 e4 d6 8 e5 dxe5 9 ♗xe5 ♖d6 10 ♗df3 ♗g7 11 ♗d3 0-0 12 0-0 bxa3 13 ♖xa3 ♗b4 (De Boer-G.Janssen, Enschede 1998) 14 ♖e1! ±.

b) 6 g3 e6 (6...g6 7 ♗g2 d6 8 b3 {8 axb4 ± cxb4? 9 ♖xa6!}) 8...♗g7 9 ♗b2 0-0 10 0-0 ♗h5 11 ♗xg7 ♗xg7 12 ♗e1 ♖b6 13 ♗d2 bxa3 14 ♖xa3 ♗b4 15 ♗e4 ♗f5 16 ♗c3 ± Davies-Votava, Rishon le Zion 1993) 7 ♗g2 ♗b7 8 ♗h4 exd5 9 cxd5 g6 10 0-0 ♗g7 11 ♗d2 0-0 (11...♗xd5 12 ♗xd5 ♗xd5 13 ♗c4 with compensation) 12 ♗c4 d6 13 ♗f4 ♗e8 14 ♗f3 bxa3 15 ♖xa3 ♗b4 16 e4 a5 17 ♖e1 ± Razuvaev-Kotronias, Sochi 1989.

6...♗xb4

6...cxb4?! 7 ♗bd2 (7 ♗e3!? ♖c7 8 ♗bd2 ♗c5 and now 9 ♗d4 ± or 9 ♗d4 d6 10 e4!? ♗fxe4 11 ♗xe4 ♗xe4 12 ♗d3 with compensation) 7...♗c5 8 ♗b3 ♗fe4 9 ♗xc5 ♗xc5 10 ♗e3! e6 11 ♗d4 offers White an obvious plus and cannot be recommended.

7 ♗c3 d6 8 e4 g6

8...e5 9 dxe6 ♗xe6 ±.

9 ♗e2

9 e5!? is interesting: 9...dxe5 10 ♗xe5 ♗g7 11 ♗e3 ♗f5 12 ♗d3 ♗d7 13 ♗a4 ♖b8 (13...♖a5! 14 ♗xb4 ♖xb4+ 15 ♗d2 ♖b8! ∞) 14 ♗axc5 ♗xc5? (14...♗xb2! 15 ♗xb4 ♖xb4 16 ♖d2! ♗xa1 17 ♖xb4 0-0 18 ♗e2 ∞) 15 ♗xc5 ♗xd3+ 16 ♗xd3 ♖c7 17 ♗xa7 (17 ♖a4+ ±) 17...♖e5+ 18 ♗e2?! (18 ♗e3 is much better for White)


18...♖xb2 19 ♗e3 ± Vincze-Szieberth, Budapest 1997.

9...♗g7 10 0-0-0 11 ♗f4 ♗g4 12 h3 ♗xf3 13 ♗xf3 ♗d7 14 ♖d2 ♖e8 15 ♖a3

± I.Sokolov-Ki.Georgiev, Sarajevo 1998.

B)

5...a5 (D)



Black decides to relinquish control of the d4-square in order to obtain, as compensation, the c5-square for one of his knights. Another positive aspect for Black is the flexible queenside pawn-majority (b4 + a5 against b2) that arises, which can later cause White problems. However, in the middlegame the central squares are more important.

6 ♗bd2

White refrains from the immediate capture on b4, although that option is by no means bad: 6 axb4 cxb4 7 g3 (White refrains from the e4 advance as he wants to strengthen his control of c6; after placing a knight on that square, the g2-bishop will support it) 7...g6 8 ♗g2 ♗g7 9 0-0 d6 10 ♗d4 (10 ♗e3!? 0-0 11 ♗d4 ♗a6 12 ♗bd2 ± Nass-Soyez, Reims 2004) 10...0-0 11 h3 ♗d7 12 ♗e3 ♗a6 (12...♖c8!? 13 ♗d2? {13 ♗h2 ♖xc4 14 ♗d2 and the weakness of c6 gives White compensation}) 13...♗xh3 14 ♗xh3 ♖xh3 15 ♗f3 ♗g4 16 ♗f4 ♗e5 17 e3 h6 18 ♖d3 ♗f6 19 e4 ♗xd4 20 ♖xd4 g5 21 ♗c1 f5 22 b3 ♗d7 23 ♗b2 ♗de5 → Truchot-Soyez, Clichy 2002) 13 ♗d2 ♖c7 14 ♖c2 a4 15 ♖xa4! ♗xa4 16 ♖xa4 ♗d7 17 ♖b1 ♖fc8 18 ♖c2 ♖b7 19 ♗c6 ♗e5 20 ♗b3 ♗b8 21 ♗xe5 ♗xe5 22 c5 ♖b5 23 c6 gives White more than enough compensation and a small advantage, Gulko-D.Gurevich, USA Ch (Durango) 1992.

6...d6

The most precise. 6...g6 7 e4 d6 transposes to the next note, while after 6...♘a6 7 e4 d6 8 e5 dxe5 9 ♗xe5 e6 10 ♖a4+ ♗d7 11 ♗xd7 ♖xd7 12 ♖xd7+ ♗xd7 13 dxe6 fxe6 14 ♗e2 ♗e7 15 0-0 White maintains an indisputable plus, Berdichesky-R.Adamski, corr. 1990.


7 e4 ♗bd7

7...g6 can be met as follows:

a) 8 b3 ♗g7 9 ♗b2 bxa3! 10 ♖xa3 0-0 11 ♗e2 ♗a6 12 0-0 ♗b4 13 ♗e1 e5 14 dxe6 fxe6 15 ♗c2 ♗b7 16 ♗xb4 axb4 17 ♖xa8 ♖xa8 18 ♗f3 ♗f7 19 ♗e1 ♖a2 20 ♗xf6 ♗xf6 21 e5 ♗xf3 22 ♗xf3 ♗xe5 23 ♗e2 ♖a1 24 ♖xa1 ♗xa1 25 ♖xe6 1/2-1/2 Hoenig-Halwick, e-mail 1997.

b) The central break 8 e5!? dxe5 9 ♗xe5 is strong.

c) 8 axb4 cxb4 9 c5! (a strong positional pawn sacrifice, securing the important c4-square and the possibility of a massive central pawn advance) 9...dxc5 10 ♗b5+ ♗d7 11 ♗c4 (D) and now:



c1) 11...♗g7 12 e5 ♗g4 13 ♖e2 0-0 14 h3 ♗h6 15 ♗e4 ♗f5 16 0-0 (16 ♗xc5 ♖b6 17 ♗b3 ± Ortega-Langheinrich, Saint Vincent 2002) 16...♖b6 17 ♗f4 a4 18 ♖fd1 ♗a6 19 d6 exd6 20 ♗xd6 ± Gostiša-D.Ilić, Kladovo 1990.

c2) 11...e6 12 0-0 (12 dxe6 ♗xe6 13 ♗xe6 fxe6 14 e5 ♗d5 15 ♗e4 ♗e7 16 h4 ♗c6 17 ♗g5 h6 18 ♗xe7 ♖xe7 19 ♖a4 ♖a6 20 ♖c1 0-0 21 ♗xc5 ♖b6 22 ♗d3 ± 1/2-1/2 E.Agdestein-Tisdall, Gausdal 1986) 12...exd5 13 exd5 ♗h6?! (13...♗d6 14 ♗e1+ ♗f8 15 ♗e4 ♗xe4 16 ♗h6+ ♗g8 17 ♖xe4 ±) 14 ♗e1+ ♗f8 15 ♗e5 ♗g7? (15...♗e8 16 ♗b3 ±) 16 ♗xf7! ♗xf7 17 d6+ ♗f8 18 ♗e7 ♗e8 19 ♗e4 ♗xc1 20 ♗xf6 ♗xb2 21 ♗xh7+ ♖xh7 22 ♖f3+ ♗f7 23 ♗xf7+ 1-0


Seirawan-D.Gurevich, USA Ch (Estes Park) 1986.

8 b3 g6 9 ♗b2 ♗g7 10 ♗e2 0-0 11 ♖c2 ♗h5 12 ♗xg7 ♗xg7 13 0-0 e5 14 dxe6 ♗xe6 15 ♖fd1 ♖c7 16 axb4 cxb4 17 ♗f1 ♗b7 18 ♗d4 ♗xd4 19 ♖xd4 ♗c5 20 ♗e3

White stands slightly better due to his superior pawn-formation and the pressure down the d-file, Chekhov-Annageldiev, Pavlodar 1987.

C)**5...g6 6 ♗fd2 (D)**

This position can also be reached from Section 2.6 but will be examined here. Of course, White has many other interesting moves at his disposal, but the text-move is my favourite. Here is an alternative: 6 axb4 cxb4 7 ♗bd2 (7 e4!? ♗xe4 8 ♖d4 ♗f6 9 ♖xa7 ♖xa7 10 ♖xa7 ♗a6 11 ♗e3 d6 12 ♗e2 ♗g7 13 ♗bd2 ± I.Sokolov-Van Wely, Wijk aan Zee 2004) 7...♗g7 8 e4 0-0 9 ♗d3 d6 10 0-0 ♗fd7 11 ♗b3 a5 12 ♗e1 a4 13 h3! ♖b6 14 ♗f1 ± Grivas-Riemersma, Gausdal 1993.

**6...♗g7**

White obtains a pleasant position after:

a) 6...♗a6?! 7 e4 d6 8 axb4 ♗xb4 (8...cxb4? 9 ♖xa6! ♗xa6 10 ♖a4+) 9 ♗e2 ♗g7 10 ♗c3 0-0 11 0-0 e5 12 dxe6 ♗xe6 13 ♗b3 (13 ♗f3 ♖e7 14 ♗f4 ♖fd8 15 ♖d2 ♗c8 16 ♗e1 ♗c6 17 ♗g5 ± Dao Thien Hai-Honos, Hungarian Cht 1995/6) 13...♖b6 (13...a5 14 e5 ±) 14 ♗a5 ♖fe8 15 f3 ♗d7 16 ♗d5 ♗xd5 17 cxd5 ♗e5 18 ♗h1 ♖c7 19 ♖a4 ♖ab8 20 ♗c4 ♖b7 21 b3 ± Grivas-Vandoros, Athens 1989.

b) 6...bxa3 7 ♖xa3 ♗g7 8 e4 d6 9 ♗e2 0-0 10 0-0 ♗a6 11 ♗c3 ♗b4 12 ♗b3 a6 13 ♗e3 ♖b8 14 f3 ♗d7 15 ♖d2 f5 16 exf5 gxf5 17 ♗a5

♟e5 18 ♖h1 ♜e8 19 f4 ♝g4 20 ♙g1 ♙d7 21 ♙f3 ♜h5 22 ♞d1 ± Grivas-Rama, Athens 1995.

7 axb4 cxb4 8 e4 0-0

8...d6? would be a typical mistake: 9 ♜a4+ ♞bd7 10 ♜xb4 0-0 11 ♜a5 ♞c5 (11...♜e8 12 ♙d3 e6 13 0-0 ♞c5 14 ♙c2 ± Grivas-Vaisser, Athens 1997) 12 ♜xd8 ♜xd8 13 ♞c3 ♙d7 14 ♙e2 a5 15 ♞d1 ♝g4 16 ♙xg4 ♙xg4+ 17 ♖c2 ± Grivas-Aligeorgiou, Athens 1997.

9 ♙d3


The aggressive 9 e5 is interesting: 9...♞e8 10 ♞f3 d6 11 exd6 ♜xd6 12 ♙e2 e6 13 0-0, Dao Thien Hai-Kumaran, Budapest 1996.

On the other hand, 9 f3 seems a little ugly. Black has no reason to complain after 9...d6 10 ♞b3 e6! (10...a5 11 ♙e3 a4 12 ♜d2! ♙b7 13 ♞d4 ♜a5 14 b3! a3 15 ♚a2 ♞fd7 16 ♞c2 ♞c5 17 ♜xb4 ♜xb4+ 18 ♞xb4 ♞xb3 19 ♖f2 ±) 11 ♙e3 exd5 12 cxd5 ♞xe4! (12...♞h5? 13 g4 f5?! 14 gxf5 ± Wessman-Vescovi, Katrineholm 1995) 13 fxe4 ♜h4+ 14 ♙f2 ♜xe4+ 15 ♜e2 ♜xd5 ♞.

9...d6 10 ♞b3 ♞bd7 11 ♙d2! ♞c5

The alternative is 11...♜b6 12 ♙e3 ♞c5 13 ♞xc5 dxc5 14 ♙c1! (evading the threatened ...♞g4) 14...♞d7 15 ♞d2 ♜f6 16 0-0 ±.

12 ♙xb4 ♞fxe4 13 ♞xc5 ♞xc5 14 ♙c3 (D)




White can claim a small advantage, as the black a7- and e7-pawns seem weaker than the white b2-pawn; note also that the exchange ...♞xd3 ♜xd3 almost always favours White.

14...♜b6 15 ♙xg7 ♖xg7 16 ♚a2

White has a slight advantage.

2.4 The 4...♙b7 Variation

1 d4 ♞f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♞f3 ♙b7 (D)



Black's main idea is to undermine White's centre immediately. However, this is easier said than done!

5 ♞fd2!

In my opinion, this move does not allow Black to achieve his aim. Now Black has at his disposal several tries, among which only Line F complements Black's previous move:

- A: 5...g6?! 61**
- B: 5...b4?! 61**
- C: 5...e6 62**
- D: 5...♜a5?! 62**
- E: 5...d6?! 62**
- F: 5...bxc4 63**

For 5...e5?! see Line B.

A)

5...g6?! 6 e4 d6

6...bxc4 7 ♙xc4 d6 8 ♞c3 ♙g7 9 0-0 0-0 10 ♚e1 also favours White as the b7-bishop is out of play.

7 cxb5 ♙g7 8 ♞c3 0-0 9 ♙e2 a6 10 0-0

Equally good is 10 ♜b3 ♞bd7 11 0-0 ♚e8 12 ♜c2 ♜b8 13 ♚b1 axb5 14 ♙xb5 ♙a6 15 a4 ♜c7 16 ♞c4 e6 17 ♙f4 ± Dao Thien Hai-Gal, Hungarian Cht 1993.

10...♞bd7 11 a4 ♞e8 12 ♚a3 axb5 13 ♞xb5 ♙a6 14 ♞c4 ♞c7 15 ♞a5 ♞b8 16 ♜b3 ♙c8 17 ♙d2 ♞e8 18 ♞c4

± Lutz-Bokelbrink, Germany tt 1987.

B)

5...b4?!

The idea of closing the centre does not occur so often in the Benko/Volga Gambit, particularly when Black's light-squared bishop has

already been 'developed' so as to bite against a wall of enemy pawns. The immediate 5...e5?! can transpose, but in that case White can also try 6 cxb5!? ♖xd5 7 e4 ♜f6 8 ♜c3 d5 9 exd5 ♜xd5 10 ♜f3 ♜d7 11 ♜c4 ♜b4 (Stolte-Hohner, Fürth 1998) 12 ♜e2 ±.

6 e4 e5 7 f4!?

White also retains a plus by opting for a quiet middlegame with 7 ♙d3 d6 8 ♜f1 (8 0-0 g6 9 ♜f3 ♙g7 10 g3 ♙c8 11 ♜h4 0-0 12 ♜g2 ♙h3 13 f4 exf4?! {13...♜fd7 ±} 14 gxf4 ♜g4 15 ♜f3 ♙d4+ 16 ♜h1 ♙xg2+ 17 ♜xg2 ♜h4 18 h3 ♜f6 19 ♜d2 ♜h5 20 ♜g4 ± Zierke-Windt, Germany tt 1988) with ideas such as ♜e3, 0-0 and g3 preparing f4, trying to exploit his spatial advantage.

7...♜e7

7...exf4!? 8 ♜e2 (8 e5 ♜xd5 9 cxd5 ♜h4+) 8...d6 9 ♜f3 ♙e7 10 ♙xf4 0-0 11 ♜bd2 ♜bd7 12 0-0 ±.

8 fxe5 ♜xe5 9 ♙d3 d6 10 ♜f3 ♜e7 11 0-0 ♜bd7 12 ♙f4 ♜g4 13 a3

White has the upper hand. Staniszewski-Kuligowski, Polish Ch (Wroclaw) 1987 continued 13...a5 14 axb4 cxb4 15 ♜a4 ♜d8 16 ♜b5 ♜c5 17 ♜xa5! ♜xa5 18 ♜xa5+ ±.

C)

5...e6 6 e4 exd5!?

6...bxc4 transposes to Line F2 and seems to be Black's best option.

7 cxd5 a6 8 ♙e2 d6

Playing in the spirit of the Modern Benoni with 8...g6 9 ♜c2 d6 did not pay any dividends in Almeida-Rodriguez Guerrero, Santa Clara 2004: 10 a4 ♙g7 (10...b4 11 ♜c4 ±) 11 axb5 0-0 12 0-0 ♜e8 13 ♜c3 f5 14 exf5 ♜xf5 15 ♙g4 ♜f8 16 ♜de4 ±.

9 a4 b4 10 a5! ♙e7 11 0-0 0-0 12 f4 ♜bd7 13 ♙f3 ♜c7 14 ♜c4 ♜ad8 15 b3 ♜b8 16 ♙b2 ♜a8 17 ♜d3

± Bellon-Rodriguez Guerrero, Malaga 2001.


D)

5...♜a5?! (D)

Black misplaces a second piece!

6 ♜c3

Equally good is 6 ♜c2 g6 (6...bxc4 7 e4 ♜a6, although not completely satisfactory, is



the only decent try) 7 e4 d6 8 cxb5 ♙g7 9 ♜c3 0-0 10 ♙e2 ♜c7 11 ♜c4 ♜bd7 12 0-0 ± Deak-C.Horvath, Hungary tt 2003.

6...b4 7 ♜ce4 ♜xe4

7...e6? 8 ♜xf6+ gxf6 9 g3 ♙e7 10 ♙g2 f5 11 0-0 ♜c7 12 e4! ± Grivas-Pantazopoulos, Athens 2004.

8 ♜xe4 g6

Or 8...e5 9 f4! d6 10 fxe5 dxe5 11 ♜g3! ♙c8 12 e4 ± Grivas-Vragoteris, Aghia Pelagia 2004.

9 ♜b3!?

9 g4!? ± is my suggestion, intending ♙g2, 0-0, ♜g3 and f4, e4.

9...♙g7

9...f5 10 ♜g3 ♙g7 11 e4 ±.

10 ♜e3 ♙a6 11 d6! 0-0!

11...e6 12 ♜f3!.

12 dxe7 ♜e8

Now:



a) 13 ♜d6 ♜c6 14 ♜xe8 ♜xe8 15 ♜d2 ♜xe7 16 e3 ♜e5 (16...♜d4!? 17 ♙d3 ♜b3 18 axb3 ♜xa1 19 0-0=) 17 ♜c2 b3+ 18 ♙d2 bxc2 19 ♙xa5 ♜f3+ 20 gxf3 ♙xb2 21 ♜d2 ♙xa1 22 ♜xc2 = Hoang Thanh Trang-Seres, Budapest 1996.

b) 13 ♜xc5 ♜xc5 14 ♜xc5 ♙xc4 15 e3 d5 (15...♙xf1 16 ♜xf1 ♜xe7 17 ♜e2 is also a little better for White) 16 ♙d2 ♙xf1 17 ♜xf1 ♙xb2 18 ♜b1 ♙c3 19 ♙xc3 bxc3 20 ♜cl ♜xe7 21 ♜xc3 ±.

E)

5...d6?! 6 e4 b4 (D)

White obtained a nice position after 6...g6 7 cxb5 ♜a5 8 ♜c3 ♜bd7 9 ♜c4 ♜c7 10 ♙e2 ♙g7 11 ♙f4 ♜b6 12 0-0 ♜xc4 13 ♙xc4 ± in de Carvalho-Lobato, corr. 1996.



Now, apart from the transposition to the note to White's 7th move in Line B with 7 $\text{d}3$ e5, White has also tried:

a) 7 a3 and here:

a1) 7... $\text{d}bd7$ 8 axb4 cxb4 9 $\text{W}a4!$ \pm .

a2) 7... $\text{d}a6$ 8 axb4 $\text{d}xb4$ (8...cxb4? 9 $\text{B}xa6$ \pm) 9 $\text{e}2$ g6 (9...e5 10 0-0 $\text{e}7$ 11 $\text{B}a3$ $\text{e}c8$ 12 $\text{c}h1$ \pm Fartmann-Kruse, Münster 1987) 10 0-0 $\text{e}g7$ 11 $\text{d}c3$ 0-0 12 $\text{d}b3!$ $\text{W}b6$ 13 $\text{e}e3$ $\text{B}ab8$ 14 $\text{B}a3!$ is slightly better for White, Agdestein-Benjamin, Reykjavik 1986.

a3) 7...a5 8 axb4 cxb4 9 c5 dxc5 10 $\text{e}c4$ g6 11 0-0 $\text{e}g7$ 12 $\text{B}e1$ 0-0 13 $\text{d}f3$ $\text{d}fd7$ 14 $\text{d}bd2$ $\text{d}b6$ 15 $\text{b}b5$ $\text{W}c7$ 16 $\text{W}e2$ with compensation, V.Jürgens-Pecheiva – Starr, Jakarta wom IZ 1993.

b) 7 f4 $\text{d}bd7$ and then:

b1) 8 g4!? g6 9 g5 $\text{d}h5$ 10 f5 $\text{e}g7$ (10... $\text{d}e5?$ 11 $\text{d}f3$ $\text{d}xf3+$ 12 $\text{W}xf3$ $\text{e}g7$ 13 $\text{e}e2$ $\text{e}d4$ 14 $\text{d}d2$ a5 15 $\text{B}f1$ 0-0 16 $\text{W}h3$ \pm Jimenez Alonso-Paolantonio, e-mail 1999) 11 $\text{e}e2$ $\text{d}f4$ 12 $\text{d}f3$ $\text{d}xe2$ 13 $\text{W}xe2$ $\text{d}e5$ 14 $\text{d}bd2$ a5 15 $\text{d}xe5$ $\text{e}xe5$ 16 $\text{d}f3$ $\text{e}g7$ 17 0-0 \pm Boissonnet-Paolantonio, e-mail 1998.

b2) 8 $\text{e}d3$ g6 9 $\text{W}e2$ e5 10 dxe6 fxe6 11 0-0 $\text{e}g7$ 12 e5! \pm (12 $\text{d}f3$ \pm Psaras-Andruet, Athens 1989).

F)

5...bxc4

This is the principled move, fully in line with 4... $\text{e}b7$.

6 e4 (D)

Now Black can choose between a solid but passive set-up or immediately attacking the white centre:

F1: 6...d6 63

F2: 6...e6! 63

F1)

6...d67 $\text{e}xc4$

Another good option is 7 $\text{d}c3$ g6 8 $\text{d}xc4$ $\text{e}g7$ 9 $\text{e}e2$ 0-0 10 0-0 $\text{d}fd7$ 11 $\text{e}f4$ $\text{d}b6$ 12 $\text{d}e3$ $\text{e}a6$ 13 $\text{e}xa6$ $\text{d}xa6$ 14 $\text{W}e2$ \pm Justo-Debray, Paris 2003.

7... $\text{d}bd7$ 8 0-0 g6 9 $\text{d}c3$ $\text{e}g7$ 10 $\text{B}e1$ 0-0 11 $\text{e}f1$ $\text{d}b6$

Now:

a) 12 h3 e6 13 dxe6 fxe6 14 $\text{d}b3$ $\text{d}h5$ 15 $\text{W}g4$ $\text{e}c8$ 16 $\text{e}g5$ $\text{e}f6$ 17 $\text{e}h6$ $\text{e}g7$ 18 $\text{e}xg7$ $\text{c}xg7$ 19 e5 \pm Chakov-I.Ivanov, Sofia 1995.

b) 12 a4!? a5 13 $\text{d}c4$ $\text{d}fd7$ 14 $\text{e}g5$ $\text{d}xc4$ 15 $\text{e}xc4$ $\text{e}a6$ 16 $\text{e}xa6$ $\text{B}xa6$ 17 $\text{W}e2$ $\text{B}a8$ 18 $\text{B}ac1$ $\text{d}b6$ 19 b3 $\text{W}d7$ 20 $\text{d}b5$ $\text{B}fb8$ 21 $\text{W}c2$ $\text{B}b7$ 22 $\text{e}d2$ \pm Grivas-Leko, Budapest 1993 – see Illustrative Games.


F2)

6...e6! 7 dxe6! (D)

White can also employ an interesting pawn sacrifice, either with 7 $\text{d}c3!$? exd5 8 exd5 $\text{d}xd5$ 9 $\text{d}xd5$ $\text{e}xd5$ 10 $\text{d}xc4$ $\text{e}c6$ 11 $\text{W}e2+$ $\text{W}e7$ 12 $\text{d}d6+$ $\text{c}d8$ 13 $\text{W}xe7+$ $\text{c}xe7$ 14 $\text{e}f4$ ∞ Z.Lehmann-Hajdu, Hungarian Cht 1993 or with 7 $\text{e}xc4$ exd5 8 exd5 $\text{W}e7+$, and now:

a) 9 $\text{c}f1$ $\text{e}xd5$ 10 $\text{d}c3$ $\text{e}e6$ 11 $\text{W}a4$ $\text{W}d8$ 12 $\text{d}b3$ $\text{e}e7$ 13 $\text{e}e3$ $\text{W}b6$ 14 $\text{e}e2$ $\text{d}c6$ 15 $\text{W}b5$ d6 16 $\text{d}a5$ $\text{e}d7$ 17 $\text{W}xb6$ axb6 18 $\text{d}c4$ $\text{e}e6$ 19 $\text{e}f4$ $\text{e}xc4$ 20 $\text{e}xc4$ 0-0 21 $\text{B}e1$ ∞ Dao Thien Hai-Gyimesi, Budapest 1994.

b) 9 $\text{e}e2$ d6 (9... $\text{e}xd5$ 10 0-0 $\text{W}d8$ 11 $\text{d}c4$ $\text{e}e7$ 12 $\text{d}c3$ $\text{e}xc4$ 13 $\text{e}xc4$ 0-0 14 $\text{B}e1$ $\text{d}c6$ 15 $\text{e}g5$ ∞ Deak-Morvay, Hungary tt 2004) 10 0-0 $\text{W}d7$ 11 $\text{d}c3$ a6 12 $\text{d}c4$ $\text{W}c7$ 13 $\text{B}e1$ $\text{e}e7$ 14 $\text{W}a4+$ $\text{d}bd7$ 15 $\text{e}f3$ $\text{c}f8$ 16 $\text{e}f4$ ∞ Jabot-D.Blair, corr. 1995.



7...dxe6

Dangers are posed, but only for Black, by 7...fxe6 (7...dxe4?? 8 exf7+ ♖xf7 9 ♖f3+ ♖f6 10 ♔xc4+ wins for White) 8 e5 ♘d5 (8...dxe4 9 ♖g4 ♘d2 10 ♘xd2 ±) 9 ♘xc4 (9 ♖g4!? ♘c6 10 ♘xc4 ♖c7 11 ♖g3 0-0-0 12 ♘ba3 ♘d4 13 ♔d2 ♖b8 14 ♔a5 ♘b6 15 0-0-0 h5 16 h4 ♖c6 ± 1/2-1/2 Krijgelmans-J.Claesen, Belgium 1996) 9...♖h4! (9...dxc6? 10 ♘c3 ♘d4 11 ♘e4 ± or 9...dxe7? 10 ♔d3 ±) 10 ♘ba3! (10 ♘a5 ♖e4+ 11 ♖e2 ♖b4+ 12 ♖d2 ♖e4+ 13 ♖e2 ♖b4+ 14 ♖d2 ♖e4+ 1/2-1/2 Nickoloff-B.Hartman, Toronto 1992) 10...dxb6 11 ♔e3 ♔d5 12 ♖c1 and White retains the advantage.

8 ♘c3

It is better for White to keep his pawn on e4, as 8 e5 ♘d5 9 ♘xc4 ♘c6 10 ♔e2 (10 ♘bd2 ♖c7 11 ♘f3 ♔e7 12 ♔d2 ♖d8 13 ♖c1 0-0 14 ♔d3 ♘cb4 15 ♔b1 ♘f4 16 ♖f1 ♖d7 17 ♖b3 1/2-1/2 de Carvalho-D.Dias, corr. 1996) 10...d4 11 0-0 ♔e7 12 a3 ♘xe2+ 13 ♖xe2 0-0 gave Black a satisfactory game in Ferrer Montilla-Vazquez Acevedo, corr. 1991.

8...dxc6

An alternative set-up is 8...dxb7 9 ♔xc4 ♔d6 10 ♖e2 0-0 11 0-0 ♖c7 12 ♘f3 ♘e5 13 h3 ♘f3+ 14 ♖xf3 ♔h2+ 15 ♖h1 ♔e5 16 ♖e1 ♖h8 17 ♔d3 ± Petzold-Wiedersich, corr. 1994.


9 ♔xc4

This is 'optically better' than 9 ♘xc4!?! ♖xd1+ 10 ♖xd1 0-0-0+, although White won quite soon after in Khlian-Sumaneev, Ozel 1996: 11 ♔d2 ♔e7 12 ♖c1 ♘g4 13 ♖e1 ♘ce5 14 ♔f4 ♘xc4 15 ♔xc4 ♔d6 16 ♔g5 ♘f6 17 f3 ♔e5 18 ♘a4 ♔d4 19 ♘xc5 ♔xb2 20 ♖b1 ♔c3+ 21 ♖e2 ♔c6 22 ♖hc1 ♔d4 23 ♘b3 1-0. As White seems able to parry all threats, this idea should be studied more carefully by prospective white players.

9...dxe7 10 0-0

An interesting alternative was seen in Koneru-C.Weiss, Budapest 2002: 10 ♔b5!? 0-0 11 ♔xc6 ♔xc6 12 ♖e2 ♖b6 13 ♘c4 ♖a6 14 0-0 ♖fd8 15 b3 ♘d7 16 ♖c2 ♔f6 17 ♔b2 ♘b6 18 ♘e3 ♔d4 19 ♖fe1. However, in my opinion Black's bishop-pair fully compensates for the weakened pawn-structure. The position seems to offer Black at least equal chances.

10...0-0 (D)




White has obtained a better pawn-structure, but on the other hand Black has developed harmoniously and controls the d4-square. My opinion is that White's structural advantage will tell in the end, but he should carefully tread among the tactics that Black can employ in the centre and on the d- and b-files. This is the kind of position that I would love to play as White, but also would not be afraid to play as Black! Some examples:

a) 11 f4?! ♖d7 (11...d4 12 ♔e2 c4 13 e5 ♘d5 14 ♘xc4 ♘xc4 15 ♔xc4 ♖b6+ 16 ♖h1 ♘xc3 17 bxc3 ♖ac8 18 ♔e2 ♖xc3 = Ippolito-Plaskett, Newcastle 1998 or 11...d7 12 ♘f3 ♘b6 13 ♔e2 ♖xd1 14 ♘d1 ♘d4 15 ♔xd4 cxd4 16 ♘b5 ♔xe4 17 ♘xd4 ♔c5 18 ♖f1 ♘d5 19 ♔f3 ♔xf3 20 ♘f3 = Ippolito-Kinsman, Lichfield 2000) 12 e5 (12 ♘f3 ♖xd1 13 ♘d1 ♘a5 14 ♔d3 c4 15 ♔c2 ♔c5+ 16 ♖f1 ♖fd8 17 ♖xd8+ ♖xd8 18 ♔d2 ♘g4 19 ♖e2 ♖ Kamprath-H.Frank, corr. 1996) 12...d5 13 ♘de4 ♘d4 14 ♔d3 ♖ad8 15 ♔b1 (15 ♖h5 g6 16 ♖h3 ♘xc3 17 bxc3 ♘e2+ 18 ♔xe2 ♔xe4 19 ♔e3 ♖a4 ♖) 15...f5 16 exf6 gxf6 17 ♖h5 ♖f7 18 ♘xd5 ♔xd5 19 ♘c3 ♔b7 ♖ Jelen-Mencinger, Portorož 1987.

b) 11 b3!? ♖a5 12 ♔b2 ♖ad8 13 ♖e1 ♘d4 14 ♖c1 ♖d7 15 e5!? (better than 15 ♘f3?!,

E.Peicheva-Kinsman, Gausdal 1990) 15...d5 (15...d4 16 f3! d6 17 d4e4 ±) 16 d4e4 dxc3 17 dxc3 ♖c7 18 ♗e3 ∞.

c) 11 d3! (this untested move is an interesting idea) 11...d4 (11...a5?! 12 d3 or 11...♗b6 12 e5 ♜fd8 13 ♗e2 d7 {13...d5 14 d4e4 ±} 14 d4 ±) 12 e1 (D) and now:



c1) 12...♗a5? 13 d4d4 ♜fd8? (13...cxd4 14 ♗xd4 ±) 14 ♗b3 +-.
 c2) 12...d4?! 13 d4d4 ♗xd4 (13...cxd4? 14 ♗xg4 dxc3 15 d6 ±) 14 ♗xg4 ♗xc4 15 d5! (15 d6?! d6 16 ♜ac1 d5! ∞) 15...f6 (15...d5 16 ♗xg5 ± or 15...f5 16 ♗h4 d6 17 d4f6 ♜xf6 18 ♜ac1 ±) 16 d6 ♜f7 17 ♜ac1 d8 18 d3! ±.


c3) 12...♗b6! and then:
 c31) 13 d4 ♜fd8 14 d2 d6! (14...e5 15 d4 ♗e6 16 d5! ♜ab8 17 b3 ± with ideas such as d3 and c4; e.g., 17...d5 18 ♗f3 dxc3 19 d4f6 ♗xf6 20 ♗xc3 d4 21 ♗a5! ±) 15 e5 d5 (15...d7 16 dxa6 ♗xa6 17 d3! ♗c4 18 e4! d8 19 d3! ± and 15...d8 16 dxa6 ♗xa6 17 d4e4 d6!?) {17...c4!? 18 ♜b1 d6!?!} 18 ♗h5 g6 19 ♗h6 dxe5 20 d5 d5 21 d5 d4 {21...f6 22 dxe5 fxe5 23 d8 d8 24 ♗e3 ±} 22 ♗h4 d4 23 d4 ± are nice and instructive variations) 16 d6 ♗xa6 ♗xa6 17 d4e4 dxc3 (17...d6 18 ♗h5 g6 19 ♗h6 dxe5 20 d5 d5 d5 d4 21 d5 d4 22 ♗e5 f6 22 ♗xe5 fxe5 23 d8 d8 24 ♗g5 ♜f8 25 ♗xe5 ±) 18 dxc3 (18 bxc3?? d2+ -+) 18...c4! 19 ♜b1 d5! and now White should settle for 20 ♗c2 = (rather than go in for 20 ♗a4?! ♗xa4 21 dxa4 d4 22 ♜f1 d5 23 a3 d7 24 f4 d3 ♠).

c32) 13 ♜b1! ♜fd8 14 d4 d6 (14...♗b4 15 d4 d6 16 d6 ♜xd6 17 a3 ♗a5 18 d4d4 ♜xd4 19 ♗c2 e5 20 f3 ±) 15 d5! (15 d6 ♗xd6! 16 d5 ♗f4 15...♗c7 16 h3 d4 17 d4f6 gxf6 18 d3! and although the position remains difficult to handle for both sides, White seems to have a very slight plus. Of course there is plenty of room for analysis and new ideas in this line.
 d) 11 e1! (probably the most solid line) 11...d5 (alternatives such as 11...♗c7 12 d5! or 11...♗b8 must be tested in the future) 12 ♗e2 ♗d4 (12...♗c7 13 f4!) 13 d1! (13 d5? ♗d7 14 f3 dxc4 15 ♗xc4 d6 16 a4 ♜fb8 17 ♗c3 dxb5 18 axb5 ♗d4+ 19 d1 ♗xc3 20 bxc3 ♜xb5 ♠ Srebrnić-Kuljasević, Nova Gorica 2005) 13...♜fd8 14 d5! and White retains a small advantage due to his better pawn-structure. Of course, this position is also quite difficult for both players. In such cases chess understanding decides.

1 d4 d6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 d3 bxc4 (D)

2.5 The 4...bxc4 Variation

1 d4 d6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 d3 bxc4 (D)



The most popular continuation. At the same time I believe that this move only helps White to establish a strong centre and to develop harmoniously. Of course, Black is also not lacking in ideas.

5 d3 d6

The immediate fianchetto by 5...g6 6 e4 d7?! (6...d6 transposes to Line C) 7 e5 d4 8 d4 ± is hardly preferable.

5...e6?! is not to be recommended as 6 e4 boosts White's opening achievements:

a) 6...exd5? 7 dxd5! (7 e5! is very strong; but not 7 exd5?! d6 8 dxc4 d7 9 h3 0-0 10 0-0 d8 11 b3 d6 12 d5 h6 13 d3 dxc4 14 bxc4 d7 15 d2 f5 16 d2 g5 17 f4 ♜b8 1/2-1/2


Bolduc-Angers, Sherbrooke 2004) 7...♞xd5? (7...♞xe4? 8 ♖e2 f5 9 ♞d2! ♞c6 10 ♞xe4 fxe4 11 ♖xe4+ ♙e7 12 ♙xc4+-; Black should play 7...♙a6 8 ♙g5 ♙e7 9 ♞c1 0-0 10 ♙xc4 ±) 8 ♖xd5 ♞c6 9 ♙xc4 ♖f6 10 ♞g5 +.

b) 6...d6 7 ♙xc4 ♞bd7?? 8 dxe6 fxe6 9 ♙xe6 ♞b6 10 ♙xc8 ♖xc8 11 0-0 ♙e7 12 a4 a6 13 a5 ♞c4? 14 ♖a4+ 1-0 Leitão-Oliveira, Guarapuava open 1992.

c) 6...♙b7 7 ♙xc4 exd5 8 ♞xd5 ♞xd5 (not 8...♞xe4? 9 0-0 f5 10 ♞e1 +-) 9 ♙xd5 ♙xd5 10 ♖xd5 ♞c6 11 0-0 ♙e7 12 ♙f4 ♞b4 13 ♖c4 0-0 14 ♞ad1 ± Villavicencio Martinez-Barrenechea Bahamonde, Dos Hermanas 2004.

d) 6...♖a5 7 ♙d2 ♖b6 8 ♖c2 (8 ♙xc4! ♙b7 9 ♙c1! ±) 8...♙a6?! (8...♞a6!?) 9 ♞e5 exd5 10 exd5 ♖d6 11 ♞xc4 ♖e7+ 12 ♙e3 ± Sauleda Roig-Palencia Morales, Calvia OL 2004.

6 e4 (D)



Now:

- A: 6...♙a6 66
 B: 6...♙g4 66
 C: 6...g6 67
 D: 6...♞bd7 69

Lines A and B are two significant independent options for Black, while Lines C and D are closely linked with one another, but I regard an attempt to omit ...♞bd7 as inaccurate and allowing White a definite advantage. D is the main line.

A)

6...♙a6 7 ♞d2

7 ♖a4+ ♖d7 8 ♖c2 1/2-1/2 was the conclusion of D.Bischoff-W.Schmidt, Bad Neustadt 1988.

7...g6

7...♖a5 is risky: 8 ♞xc4! (8 ♙e2?! ♞bd7 9 0-0 ♞b6 ♢ Willim-Moreto Quintana, Internet 2004 or 8 ♖c2 ♖b4 9 a3 ♖b7 10 ♞xc4 g6 11 ♙e2 ♙g7 12 0-0 0-0 13 h3 ± Kaidanov-MChess Pro, Boston 1995) 8...♙xc4 9 ♙xc4 and now:

a) 9...♞xe4 10 ♖g4! f5!?! (10...♞f6 11 ♖c8+ ♖d8 12 ♖b7 ♞bd7 13 ♞b5! ♞c8 14 0-0 ± or 10...♞xc3 11 ♙d2 ♞d7 12 ♙xc3 ♖b6 13 0-0 ±) 11 ♖xf5 ♞xc3 12 ♙d2 g6 13 ♖e6 ♙g7 14 0-0 ♞d7 15 ♞ael 0-0-0 16 ♖xe7 ♙e5 17 ♙xc3 ♖c7 18 ♙xe5 ♞xe5 19 ♙a6+ ♖b8 20 ♖xc7+ ♖xc7 21 f4 ± Tregubov-Hertneck, Saint Vincent Ech 2000.

b) 9...♞fd7 10 0-0 g6 11 ♙d2 ♙g7 12 ♞e1 0-0 13 ♞b1 is slightly better for White, Davies-Sievers, Hamburg 1995.

8 ♙xc4 ♙xc4 9 ♞xc4 ♙g7 10 0-0 0-0 11 ♖e2 ♞fd7 12 f4!

Less precise is 12 ♙g5 ♞b6 13 ♞xb6 axb6 14 f4 ± Drozdovsky-Roiz, Cannes 1997.

12...♞b6 13 ♞xb6


13 ♞e3!?! is also satisfactory.

13...♖xb6 14 e5

White has achieved a powerful position, Drozdovsky-Jobava, Cannes 1997.

B)

6...♙g4 7 ♙xc4 ♞bd7 8 h3 ♙xf3 9 ♖xf3 g6 10 0-0 ♙g7 11 ♖e2 0-0 (D)



12 ♞e1

Or 12 ♙d2 ♖c7 13 ♞ac1 ♞b6 14 ♙a6! ♞fd7 15 b3 ♞ae8 16 a4!?! (16 ♞b5!?! ♖b8 17 ♙c3 ±) 16...e6 17 dxe6 fxe6 18 f4 ± Kogan-D.Gurevich, USA 1982.

12...♞b8

12...♞b6 13 ♙b5 e6 14 dxe6 fxe6 15 e5 ♞fd5 16 ♞e4! ♙xe5 17 ♞xc5 ♖f6 18 ♞d3

♙d4 19 ♙c6! ♜ac8 20 ♙xd5 exd5 21 ♙h6 ♜fd8 22 ♜ad1 ±.

13 ♜b1

White's idea is b3, ♙d2 and f4 ±.

13...♗b6 14 ♙b5 e6 15 dxe6

15 ♙c6 ♗fd7! 16 f4 ♜e8 offers Black counterplay.

15...fxe6 16 e5 ♗fd5 17 exd6 ♜xd6

17...♗xc3 18 ♜xe6+ ♘h8 19 bxc3 ♙xc3 20 ♙h6 ±.

18 ♗e4 ♜e7

18...♜c7? 19 ♗g5 +-.

19 ♙g5 ♜c7 20 ♗d2! ♗f4 21 ♙xf4 ♜xf4 22 ♜xe6+

± Maksimenko-Danner, Graz 1998. It seems that Black cannot afford to surrender his light-squared bishop for the white knight, as it will prove difficult in the future to create activity.

C)

6...g6

As we have noted, Black needs to play an early ...♗bd7 in this line. In a lot of games Black has chosen to omit this move, but at the cost of allowing White a strong counter.


7 ♙xc4 ♙g7?!

7...♗bd7!.

8 e5! (D)

8 0-0 0-0 9 e5 gives Black the extra option 9...♗e8, as in Olsson-Arun, Kochin 2004.

B



8...dxe5

Black should try this, as 8...♗g4?! 9 e6! (9 exd6 0-0!? {9...exd6 10 ♜e2+ ± or 9...♜xd6 10 ♗e4 ±} 10 h3 ♗f6 11 dxe7 ♜xe7+ 12 ♜e2 ♜b7 13 0-0 ± Stavrianakis-Martić, Budva 2003) 9...0-0 10 h3 ♗e5 (10...♗f6 11 exf7+ ♜xf7 12 0-0 ±) 11 ♗xe5 ♙xe5 12 ♙h6 ♙g7 13 ♙xg7

♘xg7 14 0-0 led to a clear advantage for White in Perdomo-Pascolini, Olavarria 2004.

9 ♗xe5 0-0

9...♗fd7? 10 ♗xf7! ♘xf7 11 d6+ with 12 ♜f3 + to follow.

10 0-0 ♗fd7

Or:

a) 10...♗e8 11 ♜e1 ♗d6 12 ♙b3 ♙b7 (½-½ Leitão-Milos, São Paulo 2004) 13 ♙f4 ♜e8 14 ♜f3 ±.

b) 10...♜d6 11 ♜e1 ♙a6!? 12 ♜f3! (12 ♙xa6?! ♗xa6 13 ♙g5 {13 ♗xf7 ♜xf7 14 ♜e6 ♜d7 15 ♜xa6 ♗g4! ∞} 13...♗c7 14 ♗c4 ♜d7 15 d6 exd6 16 ♜f3 ♜g4! 17 ♜xg4 ♗xg4 18 ♙e7 ♜fb8! 19 ♙xd6 ♜b4 = Jovanić-Sermek, Pula 2001) 12...♗fd7 13 ♗xd7 ♜xd7 (13...♗xd7 14 ♙f4 ♜b6 15 ♙xa6 ♜xa6 16 ♜xe7 +-) 14 ♜e2 ±.

c) 10...♜b6 11 ♜e2 ♗fd7? (11...♗e8 12 ♜e1 ♗d6 13 ♙d3 ±) 12 ♗xf7! ♜xf7 13 d6 e5 14 ♜f3 ♙f6 15 ♜d5 1-0 Schebler-Kummerow, Essen 2003.

d) 10...♙a6 11 ♙g5 (11 ♜e1 ♙xc4 12 ♗xc4 ♗bd7 13 ♜f3 ♜e8 14 ♙g5 ± Hebden-Arkell, Isle of Man 1995) 11...♙xc4 12 ♗xc4 ♗bd7 13 ♜e1 ♗b6 14 d6! (14 ♗e5? ♗fxd5! 15 ♗c6 ♗xc3 16 ♜xd8?! {16 ♜c2} 16...♜fxd8 17 ♗xd8 ♜xd8! {17...♗cd5? 18 ♗c6 ± Sadler-Manca, Cappelle la Grande 1993} 18 bxc3 ♜d5! ♣) 14...e6 (14...exd6 15 ♗xd6 ♜d7 16 ♜d2 ±) 15 ♗e5 h6 16 ♙h4 ♗bd7 17 ♜c1 ±.

e) 10...♙b7 11 ♜e1 and then:

e1) 11...♜c7 12 d6! ♜xd6 (12...exd6 13 ♗b5 ±) 13 ♜b3! ♙a6 14 ♙xf7+ ♘h8 15 ♙f4 ♜b6 16 ♙g3 ± Dao Thien Hai-Szieberth, Hungarian Cht 1993/4.


e2) 11...♗fd7 12 ♗xf7! ♜xf7 13 d6 e6 (13...♗e5 14 ♙xe5 ♙xe5 15 ♙xf7+ ± Kallai-Loch, Germany tt 1994/5) 14 ♙xe6 ♜f6 15 ♙xf7+ (15 ♗d5 ♜xf2+ 16 ♘h1 ♗f8 17 ♙xf7+ ♜xf7 and now 18 ♗c7 ± is an improvement over 18 ♗e7+? ♘h8 ∞ S.Pedersen-Gunnarsson, Selfoss 2002) 15...♜xf7 16 ♜e7 ♜c4 17 ♙g5 ±.

e3) 11...♗e8 12 ♙g5! (better than 12 ♙f4 ½-½ D.Paunović-Lukov, Rio Galegos 1986) 12...♗d6 (12...♙f6 13 ♙h6 ♗g7 {13...♙g7 14 ♙xg7 ♘xg7 15 ♜e2 ±} 14 ♜b3 ♜b6 15 ♗g4! ±) 13 ♗c6! ♗xc6 (13...♙xc6 14 ♙xe7! ♗xc4 {14...♜c7!? 15 ♙xd6 ♜xd6 16 dxc6 ±} 15 ♙xd8 ♜xd8 16 ♜e2 ♙xc3 17 dxc6 ♙xe1 18 c7

♠f8 19 ♖xc4 + Khenkin-Marjanović, Athens 2000) 14 dxc6 ♗xc4 15 cxb7 ♖xd1 16 ♠axd1 ♠ab8 17 ♗xe7 ♗xb2 18 ♗xf8 ♗xf8 (18...♠xf8 19 ♗d5 ♗xd1 20 ♗e7+ ♗h8 21 ♗c8 + or 18...♗xc3 19 ♗d6 ♠xb7 20 ♠e8+ ♗g7 21 ♗f8+ ♗f6 22 ♠d6+ +) 19 ♠d5! + (19 ♠d7 ♗xc3 20 ♠e7 ±).

e4) 11...♗bd7 12 ♗xf7! ♠xf7 13 d6 e6 (13...exd6? 14 ♗xf7+ ♗xf7 15 ♖b3+ +- or 13...♖b6 14 ♠xe7 ♠af8 15 ♖b3! ♖xb3 16 ♗xb3 ±) 14 ♗xe6 ♖b6 15 ♗f4 (15 ♗xf7+!? ♗xf7 16 ♠e7+ ♗f8 17 ♖d3 ±) 15...♠af8 16 ♖d2 ♗h5 (16...♗h8?! 17 ♗xf7 ♠xf7 18 ♠e7 ± Jasnikowski-Protaziuk, Polanica Zdroj 2004) 17 ♗e3 ±.

We now return to the position after 10...♗fd7 (D):



This is the critical move, but anyway White seems to have a nice position, though it can become highly tactical.

11 ♗xf7!?

White can also choose:

a) 11 ♗c6?! ♗xc6 12 dxc6 ♗b6 13 ♖xd8 (13 ♖b3?! ♗xc4 14 ♖xc4 ♖d6 15 ♗e3 ♖xc6 16 ♖xc5 ♗b7 ♢ Jelen-Veličković, Skofja Loka 2000 or 13 ♗e7 ♖c7 14 ♗f3 ♗a6 15 ♠e1 ♠ad8 ∞ Balashov-Stein, Moscow 1971) 13...♠xd8 14 ♗e2 ♗e6! (14...♗f5 15 ♗g5 ±) 15 ♗g5 ♠ac8! (15...♗f8?! 16 ♠ac1 ± or 15...♗xc3?! 16 bxc3 ♗d5 17 ♗a6! f6 18 ♗e3 ♗xc6 19 ♗xc5 ♗f7 20 ♠fd1 ± Valdes-N.Gonzalez, Cuba 1987) 16 ♗f3 ♗xc3! 17 bxc3 f6 18 ♗e3 ♗d5 19 ♠fd1 ♗xf3 20 ♠xd8+ ♠xd8 21 gxf3 ♠c8 22 ♗xc5 ♗f7 23 ♠e1 e5 24 f4 ♠xc6 25 ♗xb6 axb6 26 fxe5 fxe5 27 ♠xe5 ♠xc3 28 ♠b5 1/2-1/2 Tunik-Fominykh, Minsk 1995.

b) 11 ♗xd7 ♗xd7 12 ♠e1 (12 d6?! 1/2-1/2 Damaso-Chemeris, Torres Novas 2005 or 12

♗e3?! ♠b8 13 ♠c1 ♖a5! ∞ Moskalenko-Fominykh, Alushta 1994) 12...♗b6 (12...♗e5 13 ♗f1 c4 14 ♗f4 ♗d3 15 ♗xd3 cxd3 16 ♖xd3 ♗f5 17 ♖d2 ♠e8 18 ♗e5 ± Docx-Weemaes, Belgium 2001) 13 ♖b3! ♗xc4 (13...a5 14 a4 or 13...♗d4 14 ♗e3) 14 ♖xc4 ± Malakhatko-Rakhmangulov, Alushta 1999.

11...♠xf7

11...♗xf7? 12 d6+ ♗e8 (12...e6? 13 ♗xe6+! ♗xe6 14 ♖d5+ ♗f6 15 ♗g5#) 13 dxe7 ♖xe7 14 ♗d5 ♗b6 15 ♠e1 +.

12 d6 ♗b6

Or:

a) 12...♗f6? 13 ♗xf7+ ♗xf7 14 ♖f3 +-.
b) 12...♗b7? 13 ♗xf7+ ♗xf7 14 ♖b3+ +-.
c) 12...♗e5? 13 ♗xf7+ and White wins after either 13...♗xf7 14 ♖f3 or 13...♗xf7 14 ♖d5+.

d) 12...e6?! 13 ♗xe6 and now:

d1) 13...♖f6!? 14 ♗d5 ♗b6 15 ♗e4 ♖f5 (15...♖d4!? 16 ♗xf7+ ♗xf7 17 ♗g5+ ♗g8 18 ♗e3 ♖xd1 19 ♠axd1 ± or 15...♖e5? 16 ♗xf7+ ♗xf7 17 ♠e1 ±) 16 ♗xf7+ ♖xf7 (16...♗xf7?! 17 d7! ♖xd7 18 ♖f3+ ♗g8 19 ♠d1 ♖e8 20 ♗h6 ±) 17 ♗xc5 (17 ♗g5!? ♖f5 18 ♠e1 h6 19 ♗f3 ♗c6 20 ♗e3 ±) 17...♗8d7 18 ♗e3 ± Izoria-Jianu, Iraklion 2002.

d2) 13...♗b6 14 ♗xf7+ ♗xf7 15 ♠e1 ♗8d7 16 a4 a5 17 ♠e7+ ♗g8 18 ♗g5 with a large advantage for White, Bosboom-S.Kristjansson, Hafnarfjörður 1999.

13 ♗xf7+ ♗xf7 14 ♖f3+!

14 ♗b5 ♗b7 (14...♗a6 15 ♖b3+ c4 16 ♖f3+ ♗g8 17 ♗c7) 15 ♗c7 exd6 16 ♗xa8 ♗xa8 ∞ or 14 ♗d5?! ♗b7! 15 ♗c7 (15 ♗xe7?! ♗e5!, Stohl-J.Petr, Pardubice 1995) 15...exd6 16 ♗xa8 ♗xa8 17 ♗f4 d5 with an unclear position.

14...♗f6

14...♗g8? 15 ♗d5 ♗c6 16 dxe7 +-.
15 dxe7

15 ♗e4!? ♗f5! 16 ♗xf6 exf6 17 ♗f4 ♖d7 (17...♗8d7 18 ♠fel and 19 ♠e7+ ±) 18 ♠ac1 ♗c6! 19 ♠xc5 ♗d4 20 ♖d1 ♗e6 21 ♠c1 ♖b5 ∞.

15...♖xe7 16 ♗g5 ♖e5! 17 ♗xf6 ♖xf6 18 ♖xf6+ ♗xf6 19 ♗e4+ ♗f5 20 ♗xc5 ♗8d7 21 ♠ac1

White retains a pleasant advantage.

Thus, White can claim an advantage after Black's incorrect move-order.

D)

6...♟bd7 7 ♟xc4 g6

Incorrect is 7...♟b6?! 8 ♟b5+ ♟d7 9 ♟d3! (with the idea e5 ±) 9...♟xb5 10 ♟xb5+ ♟d7 11 0-0 ±.


8 0-0

Not much is achieved with 8 e5?! ♟xe5! (8...♟xe5? 9 d6! ♟b6 {9...♟g7?! 10 ♟xf7+ ♟xf7 11 ♟g5+ ♟e8 12 ♟d5 ±} 10 ♟xe5 ♟xc4 11 ♟a4+ ♟d7 12 ♟xc4 ♟e6 13 ♟a4+ ♟d7 14 ♟b5! ±) 9 ♟xe5 dxe5 10 0-0 ♟g7 11 ♟e1 and then:

a) 11...♟d7 12 d6 (12 ♟g5 ♟b6 {12...♟b6? 13 d6 e6 14 ♟e7 ± Tozer-Weisbuch, Israel 1988} 13 ♟b5+ ♟f8 14 ♟e3 ±) with the initiative for White.

b) 11...0-0 12 ♟xe5 ♟d6! =.

8...♟g7 9 ♟e1 0-0 (D)



10 h3

White has obtained a spatial advantage and good chances to break in the centre with a well-timed e5 advance; taking the initiative on the queenside with a future a4 advance is also an option.

10 ♟g5!? is an interesting alternative:

a) 10...♟g4 11 ♟f1! ♟ge5 12 ♟d2! ±; the black knights are stepping on each other's toes.

b) The immediate 10...h6 is interesting. Then 11 ♟c1!? can transpose to the game, while 11 ♟f4!? is best met by 11...♟b8! (not 11...g5?! 12 ♟c1 ♟g4 13 ♟e2 ♟ge5 14 ♟d2 ♟c7 15 ♟f1 c4 16 ♟e3 ± Tal-J.Diaz, Biel IZ 1976).

c) 10...♟b8 11 ♟c2 h6 12 ♟c1!? (White has 'lost' two tempi, but Black cannot employ the ...e6 break any more as the g6-square/pawn would be very weak after dxe6 fxe6; it should be mentioned that any other move apart from 12

♟c1 or 12 ♟f4 only helps Black: 12 ♟e3 ♟g4! or 12 ♟d2 ♟g4 13 ♟f1 ♟ge5 14 ♟xe5 ♟xe5 ∞) 12...♟e8?! (this plan only helps White; Black must seek other options, such as 12...♟b6) 13 h3 ♟c7 14 ♟f4 ♟a6 15 ♟xa6 ♟xa6 16 e5! and White has an overwhelming advantage, Grivas-Tassopoulos, Athens 2003.

Returning to the position after 10 h3, Black has tried a lot of continuations. The most important are:

a) 10...♟b8 and now:

a1) 11 ♟b1 ♟g4! 12 ♟c2 (12 hxg4 ♟xc3 13 ♟e3 ♟g7 14 g5 ♟e5 15 ♟xe5 ♟xe5 16 ♟a3 a5 17 ♟d2 ♟a8 18 ♟e1 a4 19 b3 ♟d7 20 bxa4 1/2-1/2 Kantsler-Shevelev, Ramat Aviv 2004) 12...♟ge5 13 ♟xe5 ♟xe5 14 ♟f1 c4 (14...e6!? 15 ♟e3 f5 16 f4 ♟f7 ∞) 15 ♟e3 (15 f4 ♟d3 16 ♟xd3 cxd3 17 ♟xd3 f5!? ∞) 15...♟a5 16 f4 ♟d3 17 ♟xd3 cxd3 18 ♟xd3 ♟a6 with compensation for Black, Tkachev-Nisipeanu, France 2001.

a2) 11 ♟c2 ♟e8 (or: 11...♟b6?! 12 ♟f1 e6 13 dxe6 fxe6 14 ♟g5 ♟d7 15 ♟ad1 ♟h5 16 ♟d2 ± Altshul-Bogorads, Halle 2004; 11...♟b6 12 ♟b1 ♟e8 13 ♟g5 ♟d8 14 ♟f4 f6 15 ♟d2 ± Martić-Zlatić, Paks 2004) 12 ♟g5 h6 13 ♟f4 ♟b4 14 b3 g5 15 ♟d2 ♟b6 16 ♟f1 c4 17 ♟e2 ♟b5 18 ♟ed4 ♟c5 19 b4 ♟c7 20 a4 ± Nguyen Anh Dung-Zhang Pengxiang, Budapest 1999.

b) 10...♟b6 11 ♟c2 (11 ♟b3 a5 12 ♟f4 ♟a6 13 e5 ♟xc4 14 ♟xc4 dxe5 15 ♟xe5 ♟b4! 16 ♟xb4 axb4 17 ♟e4 ♟xe5 18 ♟xe5 ♟xe4 19 ♟xg7 ♟xg7 20 ♟xe4 ♟f6 = Savage-Kennaugh, Olomouc 2004 or 11 ♟b1 ♟a6 12 ♟xa6 ♟xa6 13 ♟f4 ± 1/2-1/2 Marin-Sermek, Cairo 2001) 11...♟a6 12 ♟xa6 ♟xa6 13 ♟f4 ♟ab8 14 e5 (14 ♟ad1 ±) 14...dxe5 15 ♟xe5 ♟xe5 (15...♟b4? 16 ♟xd7 {16 ♟h2? ♟xe5 17 ♟xe5 ♟b7! ∞ Schaffer-Zimmermann, Kassel 2003} 16...♟xd7 17 ♟xe7 ±) 16 ♟xe5 ♟bd8 17 ♟ad1 ±.

c) 10...♟b6 and here:

c1) 11 ♟b3!? ♟fd7 12 ♟f4 ♟b7 13 ♟d2 ♟e8 14 ♟ad1 ± Sand-Lauer, Dortmund 2004.

c2) 11 ♟b5!? ♟fd7 (11...♟d7 12 a4 ♟xb5 13 axb5 ♟fd7 14 ♟e2 ± Tunik-Sharapov, Minsk 1997) 12 ♟f4 a6 13 ♟f1 ♟b8 14 ♟d2 ± H.Grünberg-O.Lorenz, Würzburg 1998.

c3) 11 ♟f1 and here:


c31) 11...e6 12 dxe6! (12 ♟g5 exd5 13 exd5 h6 14 ♟f4 a6 15 ♟h2 ♟b7 16 ♟g4 ∞ Riisen-Wifsbeck, Oslo 2005) 12...♟xe6 (12...fxe6? 13

e5 ♖fd5 14 ♜e4 is much better for White) 13 ♜c2 d5!? 14 exd5 ♜bxd5 15 ♜xd5 ♜xd5 16 ♙e3 ±.

c2) 11...♙b7 12 ♜c2 ♜e8 13 ♙g5 ♜c7 14 ♜ad1 ± Tishin-Kryvoruchko, Dnepropetrovsk 2004.

2.6 The 4...g6 Variation

1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♜f3 g6 (D)



Black forgets about any adventures on the queenside and in the centre, and instead focuses on standard Benko Gambit development by fianchettoing his dark-squared bishop.

5 ♙fd2!?

Of course there are several decent options here (though 5 e4?! ♜xe4 6 ♙d3 ♜f6 7 cxb5 ♙g7 8 0-0 d6 9 ♜c3 0-0 ♞ Molnar-Pinter, Hungary 1973 is not one of them), but the text-move will be the basis of the suggested repertoire. White wishes to achieve a strong centre with 6 e4 and/or capture the black b5-pawn under favourable circumstances.


5...♙g7

Or:

a) 5...b4 6 a3 transposes to Line C of Section 2.3.

b) 5...d6 6 e4 bxc4 (6...♙g7 transposes to the note to Black's 6th move; the extravagant 6...♙g4? 7 f3 ♙d7 8 cxb5 ♙h6 9 ♜c3 a6 10 bxa6 ♜xa6 11 ♜c4 ± Herbst-Sparice, corr. 1997 can hardly suit Black) 7 ♜c3 ♜bd7 8 ♜xc4 ♜b6 9 ♜e3 (or 9 e5!? dxe5 10 ♜xe5 a6 11 ♙e3 ♜c7 12 ♜c4 with a slight advantage for White, Olszewski-Szwed, Laczna 2002) and White is ready for the a4-a5 advance; positions of this type are discussed in Line B3.

c) An interesting alternative is 5...♜a5!? (D), trying to prevent 6 e4, but the black queen turns out to be misplaced. White must however be careful!



c1) Quite interesting complications arose after 6 a3!? ♙g7 7 ♜c3 b4 8 ♜b3 ♜d8 9 axb4 cxb4 10 ♜b5 a5 11 d6 0-0 12 ♜c7 ♜a7 13 ♙e3 ♜xc7 14 dxc7 ♜xc7 15 ♜xa5 ♜g4! 16 ♙c1 ♜xh2 in Arkhipov-Kotronias, Moscow 1987. Black has compensation.

c2) No less interesting is 6 f3!? and 7 e4 as the black queen will always lose a tempo after a future ...bxc4 exchange, as White will meet this with ♜c3 and ♜xc4.

c3) 6 ♜c3 a6 (best, as 6...b4?! 7 ♜ce4 ♜xe4 8 ♜xe4 d6 9 f4 gives White a pleasant spatial advantage and promising kingside play) 7 e4 b4 8 ♜e2 (wrong is 8 ♜a4?! ♜c7 9 ♜e2 ♙g7 10 f4 0-0 ∞ Grotnes-Soloviov, Copenhagen 1991; now it is the white queen that is misplaced!) 8...♙g7 9 f4 and the position seems to be better for White due to his great space advantage. Practical tests are needed to confirm this conclusion.

6 e4 bxc4

This is probably best. Black has also tried 6...d6 7 cxb5 a6 8 ♜c3 (8 b6 ♜xb6 9 ♙e2 0-0 10 0-0 ♜bd7 ∞ Matić-Matijasević, Djakovo 2005) 8...0-0 9 a4 (9 bxa6 ♜bd7 {9...♙xa6 10 ♙xa6 ♜xa6 11 ♜c2 ♜fd7 12 0-0 ♜b6 13 ♜c4 ♜xc4 14 ♜xc4 ♜b6 15 ♜b1 ♜d7 16 ♙f4 ± H.Riedl-Weigert, Bavaria tt 1998/9) 10 ♙e2 ♙xa6 11 0-0 ♜b6 12 ♙xa6 ♜xa6 13 ♜e2 ♜a8 14 f4 ♜fd7 15 ♜f3 ± Judas-Osieka, Wittlich 1985) and now:

a) 9...axb5?! 10 ♙xb5 ♙a6 11 ♙xa6 ♜xa6 12 ♜c4 ♜d7 13 0-0 ♜e5 14 ♜xe5 ♙xe5 15 ♙h6 ♜e8 16 f4 ♙d4+ 17 ♙h1 ♜b6 18 ♜e2

♞c7 19 f5 ♙g7 20 ♙xg7 ♜xg7 21 e5 dxe5 22 ♜xe5+ f6 23 ♜e2 ± Santa Torres-Boada, Valencia 2000.

b) 9...♞bd7 10 ♞a3 (10 f4!? axb5 11 ♙xb5 ♙a6 12 ♜e2 ♙xb5 13 ♞xb5 ♞b6 14 ♞c3 ♜d7 15 a5 ♞fb8 16 0-0 ♞c8 17 h3 ♞a7 18 ♞c4 ± Medina-Ochoa, San Antonio de Padua 2001) and then:

b1) 10...♞e8 11 bxa6 (11 ♞c4 axb5 12 axb5 ♞xa3 13 ♞xa3 ♞b6 14 ♙e2 ♞c7 15 0-0 ± Orr-Mannion, Scotland 1993) 11...♞c7 12 ♙e2 ♙xa6 13 0-0 ♞b6 14 a5 ♞d7 15 ♙xa6 ♞xa6 16 ♞c4 ♞e5 17 ♜e2 ♞xc4 18 ♜xc4 ♜a8 19 ♜a4 ± Stolte-Gipslis, Senden 1999.

b2) 10...♜c7 11 ♞c4 h5 12 ♙e2 axb5 13 axb5 ♙b7 14 0-0 ♞fb8 15 ♙g5 ♙c8 16 ♜c2 ♞b6 17 ♞fal ♞xa3 18 ♞xa3 ♞xc4 19 ♙xc4 ± Lanzani-Podini, Chiasso 1991.

c) 9...e6 10 dxe6 (White can also try 10 ♙c4 axb5! {10...exd5?! 11 ♞xd5 ♞xd5 12 ♙xd5 ♞a7 13 b6! ♜xb6 14 ♞c4 ♜c7 15 ♙f4 ♞d8, Safarian-Switzer, Suncoast 1999, 16 ♙xd6 +} 11 ♙xb5 exd5 12 exd5 ♞bd7 13 0-0 ♞b6 14 ♙c6 ±) 10...fxe6 (after 10...♙xe6 11 ♙e2 d5 12 exd5 ♞xd5 13 ♞xd5 ♙xd5 14 0-0 White safely retains his material advantage) 11 e5! (almost forced, as after 11 ♙e2 axb5 12 ♙xb5 ♙b7 13 0-0 d5 as in Mollov-Benitah, Orange 1994 Black would achieve his aim, obtaining a strong centre as compensation for the pawn) 11...♞d5!? (White would be quite happy to face 11...dxe5? 12 ♙e2 ♙b7 13 0-0 due to Black's destroyed structure) 12 exd6 ♞xc3 13 bxc3 ♙xc3 (13...♜xd6 14 ♙b2 ♙b7 15 f3 ±) 14 ♞a3 and White keeps the advantage due to his better pawn-structure, as 14...♜f6 15 ♜f3! ♜xf3 16 gxf3 ♞xf3? (16...♙b4 17 ♞b3 ±) 17 ♙g2! ♙xd2+ 18 ♜e2! ± or 14...♙b4 15 ♞f3 does not promise Black an easy game.

We now return to the position after 6...bxc4 (D):

7 ♞c3


The immediate capture with 7 ♙xc4 is interesting: 7...d6 8 ♙b5+ (8 ♞c3 transposes to Line A) 8...♙d7 9 ♙d3 0-0 10 0-0 e6 11 ♞c4 exd5 12 exd5 ♙b5 13 ♞ba3 ± Stolte-Pop, Fürth 1998.

7...d6

Now White should choose between:

A: 8 ♙xc4 71

B: 8 ♞xc4 72



The delay in recapturing on c4 with 8 ♙e2 does not offer anything special: 8...0-0 9 0-0 ♙a6 10 f4 ♞bd7 11 ♜el e6 12 dxe6 1/2-1/2 Pekarek-Danek, Czechoslovakia 1990.

A)

8 ♙xc4 0-0 9 0-0 ♞bd7

This looks better than alternatives like:

a) 9...♞g4?! 10 ♙e2 h5 (10...♞e5 11 f4 ♞ed7 12 ♞c4 ♞b6 13 ♞e3 ± Joubert-Loukachev, France 2002) 11 h3 ♞f6 12 ♞c4 ♞bd7 13 ♙f4 ♞e8 14 ♜d2 ♞b6 15 ♙h6 ♜h7 16 ♙xg7 ♞xg7 17 ♞ad1 ± Bousios-Lakakis, Patras 2001.

b) 9...♙b7 10 ♜b3 (10 ♜e2!? ±) 10...♜c8 11 f4 a5 12 f5 ± Kaasjager-Kazantsev, corr. 1990.

c) 9...♙a6 10 ♜e2 ♜b6 11 ♞b1 ± Starke-Si.Maus, Germany tt 1990/1.

d) 9...♞fd7 10 ♜c2 (10 ♜h1?! ♜a5 11 ♞el ♞e5 12 ♙e2 ♙a6 13 f4 ♞d3 14 ♙xd3 ♙xd3 15 ♞b3 ♜a6 16 ♙e3 ♞d7 with compensation, Hubert-Stoeber, Germany tt 1994/5 but 10 ♙e2! seems to be best) 10...♞b6 11 b3 ♙a6 12 ♞b1 ♜c8 13 ♙b5 ♞8d7 14 ♞c4 ♞b8 15 ♙g5 ± Jeiter-Schnell, Germany 1983.

10 ♙e2


Black does not face any problems after 10 b3? ♞xd5 11 ♙xd5 ♙xc3 12 ♞b1 ♞b8 ± Tkachev-Katolikov, Tula 2000 or 10 ♞b1 ♞e8 11 ♜c2 ♞b6 12 ♙d3 ♞c7 13 b4 cxb4 14 ♞xb4 ♞a6 15 ♞b1 ♞c5 16 ♙b5 ♙d7 17 ♙xd7 ♜xd7 = Rihterović-Sekulić, Kragujevac 1995.

10...♞b6 (D)

Black's position appears secure, but White can obtain the advantage by forceful queenside play:

11 a4! a5

11...♞b8 12 a5 ♞a8 13 ♞b5 ♜d7 14 ♞a3 ♞c7 15 ♞el ♙a6 16 ♙xa6 ♞xa6 17 ♞dc4



$\text{Wb7 18 } \text{d2 d7 19 } \text{c3 b5 20 } \text{xb5 } \text{xb5 21 } \text{d3 } \pm \text{ Krebs-Ranegger, Austria 2002.}$

12 $\text{Wc2!?$

$12 \text{ a3 e6 13 dxe6 } \text{xe6 (13...f6 14 e5!) 14 f4 } \text{c8 (14...d5!? 15 f5! gxf5 16 exd5 fxd5 17 dxd5 } \text{xd5 18 d3 } \text{e5 19 f3 with compensation) 15 b5 de8 16 } \text{c2 } \pm \text{ f5? 17 d4! dxc4 18 } \text{xc4 fxe4 19 } \text{xe4 } \text{xc4 20 } \text{xc4+ } \text{h8 21 } \text{d3 } \pm \text{ Dragomaretsky-Kalegin, Moscow 1991.}$


12...e6 13 dxe6 $\text{xe6 14 } \text{d1 } \text{e7 15 } \text{df3}$

White has a slight advantage due to his better pawn-structure.

B)

8 $\text{dxc4 0-0 9 } \text{e2 (D)}$

Quite similar is $9 \text{ d3 } \text{bd7 10 0-0 } \text{b6 11 } \text{b1 } \text{dxc4 12 } \text{xc4 } \text{b8 13 } \text{c2 } \text{wb6 14 } \text{d2 } \text{g4 15 } \text{b3 } \text{a6 16 } \text{d4 } \text{wb7 17 } \text{b2 } \pm \text{ Doere-Bukal, St Ingbert 1990.}$



Now Black can choose between developing his light-squared bishop or regrouping one of his knights via d7.

9... dbd7

The other two options are thus:

a) $9... \text{a6 10 } \text{d3 } \text{wb6 (10... } \text{a5 11 } \text{d2 } \{11 0-0 \pm\} 11... \text{xe2 12 } \text{xe2 } \text{a6 13 } \text{xa6 } \text{xa6 14 } \text{e2 } \text{ab8 15 } \text{abl } \text{d7 16 } \text{g4 } \text{d7 17 } \text{hcl } \text{b5?! 18 } \text{xb5 } \text{xb5 19 } \text{b3 } \text{fb8 20 } \text{c4 } \text{d5 21 } \text{h3 } \text{dxc4 22 } \text{xc4 } \text{5b7 23 } \text{a4 } \pm \text{ Dobosz-Trauth, Zurich 1997 - see Typical Endgames) 11 0-0 } \frac{1}{2}\text{-}\frac{1}{2} \text{ Vokač-Mikhailchishin, Trnava 1988 although White stands slightly better and should play on.}$


b) $9... \text{df7 10 } \text{a4}$ (the standard idea, although $10 \text{ f4! } \text{b6 11 } \text{d3 } \text{a6 12 0-0 } \text{c8 13 } \text{a4 } \text{xe2 14 } \text{xe2 } \text{d6 15 } \text{a5 } \text{d7 16 } \text{d4}$ also seemed slightly better for White in Inkiov-Stanojoski, Skopje 1998) $10... \text{d6 11 0-0 } \text{b4 12 } \text{a5 } \text{a6 13 } \text{e3 } \text{c7 14 } \text{d2 } \text{fe8 15 } \text{fd1 } \pm \text{ Bellon-Braga, Benasque 1993.}$

10 0-0

Interesting is $10 \text{ g5! } \text{h6 (10... } \text{b8 11 0-0 } \text{b6 12 } \text{d3 } \text{c7 13 } \text{c1 } \text{d7 14 } \text{c2 } \text{fc8 15 } \text{b3 a5 16 } \text{a4 } \text{d8 17 } \text{b5 } \text{xb5 18 } \text{xb5 } \text{d7 19 } \text{d4 } \text{dxc4 20 } \text{bxc4 } \pm \text{ Grivas-Georgopoulos, Kalavrita 1998) 11 } \text{d2 } \text{b6 12 0-0 e6 13 dxe6 } \text{xe6 14 } \text{d3 } \text{d5 15 } \text{exd5 } \text{fxd5 16 } \text{dxd5 } \text{dxd5 17 } \text{c1 (17 } \text{f3 } \text{dxc3 18 } \text{xc3 } \text{xc3 19 } \text{bxc3 } \text{b8 20 } \text{a4 } \text{c7 21 } \text{abl } \text{fd8 with equality, W.Schmidt-Tringov, La Valetta OL 1980) 17... } \text{dxc3 18 } \text{xc3 } \text{xc3 19 } \text{xc3 } \text{wb6 (19... } \text{d4!?) 20 } \text{fcl } \text{fd8 21 } \text{b3 } \text{ac8 22 } \text{e3 } \pm \text{ Sveshnikov-Mikhailchishin, USSR Ch (Frunze) 1981 - see Typical Endgames.}$

10... a6 (D)

$10... \text{b7?!}$ proves completely misguided after $11 \text{ e1 } \text{a5 12 } \text{f4 } \text{b6 13 } \text{d2 } \text{df7 14 } \text{h6 } \text{dxc4 15 } \text{xc4 } \text{d5 16 } \text{e2 } \pm \text{ Haik-Doherty, Metz 1997, while } 10... \text{b6 11 } \text{d3 } \text{b7 12 } \text{a4! } \text{a5 13 } \text{c2 } \text{c8 14 } \text{d1 } \text{df7 15 } \text{d2 } \pm \text{ Nguyen Anh Dung-Nguyen Duc Hoa, Vietnamese Ch (Dalat) 2004 is not of much help either.}$



White seems to keep a small advantage, as the following examples demonstrate:

a) 11 ♖e3 ♗xe2 (11...♞a5?! 12 a4 ♜f8 13 ♜a3 ♞b4 14 ♗b5 ♗xb5 15 axb5 ♞b6 16 ♞e2! ♖e8 17 ♖c4 ± Antić-Balenović, Biel 1998) 12 ♞xe2 ♞b8 13 ♞b1 ♞b4 14 ♖c2 ♞b7 15 ♗d2 ♞c7 16 b3 ♜f8 17 ♖e3 ♖b6 18 f3 ♞d7 19 ♜fd1 ± 1/2-1/2 Petursson-Geller, Reykjavik 1984.

b) 11 ♗d2 ♖b6 (11...♞c7 12 ♜c1 ♜f8 13 b3 ♖e8 14 ♖h1 ♖e5 15 ♖xe5 ♗xe2 16 ♞xe2 ♗xe5 17 f4 ♗g7 18 ♜fel ± Dao Thien Hai-Ker, Singapore 1995) 12 b3 ♖f7 13 ♖a5 ♗xe2 14 ♞xe2 ♜e8 15 ♖c6 ♞c8 16 ♜ac1 e6 17 ♞d3 (17 ♞f3 exd5 18 exd5 ♖e5 19 ♖xe5 ♜xe5 ∞ Rashkovsky-Meshkov, Moscow 2002; White should then avoid 20 ♗f4? ♜f5) 17...exd5 18 exd5 ♖e5 19 ♖xe5 ♗xe5 (19...♜xe5? 20 ♗f4 ±) 20 ♜fd1 ±.

c) 11 ♞a4!? ♗xc4 12 ♞xc4 ♞b8 13 ♞a4 ♞b6 14 ♗b5 ♖e5 15 ♖h1 ♖e8 16 f4 ♖g4 17 ♗e2 ± Gausel-Røyset, Vadsø 1993.

Sämisch – Spielmann
Teplitz-Schönau 1922

1 d4 ♖f6 2 ♖f3 e6 3 c4 c5 4 d5 b5 5 ♗g5 bxc4 6 e4 ♞a5+ 7 ♖c3 ♖xe4 8 ♗xc4 ♖xc3 9 ♞d2 ♞b4 10 ♞xc3 ♗a6 11 ♞xb4 cxb4 12 ♗b3 ♗d6 13 dxe6 fxe6 14 0-0-0 ♗e7 15 ♞hel ♖c6 16 ♖b1 0-0-0 17 ♗a4 ♜he8 18 ♜c1 ♖b7 19 ♜xe6 ♗xg5 20 ♗xc6+ dxc6 21 ♖xg5 ♗d3+ 22 ♖a1 ♗c4 23 ♜xe8 ♜xe8 24 f3 ♜e2 25 ♜g1 ♗d3 26 ♖h3 ♗f5 27 ♖f4 ♜d2 28 h4 c5 29 g4 ♗d7 30 ♖h5 ♜f2 31 ♖xg7 ♜xf3 32 g5 ♜h3 33 h5 ♗g4 34 g6 hxg6 35 hxg6 ♜h6 36 b3 ♜xg6 37 ♖e6 ♜xe6 38 ♜xg4 ♜e1+ 39 ♖b2 ♜e2+ 40 ♖b1 ♖c6 41 ♜g5 ♜d2 42 ♖a1 a5 43 ♖b1 ♜d5 44 ♜g8 ♜h5 45 ♜d8 ♜h1+ 46 ♖c2 ♜h2+ 47 ♖b1 ♜h7 48 ♖c2 ♜h2+ 49 ♖b1 a4 50 ♜d1 ♖b5 51 ♜d6 ♜h1+ 52 ♖c2 ♖a5 53 ♜d8 a3 54 ♜d1 ♜xd1 55 ♖xd1 c4 56 ♖c2 c3 57 ♖c1 1/2-1/2

E. Grünfeld – Bogoljubov
Vienna 1922

1 d4 ♖f6 2 ♖f3 e6 3 c4 c5 4 d5 b5 5 ♗g5 h6 6 ♗xf6 ♞xf6 7 ♖c3 b4 8 ♖b5 ♖a6 9 e4 ♞xb2 10 ♗d3 ♞f6 11 e5 ♞d8 12 dxe6 dxe6 13 ♗e4 ♞xd1+ 14 ♜xd1 ♞b8 15 ♗c6+ ♖e7 16 ♖xa7 g5 17 ♗b5 ♗g7 18 ♖c6+ 1-0

Returning to the diagram above, we shall focus on:

5 ♗g5

Now we shall analyse:

- A: 5...♞a5+ 74
- B: 5...h6 77
- C: 5...exd5 80

Other moves seem insufficient for Black:


a) 5...♗b7?! 6 e4 ♞a5+ 7 ♞d2 (7 ♗d2?! ♞b6 8 e5 ♖e4 9 ♖c3! ±) 7...♞xd2+ 8 ♖fxd2! (8 ♖bxd2 also seems fine) 8...b4 9 ♗d3 d6 10 0-0 ♖bd7 11 f4 ♗e7 12 ♖f3 ± Grünfeld-Michel, Margate 1923.

b) 5...bxc4?! 6 ♖c3 (6 e4 ♞a5+ 7 ♗d2 ♞b6 8 ♖c3 ♗a6 9 ♖e5 exd5 10 exd5 ♗d6! 11 ♖xc4 ♗xc4 12 ♗xc4 0-0 13 0-0 ♗e5 14 ♞c2 d6 15 ♜ae1 ± Umansky-Sek, corr. 1993) 6...d6 7 e4 e5 8 ♖d2 ♗e7 9 ♖xc4 0-0 10 ♗e2 gives White a large advantage, Moiseev-Przewoznik, Lublin 1979.

c) 5...b4 6 e4 d6 and now:

2.7 The Blumenfeld Gambit

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♖f3 e6 (D)



This is the starting position of the Blumenfeld Gambit which, although considered to be a separate opening system, will be covered here as it can also arise from a Benko/Volga Gambit move-order. In my opinion it is more prudent for White not to accept (once again!) the pawn offered, as after 5 dxe6 fxe6 6 cxb5 d5 Black's strong centre and easy development provide as least good practical compensation for the pawn.


For historical reasons, the first known games with the Blumenfeld Gambit (where White followed our suggested repertoire) follow:

c1) ECO suggests the simple 7 ♙d3 , giving 7...h6 8 ♜xf6 ♞xf6 9 e5! dxe5 10 ♙e4 ♞f4 11 ♜bd2 f5 12 g3 ♞g4 13 h3 ♞h5 14 g4! \pm Vladimir-mirov-Tashkhodzhaev, Tashkent 1987, and appears to be right, but Black should instead stay passive with 7... ♙e7 8 dxe6 ♙xe6 9 0-0 \pm (not 9 e5? dxe5 10 ♜xf6 ♙xf6 11 ♙e4 ♜d7 \mp).

c2) 7 a3!? h6 8 ♜xf6 ♞xf6 9 ♞c2 ♜d7 10 axb4 cxb4 11 c5!? exd5 (11...dxc5 12 ♙b5 exd5 13 0-0 gives White compensation) 12 ♙b5 (12 exd5 dxc5 13 ♙b5 ♙d6 with compensation) 12...dxe4 13 ♞xe4+ ♞e7 14 ♜bd2 d5 15 ♞xe7+ ♙e7 16 ♙c6 \pm M.Gurevich-Alburt, Philadelphia 1989.

A)

5... ♞a5+ (D)



6 ♞d2

White's alternatives do not seem, at the moment, to promise any advantage, but these lines are complex and have not attracted much attention, and thus new ideas may possibly change the current assessment:

a) 6 ♙d2 ♞b6 7 ♜c3 bxc4 8 e4 ♙a6 9 ♞c2 ?! (9 ♜e5 !) 9...exd5 10 e5?! ♞e6 11 0-0-0 ♜e4 ! \mp Plachetka-Przewoznik, Polanica Zdroj 1980.

b) 6 ♜c3 and then:

b1) 6...b4 7 ♜xf6 gxf6 8 ♜e4 ♙e7 (8...b3+?! 9 ♜c3 ! bxa2 10 ♞xa2 ♞b4 11 e4 ♞g8 12 g3! \pm C.Ionescu-Kogan, Manresa 1997 or 8...f5?! 9 ♜f6+ ♞e7 10 ♞d2 ! h6 11 ♜h5 \pm) 9 dxe6 fxe6 10 ♜d6+ ♙xd6 11 ♞xd6 ♜c6 12 e3 is slightly better for White.

b2) 6... ♜e4 and now:

b21) 7 cxb5!? is interesting: 7... ♜xc3 8 bxc3 ♞xc3+ 9 ♙d2 ♞c4 ! 10 dxe6 ♞xe6 11 g3 (11

♜g5 !? ♞e5 12 ♞c1 \pm) 11... ♙b7 12 ♙g2 d5 13 ♙c3 \pm Danielian-Notkin, Russia 1992.

b22) 7 ♙d2 ♜xd2 8 ♞xd2 (8 ♜xd2 b4 9 ♜cb1 {9 ♜ce4 !? d6 10 f4 ∞) 9...d6 with the idea ...e5 =) and then:

b221) 8...bxc4?! 9 e4 ♙e7 (9... ♙a6 ?! 10 ♜e5 ! ♞b4 11 a3 ♞b3 12 ♙e2 d6 13 ♙d1 ♞b6 14 ♙a4+ \mp Gralka-Przewoznik, Gdynia 1982 or 9...d6 10 e5! dxe5 11 ♙xc4 ♙a6 12 ♙xa6 ♞xa6 13 0-0-0 f6 14 dxe6 ♞xe6 15 ♞d8+ ♞f7 16 ♞b1 \pm Akhmylovskaya-Pihajlić, Tbilisi 1982) 10 ♙xc4 ♙a6 11 ♜b5 ♞b6 12 a4 0-0 13 0-0 exd5 14 exd5 d6 15 ♞fe1 ♙f6 16 ♞f4 \pm Borisov-Barash, corr. 1984.

b222) 8...b4! 9 ♜e4 (9 ♜d1 d6! 10 dxe6 {10 e4!? with the idea ♜e3 is an interesting alternative) 10...fxe6 11 g3 ♜c6 ! 12 ♙g2 ♞b8 13 0-0 ♙e7 14 ♞f4 ♞c7 = Lugovoi-Smagin, Elista 1995) 9... ♙e7 and here:

b2221) 10 e3 0-0 11 ♙d3 (11 d6?! ♙d8 ! \mp Van Wely-I.Sokolov, Wijk aan Zee 1994 or 11 ♙e2 ♙b7 12 0-0 exd5 13 cxd5 d6 14 a3 ♜d7 15 ♞fc1 ♞b6 ∞) 11...exd5 12 cxd5 d6 ∞ .

b2222) 10 ♜g3 d6 11 e4 ♜d7 (11...0-0 12 ♙d3 exd5 13 exd5 ♙g4 14 ♞f4 ! ♙xf3 15 gxf3! ♞d8 16 ♜f5 g6 17 ♞g1 ♜d7 18 0-0-0 ∞ Manninen-Gausel, Östersund Z 1992) 12 dxe6 fxe6 13 e5!? (13 ♜h5 0-0 14 ♜f4 ♜f6 15 ♜g5 ♜g4 16 ♜gx6 ♙xe6 17 ♜xe6 ♞xf2 18 ♙e2 ∞) 13... ♜xe5 14 ♜xe5 dxe5 15 ♙d3 ! with compensation, Manninen-T.Ernst, Östersund Z 1992.

c) 6 ♜bd2 and then:


c1) 6... ♜e4 ?! 7 ♞c2 ♜xg5 8 ♜xg5 ♙e7 9 ♜ge4 \pm .

c2) 6... ♙e7 ?! is also poor: 7 e4! (7 dxe6 fxe6 8 cxb5 a6 9 e4! ♜xe4 ? {9...axb5 10 e5 ♜d5 11 ♙d3 ♜c6 \pm) 10 ♙xe7 ♞xe7 11 ♞c2 ! \pm Speelman-Alburt, London (5) 1986) 7... ♜xe4 8 b4 ♞xb4 9 ♞b1 ♞c3 (9... ♜c3 10 ♞xb4 ♜xd1 11 ♞b3 ♙xg5 12 ♜xg5 exd5 13 ♙xd1 bxc4 14 ♞e3+ \pm) 10 ♞b3 ♞a5 (10... ♙xg5 11 ♞xc3 ♜xc3 {11... ♙xd2+ ? 12 ♜xd2 ♜xc3 13 ♞f3+ \mp) 12 ♞c2 ♙xd2+ 13 ♜xd2 b4 14 ♜e4 ♜xe4 15 ♞xe4 ♙b7 16 ♞e5 ♜a6 {16...0-0 17 ♞c7 ♙a6 18 ♞xc5 ♞c8 19 ♞xb4 \pm } 17 ♞xg7 0-0-0 18 d6 \pm) 11 ♞xb5 ♞c3 12 ♞b3 ♞a5 13 ♙xe7 ♞xe7 (13... ♜xd2 ? 14 ♜xd2 ♞xe7 15 ♞g4 ! g6 16 ♞h4+ ♞e8 17 dxe6 fxe6 18 ♙d3 \mp Komarov-Belotelov, Qawra 1998) 14 ♙d3 ♜f6 (or 14... ♜xd2 15 ♜xd2 ♜a6 16 ♞g4 \pm) 15 0-0 d6 16 ♙e4 ! exd5 17 ♙xd5 ♜xd5 18 cxd5 ♞d8 19

♠e1+ ♜f8 20 ♠be3 ♙d7 21 ♚c4 ♙b5 22 ♚fd2 ±.

c3) 6...bxc4 7 ♙xf6 gxf6 8 e4 ♙g8! (White won a brilliant game after 8...f5?! in L.Spassov-Manolov, Primorsko 1975 – see Illustrative Games) 9 g3 ♙a6 10 ♚c2 ♙h6 11 ♙xc4 (11 ♙g2 e5 12 ♚h4 d6 13 ♚f5 ♚xd2+ 14 ♚xd2 ♙xd2+ 15 ♚xd2 ♚d7 16 ♠hc1 ♚c7 17 ♙f1 ♙c8 18 ♚e3 ♚d7 19 ♙xc4 a5 =) 11...♙xc4 12 ♚xc4 ♚a6 13 0-0 ♙xd2 14 ♚xd2 ♚xd2 15 ♚xa6 ♚xb2 16 ♠ab1 ♚e5 17 d6 (17 ♚a4 ♙g4 18 f3 ♠xg3+ =) 17...♚f8 18 ♠b7 ♙d8 19 ♚xa7 (19 ♠xd7 ♠xd7 20 ♚c8+ ♚g7 21 ♚xd7 ♠b8 =) 19...♚g7 20 ♚d3 c4 21 ♚xc4 ♚xd6 = Agama-liev-Sharapov, Polanica Zdroj 2000.

We now return to 6 ♚d2 (D):



6...♚xd2+ 7 ♚bxd2

Not much is achieved by 7 ♚fxd2:

a) 7...bxc4 8 ♙xf6 gxf6 9 ♚c3 (9 e4 ♚a6 10 ♙xc4 ♠b8 11 ♚c3 ♠xb2 12 0-0-0 ♠b8 13 ♚b5 with compensation, Lukov-Przewoznik, Naleczow 1980) 9...♙b7 10 e4 ♙g8 11 ♚xc4 f5 12 ♚a5 (12 ♚b5 ♚d8 13 ♚bd6 ♙xd6 14 ♚xd6 ♚c7) 12...♙a6 13 exf5 exf5 14 g3 f4 15 0-0-0 ♙xf1 16 ♠hxf1 d6 17 ♚c2 ♚a6 18 a3 ♚d7 19 ♚c4 ± M.Röder-Ronchetti, Lido Estensi 2003.

b) 7...♚a6 8 dxe6 fxe6 9 cxb5 ♚b4 10 ♙xf6 gxf6 11 ♚d1 a6 12 e4 axb5 13 ♚c3 ♙g8 14 g3 ♙b7 15 ♙xb5 f5 ∞ Kožul-Sermek, Ljubljana 1997.

c) 7...♙e7 8 dxe6 fxe6 9 cxb5 ♙b7 10 ♚c3 d5 11 e4 ♚bd7 12 f3 h6 13 ♙f4 0-0 14 ♙g3 ♚h5 15 ♙f2 ♚e5 16 ♚b3 ♠ac8 17 exd5 exd5 18 0-0-0 d4 ∞ Matveeva-Maksimović, Herceg Novi 1999.

Now Black can choose between:

- A1: 7...exd5 75
- A2: 7...bxc4 75

A1)

7...exd5 8 ♙xf6 gxf6 9 cxd5 ♚a6 10 e4

An interesting alternative is 10 0-0-0!? ♚b4 11 e4!? (11 ♚e4 ♚xa2+ 12 ♚b1 ♚b4 13 d6 ♙b7 14 ♚xf6+ ♚d8 15 ♚e5 is also good for White, as in Zsu.Polgar-D.Gurevich, Beersheba 1989) 11...♚xa2+ 12 ♚b1 ♚b4 13 ♙xb5 ±.


10...♠b8

Nothing is gained by 10...♚b4 11 ♚d1!? (11 0-0-0 transposes to the previous note) 11...♠b8 12 a3 ♚a6 13 a4 ♚c7 (13...b4 14 ♚h4 ±) 14 axb5 ♚xb5 15 ♚c2 a6 16 ♙d3 ±.

11 ♙e2 ♚c7 12 0-0 ♙d6

White keeps a small but stable advantage even after 12...d6 13 a4 bxa4 14 ♠xa4 a6 15 ♚c4 ♙d7 16 ♠a2 ±, but Black should probably prefer this to the text.

13 a4 (D)



After 13...a6 14 axb5 axb5 (Dautov-Lobron, Bad Homburg 1998) 15 ♚h4! White holds the advantage, because both 15...♙e5 16 ♠a7 ♚d8 (16...♠b7 17 ♠fa1 ♚d8 18 ♠xb7 ♙xb7 19 ♚f5 ±) 17 ♚f5 ♙xb2 18 ♠b1 ♙e5 19 ♚c4 b4 20 ♚xe5 fxe5 21 ♠a5 ± and 15...♙f4 16 ♚b3! c4 (16...d6 17 ♠a7 ♚d8 18 ♚a5 ♙d7 19 ♙h5 ±) 17 ♚d4 ♙e5 18 ♚hf5 ± are clearly insufficient for Black (analysis by Dautov).

A2)

7...bxc4


Black accepts an inferior pawn-structure but gains good counterchances by putting pressure on White's centre with a well-timed ...f5 break. White should play with accuracy in order not to spoil his position.

8 e4 ♙b7

8...♙e7? 9 d6! ±.

9 ♙xf6 gxf6 10 ♙xc4 ♖a6 (D)

10...f5?! 11 0-0-0 ♙h6 12 ♖b1 0-0 13 ♜he1 ±
Lukov-Semkov, Bulgaria 1977 and Savchenko-Gusev, Odessa 1991.



The last four moves have been more or less obligatory. White can now choose where to castle:

A21: 11 0-0 76

A22: 11 0-0-0!? 77


A21)

11 0-0 ♖c7

11...♜b8 12 b3 ♖c7 13 ♜ad1! ± Zsu.Polgar-Izeta, Bilbao 1987.

12 ♜ad1 (D)

12 ♜fd1?! ♜g8 (12...d6!? ∞ Dean-Thayer, corr. 1996) 13 ♖f1 ∞ (not 13 g3 ♜b8 14 ♖b3 d6 ♖ Kuligowski-Przewoznik, Lodz 1980).



Now:

a) 12...exd5? 13 exd5 ♙xd5 14 ♙xd5 ♖xd5 15 ♖e4 f5 16 ♖xc5 ±.

b) 12...♜b8 13 ♜fe1 d6 (13...♙e7 14 ♖b3 d6 15 ♖fd2 ± or 13...♙a8 14 b3 ♙e7 15 ♖f1

±) 14 ♙b3 ♙a6 15 ♖b1! ±/± (15 ♖c4? ♙xc4 16 ♙xc4 ♜xb2 ♖ Law-A.Martin, British Ch (Morecambe) 1981).

c) 12...d6 13 ♜fe1 (13 ♖b1?! should be met by 13...f5! ∞, and not 13...♙e7?! 14 ♖c3 0-0 15 ♜fe1 ± Koutsin-O.Alexandrova, Hlohovec 1996) 13...0-0-0 and then:

c1) 14 ♖b3 ♜g8 15 ♖a5 ♙a8 ∞ Oleksy-Kukawski, corr. 1990 and T.Halasz-Cziszar, Hungarian Cht 1996/7.

c2) 14 ♖b1!? f5!? (14...♙g7 15 ♖c3 is rather unclear but probably a little better for White) 15 ♖g5 fxe4!? 16 dxe6! fxe6 17 ♖xe6 ♖xe6 18 ♙xe6+ ♖c7 19 ♖c3! ±.

d) 12...♜g8!? (avoiding a future ♖g5 after ...f5 and at the same time eyeing the white king) 13 ♜fe1 (13 ♖b3? f5! { 13...d6? 14 ♖a5 ♙a6 15 ♙xa6 ♖xa6 16 ♖c4 ± Zivanović-Nen.Ristić, Smederevska Palanka 1981) 14 exf5 ♙xd5 15 ♙xd5 ♖xd5 16 ♜fe1 ♖f6 17 fxe6 fxe6 18 ♖e5 d6 19 ♖c6 ♖d7 ♖ 20 ♖ba5 ♖d5 21 ♜e4 a6 22 b4? ♖c3 0-1 Oberbeck-Haas, corr. 1996) and now:

d1) 13...0-0-0 14 ♖b3 f5 (14...d6!? transposes to line 'c1') 15 ♖e5 (15 ♖a5?! and now 15...fxe4! ♖ is superior to 15...♙a8?! 16 ♖e5 with an unclear position, Shapiro-Men, Philadelphia 1993) 15...♜g7 (15...f6 16 ♖f7 ♜e8 17 dxe6 dxe6 18 ♖d6+! ♙xd6 19 ♜xd6 ♙xe4 20 g3 ±) 16 d6 ♖e8 17 ♖xc5 ♖xd6 18 ♙a6! ♙xa6 19 ♜c1! f6 20 ♖xe6+ ♖c4 21 ♖xg7 fxe5 22 ♖xf5 ♖b8 23 ♜ed1 ± Petermans-Schepers, e-mail 1999.

d2) 13...d6 14 ♖b1 0-0-0 15 ♖c3 ♙g7! (15...f5? 16 exf5 exd5 17 ♖xd5 ♜g4 18 b3 ± Vlikov-Shtepa, Kaluga 1996) 16 ♖f1 =.

A22)


11 0-0-0!?

This is an interesting line. The white king protects the b-pawn and at the same time moves away from the trouble brewing on the g-file, where the black pieces (the b7-bishop and the rook soon to be on g8) are focusing. Another positive aspect of this move is that the white rook reaches d1 more quickly.

11...♜g8

Black does not wish to allow a future ♖g5 after the intended ...f5.

12 g3 ♖c7 13 ♜he1 (D)



13...0-0-0

Or:

a) 13...♖b8?! 14 ♖b1 ♗a6 (14...d6!? 15 ♖c3 ♗a6 16 ♖d2 ±) 15 ♗xa6 ♖xa6 16 ♖a3 ♖b4 17 b3 ♖c7 18 ♖c4 ♖a8 19 ♖c2 ♖b6 20 ♖xb6 ♖xb6 (20...axb6 21 a3 ♖b5 22 ♖d2 ♖a5 23 ♖c4 ♖a6 24 a4 ±) 21 ♖d2 h5 22 ♖c4 ♖b7 23 ♖d3 ± Bukić-Inkiöv, Banja Luka 1983.

b) 13...d6 and now:

b1) Not 14 ♖b1? 0-0-0 (14...e5? 15 ♗b3 ♗c8 16 ♗a4+ ♖d8 17 ♖h4 ♖b8 18 ♖c4 ♖b5 19 ♗xb5 ♖xb5 20 ♖e3 ± Sanchez Rodenas-Van Damme, corr. 2001) 15 ♖b3 f5! 16 ♖a5 (16 dxe6? ♗xe4+ 17 ♖xe4 fxe4 18 exf7 ♖g7 19 ♖h4 d5 ≠ Liedl-Miniböck, Vienna 1994) 16...♗a8 17 exf5 exd5 18 ♗f1 ♗g7 ≠ Gralka-Przewoznik, Gdynia 1982.

b2) 14 ♖e3?! 0-0-0 15 ♖a3 ♖b8 16 ♖d3?! f5! ≠ D.Blair-G.Smith, corr. 1996.

b3) 14 ♗b3!? 0-0-0 15 ♖h4 (15 ♖b1 ♖g4!? 16 h3 ♖g7 17 ♖h4 ♖g5 18 ♖g2 f5 19 h4 ♖g4 20 ♖e3 ♖g8 21 dxe6 fxe4 22 exf7 ♖g6 23 ♗c2 d5 24 f3 ∞ Bagonyai-Csiszar, Hungarian Cht 1997/8) and now Black should try 15...♗e7 rather than 15...exd5? 16 exd5 ♗xd5 17 ♗xd5 ♖xd5 18 ♖e4 ± or 15...f5 16 dxe6 fxe4 17 exf7 ♖g4 18 f3! ♖xh4?! (18...exf3 19 ♖hxf3 ±) 19 gxh4 exf3 20 ♖f1 ♗h6 21 ♖c2 ♗xd2 22 ♖xd2 ± – M.Müller-Kasperski, corr. 1990.

14 ♖b3!

14 ♖b1?! f5!? (14...d6 15 ♖c3 f5! 16 exf5 {16 ♖h4? fxe4 ≠ T.Thomsen-Fossan, Gausdal 1992} 16...♖g4 17 ♗b3 ♗g7 18 h3 ♖b4 19 ♖g5 ∞) 15 ♖e5 fxe4! 16 d6 ♗xd6! (16...f6? 17 dxc7 ♖xc7 18 ♖f7 ♖e8 19 ♗b5! ± Selin-Feoktistov, Tula 1999) 17 ♖xd6 f6 18 ♖xd7! (18 ♖d2? fxe5 19 ♖xe4 ♗xe4 20 ♖xe4 ♖df8 21 ♖xe5 ♖xf2 is unpleasant for White) 18...♖xd7 19 ♗xe6 ♖xe6 20 ♖xe6 ♖f8 =.

14...d6 15 ♖h4

White plans f4-f5 or ♖g2-e3 ±.

15...f5!?

15...♗e7!? 16 ♖a5 ♗a8 17 f4 f5 18 dxe6 ♗xh4 (18...fxe6 19 ♗xe6+! ♖xe6 20 exf5 ♗xh4 21 ♖xe6 ♖gf8! {21...♗f3?! 22 ♖d2 ♖gf8 23 gxh4 ♖xf5 24 ♖c4! ±} 22 gxh4 ♖xf5 23 ♖exd6 ♖xd6 24 ♖xd6 ♖xf4 25 ♖h6 ♗e4 26 ♖h5! ±) 19 gxh4 ♖xe6 (19...fxe6 20 exf5 d5 21 ♗d3 gives White a large advantage) 20 exf5 ♖xf4 21 ♗xf7 ±.

16 dxe6 fxe4 17 exf7 ♖g7

Now:

a) 18 ♖f5 ♖g5 19 ♗f1!? ♗d5! and now:

a1) 20 ♗h3!? ♗e6! (20...♖b7? 21 ♖d2 ±) 21 ♖xd6+ ♖xd6 22 ♖xd6 ♗xd6 (22...♗xh3 23 ♖f6 ♖f5 24 ♖xf5 ♗xf5 25 f3! ±) 23 ♖d2!? ♗f8! (23...♖d7? 24 ♖xe4 ♖e5 25 ♖d1! ♖e7 26 ♗g2! ♖xe4 27 ♗xe4 ± or 23...♗e7 24 ♖xe4 ♗xh3 25 ♖xg5 ♗xg5+ 26 f4 ♗h6 27 ♖e8+ ±) 24 ♖xe4 ♖g7 25 ♖g5 ♖xg5 26 ♗xe6+ ♖xe6 27 ♖xe6 ♖d5! =.

a2) 20 ♖xd5!? ♖xd5 21 ♗h3 ♖c7 22 ♖xe4 is slightly better for White, Chetverik-Csiszar, Budapest 1996.


b) 18 ♖a5! ♗a8 (18...d5 is met by 19 ♖xe4!) 19 ♖f5 ♖g5 20 ♗f1! ♖b8 (20...♗d5? 21 ♗a6+! ♖d7 {21...♖b8 22 ♖xd5 ♖xd5 23 ♖c6+ ± or 21...♖xa6 22 ♖xd5 ±} 22 ♖e3 ♗xf7 {22...♗h6 23 ♗b7! ±} 23 ♗b7 d5 24 h4 ±) 21 ♗h3 and White holds the advantage.

B)

5...h6 6 ♗xf6

Almost forced, but at the same time a logical move. Instead, 6 ♗h4 ♖a5+ allows Black the extra option of inserting ...g5 at some point.

6...♖xf6 (D)



Black has obtained the bishop-pair at the cost of allowing White a significant space advantage and easier development. White has chosen:

B1: 7 ♖c3 78
B2: 7 ♗c2 79

B1)

7 ♖c3 b4!

Outright bad is 7...bxc4? 8 e4 d6 9 dxe6 ♗xe6 (9...fxe6 10 ♗xc4 ♖c6 11 0-0 ±) 10 ♗xc4! ♖d7 11 ♗xe6 (11 ♖d5!) 11...♗xe6 (11...fxe6 ±) 12 0-0 ♖b6 13 a4 ± Chukaev-Chesnauskas, USSR 1961.

8 ♖b5 ♖d8!?

Knaak's idea. Previously, the inferior move 8...♖a6?! (8...♗d8?! 9 d6! ♖a6 10 e4 ±) was played:

a) 9 ♗d2?! e5 (9...g5 10 a3! g4 11 ♖g1 ♖d8 12 e3 ♖c7 13 ♖xc7 ♗xc7 14 axb4 cxb4 15 ♖e2 ♗c5 16 ♖f4! ±) 10 a3! (10 d6 ♗b7 11 e4 g6 12 0-0-0 ♗g7 13 ♗d3 0-0 14 h3 ♗e6 ∞ L.Popov-Bilek, Sinaia 1964) 10...♖d8 11 e4 ±.

b) 9 ♗c2 g5 (9...d6? 10 ♗a4! or 9...♗b7 10 e4 exd5 11 exd5 ♗d6 12 ♖xd6+ ♗xd6 13 ♗d3 0-0 14 0-0 ♖c7 15 ♖d2 ♖e8 16 ♖e4 ♗c7 17 f4 ♖d6 18 ♖g3 ♗ae8 19 f5 f6 20 ♖h5 ± De Wit-Wiggerman, Groningen 2003 but 9...e5!?! is an acceptable, though hardly better, alternative) 10 e4 (equally good is 10 dxe6 dxe6 11 ♗d1 ♗g7 12 ♗e4, L.Popov-Dieks, Wijk aan Zee 1974) 10...♗b7 11 0-0-0 ♗f4+ 12 ♗d2 ♗xe4? (12...♗xd2+ 13 ♖xd2 ±) 13 h4? (13 dxe6! ♗xe6 14 ♗e1 ♗e4 15 ♗d3 f5 16 ♗xe4 fxe4 17 ♗xe4 ♗xe4 18 ♗e1 ±) 13...♗d8 14 hxg5 ± 1-0 Behrmann-M.Scott, e-mail 1996.

c) 9 e4 and then:

d1) 9...♗xb2?! cannot be recommended: 10 ♗d3 d6 (10...♗f6 11 e5! ♗d8 12 dxe6 dxe6 13 ♗e4! ♗xd1+ 14 ♗xd1 ♗b8 15 ♗c6+ ♖e7 16 ♖xa7 g5 17 ♗b5 ♗g7 18 ♖c6+ 1-0 Grünfeld-Bogoljubow, Vienna 1922) 11 0-0 ♗d7 (Helling-P.Leonhardt, Berlin 1928) 12 ♗b1 ♗xa2 (12...♗f6 13 ♗a4 is also winning for White) 13 ♗a1 +.

c2) 9...g5 10 e5! ♗f4 11 ♗d3! g4 12 ♗d2 ♗xd2+ 13 ♖xd2 and now:


c21) 13...♖d8 14 dxe6 fxe6 15 ♗e4 ± Polugaevsky-Ljubojević, Manila 1975.

c22) 13...♗e7 14 ♖e4 ♗b8 15 ♖xa7 0-0 16 ♖xc8 ♗fxc8 17 h3 1-0 Van Gool-Abels, corr. 1989.

c23) 13...♗g7 14 f4 gxf3 15 ♖xf3 0-0 16 0-0-0 ♗b8 17 ♗e4 ♗b7 18 ♗he1 ± Nayer-Malakhov, Moscow 2003.

c3) Maybe Black should try 9...e5 10 a3 ♗d6 11 ♗e2 0-0 12 0-0 ♗b8 13 d6 ♗b7 14 ♗d3 ♗e8 15 ♗fd1 ±± Vescovi-Skembris, Copenhagen 1995.

9 e4 (D)



9...g5

Black has two major alternatives, the second of which should probably receive more attention in the future:

a) 9...e5 10 ♗a4! (10 a3 ♗b7 11 a4? a5? 12 ♗e2 d6 13 0-0 g5 14 ♖e1 ♗f4 15 ♗c2 b3 16 ♗xb3 ♗c8 17 ♗c2 g4 18 g3 ♗g5 19 f4 gxf3 20 ♖xf3 ♗e3+ 21 ♖g2 ♗d7 1-0 Krivoshei-Skorna, Leuterdorf 2000 was a bad continuation and a bad game, full of mistakes) 10...a5 11 ♗d3 (11 ♗e2?! d6 12 h4 ♗g4 13 ♗d1 ♖d7 14 ♖d2 ♗xe2 15 ♗xe2 ♗e7 16 0-0-0 h5 = S.Anderson-Annakov, Dallas 2000) 11...d6 12 a3 (or 12 0-0 ♗g6 13 ♖h4 ♗g4 14 ♖f5 ♗xf5 15 exf5 e4 16 f3 exf3 17 ♗xf3 ± Poivre-Michels, corr. 1997) 12...♖d7 13 ♗c2 g5 14 0-0 ± Schlanga-Lütke, Germany tt 1989/90.

b) 9...♗xb2?! 10 ♗b1 (10 e5 a6 11 ♗b1 ♗xa2 12 ♗a1 ♗b2 13 ♗b1 {13 ♗a4?! axb5! 14 ♗xa8 ♗c3+ ♖} 13...♗a2 14 ♗a1 ♗b2 1/2-1/2 M.Röder-Cmiel, Mittelrhein 1993 or 10 ♗d3 a6 11 ♗b1 ♗xa2 12 ♗a1 ♗b2 13 ♗b1 ♗a2 14 ♗a1 1/2-1/2 Jankowicz-J.Schaffer, corr. 1974) 10...♗f6 (10...♗xa2? 11 ♖e5! +-) 11 ♗d3! (11 e5 ♗g6 {11...♗f4? 12 ♗d3 ±} 12 dxe6 and now Black should play 12...♗b7! ∞ rather than 12...fxe6? 13 ♗d3 ♗xg2 14 ♗g1 ♗h3 15 ♗e4

+— or 12...♖xe6? 13 ♔d3 ±) 11...e5 (11...a6? 12 e5 ±) 12 a3! and although White seems to have good compensation (better development and the initiative) things are far from easy, as the closed character of the position does not help him. I was not able to find any practical example, nor a clear refutation of 9...♖xb2!?, so this move seems to be the most interesting try for Black.


10 ♔d3!? (D)

Or:

a) Only equality is promised by 10 h3! ♖xb2! (10...♔b7? 11 e5 ♖g7 12 ♖a4 a5 13 0-0-0 ± De Boer-Rogers, Wijk aan Zee 1985) 11 e5 with the idea ♔b1-a1.

b) White could also try 10 a3!? g4 11 ♔d2 ♖xb2 12 axb4 cxb4 13 ♔e2 ± Vokač-Rogers, Lazne Bohdanec 1994.

c) 10 e5! has scored excellently, and may well be better than the text-move: 10...♖g7 (10...♖f4 11 h3 ♔b7 12 ♖d3 g4 13 hxg4 exd5 14 cxd5 a6 15 g5 c4 16 ♖d4 ♖xd4 17 ♔bxd4 ♔xd5 18 0-0-0 ♔c6 19 ♔xc4 ♔xd4 20 ♔xd4 ♔xc4 21 ♔xc4 ♔c8 22 ♔xc8+ ♔xc8 23 ♔c2 ♔b7 24 ♔b3 a5 25 ♔a4 ♔c6 26 e6 fxe6 27 ♔e5+ 1-0 Blankenberg-Sexauer, e-mail 2001) 11 g4! ♔b7 12 ♖a4 a5 13 0-0-0 f5 (13...f6 14 ♔d6! ♔xd6 15 exd6 ♔c8 16 ♖b5 ♔a6 17 ♔g2 exd5 18 ♔he1 ± Malaniuk-Palatnik, Tallinn 1985 or 13...h5 14 ♔g1!) 14 gxf5! g4 15 f6 ♖g8 16 ♔d2 exd5 17 ♔g2 ± Adorjan-S.Farago, Hungary tt 1987. I cannot find an improvement for Black in the above, a fact which further emphasizes the significance of 9...♖xb2! in the previous note.



10...♔b7

The immediate 10...g4?! proves hazardous: 11 ♔d2 ♖xb2 12 ♔b1 ♖g7 13 0-0 h5 14 e5

♖xe5 15 dxe6 fxe6 16 ♔e4 d5 17 ♔e1! ♖g5 18 ♔b3 ± Milos-An.Rodriguez, Santos 2004.

11 e5!?

An interesting alternative is 11 ♖a4!? a5 12 ♖c2, which also looks better for White and deserves to be tested in the future.

11...♖g7 12 ♖a4 a5 13 0-0


Another good option is 13 ♔d6!? ♔xd6 14 exd6.

13...g4 14 ♔d2 ♖xe5 15 ♖c2

Portisch-Rogers, Reggio Emilia 1984/5. According to Rogers, White has full compensation for the pawn (Black's king is exposed!) and stands better.

B2)

7 ♖c2 (D)



7...b4

As in the previous line, this seems the most precise. After other moves White holds the advantage:


a) 7...♔b7 8 e4 b4 9 ♔bd2 e5 (9...g5? 10 e5 ♖f4 11 h3 ±) 10 g3 g6 11 a3 ♔a6 12 ♔h3 ± Dautov-Rogers, Bundesliga 1996/7.

b) 7...exd5 8 cxd5 and now:

b1) 8...♔a6?! 9 e4 ♔b8 10 ♔c3 c4 11 e5! ♖f4 (11...♔b4 12 ♖e4 ♖g6 13 ♖xg6 fxg6 14 0-0-0 ±) 12 d6 ♔b7 13 ♖d2! ± Liogky-Sher, USSR 1980.

b2) 8...c4?! 9 e4 ♔b4+ 10 ♔c3 0-0 11 ♔e2 ♔a6 12 e5! (12 0-0, Bukić-Ljubojević, Yugoslav Ch (Umag) 1972) 12...♖b6 13 a4 bxa4 14 0-0! ±.

b3) 8...d6 9 e4 a6 10 a4 b4 (10...bxa4 11 ♖xa4+ ♔d7 12 ♔c3 ±) 11 ♔bd2 (D) (the standard 11 ♔fd2!? ♔e7 12 ♔c4 ♔d7 13 ♔bd2 gave White a stable advantage in Lipnitsky-Tolush, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1950) and here:




b31) 11...g4? 12 e5! dxe5 (12...W7 13 Qc4! Qxf3 14 Qxd6+ Qd8 15 Wf5! ±) 13 Qe4 Wf4 (13...W7 14 d6 W6 15 Qc4 +- or 13...Wf5 14 h3! +-) 14 Qfd2! Qf5 15 Qd3 Qxe4 16 Qxe4 Qd7 17 g3 Wg4 18 h3 Wh5 19 d6! +- Chermine-Miles, Tunis IZ 1985.

b32) 11...Qd7 12 Qd3 (12 Qc4 g5?! 13 Qd3 Qg7 14 0-0 W7 15 e5! ± Shashin-Bastrikov, Leningrad 1967 or 12 Qe2 g5?! 13 Qc4 Qg7 14 Qfd2! 0-0 15 Qg4 ± Bobotsov-Szily, Busum 1969; Black must proceed with 12...g6 in both cases) 12...g6 13 Qc4 Qg7 14 0-0 0-0 15 a5 ± Pugachov-Kiselev, Katowice 1991.

8 Qbd2!

A new and untested idea. White refrains from the immediate e4, deferring it for a more appropriate moment. 8 e4 is not sufficient for an advantage: 8...g5 9 Qbd2 g4 10 Qd1 Qg7 11 Bb1 d6 12 Qd3 Qd7 13 Qe2 Qe5 14 0-0 h5 15 f4 gxf3 16 Qxf3 Wb6 17 Qxe5 Qxe5 18 Qh1 h4 19 Qd1 Qd7 (19...Wg7 20 Qf3 Qf4 21 a3 ∞ Am.Rodriguez-Martin Gonzalez, Biel IZ 1985) 20 Qf3 Qg3 ∞ Nikolić-Miles, Tunis IZ 1985.

8...g5 9 g3! (D)



White keeps a small advantage according to Dautov. His plan with Qg2, 0-0 and only then

e4, guarantees a healthy spatial advantage, while Black's bishop-pair doesn't seem to do much: 9...Qb7 10 Qg2! (10 e4?! g4 11 Qh4 Qg7 12 Bb1 a5 13 Qe2 h5 14 0-0 a4 ∞ Tunik-Abrashkin, Saratov 1993) 10...exd5?! 11 cxd5 Qxd5 12 Qe4! W7 13 Qd4! ±.


Line B2 is relatively quiet, in contrast to Line B1, which is full of tactics. The reader can make his choice based on style and personal preference.

C)

5...exd5 6 cxd5 d6

In my opinion the most accurate continuation. Instead, 6...h6 7 Qxf6 Wxf6 8 Wc2 (8 Qc3?! b4! and now: 9 Qb5? Wb6; 9 Qa4 d6 and ...Qd7 ♣; or 9 Qe4 Wxb2 10 d6 Qa6! with the idea ...Qb7 ♣) transposes to Line B2, while Black should avoid 6...Wb6?! 7 Qc3 (7 e4!? Qxe4 8 W2 f5 9 Qc3 Wg6 10 h4 Qe7 11 h5 Wd6 12 Qxe4 fxe4 13 Wxe4 Qd8 14 0-0 1-0 Goormachtigh-Moulin, Brussels 1986) 7...b4 8 Qa4 Wc7 9 Qxf6 gxf6 10 Bc1 d6 11 e3 Wb7 12 Qd3 ± Glowatzky-Hofstetter, corr. 1991.

The most important alternative is 6...Wb6+ 7 Qc3 Qe4! (D) (7...Qe7?! 8 d6 Qd8 9 a4 b4 10 Qd5 ± Razuvaev-V.N.Kozlov, Cheliabinsk 1975), and now:



a) 8 Wd3 Qxg5 9 Qxg5 Qe7 and then:

a1) 10 d6!? Qxg5 11 W7 12 Wxa8 Qc6 with compensation, Jimenez Clavero-Duran Leon, Malaga 1985.

a2) 10 Qe4 and here:

a21) 10...c4 11 Wd4 (11 Wd2 b4 12 Qd1 0-0 13 Qe3 ∞ Ermenkov-Barlov, Vrnjačka Banja 1979) 11...0-0 12 d6 Qd8 13 Wd5 Qa6! 14 g4 (14 Wxa8? Qc6 15 e3 b4 ♣) 14...Qc6 15 Qg2

b4 is unclear, Haik-Barlov, Vrnjačka Banja 1981.

a2) 10...b4 11 ♖b5 (11 ♜b5!?) 11...♗d8 12 d6 bxc3 13 dxe7 ♗xe7 14 ♜xc3 ∞ Meduna-E.Pedersen, Trnava 1985.

a3) 10 h4 b4 (10...h6? 11 d6! hxg5 12 dxe7 ♗b7 13 0-0-0 b4 14 ♜b5 ♖h6 15 hxg5 ♖xh1 16 ♜d6+ ♜xe7 17 ♗e3+ 1-0 Ikonnikov-Mehrer, Deizisau 1997) 11 ♜ce4 (11 ♜d1 h6 {11...d6!?) 12 d6 hxg5 13 ♗e4 ♜c6 ∞ Arnett-Klein, New York 1995) 11...d6 12 ♜d2 ♜d7 13 ♜c4 ♗c7 14 e4 h6 15 ♜f3 ∞ Cao-Seredenko, Kuala Lumpur 1993.


b) 8 ♗d2 ♜xd2 (8...♜d6?! 9 e4 b4 10 e5 ± or 8...♜xc3?! 9 ♗xc3 ±) 9 ♜xd2! b4 (9...d6 10 e4 and now both 10...b4 11 ♜c4 ♗d8 12 ♜b1 ♗e7 13 ♗d3, Browne-Ljubojević, Buenos Aires 1979, and 10...a6 11 ♗e2 ♜d7 12 0-0 ♗e7 13 a4 b4 14 ♜cbl ♗f6 15 ♜c4 ♗c7 16 ♜bd2 0-0 17 a5, Kuligowski-Ermenkov, Niš 1979, are pleasant for White) 10 ♜ce4! (10 ♜cbl?! is insufficient: 10...♗a6 11 e4 g6 12 ♗xa6 ♗xa6 13 ♗c2 d6 14 ♜c4 ♗g7 ∞ Petrosian-Sax, Nikšić 1983) and White stands better, planning ♜c4, ♜g3, e4 and f4. For example: 10...♗a6 11 ♗b3 f5 12 ♜g3 c4 (12...g6 13 e4 ±) 13 ♜xc4 ♗xd5 14 e3 ± Freiburghaus-Färber, corr. 1996 or 10...d6 11 e3 ♗e7 12 ♜c4 ± Genova-Pavlova, Bankia 1992).

7 e4 a6 8 a4

This seems better than 8 ♗d3 ♗e7 9 0-0 0-0 10 ♗d2 ♜bd7 ∞.

8...♗e7 (D)

Probably the only serious try, as 8...b4?! hands White the important c4-square on a plate: 9 ♜bd2 (9 ♜fd2 ♗e7 10 ♗f4 0-0 11 ♗d3 ♖e8 12 0-0 a5 13 ♜c4 ♗f8 14 ♜bd2 ♗a6 15 ♗f3 ♖a7 16 ♖fe1 g6 17 h3 ♖d7 18 ♜b2 ♗xc4 19 ♗xc4 ± Vasquez-Gonzalez Custodio, Seville 2003) 9...♗e7 (9...h6 10 ♗xf6 ♗xf6 11 ♗e2 ♜d7 12 ♜c4 g6 13 0-0 ♗g7 14 ♜fd2 0-0 15 ♗g4 ♗e7 16 ♗c2 ♜e5 17 ♗xc8 ♖axc8 18 ♜xe5 ♗xe5 19 ♜c4 ♗g7 20 ♖a1 ± Rivera-Dobrov, Neiva 2005) 10 ♗f4! (10 ♗c4 0-0 11 0-0 ♜bd7 12 a5 ± Voronkov-A.Makarov, USSR 1957) 10...0-0 11 h3 a5?! (Black has to settle for 11...♜h5!? 12 ♗h2 f5 13 exf5 ♜f6 14 ♗c4 ♗xf5 15 0-0 ±) 12 ♗b5 ♗a6 13 ♗xa6 ♖xa6 14 ♗e2 ♖a7 15 0-0 ♜bd7 16 ♜c4 ♜b6 17 ♜fd2 ♖e8 18 ♗f3 ♖a6 19 ♜xb6 ♗xb6 20 ♜c4 ♗b7 21 ♖fe1 ♗f8 22 b3 ± Goldin-Leuba, Berné 1991.




This position is very interesting. It is not entirely clear that White can obtain an indisputable advantage. He must try:

9 ♗xf6!

The only satisfactory move, as 9 ♜bd2 ♜xd5 10 ♗xe7 ♗xe7 11 axb5 0-0 = or 9 axb5 ♜xe4 10 ♗xe7 ♗xe7 11 ♗e2 0-0 12 0-0 ♗b7 13 ♖e1 (13 ♜c3 axb5 {13...♜xc3?! 14 bxc3 axb5 15 ♖xa8 ♗xa8 16 ♗xb5 ± Elianov-Firman, Alushta 2004} 14 ♖xa8 ♗xa8 15 ♗xb5 ♜f6 = Z.Milev-Portisch, Moscow 1959) 13...f5 14 ♜c3! ♗f7 ∞ can hardly be considered a satisfactory outcome for White.

9...♗xf6 10 axb5 (D)

Black gets sufficient play after 10 ♖a2?! bxa4 11 ♗xa4+ ♗d7 12 ♗c2 0-0 13 ♜bd2 a5 14 ♗e2 ♜a6 15 ♖a3 ♜b4 16 ♗b1 ♖e8 ♞ Barlov-Djorić, Mataruska Banja 1997 or 10 ♗c2 0-0 11 ♗e2 bxa4 12 0-0 ♜d7 13 ♖xa4 ♖b8 14 ♖a2 ♖e8 15 ♜c3 ♖b4 ∞ Bielek-Staszko, Tatranske Zurby 2002.



10...♗xb2


Sacrifices such as 10...0-0?! 11 ♜c3 (11 ♗c2?! ♗b7 12 ♜bd2 ♗e7 with compensation, Gavrillov-Galinsky, Moscow 1996) 11...♗b7 12 bxa6 ♜xa6 13 ♗e2 ♗b6 14 ♖b1 ♗b4 15 0-0

♠c7 16 ♠d2 ± Neverov-Smagin, Odessa 1989 are out of the question.

11 ♠a2 ♠f6 12 ♠bd2

Better than 12 ♠d3 0-0 13 ♠e2 (13 ♠bd2 transposes to note 'a' below) 13...♠e8 14 bxa6 ♠b6 15 0-0 ♠xa6 16 ♠xa6 ♠xa6 17 ♠xa6 ♠xa6 18 ♠xa6 ♠xa6 19 ♠bd2 ♠b4 20 ♠d1 ♠a2 21 ♠b1 ♠c3 22 ♠b6 ♠f8 1/2-1/2 Solozhenkin-S.Ivanov, Jyväskylä 2003 or 12 ♠e2 0-0 13 0-0 ♠b7 14 ♠b3 axb5 15 ♠xa8 ♠xa8 16 ♠xb5 ♠c7 17 ♠a3 ♠b7 18 ♠a4 ♠c8 ∞ Naumkin-Arkhipkin, Moscow 1988.

12...0-0 (D)



Now White has tried:

a) 13 ♠d3 ♠b7 14 0-0 axb5 15 ♠xa8 ♠xa8 16 ♠xb5 and here:

a1) 16...♠b7 17 ♠a4 ♠c8 18 ♠c4 ♠e7 19 ♠b6 ±, e.g., 19...♠g4? 20 e5 ♠xe5 21 ♠xe5 dxe5 22 ♠xg4 ♠b7 23 ♠d7 f5 24 ♠a4 1-0 Forintos-Sievers, Germany tt 1991.

a2) 16...♠b6?! 17 ♠a4 ♠b7 18 ♠c4 ♠c7 19 ♠a7 ♠d8 20 ♠a1 ♠d7 21 ♠xd7 ♠xd7 22 ♠b1 ♠c8 23 ♠xd7 ♠xd7 24 ♠xd6 + Rogemont-Hang, corr. 1990.

a3) 16...♠d7 17 ♠b3 (17 ♠c4 ♠b6 18 ♠e3 ♠e7 19 ♠d3 g6 20 ♠b1 ♠g7 21 ♠c6 ♠d7 22 ♠c4 ± Vaganian-K.Grigrorian, Leningrad 1971 and 17 ♠a4!? ♠b6 18 ♠a5 ♠c7 19 ♠c4 ± Van Putten-Clemens, Groningen 2003 are decent alternatives) 17...♠e7 18 ♠xd7 ♠xd7 19 ♠c4 ♠e7 20 ♠e1 ♠d8 21 h3 ♠b7 22 ♠a2 ± Mraz-T.Thomas, corr. 1992.

b) 13 bxa6!? ♠b6 14 ♠c4 ♠xa6 (14...♠xa6? 15 0-0 ♠b7 16 ♠e2! ±) 15 h3! ± Grivas-Mastrokoukos, Athens 2004 – see Illustrative Games (15 0-0 ♠b8 16 ♠e1 ♠b4 17 ♠a3 ♠g4! 18 h3 ♠xf3 19 ♠xf3 ♠d8 ∞ Neverov-Baturin, Zepter 1998).

2.8 Illustrative Games

Our coverage of the exciting world of the Benko/Volga and Blumenfeld Gambits cannot be considered complete without some interesting illustrative games, which present highly important strategic and tactical motifs for both sides.

Game 1

I. Sokolov – Ki. Georgiev

Sarajevo 1998

1 d4 ♠f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♠f3 b4 5 a3 ♠a6

For more information on this line, see Section 2.3, Line D.

6 axb4 ♠xb4 7 ♠c3 d6 8 e4 g6


Another possibility is 8...e5 9 dxe6 ♠xe6 with a slight plus for White.

9 ♠e2 ♠g7 10 0-0 0-0 11 ♠f4!

An important move, as 11 h3 e5 12 dxe6 fxe6 is just unclear.

11...♠g4 12 h3 ♠xf3 13 ♠xf3 ♠d7 14 ♠d2 ♠e8?! (D)

14...♠b6!?, with the idea ...♠fb8, is more to the point.



15 ♠a3! ♠b6 16 ♠g4! ♠e5 17 ♠e2 ♠eb8 17...e6 18 ♠e3 ±.

18 h4! ♠b7

Black cannot react on the kingside, as 18...h5 19 ♠d1 with the idea ♠g3 is quite dangerous.


19 h5 gxh5 20 ♠xe5 ♠xe5

20...dxe5 is even worse: 21 ♠xh5 ±.

21 ♠xh5

White intends ♠e2-f4 with an irresistible attack.

21...e6 22 ♠e2 exd5 23 exd5 ♠h8 (D)



White has a clear advantage, as his attack on the black king is very strong, whereas Black's queenside counterplay is negligible.

24 ♖f3?!

White slips up. He should continue with 24 ♔g4! intending ♖h3, b3, g3, ♕g2 and ♖fh1 ±.

24...♗d8

24...♖f8?! 25 ♔g4!.

25 ♖xf7 ♖xf7 26 ♔xf7 ♗f6 27 ♕e6 ♔xb2?!

The last mistake. Black could still fight on with 27...a5! ±.

28 ♖b1 ♔a1 29 ♖b3!

Now White is again on the right track! New forces join the battle against the black king.

29...♗g6 30 ♔g3 ♗h1+ 31 ♕h2 ♔e5 32 f4 ♗b2 33 ♗e3 ♔g7 34 ♔f5! ♖f8 35 ♗e4 h6 36 ♔g6 a5

Nothing would be changed by 36...♖xf5 37 ♗xf5 ♗xe2 38 ♖e6 +–.

37 ♗e6! ♖f6 38 ♗e8+ ♖f8 39 ♗d7!

Winning in style!

39...♖xf5 40 ♗xf5 a4

40...♗xe2 41 ♖e6.

41 ♖xd6 1-0

Game 2

Grivas – Leko
Budapest 1993

1 d4 ♔f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♔f3 ♔b7 5 ♔fd2 bxc4 6 e4 d6

This line is examined in Section 2.4, Line F1.

7 ♔xc4 ♔bd7 8 0-0 g6 9 ♔c3 ♔g7 10 ♖e1 0-0 11 ♔f1 ♔b6 12 a4!

This is an interesting plan, trying to gain space on the queenside and drive the knight away from b6.

12...a5

After 12...♖b8 13 a5 ♔bd7 14 ♔c4 White retains a comfortable plus, as it is difficult for Black to create active play. But now White takes full control of the important b5-square.


13 ♔c4! ♔fd7 14 ♔g5 ♔xc4 15 ♔xc4 ♔a6

15...♔e5 16 ♔b5 was another try, but White still keeps a small advantage (16...c4 17 ♗d2!).

16 ♔xa6 ♖xa6 17 ♗e2! ♖a8

17...♖b6 18 ♔b5 ±.

18 ♖acl ♔b6 19 b3! (D)



White's plan is obvious: regrouping the knight to c4 and the bishop to d2.

19...♗d7


Maybe Black should have tried 19...c4!? 20 bxc4 ♖c8 21 ♔e3! ♔xc4 22 ♔b5 ♔xe3 23 ♗xe3 ±.

20 ♔b5! ♖fb8

20...c4? 21 ♔e3.

21 ♗c2 ♖b7 22 ♔d2! (D)

White has fulfilled his plan and holds the advantage.



22...♗d8

Preparing to regroup the knight with ...♔d7-b8-a6-c7 to challenge the strong b5-knight. However, this plan is slow.

23 h3 ♖d7 24 ♜b1

Another possibility is 24 ♖a3!? ♖b6 (or 24...♖b8 25 ♖c4 ±) 25 ♜b1 and White retains a healthy advantage, intending ♙c3 or ♖c4.

24...♖b8 25 ♜ec1?

A time-trouble error, throwing away the advantage. After 25 ♙c3! ♙xc3 26 ♜xc3 ♖a6 27 e5! Black would face serious problems.

25...♖a6 26 ♜d1 ♖c7 27 ♖a3 ♖a6 28 ♖b5 ♖c7!

Black has equalized and White has nothing better than to repeat the position.

29 ♖a3 ♖a6 30 ♖b5 ½-½

Game 3

L. Spassov – Manolov
Primorsko 1975


1 ♖f3 ♖f6 2 c4 e6 3 d4 c5 4 d5 b5 5 ♙g5 ♜a5+ 6 ♖bd2 bxc4 7 ♙xf6 gxf6 8 e4 f5?!

For the correct 8...♙g8, see Section 2.7, Line A (note 'c3' to White's 6th move).

9 dxe6!

The best move, as less is gained by 9 exf5 exd5!.

9...fxe4 10 exf7+ ♖d8 (D)



11 ♙xc4!

A pseudo-sacrifice which Black cannot afford to accept, because after 11...exf3 12 ♜xf3 the twin threats 13 ♜xa8 and 13 ♜f6+ are decisive.

11...♙b7 12 ♖g5 h6 13 ♖xe4!!

An excellent move and at the same time the only one. Unclear positions would arise after the naïve 13 ♖h3 d5 or 13 ♜h5 ♙g7.

13...♙xe4 14 ♜g4 d5

Or 14...♙b7 15 ♜g8! +.

15 0-0!

White is playing accurately. After the 'obvious' 15 ♜g8? dxc4 16 ♜xh8 ♖d7 Black would hold the advantage!

15...♜xd2


Also hopeless was 15...dxc4 16 ♜xe4 +.

16 ♜ad1 h5

Or 16...♜g5 17 ♜xe4 +.

17 ♜e6! (D)

Much better than the obvious 17 ♜xe4?! dxe4 18 ♜xd2+ ♖c7 19 ♙d5 ♖c6 20 ♙xe4 =.



17...♜b6 18 ♜xe4 ♖c7 19 ♜xd5 ♖c6 20 ♜d7+ ♖b6 21 ♜d3 ♖b4?

A typical mistake in time-trouble, but the 'correct' 21...♜b8 22 ♜b3+ ♖b4 (22...♖a5 23 ♜xb8 +-) 23 a3 would also fail to save Black. 22 ♜b5+ 1-0

Game 4

Grivas – Mastrokoukos
Athens 2004

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 e6 3 ♖f3 c5 4 d5 b5 5 ♙g5 exd5 6 cxd5 d6 7 e4 a6 8 a4 ♙e7 9 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 10 axb5 ♙xb2 11 ♙a2 ♙f6 12 bxa6 ♜b6 13 ♖bd2 0-0 14 ♙c4

For more information on the opening, see Section 2.7, Line C.

14...♖xa6

14...♙xa6? 15 0-0 ♜b7 16 ♜e2! ±

15 h3!

It is important not to allow a future ...♙g4, exchanging the valuable white knight.

15...♙d7 16 0-0 ♖b4 17 ♜xa8 ♜xa8 18 ♜e2


White has achieved a valuable spatial advantage. His general plan involves regrouping his pieces towards the kingside, preparing an attack. The passed black c-pawn is going nowhere and cannot be considered a plus in Black's position,

in sharp contrast to the white pawn on e4, which retains considerable mobility.

18...♖e8 19 ♖b1 ♗a4 20 ♗b3

Just checking! Black cannot afford to exchange the bishops as then the white knight would occupy the c4-square and radiate power from there.

20...♗b5 21 ♗c4 ♗a4 22 ♖f1! g6 23 ♖g3 ♖e7 24 ♖d2! (D)



After the knight, now comes the turn of the white queen to be transferred to the kingside. In the meantime Black is not undertaking any activity but must focus on organizing his defences.

24...♗c7 25 ♖c1 ♖d7 26 ♗f4 ♖g7


Or 26...♗g7 27 h4! ±.

27 ♖h4

Too optimistic. Better is 27 ♖e1 ±.

27...♖e5! (D)

Not falling for 27...♗xh4? 28 ♗xh4 h6 29 ♖a1 ± or 27...♖e8? 28 ♖hf5+ gxf5 29 ♖xf5+ ♖g8 30 ♖xd6 ±.



28 ♖hf5+?

A ridiculous sacrifice. White should go back with 28 ♖f3 ♖e7 29 ♖e1, but could not resist the temptation.

28...gxf5 29 ♖h5+ ♖g6 30 ♖c3


This was White's main attacking idea, but...

30...♗g5!

30...♖xh5?? 31 ♗e2+ ♖g6 32 ♖g3+ ♗g5 33 ♗xg5#. 'Only' equal was 30...♖xe4 31 ♖g3+ ♖xh5 32 ♗e2+ ♖xe2 33 ♗f3+.

31 ♖g3 h6 32 h4 f6?? (D)

Returning the favour. After the correct continuation 32...♗e7! 33 hxg5 hxg5 White is in deep trouble.



33 ♖xf6!!

A decisive shot, overlooked by Black.

33...♖xf6 34 hxg5+ ♖g7

34...hxg5 35 ♗xg5+ ♖f7 36 ♗g7+ ♖e8 37 ♗g8+ ♖e7 38 ♖g7+, mating, or 34...♖f7 35 gxf6 ♖f8 36 ♗g5 +-.

35 gxf6++ ♖h8 36 ♗g5 ♗f7 37 ♗d8+ ♖e8

37...♗e8 38 ♗xd6 ♗e7 39 ♗b8! ♖xe4 40 ♖g8+! +-.

38 ♗xd6 ♖xe4?!

38...♗f8 39 ♗xf8+ ♖xf8 40 e5 +-.

39 ♗xc5

39 ♖g7 was also a winner.

39...♗e7 40 d6

Time-trouble! The win could also be achieved by 40 ♖g8+ ♖xg8 41 d6+ ♖xc4 42 ♗xc4+ ♗f7 43 h7+.

40...♖e1+ 41 ♗f1 ♗e5 42 ♗xb4 ♗b5 43 d7! ♖xf1+ 44 ♖h2 ♗f6 45 d8♗+! ♗xd8 46 ♗b2+ 1-0

A game with mistakes, but at the same time quite entertaining!

3 Beating the Modern Defence

3.1 Starting Out

Curnock – Tattersall
London 1904

The Modern Defence is closely linked to the King's Indian Defence. The difference is that Black does not rush to play ... $\text{d}f6$, a standard move in the King's Indian. Of course, if Black continues with ... $\text{d}f6$ at any early stage, the play transposes to the King's Indian Defence. Thus, in this part of the book only lines without an early ... $\text{d}f6$ will be analysed, and we shall choose our lines with this transposition in mind.

Black's main idea is an early attack on the white centre, in an effort to grab the initiative. The powerful black g7-bishop operates with full force as it is not blocked by the f6-knight and, with the help of moves like ... $\text{g}4$, ... $\text{d}c6$ and ...e5, Black tries to clarify matters in his favour early in the opening.

On the other hand, White's privilege of the first move should not be underestimated. As he controls more space and can develop with greater freedom, he is usually able to obtain a significant spatial advantage and create play on both sides of the board. Of course, there are many systems that White can choose in his search for an advantage, but the line 1 d4 g6 2 c4 $\text{g}7$ 3 $\text{d}f3$ will be the basis of my analysis. Please note that this sequence allows Black to transpose to the Leningrad Dutch (not covered here), so you will need to check that your repertoire choice against that opening fits.

It is worth mentioned that the main expert on the white side of this system is the Russian GM Vladimir Epishin and the experts with Black are the Georgian GM Zurab Azmaiparashvili and the Romanian GM Andrei Istratescu. Their contributions to the theoretical development of this system have been extremely valuable, and their games must be taken seriously into account and serve as instructive examples.

For a little historical background, here is the debut game of this opening (although not a masterpiece!):

1 e4 d6 2 d4 g6 3 c4 $\text{g}7$ 4 $\text{d}f3$ c5 5 $\text{e}3$ $\text{g}4$ 6 $\text{d}c3$ $\text{d}a6$ 7 $\text{e}2$ $\text{b}6$ 8 0-0 h5 9 h3 $\text{d}7$ 10 $\text{b}1$ e6 11 a3 $\text{d}e7$ 12 b4 cxb4 13 axb4 $\text{d}xb4$ 14 $\text{d}b5$ $\text{d}a6$ 15 d5 $\text{d}c5$ 16 dxe6 $\text{xb}5$ 17 exf7+ $\text{xf}7$ 18 $\text{d}g5+$ $\text{g}8$ 19 cxb5 $\text{f}6$ 20 e5 $\text{xe}5$ 21 $\text{c}4+$ $\text{g}7$ 22 $\text{f}3$ $\text{d}f5$ 23 $\text{d}e6+$ $\text{h}7$ 24 $\text{xc}5$ dxc5 25 g4 hxg4 26 hxg4 $\text{d}d6$ 27 $\text{g}2$ $\text{g}8$ 28 $\text{h}1$ $\text{d}xc4$ 29 $\text{hx}8+$ $\text{hx}8$ 30 $\text{h}1+$ $\text{g}8$ 31 $\text{d}5$ $\text{d}e3+$ 32 fxe3 $\text{d}d6$ 33 $\text{xb}7$ $\text{d}d2+$ 34 $\text{f}3$ $\text{f}8+$ 35 $\text{d}xf8$ $\text{xf}8$ 36 $\text{c}8+$ $\text{f}7$ 37 $\text{h}7+$ $\text{f}6$ 38 $\text{f}8+$ $\text{e}6$ 39 $\text{e}7+$ 1-0

3.2 Typical Endgames

In this section I shall present two interesting and characteristic endgames resulting from the proposed system against the Modern Defence.

Endgame 1

Ivanisević – Šolak
Interlaken 2001

1 d4 g6 2 e4 $\text{g}7$ 3 $\text{d}f3$ d6 4 c4 e5 5 $\text{e}2$ $\text{d}c6$ 6 $\text{e}3$ $\text{g}4$ 7 d5 $\text{xf}3$ 8 $\text{xf}3$ $\text{d}d4$ 9 $\text{xd}4$ exd4 10 $\text{d}d2$ $\text{d}e7$ 11 0-0 0-0 12 g3 c5 13 $\text{e}2$ $\text{d}c8!$? 14 $\text{d}d3$ $\text{d}b6$ 15 $\text{g}2$ $\text{d}d7$ 16 f4 $\text{e}7$ 17 $\text{f}3$ $\text{f}6$ 18 $\text{a}e1$ ±

For more information on this line, see Section 3.4, Line D32 (note 'c3' after White's 12th move).

18... $\text{g}7$ 19 $\text{e}2$ $\text{a}e8$ 20 $\text{g}4$ h5! 21 $\text{h}3$ h4 22 $\text{d}f3$ hxg3 23 hxg3 $\text{h}8$ 24 $\text{g}4$ $\text{h}5!$ 25 $\text{f}2$

Nothing is gained by 25 e5 dxe5 26 f5 $\text{h}6!$.


25... $\text{h}8$ 26 $\text{e}1$ $\text{h}8$ 27 $\text{f}1$ $\text{h}8$ 28 $\text{h}1$ $\text{hx}1$ 29 $\text{hx}1$ $\text{hx}1$ 30 $\text{hx}1$ $\text{d}8$ 31 $\text{g}2$

Black has defended well, keeping White's advantage to a minimum. 31 e5 dxe5 32 f5 $\text{d}f8$ was also OK for Black.

31...♖f8 32 ♖h2

Interesting is 32 ♖h3 ♖g8 33 g4!? g5 34 e5! dxe5 35 fxe5 ♗g7 36 ♖h7+ ♖f8 37 ♖f5 ±.

32...♗g7 33 ♖e2 ♖c7 34 ♖g4 ♖f6 35 ♖f2 ♖d7 36 ♖d2 ♖b6 37 ♗e2 ♖b4! (D)



White cannot decline the offer to exchange queens (38 ♖c2 ♖b6!) and thus Black gets closer to his final aims.

38 ♖xb4 cxb4

Black has accepted some damage to his pawn-structure, but has earned the important c5-square for exchanging another pair of pieces.

39 ♖d3 a5 40 ♗g4! ♖c5 41 ♖xc5 dxc5 42 e5?!

White should try 42 d6! f6! (42...♖e8? 43 e5! ±) 43 ♖f3 ♖e8 44 ♗e6 ♖d8 ±.

42...f6! 43 exf6

43 e6 f5 44 ♗f3 ♖e7 =.

43...♗xf6 44 ♗e2 ♖f7 45 ♗d3 ♗e7 46 g4 g5!

White's two passed pawns are not enough for a win. A well-played game by both sides.

47 fxe5 ♗xg5 48 ♗f5 ♖f6 49 d6 ♖e5 50 d7 ♖f4 51 ♖f2 b6 52 ♖e2 1/2-1/2

Endgame 2

Epishin – Hennig

Hamburg 1997

1 d4 g6 2 e4 ♗g7 3 c4 ♖c6 4 ♖f3 d6 5 ♗e2 ♗g4 6 ♗e3 e5 7 d5 ♗xf3 8 ♗xf3 ♖d4 9 ♗xd4 exd4 10 ♖d2 ♖e7 11 ♗e2 0-0 12 0-0 c5 13 f4?!

For more information on this line, see Section 3.4, Line D32 (note 'c1' after White's 12th move).

13...a6?! 14 ♗d3 ♖b8 15 h4! b5 16 h5 ♖c8 17 hxg6 fxe6?!

17...hxg6 ± is essential, as now the light squares in the centre become weaker.

18 ♖g4! ♖h8 19 b3 ± ♖b6 20 ♖f3 ♖d7

Black is forced to exchange queens, as the threat of e5 in connection with a possible attack against the black king is too tough to handle.

21 ♖xd7 ♖xd7 22 g3

Another possibility was 22 ♖g5 and ♖e6, but White is not in a hurry.


22...bxc4 23 bxc4!

The correct way. The consequences of 23 ♗xc4?! ♖f6 24 e5 ♖g4! 25 exd6 ♖e3 are unclear.

23...♖b2 24 ♖f2 ♖xf2 25 ♖xf2 ♖b8 26 ♖e1

The threat of 27 e5 forces Black's hand.

26...♖b2+ 27 ♖e2 ♖xe2+ 28 ♖xe2 ♗f6 (D)



At a cursory glance, Black's passed d4-pawn and the presence of opposite-coloured bishops seem to indicate that Black is at least not in any danger of losing. But White actually has a clear advantage, as he can advance his pawn to e5.

29 ♗c2!

With the idea ♖d3, ♗a4 and e5.

29...♖g7 30 ♖d3 g5!

Black correctly tries to be active, also hoping for 31 fxe6? =.

31 ♗a4! ♖b6 32 ♗e8 ♖f8 33 ♗h5

After 33 ♗c6 g4! and 34...h5, Black would find counterplay.

33...gxf4 34 gxf4 ♖a4 35 e5!

Mission accomplished, but matters are still not easy.

35...♗e7?

Black should try 35...♗d8! 36 ♖c2! (36 ♖d2 is met by 36...♗a5) with only a slight disadvantage.

36 ♖d2! ♜c3

Or 36...h6 37 a3! a5 38 ♙g6 and Black has no useful moves.

37 ♜e4! dxe5

37...♜xa2 38 exd6 ♜b4+ 39 ♜d2 ♙d8 40 ♜xc5 or 37...♜xe4 38 ♜xe4 ♙h4 39 exd6 with the idea ♜f5-e6 was also losing.


38 d6 ♙xd6

There was no chance even after 38...♙h4 39 ♜xc5.

39 ♜xd6 exf4 40 ♜e4 ♜a4 41 ♜c2 1-0

3.3 Black's 3rd-Move Deviations

1 d4 g6 2 c4 ♙g7 3 ♜f3 (D)



Black's main continuation is 3...d6, which will be analysed in Section 3.4. In the present section, all other lines except 3...d6 will be examined.

From the diagram, Black has tried:

- A: 3...f6 88
 B: 3...e6 88
 C: 3...b6 88
 D: 3...f5 89
 E: 3...♜c6 89
 F: 3...c6 89

A)

3...f6

A rather unusual set-up, aiming for a knight tour to f7, which will support the black e- and f-pawns' advance at a later stage. Although this seems like a 'garbage' move, White cannot claim anything more than a slight advantage,

thanks to his greater space occupation and slight lead in development.

4 e4 ♜h6 5 ♜c3 ♜f7

5...d6 6 h4 (6 h3 ♜d7 7 g4 0-0 8 ♙e3 ♜f7 9 g5 e5 10 dxe5 ♜fxe5 11 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 12 f4 was unclear in Sabelfeld-Kunth, Germany 2004) 6...♙g4 (6...♜d7 7 ♙e2 e5 8 ♙xh6!? ♙xh6 9 h5 ♜f7 10 ♜d3 ♜g7 11 ♜d1! ± Grivas-Vizantiadis, Athens 1983) 7 ♙e2 ♜f7 8 ♙e3 0-0 9 ♜d2 c6 10 0-0-0 ± Lüchtemeier-Höhne, Hessen 1991.

6 h4!?

Equally good is 6 ♙d3 d6 7 0-0 0-0 8 d5 e5 9 dxe6 ♙xe6 10 ♜d4 ± Elstner-I.Schwarz, Dortmund 2003.

6...d6 7 h5 ♙g4 8 hxg6 hxg6 9 ♙xh8+ ♙xh8 10 ♙e2 ♙xf3 11 ♙xf3 ♜c6 12 ♙e3

± Kazilaris-Vizantiadis, Athens 1971.

B)

3...e6

An unusual set-up for the ...g6 systems. Still, Black obtains a solid position, allowing White only a slight advantage. This line has a lot in common with Line C.

4 e4 ♜e7

4...c5 5 d5 exd5 6 exd5 (6 cxd5 may transpose to the Modern Benoni) 6...d6 7 h3 ♜e7 8 ♙d3 0-0 9 0-0 ♙f5 10 ♜c3 ♜d7 11 ♙f4 ♜e5 12 ♜xe5 ♙xe5 13 ♙xe5 dxe5 14 ♙e1 ± Dimitrijeski-Fietz, Kreuzberg 2005.

5 ♜c3 0-0 6 ♙d3

Or 6 ♙f4 d6 7 ♙e2 ♜d7 8 ♜d2 ♙e8 9 0-0 b6 10 h3 ± Jelen-Z.Basagić, Dobrna 2002.

6...b6

6...f5?! 7 0-0 b6 8 d5 ♜a6 9 e5 ♜c5 10 ♙c2 exd5 11 cxd5 d6 12 ♙e1 dxe5 13 ♜xe5 ♜d7 14 ♙f4 ♜xe5 15 ♙xe5 ♙xe5 16 ♙xe5 ♙b7 17 ♙b3 ± Navara-Komora, Martin 2003.

7 0-0 ♙b7 8 ♙e1 d6 9 ♙e3 ♜d7 10 ♙c1

± I.Takacs-Simon, Ajka 1997.

C)

3...b6

A very interesting set-up for Black, who proceeds with ...♙b7, ...d6, ...e6, ...♜d7 and ...♜e7, hoping to attack the white centre later with a well-timed ...e5 or ...c5. White retains a plus due to his spatial advantage.

4 e4 ♘b7 5 ♖c3 d6

Black has tried an early ...d5, without much success: 5...e6 6 ♘d3 (6 ♘f4 ♖e7 7 ♘e2 0-0 8 0-0 d5 9 e5 dxc4 10 ♘xc4 c6 11 ♘g5 ♖c7 12 ♖c1 h6 13 ♘e3 ♖d8 14 ♖b3 ♖d7 15 ♖e4 ± Soshnikov-Bozhik, Ukraine 2000) 6...♖e7 7 0-0 0-0 8 ♘g5 h6 9 ♘e3 d5 10 cxd5 exd5 11 e5 ♘c8 12 ♖c1 ♖h7 13 ♖b5 c6 14 ♖d6 ♘e6 15 h4 ± Hevesi-Gal, Fuzesabony 1996.

6 ♘e2

6 ♘d3 ♖d7 7 0-0 e5 8 d5 ± 1/2-1/2 Markov-Benderac, Herceg Novi 2000 and 6 ♘f4 ♖d7 7 ♖c2 e6 8 ♘e2 ♖e7 9 0-0 0-0 10 ♖ad1 h6 11 b4 f5 12 e5 dxe5 13 ♘xe5 ♖xe5 14 ♖xe5 ± Kazarina-Turcheniak, Serpukhov 2004 are fair alternatives.

6...♖d7 7 0-0

7 h3 is not bad either; e.g., 7...e5 8 0-0 exd4 9 ♖xd4 ± A.Kovacs-Gal, Fuzesabony 1995.

7...e6 8 ♖e1 ♖e7 9 ♘f1 0-0 10 ♖b1 h6 11 h3 ♖h7 12 ♖c2 f5 13 ♘d3 f4 14 b4 e5 15 d5 a5 16 a3 axb4 17 axb4 g5 18 ♖a4 ♖g6 19 c5

White retained a slight advantage in Baryshpolets-O.Vovk, Kiev 2005.

D)

3...f5

This is actually a form of Leningrad Dutch, which is outside the scope of this book. White should continue with his standard development in that opening with ♖c3, g3, etc., and not try the 'active' idea 4 e4?! fxe4 (4...♖h6 5 ♖c3 d6 6 ♘d3 0-0 and now 7 0-0 ± rather than 7 h4 fxe4 8 ♖xe4 ♘g4 9 ♘e3 ♖f5 10 ♘e2 ♖c6 ♖ Lakat-A.Zoltan, Budapest 2002) 5 ♖g5 ♖f6 (5...c5?! 6 d5 ♖f6 7 ♖c3 d6 8 ♖gxe4 0-0 9 ♘e2 ♘f5 10 ♖g3 ± Krivoshei-Malaniuk, Minsk 1999) 6 ♖c3 0-0 7 ♖gxe4 (7 d5 c6 8 ♖gxe4 ♖xe4 9 ♖xe4 cxd5 10 ♖xd5+ e6 11 ♖d6 (11 ♖g5 d5! 12 ♖xd8 ♖xd8 13 ♘g5 ♖f8 ♖ Fichte-Haub, Baunatal 2001) 11...♖a5+! ♖) 7...♖xe4 (7...d6?! 8 ♘e2 ♖c6 9 ♘e3 e5 10 dxe5 ♖xe5 = Pinto-Gonzalez Costas, Mondariz 2000) 8 ♖xe4 d5 9 ♖c3 and now with 9...e5! or 9...♖c6!/? Black is more active than he should be after only 9 moves.

E)

3...♖c6

This early attack on the white centre is not effective.

4 d5! ♖e5

4...♖b4?! 5 a3 ♖a6 6 ♖c2 c5 7 ♖c3 d6 8 e4 ♖h6 9 ♘d3 0-0 10 0-0 ♖c7 11 h3 ♘d7 12 ♖b1 ± Oms Pallise-Argandona Riveiro, Villa Real 2001.

5 ♖fd2!?

5 ♖xe5 is not bad either: 5...♘xe5 6 e4 ♘g7 7 ♖c3 c5 8 ♘e3 d6 9 ♖d2 h6 10 f3 a6 11 ♘e2 ♖b8 12 0-0 ± Vujmilović-Cabarkapa, Novi Sad 1989.

5...d6 6 g3 e6 7 ♘g2 ♖e7 8 ♖c3 ♖f6 9 0-0 h5 10 h3 exd5 11 ♖xd5 ♖xd5 12 cxd5 h4 13 g4

White has a slight advantage. Black should avoid 13...♖xg4? 14 hxg4 ♘xg4 15 ♖a4+ ♘d7 16 ♖a5 ± (improving over 16 ♖e4?! ♘e5 17 f4 h3 18 ♘f3?! ♖h4 ∞ Haag-Tumurbator, Varna 1958).

F)


3...c6

This line can transpose to the Schlechter Slav (ECO D94 – NIC SL 10.2-10.3), viz. 1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 ♖f3 ♖f6 4 e3 g6 5 ♖c3 ♘g7, where White can claim his usual opening advantage without any particular risks.

4 ♖c3 d5

4...d6 is likely to transpose to a line of the King's Indian Defence.

5 e3 (D)



This is, in my opinion, one of the best lines for White here. Now Black can try:

- F1: 5...e6 90
- F2: 5...♖h6 90
- F3: 5...♖f6 90

F1)

5...e6 6 $\text{\textcircled{d}}3$

An interesting new alternative is 6 e4!? dxe4 7 $\text{\textcircled{x}}e4$ h6? (7... $\text{\textcircled{d}}f6$ 8 $\text{\textcircled{x}}f6+$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}f6$ 9 $\text{\textcircled{x}}e2$ \pm) 8 $\text{\textcircled{x}}f4$ g5 9 $\text{\textcircled{x}}e5$ $\text{\textcircled{c}}f8$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d6+$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}e7$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e5$ $\text{\textcircled{c}}g8$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{w}}h5$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}e8$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{x}}b8$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}b8$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}d8$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xf7+$ $\text{\textcircled{c}}h7$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xc8$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}c8$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d3+$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}f5$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xe6$ 1-0 A.Kovalyov-Blanco Fernandez, Buenos Aires 2005.

6... $\text{\textcircled{d}}e7$

6...f5?! 7 0-0 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 8 b3 $\text{\textcircled{d}}h6$ 9 cxd5 exd5 10 $\text{\textcircled{x}}a3$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}a5$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{w}}c1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}f7$ 12 b4 $\text{\textcircled{w}}d8$ 13 b5 gives White a large advantage, Grünfeld-Treybal, Karlsbad 1923.

7 0-0-0 8 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e2$

8 b3!? dxc4 9 bxc4 c5 10 $\text{\textcircled{x}}a3$ \pm Ngo Ninh-Tran Ngoc Lan, Hue 2005.

8...a6 9 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d1$ b5 10 b3 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{x}}a3$ f5 12 $\text{\textcircled{x}}ac1$

\pm Panno-Paglilla, Buenos Aires 1985.

F2)

5... $\text{\textcircled{d}}h6$ 6 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d3$

Other good options are:

a) 6 cxd5 cxd5 7 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ e6 8 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d2$ 0-0 9 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}c6$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e2$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}e8$ 11 0-0 \pm Zatulovskaya-Vovinkina, Tel Aviv 2002.

b) 6 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ e6 7 $\text{\textcircled{x}}e2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 8 0-0 f5 9 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d2$ 0-0 10 cxd5 exd5 11 $\text{\textcircled{x}}ac1$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}e8$ 12 a4 $\text{\textcircled{c}}h8$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{x}}fe1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}f7$ 14 a5 a6 15 $\text{\textcircled{d}}a4$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d6$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{x}}f1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}b5$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{x}}b4$ \pm Minzer-Schmidlin, Vina del Mar 1998.

c) 6 $\text{\textcircled{x}}e2$ 0-0 7 0-0 e6 (or: 7...b6 8 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d2$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}b7$ 9 $\text{\textcircled{x}}c1$ \pm Grivas-Delithanasis, Komotini 1992; 7... $\text{\textcircled{d}}f5$?! 8 b4!? dxc4 9 $\text{\textcircled{x}}c4$ a5?! 10 b5! c5 11 $\text{\textcircled{x}}a3$! cxd4 12 exd4 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd4$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd4$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xd4$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xd4$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xd4$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{x}}ac1$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}e6$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xe7+$ $\text{\textcircled{c}}h8$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{x}}fd1$ 1-0 Bischoff-Pergerich, Haifa Echt 1989) 8 e4!? dxe4 9 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xe4$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}f5$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{x}}g5$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}b6$ 11 b3 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd4$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd4$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xd4$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xd4$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xd4$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{x}}ad1$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}g7$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{x}}e7$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}e8$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{x}}h4$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}f8$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{x}}fd1$ gives White enough compensation for a small advantage, Ricardi-Bazan, Buenos Aires 1986.

6...0-0 7 0-0 e6

7... $\text{\textcircled{d}}a6$!?! \pm Thim Siong-Dervieux, Etang Sale 2003.

8 b3 f6 9 $\text{\textcircled{x}}b2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}f7$ 10 e4 a6 11 a4 a5 12 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e2$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}e8$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{x}}fe1$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}d7$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{x}}ad1$

\pm L.Nagy-Zilahi, Budapest 2005.


F3)

5... $\text{\textcircled{d}}f6$

This move completes the transposition to the standard Schlechter Defence.

6 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d3$ 0-0 7 0-0 (D)

This is considered the main line, although 7 h3!? deserves attention: 7...c5 (7...b6 8 0-0 $\text{\textcircled{x}}b7$ 9 e4 dxe4 10 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xe4$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xe4$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xe4$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{x}}e1$ \pm Ehlvest-Lakdawala, San Francisco 2000) 8 0-0 cxd4 9 exd4 dxc4 10 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xc4$ a6!? (10... $\text{\textcircled{d}}bd7$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{x}}e1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}b6$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{x}}b3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}bd5$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{x}}g5$ \pm Grivas-Soylu, Elista OL 1998) 11 a4 $\text{\textcircled{d}}bd7$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e5$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}c7$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}b6$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{x}}b3$ \pm D.Raičević-Skembris, Banja Luka 1987.



This is an important decision-point for Black, who has several paths he can follow.

7...dxc4

Other options:

a) 7... $\text{\textcircled{d}}a6$? 8 cxd5 cxd5 9 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ e6 10 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d2$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}e8$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{x}}fc1$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}f8$ 12 a3 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}db8$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{x}}c2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}c6$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{x}}ac1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}ab8$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c3$ a6 17 e4! \pm Grivas-Shahtahtinski, Athens 2004.

b) 7... $\text{\textcircled{x}}e6$ 8 $\text{\textcircled{d}}g5$! (a slight advantage is also promised by 8 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e2$ dxc4 9 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xc4$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xc4$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xc4$ or 8 b3 $\text{\textcircled{d}}bd7$ 9 $\text{\textcircled{x}}a3$!?! $\text{\textcircled{w}}a5$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{w}}c1$ \pm Portisch-Hort, Lucerne OL 1982 but the text-move is more ambitious) 8... $\text{\textcircled{x}}c8$ 9 f4 (9 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ is also strong) 9...a6 10 c5 b6 11 cxb6 $\text{\textcircled{d}}bd7$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{d}}a4$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xb6$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{x}}d2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xa4$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xa4$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}d7$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{x}}a5$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}b8$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{w}}a3$ \pm Kursova-Mashinskaya, Russian wom Ch (Elista) 2003.

c) 7... $\text{\textcircled{x}}f5$ 8 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf5$ gxf5 9 cxd5 cxd5 (or 9... $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd5$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ b6 { 10... $\text{\textcircled{d}}b6$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{w}}c2$! e6 12 e4 fxe4 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xe4$ \pm Seirawan-Meduna, Moscow OL 1994) 11 $\text{\textcircled{x}}e1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xc3$ 12 bxc3 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 13 e4 \pm Janošević-Panov, Skopje 1967) 10 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ b6 and then:

c1) 11 ♖e5!? e6 12 ♔d2 ♗g4 (12...♗fd7?! 13 ♗d3 ♗c6 14 ♖a4! ♚c8 15 ♗b5 a5 16 ♗d6 ♚c7 17 ♚fc1 ± Malishauskas-Sapis, Bielsko-Biala 1990) 13 ♗d3 ♗c6 14 h3 ♗f6 15 ♚fc1 ♗d7 16 ♗e2 ± Samarin-Sapis, Polish Cht (Mikolajki) 1991.

c2) 11 ♔d2 ♗c6 12 ♚fc1 ♚c8 13 ♚c2 ♗d7 14 ♚ac1 e6 15 ♖b5 ± Tarjan-Shamkovich, Lone Pine 1981.

d) 7...e6 8 e4! (8 ♔d2 a6 9 ♚c1 b5 10 cxd5 cxd5 11 b4 ♔b7 12 a4 bxa4 13 ♖xa4 ♗bd7 14 ♚c2 ♗e4 15 ♚fc1 ± Z.Rahman-E.Hasan, Bangladesh Ch (Dhaka) 2005) 8...dxe4 9 ♗xe4 ♗xe4 10 ♔xe4 ♗d7 11 ♔f4 ♗f6 (11...♖e7 12 ♚e1 ♔d8 13 ♖e2 c5 14 ♔g5 f6 15 ♔e3 ± Slavina-Galliamova, Russian wom Cht (Sochi) 2005) 12 ♔c2 b5 13 c5 a5 14 ♔d6 ♚e8 15 ♗e5 ♔b7 16 ♖f3 ± Kuligowski-R.Kwiatkowski, Augustow 1996.

e) 7...a6 8 b3 ♔g4 9 ♔b2 ♗bd7 10 h3 ♔xf3 11 ♖xf3 e6 12 ♚ac1 (12 ♚fd1 b5 13 ♖e2 ♗b6 14 ♚ac1 ♖b8 15 ♗b1 ♗fd7 16 ♗d2 ± M.Gurevich-Seeman, Gent 1995) 12...♚e8 13 ♗d1 ♚b8 14 ♚c2 ± Gelfand-Van Wely, Monaco rpd 2000.

f) 7...♗bd7 8 cxd5 (8 h3 e6 9 b3 b6 10 a4 a5 11 cxd5 exd5 12 ♔a3 ♚e8 13 ♚c1 ♔b7 14 ♚c2 ♗e4 15 ♖b1 f5 16 ♚fc1 ± Grivas-Radulov, Athens 1991) 8...♗xd5 (8...cxd5?! 9 ♖b3 ±) 9 e4 (9 ♗xd5 cxd5 10 ♖b3 ♗b8 {10...♗f6?! 11 ♔d2 ♗e4 12 ♚fd1 ± Rubinstein-Bogoljubow, Vienna 1922}) 11 ♔d2 ♗c6 12 ♚fc1 ♗d6 13 ♚c2 ♚b8 14 h3 ♔d7 15 ♚ac1 ± Temirbaev-Driamin, Samara 2002) 9...♗xc3 (9...♗b4 10 ♔e2 a5 11 ♔f4 b6 12 a3 ♗a6 13 ♖c2 ♔b7 14 ♚fd1 ± Wojtaszek-Czarnota, Polish Ch (Poznan) 2005) 10 bxc3 and here:

f1) 10...e5 11 ♔g5 (11 ♚b1 exd4 12 cxd4 ♗f6 13 a4 ♔g4 14 a5 ♗d7 15 ♔e3 b6 16 ♖c2 ♔xf3 17 gxf3 c5 = Zagrebelny-Saltaev, Abu Dhabi 2000) 11...♖a5 12 ♖c1 exd4 13 cxd4 c5 14 ♔h6 cxd4 15 ♔xg7 ♗xg7 16 ♗xd4 ♗e5 17 ♖b2! ♗g8 18 ♔e2 ± Meulders-Bierenbroodspot, Netherlands 1991.

f2) 10...c5 11 ♔e3 b6 12 ♚c1 (12 ♗d2 ♔b7 13 ♚ad1 ± Alekseev-Kochetkov, Minsk 2003) 12...cxd4 13 cxd4 ♔b7 14 d5 ♗e5 15 ♗xe5 ♔xe5 16 f4 ♔g7 17 ♔c4 ±± Browne-Ardiansyah, Surakarta/Denpasar 1982.

g) 7...♔g4 8 h3 ♔xf3 9 ♖xf3 e6 (9...♗d6 10 ♚d1 ♗bd7 {10...♚e8 11 e4 dxe4 12 ♔xe4! ± Ribli-Smyslov, London Ct (8) 1983}) 11 cxd5

cxd5 12 ♔d2 e5 13 dxe5 ♗xe5 14 ♖e2 ♗xd3 15 ♖xd3 ♖e5 16 ♔e1 ± Liogky-Barbero, Belgrade 1988) and now:

g1) 10 ♔d2 ♗bd7 11 cxd5 and then:


g11) 11...♗xd5!? 12 ♚fd1 (12 ♗xd5 1/2-1/2 Dunnington-Crouch, Hampstead 1998 or 12 a3 ♗xc3 13 ♔xc3 ♖e7 14 ♔b4 c5 15 dxc5 ♗e5 16 ♖e2 ♗xd3 17 ♖xd3 a5 18 ♔c3 ♖xc5 1/2-1/2 Herker-Andreazza, e-mail 2000) 12...♖e7 13 ♚ac1 ♗xc3 14 bxc3 e5 15 ♚b1 ♗b6 16 ♔c1 ♖e6 17 ♚b3 ± M.Gurevich-Yusupov, Groningen 1992.

g12) 11...cxd5 12 ♚fc1!? a6 13 ♚c2 ♚e8 ± 1/2-1/2 Grivas-Smyslov, Karditsa 1995.

g2) 10 cxd5 cxd5 11 ♗d1 ♗c6 12 ♔d2 ♗e8 13 ♖b3 ♗d6 14 ♗b5 ♗c8 15 ♚fc1 f5 16 ♗c3 ♚f7 17 ♗a4 ♗d6 18 ♗c5 ♖f6 19 ♗d1 ± Grivas-Crouch, London 1998.

g3) 10 ♚d1 ♗bd7 11 cxd5!? (aiming for a minority attack, because now 11...cxd5?! 12 ♔d2 a6 13 ♚ac1 ♚c8 14 ♗a4 ± Grivas-Melachrinos, Athens 1998 proves annoying for Black) 11...exd5 12 ♔d2 ♖e7 (12...a5!? 13 ♚ab1 ± Rodshtein-S.Kaplan, Tel Aviv 2003) 13 b4! ♚ad8 14 ♔e1 ♚fe8 15 ♚ac1 ♖e6 16 ♖e2 ♔f8 17 ♖b2 ± Grivas-Makropoulou, Levidi 2001.

8 ♔xc4 (D)



8...♔g4

8...♗bd7 9 e4 (9 h3 c5 10 ♚e1 ♗b6 11 ♔b3 ♗bd5?! {11...cxd4 12 exd4 ♗bd5 ±} 12 ♗xd5 ♗xd5 13 dxc5 ♗b4? 14 ♔xf7+! ♗xf7 15 ♖b3+ ♖d5 16 ♖xb4 ± Djurić-Miladinović, Rome 2005 and 9 ♖e2 ♗b6 10 ♔b3 ♔g4 11 ♚d1 ♗fd7 12 e4 ♖b8 13 ♔e3 ± Kornev-Gubaidullin, Voronezh 2003 are decent alternatives) 9...♗b6 10 ♔e2 ♔g4 (10...♔e6 11 b3 ♔g4 12 ♔e3 ♖c7 13 ♖c2 ♚ac8 14 ♚ac1 ♖b8 15 h3

♙xf3 16 ♙xf3 e5 17 ♘e2 ± I.Farago-Gheng, Böblingen 1995) 11 ♙e3 ♘fd7 12 ♖b3 e5 13 dxe5 ♙xf3 14 ♙xf3 ♙xe5 15 ♜fd1 ♖e7 16 a4 ♘f6 17 a5 ♘c8 18 ♚d3 ± Malakhatko-Velikov, Elancourt 2004.

9 h3 ♙xf3 10 ♖xf3 ♘bd7 11 ♚d1 e5

11...♘b6 12 ♙b3 ♘fd5 13 e4 ♘xc3 14 bxc3 ♖c7 15 h4! c5 16 h5 ± Korchnoi-Hübner, Tilburg 1986.

12 d5 e4!?

This is an interesting pawn sacrifice, based on the undeveloped white queenside. The alternative is 12...cxd5 13 ♙xd5! ♖b6 (13...e4? 14 ♙xe4 ♘xe4 15 ♖xe4 ♙xc3 16 bxc3 ♘c5 17 ♖c2 ± Holemar-Kopal, Plzen 2001 or 13...♚b8?! 14 e4 h6 15 ♙e3 a6 16 ♙b3 ♖e7 17 ♘d5 ♘xd5 18 ♚xd5 ± Rogers-Barlov, Las Palmas 1995) 14 ♙xb7 ♚ad8 15 ♖c6 ± Chernin-Azmaiparashvili, Volgodonsk 1981.

13 ♘xe4

White cannot decline the offer as 13 ♖e2 cxd5 14 ♘xd5 ♘e5 15 ♘xf6+ ♖xf6 16 ♙d5 ♖f5! is fine for Black, Cvitan-V.Milov, Budapest 1991.


13...♘xe4

13...♘e5 14 ♘xf6+ ♙xf6 15 ♖e2 ♘xc4 16 ♖xc4 cxd5 17 ♚xd5 and here:

a) 17...♙c8 18 ♖b3 (18 ♖d3 ♖c7 19 e4 ♖c2 20 ♖xc2 ♚xc2 21 e5 ♚d8 22 ♚xd8+ ♙xd8 23 ♙h6 ♙b6 24 ♘h1 f6 25 f4 fxe5 26 fxe5 ♘f7 27 b3 1/2-1/2 Vidarte Morales-Arnengol Navarro, Manresa 1997) 18...♖c7 (18...♖e7?! 19 ♙d2 ♖e4 20 ♙b4 ♚fd8 21 ♚xd8+ ♚xd8 22 ♚c1 h5 23 ♙c3 ♖f5 24 ♙xf6 ♖xf6 1-0 Marin-Uržica, Romanian Cht 1993) 19 ♙d2 ♖c2 20 ♖xb7 ♙xb2 (1/2-1/2 J.Ivanov-Mrdja, Montecatini Terme 2002) 21 ♚f1 ±.

b) 17...♖b6 18 ♚b1! (18 ♚b5 ♖d6! = and not 18...♖a6? 19 ♖b3 ♚ad8 20 e4 ♚d1+ 21 ♖xd1 ♖xb5 22 ♖c2 b6 23 ♚b1 h5 24 ♙e3 ± Atakisi-Soederberg, corr. 1994) and White can keep his extra pawn and along with it the advantage: 18...♚ac8 (18...♚fd8 19 ♙d2 ♚xd5 20 ♖xd5 ♚d8 21 ♖a5 ♖xa5 22 ♙xa5 b6 23 ♙b4 {23 ♙c3 ♙xc3 24 bxc3 ♚d3=} 23...♙c8 24 b3 ♚c2 25 a4 ± Jakab-Dekić, Balatonlelle 2004) 19 ♖d3 ♚fd8 20 e4 ♙d4 21 ♙g5! ♚xd5 22 exd5 ♙xf2+ 23 ♘h1 f6 24 ♙f4 ♖d4 25 ♖e2 ♘h8 26 ♖e6 ♚d8 27 ♙d6 ♙h4 28 ♚c1 h5 29 ♖e7 1-0 Fominykh-L.Milov, Simferopol/Alushta 1992.

14 ♖xe4 ♘b6 15 ♙b3 cxd5 16 ♙xd5 (D) Nothing is promised by 16 ♖f3 ♖f6! 17 ♖xf6 ♙xf6 18 ♚b1 ♚fd8 19 ♙d2 ♘c4 = Mozezić-D.Damjanović, Belgrade 2003.



16...♙xd5

16...♚e8!? is an interesting alternative, but after 17 ♖f3 ♘xd5 18 ♚xd5 ♖c7!? (18...♖e7 19 ♚b1 ♚ac8 20 b3 ♚c2 21 a4 ± Marin-Flear, Szirak IZ 1987 or 18...♖f6 19 ♖xf6 ♙xf6 20 ♙d2! ± Muresan-Semionova, Bad Kissingen wom Ct (5) 1983) 19 e4 (19 ♖d1 ♚ac8 ∞ S.Kuznetsov-Rumiantsev, corr. 1988) 19...♖c4 20 ♚d7 b6 21 ♙e3 ♙xb2 22 ♚ad1! ♖xa2 (not 22...♚xe4?? 23 ♚7d4 +-, while 22...♙g7 is met by 23 a3! ± rather than 23 ♚c1?! = Morović-Donaldson, Lindsborg 2003) 23 ♚d5! ♚f8 (23...f6?! 24 ♙c1!! ♚ac8 {or: 24...♖a1?? 25 ♖b3! ±, 24...♙e5 25 ♚xe5! ±, 24...♙a1 25 ♖f4! ±} 25 ♙xb2 ♖xb2 26 ♚xa7 and White seems to have at least a slight advantage) 24 ♙f4! ♖a3 25 ♚d3 ♖a2 26 ♖e2! ♚ac8 27 ♚d1! ♖b3 28 ♚xa7 White enjoys the initiative. This analysis needs to be tested in practice.

17 ♚xd5 ♖b6 18 ♖d3!?

18 ♚b1 ♚ad8! 19 ♚d2 ♖a5! 20 b4 ♖a4 21 ♖c2 ♖xc2 22 ♙xc2 ♚c8! 23 ♚xc8 ♚xc8 24 ♙b2 ♚c2 25 ♙xg7 ♘xg7 ± Illescas-Hübner, Groningen PCA 1993.

18...♚ad8

18...f5? 19 ♙d2 ♚ad8 20 ♚d1 ♚xd5 21 ♖xd5+ ♘h8 22 ♙c3 ♖c7 23 ♚d4 ♚c8 24 ♖e6 ♚d8 25 ♖f7 ♖xf7 26 ♚xd8+ ♖g8 27 ♙xg7+ ♘xg7 28 ♙xg8+ ♘xg8 29 f3 +- M.Carlsen-P.Johansson, Gausdal 2002.

19 e4 ♙d4!?

19...♚xd5 20 exd5 ♚d8 21 ♙g5! ♖xb2 22 ♚d1 ♙f6 23 ♙xf6 ♖xf6 24 d6 ♖e6 25 d7 ♖xa2 26 ♙e1 ♖a4 27 ♚e7 ♖a1+ 28 ♘h2 ♖f6 29

♖e8+ ♘g7 30 ♜xd8 ♞xd8 31 ♞c3+ ♜f8 32 ♞c5+ 1-0 Maiorov-Glyzin, Minsk 2005.

20 ♜h1! ♙xf2 21 ♙h6 ♜xd5

21...♞fe8 22 ♞d1 ♙h4 23 b3 ♜xd5 24 exd5 ♙f6 ± (not 24...g5? 25 d6 1-0 M.Berg-Petzold, Germany 2004).

22 exd5 ♞d8 23 ♞d1!


± Bareev-Kramnik, Novgorod 1994.

3.4 The 3...d6 Variation

1 d4 g6 2 c4 ♙g7 3 ♜f3 d6

This is Black's standard move in the Modern, keeping open the possibility of transposing to a King's Indian, or of pursuing independent lines making use of the bishop's pressure on d4.

4 e4 (D)



Now, keeping in mind that 4...c5 and 4...♜f6 will transpose to the Modern Benoni and the King's Indian Defence respectively, Black's possibilities that we shall examine here are as follows:

- A: 4...♜c6 93
- B: 4...♜d7 94
- C: 4...e5 96
- D: 4...♙g4 99

A)

4...♜c6 5 d5!

This is the best try for White. 5 h3 e5!? (5...♜f6 6 d5 ♜e5 7 ♜xe5 dxe5 8 ♜c3 0-0 9 ♙e3 ± Bacrot-Svidler, Dortmund 2005) 6 d5 ♜b8! 7 ♜c3 a5 8 a3 ♙d7! 9 ♞b1 f5 was unclear in Antić-Istratescu, Korinthos 2002.

5...♜b8

A playable alternative is 5...♜e5!? 6 ♜xe5, and now:

a) 6...dxe5 7 ♜c3 and here:

a1) 7...♜f6 8 ♙e2 0-0 9 0-0 ♜d7 (9...e6 10 ♙e3 exd5 11 cxd5 ♜e8 12 ♙c5 ♜d6 13 ♜b5 ± P.Varga-Kolar, Budapest 1990 or 9...♜e8 10 f4!? f5?! {10...c6!? ±} 11 exf5 ♙xf5 12 ♙e3 ♙d7 13 ♞d2 ♜d6 14 fxe5 ♙xe5 15 ♙d4 ± Komljenović-Schreiner, Bavaria 2001) 10 ♙e3 f5 11 f3 ± C.Ionescu-Moldovan, Bucharest 1994.

a2) 7...f5!? 8 exf5 gxf5 9 ♞h5+ ♜f8 10 ♞e2 ± Atalik-Summerscale, Hastings 1995.

b) 6...♙xe5 can be met by:

b1) 7 ♙e2 ♙g7 (7...c5?! 8 0-0 e6 9 ♜c3 ♜f8 10 ♙e3 exd5 11 cxd5 ♜g7 12 ♞d2 h6 13 f4 ♙f6 14 e5 dxe5 15 ♙xc5 ± Gleizerov-Darban, Kish 2005) 8 0-0 ♜f6 9 ♜c3 0-0 10 ♙e3 e6 11 ♞d2 exd5 12 cxd5 ♞e8 13 f3 c6 14 dxc6 ± 1/2-1/2 Serper-Svidler, Novgorod 1995.

b2) 7 ♙d3 ♙g7 (7...e6 8 ♜d2 exd5 9 cxd5 ♜f6 10 ♜f3 ♜d7 11 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 12 0-0 0-0 13 ♙e2 ± Ibragimov-Delithanasis, Athens 1995) 8 ♜c3 ♜f6 9 0-0 0-0 10 h3 (10 ♙f4 a6 11 ♞d2 c5 12 h3 ♞a5 13 ♞fe1 ♜d7 14 ♙h6 ♞b8 15 ♙xg7 ♜xg7 16 a4 ± P.Horvath-Stoll, Austria 2003) 10...e6 11 ♙g5 c6 12 ♞d2 cxd5 13 cxd5 e5 14 a4 a6 15 a5 ♙d7 16 ♜a4 ♙xa4 17 ♞xa4 ♞c8 18 ♞c1 ♞d7 19 ♞ac4 ♞xc4 20 ♞xc4 ♞c8 21 ♞xc8+ ♞xc8 22 ♞c2 ♞xc2 23 ♙xc2 ± Kasparov-Lefstein, Catonsville simul 1997.

6 ♜c3 ♜f6

Black should not close the centre so early with 6...e5, as this leaves White with the possibility to launch a strong attack: 7 h3 c5 (7...♜e7 8 g4 ♜a6 9 ♙e2 0-0 10 ♞g1 c6 11 ♙e3 ± P.Cramling-M.Yunusov, Stockholm 2003) 8 g4 ♜f6 9 ♙e3 0-0 10 ♙e2 ♜e8 11 a3 a5 12 ♞d2 ♜a6 13 0-0-0 ♙d7 14 ♞dgl f6 15 h4 ± Bacrot-Istratescu, France 2003.

Other playable options for Black are 6...c6 7 ♙e2 ♙g4 8 0-0 ♜f6 9 e5 dxe5 10 ♜xe5 ♙xe2 11 ♞xe2 cxd5 12 cxd5 0-0 13 ♞d1 ♜a6 14 ♙g5 ± Babula-Bischoff, Bundesliga 2000/1 and 6...a5 7 ♙e2 ♙g4 8 ♙e3 ♜d7 9 0-0 ♜g6 10 ♜d4 ♙xe2 11 ♞xe2 ♜c5 12 f3 0-0 13 ♞fd1 ♜fd7 14 ♞ab1 ± M.Socko-Makropoulou, Bled wom OL 2002.

7 ♙e2

Another promising set-up for White is 7 h3 0-0 8 ♙d3 ♜a6 9 ♙e3 c6 10 0-0 ♜c7 11 ♞d2

♠e8 12 ♠ad1 cxd5 13 cxd5 b6 14 b4 ± Smirnov-Bryndin, St Petersburg 2005.

7...0-0 8 0-0 ♗g4 9 h3 ♙xf3 10 ♙xf3 ♖bd7 11 ♙e3 c6 12 ♠c1 ♜a5 13 ♜d2 ♠fc8 14 b3


White has emerged with a slight advantage thanks to his bishop-pair and spatial advantage, Ovseevich-Istratescu, Korinthos 2000.

B)

4...♖d7 5 ♖c3

White develops naturally, waiting for Black to show his hand. A future ...♖g6 will nearly always transpose to the King's Indian Defence.

5...e5 6 ♙e2 (D)



Now Black must make an important decision:

- B1:** 6...c6 94
B2: 6...♖e7 94
B3: 6...♖h6 95

B1)

6...c6 7 0-0 ♖h6

7...♜c7 8 ♠b1 ♖h6 9 b4 f6 10 d5 ♖f7 11 ♜c2 0-0 12 ♠d1 c5 13 ♖b5 ♜d8 14 ♙e3 b6 15 a3 a6 16 ♖c3 ± Knaak-Ciocaltea, Halle 1974 is playable, but 7...♜e7 is very risky in view of 8 c5! exd4?! 9 cxd6 ♜xd6 10 ♙e3 ♖e7 11 ♖xd4 ± Sulava-Tibensky, Pula 2003 – see Illustrative Games.

In my opinion Black should transpose to a King's Indian Defence with 7...♖gf6.

8 c5!

This is the best attempt to prove an advantage.

8...exd4

White also stands better after 8...dxc5 9 dxe5 0-0 (9...♜e7 10 ♙g5 ♜e6 11 ♙f4 ± Steiner-Bauermann, Germany 1996) 10 ♙g5 ♜e8 11 h3 ♖h8 12 ♜d6 ± Göhler-T.Bosboom Lanchava, Bundesliga wom 2002.

9 ♙xh6 ♙xh6 10 ♜xd4 0-0 11 cxd6 ♜b6!?

Worse is 11...♙g7?! 12 ♜d2 ♖c5 13 ♠ad1 ♙xc3 14 ♜xc3 ♖xe4 15 ♜d4 ♖f6 16 ♙c4 ± Stohl-Berezovics, Mlada Boleslav 1993.

12 ♠ad1

Most precise, as 12 ♙c4?! ♜xd4 13 ♖xd4 ♖b6 14 ♙b3 ♙f4 15 ♠ad1 ♠d8 was approximately equal in Guedon-Chomet, St Affrique 2002.

12...♠e8 13 ♠fe1 ♜xd4 14 ♖xd4 ♙f4 15 ♖b3 h5 16 g3 ♙e5 17 f4 ♙xc3 18 bxc3 ♙xe4 19 ♙f1 ♙xe1 20 ♠xe1


White stands clearly better, and went on to win in Lastin-Kornev, Bor 2000 after 20...♖f6 21 ♠e7 ♙e6 22 ♖c5 ♙xa2 23 ♠xb7 a5 24 d7 a4 25 ♠a7 ♠d8 26 ♙h3 ♙e6 27 ♖xe6 fxe6 28 ♙xe6+ ♖f8 29 ♠xa4 ♖e7 30 ♙h3 1-0.

B2)

6...♖e7 7 0-0

Interesting is 7 h4! exd4 (7...h6! 8 h5 g5 9 d5 f5 10 g4! fxg4 11 ♖h2 ♖f6 12 ♖xg4 ♖xg4 13 ♙xg4 ♙xg4 14 ♜xg4 ♜d7 15 ♜xd7+ ♖xd7 16 ♙e3 b6 17 ♖e2 ♠hc8 18 ♖d2 ± Grivas-Tsorbatzoglou, Athens 1995) 8 ♖xd4 ♖c6 9 ♙g5 ♖f6 10 ♜d2 (10 ♖d5! ±) 10...♖xd4 11 ♜xd4 h6 12 ♙e3 0-0 13 ♜d2 ♖h7 14 h5 g5 15 f3 ± Schandorff-P.E.Nielsen, Denmark 2001.

7...0-0 8 ♙e3! (D)



8...h6

Other ideas don't tend to work out well. These include:

a) The early surrender of the centre with 8...exd4 9 dxd4 (9 dxd4!? dxe5 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 f4 dxd4+ 12 dxd4 dxc6 13 d2 gives White a slight advantage, Van Scheltinga-Pirc, Beverwijk 1963) 9...dxc6 (9...dxc5 10 d2 dxe6 11 d1 ± Tukmakov-Iveković, Schellenberg 1991) 10 d2 (10 d2?! dxc5 11 f3 f5 12 exf5 dxf5 13 d2 e8 14 f2 dxc2 15 dxc2 d4 ∞ Cousigne-Popchev, St Affrique 2004) 10...dxc5 (10...dxd4 11 dxd4 dxd4 12 dxd4 dxc5 13 d1 f6 14 f4 a5 15 e5 fxe5 16 fxe5 dxf1+ 17 dxf1 dxe6 18 e3 d5 19 d5 dxe5 20 exd6 cxd6 21 dxd6 ± Cvitan-Jurković, Pula 2003) 11 d1 dxd4 12 dxd4 dxe6 13 f4 f6 14 b3 ± Tratar-Supancić, Austria 2003.

b) The 'active' 8...f5?!

b1) 9 exf5 gxf5 10 dxe5 (10 d5?! e4 11 d4 d6 is unclear, Loncar-Jurković, Rijeka 2004) 10...dxe5 (10...f4? 11 exd6 fxe3 12 dxe7 exf2+ 13 dxf2 dxe7 14 d5+ d8 15 d1 ± Easton-Fishburne, British League (4NCL) 2004) 11 d5 h6 12 d4 c6 13 d6 d6 14 d1 ± Kozma-Plachetka, Luhačovice 1969.

b2) 9 d5 d6 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 d8 (11 c5 e8 12 b3+ d8 13 d5 h6 14 dxc7 c6 15 d6 dxe6 16 dxe6 dxc8 17 f3 a6 18 d1 d8 19 d7 d7 20 c3 d6 21 f4 d7 22 fxe5 c6 23 b3 c7 24 d6 dxe4 25 d3 1-0 Cebalo-Kljako, Bizovac 2005) 11...d8 12 d5 d8 13 d1 d7 14 c5 dxb5 15 dxb5 d1+ 16 d1 d6 17 d4+ d7 18 d7 f4 19 d6+ d8 20 d2 c8 21 d3 d8 22 d1 g5 23 f3 a6 24 a4 d6 25 d5 b5 26 dxb5 1-0 Van Wely-G.Shahade, New York 1996.

9 d2 d7 10 d1 d6 11 d5

11 d2 b6 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 dxe5 dxe5 14 h3 d6 15 b3 g5 16 d5 d6 17 d4 d5 18 d4 d6 19 e2 ± Gavrikov-Ermenkov, Tunis LZ 1985.

11...d6

Or:

a) 11...f5 12 exf5 gxf5 13 dxe5 dxe5 and White should play 14 d2! ± (not 14 d1?! f4! 15 d3+ d8 16 d1 d4 17 d4 d5 18 d3 d4 19 d4 c6 20 d3 d7 ± T.Sørensen-K.Pedersen, Århus 1984).

b) 11...e8 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 d4 d4 14 d4 d4 15 f3 ± Doroshenko-Cioara, Romanian Cht 1993.

12 dxe5 dxe5 13 dxe5 dxe5 14 d2

14 d4?!

14...d7 15 d6 c6 16 d3

White enjoys a slight but secure advantage, Van Scheltinga-Bednarski, Wijk aan Zee 1973.


B3)

6...d6 7 h4? (D)

An active continuation, but other moves are also possible:

a) 7 d3 0-0 8 0-0 f6 9 h3 d7 10 d2 ± d5?! 11 d5 f6 12 d2 exd4 13 d5 e8 14 d5 d5 15 dxc7 c6 16 d5! dxe4 17 d2 e8 18 d7+ d7 19 dxe7 d5 20 d3 ± Golod-Lupu, Romanian Cht 1994.

b) 7 0-0 0-0 8 d1 (8 e1 c6 9 d1 f6 10 a3 d7 11 dxe5 dxe5 12 b4 d7 13 b3 1/2-1/2 V.Mikhalevski-Kharitonov, Hoogeveen 2000) 8...c6 9 b4 f6 10 d2 d7 11 d1 d7 12 b5 e8 13 bxc6 bxc6 14 c5! dxc5 15 d5! cxd5 16 dxd5 d8 17 d4 ± Nogueiras-Gallego Martinez, Andorra 1995.



7...exd4

Black surrenders the centre, trying to exploit the early 7 h4 with dynamic play. Other moves:

a) 7...d4 8 h5 (8 d5 f6 9 d1 d6 10 h5 d7 11 d3 f5 ∞ Vasiliadi-Talon, e-mail 2000) 8...c6 (8...exd4 9 dxd4 dxc5 10 f3 d5 11 d3 d6 12 d2 d4+ 13 d1 d6 14 d2 d6 15 dxe6 dxe6 16 d5 dxd5 17 exd5 18 h6 dxc6 19 d3 ± Bendorp-T.Bosboom Lanchava, Leeuwarden 2002) 9 d5! (9 h6?! d6 10 d5 d6 11 0-0 d7 12 d2 d2 13 d2 0-0 14 d3 c5 ∞ Stone-Piasetski, Canada 1989 or 9 h6 h6 10 d8+ d8 11 d5 1/2-1/2 M.Vukić-Šahović, Nikšić 1996) 9...d6 10 d4 d7 11 d5 ± d5?! 12 dxc5 d5+?

13 ♖d2! 1-0 Van Wely-T.Miller, Minneapolis 2005.

b) 7...f6 8 h5 (8 ♗xh6!? ♗xh6 9 h5 c6 10 d5 ♜e7 11 ♖h4 ♖f8 12 ♗g4 ♗xg4 13 ♜xg4 ♜d7 14 ♜f3 ♗g5 15 g3 0-0-0 16 ♖f1 ♖b8 17 ♗g2 ± Knaak-Peev, Leipzig 1977 is ECO's recommendation) 8...g5 (8...c6 9 d5 ♜e7 10 b4! cxd5 11 ♖xd5 ♜d8 12 ♜b3 ± Efimov-Badea, Porto San Giorgio 2000) and now:

b1) 9 ♗e3!? c6 10 ♜c2 (10 dxe5 dxe5 11 ♜d2 ♖f8 12 ♜xd8+ ♖xd8 13 0-0-0+ ♖e7 14 ♖d2 ♖e6 15 ♖b3 ♗d8 16 g4 ♗f8 17 f3 ♖f7 18 c5 ♖f4 19 ♗c4 ♗e6 20 ♗xe6 ♖xe6 21 ♖c2 ± Kožul-Mortensen, Moscow OL 1994) 10...♖f7 11 0-0-0 h6 12 c5!? dxc5 13 d5 ♗f8 14 dxc6 bxc6 15 ♖d2 ♗e7 16 ♖b3 ± Roktim-Vinoth, Dhaka 2005.

b2) 9 d5 0-0 (9...a5 10 ♖h2 0-0 11 g4 ♗f7 12 ♗e3 ♗f8 13 f3 ♖c5 14 0-0 b6 15 ♜d2 ♜e8 16 b3 ♗g7 17 ♗d1 ♗d7 18 ♗c2 ♗e7 19 ♜e2 ♖h8 20 ♖h1 ♗g8 21 ♗f2 ± L.Müller-Mannhart, Calvia OL 2004) 10 b3 a5 11 ♜b1 ♖c5 12 ♗e3 ♖f7 13 ♖d2 f5 (otherwise 14 g4 as in the previous game) 14 ♗xc5 dxc5 15 exf5 ♗xf5 16 ♖de4 ♖d6 17 ♗d3 and White stands slightly better, M. Vukić-Sekulić, Neum 2002.

8 ♖xd4 ♖c5

8...♖e5?! is not good: 9 h5 (or 9 f3!? and now 9...♖c6 10 ♗e3 f5 11 ♜d2 ♖f7 12 exf5 gxf5 13 ♖d5 ♖fe5 14 ♗g5 ♜d7 15 ♖e6! h6 16 ♗f6 1-0 Bewersdorff-T.Horvath, Frankfurt 1990 or 9...f5 10 ♗g5 ♜d7 11 ♜d2 ♖hf7 12 exf5 gxf5 13 0-0-0 0-0 14 ♗e3 c6 15 g4 fxg4 16 fxg4 ♜e7 17 ♗dg1 ± Muraviev-A.Popov, corr. 1994) 9...a6 10 ♗f4 g5 11 ♗g3 0-0 12 ♜d2 c5 13 ♖f3 f6 14 0-0-0 ♖hf7 15 ♖xe5 fxe5 16 h6 ♗f6 17 ♗h5 ♗e7 18 ♖d5 ± Uhlmann-Jürgens, Dresden 2004.

9 h5!?

9 ♗e3 c6 10 ♜d2 ♖g4 11 ♗xg4 ♗xg4 12 h5 ♜e7 13 f3 ± Lengyel-Rakić, Odzaci 1978.

9...c6 10 ♗f4 ♜f6!?


10...♜e7? proved bad in Am.Rodriguez-T.Rakić, Vrnjačka Banja 1977: 11 ♗f3 g5 12 ♖xc6! bxc6 13 ♗xd6 ♜b7 14 ♗xc5 ♜xb2 15 0-0! ♜xc3 16 e5 ♗d7 17 ♗xc6!! ♗d8 18 ♜d6 ♗f8 19 ♗xd7+ ♗xd7 20 ♜b8+ ♗d8 21 ♜b5+ ♗d7 22 ♗ad1 ♗xc5 23 ♜xd7+ ♖f8 24 ♜d8+ 1-0.

11 ♗e3 ♜e7 12 ♜d2 ♖g4 13 ♗xg4 ♗xg4 14 f3

White enjoys a slight advantage due to his greater spatial control, according to Am.Rodriguez.

C)

4...e5 5 ♖c3 (D)



Now all lines with 5...♗g4 will be examined in D. Alternatively, Black can opt for:

C1: 5...♖c6 96

C2: 5...exd4 97

C1)

5...♖c6 6 ♗g5

One of the best continuations for White, although 6 d5 is also possible. Nothing much is offered by 6 dxe5 dxe5 7 ♜xd8+ ♖xd8! (not 7...♖xd8? 8 ♖b5 ♖d7 9 ♗g5 and 10 0-0-0+ ±).

6...f6

Other moves are mistaken: 6...♜d7?! 7 dxe5 dxe5 8 ♖b5! ± Miles-Quinteros, Puerto Madryn 1980, 6...♗f6?! 7 ♗e3! or 6...♖ge7?! 7 d5 ♖d4 8 ♖xd4 exd4 9 ♖b5 ± Gasik-Lukasiewicz, Sopot 1998.

7 ♗e3 ♖h6 (D)


Black has at his disposal some reasonable alternatives:

a) 7...exd4 8 ♖xd4 ♖ge7 9 h4 ♖xd4 10 ♜xd4 ♗e6 11 ♜d2 ♖c6 12 ♖d5 ♜d7 13 h5 ♜f7 14 h6 ♗f8 15 f4 ± Ostojić-Ermenkov, Jagodina 1998.

b) 7...♗h6 8 ♜d2 ♗xe3 9 ♜xe3 ♗g4 10 d5 (10 dxe5 ♗xf3 11 gxf3 dxe5 {11...fxe5?! 12 c5 ♖d4 13 0-0-0 dxc5 14 f4 exf4 15 ♜xf4 ♜d6 16 ♗b5+ ♖d8 17 e5 ♜e7 18 ♖e2 ± Radjabov-Z.Basagić, Izmir ECC 2004}) 12 f4 ♖ge7 ∞)

10...♗c7 11 ♖d2 ± Epishin-Zaichik, New York 1990.

c) 7...♗g4 8 d5 ♗c7 (8...♗xf3 9 ♖xf3 ♖d4 10 ♖d1 ± Cherepennikov-Maliuga, Moscow 1996 or 8...♗d4 9 ♗e2 ♗xf3 10 ♗xf3 ± Jansa-Plachetka, Luhačovice 1968) 9 c5 ♗h6 10 ♖d2 ♗xe3 11 ♖xe3 ♗f8 12 ♖d2 ♗g7 13 f3 ♗d7 14 ♖c4 ± Ki.Georgiev-Azmaiparashvili, Moscow 1990.



8 dxe5

Probably the best, although other moves are also possible:

a) 8 c5!? exd4 (8...♗g4!? 9 d5 ♗xe3 10 fxe3 ♗e7 11 ♗b5+ ♗f8 ♞) 9 ♗xd4 ♗g4 10 ♗f4 ♗xd4 11 ♖xd4 dxc5 12 ♖xc5 c6 13 ♗e2 ♖b6 14 ♗d6 ♗f8 15 ♗xf8 ♞xf8 16 ♖a4 ♖xc5 17 ♗xc5 ♗e5 18 f4 ♗f7 19 ♗f2 gives White a slight advantage, Epishin-S.Mohr, Bad Zwesten 1997.

b) 8 ♗e2 0-0-0 d5 ♗e7 10 h4 ♗g4 11 ♗d2 h5 12 ♗h2 f5 13 ♗xg4 fxc4 14 f3 gxf3 15 ♗xf3 ♗h7 16 ♖e2 ♗g8 17 0-0-0 ♗h6 18 ♗b1 ♗g7 ± 1/2-1/2 Ivanisević-Solak, Novi Sad 2000.

c) 8 h3 ♗f7 9 g4!? (9 c5!? dxc5 10 dxe5 ♗fxe5 11 ♗xc5 ♖xd1+ 12 ♗xd1 ♗d7 13 ♗e2 0-0-0 ± 1/2-1/2 I.Sokolov-Vallejo Pons, Spanish Cht (Sanxenxo) 2004) 9...exd4 10 ♗xd4 ♗xd4 11 ♖xd4 0-0 12 ♖d2 ♞e8 13 0-0-0 ♖e7 14 ♗e2 c6 15 h4 ± P.H.Nielsen-McNab, Gothenburg Echt 2005.

8...dxe5

White retains the advantage after 8...fxe5 9 h3 ♗f7 10 ♖d2 ♗e6 11 ♗e2 ♖d7 12 ♗d5 0-0 13 b4 h6 14 ♞d1 (Korchnoi-Avrukh, Beersheba 1997) or 8...♗xe5 9 ♗xe5 (9 ♗e2!? ♗hg4 10 ♗d4 c5 11 ♗xe5 fxe5 12 ♖d3 ♗f6 13 0-0-0 ♗e7 14 ♖e3 ♖a5?? {14...♗g4 15 ♖g5+ ♗f7 ±} 15 ♞xd6!! ♗g4 16 ♖g5+ ♗xd6 17 ♖d2+

♗e6 18 ♗g5+ ♗f6 19 ♗d5# (1-0) Korchnoi-Solak, Basle 2002) 9...dxe5 (9...fxe5 10 ♗e2 ♗f7 11 c5 ±) 10 ♖xd8+ ♗xd8 11 0-0-0+ ♗d7 12 f3 ♗g8 13 c5 ♗e8 14 ♗b5 ♗xb5 15 ♗xb5+ c6 16 ♗c4, Tarasov-G.Kuzmin, St Petersburg 2000.

9 ♖xd8+ ♗xd8

Not, of course, 9...♗xd8? 10 ♗d5 +-.

10 0-0-0+

Equally good is 10 h3 ♗e6 11 0-0-0+ ♗c8 12 g4 ♗f7 13 ♞g1 b6 14 c5 ♗b7 15 ♗d5 ♞ad8 16 ♗a6+ ± Zsu.Polgar-Azmaiparashvili, Dortmund 1990.

10...♗d7 11 h3 ♗c8 12 c5 ♗f7 13 ♗c4 ♗cd8 14 ♗c2!?


Or 14 b4 c6 15 ♗d2 ± Karpov-Seirawan, Roquebrune rpd 1992.

14...♗e6 15 ♗b3 c6 16 ♞d3

White has a slight advantage. Illescas-McNab, Gothenburg Echt 2005 finished unexpectedly quickly: 16...♗xc4+ 17 ♗xc4 ♗e6 18 ♞hd1 ♞d8 19 ♞xd8+ ♗exd8 20 b4 ♗e6 21 b5 ♗f8 22 ♗e1 ♗c7 23 ♗c2 b6? 24 bxc6 bxc5? 25 ♞d7+ 1-0.

C2)

5...exd4 6 ♗xd4 (D)



Black surrenders the centre, hoping for active piece-play and a future ...f5 advance. If White continues with normal development, then Black will probably succeed in fulfilling his plan. But White can try to seize the initiative with activity on the kingside, mainly connected with the move h4. Now the main paths for Black are:

- C21: 6...♗e7 98
- C22: 6...♗c6 98

C21)

6...♗e7 7 h4!? 0-0

7...h5 8 ♗g5 ♗bc6 9 ♗c2 f6 10 ♗f4 ♗e6 11 ♗d4 ♗xd4 12 ♗xd4 ♗c6 13 ♗e3 ♗e5 14 c5 ♗g4 15 ♗d4 0-0 16 ♗c4 ♗xc4 17 ♗xc4+ ♗h7 18 cxd6 cxd6 19 ♗d1 ♗b6 20 ♗e2 ± Wewers-Külshammer, Duisburg 2005.

8 h5 c5!?

This is the main 'defence', as 8...♗bc6 9 ♗xc6 ♗xc6 10 hxg6 hxg6 11 ♗h6 seems quite attractive for White.

9 ♗db5

9 ♗b3 ♗bc6 10 hxg6 fxg6 11 ♗g5 ♗e8! 12 ♗d2 ♗f5 13 0-0-0 is rather unclear but probably a little better for White, Gelfand-Azmaiparashvili, Wijk aan Zee 1993.

9...♗bc6 10 hxg6

Also good for White is 10 ♗f4 ♗a5 11 ♗d2 a6 12 ♗xd6 ♗d8 13 0-0-0 ♗d4 14 ♗b1 ♗b6 15 ♗xc8 ♗axc8 16 ♗d5 ♗e6 17 f3 ± Krizsany-Baldan, Pecs 1997 but not 10 ♗g5?! ♗a5 11 ♗xd6 a6 12 ♗f6 ♗f5? (12...♗d8! ∞) 13 exf5 ♗e8+ 14 ♗e2 ± Wells-A.Ledger, Hastings 1994/5.

10...fxg6 11 ♗e3 a6 12 ♗xd6 ♗a5 13 ♗xc8 ♗axc8 14 ♗d2

± Cvitan-Azmaiparashvili, Tilburg 1993.

C22)

6...♗c6 7 ♗e3 ♗ge7 8 h4!?

Again the same idea.

8...f5!?

Most other moves are in White's favour:

a) 8...h5 9 ♗d2 (9 ♗e2 ♗e5 10 ♗d2 a6 11 ♗d1 {11 ♗g5 c6 12 ♗d1 f6 13 ♗f4 ± M.Gurevich-J.Horvath, Haarlem 1998}) 11...c6 12 0-0 0-0 13 ♗h6 ±/± Krasenkow-Kveinys, Polish Cht (Suwalki) 1999) 9...0-0 10 0-0-0 ♗e8 11 ♗e2 ♗e5 12 f3 a6 13 ♗h6 ♗h8 14 ♗g5 c6 15 g4 ± Lukacs-Dorfman, Debrecen 1988.

b) 8...h6 and then:

b1) 9 ♗d2 ♗e5 10 ♗e2 (10 0-0-0 a6 11 ♗e2 ♗d7 12 ♗b1 h5 13 f3 c6 14 ♗b3! ♗e6 15 ♗xd6! ♗xd6 16 ♗xd6 ♗xc4 17 ♗a5! is much better for White, Podgaets-Azmaiparashvili, Haifa open 1989) 10...♗g4 11 ♗xg4 ♗xg4 12 f3 ♗d7 13 ♗d1 b6 14 ♗f2 a6 15 ♗de2 ♗c6 16 ♗d5 ♗e5 17 b3 ± Ftačnik-Badea, Krynica Z 1998.


b2) 9 ♗e2 f5 10 exf5 ♗xf5 11 ♗xf5 ♗xf5 12 ♗d2 ± Kasparov-Speelman, Barcelona 1989.

c) 8...0-0-0 9 h5 ♗xd4 (9...♗e8 10 hxg6 fxg6 11 ♗e2 ♗xd4 12 ♗xd4 ♗xd4 13 ♗xd4 ♗c6 14 ♗e3 ♗e6 15 0-0-0 ± P.H.Nielsen-Siebrecht, Warsaw 2005) 10 ♗xd4 ♗xd4 11 ♗xd4 ♗c6 12 ♗e3 ♗e6 13 f4 ♗e7 14 ♗e2 ♗ae8 15 0-0-0 ± Gofshtein-Danner, Hartberg 1991.

9 h5!?

(D)

9 exf5 ♗xf5 10 ♗xf5 ♗xf5 11 ♗e2 ♗d7 12 ♗d2 0-0-0 ± Illescas-Piket, Biel IZ 1993. This is similar to the Kasparov game in the previous note.



9...fxe4

9...♗f8 is too passive: 10 hxg6 hxg6 11 g3 fxe4 12 ♗xe4 ± Lautier-Degraeve, Belfort 2004.

10 hxg6

10 ♗xe4? ♗f5 11 ♗g5 ♗d7 12 ♗f6+ ♗xf6 13 ♗xf6 0-0! 14 ♗xf5 ♗xf5 was better for Black in Vaganian-Mestel, Hastings 1974/5.

10...hxg6

10...♗xg6?! 11 ♗d2 ♗xd4 12 ♗xd4 ♗e5 13 ♗xe4 ♗e7 14 0-0-0 ♗e6 15 f4 gave White a clear advantage in Bönsch-Azmaiparashvili, Dortmund 1990.

11 ♗xh8+ ♗xh8 12 ♗xe4 ♗f5!

This is the 'standard' position of this line! Black's last move was introduced by Seirawan and White needs to play with care and accuracy if he is to secure an opening advantage.

13 ♗xf5

13 ♗g3?! ♗xd4 14 ♗xd4 ♗d7! ∞ Zsu.Polgar-Seirawan, Monaco blindfold 1993.

13...gxf5

13...♗xf5 14 ♗g5 ♗d7 15 ♗d2 (15 ♗d5!?) 15...♗ce7 16 0-0-0 0-0-0 17 g4 ♗d4 18 ♗f6 ♗xf6 19 ♗xf6 ♗dc6 20 ♗d3 ± Gelfand-Piket, Monaco rpd 2001.

14 ♖h5+ ♔d7 15 0-0-0 ♖g8 16 ♘c5+ ♗c8
17 ♘e6!? ♔d7!


17...♗xb2+? 18 ♗xb2 ♖xe6 19 ♖e8+ ♘d8
20 c5! with the initiative.

18 ♘f4 ♘e5 19 ♘d5

± M.Gurevich-Speelman, Antwerp 1993.

D)

4...♗g4 5 ♗e2 (D)



Black's strategy is directed towards control of the important d4-square and he has three possibilities that further this aim:

- D1: 5...c6 99
- D2: 5...e5 100
- D3: 5...♗xf3 100

5...♘c6 is another possibility, and closely linked to Line D3. However, White has a useful extra option here: 6 ♘bd2!? (6 ♘g1!? is less effective: 6...♗d7! 7 ♗e3 e5, Kholmov-Spiridonov, Sochi 1973) 6...e5 (6...♘f6 7 d5 ± H.Olafsson-Speelman, Reykjavik 1990) 7 d5 ♘ce7 (7...♗xf3?! 8 ♘xf3 ♘d4 9 ♘xd4 exd4 10 0-0 ♘e7 11 ♖b1! ±) 8 0-0 (8 ♖b3!?, as in Vadasz-Adorjan, Hungary 1978, is interesting, but not 8 h3?! ♗c8! 9 ♖c2 ♘f6 10 c5 0-0 11 ♘c4 ♘e8 12 0-0 f5 ∞ Golod-Finkel, Givatayim 2003) 8...♘f6 9 ♘e1! h5 (9...♗d7 10 ♘d3 h5 11 c5 ♗h6 12 f3 ♗e3+ 13 ♗h1 h4 14 ♘c4 ♗xc1 15 ♖xc1 ± C.Ionescu-Moldovan, Bucharest 2002) 10 ♘d3 ♗h6 11 f3 ♗e3+ 12 ♗h1 ♗c8 13 ♘b3 (13 c5! ±) 13...♗xc1 14 ♖xc1 b6 15 f4 ♘xe4 16 ♖e3 ♘c5 17 ♘bxc5 bxc5 18 fxe5 ♘f5 19 ♖f4 0-0 20 ♖ae1 ± Gelfand-Cu.Hansen, Cap d' Agde 1996. This represents a viable option for White, in addition to allowing a transposition to Line D3 by 6 ♗e3 ♗xf3 7 ♗xf3.

D1)

5...c6 6 ♗e3!?

Avoiding future trouble with ...♖b6, although an active alternative is 6 0-0 ♗xf3 7 ♗xf3 ♖b6 8 ♗e3 ♖xb2 9 ♘d2 ♖b6 10 ♖b1 ♖c7 11 ♖b3 b6 12 c5 with compensation, Kariakin-Raud, Tallinn 1998 or the more common 6 ♘c3 ♗xf3 7 ♗xf3 ♖b6 8 d5 ♘d7 9 0-0 ♖c8 (9...♘g6 10 ♖b1 0-0 11 ♗e3 ♖c7 12 ♗e2! ± Gleizerov-McNab, Port Erin 2001) 10 ♖b3 ♘gf6 11 ♗e3 c5 12 ♖xb6 ♘xb6 13 ♗e2 ♘fd7 14 f4 ± Aquino-Gansvind, Victoria 2004.

6...♘d7

6...♘f6 is a rare line of the King's Indian Defence. An example is 7 ♘c3 0-0 8 0-0 a6 9 ♖d2 b5 10 cxb5 cxb5 11 h3 ♗d7 12 a3 ♗c6 13 d5 ♗b7 14 ♘d4 ± Zacharias-Sahlander, Germany tt 1997/8.

7 ♘c3


There is no need for 7 h3 ♗xf3 8 ♗xf3 e5 9 0-0 ♘e7 10 ♗e2 0-0 11 ♘c3 ♖c7 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 c5 ♖ad8 14 ♖a4 ♘c8 15 ♖ac1 ♖fe8 16 ♗g5 ♗f6 17 ♗xf6 ♘xf6 18 ♖fd1 ♖xd1+ 19 ♖xd1 ♖d8 20 ♖xd8+ ♖xd8 1/2-1/2 as in Kropp-Fegebank, Germany tt 1995/6.

7...♗xf3

Black prefers to exchange his bishop for the white knight, and not for the white bishop after a well-timed ♘d2/g1/e1. Alternatives like 7...e5 8 d5 c5 9 0-0 ♘e7 10 ♘e1! ♗xe2 11 ♖xe2 0-0 12 f4! ± Botvinnik-Czerniak, Hastings 1966/7 are not really appropriate.

8 ♗xf3 ♘gf6 9 0-0 (D)

The active continuation 9 ♖d2 e5 10 d5 c5 11 b4? cxb4 12 ♘b5 ♘c5 13 ♗xc5 dxc5 14 d6 0-0 15 ♘c7 ♖c8 16 a3 a5 17 axb4 axb4, as in N.Nogueira-J.Leonardo, Lisbon 1999, is not recommending.



This is a line of the King's Indian Defence and White enjoys a slight and secure advantage, as Black is lacking real counterplay. Some examples:

a) 9...♖a5 10 ♙e2 0-0 11 f4 e5 12 fxe5 dxe5 13 d5 ♘c5 14 ♗b1 ♘a4 15 ♘xa4 ♗xa4 16 b3 ♗b4 17 a3 ♗e7 18 b4 ± Eckert-T.Schmidt, Dortmund 1998.

b) 9...a6 10 g3 (10 a4!? a5 11 ♙e2 e5 12 d5 ♘c5 13 f3 0-0 14 ♖a3 ± ♗b6? 15 dxc6 ♗xb2? 16 cxb7? {16 ♙xc5 +-} 16...♗xa3 17 bxa8 ♗xa8 18 ♗c1? {18 ♗xd6 ±} 1/2-1/2 Lukacs-Barczay, Budapest 1995) 10...h5 11 h3 e5 12 ♙g2 0-0 13 ♗d2 b5 14 d5! ♘b6 15 b3 ± L.Schmid-Bronstein, Monte Carlo 1969.

c) 9...0-0 10 ♖c1 (10 ♗b3 ♗c7 11 ♖ael e5 12 d5 c5 13 g4 h6 14 ♙g2 ♘h7 15 h4 ± Dimitrov-Andreev, Velingrad 2004) 10...e5 11 d5 c5 12 ♗h1 ♗h8 13 ♗b3 b6 14 ♗a4 ♘e8 15 ♙g4 f5 16 ♙h3 ♖f7 17 exf5 gxf5 18 f3 ± Gomez Esteban-Campora, Merida 2005.

D2)

5...e5 6 d5!

Closing the centre is the best option, as now it is difficult for Black to advance ...f5, with or without his g4-bishop.

6...a5

A useful move, aiming at strengthening the c5-square for one of the black knights and at the same time restricting White's b4 advance. Other moves give White too much:

a) 6...♘f6 7 ♘c3 c5 8 0-0 0-0 9 ♘e1 ♙xe2 10 ♗xe2 a6 11 ♖b1 ♘bd7 12 b4 ± Gladyszev-Le Kouaghet, La Fere 2003.

b) 6...♘e7 7 ♘c3 0-0 and now:


b1) 8 h3 ♙xf3 9 ♙xf3 f5 10 g4 ♘d7 11 gxf5 gxf5 12 ♖g1 ♗h8 13 ♙e3 f4 14 ♙d2 ♘c5 15 ♗e2 a5 16 h4 ± Labollita-Tristan, Buenos Aires 2005.

b2) 8 ♙e3 h6 (8...♙xf3 9 ♙xf3 ♘d7 10 ♙e2 f5 11 f3 a5 12 0-0 ♗h8 13 a3 ♘g8 14 b4 ± I.Sokolov-Vujadinović, Vrnjačka Banja 1990) 9 h3 ♙c8 10 ♘d2 f5 11 f3 ♘d7 12 g4 c6 13 ♗c2 is slightly better for White, Ree-Seret, Thessaloniki OL 1984.

b3) 8 0-0 ♙xf3?! (8...♙c8!?) 9 ♙xf3 ♘d7 10 ♙e2 f5 11 f3 f4 12 ♖b1 g5 13 b4 b6 14 ♗c2 ± Timman-Romanishin, Indonesia 1983.

7 ♘c3 (D)

There is no need for 7 h3?! ♙d7! 8 ♘c3 ♘a6 as in Zhao Xue-C.Foisor, Cannes wom 2003. White must ignore the g4-bishop for the moment and wait to see its intentions.



7...♘a6

7...♘f6 is again a line of the King's Indian Defence. An instructive example is 8 ♙e3 ♘a6 9 0-0 0-0 10 b3 ♘c5 11 ♘d2 h5 12 f3 ♙d7 13 a3 ♘h7 14 b4 axb4 15 axb4 ♖xa1 16 ♗xa1 ♘a6 17 ♗a3 f5 18 c5 f4 19 ♙f2 ♘b8 20 ♘c4 g5 21 cxd6 cxd6 22 b5 g4 23 ♗xd6 g3 24 hxg3 ♖f6 25 ♙b6 ♗e8 26 ♗c7 fxg3 27 ♗d8 1-0 Pinter-Remmler, Dortmund 1995.

White stood slightly better in Hertneck-Cu.Hansen, Munich 1992 after 7...♘e7 8 a3 (8 ♘d2!?) 8...0-0 9 0-0 ♘d7 10 ♙d2 ♘c5 11 ♙e3 ♙xf3 12 ♙xf3 f5 13 ♙xc5 dxc5 14 ♘a4.

8 0-0 ♙d7!?

Or 8...♘e7 9 a3 0-0 10 ♖b1 ± Korchnoi-Hübner, Wijk aan Zee 1971.

9 a3!

Equally good is 9 ♘e1 f5 10 ♘d3 ♘f6 11 f3 f4 12 a3 ♘c5 13 ♘xc5 dxc5 14 ♙d2 ± Cebalo-Biti, Bizovac 2005.

9...♘f6 10 ♙e3 ♘g4 11 ♙g5 f6 12 ♙d2 ♘h6 13 b4!

White stood better in Epishin-Ehlvest, New York 1990, thanks to his spatial advantage and initiative on the queenside.

D3)

5...♙xf3

With this immediate exchange (rather than 5...♘c6) Black avoids lines with ♘bd2.

6 ♙xf3 ♘c6 7 ♙e3


7 d5 ♘d4 8 ♘c3 c5 9 0-0 e5 10 dxe6?! (10 ♙e2! and ♙d3 ±) 10...fxe6 11 e5 ♙xe5 12

♙xb7 ♖b8 13 ♙e4 ♗e7 14 ♖b1 0-0 was fine for Black in Grivas-I.Nikolaidis, Thessaloniki 2001.

7...e5 8 d5

8 dxe5? dxe5 9 ♗c3 ♗d4 10 c5 c6 11 a3 ♖e7!
 ♣ Zsu.Polgar-Wolff, Groningen PCA 1993.

8...♗d4 (D)



This is a critical position, where White has two options: to exchange the knight or try to co-exist with it.

D31: 9 ♗c3 101

D32: 9 ♙xd4 101

D31)

9 ♗c3 ♗e7

Another option is 9...c5!? 10 dxc6 bxc6 11 0-0 (or 11 b4 ♗e7 12 0-0 0-0 13 ♖b1 ± I.Ivanov-R.Burnett, Dearborn 1992) 11...♗e7 12 c5 ♖b8 (12...dxc5 13 ♗a4 ♖a5 14 ♖c1 ♗d8 15 b3 0-0 16 ♖xc5 ♖a6 17 ♖c4 ♗df5 18 ♖c1 ♗xe3 19 ♖xe3 ± S.Löffler-Moreno Carnero, Hamburg 2004) 13 cxd6 ♖xd6 14 ♗a4 0-0 15 b3 ♖fd8 16 ♙e2 ± Neverov-Nevednichy, Bucharest 1993.

10 h4!?

The same thematic move as in a lot of positions in this opening.

10...h5

Other moves are worse:

a) 10...h6?! 11 h5 g5 12 ♙g4 c6 13 ♖d2 ±± Y.Hernandez-Fierro Baquero, San Felipe 1999.

b) 10...c5?! 11 h5 (11 ♙g4?! f5 12 exf5 gxf5 13 ♙h5+ ♗g6 14 g4 ♖d7 15 gxf5 ♖xf5 16 ♙g4 ♖c2 17 ♖b1 h5 18 ♙xh5 ♖xd1+ 19 ♙xd1 ♗xh4 20 ♙a4+ ♗e7 1/2-1/2 M.Salm-O'Kelly de Galway, corr. 1959) 11...a6 12 ♙e2 f5 13 hxg6 hxg6 14 ♙xh8+ ♙xh8 15 ♙d3 ±±

Krasenkov-Zlotnikov, Voskresensk 1992 – see Illustrative Games.

11 ♙e2

This looks better than 11 g3 c5 (11...c6 12 0-0 ♖b6 13 ♖b1 ♖b4 14 ♙e2 0-0 15 ♖d2 ♖ac8 16 a3 ♖b3 17 ♖fc1 f5 ∞ M.Nilsson-Quinn, Siofok jr Ech 1996) 12 ♙g2 a6 13 0-0 0-0 14 ♖b1 b5 15 b3 ♖b8 16 ♖d2 ♖a5 17 ♗h1 f5 18 ♙g5 ♖b7 19 cxb5 1/2-1/2 S.Pedersen-Lindfeldt, Denmark 2001.

11...c5 12 ♙d3 ♖d7 13 a3 0-0 14 b4 b6 15 ♖b1

White enjoys a slight advantage, Krasenkov-Kakgeldiev, Oviedo rpd 1993.

D32)

9 ♙xd4 exd4

Black has achieved a passed pawn on d4, which he often defends with ...c5, but White can launch two different pawn-storms, if properly prepared, usually ensure White's advantage.

10 ♗d2

This is more flexible than 10 ♗a3 ♗e7 (10...c5 11 dxc6 bxc6 12 ♖a4 ♗e7 13 0-0 0-0 14 c5 f5 15 cxd6 ♖xd6 16 ♗c4 ♖c7 17 ♖fe1 fxe4 18 ♖xe4 ± Gleizerov-Yuldachev, Abu Dhabi 2005) 11 0-0 c6 12 ♖b1 0-0 13 ♗c2 c5 14 b4 and now I recommend 14...b6!?! ∞ instead of 14...♗c8?! 15 ♖d3 ♖c7 16 ♙e2 ♖e8 17 bxc5 dxc5 18 f4 b5 19 ♖xb5 ♗d6 20 e5! ± Portisch-Timman, Antwerp 1989.

10...♗e7

Also possible:

a) 10...♗f6 11 0-0 ♗d7 12 ♙e2! ± d3?! 13 ♙xd3 ♙xb2 14 ♖b1 ♙g7 15 f4 0-0 16 ♗f3 ♖f6 17 ♖d2! ♙h6 18 g3 ♗c5 19 ♖be1 ♖ae8 20 ♙b1 ±± Epishin-Djurić, Cutro 1999.


b) 10...c5 11 dxc6 bxc6 12 b4 (12 e5?! ♗e7 13 exd6 ♖xd6 14 0-0 0-0 15 ♗e4 ♖b4 16 ♖b3 1/2-1/2 Novik-Chepkaitis, Dubai 2002) 12...♗e7 13 0-0 0-0 14 ♗b3 ♖b8 15 a3 c5 (15...♖b6 16 c5 dxc5 17 ♗xc5 ♖fd8 18 ♗d3 ± Epishin-Gulko, Erevan OL 1996 or 15...♖c7?! 16 c5 ♖fd8 17 ♖d3 dxc5 18 ♗xc5 ♖d6 19 ♖a6 ± Atalik-McNab, Calvia OL 2004) 16 b5 f5 17 ♖b1 ♗h8 18 a4 fxe4 19 ♙xe4 d5 20 ♙d3 dxc4 21 ♙xc4 ♖d6 22 ♖c1 ± Epishin-McNab, Gibraltar 2003.

11 0-0

11 ♙e2 c5 12 f4 g5! 13 fxg5 ♜g6 14 ♚a4+ ♜f8 with compensation, Rogozenko-Moldovan, Romanian Cht (Sovata) 2001.

11...0-0 12 ♙e2 (D)

This is more flexible than 12 b4 a5 (12...c5 13 bxc5 dxc5 14 ♚b1! b6 15 ♚e1 \pm or 12...c6 13 ♜b3 cxd5 14 exd5 ♜f5 15 ♚c1 \pm C.Jepson-Ohlin, Seden 2002) 13 b5?! (13 a3! \pm) 13... ♜c8 ∞ Likavsky-Navara, Pula 2003.



Black has now tried the following:

a) 12...c6 13 ♜f3 ♚b6 14 ♚d2 f5 15 ♙d3 fxex4 16 ♙xe4 cxd5 17 cxd5 ♚ac8 18 ♚e2! ♙f6 19 ♜e1 ♙g7 20 ♜d3 ♚ce8 21 ♚fe1 \pm/\pm Epishin-Gulko, Philadelphia 1998.

b) 12...f5 13 ♜f3! fxe4 14 ♜xd4 and then:

b1) Sutovsky suggests the tactical continuation 14... ♜f5! ? 15 ♜e6 ♚h4 16 g3! (16 ♜xf8? ♙e5 17 g3 ♜xg3 =) 16... ♚f6 17 ♜xf8 (17 ♜xc7 ♚ab8 18 ♜e6 ♚xb2 19 ♚b1 ♚xa2 20 ♜xf8 ♜xf8 ∞) 17... ♙xf8 18 ♚c2 ♚e5 19 ♚ael ♜d4 20 ♚d1 h5! with compensation, but I believe that White stands better after 21 f4! ♚f5 22 g4!.

b2) 14... ♙xd4 15 ♚xd4 ♜f5 16 ♚xe4 ♚f6 17 ♙g4! (17 ♚c2?! ♜d4 18 ♚d2 ♚f4! ∞ Chuchelov-Sutovsky, Moscow 2003) 17... ♚xb2 (17... ♚ae8 18 ♚d3 \pm) 18 ♚abl ♚xa2 19 ♚xb7 ♚ae8 20 ♚d3 ♚a5 21 ♚b5 ♚a2 22 ♚c3! ♚e4 23 ♙xf5 gxf5 24 ♚c1 ♚fe8 25 h3 \pm .

c) 12...c5 and then:

c1) The immediate 13 f4?! is poor: 13...f5! (13...a6?! 14 ♙d3 ♚b8 15 h4 b5 16 h5 ♜c8 17 hxg6 fxg6?! {17...hxg6 \pm } 18 ♚g4 ♜h8 19 b3 ♜b6 20 ♜f3 \pm Epishin-Hennig, Hamburg 1997 – see Typical Endgames) 14 ♙d3 fxe4 15 ♜xe4 ♜f5 16 ♚g4 ♚e7 ∞ Atalik-Vallejo Pons, Calvia OL 2004. The f4-pawn is weak and the black knight can land on the e3-square.

c2) 13 ♙d3 is the common move and if 13...f5?! then 14 ♚e1 fxe4 15 ♜xe4 ♜f5 16 ♚g4 \pm .

c3) 13 g3!?! is an interesting new try for White: 13... ♜c8! ? (13...f5 14 exf5 ♜xf5 15 ♙d3 is pleasant for White) 14 h4! (14 ♙d3 ♜b6 15 ♜g2 ♜d7 16 f4 ♚e7 17 ♚f3 ♙f6 18 ♚ael \pm Ivanisević-Šolak, Interlaken 2001 – see Typical Endgames) 14... ♜b6 15 h5 ♜d7 16 hxg6 hxg6 17 ♜g2! \pm Epishin-de la Villa, Lausanne 2001 – see Illustrative Games.

3.5 Illustrative Games

Completing our survey in the Modern Defence, here are three illustrative games, which present highly important strategic and tactical motifs for both sides.

Game 1

Sulava – Tibensky

Pula 2003

1 ♜f3 g6 2 c4 ♙g7 3 d4 d6 4 ♜c3 ♜d7 5 e4 e5
6 ♙e2 c6 7 0-0 ♚e7

For more information on this line, see Section 3.4, Line B1.

8 c5! exd4

Maybe Black should try 8...dxc5 9 d5! cxd5 (9... ♜gf6! ? 10 dxc6 bxc6 11 b3 0-0 12 ♙a3 ♜e8 13 ♜a4 ♜c7 14 ♚c1 ♜e6 15 ♙c4 with good compensation for White due to his better pawn-formation) 10 ♜xd5 ♚d8 11 ♙b5! a6 (11... ♜gf6 12 ♙g5 h6 13 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 14 ♜xf6+ ♚xf6 15 ♚d5 \pm) 12 ♙xd7+ ♙xd7 13 ♙e3 b6 14 b4 ♚c8 15 bxc5 bxc5 16 ♚c1 and although White's position is preferable, Black retains fair chances.

9 cxd6 ♚xd6 10 ♙e3! (D)

The point behind 8 c5!.


10... ♜e7

Not much help is offered by:

a) 10... ♜gf6 11 ♙xd4 ♚e7 (or 11... ♚c7 12 e5 ♜h5 13 ♜g5! and then 13... ♙xe5 14 ♙xh5 , 13... ♜f4 14 e6! or 13... ♜xe5 14 f4) 12 e5 ♜g4 13 e6!.

b) 10...c5 11 ♜b5 ♚b8 12 ♜fxd4! and here:

b1) 12...a6 13 ♜f5! gxf5 (or 13...axb5 14 ♜xg7+ ♜f8 15 ♙xb5 ♚c7 16 ♜h5! gxf5 17



♖xh5 with a strong attack) 14 ♘d6+ ♕f8 (14...♗e7 15 ♘xf5+ ♕f8 16 ♙xc5+ +-) 15 ♗d5 ♘e5 16 ♙xc5 ♘e7 17 ♘xf7! ♖c7 (White also wins after 17...♘xf7 18 ♙c4) 18 ♘xe5 ♖xe5 19 ♗d8+ ♕f7 20 ♙c4+ +-.

b2) 12...cxd4 13 ♙xd4 ♙xd4 (13...♕f8? 14 ♙c5+ or 13...♘g6 14 e5! 0-0 {14...♘xe5 15 ♙c5 ♙f8 16 ♘d6+ +-}) 15 exf6 ♙xf6 16 ♙xf6 ♘xf6 17 ♗d4 ±) 14 ♖xd4 f6 15 ♖ac1 ±.

11 ♘xd4 g5!?

11...0-0 12 f4 ±.

12 ♙g4 ♘b6

12...0-0 13 ♘f5 ♘xf5 14 ♙xf5 ±.

13 ♘e6! ± ♙e5 14 ♘g5 ♙xh2+ 15 ♕h1

♖xd1

15...♙xg4 16 ♖xg4 ♙e5 17 f4 +-.

16 ♙xd1 ♙e5 17 ♙b3 ♖f8 18 ♖ad1

18 f4 ♙f6 19 f5! ♘d7 20 ♖ad1 ♘e5 21 ♕g1 ±.

18...♘d7

18...♙g4 19 f3 ♙h5 20 ♕g1 ♙g6 21 f4! ♙xc3 22 bxc3 h6 23 f5 hxg5 24 fxg6 ♘xg6 25 ♙xg5 ♘e5 26 ♙f6 ♘bd7 27 ♖f5 ♘g4 28 ♙g7 ♘e3 29 ♖e1 ♘xf5 30 exf5+ +-.

19 f4 ♙xc3 20 bxc3 h6 21 ♘f3

White could also continue with 21 ♖xd7! ♙xd7 (21...hxg5 22 ♖xe7+ ♕xe7 23 ♙c5+ or 21...♕xd7 22 ♘xf7) 22 ♘h7 ♙e6 (22...f5 23 ♘xf8 ♕xf8 24 ♖d1 ♕e8 25 ♖d6 fxe4 26 ♖xh6) 23 ♘xf8 ♙xb3 24 axb3 ♕xf8 25 g4 ±.

21...♘f6 22 ♙d4 ♘h5

22...♘xe4 23 ♖fel f5 24 ♘d2 c5 25 ♘xe4 fxe4 26 ♙a4+ ±.

23 ♕h2 ♘xf4 24 ♘e5 ♘e6 25 ♙e3 f6 26 ♘c4 ♘g6 27 ♘d6+ ♕e7 28 ♙xh6 ♖h8 29 ♘f5+ ♕e8 30 ♕g1 ♘e5 31 ♖d6!?

31 ♙xe6 ♙xe6 32 ♘d6+ ♕e7 33 ♙g7 was winning.

31...♘f7 32 ♙g7

Although this move does not spoil anything, the simple 32 ♙xe6 ♘xd6 (32...♘xh6 33 ♖fd1 ♘xf5 34 exf5) 33 ♘xd6+ ♕e7 34 ♙xc8 was not that difficult to find.

32...♘xg7 33 ♘xg7+ ♕e7 34 ♖dxf6 ♘e5 35 ♖6f4!?

35 ♙e6 ± was crying out to be played.

35...♙d7 36 ♘f5+ ♕d8 37 ♘d6 ♕c7 38 ♘f7 ♖he8 39 ♖d1 ♙g4 40 ♖df1!?

40 ♖d4!.

40...♙e2 41 ♖b1 ♘g6?

Black cracks! With 41...♘d3 42 ♖h4 ♖e7 he could limit White's advantage and fight for his survival.

42 ♖f6 ♙d3? 43 ♖d1 ♙xe4 44 ♘d6 1-0

Game 2

Krasenkov – Zlotnikov

Voskresensk 1992

1 d4 g6 2 e4 ♙g7 3 ♘f3 d6 4 c4 ♙g4 5 ♙e2 ♘c6 6 ♙e3 ♙xf3 7 ♙xf3 e5 8 d5 ♘d4 9 ♘c3 ♘e7


For more information on this line, see Section 3.4, Line D31.

10 h4 c5

Maybe 10...h5! 11 ♙xd4 exd4 12 ♘e2 c5 13 ♘f4 ± is a decent alternative for Black.

11 h5 a6 12 ♙e2f5 13 hxg6 hxg6 14 ♖xh8+ ♙xh8 15 ♙d3 ♕d7?! (D)

Better is 15...♖a5 16 ♙d2 ♖c7 ±. Now the black king will suffer.



16 b4! f4

16...cxb4 17 ♖a4+ b5 18 cxb5 (18 ♖xb4 ±) 18...bxc3 19 bxa6+ ♕c8 20 ♖c1 ♖a7 21 ♖b4! ± is also bad for Black, but 16...b6 is preferable.

17 ♙xd4 exd4


After 17...cxd4 18 ♖a4 b6 19 ♖g4+ the game is one-way traffic.

18 ♖a4 cxb4

18...b6! ±.

19 c5 ♖e8 20 ♖g4?! (D)

Better is 20 ♖b6! ♖b8 21 ♖g4 (21 ♖a4+?! ♜f7 22 ♖xb4 ♖c8! ±) 21...♖c7 22 ♖c4 ♖xc5 23 ♖xf4 ♖d8 (23...♗e5 24 ♖xe5!) 24 ♖c1 ±.



20...dxc5

20...♖c7 21 ♖xf4 ♗e5 22 ♖g5! dxc5 23 ♖b6! ±.

21 ♖xc5 ♖c8?!

Returning the favour. Black should prefer 21...♖c7 22 ♖h4 ♗e5 23 ♖c1 b6 24 ♖b3 ♖d6 ∞.

22 ♖h4 ♖xc5

22...♗e5? 23 d6! +.

23 ♖xh8+ ♜f7

After 23...♜d7? 24 ♖xa8 + the black king will not manage to escape.

24 ♖h7+! ♜f6?

Black had to play 24...♜f8! 25 ♖e2 ♖d6 26 ♖h8+ ♖g8 27 ♖xd4 ±/±.

25 ♜f1! + - ♖e8

25...♖d6 26 e5+! or 25...♖e5 26 ♖f7! ♖d6 27 g3 g5 28 gxf4+ gxf4 29 ♖h5+ ♜f6 30 ♖h6+ +.

26 e5+ ♜xe5 27 ♖f7 ♖c8 28 ♖e1+ 1-0

Game 3

Epishin – de la Villa

Lausanne 2001

1 d4 g6 2 c4 ♗g7 3 e4 ♖c6 4 ♖f3 d6 5 ♗e2 ♗g4 6 ♗e3 e5 7 d5 ♗xf3 8 ♗xf3 ♖d4 9 ♗xd4


exd4 10 ♖d2 ♖e7 11 ♗e2 0-0 12 0-0 c5 13 g3 ♖c8 14 h4! ♖b6 15 h5 ♖d7 16 hxg6 hxg6 17 ♜g2!

For more information on this line, see Section 3.4, Line D32 (note 'c3' after White's 12th move).

17...♖e8 18 ♖h1 ♖b8 19 f4 a6 20 a4 d3?

A serious mistake. Black should try 20...♖f6 21 ♗d3 ♖d7 22 ♖h4 ♖e7 23 ♖f3 with only a slight advantage for White.

21 ♗xd3 ♗xb2 22 ♖a2 ♗f6 (D)



23 e5!!

A strong positional sacrifice which turns the d3-bishop into a monster, enabling White to attack the black king.

23...dxe5 24 f5 ± g5

24...gxf5 25 ♗xf5 ♗g7 26 ♖e4 ♖f6 27 ♖xf6+ ♖xf6 28 ♖h5 ±.

25 ♖e4 ♗g7 26 f6! ♖xf6 27 ♖f2! b5

Black tries to become active, as 27...♖xe4 28 ♗xe4 ♖d7 29 ♖h5 ± was not encouraging.

28 ♖xf6+ ♗xf6 29 ♖h7

29 ♖h5!? ±.

29...e4 30 ♖h5 ♖b7 31 ♗e2 bxc4

The outcome of the game would not have changed after 31...e3 32 ♖f1 bxc4 (32...♗e7 33 ♗d3 ♖e5 34 ♖h6! +) 33 d6! ♖xd6 (33...♗g7 34 ♖h1 ♖f6 35 ♖h8+ ♗xh8 36 ♖h7+ ♜f8 37 ♖xh8+ ♖xh8 38 ♖xh8+ ♜g7 39 ♖xe8 +) 34 ♗xc4 ♖ee7 35 ♖g6+ ♜f8 36 ♖h8+ ♗xh8 37 ♖xd6 +.

32 d6! + - ♖xd6 33 ♗xc4 ♖e6

Or 33...♖ee7 34 ♖g6+ ♜f8 35 ♖h8+ ♗xh8 36 ♖xd6 +.

34 ♖xf6! ♖b2+ 35 ♜h3 g4+ 36 ♖xg4+ 1-0

4 Beating the Modern Benoni

4.1 Starting Out

The Modern Benoni (1 d4 ♀f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♀c3 exd5 5 cxd5) is an aggressive, uncompromising opening for Black. My suggestion against it is based on the h3/♁d3 system, which was popularized in the late 1980s and still seems to be alive and kicking.

In the kind of positions that arise in the Modern Benoni, White in general wants to achieve the e5 and b4 advances. The first advance is a very logical idea, as White has acquired a pawn-majority in the centre and wants to derive some benefits from it. The second advance is more sophisticated; with its help White usually ensures a strong 'semi-outpost' on d4 and at the same time the passed black c-pawn does not mean much. After the execution of this advance Black's activity in the queenside usually slows down. On the other hand, Black's plans are easy to predict. The first is to forestall White's e5 advance by some kind of blockade and the second is to gain the initiative on the queenside with a well-timed ...b5 advance. Sometimes the ...f5 break is a useful idea to keep in mind.

What is most important to remember is that the Modern Benoni, because of the unbalanced pawn-structure, is not an easy opening to handle and any small mistake can easily change the assessment.

The system in question can be located under ECO A70 and NIC BI 8.4. Other systems covered are the Snake Benoni (A60 – BI 4.4) and the early ...♁g4 variation (A75 – BI 13.7).

As historical background, here is the debut game of the h3/♁d3 system:

Tolush – Aronin
Moscow 1948

1 d4 ♀f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♀c3 ♁g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♀f3 0-0
6 h3 c5 7 d5 e6 8 ♁d3 exd5 9 cxd5 b5 10 0-0

c4 11 ♁c2 b4 12 ♀e2 ♖e8 13 ♀g3 ♀bd7 14 ♀d4 ♀c5 15 ♖e1 ♁d7 16 ♖e2 ♗b6 17 ♁f4 h5
18 ♀f3 b3 19 axb3 cxb3 20 ♁b1 ♁b5 21 ♖e3
♀fd7 22 ♀d4 ♀e5 23 ♀xh5 gxh5 24 ♀f5 ♀g6
25 ♁xd6 ♖ad8 26 ♀xg7 ♗xd6 27 ♀xe8 ♖xe8
28 ♗xh5 a5 29 e5 ♖xe5 30 ♖xe5 ♀xe5 31
♁h7+ ♀g7 32 ♖e1 ♀g6 33 ♖e3 ♁d3 34 ♖e8
♀f8 35 ♁xd3 ♀xd3 36 ♗g4+ ♗g6 37 ♗d4+
f6 38 ♖e3 ♀c1 39 ♀h2 ♀h7 40 d6 ♀g5 41 d7
1-0

4.2 Typical Endgames

In this section I shall present three interesting and characteristic endgames resulting from the proposed system against the Modern Benoni.

Endgame 1

Simonenko – Senador
Manila OL 1992

1 ♀f3 ♀f6 2 d4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 c4 d6 5 ♀c3 exd5
6 cxd5 g6 7 e4 ♁g7 8 h3 0-0 9 ♁d3 ♖e8 10 0-0
c4 11 ♁c2 b5 12 ♀xb5 ♀xe4 13 ♁xe4 ♖xe4
14 ♁g5 ♗b6 15 a4 ♗c5

For more information on this line, see Section 4.6, Line C2.


16 ♖e1 ♖xe1+ 17 ♗xe1 ♀a6 18 ♗e8+ ♁f8
19 ♖e1 ♁b7 20 ♁h6 ♗c8 21 ♗xc8 ♖xc8 22
♁xf8 ♖xf8 23 ♖e7 ♀c5 24 ♀xd6 ♁xd5 25
♖e5 ♁xf3 26 ♖xc5 ♁e2 (D)

White's advantage is clear, as he can win a pawn immediately and in general his pieces are more active.

27 a5?

The wrong approach. White should immediately capture the pawn with 27 ♀xc4 ♖b8 (27...♁xc4 28 ♖xc4 ♖b8 29 b4 ±) 28 ♀d6 ♖b6 (28...♖xb2 29 ♖c8+ ♀g7 30 ♖c7 ±) 29 ♀c8 ♖b7 30 ♖d5! ±. Now Black finds his way to the desired result.

27...♖b8 28 ♀xc4 ♁xc4 29 ♖xc4 ♖xb2 30
♖c7 ♖b1+ 31 ♀h2 ♖b2 32 ♀g3 ♖a2 33 ♖xa7



The endgame that has arisen is a theoretical draw.

33...♔g7 34 a6 h5 35 ♖a8 ♕f6 36 ♕f3 ♜a3+ 37 ♖e4 ♜a2 38 ♕e3

White cannot achieve more than a draw after 38 ♕d5 ♜xf2 39 ♜b8 ♜a2 40 ♜b6+ ♕g5.

38...♜a3+ 39 ♕d4 ♜a2 40 ♕e3 ♜a3+ 41 ♕f4 ♜a4+ 42 ♕e3 1/2-1/2

Endgame 2


Kožul – Vranesic

Toronto 1990

1 d4 ♘f6 2 ♘f3 c5 3 d5 d6 4 c4 g6 5 ♘c3 ♙g7 6 e4 0-0 7 h3 e6 8 ♙d3 exd5 9 cxd5 b5 10 ♙xb5 ♘xe4 11 ♘xe4 ♖a5+ 12 ♘fd2 ♖xb5 13 ♘xd6 ♖a6 14 ♘c2c4 ♘d7 15 0-0 ♘b6 16 ♘xb6 ♖xb6 17 ♘xc8 ♖axc8 18 ♜b1 ♖d6

For more information on this line, see Section 4.7, Line C.

19 ♙e3 ♜fd8 20 ♖a4 ♖xd5 21 ♜fd1 ♙d4 22 ♜d2 ♖c6 23 ♖xc6 ♜xc6 24 b3 ♜a6 25 ♕f1 (D)



White has achieved a slight advantage thanks to his better pawn-structure, as the weak black pawns on a7 and c5 need constant protection. As

a general rule, **Black** must think about playing actively.

25...♕g7

A serious alternative is 25...♜dd6!? 26 ♜bd1 ±.

26 a4?!

Better is 26 ♜bd1 ♜e8 27 ♙xd4+ cxd4 28 ♜c2 ±.

26...♜b6?!

Black should continue 26...♜ad6! 27 ♙xd4+ ♜xd4 28 ♜c2 ♜d1+ 29 ♜xd1 ♜xd1+ 30 ♕e2 ♜b1 with a draw. The difference between a win and a draw is often very small.

27 b4!

Black probably missed this move.


27...a6 28 ♜dd1! ♜d5?!

The last mistake. Black should try 28...♜bd6 29 bxc5 (29 ♙xd4+ ♜xd4 30 ♜xd4 ♜xd4! 31 b5 axb5 32 axb5 c4 33 b6 c3 =) 29...♙xc5 30 ♜xd6 ♙xd6 31 ♜b6 a5 32 ♙d4+, when White has a small advantage but things are far from easy, as Black always has the option of liquidating to a rook endgame with a pawn less, as described in our previous example.

29 ♙xd4+ cxd4

29...♜xd4 30 ♜xd4 cxd4 31 ♕e2 ± – the black rook is passive.

30 ♕e2 h5 31 ♕d3 (D)



Now the white king becomes the perfect blockader of the black passed pawn, allowing his own b-pawn to march on.

31...♜d7 32 b5 axb5 33 axb5 ♕f6 34 ♜b4 ♜a7

White would retain his advantage even after 34...♕e5 35 ♜e1 +! ♕f5 (35...♕d5?? 36 ♜xd4+ ♕c5 37 ♜e5+ ♜d5 38 ♜exd5#) 36 ♜al but Black had to give this a try.

35 ♜d2 ♜a5?!

The black rooks have been rendered passive, in contrast to all the white pieces that are not only defending, but also attacking.

36 ♖c4 d3 37 ♠xd3 ♠a2 38 ♠f3+ ♔g7 39 ♖c5 ♠b8 40 b6

The win seems easy, as the passed pawn can be supported by its king.

40...♠c2+ 41 ♖b5 f5 42 h4! ♖h6 43 g3 ♠a2 44 ♠ff4 ♠c2 45 ♠f3 ♖g7 46 ♠d3!


Returning a useless pawn is the best policy to convert the advantage. The white rooks must be activated in order to help their king promote his passed pawn.

46...♠xf2 47 ♠d7+ ♖f6 48 b7 ♠f3 49 ♖c6 ♠xg3 50 ♖c7 ♠g8 51 b8♗ ♠xb8 52 ♖xb8

The rest is easy. It should be mentioned that, as a general rule, the presence of two pairs of rooks instead of one is to White's advantage. If one pair of rooks had been exchanged, then Black might have had some saving chances.

52...g5 53 ♠b6+ ♖e5 54 ♠e7+ ♖d5 55 hxg5 ♠xg5 56 ♖c7 h4 57 ♠d6+ ♖c4 58 ♠e1 1-0

Endgame 3



For more information on this line from which this position arose, see Section 4.7, Line C. White retains a small advantage, as his king is closer to the opponent's b-pawn and can attack (♖e2-d2-c3-c4) and win it. There are a lot of positions that are still drawn, even with the extra b-pawn, but nevertheless White is on the driving seat, facing absolutely no danger. But the question remains: can White achieve anything more than the better half of a draw?

38...♖g7 39 ♖e2 h5

39...♠c5 40 ♠xb3 ♠c2+ 41 ♖e3 ± does not seem to be the 'best' for Black, but there are

many positions that he can draw, according to modern endgame theory.

40 ♖d2

40 ♖d3 is met by 40...♠c5!, while 40 h4 f6!, with the idea ...g5, creates counterplay on the kingside.

40...h4

Targeting the g2-pawn.

41 ♖c3 ♠g5


The other try would be 41...♠f5 42 f3 ♠g5 43 ♠e2 ♠b5 44 ♠e4! g5 45 ♠b4 ♠e5 46 ♖xb3 ♠e3+ 47 ♖a2 ♠e2 48 ♠g4 ♖g6 49 f4 f6 50 ♖a3 and it seems that White has every reason to smile.

42 g4 hxg3 43 fxg3 ♠b5 44 ♖c4

White has secured the win of the black b-pawn. I cannot claim that White is definitely winning, but there is the feeling that he can really succeed.

4.3 Black Avoids ...exd5

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♖c3 d6 5 e4 g6 6 ♖f3 ♠g7 7 h3 0-0 8 ♠d3 ♖a6 (D)



Sometimes Black avoids an early ...exd5 exchange, hoping that he will trick White into unexplored or unfamiliar lines. White should not be worried, but he should know a little bit of theory! This position can also arise from the King's Indian Defence and can also transpose to Section 4.6, Line A. It is classified under ECO E90 and NIC KI 20.3.3.


9 0-0 ♖c7 10 dxex6!?

This is the suggested line, which could save White from a lot of unwelcome transpositions. Moreover, it is quite acceptable!

10...♖xe6

Black can consider 10...fxe6 11 e5 dxe5 12 ♖g5! (12 ♜xe5?! ♜h5! 13 ♜g4 ♜f4 14 ♖e4 ♖d4 15 ♖e3 e5 = W.Leonhardt-Whaley, Auckland 1977) 12...b6 13 ♜e2 although White retains an advantage due to his better development and pawn-structure.

11 ♖e3 (D)



White is better developed and has created a target on d6. But Black's resources are adequate, as his pieces are well placed and he can create counterplay against the e4-pawn. All in all White can claim (at least) a slight advantage after the following lines:

- A: 11...♜h5?! 108
 B: 11...b6 108
 C: 11...♖d7 108
 D: 11...♜d7 109

A)

11...♜h5?! 12 ♜d2 f5 13 exf5 gxf5 14 ♖c2! ♜d7

14...♜e7? is a serious mistake: 15 ♜d5 ♜f7 16 ♖xf5 ± Lehtikainen-J.Fries Nielsen, Stockholm 2003.

15 ♜d5 ♜f7 16 ♖ad1 f4 17 ♖c1 ♜f6 18 ♜xd6 ♜d4 19 ♜xd4 cxd4 20 ♜xd4 f3 21 ♜h4 fxg2 22 ♜fe1 ♖e6 23 ♜e4 ♜xe4 24 ♖xe4 ± Mooij-Holthuis, corr. 1991.


B)

11...b6 12 ♜d2

White must be precise, as Black is OK after 12 ♖c2 ♖a6! 13 b3 ♜g4 14 hxg4 ♖xc3 15 ♜c1 ♜e7 16 ♜d3 ♖g7 17 ♜cd1 ♖ad8 18 ♜fe1 ♖b7 1/2-1/2 Garcia Palermo-G.Hernandez, Benasque 1993 or 12 ♖e2 ♖b7 13 ♜c2 ♜e8 14 ♖ad1

♜xe4! 15 ♜xe4 ♜d4 16 ♜xd4 cxd4 17 ♖xd4 ♖xe4 18 ♖d3 ♖xg2 19 ♜xg2 ♖xd4 20 ♖xg6 ♜g5+ 21 ♜h1 hxg6 22 ♜xd4 ♜f6 = Shneider-Smirin, Norilsk 1987.

12...♖b7 (D)



13 ♖ad1

Another idea is 13 ♖h6 ♜d7 14 ♖xg7 ♜xg7 15 ♖ad1 with a slight advantage for White, Kunz-Suran, Bavaria tt 1998/9.

13...♜d7

Another possibility for Black is 13...♜e8 14 ♜fe1 ♜c7 15 ♜d5 ♖xd5 16 cxd5 ♜f8 17 ♖f4 ± Burijovich-Quinteros, Vicente Lopez 1993.

14 ♖c2 ♖ad8 15 ♜fe1 ♖c6 16 ♜c1

Not bad either is 16 ♖h6 ♜fe8 17 ♖xg7 ♜xg7 18 a3 ♜c7 19 ♜d5 ♖xd5 20 exd5 ♜f8 21 ♖a4 ♜xe1+ 22 ♜xe1 h6 23 ♜c3 ±± Labollita-Quinteros, Buenos Aires 1998.

16...♜b7 17 ♜d5 ♜fe8 18 ♖h6 ♖h8 19 ♖d2 a6 20 ♖c3 ♖xd5 21 exd5 ♜f8 22 g4!

White has at least a slight advantage, Kishnev-Anstad, Copenhagen 1991.

C)

11...♖d7 12 ♜c2

The alternative is 12 ♜d2 ♜e8! 13 ♖ad1 ♖c6 14 ♜fe1 ♜b6 15 ♜d5 ♖xd5 16 exd5 ♜d4 17 ♖xd4 cxd4 = Raetsky-Gheorghiu, Lausanne 2005.

12...♜h5 13 ♜d5 ♖c6 14 ♜fd1 ♖xd5 15 exd5 ♜c7 16 ♖ab1!


16 ♖g5?! gives White little: 16...♖f6 17 ♜d2 ♖xg5 18 ♜xg5 ♜xg5 19 ♜xg5 ♜f4 20 ♜e4 ♖ad8 21 ♖f1 1/2-1/2 Demin-Yatsenko, Salekhard 2003.

16...♜f6 17 a3 ♜e8 18 b4

White has a slight advantage.

D)

11...d7 (D)



One of the most popular options for Black. Now White seems to have an easy game, but in fact he can only gain a slight advantage with precise play.

12 e2

Or:

a) 12 e2?! e5 13 ex5 dxe5 14 xd8 xd8 15 d5 d7 16 d3 c6 17 fdl d7 18 d2 b6 19 ad1 b7 20 cl f8 21 b4 cxb4 22 cxb4 d7 23 a6 c8 24 c5 d4 25 b2 f8 1/2-1/2 Biro-Barbero, Hungary it 1999.

b) 12 e1?! e5 13 f1 (13 bl h8 14 d5 dxf3+ 15 wxf3 d4 16 wg3 e5 17 f4 g7 18 h1 f5 19 b3 e6 ∞ Panno-Needleman, Argentine Ch 1989) 13... dxf3+ 14 wxf3 d4 15 wd1 e6 16 wd2 xh3 17 xd4 cxd4 18 db5 d7 19 dxd4 wb6 with an unclear position, Rustemov-Saldano Dayer, Almeria 2003.

c) 12 wd2?! e5 13 dxe5 (13 e2?! dxf3+ 14 xxf3 d4 15 xd4 xd4 16 g4 xg4 17 hxg4 wh4 f Gladyshev-Chatalbashev, France 2003) 13... dxe5 14 d5 d7 15 fel e6 16 f1 wd7 1/2-1/2 Kiselev-Ulybin, Cheliabinsk 1993.

d) 12 dh2!? e5 13 f4 dxd3 14 xd3 d4 (14... f5!?) 15 f5 e5 16 eh6 e8 17 dg4 f6? (17... wh4! ±) 18 d5 g5 19 h4! gxh4 20 dxe5 fxe5 21 wd2 f8 22 f6 d6 23 xxf8 wxf8 24 d7+ cf7 25 wxd6 d4 26 wxe5 wh6 27 dxc8 xc8 28 we7+ 1-0 Van Wely-M.Ivanov, Vlissingen 1997.

12...e5 13 dxe5

13 wc2 f5 14 xf5 gxf5 15 ad1 f4 ∞ Benda-Mester, Budapest 2003.

13...dxe5 14 wxd8 xd8 15 g4! h5


15...d4?! 16 xc8 axc8 17 b3 ±; d5 is weak.

16 xe6 xe6 17 d5 b6 18 a4 f5 19 f3 xd5 20 cxd5 f8 21 fcl cf7 22 c3 dc8 23 ac1 c7 24 b4 ac8 25 c4 d6 26 bxc5 xc5 27 cf1

White has a slight advantage after both 27... e7 28 a5! d6 29 axb6 axb6 30 xc5+ xc5 31 xc5 bxc5 32 al ± and 27... d6 28 xc7+ xc7 29 xc7+ xc7 30 a5! ± Bacrot-Topalov, Dortmund 2005.

4.4 The Snake Benoni

1 d4 f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 c3 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 (D)



The name Snake Benoni (ECO A60 – NIC BI 4.4) is illustrative of the winding road Black's dark-squared bishop travels in this system, from f8 via d6 to c7 and eventually to b6 or a5. This development is very different from the 'normal' Benoni, where Black plays ...g6 and develops the bishop to g7. Usually the g6-square is reserved for a black knight (via f8 or e5).

Black's main plan in the Snake Benoni is to achieve a majority attack on the queenside. White's usual plan is to exploit his spatial advantage and prepare a pawn-storm in the centre. Attacking the black king, exploiting the c4-square and developing more harmoniously and quickly (due to the loss of time involved in the manoeuvre of the black bishop) are White's main aims.

All in all, the Snake Benoni is an interesting set-up. Its main black expert nowadays is the Latvian GM Normunds Mieziš. Other good

players who have used this system regularly are GMs Yaacov Murey, Julian Hodgson, Harry Schüssler and Jonny Hector.


Before we move on to our main dish, I should mention that there is another move-order for Black to play the Snake Benoni, one without ... $\text{d}f6$, via $1 \text{ d4 e6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 exd5 4 cxd5 5 \text{ d}d6$ (ECO A43 – NIC VO 22.7) $5 \text{ d}c3 \text{ d}e7$ (5... $\text{d}c7$ 6 $\text{d}f3$ $\text{d}6$ 7 $\text{d}g5$ $\text{d}f6$, Genutis-Milasiute, Vilnius 1995, transposes) $6 \text{ e4 0-0 7 d}f3 \text{ e}e8$ 8 $\text{d}d3 \text{ d}g6$ 9 0-0 \pm ; e.g., 9... $\text{c}c7?$ 10 $\text{d}b5 \text{ c}c6$ 11 $\text{d}xd6 \text{ c}xd6$ 12 $\text{e}e1$ $\text{b}6$ 13 $\text{d}d2 \text{ d}e5$ 14 $\text{d}xe5 \text{ c}xe5$ 15 $\text{d}c3 \text{ c}g5$ 16 $\text{e}e3 \text{ c}e7$ 17 $\text{c}h5!$ \pm $\text{g}6??$ 18 $\text{c}xh7+$ $\text{c}xh7$ 19 $\text{h}h3+$ $\text{c}h4$ 20 $\text{c}xh4+$ $\text{c}g8$ 21 $\text{h}h8\#$ (1-0) Mazzeo-Doering, corr. 1990.

6 $\text{d}f3$

White should be on the alert, as $6 \text{ e4 0-0 7 f4 d}xe4!?$ 8 $\text{d}xe4 \text{ e}e8$ 9 $\text{c}c2 \text{ d}f8$ 10 g4 (10 $\text{f5 c}h4+$) 10... $\text{d}6$ 11 $\text{f5}?! (11 \text{ d}h3!)$ 11... $\text{d}xf5!$ 12 $\text{gxf5 c}h4+$ 13 $\text{c}d1 \text{ e}xe4$ gave Black a dangerous attack in Hebden-Hector, Nantes 1987.

6...0-0

If Black delays castling with $6... \text{d}c7$, then White has the extra option $7 \text{ g4}!?$ (D), and now:




a) $7... \text{c}c7$ 8 g5 (8 $\text{c}d3 \text{ a}a5$ transposes to line 'b') $8... \text{d}e4$ 9 $\text{c}c4 \text{ f5}?! (9... \text{d}xc3$ 10 bxc3 0-0 was the right continuation) 10 $\text{gxf6 d}xf6$ 11 $\text{g}g1 \text{ d}a6$ 12 a3 0-0 13 $\text{c}h4 \text{ c}h8$ 14 $\text{d}h3 \text{ c}f7$ 15 $\text{d}d2 \text{ c}h5$ 16 $\text{c}xh5 \text{ d}xh5$ 17 $\text{d}e4 \text{ d}6$ 18 $\text{d}xc8 \text{ a}xc8$ 19 $\text{d}c3 \text{ h}6$ 20 $\text{g}g4 \text{ c}h7$ 21 0-0-0 \pm Kober-Illner, Germany 1999.

b) $7... \text{d}a5$ 8 $\text{c}d3 \text{ c}e7$ 9 $\text{d}d2$ 0-0 10 $\text{d}6!?$ (10 $\text{g5 d}xc3$ 11 $\text{d}xc3 \text{ d}e4$ 12 $\text{d}e5 \text{ d}xg5$ 13 $\text{d}xg5 \text{ c}xg5$ 14 $\text{d}d6 \text{ e}e8$ 15 $\text{d}xc5 \text{ d}a6$ 16 $\text{d}d6 \text{ b}6$ 17 $\text{c}g3 \text{ c}f6$ 18 0-0-0 $\text{d}c5$ 19 $\text{f3 d}a4$ 20 $\text{d}d2 \text{ d}a6$ ∞ 21 $\text{c}f4?? \text{ e}ac8+$ 22 $\text{c}d1 \text{ d}xb2+$

$23 \text{ e}e1 \text{ c}c1+$ 24 $\text{c}f2 \text{ d}d1+$ 0-1 Blee-Miezis, Antwerp 1996) 10... $\text{c}c6$ 11 $\text{g5 d}xc3$ 12 $\text{d}xc3 \text{ d}d5$ 13 $\text{d}d2 \text{ d}c6$ 14 $\text{a3 e}e8$ 15 0-0-0 $\text{d}b6$ 16 h4 a5 17 $\text{g6}!?$ (17 $\text{h5 d}b4!$ 18 axb4 axb4 19 $\text{d}h3 \text{ e}a1+$ 20 $\text{c}c2 \text{ b}3+$ 21 $\text{c}xb3 \text{ c}e4+$ 22 $\text{c}d3 \text{ c}a4+$ 23 $\text{c}b3 \text{ c}e4+$ 1/2-1/2 Dgebuadze-Miezis, Linares 1997) 17... hxg6 18 h5 c4 19 $\text{c}e3!$ and White has the initiative.

c) $7... \text{d}6$ 8 $\text{g5 d}f7$ (8... $\text{d}g8$ 9 h4 a6 10 $\text{a4 d}g4$ 11 $\text{d}d2 \text{ h}6$ 12 $\text{d}c4 \text{ hxg5}$ 13 $\text{d}xg5 \text{ d}e7$ 14 $\text{c}c3 \text{ d}c8$ 15 $\text{d}h3 \pm$ D.Bischof-Ackermann, Ruhrgebiet 1998 or 8... $\text{d}h5$ 9 e4 0-0 10 $\text{d}e5 \text{ g}6$ 11 $\text{d}c4 \pm$ Palliser-Aronian, Athens jr Wch 2001) 9 h4 a6 10 $\text{a4 c}e7$ (10...0-0 11 $\text{d}h3 \text{ e}e8$ 12 $\text{c}d3 \text{ d}f8$ 13 $\text{h5 d}xh3$ 14 $\text{e}exh3 \text{ d}bd7$ 15 $\text{d}f4 \pm$ Goganov-Shapiro, St Petersburg 2005) 11 $\text{d}h3$ (11 $\text{d}g2!?$ $\text{d}e5$ 12 $\text{d}xe5 \text{ c}xe5$ 13 $\text{a5 d}d7$ 14 $\text{e}a4!$ \pm Schön-Ivanković, Pula 1998) 11...0-0 12 $\text{c}d3 \text{ d}e5$ 13 $\text{d}xe5 \text{ c}xe5$ 14 $\text{a5 d}xh3$ 15 $\text{e}exh3 \text{ d}d7$ (15... $\text{c}d4$ 16 $\text{c}g3 \text{ d}d7$ 17 $\text{g6}!$ with the initiative for White, as in Piket-Adams, Groningen 1995) 16 $\text{e}a4 \infty$ Hrvacić-Goebert, e-mail 2002.

7 $\text{d}g5!?$ (D)



Of course there are many plans that White can follow, but I consider the line with $7 \text{ d}g5!?$ a logical and critical one. Now Black can choose from:

A: $7... \text{d}c7$ 110

B: $7... \text{e}e8$ 111

A)

7... $\text{d}c7$

Now White's options are:

A1: $8 \text{ d}d2$ 111

A2: $8 \text{ e}e3$ 111

A3: $8 \text{ d}6!?$ 111

A1)

8 ♀d2 h6 9 ♀h4 ♀e5!?

A new try, as 9...d6 10 e3 transposes to Line A2.

10 ♣b3 d6 11 e3 ♀bd7 12 ♀e2 a6 13 a4 ♣b6 14 ♣c2 ♀xc3 15 bxc3 ♀xd5 16 ♀c4 ♣c7 17 ♀d1!

± Roussel Roozmon-Epishin, Kapuskasing 2004.

A2)

8 e3 d6 9 ♀e2

9 ♀d3 ♀e8 10 ♣c2 (10 h3 ♀a5 11 ♣a4 h6? {11...♀xc3+} 12 ♀xf6 ♀xc3+? {12...gxf6 ±} 13 ♀xc3 ♀d7 14 ♣c2 1-0 Pechy-de Marco, Bratto 2004 or 10 0-0 h6 11 ♀h4 a6 12 a4 ♀bd7 13 ♀e1 {13 ♣c2 or 13 ♀d2 transposes} 13...♀a5 14 e4 ♣b6 15 ♣c2 ♀h5 16 ♀d2 ± Dussol-Forintos, Val Maubuée 1988) 10...h6 11 ♀h4 a6 12 a4 ♀bd7 13 0-0 ♣e7 14 ♀d2 ♀e5 15 ♀de4 g5 16 ♀xf6+ ♣xf6 17 ♀g3 ♀xd3 18 ♣xd3 ♀f5 19 e4 ± Ariste Justo-Lazarev, Pontevedra 2004.

9...a6 10 a4 ♀bd7 11 0-0 h6 12 ♀h4 ♀e8 13 ♣c2

13 ♀d2 ♣b8 14 h3 (14 ♣c2 ♀f8 15 ♀abl ♀g6 16 ♀g3 ♀d7 17 b4 cxb4 18 ♣xb4 ♀a5 ∞ Lorscheid-Chiong, Internet 2003) 14...♀e5 15 ♀de4 g5 16 ♀xf6+ ♣xf6 17 ♀g3 ♀g6 18 ♣c2 ♀f5 19 ♀d3 ♀xd3 20 ♣xd3 ± Dumitrache-Tikhomirov, Bucharest 2002.

13...♀f8

13...♣e7 14 ♀d2 ♀f8 15 ♀d3 ± Dumitrache-Runić, Bijeljina Dvorovi 2002.

14 ♀d3 g5

Now a draw was agreed in Dumitrescu-Kacheishvili, Guarapuava U-18 Wch 1995, but White can play on with 15 ♀g3 ♀h5 16 ♀d2 ±.

A3)

8 d6!? ♀a5 9 ♀d2

9 ♀c1 ♀c6 10 e3 ♣b6?! 11 ♀xf6 ♣xb2 12 ♀c2 ♣a3 13 ♀d2 gxf6 14 ♣g4+ ♀h8 15 ♣f5 ± proved equally good in Notkin-Vasiukov, Russian Ch (Elista) 1996.

9 e3 is a really interesting line. Then:

a) 9...♀e8 10 ♀c4 ♀c6 11 0-0 ♀xc3 12 bxc3 ♀e5? (12...h6 13 ♀h4 transposes to line

'b') 13 ♀xe5 ♀xe5 14 f4! ♀xe3 15 ♣d2 ♀e8 16 ♀ael ♀f8 (16...♣b8 17 ♀xe8+ ♣xe8 18 ♀e1 ♣f8 19 ♀e7 b5 20 ♀xf7+ ♣xf7 21 ♀xf7 ♀xf7 22 ♀xf6 ♀xf6 23 ♣e3 ♣b6 24 ♣e5+ ♀f7 1-0 I.Farago-Kottke, Deizisau 1999) 17 ♀e7 ♣b8 18 ♀xf6 gxf6 19 ♣d5 b5 20 ♀d3 c4 21 ♀xh7+ ♀g7 22 ♣h5 ♣b6+ 23 ♀h1 f5 24 ♀xf7+ 1-0 Arbakov-Handke, Stuttgart 1998.

b) 9...h6 10 ♀h4 ♀e8 11 ♀c4 ♀xc3+ 12 bxc3 ♀c6 13 0-0 b6 14 ♣c2 (14 ♣d3 ♀a5 15 ♀d5 ♀b7 16 ♀xb7 ♀xb7 17 e4 g5! {17...♣b8? 18 e5 ♀h7 19 ♀ael ♀e6 20 ♀d2 ♀a5 21 f4 ♀c6 22 ♀f3 g6 23 g4 ♀e8 24 f5 g5 25 ♀g3 ♣b7 26 h4 gxh4 27 ♀xh4 ♀h8 28 ♣d2 1-0 Lautier-Degraeve, French Ch (Besançon) 1999) 18 ♀xg5 hxg5 19 ♀xg5 ♀xd6 {1/2-1/2 Van der Stricht-Dgebuadze, Belgian Ch (Westerlo) 2004} 20 ♀ael! ♀dx4 21 ♀xe4 ♀xe4 22 ♀xf6 ♣xf6 23 ♣xe4 ♀d8 24 ♣d5 =) 14...♀a5 15 ♀d3 ♀b7 16 ♀ad1 ♀c8 17 ♀f5 ± S.Ionov-C.Bauer, Wijk aan Zee 1999.

9...h6 10 ♀h4 ♀e8 11 e3 ♀c6 12 ♀e2 ♀e6 13 0-0 ♀xd6

Or 13...♀xc3 14 bxc3 ♀xd6 15 ♀xf6 ♀xf6 16 ♀e4 ♀e6 17 ♀xc5 ♀e8 18 ♣d6 ±±.

14 ♀xf6 ♀xf6 15 ♀de4 ♀e6 16 ♀xc5 ♀e8 17 ♀d5 d6 18 ♀d3

White has achieved a stable advantage, Beljavskey-Runić, Bled 2002.

B)

7...♀e8 8 e3 (D)

Most precise, as 8 ♀d2?! ♀e5! has proved unacceptable for White: 9 ♀c4 ♀xc3+ 10 bxc3 d6 (10...h6 11 ♀xf6?! ♣xf6 12 ♀c1 b5 13 ♀d2 ♀b7 14 c4 ♀a6 15 ♣b3 ♀ab8 16 e4 bxc4 17 ♣xc4 ♀b4 18 ♀e2 ♀xd5! 19 0-0 ♀f4 20 ♀fe1 ♀xg2 0-1 Gaule-Miezis, Winterthur 2004) 11 e3 h6 12 ♀h4 b6 13 ♀d3 ♀a6 14 0-0 ♣e7 15 a4 ♀xc4 16 ♀xc4 ♣e4 17 ♀b5 ♣xh4 18 ♀xe8 ♀xe8 with a clear advantage for Black, Izoria-Bratanov, Izmir 2002.


We shall now consider the following lines for Black:

B1: 8...a6 111

B2: 8...h6 112

B1)

8...a6 9 a4



White can try to 'trick' Black with 9 $\text{\textcircled{d}}3$ h6? (9...b5?! 10 a4! c4 11 $\text{\textcircled{c}}2$ is equally bad, but 9... $\text{\textcircled{f}}8$ 10 a4 is the correct move-order) 10 $\text{\textcircled{x}}f6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xf6$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e4$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}e7$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c1$ b5 13 $\text{\textcircled{b}}b1$ c4 14 0-0 \pm g6? 15 $\text{\textcircled{w}}d4$ 1-0 Yermolinsky-Dimitrijević, Chicago 2003.

9... $\text{\textcircled{f}}8$

9...h6 transposes to Line B2.

10 h3

The 'wild' 10 d6!? $\text{\textcircled{e}}e6$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c4$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xd6$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}e8$ 13 0-0 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c6$ 14 a5 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b4$ 15 e4 b5 16 axb6 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xb6$ 17 e5 d5! 18 exd6 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xd6$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{f}}f1$ was quite interesting in Lugovoi-B.Ionov, St Petersburg 2002. White has enough compensation for a small advantage.

10...d6 11 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}bd7$ 12 0-0 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e5$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xe5$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xe5$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{h}}h4$ $\text{\textcircled{e}}e8$ 15 e4 $\text{\textcircled{e}}e7$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{e}}e2$ $\text{\textcircled{f}}f6$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{w}}c2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d8$ 19 f4

White stands slightly better thanks to the spatial advantage, Zsu.Polgar-Forintos, Hungarian Ch (Budapest) 1986.

B2)

8...h6 9 $\text{\textcircled{h}}h4$

An equal position arises after 9 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b5$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}e7$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{h}}h4$ a6 11 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xd6$ 12 a4 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e4$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c4$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}g6$ 14 0-0 d6 15 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}dxg3$ 16 hxg3 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g4$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf3$ 18 gxf3 (18 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xb7$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xg2$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xg2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$! ∞) 18... $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c2$ $\text{\textcircled{e}}eab8$ 20 a5 $\text{\textcircled{w}}f6$ 1/2-1/2 Ortega Hermida-Sanz Alonso, Seville 2004.

9...a6

Black's alternatives are:

a) 9...g5? 10 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xg3$ 11 hxg3 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c7$ 12 d6 b6 13 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c4$ $\text{\textcircled{b}}b7$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{w}}d3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}c6$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf7$ (or 15 0-0-0 $\text{\textcircled{d}}a5$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf7$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf7$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xh6$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf3$ 18 gxf3 1-0 Vaganian-Hodgson, Sochi 1986) 15... $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf7$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xh6$ $\text{\textcircled{e}}e8$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{w}}f5$ $\text{\textcircled{g}}g7$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d5$

$\text{\textcircled{d}}d4$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e5+$ $\text{\textcircled{c}}c8$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf6+$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xf6$ 21 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xf6$ $\text{\textcircled{f}}f8$ 22 $\text{\textcircled{h}}h8+$ 1-0 Mancini-Miezis, Fourmies 2001.

b) 9... $\text{\textcircled{w}}e7$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{e}}e2$ (or 10 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c4$ b6 11 $\text{\textcircled{w}}d3$ a6 12 a4 g5 13 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ $\text{\textcircled{c}}c7$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xd6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xd6$ 15 0-0 $\text{\textcircled{d}}g8$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d2$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}g6$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xg6+$ fxxg6 18 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d3$ a5 19 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c4$ $\text{\textcircled{e}}e6$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b5$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xb5$ 21 axb5 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d6$ 22 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xb6$ $\text{\textcircled{e}}e7$ 23 d6 $\text{\textcircled{e}}e6$ 24 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c4$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xd6$ 25 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c8$ 1-0 Lukacs-A.Fernandes, Almada 1988) 10...b6 11 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d2$ g5 12 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ $\text{\textcircled{e}}e6$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xa6$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xa6$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c4$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xg3$ 15 hxg3 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c7$ 16 0-0 d6 17 e4! $\text{\textcircled{d}}c7$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e3$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}d7$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{d}}f5+$ $\text{\textcircled{c}}c6$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}fxd5$ 21 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd5$ 22 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd6$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}b4$ 23 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xe8$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xe8$ 24 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d1$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}e6$ 25 a3 1-0 Izoria-Gogvadze, Tbilisi 2001.

c) 9... $\text{\textcircled{f}}f8$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d3$ (10 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d2$ d6 11 $\text{\textcircled{b}}b5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{e}}e2$ $\text{\textcircled{f}}f5$ 13 0-0 a6 14 a4 b6 15 e4 $\text{\textcircled{h}}h7$ 16 f3 \pm Blagojević-Kontić, Bijelo Polje 2004; 10 $\text{\textcircled{e}}e2$ a6 11 a4 d6 12 $\text{\textcircled{w}}c2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}bd7$ 13 0-0 $\text{\textcircled{h}}h8$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}e5$ 15 a5 $\text{\textcircled{d}}g6$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ \pm Krizsany-Caposciutti, Lugano 1999) and now:

c1) 10...a6 11 a4 d6 12 $\text{\textcircled{w}}c2$?! $\text{\textcircled{d}}bd7$ 13 0-0 g6 14 a5 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g7$ 15 h3 $\text{\textcircled{h}}h8$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{f}}fd1$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}e7$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{e}}e4$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}f8$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ \pm $\text{\textcircled{d}}h5$?! 19 $\text{\textcircled{h}}h2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}e5$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xe5$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xe5$ 21 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xg6$ fxxg6 22 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xg6+$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}g7$ 23 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xh6$ $\text{\textcircled{f}}f5$ 24 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xe5$ dxe5 25 $\text{\textcircled{h}}h4$ 1-0 Zakharevich-Cherniaev, Arkhangelsk 1996.

c2) 10...d6 11 h3 (11 $\text{\textcircled{w}}c2$?! $\text{\textcircled{d}}a6$ 12 a3 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c7$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d1$ $\text{\textcircled{g}}g4$ 14 h3 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf3$ 15 gxf3 $\text{\textcircled{e}}e7$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf6$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf6$ ∞ Ganesan-Ravisekhar, Indian Ch 1988) 11... $\text{\textcircled{d}}bd7$ (11... $\text{\textcircled{d}}a6$? 12 $\text{\textcircled{b}}b5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xf6$ gxf6 \pm Sachdev-Hamdouchi, Abu Dhabi 2004) 12 0-0 a6 13 a4 \pm .


10 a4 (D)

A wild and unclear position arose in Plasket-Murey, Brighton 1983 after 10 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d3$ g5 11 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xg3$ 12 hxg3 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c7$ 13 d6 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c6$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{f}}f1$ b5 15 $\text{\textcircled{f}}f5$ $\text{\textcircled{b}}b7$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}e5$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c7$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf3$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xe8+$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xe8$ 19 gxf3 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e5$ 20 e4 $\text{\textcircled{w}}xb2$, where Black had sufficient compensation.

Black has now chosen:

a) 10... $\text{\textcircled{f}}f8$ 11 d6!? (11 $\text{\textcircled{w}}c2$ d6 12 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d3$ transposes to note 'c1' to Black's 9th move above) 11... $\text{\textcircled{e}}e6$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c4$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xd6$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ $\text{\textcircled{e}}e6$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xe6$ fxe6 15 e4! $\text{\textcircled{d}}c6$ 16 e5! (16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d1$ g5!, G.Georgadze-Lima, Elgoibar 1997) 16...g5 17 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ \pm .

b) 10...b6 11 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c4$ $\text{\textcircled{b}}b7$ 12 g4!? (12 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$?! g5?! 13 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g3$ $\text{\textcircled{x}}xg3$ 14 hxg3 $\text{\textcircled{c}}c7$ 15 d6! \pm Mourot-Husson, France 2001) 12... $\text{\textcircled{e}}e7$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{g}}g1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}h7$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{x}}xe7$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xe7$ 15 h4 d6 16 g5 h5 17 g6




fxg6 18 ♗d3 ♖f8 19 ♗xg6 ♖xg6 20 ♖xg6 ♗f7 21 ♖g3 ± J.Jimenez-Ghisi, e-mail 2002.

c) 10...g5 11 ♗g3 ♗xg3 12 hxg3 ♗g7 13 d6! (13 ♗d3 d6 14 0-0 ♗g4 15 ♗c2 ♖bd7 16 ♗f5 ♖e5 17 ♖d2 ♗xf5 18 ♗xf5 ± Zaltsman-Murey, New York 1987) 13...♖c6 14 ♗c4 b6 15 ♗d3! and White has the advantage; Black must always keep the typical ♗xf7 sacrifice in mind.

In general one must be careful as there are a lot of transpositions, but White seems to keep an edge.

4.5 The 8...♗g4 Variation

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♖c3 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 6 e4 g6 7 ♖f3 (D)



In this position Black makes an attempt to bypass White's e4/h3/♗d3 system. Either Black gets in the desired ...b5 advance, or he will be able to play ...♗g4, giving a completely different character to the game. A lot of Benoni players prefer this method of playing, as it gives them more chances for a double-edged game.

On the other hand, classical values such as a spatial advantage and the bishop-pair should

not be underestimated. Readers can locate this line classified under ECO A75 and NIC BI 13.7.

7...a6

Note that the immediate 7...♗g4? is inadequate due to 8 ♗a4+, and now:

a) 8...♖bd7 9 ♖d2! ♗g7 (9...♗e7! ±) 10 h3 ♗h5 11 g4 ♖xg4 12 hxg4 ♗xg4 13 f3 ♗h5 14 ♗b5 +- J.Østergaard-C.Andersson, Copenhagen 1996.

b) 8...♗d7 and then:

b1) White should avoid 9 ♗d1? ♗g7 10 a4 0-0 11 h3 ♖e8 12 ♗d3 ♖xe4 ♠ Maduekwé-Crouch, London 2001.

b2) 9 ♗b5 ♗g7 (9...♖a6? is a serious mistake, allowing the incisive 10 e5 dxe5 11 ♗g5, which is more or less winning by force) 10 ♗f4 ♗e7 11 0-0 0-0 12 e5 ±±.

b3) 9 ♗c2 a6 (9...♗g4? 10 ♖d2 ♗g7 11 h3 ♗c8 12 ♗e2 0-0 13 0-0 ♖a6 14 ♖c4 ♖c7 15 a4 ♖fe8 16 ♗f4 ± Ikonnikov-Blekhtsyn, Wiesbaden 1999) 10 a4 ♗c7 (10...♗g7 11 ♗e2 0-0 12 ♗f4 ♗g4 13 0-0 ± J.Adler-Libardo, Kiljava jr Wch 1984) 11 h3 ♗c8 12 ♗e2 ♗g7 13 ♗g5 ♖bd7 14 0-0 0-0 15 ♖d2 ± Nieva-R.Gomez, Florida 2001.

b4) 9 ♗b3! is best:

b41) 9...♗b6? 10 ♗xb6 axb6 11 ♖d2 ♖a6 12 ♖c4 b5 (12...♖b4 13 ♗g5! ±) 13 ♖b6 ♖d8 14 ♖xd7 ♗xd7 15 ♗xb5+ +- Servat-de la Riva, Guarapuava tt 1991.

b42) 9...b6 10 a4 a6 11 ♗f4 (11 ♗g5 ♗e7 12 ♖d2 0-0 13 ♗xf6 ♗xf6 14 ♖c4 ♗xa4 15 ♗xb6 ♗xc3+ 16 bxc3 ± Tennant-Kensek, Ann Arbor 1982) 11...♖h5 12 ♗g5 f6 13 ♗e3 ♗e7 14 ♖d2 ♗c8 15 f4 ± I.Nikolaidis-Rama, Ilioupolis 1995.

b43) 9...♗c7 10 ♗f4 ♖h5 11 ♗g5 h6 12 ♗e3 ♗g7 13 ♖d2 a5 14 a4 ♖a6 15 ♖b5 ♗xb5 16 ♗xb5+ ♗f8 17 ♗xa6 bxa6 18 ♖c4 ± S.Kovačević-Rorato, Caorle 1984.

b44) 9...♖a6 10 ♗e2 ♗b6 11 ♗xb6 axb6 12 0-0 ♖c7 13 a4 ♗g4 14 ♗f4 ♗xf3 15 ♗xf3 ♖d7 16 ♗e2 ± Matamoros-J.Fernandez Aguado, Ponferrada 1992.

8 a4

8 h3, allowing 8...b5, is outside the scope of the proposed repertoire.

8...♗g4


Of course, 8...♗g7 9 h3 transposes to Section 3.6, Line D.

9 e2

I think that Black gets fair chances after the positional 9 h3 or the tactical 9 b3 .

9... xf3

A practically forced exchange. In a lot of games Black tried to delay this exchange with 9... g7 (or 9... bd7), but then White can make use of this delay and play 10 d2! xe2 11 xe2 (D).



Now:

a) 11... bd7 12 c4! (12 0-0?! 0-0 transposes to line 'b1') 12... b6 13 e5! (13 xb6?! xb6 14 e5 dxe5 15 xe5+ d7 16 0-0 he8 17 g3 e7 18 a5 d8 19 e3+ d6 20 g3+ e7 21 e3+ d6 22 g3+ $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ Sapis-Yakovich, Cappelle la Grande 1996) 13... dxe5 14 xe5+ xf8 15 xb6 xb6 and then:

a1) 16 0-0 e8 (16... $\text{e8!?$ or 16... $\text{d7!?$ 17 xf4 e5 18 h6+ cg8 19 d1 e8 20 a5 b4 21 h3 df6 22 f3 cg7 23 a4 b3 24 a3 b4 25 h3 c4 26 a4 b3 27 a3 b4 $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ P.Costa-Marcotulli, e-mail 2001) 17 xf4 h5 18 a5 b3 19 c7 h4 20 d6 e6 21 d2 d7 22 fe1 xc7 23 dxc7 e8 24 f4 e8 25 d5 g5 26 b6 gxf4 27 xc8 xc7 28 e7 b5 29 xb7 xb2 30 d1 d4 31 e7 h5 32 c6 d5 33 cf1 cg7 34 xb5 axb5 35 a6 d6 36 a7 xc6 37 a8 1-0 Benjamin-de Firmian, New York 1993.

a2) 16 a5! d8 17 0-0 e8 18 h6! (18 g3?! d6 19 f4 d5 20 d3 d4 21 g4 g7 22 e4 h5 23 a4 hxg4 24 xd4 h3 25 c4 cxd4 26 c7 h4 27 g3 d8 28 c7 h4 29 g3 d8 30 c7 $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ A.Mikhalevski-Marin, Tel Aviv 2000) 18... g8 (on 18... wf6 either 19 xf6 xf6 20 f4 \pm or 19 e3 \pm) 19 gxg7+ \pm .

b) 11...0-0 and then:

b1) 12 0-0?! bd7 and then:

b11) 13 f3 e8 14 c4 b6 15 g5 c7 16 d3 xc4 17 xc4 ab8 18 a5 d7 ∞ Chernov-Lukasovics, Moscow 1997.


b12) 13 a5 c7 14 c4 b5 15 axb6 xb6 16 d2 fe8 ∞ Kunert-Ortmann, Württemberg 1999.

b13) 13 f4 e8 14 wf3 e8 15 a5 c4 16 a4 c5 17 xc4 b5 18 axb6 xb6 19 ch1 a5 with an unclear position, Granero Roca-Mirzoev, La Roda 2004.

b14) 13 c4 b6 14 a5 (14 b1 e8 15 d3 xa4! ∞ Osorio-Suba, Villalba 1996 or 14 f4 xc4 15 xc4 d4 16 e2 e5 17 h1 d7 18 g3 ae8 19 f4 d4 20 f3 f5 21 h3 d6 ∞ Renaze-O.Foisor, France 1997) 14... xc4 15 xc4 d7 16 f4 e8 ∞ Mamedyarov-Mirzoev, Baku 2000.

b2) 12 c4! e8 (12... e8 13 f4 d7! 14 0-0 {14 xd6? xc3+ 15 bxc3 wf6! \rightarrow or 14 xd6 xd6 15 xd6 c7 16 c4 b5! with compensation} 14... b6 15 e3 \pm K.Movsziszian-Suba, Albacete 2003) 13 0-0 (13 $\text{f4!?$ f8 14 0-0 h5 15 d2 d7 16 f4 b6 17 e3 g7 18 a5 d7 19 c4 d4+ 20 ch1 c7 21 f3 \pm Nikolov-Dimov, Varna 1995) 13... e7 14 a5 e8 15 g5 f6 16 f4 c7 17 b6 \pm Niebling-Thieme, Halle 2004.

10 xf3 g7 11 0-0 0-0 12 e1 (D)



This is a different approach against the ... g4 variation. The usual set-up involves placing the dark-squared bishop on f4; there are hundreds of practical examples with this. In my opinion White gets nothing substantial in that line, as the f4-bishop (and the f3-bishop) blocks the important advance f4. So, White repositions the f3-bishop to f1 and keeps his other bishop on its starting square for as long as possible.

What's the idea behind this though? Well, Black's plan is to be active on the queenside, trying for the ...b5 advance. So, White's light-squared bishop is better placed on the f1-a6 diagonal, where it makes the ...b5 advance more difficult and, even if Black succeeds in executing it, then the black a6-pawn becomes a target. The other white bishop is protecting the b2-pawn, which can become a target on a future semi-open file, and waits for the right moment to be developed to a better square. Finally, the f-pawn is ready to march, gaining space, central squares and helping a future e5 advance. What more can you ask from a relatively new idea?


12...♟bd7

After 12...♟e8?! 13 ♟f4! (13 ♟c2 ♟bd7 14 ♟f4 ♟e5 15 ♟e2 ♟c7 ± Guddat-Zemella, Dortmund 2004) 13...♟e7?! 14 ♟b3! ♟c7 15 ♟xd6! ♟xd6 16 e5 White achieves a healthy advantage.

13 ♟e2 ♟e8

Black's alternatives are 13...♟e7 14 ♟f1 ♟ab8 15 a5 ♟e8 16 ♟a4 ♟c7 17 ♟f4 ♟b5 18 ♟b3 ♟d4 19 ♟g3 ♟e5 20 ♟ac1 ♟be8 21 ♟b6 ♟d8 22 ♟xe5! ♟xe5 23 f4 ♟f6 24 ♟h3 ♟e7 25 b4! ± Fuhrmann-Lemmers, Bundesliga 1996/7 and 13...♟e8!?! 14 ♟f1 ♟c7 15 ♟a3 ± (15 ♟c2 ♟b8 16 ♟f4 ± Nikolov-Bozinović, Kastel Stari 1997).

14 ♟f1 (D)



14...♟c8

A logical approach, as Black wants to get ...c4 and ...♟c5 in. There are not many practical examples with this variation. Black can also play 14...h5 15 f3 ♟h7 16 ♟e3 ± Sowray-P.Taylor, British League (4NCL) 2002/3 or 14...♟c7 15 a5 b5 (15...♟ac8?! 16 ♟a4 ♟d8 17 ♟d2 ♟e7 18 ♟c2 ± J.Nilssen-K.Lie, Gausdal 2001) 16 axb6

♟xb6 17 h3 ♟h5 18 g4 ♟hf6 19 ♟a4 ♟b7 20 f3 ♟b6 21 ♟a3 ♟fd7 22 ♟g2 ± Dolezal-Sott, Klatovy 2004.

15 a5 c4 16 ♟a4 ♟e5

As an alternative, Black can try 16...♟h5 17 ♟xc4 ♟xc4 18 ♟xc4 ♟xa5 19 ♟d2 ±

17 ♟e3 ♟fd7


Or 17...♟e7?! 18 f3 ± Mirete Bernabe-S.Kovačević, Alicante 1997.

18 f4!

White has the initiative and a preferable position, Grivas-Minasian, Debrecen Echt 1992 – see Illustrative Games.

4.6 The Main Line without 9...b5

1 d4 ♟f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♟c3 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 6 e4 g6 7 ♟f3 ♟g7 8 h3 0-0 9 ♟d3 (D)



This is a well-known position. Apart from the main line with 9...b5, which will be discussed in the next section, Black has tried to make his living with the following continuations:

- A: 9...♟a6 116
- B: 9...b6 118
- C: 9...♟e8 119
- D: 9...a6 121
- E: 9...♟d7 124
- F: 9...♟h5 125

Two other lines are wholly unacceptable for Black:

a) 9...c4? 10 ♟xc4 b5 11 ♟xb5 ♟xe4 12 0-0 ♟d7 13 ♟e1 ± G.Buckley-D.Knox, Hastings 1995.

b) 9...♟fd7?! 10 ♠f4 ♜e7 and now:

b1) 11 ♞b5 is needlessly risky: 11...♙xb2 12 ♜b1 (12 ♙xd6 ♜f6 13 ♜b1 a6! ∞) 12...♙e5 13 ♙h6!? (13 ♚xe5 ♚xe5 14 ♙xe5 dxe5 15 d6 and now 15...♜g5! ∞ is an improvement over 15...♜d7? 16 ♚c7 ♜xd6 17 ♚xa8 ♚c6 18 ♙c4 ♚d4 19 ♙d5 ± Nikčević-Collas, Cannes 1995) 13...a6! ∞.

b2) 11 0-0 ♚e5 12 ♚xe5 ♙xe5 13 ♜d2 ±.

A)

9...♚a6

This knight manoeuvre to c7 is intended both to support the ...b5 advance and to put pressure on the white d5-pawn, in order to forestall a quick e5 advance. However, I have the feeling that this knight is not very active in its new home, and so White can claim a large plus in most of the lines. Usually White obtains the advantage in this line with the thematic e5 advance, creating a strong passed d-pawn.

10 0-0 ♚c7

Or:

a) 10...♚b4?! seems wrong: 11 ♙c4! ♜e8 (alternatives like 11...♚d7 12 a3 ♚b6 13 ♙e2 ♚a6 14 ♙f4 ± Avrukh-Uritzky, Israel 2002, 11...b5? 12 ♙xb5 ♜b8 13 ♜e1 ♙a6 14 ♙xa6 ♚xa6 15 e5 ± C.Horvath-Guller, Triesen 2005 and 11...b6 12 ♜e1 ♙a6 13 ♚b5 {13 ♙xa6 ♚xa6 14 ♙f4 ± is also good} 13...♜e8 14 a3 ♜d7 15 ♜a4 ♚c2 16 ♜xc2 ♙xb5 17 ♙xb5 ♜xb5 18 ♙d2 ± Skare-Sarovski, Belgrade 2005 do not help Black either) 12 ♜e1 ♜b8 13 ♙f4 ♚h5 14 ♙h2 a6 15 a3 b5 16 ♙f1 ♜b6 17 ♜b3! — San Segundo-J.Cortes, Zaragoza 1992.

b) 10...♙d7?! is also inappropriate: 11 ♙f4 ♚e8 12 ♜d2 ♜c7 13 ♜f1 c4 14 ♙f1 b5 15 e5! dxe5 16 ♚xe5 ♚d6 17 ♚c6 ♙xc6 18 dxc6 ♙xc3 19 bxc3 ♜fd8 20 ♜ad1 ♜xc6 21 ♙xd6 +- Kulikov-Frenzel, Moscow 1991.

11 ♜e1 (D)


11...♜b8

Alternatives for Black:

a) 11...♙d7?! 12 ♙f4 ♚fe8 13 a4 f6 14 ♚d2 ♜f7 15 ♚c4 ± Hegeler-Wenzel, 2nd Bundesliga 1989/90.

b) 11...♚fe8?! 12 a4! a6 13 ♙f4 ♜b8?! transposes to note 'a' after White's 13th move.

c) 11...b6 12 ♙f4 ♚fe8 (or: 12...a6 13 ♜d2 ♚h5 14 ♙g5 f6 15 ♙e3 f5 16 ♙g5 ♙f6 17



♙xf6 ♜xf6 18 e5 dxe5 19 ♚xe5 ♚e8 20 ♚c6 ± Ikonnikov-Kauch, Wiesbaden 2001; 12...♚h5 13 ♙g5 f6 14 ♙e3 f5 15 exf5 gxf5 16 ♚g5 ♚f6 17 ♙f4 ♚e4 18 ♜h5! ± Bellon-Torres Maesso, Seville 1994; 12...♙b7 13 a4 ♚fe8 14 ♜d2 ♜b8 15 ♙f1 f6 16 ♜ab1 ♚a6 17 ♙h2 ♚b4 18 ♜bd1 ± Miniböck-Mahdi, Austria 1997) 13 ♜e2 (equally good is 13 a4 a6 14 ♜d2 ± Ingbrandt-Janig, Berlin 1994) 13...a6 14 a4 ♜b8 15 e5 dxe5 16 ♚xe5 ♙b7 17 ♚c6 ♙xc6 18 dxc6 ♜c8 19 ♜ad1 ± Polak-Ondrejat, Pilsen-Lobzy 2003.

d) 11...♚d7 12 ♙f4 ♜e7 13 ♙c4 ♚e5 14 ♚xe5 ♙xe5 15 ♙xe5 ♜xe5 16 ♜d2 with f4 ± to follow.

e) 11...a6 12 a4 and now:

e1) 12...h6?! 13 ♚d2 (13 ♙f4 also looks strong) 13...♜b8 14 ♚c4 ± Baquero-Odink, Amsterdam 2005.

e2) 12...♙d7?! 13 ♙f4 ♙e8 14 ♜b3! b5 15 axb5 ♙xb5 16 ♙xb5 ♜b8 17 e5! ♚h5 18 ♙h2 ♚xb5 19 ♜c4 ♚d4 20 ♚xd4 cxd4 (20...♜b4 21 ♚c6 ♜xc4 22 ♚xd8 ♜xd8 23 exd6 +-) 21 ♜xd4 ♜xb2 22 ♜xa6 ♜e8 23 ♚e4 ♜b8 24 ♚xd6 +- Remon-Martin del Campo, Mexico 1991.

e3) 12...♚d7 13 ♙f4 ♜e7 14 ♙c4 ♚e5 15 ♚xe5 ♙xe5 16 ♙xe5 ♜xe5 17 ♜d2 g5 18 ♜ab1 (18 f4!? gxf4 19 ♜f1 ♚d7 20 a5 ♚b5 21 ♜xf4 ♜ae8 22 ♜af1 f6 23 ♙e2 ♚d4 24 ♙g4 ± Hashim-Teodoro, Duisburg U-16 Wch 1992 and 18 ♜e3!? are interesting alternatives) 18...♙d7 19 a5 ♙b5 20 ♙e2! with the idea b4 ±.

f) 11...♜e8 and here:

f1) 12 ♙f4 is quite an interesting option: 12...b5 13 e5 dxe5 (13...♚fxd5 14 ♚xd5 ♚xd5 15 ♙g5 ♜d7 16 ♙e4 +-) 14 ♙xe5 c4 15 d6 ♚e6 (15...cxd3? 16 dxc7 ♜d7 17 ♜e3 ± Polak-Pisk, Czech Cht 1998/9) 16 ♙f1 ♙d7 17 a4 a6 18 axb5 axb5 19 ♜xa8 ♜xa8 20 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 21

♭e5 ♖d8 22 ♭d5 ± Sturua-Moldobaev, Elista OL 1998.

f2) 12 a4 b6 (or: 12...h6 13 ♕f4 g5 14 ♕h2 g4 15 hxg4 ♭xg4 16 ♕g3 ±; 12...a6 13 ♕f4 ♭h5 {13...♖b8?! transposes to note 'b' after White's 13th move} 14 ♕h2 ± Goldin-Ji.Nun, Sochi 1989; 12...♭d7 13 ♕f4 ♖e7 14 ♖d2 ♭e5 15 ♭xe5 ♕xe5 16 ♕xe5 ♖xe5 17 ♕c4!? g5!? 18 f4! ♖xf4 19 ♖xf4 gxf4 20 ♖fl ±) 13 ♕f4 and now:

f21) 13...h6 can be met by 14 ♖d2 or 14 ♕h2 ±.


f22) 13...a6?! 14 ♕c4 ♭h5 15 ♕h2 ♕b7 16 e5! (not 16 ♖d3?! ♕h6! 17 ♖f1 ♕f4 = Åkesson-Veszpremi, Paks 2005) 16...dxe5 17 ♭xe5 b5 (17...♖f8? 18 d6 ♕xe5 19 ♕xe5 ♭e6 20 ♕d5 ♖a7 21 ♕xb7 ♖xb7 22 ♭d5 f6 23 ♕xf6 ♖xf6 24 ♭xf6+ ♖xf6 25 ♖d5 +- Hynes-Quinn, Dublin 1991) 18 ♖b3! ±.

f23) 13...♕a6?! 14 ♕xa6 ♭xa6 15 ♭d2 (15 e5?! dxe5 16 ♭xe5 ♭b4 17 d6 = Szeberenyi-Parkanyi, Budapest 2000) 15...♭h5 16 ♕h2 ♕d4 (16...♖f6 17 ♭c4 ♭f4 18 ♖f3 g5 19 ♭b5 ♖ad8 20 ♭bxd6! ♖xd6 21 e5 +- or 16...♕e5 17 ♕xe5 dxe5 18 g3 ± Zo.Popović-Rmus, Serbia 2004) 17 ♭c4 ♖f6 18 ♖d2 ♖ad8 19 ♭b5 ±.

f24) 13...♭h5 14 ♕g5 (the alternative is 14 ♕h2 ♕e5 {14...♕h6 15 e5 dxe5 16 ♭xe5 is much better for White, G.Goldberg-Veltmander, Leningrad 1953} 15 ♕xe5 {or 15 ♭xe5 dxe5 16 a5!} 15...dxe5 16 ♕fl ± Kadziolka-Szoen, Warsaw 2005) 14...♕f6 (14...♖d7?! 15 ♖d2 ♕b7?! 16 g4! ♭f6 17 ♖f4 ♖e7 18 ♖ad1 ♖ec8 19 ♕c4 ♭ce8 20 e5! dxe5 21 ♭xe5 ♖f8 22 ♭xf7! 1-0 Bönsch-Molnar, Szekszard 1989) 15 ♕d2 ♕g7 16 ♖b1 ♕a6 17 ♕c2 b5 18 axb5 ♭xb5 19 ♖a1 ♭xc3 20 bxc3 ♕b5 21 ♕a4 a6 22 ♖c2 is slightly better for White, C.Bernard-Janier, France 1993.

12 a4 a6 13 ♕f4! (D)

This is considered to be the strongest continuation, although White also obtained an advantage with 13 ♕fl b5 14 e5 dxe5 15 ♭xe5 (15 d6 ♭e6 16 axb5 axb5 17 ♭xe5 ♭d4 18 ♕f4 ♖b6 19 ♭f3 ± Mittelman-S.Kaplan, Ashdod 2004) 15...♕b7 16 d6 ♭cd5 17 axb5 ♭xc3 18 bxc3 axb5 19 ♕g5 h6 20 ♕xf6 ♕xf6 21 ♕xb5 ♕xg2 22 ♖xg2 ♖xb5 23 ♖d5 in Psakhis-Simacek, Pardubice 2003 and with 13 a5 b5 14 axb6 ♖xb6 15 ♭d2 ♭b5 16 ♭a4 ♖b8 17 ♭c4 ♭d7 18 ♕f4 ± Bousios-Grivas, Kallithea 2003.



As now White is ready for the thematic e5 advance, Black has tried:

a) 13...♭fe8? 14 e5! b5 15 ♕g5 f6 16 ♕h4 c4 17 ♕fl g5 18 e6 ♖e7 19 ♭d4! +- Lima-Maga, Manila OL 1992.

b) 13...♖e8?! 14 ♕fl! (14 a5!? b5 15 axb6 ♖xb6 16 ♖c2 ♭h5 17 ♕h2 ♭b5 18 ♭a4 ♖b7 19 e5 ± Vigorito-J.Lewis, Foxwoods 2005 is another strong continuation) 14...b5 15 e5! dxe5 16 ♭xe5 ♖b6 (16...♖b7 17 ♭c6 ♖d7 18 ♕xc7 b4 19 ♖xe8+ ♖xe8 20 ♕e5 bxc3 21 bxc3 ♖b2 22 ♖f3 ♭g4 23 ♕xg7 ♖xf2 24 ♖g3 ♖xg7 25 hxg4 1-0 Browne-Finik, Las Vegas 1993 or 16...♕b7 17 ♭c6 ♖xe1 18 ♖xe1 ♕xc6 19 dxc6 b4 20 ♖d1 ♖c8 21 ♭e4 ±) 17 ♭c6 ♖d7 18 ♕xc7 ♖xc7 19 axb5 axb5 20 ♕xb5 ♖xe1+ 21 ♖xe1 +- Kragelj-Rejc, Nova Gorica 1996.

c) 13...b6?! 14 ♕fl and here:

c1) 14...b5?! 15 axb5 axb5 (15...♭xb5 16 e5! ♭h5 17 ♕h2 ±) 16 e5 ♭h5 (16...dxe5 17 ♕xe5 b4 18 d6! is also clearly better for White) 17 ♕h2 dxe5 18 ♭xe5 ±.

c2) 14...♕b7 15 ♖b1 ♖e8 16 b4 ♭d7 17 ♖d2 cxb4 (17...♖f6 18 ♭d1 ♖e7 19 ♭e3 b5 20 e5 ♭xe5 21 ♕xe5 ♕xe5 22 ♭xe5 ♖xe5 23 ♭g4 ♖g7 24 bxc5 ♭xd5 25 ♖xe8+ ♖xe8 26 axb5 dxc5 27 bxa6 +- Khalifman-Winants, Dordrecht 1987) 18 ♖xb4 a5 (18...♭c5 19 ♭d4 ♕a8 20 ♭c6 ±) 19 ♖bb1 ♭c5 20 ♕g5 ♖c8 (20...♖d7 21 ♭d4 ♕a6 {21...♭xa4? 22 ♭xa4 ♖xa4 23 ♭b5 +-} 22 ♕xa6 ♭7xa6 23 ♭c6 ♖b7 24 ♕h6 ♕h8 25 ♕e3! ±) 21 ♭d4 ♕xd4 (21...♕a6 22 ♕h6! and ♭f5 ±) 22 ♖xd4 ♭7e6 23 dxe6 ♭xe6 24 ♖xd6 ♖xc3 (24...♭xg5 25 ♭d5 ±) 25 ♕h4! ± is given by Kapengut; e.g., 25...♭c5 26 ♕f6 ♖c2 27 ♕a1!.

d) 13...b5! 14 axb5 axb5 (14...♭xb5?! 15 ♕xb5 (15 ♕d2 ♭d7 16 ♕g5 ♕f6 17 ♕xf6 ♖xf6 18 ♖d2 ± Kiriakov-Evertsson, Internet

2004 or 15 ♖d2 ♘h5 16 ♘h2 ± (Lingnau-Dreckmeier, Oertlinghauser 1994) 15...axb5 16 e5 ♘h5 17 ♘h2 dxe5 18 ♘xe5 ± (Mascaro March-Mateos Gomez, Don Benito 2004) and now:


d1) 15 e5 ♘fxd5! (not 15...dxe5? 16 ♘xe5 ♘fxd5 17 ♘xd5 ♘xe5 18 ♖xe5 ♘xd5 19 ♘xg6 hxg6 20 ♖xd5 ♖f6 21 ♖xc5 ♖xb2 22 ♖b1 ♖f6 23 ♖cxb5 ♖xb5 24 ♖xb5 ♖d8 25 ♖b3 ± (Manninen-Paavilainen, Finland 1990) 16 ♘g5 ♖d7! (16...f6? 17 ♘xd5 ♘xd5 18 ♘c4! bxc4 19 ♖xd5+ and now both 19...♘h8 20 exf6 ♘xf6 21 ♖a7! ♘f5 22 ♘xf6+ ♖xf6 23 ♖ee7 +– and 19...♖f7 20 exd6!! ♘b7 21 ♖xc4 ♘xf3 22 ♖e7 ♖f8 23 gxf3 +– are winning for White) 17 ♘xb5! (17 exd6? ♖xd6 18 ♘e4 ♘e6 ♠ Anand-Dertscheny, Frankfurt simul 1994) 17...♘xc3 18 ♘xd7 ♘xd1 19 exd6 ♘xd7 20 dxc7 ♖b7 21 ♖axd1 ♖xc7 22 ♘e7 =.

d2) 15 ♘f1 b4 16 ♘a4 ♖e8 17 ♘d2 ± ♘d7? 18 ♘xd6 ♘xa4 19 ♘xc7 ♘xd1 20 ♘xd8 ♘c2 21 ♘c7 ♖b7 22 d6 b3 23 ♘a6 ♖b4 24 ♘a5 ♖d4 25 e5 ♘d7 26 ♘f3 ♖xe5 27 ♖xe5 ♘xe5 28 ♘xd4 cxd4 29 ♖f1 d3 30 ♘c3 ♘d7 31 ♘xg7 ♘xg7 32 ♘b5 ♘c5 33 d7 1-0 D.Gurevich-Lombardy, New York 1994.

d3) 15 b4! ♘d7 (15...cxb4 16 ♘e2 ±) 16 ♖c1 c4 17 ♘f1 ± ± (Duchov-Stodola, Prague 1996. White plans to target the c6-weakness by ♘d4.

B)

9...b6 (D)



This does not seem to be a decent line for Black, although White should not underestimate it. Black wishes to exchange the light-squared bishops, but this plan does not really help him.

10 0-0 ♘a6

10...♘a6 should be compared with Line A, while 10...♖e8 11 ♖e1 ♘b7 12 ♘f4 ♘a6 13 ♘b5 ♘f8 14 a3 ♘c7 15 ♘c3 ♘h5 16 ♘h2 ♖d7 17 ♖b3 ♘g7 18 a4 ♘a6 19 ♘b5 ± (Laniella-Neila, San Sebastian 1995 cannot be recommended to Black either.

11 ♘f4!

11 ♘xa6 ♘xa6 12 ♖e1 also seems quite good: after 12...♘c7 13 a4 a6 14 ♘f4 ♖e8 15 ♖d3 ♖b8 16 ♖ad1 b5 17 e5 c4 18 ♖c2 dxe5 (18...♘h5 19 ♘h2 dxe5 20 ♘xe5 ± (Van de Mortel-Westerveld, Dutch Cht 1995/6) 19 ♘xe5 ♖b7 20 ♘c6 ♖d7 21 ♖xe8+ ♘fxe8 22 axb5 axb5 23 ♘e5 White is slightly better.

11...♖e8

Or:

a) Black has not been successful with 11...c4 12 ♘c2 b5 13 a3 ♖b6 14 ♖e1 ♘bd7 15 ♖d2 (15 e5 dxe5 16 ♘xe5 ♖fe8 17 ♖f3 ♘b7 18 ♖ad1 ± (Annakov-Langer, Dallas 2000) 15...♘b7 16 ♘e3 ♘c5 and now 17 ♘d4! ± is an improvement over 17 ♘d4 a6 18 f4 ♖fe8 19 ♘f2 ♘fd7 20 ♘f3 ± (Mironov-Sikora Lerch, Trinec 2001.

b) 11...♘e8 12 ♘xa6 (12 e5 is not bad either: 12...c4 13 ♘e2 ♘d7 14 exd6 ♘c5 15 ♖e1 ♘xd6 16 ♘f1 ♘d3 17 ♘xd3 cxd3 18 ♖a4 ♘b7 19 ♖ad1 ± (Dunis-Laurent, Metz 2005 or 12...♘xd3 13 ♖xd3 dxe5 14 ♘xe5 ♘xe5 15 ♘xe5 ♘c6 16 ♘f4 ♘b4 17 ♖d2 ± (Barsov-Bouhallel, Bethune 1998) 12...♘xa6 13 ♖e1 f6 14 a3 ♘b8 15 b4 ♘d7 16 bxc5 bxc5 17 ♖b1 gives White a large advantage, Lalić-Mrdja, Porto San Giorgio 2004.

c) Black's main alternative is 11...♘xd3 12 ♖xd3, and now:

c1) 12...a6 13 ♖ad1!? (or 13 a4 ♖e7!? (13...♘e8?! 14 e5 dxe5 15 ♘xe5 ♘d7 16 ♘c6 ♖h4 17 ♘g3 ♖h5 18 ♖fel ± (Seres-Suetin, Berne 1999) 14 ♘d2 ♘bd7 15 ♘c4 ♘e8 16 ♖fel ±) 13...♖e7 (13...♘e8!?) 14 ♘xd6!? ♖xd6 15 e5 ♖d8 16 exf6 ♖xf6 17 ♖fel ♘d7 18 d6 ± (Adla-Glavina, Argentina 1988.

c2) 12...♘e8 13 ♖fel ♘d7 14 ♘g5 (14 a4 a6 15 ♖ad1 ♘e5 (15...f6? 16 ♖b1 ♘e5 17 ♘xe5 dxe5 18 b4 ♘d6 19 bxc5 bxc5 20 ♘d2 f5 21 ♘c4 ♘xc4 22 ♖xc4 ♖d6 23 a5 ± (Bacrot-Sikora Lerch, Rethymnon ECC 2003) 16 ♘xe5 dxe5 17 ♘d2 ♘d6 18 b3 ± (Murzin-de Leo, Internet 2004) 14...♘f6 15 ♘h6 ♘g7 16 ♘f4 ♖e7 17 ♘b5! ♘e5 18 ♖c3! ♘xf3+ 19 ♖xf3

♙e5 20 ♙xe5 ♚xe5 21 ♘a3! and White has obtained a clear advantage.

12 ♚e1 ♙xd3

Other moves also leave White with the advantage:

a) 12...♘h5 13 ♙g5 ♚c8 14 ♚c1 h6 15 ♙e3 ♘d7 16 a4 ♙xd3 17 ♚xd3 a6 18 b4! ♚a7 19 g4 ♘hf6 20 ♙f4 ± Pelletier-Weigler, Swiss Cht 1995.


b) 12...c4 13 ♙c2 b5 14 a3 ♚b6 15 ♙e3 ♚b7 16 ♘d4! ♘bd7 (16...♘fd7 17 ♚d2 ♘c5 is met by 18 f4! ±, and not 18 b4? cxb3 19 ♘xb3 b4!) 17 ♘c6 ♘b6 18 ♙d4 ♚d7 19 ♚d2 ♙b7 20 ♘xa7! gives White a clear advantage, Csiszar-Torok, Hungarian Cht 1992.

13 ♚xd3 a6 14 a4 ♚a7 15 ♙h2! ♚ee7 16 ♘d2 ♘e8 17 ♚h1 ♘d7 18 f4 ♚b8 19 ♘f3

White seems to have built up a healthy advantage, thanks to his spatial control and the possibility to break in the centre with a well-timed e5 advance. Obviously, Black is lacking an energetic plan; for example, 19...c4 20 ♚xc4 b5 21 axb5 axb5 22 ♚xb5 ♚b7 23 ♚a5 ♚xb2 24 e5 and White enjoys a clear advantage according to Kapengut, or 19...♚c7 20 ♚xa6 c4 21 e5! ♚c5 22 exd6 ♚xe1+ 23 ♚xe1 ♙xc3 24 bxc3 ♘xd6 25 ♘e5 ♘f6 26 ♚b1, which was about winning in Chermín-Lyrberg, Stockholm 1995.

C)

9...♚e8 (D)



Here we shall examine ...♚e8 lines without the interpolation of ...a6 and a4, as this will transpose to Line D, and without ...♘a6-c7, which will transpose to Line A.

10 0-0 c4

Alternatives:

a) 10...♘h5 11 ♙g5 ♙f6 12 ♙e3 ♘a6 13 ♘d2 ♘b4 14 ♙e2 ♘g7 15 ♘c4 ♚e7 16 ♚d2 ± Grabliauskas-Jakel, Wiesbaden 1993.

b) 10...♘bd7 11 ♙f4 ♘e5?! 12 ♘xe5 dxe5 13 ♙e3 b6 14 ♚d2 a6 15 a4 ♘d7 16 ♘b1! ♙b7 17 ♘a3 ♚e7 18 ♘c4 ± Cantero-de Souza Mendes, Montevideo 1956.

c) 10...♙d7 11 ♙f4 transposes to note 'b2' to White's 10th move in Line E.

11 ♙c2

Not much is achieved with 11 ♙xc4 ♘xe4 12 ♘xe4 ♚xe4 13 ♙g5 ♚f8! ∞ Piket-Ljubojević, Monaco (7) 1994.

11...b5

Black should be active, although 11...♘a6 12 ♙e3 ♙d7 13 a3 ♚c8 14 ♙d4 ♘c5 15 ♚e1 b5 16 ♚d2 ± and 11...♙d7 12 ♙f4 ♚b6 13 ♚b1 ♘a6 14 e5 dxe5 15 ♘xe5 ♚ac8 16 d6 ♘b8 17 ♚f3 ♘c6 18 ♘xd7 ♘d7 19 ♙a4! ♚a5 20 ♙xc6 ± Fishbein-Larsen, New York 1990 are playable.


12 ♘xb5

White can also continue with 12 a3 ♘a6 13 ♙e3 ♙d7 14 ♚e1 ♚c7 15 ♙d4 ♘c5 16 e5 dxe5 (16...♘h5? 17 ♙xc5! ♚xc5 18 ♘e4 ± Cebalo-Leventić, Osijek 1992) 17 ♘xe5 ± Rogozenko-Bondoc, Romania 1994.

12...♘xe4 13 ♙xe4

13 ♚e1? would be a typical error: 13...♘xf2! (13...a6? 14 ♘bd4 ± Moldenhauer-Schulz, Kreuzberg 2005) 14 ♚xe8+ ♚xe8 15 ♘c7 (15 ♘xd6 ♚d7 16 ♚xf2 ♚xd6 17 ♚e2 ♘d7 18 ♚xc4 ♙b7 19 ♙f4 ♙xd5 20 ♙xd6 ♙xc4 ± M.Braun-G.Toth, Paks 2000) 15...♚e7 16 ♚e1 ♚xc7 17 ♚e8+ ♙f8 18 ♙h6 ♘xh3+! and the 'complications' favour Black, Magerramov-Totsky, Moscow open 1991.

13...♚xe4 (D)



White's better development and more harmoniously placed pieces guarantee at least a small advantage with precise play. Now White has at his disposal two continuations:

C1: 14 ♖d2 120

C2: 14 ♙g5! 121

C1)

14 ♖d2 ♖h4 15 ♖e1

A 'small' slip could be decisive: 15 ♖c2? ♙xh3 16 ♖e4 ♖d7 17 a4 ♙xg2 18 ♖exd6 0-1 Sanz Arilla-Fuertes Garay, Zaragoza 1999.

15...♙a6


Most other moves lead to problems:

a) 15...♙b7? 16 ♖e4 ♖h5 17 ♖exd6 ♖xd5 18 ♖f3 ♙c6 19 ♖xf7+ ♖h8 20 ♙h6! ♖g8 (20...♙xh6 21 ♖e7 1-0 Shikhirev-Morgulev, corr. 1993) 21 ♙xg7+ ♖xg7 22 ♖e8+ ♙xe8 23 ♖xd5 ♖xb2 24 ♖el ♙c6 25 ♖e6 ♖d7 26 ♖f7+ ♖g7 27 ♖xc6 ♖d2 28 ♖e6 ♖f6 29 ♖bd6 c3 30 ♖e7 c2 31 ♖e5+ ♖h6 32 ♖f5+ ♖h5 33 g4+ ♖g5 34 ♖f3+ 1-0 Prelević-Danilović, Subotica 2000.

b) 15...a6? 16 ♖xd6 ♖xd6 17 ♖e8+ ♙f8 18 ♖xc8 ♖xd5 19 ♖f3 ♖d7 20 ♖xf8+ 1-0 Jaworski-Delekta, Polish Cht (Mikolajki) 1991.

c) 15...♖a6?! 16 ♖e4 ♖b6 17 ♖exd6 ♙d7 18 ♖f3 ♖f8 19 ♙e3 (19 ♙g5?! ♙xb5 20 ♙xh4 ♖xd6 21 ♙e7 ♖d7 22 ♙xf8 ♙xf8 23 b3 is slightly better for White, M.Ziegler-Scheuermann, Saarlouis 2004) 19...♖c5 20 a4 ±.

d) However, the bishop sacrifice 15...♙xh3! (D) can prove more than dangerous if one's knowledge is inadequate:



d1) 16 ♖f3? ♖g4! (not 16...♖h5? 17 gxh3 ♖d7, when 18 ♖fd4! +- is a decisive improvement over 18 ♖g5?? ♖xb5 19 ♖g4 ♖d7 20 a4

♖a5 21 ♖d1 ♖e5 22 ♖g2 ♖e8 ♠ Notkin-Chudinovskikh, Moscow 2002) 17 g3 ♖a6 18 ♖h2 ♖d7 19 ♖c3 ♖f5 ♠.

d2) 16 gxh3 and then:

d21) 16...♖g5+ 17 ♖f1 ♖xh3 and here:

d211) 18 ♖e8+ ♙f8 19 ♖f3 ♖h5 20 ♙f4! (20 ♙e3? ♖xf3 21 ♖d4 ♖xe3 22 fxe3 ♖h1+ 23 ♖e2 ♖g2+ 24 ♖e1 ♖d7 25 ♖xa8 ♖e5 26 ♖e2 ♖gl+ 27 ♖d2 ♖xa1 28 ♖c2 ♖xa2 29 ♖f1 c3 30 ♖xc3 ♖xd5 0-1 Rojo Huerta-Sanz Alonso, Madrid 2000) 20...♖xf3 21 ♙xd6 ♖h3+ 22 ♖e2 and then:

d211) 22...♖h5? 23 ♖xf8+ ♖g7 24 ♖d4+ f6 25 ♖h1!! (25 ♖e1? ♖h1+ 26 ♖e2 ♖h5 =) and White wins: 25...♖xh1 26 ♖g4 ♖f5 27 ♖c7 or 25...♖h3+ 26 ♖d2 ♖g5+ 27 ♙f4.

d212) 22...♖d7! 23 ♖xa8 ♖h5! 24 ♖xf8+ ♖xf8 25 ♖f1 (25 ♖f1? ♖b3+! 26 ♖e1 ♖xb5 ♠) 25...♖h1+ (seems to lead to a draw.

d212) 18 ♖f3 ♖h1+ (18...♖h5? 19 ♖gl ±) 19 ♖e2 ♖e7+ 20 ♙e3 ♖xe1+ 21 ♖xe1! ♙xb2 22 ♖bl is slightly better for White although he must be careful because of his vulnerable king.

d22) 16...♖d7 17 ♖f3 (17 ♖e4 ♖xh3 18 ♖g3 ♖d7 19 ♖xd6 ♖e5 20 ♖e4 ♖h2+ 21 ♖f1 ♖h3+ 22 ♖gl ♖h2+ 1/2-1/2 Noack-Schirmer, e-mail 2001) 17...♖xb5 18 ♖e7 f5 19 ♖g3! (19 ♖e3? ♙e5 20 ♖xe5 dxe5 21 ♖xe5 should be met by 21...♖d7! ♠, and not 21...♖d7? 22 b3 ♖xh3 23 bxc4 f4 24 ♖xf4 ♖f5 25 ♖e4 ± Estremera Panos-Sanz Alonso, Lanzarote 2003) 19...♙f6 20 ♖xd6 ♙xe7 21 ♖xe7 ♖h5 22 ♖e6+ ♖g7! (22...♖h8? 23 b3! and 22...♖f8? 23 b3 ♖a6 24 ♖e5 1-0 A.Stuart-Hage, e-mail 1999 are winning for White) 23 ♖e7+ ♖g8 with perpetual check. I am not sure that the analysis is over in this extremely complicated line, but this is a reason why I would prefer Line C2 instead.

16 a4 ♙xb5

Precise, as after 16...♖d7?! 17 ♖f3 ♖h5 18 ♙g5 White is on top.

17 axb5 ♖d4

The alternative is 17...♖d7 18 ♖e4 ♖b6 19 ♖a4! ± (rather than 19 ♖a6?! ♖xb5 20 ♖xd6 ♖e5 21 ♙g5 ♖h5 22 ♖f6+ ♙xf6 23 ♙xf6 ♖d3 24 ♖e7 ♖c5 25 ♖ed7 ♖xf2+ 26 ♖h1 ♖f8 27 ♖d8 ♖xd5 28 ♖xd5 ♖xf6 29 ♖xf8+ ♖xf8 30 ♖d2 = Wu Shaobin-Bu Xiangzhi, Shenyang 1999).

18 ♖e2

Equally good is 18 b6 ♖d7 (18...a6? 19 b7 ♖a7 20 ♗a4 ♜f8 21 ♚f3 (or 21 ♚e4 ♖xb7 22 ♙g5 f6 23 ♚xd6! +-) 21...♖xd5 22 ♗xc4 ♖c5 23 ♗e4 ♗d7 24 ♙e3 ♖xb7 25 ♙xc5 dxc5 26 ♖ad1 ♖b4 27 ♖xd7 ♖xe4 28 ♖d8+ ♜e7 29 ♖xb8 ♖xe1+ 30 ♚xe1 1-0 Estremera Panos-S.Kovačević, Mancha Real 2000) 19 bxa7 ♖xd5 20 ♗f3 ♖d3 21 ♗b7 d5 22 ♚f3 ♚c5 23 ♗c6 ♚e4 (23...♚b3? 24 ♙g5 f6 25 ♗e6+ ♜h8 26 ♚e5!! ♗f8 27 ♚d7 ♚c5 28 ♚xf8 ♚xe6 29 ♚xe6 1-0 Krasenkow-Bu Xiangzhi, Shenyang 1999) 24 ♖a5! ±.

18...♚d7 19 ♚xc4 ♖xd5 20 ♙f4 ♚e5

20...♖xb5?! is wrong: 21 ♚xd6 ♖xb2 22 ♗f3 ♗f8 23 ♖ad1! ♚b6 24 ♙g5 f5 25 ♙e7 ♗b8 26 ♗e3 h5 27 ♙f6! 1-0 Magerramov-Wedberg, Andorra 1993.

21 ♖ad1 ♖xd1 22 ♖xd1 ♚xc4 23 ♗xc4 ♙xb2 24 ♖xd6


White is slightly better according to Kapengut.

C2)

14 ♙g5! ♗b6

This energetic move seems best. 14...♗d7?! 15 ♗c2 ♖e8 16 ♗xc4 ♙a6 17 a4 ♖c8 18 ♗b3 ♙xb5 19 axb5 ♗b7 20 ♙f4 (20 ♖fc1! ±) 20...♖c5 21 ♖fc1 ♚d7 22 ♖xc5 dxc5 23 ♚d2 was quite pleasant for White in Barsov-Saraukauskas, France 2003.

15 a4 (D)



15...♗c5

Other moves seem insufficient for Black:

a) 15...h6? 16 ♚d2 hxg5 (16...♙f5 17 ♚xe4 ♙xe4 18 ♖e1 hxg5 19 ♖xe4 ♚d7 20 ♖xc4 ♚c5 21 ♖a2 a5 22 b3 ♙e5 23 ♖e2 ♜g7 24 ♗d2 f6 25 ♗e3 ♖h8 26 h4! ♖h5 27 hxg5 fxg5 28 g4

♖h8 29 ♚xd6! 1-0 Mrkvicka-Ponelis, e-mail 2001) 17 ♚xe4 +- Bets-Dumitrache, Bucharest 1993.

b) 15...a6? 16 ♖e1 ♖xe1+ (16...♙f5 17 ♚d2 ♖xe1+ 18 ♗xe1 ♚d7 19 ♚xc4 ♗c5 20 ♚bxd6 ±) 17 ♗xe1 ♚d7 (17...♙d7 18 ♙e3 ♗d8 19 ♚xd6 ±) 18 ♗e8+ ♚f8 19 ♙e3 ♗b7 20 ♚xd6 ♗c7 21 ♗c6 ♗xc6 22 dxc6 ♙xb2 23 ♖b1 c3 24 ♙c1 ♙e6 25 c7 is inadequate for Black.

c) 15...♙f5? 16 ♚d2 a6 17 ♚xe4 ♙xe4 18 ♗e2 axb5 19 ♗xe4 ♚d7 20 axb5 ♖c8 21 ♖a6 ♗xb5 22 ♖c6 ♖f8 23 ♗xc4 ♗xb2 24 ♖xd6 1-0 Bronznik-Klunt, Austria 2002.

d) 15...♖e8? 16 ♚d2 ♗c5 17 ♚xc4 ♗xc4 (17...♙a6 18 ♖c1 ♙xb5 19 axb5 ♙f8 20 b6 ± 1/2-1/2 Kragelj-Jedynak, Balatonlelle 2004) 18 ♚xd6 ♗c7 (18...♗e2 19 ♗xe2 ♖xe2 20 ♚xc8 ±) 19 ♚xe8 ♖e5 20 ♚xg7 ♗xg5 21 ♚e8 1-0 Novikov-G.Shahade, New York 2001.

16 ♖e1

Quite strong is 16 ♚d2!? ♖e5 17 ♙e3 ♖xe3 (17...♗b4 18 ♚xc4! ♗xc4 19 ♖c1 +-) 18 fxe3 ♙f5! (18...♙b7? 19 ♗f3 f5 20 ♚e4 ♗xd5 21 ♚exd6 ♗xb5 22 axb5 ♙xf3 23 gxf3 ♙xb2 24 ♖a2 c3 25 ♚c4 1-0 Barnsley-Sarobe, e-mail 1999) and, although there are no other examples, White seems to be still on top.

16...♖xe1+ 17 ♗xe1 ♚a6

Insufficient is 17...♚d7 18 ♙e3 ♗xd5 19 ♖d1 ♗e4 20 ♚xd6 ♗e7 21 ♗a5 ♚f8 22 ♚xc4 ♙b7 23 b3 ♙xf3 24 gxf3 ♗b7 25 ♖d3 ♗xf3 26 ♗d5! ± Simonenko-Razvaliaev, corr. 1991.

18 ♗e8+ ♙f8 19 ♖e1 ♙b7 20 ♙h6 ♗c8 21 ♗xc8 ♖xc8 22 ♙xf8 ♖xf8 23 ♖e7

Equally good is 23 ♚xd6 ♖xd5 24 ♚d2 ♖b8 25 ♚2xc4 ♖b4 26 ♖e8+ ♜g7 27 ♚e3 ♙e6 28 ♖a8 ± M.Kozlov-Druon, e-mail 2001.

23...♚c5 24 ♚xd6 ♖xd5 25 ♖e5 ♙xf3 26 ♖xc5


± Simonenko-Senador, Manila OL 1992 – see Typical Endgames.

D)

9...a6 10 a4 (D)

This is one of the most frequently played lines. Rather than making an active attempt to break out, Black concerns himself mostly with harmonious development in a slightly cramped but playable position.

10...♚bd7



Or:

a) 10...b6 11 0-0 ♖a7 12 ♜e1 ♞e7 13 ♙e3 ♚e8 14 ♜d2 ♚d7 15 ♙g5 f6 16 ♙f4 ♚e5 17 ♚xe5 fxe5 18 ♙g5 ♙f6 19 ♙h6 ♚g7 20 ♚d1 ± Shulman-Minasian, Erevan OL 1996. ♜b1 and b4 will follow.

b) Another interesting plan for Black was seen in the game Kožul-Kosanski, Neum 2000: 10...♚f7?! 11 ♙f4 ♜e7 12 0-0 ♚e5 13 ♙xe5 ♙xe5 14 ♚xe5 ♜xe5 15 f4 ♜d4+ 16 ♚h2 ♚d7 17 ♜e2 ♞e8 18 ♜ad1 ♜g7 19 ♜f2 ±.

c) 10...c4 11 ♙c2 ♚bd7 12 0-0 ♞b8 (12...♞e8 13 ♞e1 ♚c5 14 ♙f4 ♚h5 15 ♙h2 ♜b6 16 ♞b1 ♙d7 17 ♚d2 ♜c7 18 ♚xc4 ♚xe4 19 ♚xe4 ♜xc4 20 b3 ♜c7 21 ♙xd6 ♜b6 22 ♙h2 ± Akobian-Ishkhamov, Las Vegas 2002) 13 ♙f4 ♚c5 14 e5 ♚f7 (14...♚h5? 15 ♙e3! b5 16 axb5 axb5 17 ♚d4 ♙xe5 18 ♚c6 ♜f6 19 ♚xb8 ♙xh3 20 ♚c6 b4 21 ♚xe5 bxc3 22 bxc3 ♜xe5 23 ♜d4 ♜e7 24 gxh3 1-0 Sakaev-Sulskis, Tripoli FIDE KO 2004) 15 exd6 seems good for White.

11 0-0 ♞e8

Black has tried several alternatives:

a) 11...♚h5 transposes to Line F2.

b) 11...♞b8?! 12 ♙f4 ♚e8 13 ♞e1 ♜c7 (or 13...♜e7 14 ♙g5! f6 15 ♙h4 ♚e5 16 ♚xe5 dxe5 17 a5 ♚d6 18 ♚a4 c4 19 ♙f1 ♙d7 20 ♚b6 ♙b5 21 ♞c1 ± Browne-G.Hernandez, Linares 1993) 14 ♞c1 ♚e5 15 ♚xe5 dxe5 16 ♙e3 c4 17 ♚b1 b5 18 b3 ♚d6 19 bxc4 bxc4 20 ♚a3 ± Evans-Lombardy, New York 1955/6.

c) 11...♚e8?! 12 ♙f4 ♚e5 13 ♚xe5 dxe5 14 ♙e3 ♜c7 15 a5 ♙d7 16 ♚a4 ♙xa4 17 ♜xa4 ♚d6 18 ♞f1 1-0 Shulman-Dorsch, Sioux Falls 2000.


d) 11...♜e7 12 ♙f4 (12 ♞e1 looks like a good alternative, trying to transpose to line 'b') 12...♚h5 (12...♚e8 13 a5 ♞b8 14 ♜d2 b5 15

axb6 ♜xb6 16 ♞fe1 ♚e5 17 ♚xe5 ♙xe5 18 ♙h6 ♙g7 19 ♙xg7 ♚xg7 20 f4 f6 21 ♙c4 ♚c7 22 ♞a5 ♙d7 23 b3 ± Garcia Toledo-Malvaceda, Peru 1994 or 12...♚e5?! 13 ♚xe5 dxe5 14 ♙e3 b6 15 ♞c1 a5 16 ♚b5 ♜d8 17 f4 exf4 18 ♙xf4 ♚h5 19 ♙d6 ± Hebden-Arkell, Paignton 2000) and now White has two equally good options:

d1) 13 ♙h2 ♚e5 14 ♚xe5 (14 ♙e2 ♚xf3+ 15 ♙xf3 ♚f6 16 e5!? dxe5 17 d6 ♜e6! 18 ♞e1 ♚d7 19 ♙d5 ♜f6 20 ♚e4 ♜d8 21 ♜c2 with compensation) 14...♙xe5 15 f4 ♙d4+ 16 ♚h1 ♙d7 17 ♜f3 b5 18 g4 ♚g7 19 f5 (19 axb5 axb5 20 ♞xa8 ♞xa8 and now White should play 21 ♚xb5! ±, avoiding 21 e5? c4 22 ♙b1 ♞a1 23 ♚e4 ♚e8 24 ♚g5 ♙c8 25 e6 ± 1/2-1/2 Nogueiras-Cu.Hansen, Thessaloniki OL 1988) 19...f6 20 e5! ♙xe5 21 ♙xe5 dxe5 22 fxg6 with the better chances for White – this is a suggestion by Kapengat.

d2) 13 ♙g5 ♙f6 14 ♙e3 ♚e5 (14...♞b8 15 ♜d2 ♞e8 16 ♞fe1 ♜d8 17 g4! ♚g7 18 ♚g2 ± Zsu.Polgar-de Firmian, New York 1989) 15 ♙e2 ♚xf3+ 16 ♙xf3 ♚g7 17 a5 ♙d7 18 ♜d2 ♚h8 19 ♞fe1 ♞ae8 20 ♞ab1 ± S.Ionov-Szalanczy, Dortmund 1992.

12 ♙f4! (D)



12...♜c7

Black's main alternatives are:

a) 12...♜e7 13 ♞e1 and here:

a1) 13...♜f8 14 ♜d2 ♚h5 and now 15 ♙h2 transposes, but a very interesting sacrifice occurs after 15 ♙e3 h6 16 ♞ab1 b6 17 b4 f5 18 exf5 gxf5 19 ♜c2 ♚e5 20 ♚xe5 ♙xe5 21 ♙d2 ♞a7 22 a5 b5 23 bxc5 dxc5 24 ♚xb5!? axb5 25 ♙xb5 ♙d7 26 ♙xd7 ♞xd7 27 ♞b6 ♞xd5 (27...♞g7? 28 ♙xh6 ♙f4 29 ♞xe8 ♜xe8 30 ♞e6 ♞e7 31 ♜xf5 ♙xh6 32 ♙xh6 ♚g7 33

♖h7+ ♜f7 34 ♖g6+ ♜g8 35 ♖xe8+ ♜xe8 36 ♜c6 ♜e1+ 37 ♜h2 ♜c1 38 d6 ♜f6 39 ♜c7 ♜d1 40 a6 1-0 Izoria-Zhang Pengxiang, Erevan jr Wch 2000) 28 a6 ♜c7 29 ♖c4 ♜xe1+ 30 ♜xe1 ♜xb6 31 ♖xd5+ ♖f7 32 ♖c6 ♜a7 33 ♖xh6 ♖h7 34 ♖c6 ♖f7 35 ♜c3 ♜f4 36 ♖a8+ ♜b7 37 ♖h8+ ♜g6 38 ♜d2 ♖c7? (38...♜e2+∞) 39 ♖g8+ ♜f6 40 ♜c3+ ♜e7 41 ♖g7+ ♜d8 42 ♖xc7+ ♜xc7 43 ♜e5+ ♜b6 44 ♜xf4 ♜xa6 45 g4 fxg4 46 hxg4 ♜b6 47 ♜e5 1-0 Akobian-Zhang Pengxiang, Erevan jr Wch 2000. White won both games, as the compensation for the piece proved more than enough.

a2) 13...♜h5 14 ♜h2 and now Black has chosen:

a21) 14...♖f8 15 a5 (15 g4 ♜hf6 16 ♜d2 ♜e5 17 ♜f1 g5 18 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 19 ♜f3 ♜d7! 20 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 ∞ Hernando Rodrigo-Almeida, Barcelona 2005; 15 ♜b1 b6 16 ♖c2 ♜b7 17 ♜e2 ♜h6 18 ♜d2 ♜f4 19 ♜f1 ± Shipov-Zhang Pengxiang, Internet 2002 is a fair alternative for White) 15...♜e5 (15...♜b8 16 ♜a4 ♜e5 17 ♜e2 f5 18 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 19 ♜xh5 gxh5 20 ♖xh5 fxe4 21 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 22 ♖h4 ± Kaidanov-D.Gurevich, USA Ch (San Diego) 2004) 16 ♜e2 ♜f6 17 ♜xe5 dxe5 18 ♖c2 ♜d7 19 ♜a3 ♖d6 20 ♜b3 ♖c7 21 ♜b6 c4 22 ♜a1 ±± Atalik-Lafuente, Mar del Plata 2003.

a22) 14...♜e5 15 ♜e2 and here:

a221) 15...♜b8 16 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 17 ♜xh5 ♜xh2+ 18 ♜xh2 ♖e5+ 19 f4 (19 g3 is also very good for White) 19...♖xf4+ 20 ♜h1 gxh5 21 ♜f1 ♖g5 22 ♖f3 ♖g6 23 ♖f4 ♜e5 24 ♜f3 ♖g5 25 ♜af1 ♜xg2 26 e5 ♖g5? (26...♜h8) 27 e6 f5 28 ♖xd6 ♜a8 29 ♖d8+ ♜g7 1-0 Emodi-Balazs, Hungary 1997.

a222) 15...♜d7 16 ♜xe5 (16 g4 ♜f6 17 ♜d2 g5 18 ♜c4 ♜xc4 19 ♜xc4 ♖d8 20 ♖d3 ♜c8 21 e5 dxe5 22 ♜xe5 ♜d7 23 ♜xe8+ ♖xe8 24 d6 ± Rogozenko-Veličković, Dubai 2002) 16...♜xe5 17 ♜xh5 ♜xh2+ 18 ♜xh2 ♖e5+ 19 g3 ♖xh5 20 ♖xh5 gxh5 21 e5!/? (21 a5 ±) 21...♜xe5 22 ♜xe5 dxe5 23 ♜e4 ♜f5 24 ♜d6 ♜c2 25 ♜xb7 ♜b8 26 ♜xc5 ♜xb2 27 d6 ± K.Movsziszian-Damaso, Torres Novas 2005.

a223) 15...♜f6 16 ♜xe5 dxe5 17 a5 ♜d8 18 ♜f1 ♜h5 19 ♜a4 ♜f4 20 ♜c1 ♜e6 21 ♖c2 ♜d4 22 ♜xd4 cxd4 23 ♜b6 ♜b8 24 ♖c7 ♜d7 25 d6 ± P.Kiss-Hardicsay, Hungary 1997.

b) 12...c4 13 ♜c2 ♜c5 (or: 13...♖c7 14 ♜e1 ♜b8 15 ♖d2 ♜h5 16 ♜e3 b6 17 ♜d4 ♜b7 18


♜ed1 ♜hf6 19 ♖e2 ♜e5 20 f4 ♜ed7 ± Gelfand; 13...♖b6?! 14 ♖d2 ♜c5 15 a5 ♖c7 16 e5! ± Teofilović-Vargić, Djakovo 1994) 14 ♜e1 and then:

b1) 14...♜b8?! is probably unplayable due to 15 e5! ♜h5 16 ♜h2 ♜f8 17 ♖d4 dxe5 18 ♜xe5 ♜a8 19 ♜xc4 ♜g7 20 ♜xe8 ♖xe8 21 ♜b6 +– Dekker-V.Szabo, Zalakaros 1996.

b2) 14...♖b6?! also looks dubious: 15 a5! ♖xb2 16 ♜a2 ♖xc3?! (forced is 16...♖b4 17 ♜xd6) 17 ♜d2 ♖b3 (maybe Black should try 17...♜cxe4 18 ♜xc3 ♜xc3 19 ♜xe8+ ♜xe8 20 ♖e1 ♜d7 21 ♜a3 ♜xd5 22 ♖e4 ♜e6 23 ♜g5 ♜df6 24 ♖xb7 ± Goormachtigh-Kraidman, Sas van Gent 1990, although it will not be enough) 18 ♜xb3 cxb3 19 ♜a3 ♜fxe4 20 ♜xb3 ♜xb3 21 ♖xb3 ♜f5 22 ♜f4 ♜c3 23 ♜e3 ♜xa5 24 g4 ♜d7 25 ♖xb7 +– Zsu.Polgar-Norwood, London 1989.

b3) 14...♜h5 (best) 15 ♜h2 ♖b6 16 ♜b1 ♜d7 17 ♜d2 ♜d3 (17...♖c7? 18 ♜xc4 ♜xe4 19 ♜xe4 ♜xe4 20 ♜xe4 ♖xc4 21 ♜xd6 +– Khalifman-Tomczak, Bundesliga 1990/1) 18 ♜e3! ± Kapengut. Still, this is what I believe Black should try as his best shot in Line D.

13 ♜e1 (D)



13...♜b8

Continuations such as 13...b6 14 ♜c1 ♜h5 (14...♜e5 15 ♜xe5 dxe5 16 ♜e3 ♖d6 17 ♜b1! a5 18 ♜a3 ♜h5 19 ♜b5 ± Bachtiar-Mukhtudinov, Tashkent 1959) 15 ♜e3 ♜e5 16 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 17 ♖d2 ♖e7 18 f4 ♜g7 19 ♖f2 ♜d7 20 ♜c2 ♜eb8 21 g4 ♜f6 22 ♜ce2 ± Drilinh-Dommes, Riga 1991 or 13...♜h5 14 ♜h2 ♜b8 15 ♜e2 ♜hf6 16 ♜d2 ♜f8 17 ♜h1 ♜b6 18 f4 ♜fd7 19 ♜f1 ♜g7 20 ♜f3 f6 21 ♖d2 ♖d8 22 ♜ad1 ± Bacrot-Nazar, France 2004 should not be imitated, but 13...h6!? 14 ♜d2 ♜h5 15 ♜h2

♙e5 16 ♖c4 ♙xh2+ 17 ♜xh2 ♗e5 18 ♗xe5 ♜xe5 19 ♜d2, Novikov-Madl, Århus 1991, is possible and mostly unexplored, although it seems that White stands better. Black should continue with 19...g5!?, not allowing a quick f4 advance.

14 ♙f1

Or:

a) 14 ♜c1 ♗h5 15 ♙h2 ♗e5 16 ♙e2 led to a quick win for White after 16...♗f6? 17 ♗xe5 dxe5 18 ♜d2 h5 19 ♙c4 ♙f8 20 f4 ♗d7 21 f5 1-0 in Hutters-Damm, Køge 2005 but Black can improve with 16...♗xf3+ 17 ♙xf3 ♗f6 when White is only slightly better.

b) 14 ♜d2!? is not bad either; e.g., 14...♗h5 15 ♙h2 ♗e5 16 ♙e2 ♗xf3+ 17 ♙xf3 ♗f6 18 e5 dxe5 19 d6 ♜d8 20 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 21 ♙xe5 ♙d7 22 ♜f4 ♙c6 23 ♜d1 ♗d7 24 ♙xg7 ♜xg7 25 ♙xc6 bxc6 26 ♗e4 ♜a5 27 ♗g5 ♜f8 28 ♜e4 h6 29 ♜xc6 ♗f6 30 ♗e4 1-0 Savchenko-Simantsev, Alushta 2004.

14...c4 15 ♜c1 ♗h5

White is the side to benefit from 15...b5 16 axb5 axb5 17 ♗d4! ♙a6 18 b4 (or 18 ♜a1 ♜b6 19 ♗c6 ♗h5 20 ♙e3 ♗c5 21 ♙e2 ♙b7 22 ♙xh5 ♙xc6 23 dxc6 ♙xc3 24 bxc3 gxh5 25 ♜xh5 ♜e6 26 ♜a8+ +- S.Andersen-Hugyec, Budapest 2005) 18...♗h5 19 ♙e3 ♗hf6 20 ♜a1 ♜b7 21 ♜c2 h6 22 ♜a5 ± ♗c5 23 bxc5 b4 24 c6 ♜b6 25 ♜a4 1-0 Züger-Potterat, Bad Ragaz 1991.

16 ♙h2 ♗e5

White won after 16...♜c5? 17 g4 ♗hf6 18 e5! ♗xe5 19 ♗xe5 dxe5 20 ♙xe5 ♜a8 21 ♙xf6 in Priehoda-Batter, Czech Republic 1991.

17 ♗xe5 ♙xe5 18 ♙xe5 ♜xe5 19 ♜d4 b5 20 axb5 axb5 21 b3!


White has a serious advantage. Priehoda-Krajcović, Hlohovec 1993 continued 21...b4 22 ♗a2 ♜a5 23 ♜xc4! ♗f6 (23...♜xa2? 24 ♜a1 ♜d2 25 ♜c7 +-) 24 ♗xb4 ♜xb4 25 ♜xb4 ♜xb4 26 ♜xc8+ ♜g7 27 f3 ♗xd5 28 ♜d1 ♗e3 29 ♜d3 ±.

E)

9...♙d7 (D)

This is a relatively new concept for Black, aiming for a ...b5 advance, while keeping the option of ...♗a6-b4 open after 10 a4.

10 a4



Still, I think this move is one of White's best options, although alternatives should be not underestimated, especially line 'b':

a) 100-0 b5 11 a3 (11 ♜e1 c4 12 ♙c2 b4 13 ♗e2 ♜e8 14 ♗ed4 ♗a6 15 ♙g5 ♜b6 16 ♙e3 ♗c5 17 ♗d2 ♜a6 ♣ Skembris-Papaioannou, Thessaloniki 1998) 11...c4 12 ♙c2 a5 13 ♙f4 ♜b6 14 e5 (1/2-1/2 P.H.Nielsen-Brynell, Munkebo Z 1998) 14...dxe5 15 ♗xe5 ♗a6 16 ♜f3 ♜ad8 ∞ Shariyazdanov-Derieux, Biel 2003.

b) 10 ♙f4!? ♜e8 (10...♜c7?! 11 0-0 c4 12 ♙c2 ♗a6 13 e5! ♗h5 14 exd6 ♜b6 15 ♙e5 ♜xb2 16 ♗e4! ♙xe5 17 ♜bl ♜xa2 18 ♗xe5 ± Zsu.Polgar-Blees, Lillafüred 1989) and now:

b1) 11 ♗d2 ♗h5! (11...b5? 12 ♙xd6 b4 13 ♗e2 ♙xh3 14 ♜xh3 ♜xd6 15 f4 c4 16 ♗xc4 ♜c5 17 ♗e5 ♗bd7 18 ♜c1 ♜a5 19 ♗c4 ♜c5 20 ♗e5 ♜a5 21 ♗c6 ♜b6 22 e5 ♗g4 23 ♗ed4 ♗gx5 24 fxe5 ♗xe5 25 ♜f1 ♜ad8 26 ♜b3 ♗g4 27 ♙e2 ♙xd4 28 ♙xg4 ♙g1 29 ♜c2 h5 30 ♙xh5 ♜d6 31 ♙f3 ♜f6 32 ♜xb4 ♜a6+ 33 ♜xg1 1-0 Navara-Volokitin, Greek Cht (Ermioni Argolidas) 2005) 12 ♙xd6 ♙xc3! 13 bxc3 ♜f6 14 ♙xb8 (14 ♙b2 ♜xc3 15 ♙c2 ♙a4!! 16 ♜c1 ♙xc2 17 ♜xc2 ♜xe4+ ♣) 14...♜xc3 15 0-0 is unclear.

b2) 11 0-0 and here:

b21) 11...b5!? 12 ♙xd6 b4 13 ♗e2 ♗xe4 14 ♙xe4 ♜xe4 15 ♙xc5 (15 ♗g3 ♜e8 16 ♙xc5 ♙b5 17 ♜e1 ♗a6 18 ♜xe8+ ♙xe8 19 ♙d4 ♜xd5 =) 15...♙b5 16 ♜e1 ♗a6 17 ♙e3 ♙xb2 18 ♜c2 ♜xe3! (18...♙xa1 19 ♜xe4 ♙g7 20 ♗ed4 ♜e8 21 ♜h4 ± Rogozenko-Shulman, Calcutta 1999) 19 ♜xb2 ♜xe2 20 ♜xe2 ♙xe2 21 ♜xe2 ±.

b22) 11...c4 12 ♙c2 ♜b6 13 ♜d2 (13 ♜b1 ♗a6 14 a3 ♗c5 15 ♜e1 ♜ad8 16 ♜d2 ± Golod-D.Gurevich, Bonnevoie 1998) 13...♗a6 14 e5 dxe5 15 ♙xe5 ♗b4 16 ♜ad1 ♗xc2 17 ♜xc2

♠f5 18 ♖c1 ♗d3 19 ♜fel ♞ed8 20 b3! ±
Izoria-Quinn, Bled OL 2002.

10...♗a6 (D)


Black's alternative course is 10...♞e8 11 0-0
c4 12 ♗c2 ♗a6, and now:

a) 13 ♗e3 and here:

a1) 13...b6?! 14 ♗d4 ♗c5 15 f3 a6 16 ♖e2
♞c8 17 ♜fd1 ♞e7 18 ♞d2 ♖e8 19 ♞ad1 b5 20
axb5 axb5 21 ♗c6 ♗xc6 22 dxc6 ♞xc6 (or
22...b4?! 23 ♗b5 ♖xc6 24 ♗xd6 ♗cd7 25 ♗a4
♖c7 26 ♗xc8 ♖xc8 27 e5 1-0 Wojtaszek-
Sikora Lerch, Prerov 2001) 23 ♗xb5 d5 24
♗c3! ±.

a2) 13...♗b4 14 ♗bl a5 (14...♖a5?! 15 ♞a3
♗a6 16 ♗d2 ♞ac8 17 ♗a2 ♖b4 and now 18
♗xc4! ± rather than 18 ♖b1? ♗c5 19 f3 ♗xa4
20 ♗xa4 ♗xa4 21 ♗xc4 b5 22 ♗b3 ♗d7! ∞
Gamundi-Garcia Palermo, Palma de Mallorca
1992) 15 ♞el h6 (15...♞e7?! 16 ♖d2 ♗e8 17
♗d4 ♗c7 18 ♗g5 f6 19 ♗f4 ♗e8 20 ♞a3 ♞c8
21 b3 cxb3 22 ♞xb3 ♗f8 23 f3 ♗f7 24 ♗cb5 ±
Krallman-Maus, Hamburg 1992) 16 ♖d2 ±.

b) 13 ♗f4!? ♖b6 14 ♖d2 ♗h5 15 ♗e3 ♖c7
(15...♖xb2 16 ♗d4! ♖b6 17 g4! ♗f4 (17...♗f6
18 ♗e6 ♖a5 19 ♗xg7 ♗xg7 20 ♗d4 +-) 18
♞abl ♗b4 19 ♗db5 ±) 16 ♞ad1 ♗c5 17 ♜fel
a6 18 g4 ♗f6 19 ♗f4 b5 20 axb5 axb5 21 e5
dxe5 22 ♗xe5 ± Kadziolka-Kulovana, Iraklion
2004.



11 0-0

Nothing is gained by 11 ♗xa6?! bxa6 12
♖d3 ♗c8 13 0-0 ♗d7 14 ♗f4 ♖e7 15 ♜fel
♞b8 16 ♖c2 ♞e8 = S.Silva-Panno, São Paulo
1993.

11...♗b4

11...♞e8 12 ♞el ♗b4 13 ♗f4! (13 ♗f1 a6 14
♗f4 ♗h5 15 ♗g5 ♗f6 16 ♗e3 b6 17 ♗h2 ♗g5
18 ♗g4 ♗xg4 19 hxg4 ♗xe3 20 ♞xe3 ♗f6 ∞

Acosta Garcia-Guerra Bastida, San Sebastian
2005 and 13 ♗c4 a6 14 ♗f4 b5 15 ♗f1 ♖b6 16
e5 dxe5 17 ♗xe5 ♗f5 18 ♞c1 ♞ad8 was fine
for Black in Sarichev-Oleksienko, Minsk
2005) transposes to the note to Black's 12th
move.

12 ♗f4!?

This is White's idea, allowing the exchange
of the d3-bishop, focusing on preparing the e5
advance under the best circumstances.

12...♗xd3


Interpolating an opposition of rooks on the e-
file didn't help Black in Peisser-Pesorda, Graz
1999: 12...♞e8 13 ♞el ♗xd3 14 ♖xd3 ♖c7 15
♗d2 ♗h5 16 ♗h2 ♗e5 17 ♗c4 ♗xh2+ 18
♗xh2 ♞ad8 19 ♖d2 ± (although the game was
agreed drawn here).

13 ♖xd3 ♗e8 14 ♜fel ♖b6 15 ♞e2

± Bocharov-V.Popov, Nefteyugansk 2002 –
see Illustrative Games.

F)

9...♗h5 (D)



A somewhat unusual but intriguing move,
strongly recommended by American IM John
Watson in *The Gambit Guide to the Modern
Benoni*. Black's main idea is, with the help of
...♗d7-e5, to take control of the dark squares
and, at the same time, to prevent the annoying
♗f4. At this particular moment, interpolating
the moves 9...a6 10 a4 is in White's favour, as
can be seen in the analysis. Black reserves this
possibility for a later stage.


10 0-0

The active 10 g4 just weakens White's king-
side. Black can feel happy with 10...♗f6 11
♗f4 h5! 12 gxh5 (12 ♗d2 hxg4 13 ♗c4 gxh3

14 dxd6 g4! 15 f3 d5! or 12 g5 d8 with ... f6 or ... f5 to follow) 12... d5 13 g5 f6 14 e3 d7 15 d2 e8 ∞ .

10... d7 11 e1 (D)

This seems to me to be the best try. 11 g5 and 11 e3 are the alternatives, but of course there are many lines and the following are just two illustrative examples: 11 g5 f6 12 e3 a6 13 a4 d5 14 e2 xf3+ 15 xf3 d7 16 f4 e8 17 e1 e5 18 d2 d7 19 a5 xf4 20 xf4 e5 21 a3 d5 22 d2 d7 23 eal d8 24 b3 b5 25 d3 g5 26 xfg5 g5 27 g4 e5 28 $\text{f4} \pm$ Kožul-Loncar, Neum 2002 and 11 e3 a6 12 a4 e8 13 d2 b8 14 fel d5 15 e2 xf3+ 16 xf3 b5 17 axb5 axb5 18 d5 gxh5 19 g5 f6 20 h6 b7 21 f4 e7 22 d7 d7 23 e3 e5 24 g3+ h8 25 h6 f5 26 exf5 xf5 27 d5 1-0 Shengelia-Ehlvest, Batumi Ech 2002.



Now Black can choose among:

F1: 11... e8 126

F2: 11... a6 126

F3: 11... d5 127

Note that 11... a6 12 a4 e8 is covered in Line F2.

F1)

11... e8

Here we examine this move without the preliminary ... a6 and a4 .

12 g4!

12 f1 a6! (12... d5 13 d2! \pm ; note that then 13... h4? is not playable due to 14 b5) 13 a4 d5 14 d2 h4! (14... $\text{f6?!$ 15 g4 d7 16 f4 d7 17 d3 h6 18 h2 g5 19 e5! dxe5 20 fxg5 dxe5 21 dxe5 hxg5 22 d4 f6 23

a3! \pm (with the idea h4 and h3) Murdzia-Oliwa, Krynica 1997) is unclear but another good try for White is 12 g5 f6 13 e3 d5 14 e2 xf3+ 15 xf3 d7 16 d2 a6 17 a3 b6 18 a1 a7 19 b4 e5 20 $\text{d4} \pm$ J.Ivanov-Kirkebo, Malaga 2004.

12... d5 13 f4 d5 14 dxe5 dxe5 15 e3 b6 16 a4

\pm Golod-Krush, Montreal 2005. White's advantage is small, but secure. In general, 11... e8 does not seem to help Black.

F2)

11... a6 12 a4 e8

Black needs to be accurate:

a) 12... $\text{b8?!$ 13 e3 (or 13 g5 f6 14 e3 d5 15 e2 xf3+ 16 xf3 d7 17 e2 d7 18 a5 d8 19 d2 c7 20 f4 d5 21 xb5 xb5 22 e5 dxe5 23 xe5 xe5 24 $\text{xe5} \pm$ Xu Jun-C.Martinez, Calvia OL 2004) 13... d5 14 e2 xf3+ 15 xf3 d6 16 f4 d8 17 a5 b5 18 axb6 xb6 19 d4 b4 20 d2 b8 21 c3 f6 22 $\text{d2} \pm$ was not attractive for Black in Atalik-Khomiakov, Alushta 1999.

b) 12... $\text{d5?!$ 13 e2 xf3+ (13... f5? 14 dxe5 xe5 15 d5 gxh5 16 d5 f4 17 f3! (17 $\text{d2?!$ b6 18 d1 a7 with compensation, Mohandesi-Vanderwaeren, Belgium 1992) 17... b6 18 b1 a7 19 $\text{b4} \pm$) 14 xf3 h4 15 d5 (forced, as 15 e3 d4 16 g4 dxe2 17 dxe2 f5 18 exf5 gxf5 19 f3 fxg4 20 fxg4 h5 21 h1 e5 22 e1 f6 23 e2 g6 , Mohota-Ravi Lanka, Mumbai 2004, is not recommendable) 15... gxh5 and here:

b1) 16 f3 f5 17 f4 f6 18 g5 is one possibility. Then the weakness on the b-file (compare with Line E3) is in White's favour. In Lazarev-Poluliakhov, Simferopol 1989 Black tried to play actively and faced difficulties after 18... f4 19 d5 e7 20 d2 xe4 21 xf4 f5 22 h4 d7 23 g3 h8 24 xd6 xd5 25 $\text{ad1} \pm$.

b2) 16 d2 d7 (Black cannot continue as in Line E3 with 16... $\text{f5?!$ due to 17 a3! f4 18 d2 f3 19 d4! fxg2 20 g3 with a strong attack for White!) 17 f4 e7 18 g3 h4 19 g5 d5 20 d5 e5 21 a5 b5 22 axb6 fb8 23 a2 xb6 24 e2 b5 25 d5 xb5 26 f4 d4+ 27 h2 f6 28 d4 and White won in Tunik-Cherniak, Smolensk 1991.

13 ♖g5 ♖f6 14 ♖e3

14 ♖d2 ♗e5 15 ♖e2 ♗xf3+ 16 ♖xf3 ♗g7
17 ♖b1 ♖e5 18 b4 b6 19 ♖b3 ♖h4 20 ♗d1 ♖d7
21 ♖c3 b5 22 axb5 axb5 23 bxc5 dxc5 24 ♖xe5
♖xe5 25 ♖c3 ♖e7 was unclear in Sjödahl-
Agrest, Sweden 2004.

14...♗e5 15 ♖e2 ♗xf3+

The alternative 15...♖e7 16 g4! ♗xf3+ 17
♖xf3 ♗g7 18 ♖g2 g5 19 ♖d2 ± is not bad, as
in Kiriakov-Abergel, Internet 2003.

16 ♖xf3 ♗g7 17 ♖f4

17 ♖d2 ♖e5 (17...♖b8 18 ♖ab1 ♖e5 19 b4!?)
{19 ♖e2 ±} 19...cxb4 20 ♖xb4 ♖xh3! 21 ♖eb1
{21 gxh3 ♖f6} 21...♖c8 with compensation,
Avrukh-Sergienko, Budapest 1993) 18 ♖f4 ♖d7
19 ♖xe5 ♖xe5 20 ♖d1 g5 21 ♖g4 ♖xg4 22
hxg4 h5 23 ♖e2 hxg4 24 ♖xg4 also proved
better for White in Dautov-Luther, Sverdlovsk
1989.

17...b6

This looks better than 17...♖e7 18 a5 ♖d7
19 ♖b3 ♖ab8 20 ♖b6! ♖e5 21 ♖xe5 ♖xe5 22
♖ac1 ♖ec8 23 ♗b1 ♖b5 24 ♗a3 ♖d3 25 ♖c3
+– Savchenko-Todorov, Cappelle la Grande
1994.

**18 ♖b1 ♖d7 19 ♖c2 ♖d4 20 ♗e2 ♖e5 21
♖xe5 ♖xe5 22 b4 f5 23 bxc5 bxc5 24 ♗c3
fxe4 25 ♖xe4 ♖g5 26 ♖d3**

White retains a slight advantage, Luise-
Dibley, e-mail 2001.


F3)**11...♗e5 12 ♖e2!**

Only equality is offered by 12 ♗xe5 ♖xe5 13
♖h6 ♖e8 14 ♖d2 a6 15 a4 ♖f6 (or 15...♖h4!?)
16 ♖g5 ♖f4 17 ♖xh4 ♖xd2 18 ♖ed1 ♖h6 =)
16 ♖g5 ♖f4 17 ♖xf4 (17 ♖xf6?! ♖xd2 18
♖ed1 ♖f4! 19 ♖h4 g5 ♢) 17...♖xf4 18 ♖xf4
♗xf4.

12...♗xf3+ 13 ♖xf3 ♖h4! (D)

A practically forced move, as 13...♗f6 14
♖f4 ± is not what Black had wished for.

This queen move is dubious with ...a6 and
a4 thrown in, mainly because ♖a3! is a good
move for White at some point, as in Line E2.
By playing 13...♖h4! Black believes that he
gets sufficient counterplay for his shattered
pawn-structure, thanks to his active pieces and
the bishop-pair.

14 ♖xh5 gxh5 15 ♖d2!?

Going for the endgame. Not much is achieved
by 15 ♗b5 ♖e5! and the resulting complications
do not favour White, according to J. Watson (16
♗c7 ♖b8 17 ♖h6 ♖xh3! or 16 ♖c2 ♗h8!).

15...f5

The most active. White retains the advantage
after both 15...♖d7? 16 ♖f4 ♖e7 17 ♖g3 ♗h8
18 ♖f4 ♖e5 19 ♖xe5+ ♖xe5 20 ♖xe5+ dxe5
21 ♖ad1 ± Lemos-Fiori, Buenos Aires 2003
and 15...♖e5 16 ♖g5+ (16 ♖h6?! ♖xh3! 17
gxh3 ♖xh3 18 ♖e3 ♖h2+ =) 16...♖xg5 17
♖xg5 ♖d7 (17...f5 18 f4! ♖d4+ 19 ♗h2 ±) 18
a4 f5 19 f4 ♖d4+ 20 ♗h2 ♖ae8 21 exf5 ♖xc3
22 bxc3 ♖xf5 23 ♖xe8+ ♖xe8 24 c4 b6 25 g4
hxg4 26 hxg4 ♖f7 27 ♗g3, Merbis-Langedijk,
Haarlem 2005.

16 ♖g5

On 16 ♖f4 ♖f6! (16...♖xf4 17 ♖xf4 ±) 17
♖g5 (White should be careful, as 17 ♗b5 fxe4
18 ♖xf6 ♖xf6 is fine for Black) 17...fxe4! 18
♖xf6 ♖xf6 19 ♗xe4 ♖g6 20 ♗h1 b6! Black
stood more than fine in Campos Moreno-Guerra
Bastida, Andorra 2003.

16...♖xg5 17 ♖xg5 fxe4 18 ♖e7


18 ♗xe4 is harmless: 18...♖xb2 19 ♖ad1
♖f5! 20 ♖e7 b6! 21 ♖xf8 ♗xf8 22 ♗xd6!?
♖c2 23 ♖d2 ♖c3 24 ♖xc2 ♖xe1 ∞.

After the text-move (18 ♖e7), White seems
to have a very slight advantage. His main prob-
lem is the coming opposite-coloured bishop
endgame, which will increase Black's chances
to hold the draw. However, I think that White
can retain this small advantage and pursue vic-
tory without any risk of losing after 18...♖e8
(18...♖f7 19 ♖xd6 b6 20 ♖g3! ♖b7 21 ♖xe4 ±
is also possible) 19 ♖xd6 (19 ♖xe4 ♖f5 20 ♖f4
♖xe7 21 ♖xf5 ♖f8 =) 19...♖xc3 20 bxc3 ♖d8
21 ♖xc5! (21 ♖f4 ♖xd5 22 ♖xe4 ♖d7 with
equality after both 23 ♖ae1 ♖f8 and 23 c4 ♖d4

24 ♖xd4 cxd4 25 ♜d1 ♜c8 26 ♖xd4 ♙e6 =)
21...♖xd5 22 ♙d4 ♙f5 23 a4! ± thanks to the
shattered black pawn-structure and the better-
placed white bishop.


4.7 The Main Line with 9...b5

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♗c3 exd5 5 cxd5 d6
6 e4 g6 7 ♗f3 ♙g7 8 h3 0-0 9 ♙d3 b5 (D)



As we have noted more than once earlier in this chapter, when play develops quietly, the initiative usually belongs to White. Therefore, Black's desire to force matters or to change the character of the battle at an early stage is understandable. In my opinion 10 ♗xb5 is an extremely tactical line, where theory has not yet come to any clear conclusion. Therefore, my analysis will focus on the other capture.

10 ♙xb5 ♗xe4 11 ♗xe4 ♖a5+ 12 ♗fd2 ♖xb5 13 ♗xd6 (D)



After a series of rather forced moves we have reached a position where White has temporarily

won a pawn, but Black, as compensation, counts on the undeveloped white pieces and his pressure down the a1-h8 and f1-a6 diagonals. Now Black has a choice:

A: 13...♖d7?! 128

B: 13...♖d3 129

C: 13...♖a6 130

13...♖b4? cannot be recommended: 14 0-0 ♙a6 15 ♜e1 ♗d7 16 ♜e4 ♖b8 17 ♗2c4 ♗f6 18 ♜h4 ♜d8 19 ♙f4 ± Goormachtigh-Piceu, Gent 2003.

A)

13...♖d7?!

This line doesn't look right and in my opinion isn't.

14 ♗2c4 ♙a6

Only White benefits from 14...♖e7+ 15 ♙e3 ♗d7 16 0-0 ♗b6 17 ♜e1 ♙a6 18 ♙xc5 ♖c7 19 ♗xb6 ♖xc5 20 ♗xa8 ♖xd6 21 ♜c1 ± Cvitan-Velimirović, Vršac 1989.

15 0-0 ♙d4

Alternatives such as 15...f5 16 ♜e1 f4 17 ♖f3 ♙xc4 18 ♗xc4 ♗a6 19 ♙d2 ♗c7 20 d6 ♗b5 21 ♜e7 ♖c8 22 ♖d5+ ♗h8 23 d7 ♖d8 24 ♜ael ♙f6 25 ♜e8 ♖c7 26 ♖xa8 1-0 Koster-Pilgrim, Groningen 2003 or 15...♙e5 16 ♗xe5 ♖xd6 17 ♜e1 ♙b7 18 ♙h6 ♜d8 19 ♖f3 ♙xd5 20 ♖c3 ♖f6 21 ♖xc5 ♗a6 22 ♖a3 ♙b7 23 ♖g3 ♜e8 24 ♙g5 ♖f5 25 h4 h5 26 ♗c4 ♜xel+ 27 ♜xel ♙d5 28 ♗e3 ♖e4 29 f3 ♖e6 30 ♗xd5 ♖xd5 31 ♙f6 ♗c5 32 ♖f4 ♗e6 1-0 Malakh-atko-Truskavetsky, Rivne 2005 do not add anything special to Black's efforts.

16 ♖f3 ♜d8 17 ♜e1 ♙xc4

Or 17...f6 18 ♙f4 ♙xc4 19 ♗xc4 ♖b7 20 ♖e4 ♗a6 21 ♖e6+ ♗g7 22 ♖e7+ ♖xe7 23 ♜xe7+ ♗g8 24 d6 ♗b4 25 ♙d2 ♗c6 26 ♜b7 ♜ab8 27 ♜xb8 ♜xb8 28 ♜e1 ♜d8 29 b3 ♗f7 30 ♙f4 ♗e5 31 ♗f1 ♜d7 1-0 Delion-Stojić, Melbourne 2003.

18 ♗xc4 ♖b5


18...♖f5 19 ♖xf5 gxf5 20 ♙g5 f6 (1/2-1/2 I.Hernandez-Munoz Pantoja, Peru 2000) 21 ♙f4 ±.

19 ♗e5 ♙xe5 20 ♜xe5

White has a serious advantage. A.Ville-neuve-Therkildsen, Le Touquet 1998 continued 20...♜e8 21 a4 ♖d7 22 ♙h6 f5 23 ♜e6.

B)

13...♖d3 14 ♘2c4 ♗xd1+ 15 ♕xd1 (D)



White is a pawn up, but Black's compensation is decent thanks to his bishop-pair, the 'uncomfortable' white king and the weakness of the d5-pawn. In a lot of cases White returns the extra pawn for positional benefits, neutralizing Black's pressure. Black has a choice:

B1: 15...♕d7 129

B2: 15...♕a6! 129

Not 15...♘d7?! 16 ♕g5 ♘f6 17 ♕xf6! ♕xf6 18 ♘xc8 ♖axc8 19 ♖c2 ± Vera.

B1)

15...♕d7 16 ♖e2 ♘a6 17 ♕e3 ♖fb8

After 17...f5 18 ♖hd1! (18 f4?! ♖ab8 19 ♖ab1 ♖f6 20 b4 and now 20...cxb4! ∞ rather than 20...♖xb4? 21 a3! ♖xb1 22 ♖xb1 ♕f8 23 ♖b7 ±) 18...f4 19 ♕d2 f3+ 20 ♖f1 ♕a4 21 b3! White gains a nice advantage.

18 ♖ab1 ♘b4 19 ♖xc5!

Black should be happy after 19 ♖hd1? ♘xa2 20 ♖al ♖xb2+! (20...♘b4? 21 ♕xc5 ♕f8 22 ♕xa7 ♘c2 23 ♖a5 {23 ♕xb8 ♘xa1 24 ♕c7 ♖a2 +- Atalik-M.Pavlović, Athens 1996}) 23...♖b4 24 ♖d2 ♕xd6 25 ♘xd6 ♖xb2 26 ♖d1 +- 21 ♘xb2 ♘c3+ 22 ♖f3 ♘xd1 23 ♖xd1 ♕xb2 24 ♖b1 (24 ♕xc5 ♕g7 ∞ Tugui-Moldovan, Tusnad 1997) 24...♕e5! =.

19...♘xd5

Black has no choice as 19...♘xa2? 20 ♖al ♘b4 21 ♖hd1 is nearly winning for White.

20 ♖hd1 ♕e6 21 ♖f1 ♖d8

Black had a lost position after 21...♘b6?! 22 b3 ♘xc4 23 ♘xc4 ♖c8 24 ♕e3 ♕xc4+ 25 bxc4

♖xc4 26 ♖d7 a5 27 ♖bb7 ♖f8 28 ♖a7 a4 29 g3! in Sakaev-Velimirović, Budva 1996.


22 ♕d4

White enjoys a clear advantage – Sakaev.

B2)

15...♕a6! 16 ♖c2 ♘d7 (D)

Kramnik states that 16...♖d8? 17 ♕g5 f6 18 ♕f4 ♕xc4 19 ♘xc4 ♖xd5 20 ♖ad1! ♘c6 21 ♖xd5 ♘b4+ 22 ♖b3 ♘xd5 23 ♕d6 f5 24 ♖d1 ♕d4 25 ♕e5! amounts to a clear advantage for White.



17 ♕f4!

This seems best, although White's alternatives carry a lot of (harmless?) poison:

a) 17 ♕e3 ♘e5 18 ♘e5 ♕xe5 19 ♘e4 ♕b7 20 ♖hd1 ♖fd8 21 ♘c3 ♕xc3 22 ♖xc3 ♖xd5 23 ♖xd5 ♕xd5 = Grabarczyk-Womacka, 2nd Bundesliga 1995/6.

b) 17 ♕g5 ♘f6 18 ♕xf6 ♕xf6 19 ♖he1 ♖fd8 20 ♖ad1 ♖ab8 21 b3 ♖f8 22 ♖d2 ♕d4 1/2-1/2 Kachur-Buturin, Litomysl 1995.

c) 17 ♖d1 ♘b6 18 ♘b6 axb6 19 ♕g5 ♖a7 and then:

c1) 20 ♖b3? ♖d7 21 ♘c4 ♕b7! (21...♕d4? 22 d6 f6 23 ♕e3 b5 24 ♘a5 ♕xe3 25 fxe3 ± Kramnik-J.Hall, Oakham jr 1992) 22 ♘xb6 ♖d6 23 ♘c4 ♕xd5 ♯.

c2) 20 a4 ♖d7 21 ♘b5 ♕b7 22 ♘c3 ♕xc3 23 ♖xc3 ♖xd5 24 ♖xd5 ♕xd5 = Finegold-Smetankin, Bolingbrook 2005.

c3) 20 ♘e4 f5 21 ♘c3 h6 22 ♕d2 (22 ♕f4 g5 23 ♕h2 f4 with compensation) 22...♖d8 and with ...♖ad7 next Black equalizes.

d) 17 ♕g5 ♖fb8 (17...f6?! 18 ♕f4 ♖fd8 19 ♖ad1 ♕f8 20 b3 ♘b6 21 ♘xb6 axb6 22 ♘e4 ♕b7 23 a4 ♖f7 24 ♘c3 ♖ac8 25 f3 ♖d7 26

♖h1 ♗cd8 27 ♖e6 ± Purtseladze-C.Foisor, Chisinau 2005) 18 ♖ad1 ♜e5 19 b3 ♜xc4 20 ♜xc4 ♙xc4 21 bxc4 ♖b2+ 22 ♜d3 ♖xa2! (22...♖xf2? 23 ♙e3 ♖xg2 24 ♙xc5 ♖g3+ 25 ♜e2 ♖c8 26 ♙f2 ♖a3 27 c5 ♖xa2+ 28 ♖d2 ♖e8+ 29 ♜d3 ♖a3+ 30 ♜c4 ♖c3+ 31 ♜b5 ♖b3+ 32 ♜c6 ♖c8+ 33 ♜d7 ♖bb8 34 d6 +— Servat-Os.Garcia, Matanzas 1995) 23 d6 ♖a3+ (23...♖a6? 24 d7 f6 25 ♙e3 ♙f8 26 ♜e4 ♖d8 27 ♖d5 ± Atalik-Gdanski, Iraklion 1993) 24 ♜e2 ♖e8+! (24...♖a2+? 25 ♜f3 ♖a3+ 26 ♙e3 ♙d4 27 ♜e4 ♙xe3 28 fxe3 ♜f8 29 ♜d5 ± Mecking-del Rio, Linares 1995) 25 ♜f1 f6 26 ♙f4 ♖d8 is unclear according to Atalik (but not 26...♖c3? 27 d7 ♖d8 28 g3! followed by ♙c7).

e) 17 a4 ♜f6 18 ♖d1 ♖fd8 19 ♙g5 ♖ab8 (19...♖d7?! seems unplayable due to 20 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 21 ♜e4 ♙g7 22 ♜e3 f5 23 ♜xc5! ♖c7 24 b4 ♙xa1 25 ♖xa1 ♖b8 26 ♜c3 ± but 19...♙xc4 is not bad: 20 ♜xc4 ♖xd5 21 ♖xd5 ♜xd5 22 ♖d1 ±) 20 g4 ♖d7 21 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 22 ♜b5 ♙b7 23 ♜cd6 a6 24 ♜e4 ♙g7 25 ♜bc3 ♖c8 26 g5 ♜f8 27 ♖d2 ♙d4 28 d6! (28 ♜f6?! ♙xf6 29 gxf6 ♖d6 is equal, Shalimov-Feigin, Yalta 1996) 28...♖e8 29 f3 ♙xc3 30 ♜xc3 ♙xe4 31 fxe4 ♖xe4 32 a5 ±.

17...♖fd8 (D)

Black's alternatives have not been helpful to his cause:

a) 17...♜b6?! 18 ♜xb6 axb6 19 a4 and now:

a1) 19...♖fd8 20 ♖hd1 ♖d7 21 ♜b5 ♙b7 22 f3! ♖e8 (22...♙xd5 23 ♜c7 ♖ad8 24 ♜xd5 ♖xd5 25 ♙c7 ±) 23 d6 ♖e2+ 24 ♖d2 ♖xd2+ 25 ♙xd2 ♙c6 26 ♙f4 ± Epishin-San Segundo, New York 1990.

a2) 19...♖ad8 20 ♖hd1 ♙d4 21 a5 b5 22 ♖xd4!? cxd4 23 ♜d3 g5 24 ♙g3 f5 25 ♙e5 ♖xd6 26 ♙xd6 ♖d8 27 ♙c5 ♖xd5 28 b4 gives White a clear advantage, Ibragimov-Berelovich, Berlin 1995.


b) 17...♙d4?! and then:

b1) 18 ♜e3 ♖fd8 19 ♖ad1 ♜f6 20 ♖h1 ♖d7 21 f3 ♖ad8 22 ♜e4 ± A.G.Panchenko-Jurković, Belgorod 1991.

b2) 18 ♙e3 ♜e5 19 ♙xd4 ♜xc4 20 ♜xc4 ♙xc4 21 ♙xc5 ♖fc8 22 b4 ♙xd5 23 f3 a5 24 a3 ± Stohl-Stocek, Czech Cht 1995/6.

18 ♖ad1 ♜f6

18...♜b6?! 19 ♜xb6 axb6 20 ♖h1! ± (20 a4?! ♙e2 21 ♖d2 ♖xa4 22 ♙h2 ♙a6 23 ♖e1 ♜f8 24 ♖e4 ♖xe4 25 ♜xe4 ♖d7 26 f3 ♙b7 27



d6 ♙d4 ∞ Deleva-Olivier, Vichy 2000) is quite helpful for White.

19 b3

Kapengut's proposal 19 ♙g5!? ♖ab8 20 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 21 ♖h1 ♜f8 22 ♖e3 ♙xb2 23 ♜xf7 ± also seems OK.

19...♖d7 20 ♖h1 ♖ad8 21 ♙e5! ♙xc4 22 ♜xc4 ♜xd5 23 a3!


White retains a small advantage thanks to his better pawn-structure.

C)

13...♖a6

This is the most critical line, but I have to point out that Black is not seeking anything more than a draw, so anyway it is 'pleasant' for White!

14 ♜2c4! (D)



14...♜d7

Although most players concentrate on this move, Black can also play 14...♖d8, when White can continue with:


a) 15 ♜xc8? ♖xc4 16 ♜e7+ ♜f8 17 d6 ♖e4+ is slightly better for Black, Olcayoz-Womacka, Internet 2003.

b) 15 ♙f4 ♜d7 (15... ♙f8 16 ♚e2 ♜d7 17 ♜xc8 ♞axc8 18 ♜e3 ♚f6 19 ♙g3 ♙g7 20 ♞b1 ♜b6 21 d6 ♚e6 22 0-0 \pm Shengelia-Pantsulaia, Tbilisi 2002) 16 0-0 ♜b6 17 ♜xb6 and then:

b1) 17... axb6 18 ♚f3 (18 ♜xc8 ♚xc8 19 d6 ♚f5 20 ♙g3 ♙xb2 21 ♞b1 ♙d4 22 ♙xb6 ♞xa2 23 ♚bl ♚xb1 1/2-1/2 Wu Shaobin-Papaioannou, Istanbul OL 2000) 18... b5 19 ♜e4 ♙xb2 20 ♜xc5 ♚a3 21 ♚xa3 ♙xa3 22 ♜e4 f5 23 ♙g5 ♞f8 24 ♜g3 ♙b7 25 ♞ad1 ♙d6 26 ♞d2 \pm Grabarczyk-Pakleza, Polanczyk 2000.

b2) 17... axb6 18 ♜xc8 ♞axc8 19 ♞b1 (19 ♚f3 ♙xb2 20 ♞ad1 c4 21 d6 ♞d7 22 ♞f1 c3 23 ♞e7 ♞e7 24 dxe7 c2 25 ♞e1 ♚b5 ? {25... ♞e8 =}) 26 ♚b3 1-0 Potapov-Simacek, Olomouc 2005) transposes to the main line.

c) 15 ♚e2 ?! (D) and then:



c1) 15... ♙f8 ? 16 ♜xc8 ♞xd5 17 ♚e4 \pm Skembris-Ortega Ruiz, Linares 2000.

c2) 15... ♙d7 ?! 16 ♚e7 ♞f8 17 0-0 ♙b5 18 ♜xb5 ♚xb5 19 ♚h4 ♜d7 20 ♙g5 ♙d4 21 ♞ac1 ♚a6 22 b4 \pm Krasenkow-H.Cordes, Baden Oos 2005.

c3) 15... ♜d7 ?! 16 ♚e7 ! (16 ♙g5 ?! ♜f6 17 ♜xc8 ♞axc8 18 0-0 ♞xd5 19 ♙e3 ♞e8 20 ♚c2 1/2-1/2 Hynes-Khechen, Novi Sad OL 1990) 16... ♙f8 (16... ♙f6 17 ♚xf7 + ♜h8 18 ♙h6 !) 17 0-0 ♜b6 18 ♜e3 \pm .


c4) 15... ♙b7 16 ♜xb7 ♚xb7 and here:

c41) 17 ♜e3 ♜d7 (17... ♚b4 + 18 ♚d2 ♚e4 19 0-0 ♜c6 20 a4 ♜b4 21 ♞a3 ♙d4 22 ♞e1 ♞e8 ∞ Potapov-Hrivnak, Budejovice 1997) 18 0-0 ♜b6 19 ♞d1 ♞d7 20 ♞b1 ♜xd5 21 ♜xd5 ♞xd5 22 ♙e3 1/2-1/2 H.Olsen-Olesen, Copenhagen 1995.

c42) 17 ♙f4 ?! ♚xd5 (17... ♞xd5 ?! 18 0-0 ♜c6 \pm) 18 ♞d1 ♙d4 (18... ♚xd1 + 19 ♚xd1 ♞xd1 +20 ♜xd1 ♜c6 21 ♙e3 \pm) 19 0-0 ♜c6 20

b3 (20 ♞f1 ?! ♞e8 ? 21 ♙e3 ♞ab8 22 b3 a5 = Dautov-Womacka, Bundesliga 1997/8) 20... ♞e8 21 ♚d2 \pm .

15 0-0 (D)



15... ♜b6

Black has also tried to be more active with 15... ♜e5 16 ♜xe5 ♙xe5 (16... ♚xd6 17 ♜c4 ♚a6 18 ♚b3 ♙d7 19 ♙f4 ♙a4 20 ♚d3 ♙b5 21 ♞ac1 ♚xa2 {21... ♙xb2 ?! 22 a4 ! \pm } 22 b3 \pm Granda-Mecking, São Paulo 2003) and then:

a) 17 ♜e4 ♙f5 (17... ♞d8 18 ♙g5 f6 19 ♙e3 ♚c4 20 ♜xc5 ♙xb2 21 ♞b1 ♙a3 22 ♚a4 ♚xa4 23 ♜xa4 ♞xd5 = Aloma Vidal-Breivik, Linares 2005) 18 ♜xc5 ♚c4 19 ♙e3 ♙xb2 20 g4 ♙xa1 21 ♚xa1 ♙xg4 22 ♞c1 ♚e2 23 ♙h6 f6 24 ♙xf8 ♞xf8 25 hxg4 ♚xg4 + 26 ♜f1 ♚h3 + 27 ♜g1 ♚g4 + 28 ♜f1 ♚h3 + 29 ♜g1 1/2-1/2 Seres-Ovseevich, Budapest 2003.

b) 17 ♜xc8 ♞axc8 (17... ♞fxc8 18 ♞e1 \pm 1/2-1/2 Emodi-Kubacsny, Hungary 2004) 18 ♞e1 and now:

b1) 18... ♙d4 ?! 19 ♚f3 ♞fd8 20 ♙g5 ! ♞d7 21 ♞e7 ♞xe7 22 ♙xe7 ♙xb2 23 ♞d1 ! ♙d4 (23... c4 ? 24 d6 c3 25 d7 c2 26 d8 ♚ +! or 23... ♚b7 ? 24 d6 +-) 24 d6 ♚a4 25 ♞b1 \pm .

b2) 18... ♞f8 19 d6 ! (or: 19 ♙h6 ?! ♚f6 ! ∞ Li Wenliang-Zhang Ziyang, Jinan 2005; 19 ♙g5 h6 ! 20 ♙xh6 ♙xb2 21 ♞b1 ♞xe1 + 22 ♚xe1 and now 22... ♚xa2 ! ∞ is a big improvement over 22... ♙d4 ? 23 ♙g5 ! +- Bareev-Vera, Novi Sad OL 1990) 19... ♚xd6 20 ♚xd6 ♙xd6 21 ♞xe8 + ♞xe8 22 ♙e3 \pm J.Gonzalez-Krumpacnik, Budapest 1995.

b3) Bareev proposes 18... ♚d6 19 ♚f3 with a slight plus for White.

b4) 18... ♚f6 ! and now White has a choice:


b41) 19 ♙h6 ♞fd8 (19... ♙d4 20 ♚d2 ♞fd8 21 ♞ad1 1/2-1/2 Koster-Breivik, Amsterdam

2005) 20 ♖g4 ♗d6 21 ♚e2 ♗xd5 22 ♚ael f6 23 f4 f5 24 ♗h4 ♗d4+ 25 ♜h2 ♙f6 26 ♙g5 ♚f8 27 ♙e6 ♙g7 28 ♙e7 ♚f7 29 ♙d6 ♗a4 30 b3 1/2-1/2 Neverov-Ovseevich, Alushta 2003.

b42) 19 ♚b1 ♚fd8 20 b3 (20 ♖g4 h5 21 ♗c4 ♗f5 22 ♗e4 ♗xe4 23 ♚xe4 ♚xd5 24 ♙e3 c4 25 f4 ♙f6 26 ♚c1 ♚a5 27 ♚cxc4 ♚xc4 28 ♚xc4 ♚xa2 29 b4 a6 = Notkin-Velimirović, Vrnjačka Banja 1998) 20...♙d4 21 ♗c2 ♚xd5 22 ♙b2 ♗a6! (22...♚cd8 23 ♚e2 ♗a6 24 ♚bel ±) 23 ♙a1 ♚cd8 24 ♚bd1 ♗a5 25 ♙xd4 cxd4 (25...♚xd4 26 ♚c1!) 26 ♚e7 d3 27 ♗c7 d2 28 ♗xa5 ♚xa5 29 a4 ♚d3 (29...♚c5 30 ♜f1!) 30 ♚e3 ♚ad5 1/2-1/2 Atalik-Velimirović, Herceg Novi 1999.

b43) 19 ♖g4 ♙d4 20 ♚e2 h5 21 ♗e4 (21 ♖g3 ♚fe8 22 ♙g5 ♗f5 23 ♚d2 ♚e5 24 ♙f4 ♚xd5 25 ♚ad1 ♚cd8 26 ♗f3 ♚5d7 27 ♙e3 ♗e6 28 b3 ♙xe3 29 ♚xd7 ♚xd7 30 ♚xd7 ♗xd7 31 ♗xe3 1/2-1/2 Blagojević-Feletar, Zadar 2003) 21...♚b8 22 ♚b1 ♚b4 23 ♙e3!? (23 ♗c2 ♚d8 24 ♙d2 ♚b7 25 ♙e3 ♙xe3 ± 1/2-1/2 Blagojević-Kovačević, Ulcinj 1997) 23...♗a6 24 a3 ♗xe2 25 axb4 ♙xe3 26 fxe3 cxb4 27 d6 ±± Raschewski-Salvador Marques, e-mail 2002.

16 ♜xb6 (D)



16...♗xb6

After 16...♗xb6?! Black misses the pressure down the b-file. White can continue with:

a) 17 a4?! ♙d7 (17...♚d8 18 ♜b5 ♗b7 19 ♚e1 ♙f5 20 d6 ± P.Cramling-Mirallès, France 2001) 18 ♚a3 and here 18...♙e5 ∞ Kakooza-Brittner, Istanbul OL 2000 is superior to 18...♚ad8?! 19 ♙g5 ♙xb2 20 ♙xd8 ♚xd8 21 ♗f3 ♚f8 22 ♚e3 ♗xa4 23 ♚e7 f5 24 ♜c4 ♗xc4 25 ♚xd7 ♗b5 26 ♚c7 ♙e5 27 d6 c4 28 ♗e2 ♚d8 29 ♚e1 1-0 Blagojević-Velimirović, Podgorica 1996.

b) 17 ♙g5 ♚a7 (17...♙xb2 18 ♙e7 ♙d7 19 ♗d2 ♙d4 20 ♗f4 ♗a4 21 ♙xf8 ♚xf8 22 ♚ael ♙g7 23 ♚e4 ♗xa2 24 ♚e7 ♙a4 25 ♚a7 ♗xd5 26 ♚xa4 ♙e5 27 ♜e4 f5 28 ♗d2 ♗b3 29 ♜g5 h6 30 ♚a3 1-0 Halkias-Paragua, Ubuda 2000) 18 ♚e1! (18 ♜xc8?! ♚xc8 19 d6 ♚d7 20 ♚e1 b5 21 ♙f4 ♙xb2 22 ♚b1 ♙f6 23 ♖g4 ♗c6 24 ♗e2 c4 25 ♚ec1 ♙g7 ♢ Provotorov-Simantsev, Voronezh 2002) 18...♙xb2 19 ♙h6 ♚d8 20 ♚b1 ♙d4 21 ♚b4 ♙g7 22 ♙xg7 ♜xg7 23 ♗a1+ f6 24 ♚f4 ♚xd6 25 ♚e6 ♚f7 26 ♚xd6 ♙f5 27 g4 ♗a7 28 g5 ♗c7 29 gxf6+ 1-0 Pheby-Demian, corr. 2002.

c) 17 ♚e1 b5 18 ♜xc8 ♚fxc8 19 ♚e2 ♗d6 20 ♙g5 ♚e8 21 ♚xe8+ ♚xe8 22 ♙e3 ♚b8 23 ♗d2 ♚a8 24 ♙f4 ♙e5 25 ♙xe5 ♗xe5 26 d6 ♚d8 27 ♚d1 ♚d7 28 ♗d5 ♗xd5 29 ♚xd5 c4 30 ♜f1 b4 31 ♜e2 ♜g7 32 ♜e3 1-0 Liehr-Giacoppelli, e-mail 2002.

d) 17 ♗b3 ♙d7 (17...♗e2?! 18 ♜xc8 ♚fxc8 19 d6 b5 20 ♙g5 ♗xb2 21 d7 +- J.Horvath-Szalanczy, Hungarian Ch 1989) 18 ♙g5 and now:

d1) 18...f6?! 19 ♙f4 f5 20 ♚fe1 ♙f6 21 a4! ♙xa4 22 ♗e3 and now both 22...c4 23 ♗e6+ ♜g7 24 ♙e5 ♙xe5 25 ♗xe5+ ♜g8 26 ♗d4 ♚a7 27 ♜xc4 +- Dreev-Shabalov, Tbilisi 1989 and 22...♙xb2 23 ♚ab1 ♚ae8 (23...♙f6 24 ♗e6+ ♜h8 25 ♙xb6! +-) 24 ♜xe8 ♚xe8 25 ♗d2 ♙d4 26 ♚xe8+ ♙xe8 27 ♗e1 ♙f7 28 ♙e5! +- are excellent for White.

d2) 18...♙a4 19 ♗f3 ♙xb2 20 ♙e7 ♙xa1? (20...c4 ±) 21 ♚xa1 ♙c2 22 ♙f6 ♗d3 23 ♗f4 g5 24 ♗xg5+ ♗g6 25 ♗e5 ♚a4 26 ♚e1 ♚d4 27 ♜c8 +- M.Voiska-Madl, Brno 1989.

d3) 18...♚a7 19 ♚fe1 ♙a4 20 ♗f3 is much better for White.


d4) 18...♗a4 19 ♗xb6 ♚fb8 20 ♗xc5 ♙xb2 21 ♚ael ♚c2 22 ♗e3 ♗xa2 23 ♗e7 ♗xd5 24 ♗xd7 ♗xg5 25 ♗xf7+ ♜h8 26 ♚e8+ 1-0 C.Horvath-Drollinger, La Perla 2000.

d5) 18...b5 19 ♜e4 c4 20 ♗b4 f5 21 ♜c3 ♗a5 22 ♙e7 ♚fe8 23 ♗xa5 ♚xa5 24 ♙b4 ♚aa8 25 ♚fel ± A.Marić-Litinskaya, Genting Highlands wom IZ 1990.

17 ♜xc8 ♚axc8 18 ♚b1! (D)

The best try. White's alternatives such as 18 ♗b3 c4 19 ♗xb6 axb6 20 a4 ♚c5 (Sakaev-Agrest, Russia 1990), 18 ♗c2 ♚fd8 19 ♚d1 ♙d4 20 ♗c4 ♗b7 (Salov-Tal, Skellefteå 1989) and 18 ♗f3 ♚fd8 19 ♚b1 ♗f6 20 ♗xf6 ♙xf6 21

♙e3 ♜xd5 (J.Campos-Marin, Zaragoza 1994) lead to easy draws.



18...♜fd8

Black has many alternatives, the most important being:

a) 18...♜fe8?! 19 d6 (or 19 b3 ♙d4 20 ♙f4 ♜a6 21 d6 ♜e2 22 b4 ♜xa2 23 bxc5 ♙xc5 24 d7 ♜d8 25 ♙c7 ♜xf2 26 ♜xf2 ♙xf2+ 27 ♙h2 ♙h4 28 ♙xd8 ♙xd8 29 ♙e1 1-0 Mrkvicka-Bueno, e-mail 2002) 19...♜cd8 20 ♙f4 ±.

b) 18...c4 19 ♙f4 (19 ♙e3 ♜a5 20 ♙d4 ♜xd5 21 ♙xg7 ♜xd1 22 ♜fxd1 ♙xg7 23 ♜bc1 ♜c7 24 ♜c3 ♙f6 ± 1/2-1/2 Czarniecki-Rydzik, Krakow 2003 and 19 ♜f3!? ♜fd8 20 ♜d1 ♜a6 21 a3 ♜b8 22 ♙g5 ♜d7 23 ♜f4 ± Garcia Roman-Y.Gonzalez, Barbera del Valles 2005 are reasonable alternatives) 19...♜fd8 transposes to 18...♜fd8 19 ♙f4 c4 (note 'e' to Black's 19th move).

c) 18...♜d6 and now:

c1) 19 ♜e1 ♜fd8 (19...♜fe8? is bad in view of 20 ♜xe8+ ♜xe8 21 ♙e3 ♜e4 22 ♜d3 ♜b4 23 ♜c1 ♙d4 24 a3 ± Machelett-I.Schneider, Bad Bevensen 2000, but 19...♜cd8 20 ♙g5 ♜d7! [not 20...f6?! 21 ♙e3 ♜xd5 22 ♜a4! f5 23 ♜xa7 f4 24 ♙xc5 ♜a8 25 ♙e7 ♜f7 26 ♙e4! ± Lima-Outereho Ucha, Mondariz 1995] is also fine) 20 ♙g5 ♜d7 21 ♜g4 h5 22 ♜a4 ♜xd5 23 ♜bd1 ♙d4 = Pasolini-Cimmino, Italy 1996.

c2) 19 ♜f3 ♜fd8 20 ♜e1 (20 ♜d1 ♙d4 21 ♜e1 and now 21...♜d7 = is correct, but certainly not 21...♜xd5?! 22 ♜e8+ 1-0 Kunin-Holfelder, Germany 2003) 20...♙e5 (20...♜d7 21 ♙f4 ♜xd5 22 ♜xd5 ♜xd5 23 b3 ♜d7 24 ♜e2 f5 25 ♜c1 ± Golod-R.Vasquez, Internet 2002) 21 ♙e3 (21 ♜e4?! ♙d4?! 22 ♙g5 f6 23 ♙h4 ♜xd5 24 b3 ♜xe4 25 ♜xe4 g5 26 ♙g3 f5 27 ♜e6 f4 28 ♙h2 ♙f7 29 ♜e1 ♜c6 ♞ Nazarenus-Nüsken,

Greifswald 2001) 21...♜xd5 22 ♜xd5 ♜xd5 23 ♜e2 ±.

c3) 19 ♙e3 ♜fd8 20 ♜a4 ♜xd5 21 ♜fd1 ♙d4 22 ♜d2 ♜c6 23 ♜xc6 ♜xc6 24 b3 ♜a6 25 ♙f1 ♜dd6!?! (25...♙g7 26 a4?! ♜b6?! 27 b4 a6 28 ♜dd1 ♜d5 29 ♙xd4+ cxd4 30 ♙e2 h5 31 ♙d3 ♜d7 32 b5 axb5 33 axb5 ± Kožul-Vranešić, Toronto 1990 – see Typical Endgames) 26 ♜bd1 ±.


c4) 19 ♙g5!?! h6 20 ♙e3 (20 ♙h4 f5 21 f3 ♙d4+ 22 ♙f2 ♜xd5 23 ♙xd4 cxd4 = Volzhin-Chadaev, Sochi 2004) 20...♜fd8 21 ♜a4 ♜xd5 22 ♜xa7 c4 23 ♜a4 ♜a8 24 ♜c2 ♜xa2 25 ♜fd1 ♜a8 26 ♜xd8+ ♜xd8 27 ♜xc4 ♜xb2 28 ♜xb2 ♙xb2 29 ♙xh6 ± was a real torture in Ibragimov-Nepomnishay, St Petersburg 1995. White went on to win an interesting queen endgame.

19 ♙f4 (D)

Although this is supposed to be the 'main line', White can try some alternatives, where his better pawn-structure ensures a slight advantage and long suffering in the endgame for Black:

a) 19 ♙g5 ♜d7 (19...f6?! 20 ♙f4 ♜b4 21 ♜f3 ♜c4 22 d6 ♜xa2 23 b3 ♜d7 24 ♜d5+ ♙h8 25 ♜be1 ± J.Adler-Duppel, Pardubice 2001) 20 ♜g4 ♜b7 21 ♜fd1 h5 22 ♜f3 ♙d4 23 ♙e3 ♜xd5 (1/2-1/2 Raceanu-G.Szabo, Los Llanos 2004) 24 ♜xd5 ♜xd5 25 ♜d2 ±.

b) 19 ♙e3 ♜b7 20 b3!?! ♙d4 21 ♜f3 ♜xd5 22 ♜xd5 (22 ♜fd1?! ♜xf3 ♞ Kharlov-Chatalbashev, Cap d'Agde 2002) 22...♜xd5 23 ♜fd1 ±.



19...♜b7!

Essentially the only move. An examination of the alternatives shows that even a 'minor' mistake is enough for White to gain an almost decisive advantage:

a) 19...♞b4? 20 ♔g3 ♞c4 21 d6 ♞xa2 22 d7 ♞c6 23 ♞a1 ♞xb2 24 ♞xa7 ♞b6 25 ♞e1 ♔f6 26 ♞e8+ ♔g7 27 ♞a8 c4 28 ♔e5 c3 29 ♞xd8 c2 30 ♞g8+ ♔h6 31 ♞cl+ 1-0 Gomez Esteban-Sanz Alonso, Salamanca 2005.

b) 19...♔d4? 20 d6 c4 21 ♞g4 h5 (21...♔xb2? 22 d7 ♞a8 23 ♔e5 +-) 22 ♞e2! ♔c5 23 ♞fc1 ♔xd6 24 ♞xc4 ±.

c) 19...♞a6? 20 d6 ♞d7 (20...♞b8 21 ♞e1 ♞c6 22 ♞c2 ♔f8 23 ♔g5 ♞d7 24 ♔e7 ♔xe7 25 ♞xe7 ♞xe7 26 dxe7 ♞e6 27 ♞xc5 ♞b7 28 ♞d1 ♞xe7 29 b4 ♔g7 30 ♞d4+ ♞e5 31 ♞xe5+ ♞xe5 32 a4 ♔f6 33 b5 ♔e6 34 ♔f1 h5 1-0 Santurbano-Taner, e-mail 2002) 21 ♞d5 (21 ♞e1 ♞xa2 22 ♞e7 ♞cd8 23 ♞a1 ♞xb2 24 ♞xd7 ♞xd7 25 ♞b1 ♞f6 26 ♞b8+ ♔f8 {26...♞d8? 27 d7! +-} 27 ♞d2 c4 28 ♞c8 ♞d8 29 d7 c3 30 ♞e3 c2 31 ♞xd8 ♞xd8 32 ♞e8 ♞c7 33 ♔c1 ♞d6 34 d8 ♞d1+ 35 ♔h2 1-0 Bogdanovski-Velimirović, Kranevo 1996) 21...c4 22 ♞bd1 ♔xb2 23 ♞fe1 ♔f6 and then:

c1) Not much is gained by 24 ♔e5?! ♔xe5! (24...c3 25 ♔xf6 c2 26 ♞d2!! cxd1 ♞ 27 ♞xd1 ♞a4 28 ♞e1 +-) 25 ♞xe5 ♞a3! (25...♞f8? 26 ♞e7 ♞dd8 27 d7 ♞xa2 28 ♞de1 +- ♞a4 29 ♔h2? {29 ♞le4!} 29...a6? {29...c3! =} 30 ♞xf7! 1-0 Rogozenko-Marin, Bucharest 1995) 26 ♞d4 (with the idea 27 ♞de1) 26...♞f8! 27 ♞e2 c3 =.

c2) 24 ♔h6! (with the threat of 25 ♞e4) 24...♔g7 (24...♞b6 25 ♞xc4! ±) 25 ♔xg7 ♔xg7 26 ♞e7 ♞xe7 27 dxe7 ♞a4 28 ♞d8 c3 29 ♞e1 +-.

d) 19...♞d7?! 20 d6 (also good is 20 ♞f3 c4 21 ♞fc1 ♞a5 22 d6 ♞xa2 23 ♞g4 f5 24 ♞e2 c3 25 ♞b5 ♞f7 26 bxc3 ♞c4 27 ♔e5 f4 28 ♞b4 ♞c8 29 ♔xf4 ♞xc3 30 ♞xc3 ♔xc3 31 ♞c4 ♔f6 32 ♞c7 1-0 Bunzmann-Kountz, France 2002 or 20 ♞d2 ♞b7 21 ♞fd1 ♞cd8 22 d6 ♔f8 23 ♞e3 ♞b6 24 b4 ♔xd6 25 ♔xd6 ♞xd6 26 ♞xd6 ♞xd6 27 ♞xc5 ♞xc5 28 bxc5 ± Bu Xiangzhi-Lopez Silva, Iraklion U-18 Wch 2002) 20...♔f8 21 ♞g4 ♞b7 (21...♞c6 22 ♞bd1 ♞e8 23 ♞d2 ♔xd6 24 ♞fd1 ♞ed8 25 ♞f3 ♞c7 26 ♞e4 ± ♔f8? 27 ♞xd6 ♞xd6 28 ♞xd6 ♞xd6 29 ♔h6+ 1-0 Xu-Van Geffen, Groningen 2002) 22 ♞fd1 ♞c6 23 ♞d2 ± Grabarczyk-Oliwa, Brzeg Dolny 1996.

e) 19...c4?! 20 d6 ♞c6! (20...♞d7? 21 ♞a4! ♞c6 22 ♞be1! ± Rogozenko-Moldovan, Romania 1995 or 20...♞b5? 21 ♞d2 ♔e5? {21...♞f5 22 ♔g3 ±} 22 ♔xe5 ♞xe5 23 d7 ♞c7 24 ♞be1

♞b5 25 ♞e8+ ♞xe8 26 d8 ♞ 1-0 Bacrot-Panarin, Internet 2003) 21 ♞d2 ♞d7 22 ♞fd1 ♞a6 and now both 23 b3 c3 24 ♞c2 and 23 a3 ♔f8 (23...c3 24 bxc3 ♞xa3 25 c4! ±) 24 ♞bc1 give White a fair advantage.

20 d6 ♔f8 21 ♞d3!


Not much is achieved by 21 ♞d2 ♔xd6 22 ♔xd6 ♞c6 23 ♞fd1 ♞a6! 24 ♞g5 ♞xd6! (not 24...♞xd6? 25 ♞xd8+ ♞xd8 26 ♞xd8+ ♔g7 27 a3 ±) 25 ♞xd6 ♞xd6 26 ♞xc5 ♞xa2 27 ♞e1 ♞d8 28 b4 a6 = Karpov-Topalov, Las Palmas 1996 or with 21 b3 ♔xd6 22 ♔xd6 ♞a6 23 ♞e1 ♞xd6 24 ♞c2 c4 25 bxc4 ♞xc4 = Weber-Bartsch, e-mail 2002 (25...♞xc4?? 26 ♞e8+ +-).

21...♔xd6

21...c4?! seems wrong: 22 ♞g3! ♞c6 23 ♞fd1 ♞b6 24 b3! (24 d7? ♞b7 25 ♞g4 h5 =) 24...c3 25 ♞bc1 ♔xd6 26 ♔xd6 ♞cd6 27 ♞xd6 ♞xd6 28 ♞xc3 ±.

22 ♔xd6 ♞c6 23 ♞fd1 ♞d7!

Black cannot afford 23...♞b6? 24 ♔xc5 ♞xd3 25 ♔xb6 ♞xd1+ 26 ♞xd1 ♞xb6 27 ♞d2 ± or 23...♞cd6? 24 ♞xd6 ♞xd6 25 ♞xd6 (D).



Although Skembris-Pigusov, Cap d'Agde 1998 was agreed drawn here, and the assessment given in *Informator* indicates just a slight advantage for White, in my opinion White has rather more than this, as the two rooks are stronger than the black queen. Although 5 out of 6 (serious) games played so far ended in draws, the feeling is that White has good winning chances:

a) 25...♔g7 26 ♞d2 ♞a6 27 a3 (27 b3! c4 28 bxc4 ♞xc4 29 ♞dd1! a5 {29...♞xa2 30 ♞a1 ♞e2 31 ♞d7 ±} 30 ♞dc1! ±) 27...♞c4 28 ♞e1 h5 29 ♞de2 h4 30 ♞e4 ♞b3 31 ♞xh4 ♞xb2 32 ♞c4 ♞xa3 33 ♞ecl a5 34 ♞xc5 a4 35 ♞5c3

♖b2 36 ♖c2 ♖b3 37 ♜e2 ♖a3 38 ♜e1 ♖b2
39 ♜b1 ♖d2 40 ♜a1 ♖c3 41 ♜ed1 ♖c2 42 ♜f1
♖b3 43 f4 ♖b4 44 ♖h2 ♖d4 45 ♜a2 ♖c4 46
♜ff2 ♖b3 47 ♜a1 ♖e3 48 ♜f3 ♖d4 49 ♜a2
♖c4 50 ♜ff2 ♖c1 51 g3 ♖e1 (1/2-1/2 Kolev-
Suba, Mallorca 2000) 52 ♜f3! f6 53 ♜fa3 +-.
b) 25...c4!?! and then:

b1) 26 ♜dd1?! h5 27 ♜e1 ♖b5 28 ♜ec1 ♖f5
29 ♜a1 ♖d3 30 ♜c3 ♖e2 31 ♜b1 a5 32 a4 ♖g7
33 ♜bc1 ♖xb2 34 ♜xc4? (34 h4! ±) 34...h4! 35
♜f1 g5 36 ♜g4 f6 37 ♜d1 ♖e2 38 ♜b1 ♖g6 39
♜d4 ♖c2 40 ♜e1 ♖c3 41 ♜ed1 ♖b3 42 ♖h1
♖c2 43 f4 ♖h5! = Shalimov-Simantsev, Khar-
kov 2000.

b2) 26 ♜d2 c3 27 ♜c2 ♖e4 28 ♜bc1 (not 28
♜cc1 ? c2) 28...cxb2 29 ♖xb2 and now:

b21) 29...♖a4 30 ♜e2?! (30 g3! ♖g7 31 h4
h5 32 ♜c7 a6 33 ♜d2 ±) 30...♖g7 31 ♜cc2 h5
32 ♜cd2 ♖c4 33 ♜el a5 34 ♜ed1 ♖a4 35 ♜b1
♖e4 36 ♜al ♖b4 37 ♜e2 ♖c3 38 ♜ae1 ♖a3?!
(38...h4! =) 39 h4! ♖h6 40 g3 f5! 41 ♖g2 ♖a4
42 ♜e7! (42 f4? ♖c6+ led to a draw in Liogky-
Hamdouchi, French Cht 1996/7) 42...♖xa2 43
♜d7! ♖g8 44 ♜ee7 a4 45 ♜a7 +-.
b22) 29...h5 30 ♜bc2 h4 31 ♜c4 ♖e7 32 a4
♖g7 33 ♖f1?! (33 ♜d4! a5 34 ♜b1 ±) 33...♖a3
34 ♜d1 ♖b3 35 ♜cd4 ♖c2 36 ♜el g5 37 ♖g1
♖c3 38 ♜ed1 ♖c2 39 f4 gxf4? (39...f6 =) 40
♜f1 ± Veingold-Saldano Dayer, Alicante 2000.

b23) 29...a5 30 ♜bc2 ♖a4 31 ♜e2 ♖g7 32
g3 ♖d4 33 a3 ♖d6 34 ♜e3 g5? (34...h5!?) 35
♜b1 ♖d7 36 ♜e5 f6 37 ♜xa5 ♖xh3 38 ♜a7+
♖g6 39 ♜a6 ♖d7 40 ♜e1?! (40 ♜bb6 +-)
40...♖f5 41 ♜e3?! (41 ♜ee6! ♖xe6 42 g4+!
+-) 41...h5 42 ♜b6?! (42 ♜f3+ +-) 42...h4 43
gxf4 ♖d1 + 44 ♖g2 gxf4 45 ♜b4? (45 ♜f3+
+-) 45...♖g5 46 ♜f3 f5? (46...♖d6!) 47 a4?
(47 ♜b5 +-) 47...♖a1 48 ♜b5 h3+ 49 ♜xh3
♖xa4 = Hörstmann-Womacka, Pardubice 2002.
24 ♖a3

White must be precise. Moves like 24 ♖e3?!
♜xd6 25 ♜dc1 ♖f5! = or 24 ♜bc1?! ♜xd6 25
♖xd6 ♖xd6 26 ♜xd6 ♜xd6 27 ♜xc5 ♜d1+ 28
♖h2 ♜d2 = Baroin-Nava Baro, e-mail 2002 and
Babula-Wojtaszek, Gothenburg Echt 2005 do
not help much.

24...♜xd6 25 ♜xd6 ♖xd6 26 ♖xa7 ♜e8

Although the game concluded in a draw,
26...♖d3?! 27 ♜c1 ♖d2 28 ♖xc5 ♖xb2 29
♖c2 was clearly better for White in Banikas-
Gashimov, Gothenburg Echt 2005. Other tries

have not sufficed either: 26...♖d4?! 27 a4 ♜d5
28 ♖b8+ ♖g7 29 ♖b3 ± Breier-Kleeschaet-
zky, Germany tt 2000 or 26...♖e5?! 27 ♖a5
♜b8 28 b3 ♜b4 29 ♜c1 ♜e4 30 ♖c3! ± Campos
Moreno-Outereelo Ucha, Burgas 1999.

27 ♖a5 (D)

Most of the alternatives offer little:

a) Not 27 ♜c1 ♜e2 28 b3 ♜xf2 29 ♜xc5 (29
♖xc5 ♖xc5 30 ♜xc5 ♜xa2) 29...♜xg2+! 30
♖xg2 ♖d2+ =.


b) 27 a3 ♖d4 28 ♜f1 1/2-1/2 Collazo-Kisi-
menko, e-mail 2001.

c) 27 ♖a4 ♜e2 28 ♖c4 ♖e5 29 ♖c3 and
then:

c1) 29...♖xc3?! 30 bxc3 ♜xa2! (30...♜c2?
31 ♜a1 ♜xc3 32 a4 ♜b3 33 a5 ♜b7 34 a6 ♜a7
35 ♖f1 ±) 31 ♜b5 ±.

c2) 29...♖f5! 30 ♜f1 ♜c2 31 ♖b3 c4 with
compensation.

d) But for those who do not like to play the
endgame arising at the end of the analysis, there
is an interesting and mostly unexplored alterna-
tive: 27 a4?! ♜e2 28 ♖a8+ (28 a5?! ♖d4 29
♖a8+ ♖g7 30 ♖f3 ♜xb2 31 ♜xb2 ♖xb2 32
♖h2 c4 33 a6 c3 34 a7 c2 35 a8 ♖ c1 ♖ =
Vovchik-Gunlycke, Internet 2004) 28...♖g7 29
♖f3 ♖e5 30 b3 ±± Neverov-Simantsev, Khar-
kov 1999; e.g., 30...♜c2 31 ♖d3!.



27...♜e2!

Correctly seeking counterplay. Wrong would
be 27...♖d4? 28 ♖c3 ±.

28 ♖c3

Still the correct move. Alternatives like 28
♜e1 ♜xb2 29 ♜e8+ ♖g7 30 ♖c3+ ♖d4 or 28
♖a8+ ♖g7 29 ♖f3 ♖e5 30 ♖c3 ♖xc3 31 bxc3
♜c2! 32 a4 (32 ♜b3 c4) 32...♜xc3 33 ♜a1 (un-
fortunately this doesn't work now as well as in
note 'c1' to White's 27th move above, because

the black king is on g7) 33...c4 34 ♖f1 (34 a5 ♜b3 35 a6 c3 36 a7 c2 37 a8 ♜b1+ 38 ♖h2 c1 ♜) 34...♞c2 35 a5 ♜b2! (35...c3? 36 ♜a3!) 36 ♖e1 (36 a6 c3) 36...c3 37 ♖d1 ♞xf2 38 ♜a3 ♞xg2 39 a6 ♞d2+ 40 ♖c1 ♞d8 would be easy for Black.

28...♜b6!

Black tried 28...♜d5?! in S.Ionov-Berelovich, St Petersburg 1999 but he was not successful – see Illustrative Games.

29 a4 c4 30 ♞f1 ♜b3!

Continuations like 30...♜xb2?! 31 ♜xc4 or 30...♜xb2?! 31 ♜xc4 will lead to unpleasant positions like the aforementioned game Banikas-Gashimov, Gothenburg Echt 2005.

31 ♜xb3

An equal endgame arises after 31 ♞c1 ♞xb2! (31...♜xa4? 32 ♜d4! ♜a6 33 ♞xc4 ♞xb2 34 ♜d8+ ♖g7 35 ♞c8 ♞bl+ 36 ♖h2 ± Piket-Topalov, Monte Carlo 2000) 32 ♜xc4 ♜xc4 33 ♞xc4 ♞a2 34 h4 h5 35 g3 ♖f8, Flumbort-Loetscher, Zug 2003, although Black will suffer.

31...cxb3 32 ♞b1 ♞e4 33 ♞a1

An easy draw would be reached after 33 ♖f1 ♞xa4 34 ♖e2 ♞c4 35 ♞d1 ♖g7 36 ♞d3 ♞c2+ 37 ♞d2 ♞c1 38 ♖e3 ♞bl 39 ♖d3 ♞c1 =.

33...♞e2 34 ♞b1 ♞e4

Here the game Komarov-Leko, Ulcinj 1997 was agreed drawn, but White can continue!

35 a5! ♞a4 36 ♞e1 ♞xa5

On 36...♞a2 37 a6! ♞xb2?? 38 a7 ♞a2 39 ♞e8+ White is winning.

37 ♞e3 ♞b5 38 ♖f1

In this endgame White retains an advantage – see Typical Endgame 3 on page 107.

4.8 Illustrative Games

Completing our survey of the Modern Benoni, here are three illustrative games that present highly important strategic and tactical motifs for both sides.

Game 1

Grivas – Minasian
Debrecen Echt 1992

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♘c3 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 6 ♘f3 g6 7 e4 a6 8 a4 ♙g4 9 ♙e2 ♙xf3 10 ♙xf3 ♘bd7 11 0-0 ♙g7 12 ♙e2

For more information on this line, see Section 4.5, Line C2.

12...0-0 13 ♞e1 ♞e8 14 ♙f1 ♞c8 15 a5!

Intending 16 ♞a4 ±.

15...c4 16 ♞a4 ♘e5 17 ♙e3

This looks better than 17 f4?! ♘fg4! with complications, or 17 h3 b5!.


17...♘f7

Not, of course, 17...♘fg4? 18 ♙b6 ±.

18 f4!

This forces Black to sacrifice his c-pawn.

18...♘d3 19 ♙xd3 cxd3 20 ♜xd3 ♘c5 21 ♙xc5 ♙xc5 (D)



Black's compensation is based on the power of the g7-bishop and the weakness of the white a-pawn. White can do nothing else than fight for the initiative in the centre, as after 22 ♞al b5! Black's compensation is fine.

22 e5! dxe5

The critical line is 22...♞xa5 23 ♞b4! dxe5 24 d6 ♞e6 (24...♜d7? 25 ♞c4! ♞e6 26 ♞d1 exf4 27 ♞c7 ♜d8 28 d7) 25 d7 exf4 26 ♞d1! ♙e5 27 ♘e4! and, although there are a lot of tactics, White seems to gain the advantage.

23 d6?!

Wrong. After 23 ♞ae4! f5 24 ♞xe5! ♙xe5 25 fxe5 White would have a decisive advantage, as the central pawns are too strong to deal with; e.g., 25...♞xa5 26 ♜d4! ♜e7 27 d6 ♜e6 28 b4! ♞a3 29 ♘d5.

23...♞c6?!

23...exf4? is bad due to 24 ♞xe8+ ♜xe8 25 ♞e4 ♞e5 26 d7 ♜d8 27 ♞c4 +– but 23...♜d7!? 24 ♞b4 ∞ was essential.

24 ♞d1 exf4?

Black should play 24...♜d7! 25 ♞c4! ♞xc4 (25...exf4 26 ♞xc6 bxc6 27 ♜xa6) 26 ♜xc4 exf4 27 ♜xf4 ±.

25 d7 ♖e3 26 ♖e4!

Black had overlooked this fine resource and now White obtains a clear advantage.

26...♙f6

Alternatives such as 26...♗xd3? 27 ♖e8+ ♙f8 28 ♗xd3 +-, 26...♗xe4? 27 ♗xe4 ♙f6 28 ♖d5 +- and 26...♙xc3? 27 ♗xe3 +- are also difficult for Black. Maybe 26...♖e6 27 ♗xe6 fxe6 28 ♗c4 ♖e5 29 ♗c8 ♙f6 30 b4! ± was the lesser evil.

27 ♗xe3 fxe3 28 ♗xe3 ♖g7 29 ♖e4 ♙xb2 29...♙e7 30 ♗d4+ f6 31 b4 +.

30 ♗b3 ♙e5 31 ♗xb7 ♖e6 32 ♗d5 ♙c7 33 ♖c5 ♖e2 34 ♗d4+!

The right way, as 34 ♖f1? ♗h4! 35 ♗xf7+ ♖h6 is only equal! Of course, 34 ♖b7 ♗h4 (34...♙xh2+ 35 ♖f1 +-) 35 ♗d4+ was another way to win.

34...♙e5 35 ♗g4 ♖b2 36 ♗e4?

Time-trouble! 36 ♖d3 ♖b5 37 ♖xe5 ♖xe5 38 ♗d4 wins.


36...♙f6 37 ♖b7 ♗xb7?

Black had to find 37...♗c7! 38 ♖d6 (38 d8♗? ♙xd8 39 ♖xd8 ♖d2!! =) 38...♗c5+ with an unclear position.

38 ♗xb7 ♗xa5 39 ♗d5 ♗b6+ 40 ♖h1 ♙d8 41 ♗d4+ ♗xd4 42 ♗xd4 +- f5 43 ♖d6?!

An easier route to victory is 43 ♖d2! ♖f7 44 ♖e2 ♙e7 45 ♖g1, going all the way to c6.

43...♖f7 44 ♗xa6 ♖e7 45 ♖a7 ♖d6 (D)



46 g3?!

White sticks with his 'policy' of small mistakes. 46 ♖g1 was the right way.

46...♙c7 47 d8♗+ ♙xd8 48 ♗xh7 ♖e6 49 ♖g2 ♙e7 50 ♖f3 ♖f6 51 ♖h8 ♖g7 52 ♖a8 ♙g5 53 ♖a7+ ♖h6 54 ♖c7 ♙d8 55 ♖d7 ♙g5 56 ♖d1 ♖h5 57 h3 ♖h6 58 ♖d5 ♙c1 59 ♖d7 ♙g5 60 ♖d1 ♖h5 61 ♖d5 ♖h6 62 g4??

The final mistake and a very serious one. White could after all obtain a decisive advantage by bringing his king to e6.

62...fxg4+

Now a theoretical draw has appeared on the board, no matter how White recaptures on g4. A pity, but also a punishment for White's unbelievably bad play after he achieved a winning position!

63 ♖xg4 ♙c1 64 ♖f3 ♙g5 65 ♖d4 ♖g7 66 ♖e4 ♙c1 67 ♖d5 ♖f6 68 ♖d6 ♙e3 69 ♖e4 ♙c1 70 ♖d7 ♖f7 71 ♖e7+ ♖f6 72 ♖e8 ♙a3 73 ♖a7 ♙c5 74 ♖c7 ♙a3 75 ♖f7+ ♖g5 76 ♖f3 ♙d6 77 ♖f7 ♖h4 78 ♖xg6 ♙g3 79 ♖f5 ♖xh3 80 ♖e3 ♖g2 81 ♖g4 ♙d6 82 ♖e2+ ♖g1 83 ♖f3 ♙c7 84 ♖g2+ ♖h1 1/2-1/2

Game 2

Bocharov – V. Popov

Nefteyugansk 2002

1 d4 ♖f6 2 ♖f3 c5 3 d5 e6 4 c4 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 6 ♖c3 g6 7 h3 ♙g7 8 e4 0-0 9 ♙d3 ♙d7 10 a4 ♖a6 11 0-0 ♖b4 12 ♙f4!? ♖xd3 13 ♗xd3 ♖e8 14 ♖fe1 ♗b6 15 ♖e2

For more information on this line, see Section 4.6, Line E.

15...♖d8

15...f5?! is inadequate due to 16 e5! dxe5 17 ♖xe5 ♖d8 18 ♗e3 ♖f6 19 a5 ♗b4 20 ♖d3 ♗d4 21 ♖xc5 ♖xd5 22 ♖xd5 ♗xd5 23 ♖d2 ♗c6 24 ♖ad1 ±.

16 ♗d2 ♗a6 17 ♖ae1 ♙xa4?!

Wrong. Black should consider 17...b5!? 18 axb5 ♙xb5 19 ♖xb5 ♗xb5 ±.

18 ♖a1 ♙xc3 19 bxc3 ♗c4 20 ♙h6 ♖g7 21 e5!

The absence of the g7-bishop and the inactive black pieces give White a strong attack against the black king.

21...♙b5 22 ♖ae1 ♗b3?!


Black should accept a worse endgame with 22...dxe5 23 ♖xe5 (23 ♖xe5 a5!?) 23...♗xd5 24 ♗xd5 ♖xd5 25 c4 ♖xe5 26 ♖xe5 ♙xc4 27 ♖xc5 b5 28 ♖a1.

23 ♖e4 dxe5 24 ♙xg7!

Also strong was 24 ♖xe5 a5 (24...♙c4? 25 ♗f4! +- or 24...♖d6?! 25 ♖g5! f6 26 ♙xg7! fxe5 27 ♙xf8 ♗xd5 28 ♗xd5+ ♖xd5 29 ♖e6! +-) 25 ♖g5 f6 (25...a4 26 ♖e4 a3? allows 27 ♖f6+ ♖h8 28 ♙xg7+ ♖xg7 29 ♖h5+, forcing

mate) 26 ♖xg7 fxe5 27 ♖xf8 ♜xf8 28 ♜e6 with a large advantage for White.

24...♗xg7 25 ♜h4 h5 (D)



26 ♜xh5!

Eliminating the last guards of the opponent's king.

26...gxf5

There is no salvation with 26...♜h8 27 ♜xh8 ♜xh8 28 ♜xe5 ♜e8 29 d6 ± either.

27 ♜g5+ ♗h7 28 ♜xh5+ ♗g7 29 ♜g5+ ♗h7 30 ♜f5+ ♗g8

30...♗g7 31 ♜e4 ♜b1+ 32 ♗h2 ♜xe4 33 ♜xe4 f6 34 ♜h4 +-.

31 ♜g5 ♗g7

After 31...♖d3 32 ♜xd3 f5 33 ♜xe5 (33 ♜e6 ♜xd5 34 ♜g3+ ♗f7 35 ♜xf8 ♗xf8 36 ♜xe5 ♜xe5 37 ♜xe5 ±) 33...c4 34 ♜f3 White's attack will tell.

32 ♜e3 ♜d1+ 33 ♗h2 ♜d6

33...♜h5 34 ♜g3 ♜g6 35 ♜e6+ +-.

34 ♜g3 1-0

Black resigned as 34...♜g6 35 ♜e6+ is easy.

Game 3

S. Ionov – Berelovich


St Petersburg 1999

1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 e6 3 ♜f3 c5 4 d5 exd5 5 cxd5 d6 6 e4 g6 7 ♜c3 ♖g7 8 h3 0-0 9 ♖d3 b5 10 ♖xb5 ♜xe4 11 ♜xe4 ♜a5+ 12 ♜fd2 ♜xb5 13 ♜xd6 ♜a6 14 ♜2c4 ♜d7 15 0-0 ♜b6 16 ♜xb6 ♜xb6 17 ♜xc8 ♜axc8 18 ♜b1 ♜fd8 19 ♖f4 ♜b7 20 d6 ♖f8 21 ♜d3 ♖xd6 22 ♖xd6 ♜d7 23 ♜fd1 ♜c6 24 ♜a3 ♜xd6 25 ♜xd6 ♜xd6 26 ♜xa7 ♜e8 27 ♜a5 ♜e2 28 ♜c3 ♜d5?! (D)

For more information on this line, see Section 4.7, Line C.

29 a4 ♜xf2

The queen ending doesn't seem pleasant for Black, but 29...♜f5 30 ♜fl ♜c2 31 ♜a3 ± was not a real improvement.



30 ♗xf2 ♜f5+ 31 ♗g3 ♜xb1 32 a5 ♜a1 33 ♗h2!


Precise and much better than 33 ♜xc5?! ♜xb2 34 a6 ♜b8+!.

33...c4 34 ♜b4 ♗g7?!

Black should try to be more stubborn, with 34...h5!? 35 ♜b5! (35 ♜b6?! ♜a4 36 a6 c3! 37 bxc3 ♜f4+ 38 ♗h1 ♜f1+ =) where White advantage is undisputed (35...c3? 36 bxc3 ♜xc3 37 ♜b8+ ♗g7 38 a6), but there is still long way to go. Now Black gets no chance.

35 ♜b5 ♜f1 36 ♜e5+ ♗h6 37 ♜e3+ g5 (D)

37...♗g7 38 a6 c3 39 ♜xc3+.



38 a6 c3 39 a7 ♜a6

39...cxb2 40 a8♜b1 ♜41 ♜f8+ ♗h5 42 g4+ ♗g6 43 ♜g8+.

40 ♜xc3 f6

40...♜xa7 41 ♜f6+ ♗h5 42 g4+ ♗h4 43 ♜h6#.

41 ♜a3

Or 41 a8♜.

1-0

5 Beating the King's Indian Defence

5.1 Starting Out

Most opening books merely mention the Makogonov Variation (1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♖c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3 0-0 6 h3 – ECO E90 and NIC KI 20) against the King's Indian Defence, without providing adequate coverage. On the other hand, in the last few decades, thousands of games have been played with this 'little-known' line, with White achieving a higher percentage score than in most other systems against the King's Indian Defence.

The 'innocent' move h3 mainly pursues the following goals:

1) White prepares to meet the standard ...f5 advance by supporting the thrust g4. White isn't necessarily thinking of a kingside attack, but rather to capture on f5 twice, in order to claim the e4-square.

2) White keeps the destination of his king open. Everything seems possible: queenside castling, kingside castling, or even staying in the centre.

3) White can place his bishop on e3 without fearing ...♗g4.

4) Most important of all, White aims to block the centre and the kingside, and then to play on the queenside, where he is superior.

Of course there are also disadvantages, as White 'loses' a tempo with h3 and sometimes the pawn on h3 can become a target for Black. On the other hand, Black must try to stay active. Passivity will only help White to accomplish his strategic goals more easily and quickly.

The flexibility inherent of this system attracts those who dislike being attacked, as often happens in the Classical King's Indian, and also like to attack.

An interesting battle lies ahead. Usually, in the King's Indian Defence it is customary for Black to attack on the kingside and White on the queenside. In this variation both players 'attack' on both flanks! Modern chess-players

have to make use of all the squares of the board.

The true expert on this system is Polish GM Michal Krasenkow, whom I quote: "The general strategic idea of this system is to restrict Black's activity on both sides." It should also be mentioned that the late Latvian GM Vladimir Bagirov was another expert of this system and his contribution is valuable and still guides us.

Among other GMs that regularly use the system we can mention Alexander Beliavsky and Alex Yermolinsky.

For reasons of historical interest, here is the debut game of the h3 system:

Sämisch – Réti

Teplitz-Schönau 1922

1 d4 ♗f6 2 ♗f3 g6 3 c4 ♗g7 4 ♖c3 0-0 5 e4 d6 6 h3 e5 7 d5 h6 8 ♗e3 ♖h7 9 ♗e2 ♗g8 10 g4 f5 11 gxf5 gxf5 12 exf5 ♗xf5 13 ♖d2 ♗d7 14 h4 ♗e7 15 h5 ♗f6 16 ♗h4 ♗fg8 17 0-0-0 ♖f7 18 ♖dg1 ♗d7 19 ♗d3+ ♗f5 20 ♗e4 ♗ge7 21 ♗g3 c6 22 ♖c2 ♖c8 23 ♗g6 ♖g8 24 ♗xe7+ ♗xe7 25 ♗e4 ♗f5 26 ♖g6 cxd5 27 cxd5 ♗xe3 28 fxe3 ♗f5 29 ♗xd6 ♗xd3 30 ♖xc8+ ♖xc8+ 31 ♗xc8 ♗xg6 32 d6 ♗f5 33 ♗e7+ ♖f8 0-1

5.2 Typical Endgames

In this section I shall present four interesting and characteristic endgames resulting from the proposed system against the King's Indian Defence.

Endgame 1

Grivas – Mastrokoukos


Athens 2001

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♖c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 dxe5 dxe5 8 ♖xd8 ♖xd8 9 ♗g5 ♖e8 10 ♗d5 ♗xd5 11 cxd5 c6 12 ♗c4 cxd5 13 ♗xd5 ♗c6 14 ♖e2 ♗b4 15 ♗c4 ♗e6 16 ♖hc1

♖c6 17 ♗e3 f6 18 ♜d2 ♜f7 19 ♗b5 ♞ec8 20
 ♗xc6 ♞xc6 21 ♞xc6 bxc6 22 b3 a5 23 ♞c1
 ♞a6 24 a4

For more information on this line, see Section 5.6, Line F.

24...♗f8 25 ♜c4 ♞a8 26 ♗d2 ♗xc4+ 27
 ♞xc4 ♞a6 28 ♜d3 ♜e6 29 ♞c2 ♗d6 30 ♜c4 f5
 31 f3 ♞a7 (D)



White's endgame advantage is undisputed. This advantage consists of fine strategic elements, such as better pawn-structure (weak black a- and c-pawns), better minor piece and better placement of his king and rook. But the problem of converting the advantage into a win remains. What can the right plan for White be? Well, the solution is not simple, as White must exchange his superior minor piece and one of Black's main weaknesses, the a5-pawn! In other words, he must give up some of his most important pluses! However, by doing so, White will create an outside passed pawn with his rook in the right place (behind the pawn) and his king will be ready to advance. This kind of advantage transformation is met quite often in modern chess.

32 ♞a2! ♜d7 33 ♗c3 ♜e6 34 b4! axb4 35
 ♗xb4 ♗xb4?

The fatal mistake. Black should keep the bishops on the board in order to put up more resistance, controlling the entry squares of the white king. After 35...♗c7! 36 a5 ♞a6 37 g4 White's advantage is undisputed, but the road to victory is long and laborious.

36 ♜xb4 ♜d6 37 a5! ♞a6 38 ♜c4

Now Black is lost, as White has at his disposal many waiting moves with his rook on the a-file, placing Black in zugzwang and thus securing the penetration of his king.

38...fxe4 39 fxe4 ♜c7 40 ♜c5 ♜b7 41 ♜d6
 ♞a8 42 ♜xe5 1-0

Endgame 2

Bagirov – Lingnau

Cuxhaven 1994

1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♜c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♜f3 0-0
 6 h3 e5 7 d5 ♜a6 8 ♗g5 ♞e8 9 g4 ♜d7 10 ♞g1
 ♜h8 11 ♜d2 f5 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 a3! ♜f6 14
 ♞c2 ♜c5 15 ♗e3! ♜xe4 16 ♜dxe4 fxe4 17
 0-0-0! ♗f5 18 ♗e2 a6

For more information on this line, see Section 5.9, Line B3.

19 h4!

With the obvious idea of h5-h6.

19...♜h5 20 ♜xe4 ♜f4 21 ♗g4 ♗g6 22 ♞g3
 ♗h6 23 ♜b1?!

In my opinion 23 h5! is better: 23...♗f5 24
 ♗xf5 ♞xf5 25 ♜b1 ± (or 25 ♜xd6!? cxd6 26
 ♞xf5 ♜e2+! 27 ♜d2 ♜xg3 28 fxg3 ♗xe3+ 29
 ♜xe3 ±).

23...♞f7 24 ♞dg1 ♞g8 25 ♗e6?!


White should stick with his plan and continue 25 h5!, with a clear advantage.

25...♜xe6 26 dxe6 ♞f5

Forced, as 26...♞xe6? 27 ♗xh6 ♗xe4 28
 ♞xe4 ♞xh6 29 ♞xb7! would be advantageous for White.

27 ♗xh6 ♞xe4 28 ♞xe4 ♗xe4+ 29 ♜c1
 ♞xg3 30 ♞xg3 ♞g8?! (D)

After 30...♞e8! 31 ♗g7+ ♜g8 32 ♗xe5+
 ♜f8 the draw would be very close.



This endgame, despite the presence of opposite-coloured bishops, offers White excellent winning chances. The passed e-pawn is quite strong and the dark squares around the black king are weak. But, of course, White still

has a long way to go and Black must 'help' a bit!

31 ♖g5!

Exchanging the rooks would be a fatal mistake and offer Black the desired result.

31...h5?!

Better was 31...♞g6! 32 e7 ♖c6 (32...♞e6? 33 ♖f6+) 33 ♞f3 ♞e6 34 ♞f8+ ♖g7 35 ♞c8 h6! 36 ♞xc7 ♖f7 and Black's problems have been reduced.

32 ♞e3 ♖c6 33 e7 ♖g7 34 f4 exf4 35 ♖xf4 ♖f7 36 ♖g5

Now the path for the white rook is clear and his fellow bishop has found an excellent post on g5.

36...♖e8 37 ♞e6 ♖f3 38 ♖d2

Now the plan is easy: activate the king and invade the opponent's camp, applying pressure on the weak pawns.

38...♖g4 39 ♞h6 b6 40 ♖c3 ♖d7 41 ♞h7 ♞e8 42 ♖d4 a5 43 ♞f7 ♖d1 44 b4 axb4 45 axb4 ♖g4 46 ♞f8 ♖d1 47 c5 bxc5+ 48 bxc5

Threatening 49 c6+.

48...♖a4 49 cxd6 cxd6 50 ♖e4 ♖c2+ 51 ♖f4 ♖d1 52 ♖f6 ♖g4 53 ♖g5 ♖d1 54 ♖g6 ♖g4 55 ♖g5 d5?!

Up until now Black has defended quite well in a very difficult position and, although things are far from easy after 55...♖e2 56 ♞f2 ♖g4 57 ♞a2 ♖e6!, he should try it and hope for the best. The weakening of the e5-square is fatal.

56 ♖f7! ♖e6+ 57 ♖f6 ♖h3

57...♞xe7 58 ♖e5! ♞g7 59 ♞d8+ ♖c7 60 ♖xe6 +-.

58 ♖e5! ♖g2 59 ♞f2 ♖e4 60 ♞a2 ♞xe7+

Forced, as the threat 61 ♞a7+ and 62 ♖e6 would win easily.

61 ♖xe7 ♖xe7 62 ♞a7+ ♖d8 63 ♞f7 ♖e8 64 ♖e6 ♖d8 65 ♖d6 ♖e8 66 ♞f4! ♖c2

Or 66...♖g2 67 ♞f5!.

67 ♖xd5

The endgame is a theoretical win. White will force the opponent's king to the b-file, then return to the kingside and capture the h-pawn with his rook, while the black king will have no time to place itself in front of White's h-pawn.

67...♖d1 68 ♖e6 ♖g4+ 69 ♖f6! ♖d7 70 ♞d4+ ♖c6 71 ♖e5 ♖e2 72 ♞d6+ ♖c7 73 ♖e6 ♖g4+ 74 ♖e7 ♖f3 75 ♞d3 ♖g4 76 ♞c3+ ♖b6 77 ♖f6 ♖b5 78 ♖g6 ♖b6 79 ♞c1! ♖f3

79...♖b7 80 ♞c5 or 79...♖b5 80 ♞c7. 80 ♞c8! 1-0

Endgame 3


Comas Fabrego – Perpinya

Spanish jr Ch 1991

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♖c3 ♖g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♖f3 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 ♖a6 8 ♖g5 h6 9 ♖e3 ♞e8 10 g4 ♖c5 11 ♖d2 a5 12 ♞c2 ♖h7 13 ♞g1 ♖h8 14 0-0-0 f5 15 exf5 gxf5 16 ♖xc5 dxc5 17 gxf5 ♖xf5 18 ♖d3 ♞d7 19 ♖xf5 ♞xf5 20 ♞xf5 ♞xf5 21 ♖de4 ♖g5 22 ♖xg5 hxg5 23 ♖e4

For more information on this line, see Section 5.9, Line B2.

23...♞f4 24 ♞del ♞a6 (D)



White's advantage is obvious, thanks to his superior minor piece. The e4-knight is a monster compared to the poor g7-bishop, which is restrained by its own pawns. Such endgames are bread and butter for White and should be avoided, as long as Black wants to put up a real fight.

25 ♖c2

Not, of course, 25 ♞xg5?? ♖h6 26 ♞h5 ♞h4+. Centralization of the king is an important endgame motif and even more so in this position, where the king can guard the c4-pawn and the e4-knight, freeing the e1-rook for other duties.

25...♞g6 26 ♖d3

Now White is ready to harvest.

26...♖f8?!

Also losing was 26...g4 27 ♞e3! and ♞eg3 but Black could perhaps put up greater resistance with 26...♖f6.

27 ♞xg5 ♞xg5 28 ♖xg5 ♖h6

No great improvement is 28...♖d4+ 29 ♖c3 ♗g7 30 ♘e4! (30 ♗e4?? ♗f6! ♡) or 28...♗xf2 29 ♗xe5 ♗d6 30 ♗e2.

29 ♗xe5

29 ♘e6 would also win, but White has correctly evaluated the resulting rook ending.

29...♗xg5 30 ♗xg5 ♗xf2 31 ♗e5! ♗xb2

The passive 31...♗f7 32 h4 would mean a slow death.

32 ♗e7!

32 ♗e8+? ♖g7 33 ♗e7+ ♖f6 34 ♗xc7 'wins' a tempo, but the centralized black king would hinder White's winning attempts.

32...♖g8

32...♗xa2 33 ♗xc7 ♗a3+ 34 ♖e4 ♗c3 35 d6 would not be much different.

33 ♗xc7 ♗xa2 34 d6 1-0

Black resigned due to 34...♗a1 35 d7 ♗d1+ 36 ♖c2 ♗d4 37 ♗c8+.

Endgame 4

Gulko – Fedorowicz


USA Ch, Durango 1992

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 h3 0-0 6 ♗g5 ♘bd7 7 ♗f3 e5 8 d5 h6 9 ♗e3 ♘c5 10 ♘d2 a5 11 ♗e2 ♗d7 12 0-0 c6 13 ♗b1 ♖e8 14 b4 cxd5 15 cxd5 ♘a4 16 ♖b3 axb4 17 ♖xb4 ♘xc3 18 ♖xc3 ♗xa2 19 ♖xb7 ♖a8 20 ♗f1 ♗c8 21 ♖b4 ♗f8 22 ♗b8

For more information on this line, see Section 5.10, Line A.

22...♖xb8 23 ♖xb8 ♖g7 24 ♖xa8 ♗xa8 25 g4 (D)

The immediate 25 ♗b7 ♗c8 26 ♗c7 ♘e8 would not achieve anything.



White is slightly better. His pieces are placed in better and more secure squares, his rook is

ready to invade and the black d-pawn is always a target. But Black can defend with accurate play.

25...♗a2?!

The first slip, as Black's rook should instead help to defend his camp. 25...♗c8 26 ♗c1 ♗e7 ± was essential.

26 ♗b7 ♗c2 27 f3 ♗c8?!

Again 27...♗e7 should be played.

28 ♗a7 ♘e8

28...♗d7 29 h4 ♗e8 30 ♗a8 ±.

29 ♗b5 ± ♘f6

29...♘c7? 30 ♗c6 ♘e6 31 dxe6 ♗xc6 32 e7 +.

30 ♘c4 ♗c3 31 ♖f2?!

Not so difficult was 31 ♗c7! ♗b3 (31...♗d7 32 ♗xd7 ♘xd7 33 ♗d2 ♗c2 34 ♘xd6 +) 32 ♗xc8 ♗xb5 33 ♗xh6+ ♖xh6 34 ♗xf8 ♘h7 35 ♗xf7 ♘g5 36 ♗d7 ♘xf3+ (36...♘h3+ 37 ♖g2 ♘f4+ 38 ♖g3 ♗c5 39 ♘xd6 ♗c2 40 ♘f7+ +) 37 ♖g2 ♘g5 38 h4 ♘e4 39 ♖f3 ♗xd5 40 ♖xe4 ♗d4+ 41 ♖f3 ♗xc4 42 g5+ ♖h5 43 ♗h7#.

31...♗c2+ 32 ♖f1 h5 33 ♗c7 ♗d7?!

This loses quickly. Black had to try 33...hxg4! 34 hxg4 ± (or 34 ♗xc8 gxh3 35 ♗d2 ♗e7 36 ♖g1 ±).

34 ♗xd7 ♘xd7 35 gxh5! gxh5

35...♘f6 36 h6+ ♖g8 37 ♗c8 +-.

36 ♘xd6! +- ♗xc7 37 ♘e8+ ♖g6 38 ♘xc7 f5 39 ♘e6 ♗d6 40 ♖e2 ♘f6 41 ♖d3 ♖f7 42 ♗g5 fxe4+ 43 fxe4 ♘e8 44 ♗h4

44 ♘d8+ ♖g6 45 ♗h4 is more accurate.

44...♗e7 45 ♗e1 ♗f6 46 ♗b4 ♗e7 47 ♗a5 ♗f6 48 ♘c5 ♖e7 49 ♗b4 ♖d8 50 ♘b7+ ♖c7 51 ♘a5 1-0



The coming ♘c4 and ♗c3 is decisive.

5.3 The Early ...♘bd7 Variation

1 d4 g6 2 c4 ♗g7 3 ♘f3 d6 4 e4 e5 5 ♘c3 ♘d7 6 ♗e2 ♘gf6 7 0-0 0-0 (D)

In our suggested repertoire, this position will arise as a transposition from the Modern Defence (for example, Chapter 3.3, Line B), which is why I have used the above move-order.

The position's character now becomes more 'strategic' and White's spatial advantage will nearly always play a significant role.



8 ♖c2

Of course there are many other good moves here, such as 8 ♖e1 and 8 ♖e3, but this line is my favourite (ECO E94 and NIC KI 14.2). Now Black must choose among four main continuations:

- A: 8...♗h5 143
- B: 8...h6 143
- C: 8...exd4 144
- D: 8...c6 144

A)

8...♗h5

Black plans to bring his knight to e6 via f4, controlling the d4-square. This idea seems correct, but valuable time is lost in the process.

9 ♖d1 ♗f4 10 ♖f1 c5 11 d5!

Not much is gained by 11 ♗b5 cxd4 12 ♗xd6 (12 ♖xf4 exf4 13 ♗bxd4 ♗e5) 12...♗e6 13 ♖bl a5 14 b3 (14 ♗e1?! ♗dc5 15 ♗xc8 ♖xc8 16 ♖d3 f5 ♣ Biriukov-Svidler, St Petersburg 1997) 14...♗dc5 15 ♗xc8 ♖xc8 16 a3 f5 = Van der Sterren-Vogt, Winterthur 1996.

11...♗f6

White also achieved a small advantage after 11...h6 12 g3 ♗h5 13 ♖e2 ♗f6 14 ♗e1 in Leitão-Martin del Campo, Parana 1993.

12 h3! (D)

This is a better try for an advantage than 12 ♖xf4 exf4 13 e5 dxe5 (13...♗e8 14 exd6 [14 ♖e4? dxe5 15 ♗xe5 ♗d6! 16 ♖xf4 g5 → or 14 ♗e4 ♖f5 =] 14...♗xd6 15 ♖e1 ♖g4 16 ♗e5 ♖f5 17 ♖d2 ±) 14 ♗xe5 ♖d6 (14...♗e8 15 ♖e1 [15 ♗d3 ♖f5 16 ♖d2 ♖xd3 17 ♖xd3 ♗d6 18 ♖xf4 ♖xc3 19 bxc3 ♖g7 20 ♖e1 ♖f6 =] 15...♗d6 16 ♖d2 ♖g5 17 ♗f3 ♖f6 18 ♖d3 ±) 15 ♗f3 (15 ♗d3 ♖f5 =) 15...♖f5 16 ♖d3 ♖g4 = Van Wely-Svidler, Groningen 1996.

12...♗e8

Another option is 12...h5 13 ♖xf4 exf4 14 ♖d2 ♖h6 15 e5 dxe5 16 ♗xe5 ♖d6 17 ♖e1 a6 18 a3 ♖g7 19 b4 f3 20 ♖b2 fxg2 21 ♖xg2 ± Lobron-Van der Weide, Leeuwarden 1997.

13 ♖xf4 exf4 14 ♖e1 ♖e7

Or 14...f5 15 e5 dxe5 16 ♗xe5 a6 17 a3 ± Mischenko-Polivanov, Donetsk 2000.

15 ♖d2 ♖e5 16 a3!

White has a slight advantage, Atakisi-Geenen, corr. 2001.

B)

8...h6

This is another typical move for Black, aiming to strengthen his control over the d4-square with ...♗h7-g5.

9 ♖d1 ♗h7

Black also has some alternatives:


a) 9...♖e7 10 dxe5 ♗xe5 (10...dxe5 11 ♗d5 ♖d8 12 c5 ±) 11 ♗xe5 ♖xe5 12 ♖e3 ♗g4 (12...♖d7?! 13 f3 ♖fc8 14 ♖f1 ♗h7 15 ♖f2 c5 16 ♖d2 ♖c6 17 ♖ad1 ± Danailov-Ki.Georgiev, Pernik 1983) 13 ♖xg4 ♖xg4 14 f3 ♖e6 15 ♖d4 ±.

b) 9...♖e8 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 c5 (11 h3!? c6 12 ♖e3 ♖c7 13 b4 ± Veingold-Rey Garcia, San Fernando 2004) 11...c6 (11...♗h7?! 12 ♖e3 ♗hf8 13 b4 ± Halldorsson-B.Kristensen, Kopavogur 1994) 12 b4 ♖c7 (12...♖e7 13 ♗a4 ♗f8 14 ♗b2 ♗h5 15 ♗c4 ♗f4 16 ♗d6 ♗xe2+ 17 ♖xe2 ♖d8 18 ♖b2 ♖g4 19 h3 ♖xf3 20 ♖xf3 ± Krasenkov-Epishin, Norilsk 1987) 13 a3 ♗f8 14 h3 ♗e6 15 ♖e3 ± ♖d7? 16 ♖d6! ♖f8 17 ♖ad1! ± Grivas-A.Vajda, Budapest 2001.

10 ♖e3 (D)

This appears best. The alternative is 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 b4 (11 c5 c6 12 ♖e3 ♖e7 13 b4 ♗df6

14 h3 ♖h5 15 ♗d6 ♜f4 16 ♙f1 ♜g5 17 ♜xg5 hgx5 18 ♗ad1 g4 19 hxg4 ♙xg4 20 f3 ♙c8 21 ♗d2 is slightly better for White, Komliakov-Iordachescu, Odorheiu Secuiesc 1993) 11...f5? (11...c6 ±) 12 b5 f4 13 ♙a3 ♗e8 14 c5 c6 15 ♗a4 ♗c7 16 bxc6 bxc6 17 ♗d6 ♙b7 18 ♗b3+ ♜h8 19 ♗f7 ♜hf8 20 ♙c4 1-0 Veingold-Vetema, Vantaa 1998.



10...♜g5

Or 10...c6 11 ♗d2! h5 12 ♙h6! ±.

11 ♜xg5 hxg5 12 dxe5 ♜xe5 13 ♗d2

Even better than 13 c5 g4 14 cxd6 c6 15 a4 ± Shestoperov-Zhelnin, USSR 1986.

13...g4 14 c5

White has a large advantage:

a) 14...♗h4 15 ♜d5 ± Rötteler-Waldmann, St Ingbert 1991.

b) 14...♙e6 15 cxd6 cxd6 16 ♜d5 ♗h4 17 ♙g5 ♗h8 18 ♜e7+ ♜h7 19 ♗xd6 ± I.Sokolov-Ehlvest, Erevan OL 1996.

C)

8...exd4

Black surrenders the centre, aiming to post his knight on c5, applying pressure on the e4-pawn. The weakness on d6 is not so important, as Black usually gets active play in return.

9 ♜xd4 ♗e8

Black must be precise, as 9...♜c5?! 10 ♜b3 ♜xb3 11 axb3 ± Korchnoi-Timman, Leeuwarden 1976 and 9...c6 10 ♙g5! ♗e8 11 ♗ad1 ♗e7 12 ♗fe1 ♜c5 13 ♙f1 a5 14 ♗d2! with the idea ♗f4 ± (rather than 14 ♙h4?! ♗c7 15 ♜b3 ♜xb3 16 axb3 ♜h5! ∞ Korchnoi-Rogers, Thessaloniki OL 1988) are not advisable.

10 ♗d1 c6

Other tries:

a) 10...♜c5 11 f3 a5 12 ♜b3 ♜fd7 (12...b6 13 ♙e3 ♙d7 14 ♜b5 a4 15 ♜3d4 ± Tiller-Saidy, Gausdal 1982) 13 ♙e3 ♜e6 14 ♜b5 a4 15 ♜3d4 ♜xd4 16 ♙xd4 ♙xd4+ 17 ♗xd4 ± Fuderer-Udovčić, Belgrade 1952.

b) 10...a6 11 ♙g5 h6 12 ♙h4 ♗b8 (12...c6 13 ♗d2 ♗b6 14 ♜b3 ± Kishnev-V.Kostić, Munich 1992) 13 f3 g5 14 ♙f2 ♜e5 15 c5! ± (15 ♗d2 ♙d7 16 ♗ad1 ± Andruet-Haik, Cannes 1986).

11 f3 ♗e7 12 ♙g5 h6 13 ♙h4 ♜e5

Now, rather than 14 ♗d2?! ♜xe4! 15 ♜xe4 ♗xh4 16 ♜xd6 ♗d8 ∞ Dorfman-Ostermeyer, Moscow 1977, White achieved a small advantage after 14 ♗d2 g5 15 ♙f2 ♜h5 16 g3 in Vanheste-Meurrens, Ostend 1992.


D)

8...c6

This is the logical follow-up and the main line.

9 ♗d1 (D)

Completely misguided is 9 ♙g5?! h6 10 ♙h4 g5 11 dxe5 dxe5 12 ♙g3 ♜h5 ∞ Grivas-Skalkotas, Iraklion 1984.



9...♗e7

Of course Black has some alternatives here:

a) 9...♗e8 10 ♙f1 (10 ♗b1!? ♗e7?! 11 d5 c5 12 ♜b5 ♜f8 13 ♜d2 ♜h5 14 g3 h6 15 b4 b6 16 bxc5 bxc5 17 ♜b3 a6 18 ♜c3 ± Grivas-Koukoufikis, Greek Cht (Kallithea) 2003) 10...a5 11 dxe5 dxe5 12 c5 ♗e7 13 ♜a4 h6 14 h3 ♗f8 15 ♙e3 ♜e8 16 ♜b6 ♗b8 17 ♗d2 ± Henley-Youngworth, Lone Pine 1981 and Danailov-Nenkov, Pernik 1984.

b) 9...exd4 10 ♜xd4 ♗e7 11 ♙g5 ♜c5 (or 11...♗e8 12 f3 h6 13 ♙h4 ♗f8 14 ♗d2 ±

Kouatly-Todorčević, Marseilles 1987) 12 f3 and then:

b1) 12...h6 13 ♖h4 ♗e6 14 ♗xe6 ♙xe6 15 ♚d2 g5 16 ♙g3 ♗e8 17 ♚ad1 ± Lukacs-Vogt, Cienfuegos 1983.

b2) 12...♗e8 13 b4 ♗e6 14 ♗xe6 ♙xe6 15 ♗d2 ♗c7 16 ♚ac1! (16 ♚ab1?! ♗d7 17 ♗d5 cxd5 18 cxd5 ♙g4 was unclear in Ftačnik-Nunn, Gjøvik 1983) 16...♗d7 (16...♗b6+ 17 ♗h1 ♗d7 {17...♗xb4? 18 ♙xf6 ♙xf6 19 ♗d5 ♗b2 20 ♚b1 ±} 18 a3 ± Nowak-Thipsay, Poznan 1984) 17 ♗d5 cxd5 18 cxd5 ♗b6+ 19 ♙e3 ♙h6 20 ♙xb6 ♙xd2 21 ♚xd2 ±.

b3) 12...♗c7 13 b4 ♗e6 14 ♗xe6 ♙xe6 15 ♙f4 ± Ftačnik-Mortensen, Esbjerg 1982.

c) 9...♗c7 and then:

c1) 10 dxe5?! dxe5 11 h3 (11 b3?! ♗e8 12 ♙a3 ♙f8 13 ♙xf8 ♗xf8 14 ♗d2 ♙g4 15 ♗d6 ♗xd6 16 ♚xd6 ♗g7 17 ♗f1 ♙xf3 18 ♙xf3 ♗e6 19 ♚dd1 ♗d4 20 ♙e2 ♗d7 21 ♚ac1 ♗c5 22 f3 a5 ± Bras-Grivas, Khania 2000) 11...♗h5 12 ♚b1 ♗f4 13 ♙f1 ♗e6 14 ♙e3 f5 15 ♗g5 ♗xg5 16 ♙xg5 ♗c5 17 ♙e3 ♗e6 18 f3 ♗d4 19 ♗f2 ♙e6 ± Ypsaridis-Grivas, Limassol 1997.

c2) 10 b3 ♗e8 11 d5 a5 12 dxc6 ♗xc6? (12...bxc6 13 ♙a3 ±) 13 ♙e3 ♗c5 14 ♗d2 ♗e6 15 ♙f3 ♗d7 16 ♗b5! ± Grivas-Hadzidakis, Greek Cht (Ermiioni Argolidas) 2005 (for example, 16...♗d4 17 ♗b2!).

c3) 10 ♚b1 a5 11 b3 ♗e8 (11...♗e8 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 ♙a3 ♙f8 14 ♙xf8 ♗xf8 15 c5 ♙g4 16 ♗d2 ♚ed8 17 f3 ♙e6 18 ♗c4 ♙xc4 19 ♙xc4 ♗e7 20 ♗a4 ♗e6 21 ♙xe6 ♗xe6 22 ♚d2 ± Grivas-Ypsaridis, Limassol 1997) 12 dxe5 ♗xe5 13 ♗xe5 ♙xe5 14 g3 (14 f4!? ♙g7 15 ♙e3 ±) 14...f5 15 exf5 ♙xf5 16 ♙d3 ± Kosić-M.Saunders, Adelaide jr Wch 1988.


10 d5 (D)

Not much is promised by other moves:

a) 10 ♚b1 a5 11 b3 ♗e8 12 d5 ♗c5 13 ♙e3 a4! 14 ♗d2! (14 b4? ♗cxe4! 15 ♗xe4 ♗xe4 16 ♗xe4 ♙f5 17 ♗h4 ♗xh4 18 ♗xh4 ♙xb1 19 ♚xb1 cxd5 20 cxd5 ♚ec8 21 ♙d1 ♚c3 ± Likavsky-Grivas, Iraklion 1997) 14...axb3 15 axb3 ∞.

b) 10 ♙g5h6 11 ♙h4g5 12 ♙g3 ♗h5 13 d5 c5 14 ♗d2 ♗f4 15 ♗f1 ♚d8 16 ♗e3 ♗xe2+ 17 ♗xe2 ♗f6 18 f3 ♗h5 19 ♙f2 ♙f6 20 a3 ♗g7 21 b4 b6 is unclear, Grivas-Jachym, Belfort 1983.

10...c5



Black must close the centre, seeking counterplay on the kingside. On the other hand, White will develop play on the queenside, mostly with the b4 advance. A complicated battle lies ahead. It should be mentioned that White has the more comfortable position after these other moves:

a) 10...cxd5 11 cxd5 ♗e8 12 ♙g5 f6 13 ♙h4 ♙h6 14 ♗d2 ♗g7 15 ♗c4 f5 16 exf5 ± Bönsch-Casper, Leipzig 1988.

b) 10...a5 11 a3 (11 ♚b1 ♗c5 12 ♗d2 ♙d7 13 b4?! axb4 14 ♚xb4 ♚fc8 ± Grivas-Banikas, Khania 1995) 11...♗c5 12 ♙e3 ♗a6 (12...♗g4 13 ♙xc5 dxc5 14 d6 ♗d8 15 h3 ♗h6 16 ♗d2 ♙e6 17 ♗a4 b6 18 d7 1-0 Ikonnikov-Van Laatum, Belgium 2001) 13 h3 ± (13 a4?! ♗g4 14 ♙g5 f6 15 ♙d2 f5 ∞ Lputian-A.Kovaliov, Blagoveshchensk 1989).

11 g3!?

An interesting measure directed against the future ..f5 advance. White creates the option of ♗h4, putting pressure on the f5-square. Unclear is 11 ♙g5 h6 12 ♙h4 g5 13 ♙g3 ♗h5 14 ♗d2 ♗f4 15 ♙g4 1/2-1/2 Szeberenyi-Grivas, Budapest 2001.

11...♗e8

The most logical move, although Black has also used some other ideas:

a) 11...♗h5? 12 ♙g5 ♗df6 13 ♗h4 h6 14 ♙d2 ♗g4 15 f3 ♗gf6 16 ♚el ♗h7 17 ♗g2 f5 18 exf5 gxf5 19 f4! ♗f7 20 fxe5 dxe5 21 ♚f1 ± G.Sakhatova-Veröci, Tuzla wom IZ 1987.

b) 11...♗g4!? 12 ♗h4 ♗b6 13 f3 (13 a3 f5 14 exf5 gxf5 15 ♙xg4 ffg4 16 ♗e4 ♙f6 17 ♙h6 ♚f7 18 ♗xf6+ ♗xf6 19 ♙e3 ♙f5 20 ♗e2 ♗d7 21 b4 b6 ∞ Kosić-Ivanchuk, Adelaide jr Wch 1988) 13...♗h6 14 ♗g2! (14 a3 f5 15 b4 f4 16 bxc5 dxc5 17 ♗g2 ♗f7 18 a4 ♙h3 19 a5 ♗d7 20 ♚a3 ♗d6 21 ♗b5 h5 22 ♗xd6 ♗xd6


23 ♖f1 ♜b8 24 gxf4 ♙xg2 25 ♙xg2 1/2-1/2
Ftačnik-Movsesian, Czech Cht 1996/7) 14...f5
15 ♜f1 with the idea ♙d2, ♜ael and f4 ±.

c) 11...♜h8!? 12 ♙g5 and then:

c1) 12...h6 13 ♙d2 ♜g8 14 ♜h4 ♜df6
(14...h5?! 15 a3 ♜df6 16 b4 b6 17 bxc5 bxc5 18
♜abl ± Pacheco-J.Garcia, Lima 2004 or 14...♙f6
15 ♜g2 h5 16 h4 ♙g7 17 a3 ± Wilder-Rizzit-
tano, Chicago 1989) 15 ♜el ♜h7 16 ♜abl ♜g5
17 b4 b6 18 bxc5 bxc5 19 ♜b3 ± Franco-
Laliena Solares, Zaragoza 1994.

c2) 12...a6 13 ♜h4 (13 a3!? ♜e8 14 b4 ±
Eingorn-G.Titov, Berlin 1991) 13...♜e8 14 ♜el
♜g8 15 ♙d2 ♜e7 16 ♜g2 f5 17 exf5 gxf5 18 f4
± Korchnoi-Romanishin, Brussels 1986.

We now return to the position after 11...♜e8
(D):



12 ♜h4 ♙f6

Or 12...♜b8 13 ♙d3 ♜a6 14 a3 ♙f6 15 ♜g2
♙g7 16 ♜e3 ♜d8 17 ♜bl ♙h6 18 ♜h1 ♜g7 19
♜g1 ♜h8 20 ♜e2 ± Ftačnik-Oratovsky, Lisbon
2001.

13 ♜g2 ♙g5 14 f4

White is slightly better even after 14 ♙xg5
♜xg5 15 ♜d2 ♜e7 16 ♜h1 ♜g7 17 ♙d3 (Mol-
ina-Chemeris, Torres Novas 2005) due to his
spatial advantage.

14...exf4 15 gxf4 ♙h6 16 ♙e3


Equally good is 16 ♙d3 ♜g7 (16...♜df6?! 17
e5 ♜h5 18 ♜el ♙h3 19 ♜f2 ± Van Laatum-
Hendriks, Sas van Gent 1994) 17 ♜el f6 18
♜e3 ♜h5 19 ♜f2 ± P.Schlosser-Gretarsson,
Reykjavik 1993.

16...f5 17 exf5 gxf5 18 ♙d3 ♜g7 19 ♜el
♜f6 20 ♜h1 a6 21 ♙f2 ♜f7 22 ♙h4 ♜f6 23
♜e2 ♜gh5 24 ♜f3

White is slightly better, Veingold-Vallejo
Diaz, Don Benito 2004.

5.4 Black's 5th-Move Deviations

1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♜c3 ♙g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♜f3 (D)



Before beginning our survey of the main
paths of the h3 system, we should take a look at
Black's deviations from the standard 5...0-0 h3
e5. These will be covered here, with the excep-
tion of 5...♙g4, which will be examined in the
next section. These deviations are as follows:

A: 5...e5?!	146
B: 5...♜c6?!	147
C: 5...♜bd7	147
D: 5...a6	148
E: 5...c5	149
F: 5...♜a6	151

A)

5...e5?!

This gambit can only be to White's benefit.
In my opinion Black should avoid it.

6 dxe5 dxe5 7 ♜xd8+ ♜xd8 8 ♜xe5 ♜xe4

The alternative 8...♙e6 9 ♙g5 c6 (9...♜c8
10 ♜f3 ♙e8 11 0-0-0 ♜g4 12 ♙h4 ♙xc3 13
bxc3 ♜c6 14 ♜d4 ± Pham Ngoc Tanh-Mariano,
Jakarta 1993) 10 ♙e2 h6 11 ♜d1+ ♜e8 12 ♙f4
♜bd7 13 0-0 ♜e7 14 ♜xd7 ♜xd7 15 ♙d6+ ±
Kurtuldu-Sunneli, Kusadasi 2004 does not help
Black either.

9 ♜xf7+

White also obtained an advantage with 9
♜xe4 ♙xe5 10 ♙g5+ ♜e8 11 ♜f6+ ♜f8 12
♙h6+ ♜e7 13 ♜d5+ ♜e8 14 0-0-0 ♙e6 15 f4
♙xd5 16 ♜xd5 ♙d6 17 c5 ♙e7 18 ♙c4 ♜c6 19
♜el ♜d8 20 a3 ♜d7 21 b4 ♜d8 22 ♜de5 ± in
Spraggett-Pares Vives, Malgrat del Mar 1991.

9...♖e7 10 ♜xe4 ♜xf7 11 ♜g5+!

White has the advantage, as Black's compensation for the pawn is insufficient. Two examples: 11...♜f8 12 ♙d3 ♜c6 13 0-0 ♜e5 14 ♙e2 ± Wagner Michel-Kowalewski, Nordhausen 1986 and 11...♖e7 12 ♙d3 ♜d8 13 ♙e4 h6 14 ♜f3 ♜c6 15 0-0 g5 16 ♜e1 ♜f8 17 h4 g4 18 ♙xc6 bxc6 19 ♜e5 ± Lalić-Pages, Olot 1992.

B)


5...♜c6?!

I cannot really believe in such moves which display no chess understanding. Black either loses time or allows the doubling of his pawns without any logical reason to do so.

6 d5 ♜e5

The other option is 6...♜b8 7 ♙e2 0-0 8 0-0 e5 (now Black has merely lost two tempi) 9 ♜e1 (or 9 ♙g5 h6 10 ♙h4 g5 11 ♙g3 ♜h5 12 ♜e1 ♜f4 13 ♙g4 ♜d7 14 ♜c2 ♜f6 15 ♙xc8 ♜xc8 16 ♜e3 ± Radziewicz-Nemcova, Wuppertal 1998) 9...h6 10 ♙e3 (10 ♙d2 ♜h7 11 b4 ♜g8 12 c5 f5 13 f3 f4 14 ♜d3 ♜d7 15 ♙e1 ♜df6 16 a4 g5 17 ♜c1 ♙d7 18 b5 ♙e8 19 ♙f2 ♙g6 20 a5 h5 21 b6 axb6 22 axb6 cxb6 23 cxd6 ♜d7 24 ♜b5 ± Vuković-Gojacanin, Sutomore 2004) 10...♞e7 11 b4 ♜h7 12 c5 ♜e8 13 ♜c1 f5 14 ♜b5! ± (14 cxd6?! ♜xd6 ∞ Tovsanaa-Mongonhuu, Ulanbatar 2002).

7 ♜xe5 dxe5 8 ♙e2 0-0 9 0-0 e6 (D)



10 ♙g5

10 c5 exd5 11 exd5 ♙f5 12 ♙g5 h6 13 ♙e3 c6 14 d6 ♙e6 was unclear in M.Grünberg-Petrescu, Romania 1999.

10...h6 11 ♙e3 exd5 12 cxd5 a6

Or 12...♙d7 13 ♜c1 c6 14 f3! (14 ♞b3 cxd5 15 exd5 b6 16 ♜fd1 is slightly better for White,

Gustafsson-Castillo, e-mail 1999) 14...cxd5 15 ♜xd5 ♜xd5 16 ♞xd5 ±.

13 a4 ♞e7 14 ♞c1 ♜h7 15 f3

±± Grivas-Balaskas, Athens 1982.

C)

5...♜bd7

Black wishes to force White into unfamiliar territory with 6 h3 e5 7 d5 ♜c5. Now White can transpose to Section 5.3 or vary with:

6 e5!? dxe5 7 dxe5 ♜g4

7...♜g8?! seems even worse: 8 ♙f4 e6 9 ♞e2! (9 ♙g5?! ♜e7 10 ♜e4 and now 10...h6! ∞ is preferable to 10...c6? 11 ♜f6+ ♙xf6 12 ♙xf6 ♜xf6 13 ♞xd8+ ♜xd8 14 exf6 ♜f5 15 ♜d1+ ♜c7 16 ♜e5 ♜f8 17 g4 ♜d6 18 h4 ± Braum-Spinnler, Germany 2001) 9...♜e7 10 0-0-0 and White is much better.

8 e6 fxe6

Or 8...♜de5?! 9 ♞xd8+ ♜xd8 10 ♜xe5 ♙xe5 11 h3 ♜f6 12 exf7 ♙e6 13 ♙e3 ♙xf7 14 0-0-0+ ♜e8 15 f4 ♙xc3 16 bxc3 a6 17 ♙d3 b6 18 ♙d4 ♜g8 19 ♜he1 ± Lustin-Rylov, Moscow 1996.

9 ♜g5 ♜de5

Other moves are simple blunders: 9...♜xf2? 10 ♜xf2 0-0+ 11 ♜e1 ♜c5 12 ♞xd8 ♜xd8 13 ♙d2 +- Harstad-Hein, Copenhagen 2003 or 9...♜df6? 10 ♞xd8+ ♜xd8 11 ♜f7+ ♜e8 12 ♜xh8 ♙xh8 13 h3 +- Hummel-Cornelies, Hengelo 2005.

10 ♞xd8+ ♜xd8 11 ♙e2!

Better than 11 h3?! ♜h6 12 ♙f4 c6 13 0-0-0+ ♜e8 14 ♙e2 ♜ef7! (14...♜hf7 15 ♜ge4 b6 16 c5 b5 17 ♙e3 ♜c4 18 ♙xc4 bxc4 19 ♜he1 ± Galyas-Musanti, Budapest 2001) 15 ♜f3 e5 16 ♙d2 ♜f5 17 ♜e1 ♜d4 18 ♙d1 ♜xf3 19 ♙xf3 ♜d6 20 b3 ♜f5 1/2-1/2 Grivas-Mastrokoukos, Athens 1995.

11...♜h6

Black must be on the alert: 11...♜e8? 12 ♜b5 ♜d7 13 ♙f4 a6 14 ♜d1+ ♜c6 15 ♜xc7 +- Ackermann-Pa.Fink, Bad Zwesten 2002 or 11...h6 12 ♙xg4 (12 ♜ge4 ♜f6 13 0-0 ± V.Mikenas-Aronin, Moscow 1949) 12...hxg5 13 ♙e2 g4 14 ♙f4 a6 15 ♜e4 ♜e8 16 0-0-0 ♙h6 17 ♙xh6 ♜xh6 18 ♜d2! (18 ♜g5 ± Moskalenko-Vassallo Barroche, Barbera 2000) with the idea ♜e3-f4 ±.

12 ♙f4 c6 13 0-0-0+ ♜e8 14 ♜he1

White's better development and pawn-structure (the extra black doubled e-pawn is unimportant and only restrains Black's game) gave him the better chances in Wirthensohn-Flückiger, Switzerland 2001.

D)

5...a6


Of course, this move (and the ideas behind it) is also possible after 5...0-0, but we shall examine it in this section. The desired set-up with ...a6, ...c6 and ...b5 has some similarities with the Byrne System in the Sämisch Variation of the King's Indian Defence, but here it is not so effective as the white knight stands excellently on f3.

6 h3 0-0 7 ♖g5 c6

Apart from this logical follow-up, Black has tried the following alternatives:

a) 7...e5? loses to 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 ♖xd8 ♜xd8 10 ♘d5.

b) 7...c5 8 d5 b5 9 ♖d3!? (D).



In this position (which is similar to those arising from the Benko Gambit with the useless extra move ...a6), White has achieved excellent results after any of Black's replies:

b1) 9...♗bd7 (now there are a lot of similarities with Line E) 10 0-0 h6 11 ♖e3 ♖h7?! (11...b4 or 11...bxc4) 12 cxb5 axb5 13 ♗xb5 ♖a6 14 a4 ♗e8 15 ♜b1 ♗c7 16 b4 ♜b8 17 bxc5 ♗xc5 18 ♖xc5 dxc5 19 ♜c2 ♖xb5 20 axb5 1-0 Agrest-Mertens, Metz 1999.

b2) 9...b4 10 ♗e2 h6 (10...a5 11 ♜d2 ♜e8 12 g4 a4 13 ♜c1 ♜a5 14 ♖f1 e6 15 ♖g2 exd5 16 exd5 ♖b7 17 ♖f4 ♜d8 18 ♗g3 ± R.Janssen-Boersma, Dieren 2003 or 10...♗bd7 11 0-0 e5 12 ♜d2 ♜c7 13 g4 h5 14 ♗h2 hxg4 15 hxg4

♗h7 16 ♖e3 ♜d8 17 ♖g2 ♖f6 18 ♗f3 ♖e7 19 g5 f6 20 ♜h1 is also slightly better for White, Ivanisević-Kr.Georgiev, Antalya 2002) 11 ♖e3 a5 12 ♜d2 ♖h7 13 ♗h2 e6 14 dxe6 ♖xe6 15 f4 ♗c6 16 0-0 ♜e8 17 ♗g3 ♖c8 18 ♜ae1 ± Potapov-Yarovik, Orsk 2001.

b3) 9...bxc4 10 ♖xc4 and now:

b31) 10...a5 11 0-0 ♖a6 12 ♖xa6 (12 b3 ± 12...♗xa6 13 ♜e1 ♗d7 14 ♖f4 (14 ♜d2 ♗e5 15 ♗xe5 ± 1/2-1/2 Agrest-Glek, Porto San Giorgio 2000) 14...♜b8 15 ♜d2 ♜e8 16 ♜e2 ♜a7 17 ♜ae1 ± Werner-Dencsi, Budapest 2003.

b32) 10...♗bd7 11 0-0 and here:


b321) 11...♗b6 12 ♖b3!? (or: 12 b3 ♗xc4 13 bxc4 ♜b8 14 ♜c1 ♗d7 15 ♜e1 ♜e8 16 ♖f4 ♜b4 17 ♜e2 ♜b6 18 e5 is slightly better for White, Cousigne-Acher, France 2001; 12 ♖d3 e6 13 dxe6 ♖xe6 {13...fxe6 14 e5! dxe5 15 ♗xe5 ±} 14 ♗d2 ♜e8 15 ♜ad1 ♜b8 16 ♜fel ± Flear-B.Mortensen, Hastings 1995) 12...a5 13 ♜e1 ♗fd7 (13...♖a6? 14 e5 dxe5 15 ♗xe5 ♖b7 16 ♗c6 ♖xc6 17 dxc6 a4 18 ♖c2 ♜c7 19 ♜f3 ♜fc8 20 ♜ad1 ♜xc6 21 ♜d8+ ♗e8 22 ♜xe7 ♜xd8 23 ♜xc6 ♗c4 24 ♗xa4 ♜ac8 25 ♜f3 f6 26 ♖b3 fxg5 1-0 Taras-Baciu, Tusnad 2000) 14 ♖f4 ±.

b322) 11...♜b8 12 b3!? (12 ♜b1 ♗e8 13 ♜c1 ♗c7 14 ♖h6 ± R.Janssen-Blees, Haarlem 2004) 12...♗e8 (12...♗g4 13 hxg4 ♖xc3 14 ♖h6 ♖xa1 15 ♜xa1 f6 16 ♖xf8 ♜xf8 17 g5 ±) 13 ♜c1 ♗c7 14 ♜e2 ♗b6 15 ♜fd1 ± Yermolinsky-Piket, Wijk aan Zee 1997.

8 ♖d3 b5

Black has also tried to live without ...b5, but after 8...h6 9 ♖e3 ♗bd7 10 0-0 ♜c7 11 ♜c1 e5 12 ♜d2 ♖h7 13 ♜fd1 ♗e8 14 ♜c2 White was on top in Topalov-Morcuende, Tenerife simul 1997.

9 0-0 (D)



9...♟bd7

This is the basic position for this type of pawn-structure. Naturally, Black has tried some alternatives:

a) 9...♟fd7 10 ♖d2 bxc4 11 ♙xc4 ♟b6 12 ♙b3 a5 13 ♟a4 ♖a7 14 ♙h6 ♟xa4 15 ♙xg7 ♜xg7 16 ♙xa4 ♖b6 17 ♞fc1 ± N.Nikolić-Vojinović, Herceg Novi 2001.

b) 9...♗c7 10 e5 dxe5 11 dxe5 ♟e8 12 ♙h4 ♙b7 13 ♖e2 f6 14 exf6 exf6 15 ♙g3 ♖f7 16 ♟d4 is much better for White, Nestorović-G.Petrov, Dimitrovgrad 2003.

c) 9...♖a7 10 ♖d2 (10 ♖e2 bxc4 11 ♙xc4 d5 12 ♙xf6 exf6 13 exd5 cxd5 14 ♙xd5 ♖d7 15 ♖c4 a5 16 ♖b3 ♙a6 17 ♙c4 ♖b7 18 ♙b5 f5 19 a4 ± Gabriel-Hug, Bad Homburg 1996) 10...bxc4 11 ♙xc4 ♟xe4 12 ♟xe4 d5 13 ♙d3 dxe4 14 ♙xe4 ♙e6 15 ♞fe1 ♞e8 16 ♙h6 ♙f6 17 b3 ♙d5 18 ♞ac1 ♖d7 19 ♖f4 ± Grivas-Hug, Moscow OL 1994.

d) 9...bxc4 10 ♙xc4 ♟bd7 11 e5 ♟e8 12 ♞e1 d5 13 ♙d3 ♟c7 14 ♟a4 ♟e6 15 ♞c1 ♟xg5 16 ♟xg5 ♙h6 17 h4 ♟b6 18 ♟c5 e6 19 ♖g4 ±± Zifroni-Blees, Tel Aviv 1999.

e) 9...♙b7 10 ♞c1 ♟bd7 11 cxb5 cxb5 12 b4 ♟b6 13 d5 ♞c8 14 ♖b3 ♟fd7 15 ♙e3 ♟c4 16 ♙xc4 ♞xc4 17 ♟d2 ♞c7 18 ♟e2 ± A.Mikhalevski-Gofshtein, Tel Aviv 1996.

10 a3

White has at his disposal several alternatives, some of which are also sufficient to gain the advantage:

a) 10 b4?! seems ineffective: 10...a5! 11 a3 bxc4 12 ♙xc4 d5 13 exd5 ♟b6 14 ♙b3 cxd5 15 ♟e5 ♙b7 16 ♖f3 axb4 17 axb4 ♖d6 ∞ Potapov-Kr.Georgiev, Ikaria 2000.

b) White cannot be satisfied with 10 e5?! dxe5 11 dxe5 ♟c5! (11...♟e8?! 12 ♖e2 ♟c5 13 ♙c2 ♟c7 14 ♞fd1 ♖e8 15 ♖e3 ♟5e6 16 ♙h6 gave White the advantage in Poluliakhov-Bogachkov, St Petersburg 2000) 12 ♙c2 ♟fd7 13 ♞e1 (13 ♖e2?! ♟e6! {13...f6?! 14 ♙e3 b4 15 ♟a4 ♟xa4 16 ♙xa4 ♖c7 17 exf6 exf6 18 c5 ± San Segundo-Sorin, Buenos Aires 1995} 14 ♙h4?! b4 15 ♟a4 ♟xe5! 16 ♟xe5 ♟d4 ♢) 13...♟e6 14 ♙h4 bxc4 15 ♖e2 ♟b6 16 ♞ad1 ♖c7 17 ♙g3 ♖b8 18 ♟e4 ♖a7 ∞ Ehlvest-Kožul, Biel IZ 1993.

c) 10 ♞e1 h6 11 ♙e3 ♟b6 12 b3 ♟fd7 13 ♞c1 b4 14 ♟e2 c5 15 ♖d2 ♜h7 16 d5 a5 17 ♖c2 a4 18 ♟g3 ♖c7 19 h4 ♟e5 20 ♟xe5

dxe5?! (20...♙xe5 21 f4 ♙c3 22 ♞f1 ♙g4 23 h5 with an attack) 21 h5 g5 22 ♙e2 ♙d7 23 ♖d1 ♖a6 24 ♙g4 ♞fa8 25 ♙f5+ ♙xf5 26 exf5 ♙f6 27 ♟e4 ♟d7 28 ♞e2 axb3 29 axb3 ♖a3 30 ♞d2 ♖b6 31 d6 1-0 Grivas-Sigalas, Khania 2000.

d) 10 ♞c1 b4 11 ♟a4 e5 12 c5! h6 13 ♙e3 (or 13 ♙h4 g5 14 ♙g3 ± but not 13 ♙xf6?! ♖xf6 14 dxe5 ♟xe5 15 ♟xe5 ♖xe5 16 cxd6 ♖xd6 17 ♖c2 ♖f4 ∞ Bareev-Pähtz, Frankfurt 1999) 13...exd4 14 ♟xd4 ±.

10...bxc4

Or 10...h6 11 ♙e3 bxc4 12 ♙xc4 d5 13 exd5 ♟b6 14 ♙a2 ♟bxd5 15 ♟e5 ♖d6 16 ♞c1 ± Ibragimov-Kotsur, Smolensk 1997.


11 ♙xc4 ♟b6 12 ♙d3 ♟fd7 13 ♞e1 ♞e8 14 ♙f1 c5 15 ♞c1

White has a slight advantage, Ibragimov-Zlochevsky, Alushta 1993.

E)

5...c5 6 d5 (D)

As nothing is gained by 6 dxc5 ♖a5, this is the natural continuation. Black can of course play ...c5 (and employ the relevant ideas) both before and after castling, but here we shall use this move-order.



Now Black's possibilities that we shall examine here are:

- E1: 6...b5** 149
- E2: 6...e5** 150

6...e6 will transpose to the Modern Benoni.

E1)

6...b5


This type of Benko Gambit usually arises via the move-order 6...0-0 7 h3 b5, but for convenience we shall examine it in this section. In my opinion, this is not a good try for Black, as White can nearly always obtain favourable positions without having to face many of the problems that he encounters in the regular Benko Gambit. Indeed, White has scored heavily after ...b5.

7 cxb5 0-0 8 h3 a6

The logical follow-up. After 8...d7 9 e3 d3 d6 (9...a6 10 0-0 axb5 11 e3xb5 a6 12 axa6 xa6 13 e2 a8 14 f4 d6 15 f1 b8 16 e5 d8 17 b3 d8 18 a1 b4 19 g3 ± Grivas-Burkhardt, Munich 1987) 10 g5 a6 11 0-0 axb5 12 e3xb5 a6 13 axa6 xa6 14 c1 a8 15 b3 h6 16 e3 b8 17 a4 b7 18 d2 d8 19 c2 c7 20 b1 d7 21 d4 White got a clear advantage in Grivas-Moutousis, Athens 1993.

9 a4! (D)

White must not be in a hurry and give Black compensation for the material with 9 bxa6?! a5! (9...axa6?! 10 axa6 xa6 11 0-0 d7 12 e2 ± Guillaumat-Guinovart, Chartres 2005) 10 d2 axa6 11 e2 d7 12 0-0 fb8 as in Cvetković-Sznapić, Belgrade 1984.



9...axb5

There are many alternatives for Black, but none of them promises a brighter future:

a) 9...f7 10 e2 axb5 11 dxb5 a6 12 0-0 d7 13 d3 a6 14 e1 b8 15 c2 b7 16 g5 ± Notkin-Kjeldsen, Aalborg 1995.

b) 9...d7 10 a3 axb5 11 e3xb5 a6 12 axa6 xa6 13 0-0 b6 14 e2 b8 15 d2 aa8 16 d4 ± Kouatly-Plaskett, Geneva 1988.

c) 9...a5 10 d2 axb5 11 e3xb5 a6 12 0-0 d7 13 c2 e3xb5 14 dxb5 b6 15 b3

e6 16 dxe6 fxe6 17 ael d5 18 exd5 exd5 19 e7 ± Sielecki-Rogers, Dutch Cht 2000.

d) 9...e6 10 dxe6 and then:

d1) 10...fxe6 11 e5 dxe5 12 xd8 (12 e3 e7 13 e4 axb5 14 axb5 d8? 15 xd8+ xd8 16 xa8 c7 17 0-0 b7 18 b6 1-0 Sommerbauer-Woeber, Austrian Cht 1993) 12...xd8 13 e4 (13 e3 b7 14 g5 d5 15 xc5 axb5 16 e3xb5 d7 17 e7 d8 18 0-0 ± H.Wegner-H.Ueter, Bundesliga 1984/5) 13...d5 14 g5 d7 15 0-0 h6 16 d2 d8 17 d4 ± Roca-A.Correa, Argentina 1992.

d2) 10...xe6 11 e2 d5 (11...axb5 12 e3xb5 d5 13 exd5 dxd5 14 dxd5 xd5 15 0-0 a6 16 g5! {16 e2?! d7 17 d1 b3! with compensation, J.Alvarez-F.Gomez, Cuba 1997) 16...fd8 17 e2 d7 18 dxe6 dxe6 19 e3 d4 20 d4 ±) 12 exd5 dxd5 13 dxd5 xd5 14 0-0 xd1 15 xd1 b3 16 e1 e8 17 e3 ± Grivas-Dedes, Athens 1991.

10 e3xb5 a6

A precise knight manoeuvre to b4. Black was not successful with either 10...a6 11 e3?! d7 12 0-0 e3xb5 13 axb5 c7 14 e2 fb8 15 d2 d6 16 a6 b7 17 d3 ± Elianov-Weetik, St Petersburg 2000 or 10...d8 11 0-0 d7 12 e4 a6 13 e2 xc4 14 xc4 d7 15 e1 b8 16 d2 ± Gligorić-Suetin, Novi Sad 1982.

11 0-0 d4

The best square for the knight. 11...d7?! is less good: 12 d3 a6 13 e1 d7 14 f4 b8 15 e2 b4 16 axa6 xa6 17 c1 d6 18 d2 d4 19 h6 f6 20 xg7 xg7 21 d2 a5 22 b1 b8 23 b3 ± Grivas-Halianis, Athens 1992.

12 e3 a6 13 d2 a5 14 e5 d8 15 h6 d7 16 xg7 xg7 17 exd6 exd6 18 axa6 a5 19 ad1

White holds the advantage, Notkin-Ivanović, Vrnjačka Banja 1998.

E2)

6...e5

Black closes the centre, bringing about a kind of Old Indian Defence (ECO A56 and NIC OI 10.7). In my opinion this suits White who, thanks to his spatial advantage, can generate an initiative on both sides of the board (h3+g4 and a3+b4) or even close one flank and concentrate

on the other. Black lacks energetic play, which is usually a decisive factor.


7 h3 0-0

Of course Black can delay castling, but this does not change the character of the battle. An example is 7...a6 8 g4 h5 (8...b5 9 cxb5 ♖a5 10 ♖a4 axb5 11 ♙xb5+ ♘fd7 12 ♙e3 ♗xa4 13 ♘xa4 ♙a5 14 ♘c3 ♙a6 15 a4 ♙xb5 16 ♘xb5 ♗e7 17 ♗e2 ♘a6 18 ♙g5+ f6 19 ♙d2 ♘b4 20 b3 ± Anastasian-Nalbandian, Armenian Ch (Erevan) 2001) 9 g5 ♘h7 10 ♙e3 ♘d7 11 ♖d2 0-0 12 a4 ♙b8 13 ♙e2 ♘b6 14 ♗f1 ♙d7 15 ♗g2 ♖c8 16 ♘e1 f6 17 gxf6 ♙xf6 18 ♘c2 a5 19 ♘b5 ♙a8 20 b3 ♖d8 21 ♘c3 ♘c8 22 ♘e1 b6 23 ♘d3 ♖e7 24 ♙ag1 ♘a7 25 ♗f1 ♙af8 26 ♗e1 ♘c8 27 h4 ♖e8 28 ♙g3 ♘e7 29 ♙hg1 ♙6f7 30 ♙h6 ♙xb6 31 ♖xh6 ♗h8 32 ♙xh5 ♘f5 33 exf5 gxh5 34 ♘e4 ♖d8 35 ♘xd6 1-0 Grivas-Quendro, Thessaloniki OL 1988. A typical example of a 'one man show', as Black stayed passive for nearly the whole game.

8 g4 (D)

A useful move, creating an initiative on the kingside and preventing a future ...♘h5-f4. The alternative is 8 ♙d3 ♘a6 9 a3 ♘c7 10 ♙e3 ♘h5 11 g3 ♖e8 12 ♖d2 ♙d7 13 g4 ♘f6 (13...♘f4!?) 14 b4 ± Poirier-M.Leger, Trois Rivières 2005.

B



8...♘a6

This knight manoeuvre seems to be the best continuation for Black, assisting a possible ...b5 advance and protecting critical squares on the queenside. Alternatives have proved tough for Black:

a) 8...♘bd7 9 ♙d3 a6 10 a4 ♙b8 11 ♙g5 h6 12 ♙e3 h5 13 ♘g5 ♙e8 14 ♙e2 hxg4 15 hxg4 ♘f8 16 ♗d2 ± Izoria-Kalagashvili, Tbilisi 2001.

b) 8...♗h8 9 ♙e3 b5 10 cxb5 a6 11 ♖d2 ♖a5 12 ♙d3 axb5 13 g5 ♘h5 14 ♘xb5 ± Shirov-Vitolinš, Daugavpils 1989.

c) 8...b5 9 cxb5 a6 10 ♙g5 h6 11 ♙e3 ♗h7 12 a4 ♙d7 13 ♘d2 ♘e8 14 ♙a3 ± Agdestein-Dedes, Thessaloniki OL 1988. In general, this type of Benko Gambit is not good for Black, as his important g7-bishop is buried by his e5-pawn.

d) 8...a6 9 a4 b6 10 ♙e2 ♙a7 11 ♙g1 ♘e8 12 ♙e3 f6 13 h4 f5 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 exf5 ♙xf5 16 ♘g5 ♘f6 17 ♘e6 ♙xe6 18 dxe6 ♘c6 19 h5 h6 20 ♙xh6 ♘d4 21 ♙g5 ♖a8 22 h6 ♘e4 23 ♙e3 1-0 Borges Mateos-Tripolsky, Andratx 2004.

9 ♙e3 ♘c7 10 ♙d3

White can try the immediate 10 a3 ♗h8 (10...a5 11 ♙d3 ♙d7 12 b3 ♙e8 13 a4 ♘a6 14 ♙c1 ♘b4 15 ♙b1 h5 16 g5 ♘h7 17 ♖e2 ♙f8 18 ♘b5 ± Dao Thien Hai-Megaranto, Jakarta 2005) 11 ♙d3 ♙d7 12 b4 ± Schneider Zinner-Alvir, Gmunden 2005.

10...♙d7 11 ♘d2 ♖e7 12 ♖e2 ♙fb8 13 ♗f1 ♙e8 14 ♗g2 ♘d7 15 h4 ♘f8 16 a3

White has obtained a secure plus (spatial advantage, play on both sides). Stohl-Goossens, Rethymnon ECC 2003 continued 16...b5? 17 cxb5 a6 18 bxa6 ♙xb2 19 h5 ♖d8 20 ♙hb1 ♙xb1 21 ♙xb1 ±.

F)


5...♘a6 6 h3 0-0 7 ♙g5 ♖e8! (D)

If it were not for this move then the continuation with 5...♘a6 would not be in this section, as instead of 7...♖e8!?, the normal 7...e5 8 d5 would transpose to Section 5.9.

As is easy to understand, Black wishes to avoid an early queen exchange, while asking White what his next useful move is. This is a tricky line favoured by my former pupil, Greek GM Hristos Banikas.

It must also be mentioned that Black can try this idea a move earlier, without ...♘a6 and ♙g5: 5...0-0 6 h3 ♖e8, but then White can continue with 7 e5! (7 ♙g5 e5 8 d5 ♘h5! 9 ♘h2 f5 10 exf5 gxf5 11 ♙e2 ♘f6 = Anka-Videki, Paks 2004 or 7 ♙e3 ♘a6! – but not 7...e5? 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 ♙c5 ± Jimenez Villena-Martinez Martin, Ciudad Real 2004) 7...♘fd7 (7...dxe5 8 dxe5 ♘fd7 9 e6 {or 9 ♙f4 ±} 9...fxe6 10 ♙e2

± 8 ♖f4 c6 9 exd6 exd6+ 10 ♙e2 ♗e7 11 0-0 ♜f6 12 ♞e1 ♙e6 13 d5 ± Grivas-Banikas, Internet (1) 1998.



8 g4!?

White doesn't get much with 8 e5:

a) 8...♞d7 9 exd6 exd6+ (9...cxd6 10 ♙e2 h6 11 ♙e3 b6 {11...e6 12 ♗d2 ± Stoeck-Dworakowska, Coventry 2005}) 12 0-0 ♙b7 13 ♗d2 ♜h7 14 d5 ♜f6 15 ♞d4 ± Shabalov-Paschall, USA 1994) 10 ♙e2 h6 11 ♙e3 (11 ♙d2 ♜f6 12 0-0 ♗d8 13 ♞e1 c6 14 ♙d3 ♜c7 15 b4 ♜e6 16 ♞c1 d5 17 c5 ± P.Cramling-Vassallo Barroche, Malaga 1998) 11...f5 12 ♗d2 g5 13 d5 ♜e5 14 0-0 ♜c5 15 ♙d4 ♜cd7 16 ♞fe1 ♗f7 17 ♜b5 ♜xf3+ 18 ♙xf3 ♜e5 19 ♙e2 a6 20 ♜c3 ♙d7 21 f4 gxf4 22 ♗xf4 ♞ae8 23 ♞ad1 ♜g6 24 ♗f2 ± Grivas-Banikas, Internet (3) 1998.

b) 8...dxe5! 9 dxe5 ♞d7 10 ♙f4 (10 ♗e2?! f6! 11 exf6 exf6 12 ♗xe8 ♞xe8+ 13 ♙e3 ♙h6 14 ♜d2 ♙xe3+ 15 fxe3 c6 ♝ Kekenj-Arsović, Niš 1998 or 10 e6 ♜dc5! 11 exf7+ ♗xf7 ∞) 10...b6! 11 ♙d3 ♙b7 12 ♙e4 ♙xe4 13 ♜xe4 ♜dc5 14 ♜xc5 ♜xc5 15 0-0 ♞d8 16 ♗c2 ♗c6 17 ♞ad1 ♜e6 1/2-1/2 San Segundo-V.Spasov, Moscow OL 1994.

8...c5!?

Of course, 8...e5 9 d5 transposes to Line B of Section 5.9.


9 ♙g2

This is White's idea. Now, we have a strange transition to a position akin to a form of Sicilian Dragon. But compared with the actual Dragon line, White has three pluses here: his pawn on c4, the bad placement of the black queen on e8 and the bad placement of the a6-knight. Also, the g4 advance is actually part of White's plans in the aforementioned opening line (g3-g4).

9...cxd4

Black tried to avoid the aforementioned transition with 9...h5?! but got into trouble after 10 gxh5! (10 ♙xf6?! exf6! 11 gxh5 f5 12 hxg6 fxe4 13 ♜g5 fxg6 14 ♜cxe4 ♙xd4 15 0-0 ♗e5 ∞ P.H.Nielsen-Michelakis, Copenhagen 2003) 10...♜xh5 11 ♗d2 ♜c7 12 ♙h6 cxd4 13 ♜xd4 e5 14 ♙xg7 ♜xg7 15 ♜f5+ ♙xf5 16 exf5 ♜f4 17 ♙xb7 ♞b8 18 ♙e4 ± Krasenkow-Bobras, Polish Ch (Glogow) 2001.

10 ♜xd4 ♜c5 11 0-0 (D)



In this position Black has tried many similar plans, without having been able to equalize:

a) 11...♞b8 12 f4 ♜e6 13 ♜xe6 ♙xe6 14 ♗d3 ♜d7 15 b3 ♜c5 16 ♗e3 f6 17 ♙h4 a6 18 ♜d5 ♗d8 19 e5 ± Krasenkow-Pereyra Arcija, Buenos Aires 1998.

b) 11...♜e6 12 ♙e3 h5 13 g5 ♜h7 14 h4 f6 15 ♜d5 fxg5 16 ♜xe6 ♙xe6 17 hxg5 ± Miljković-Benderac, Budva 2003.

c) 11...♙d7 12 ♙e3 ♞c8 13 ♞c1 a6 14 ♗e2 e5 15 ♜b3 ♜e6 16 ♞fd1 ♜f4 17 ♙xf4 exf4 18 ♞xd6 ± Alterman-Kasparov, Internet 1998.


d) 11...h6 12 ♙e3 ♙d7 13 b3 ♞c8 14 ♞c1 a6 15 b4 ♜e6 16 ♜d5 ♜xd4 17 ♙xd4 ♜xd5 18 exd5 ± J.Ivanov-Barredo Duran, Oviedo 2000.

e) 11...♗d8! 12 ♙e3 a6 (12...♜e6 13 ♜b3 ♜d7 14 ♗e2 a5 15 ♞ad1 a4 16 ♜d4 ♜xd4 17 ♙xd4 ♙xd4 18 ♞xd4 ♜c5 19 ♞d2 ± Chytilék-Salai, Czech Republic tt 2003) 13 ♞c1 ± Grivas-Begniss, Poros 1998.

5.5 The 5...♙g4 Variation

1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♜c3 ♙g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♜f3 ♙g4 (D)

This is a popular line for Black, usually arising via the move-order 5...0-0 6 ♙e2 ♙g4,



classified as ECO E91 and NIC KI 19.5. Black accepts a slightly worse but compact position, leaving White in the driving seat.

6 e2 0-0

Black's alternatives, such as 6...c6 7 d5 e3 8 e3xf3 9 e5 9 e2 0-0 10 0-0 e8 11 e3 e6 12 f4 d7 13 dxe6 e6xf6 14 e3 f3 c6 15 d2 ± Smejkal-Rogers, Szirak 1986 and 6...f7 7 d5! e2 8 dxe2 c6 9 0-0 a6 10 g5 b5 11 cxb5 axb5 12 d2 ±, leave White with a pleasant position.

7 e3 d7

This is one of the main ideas for Black. Of course there are some other moves for Black to choose among. For example:

a) 7...a6 8 h3 (8 d2 and 8 0-0 are fair alternatives) 8...e3 9 e3xf3 d7 10 h4 c5 11 d5 b5 12 h5 e5 13 hxg6 fxg6 (13...hxg6 14 e2 ±) 14 g4! ± Tisdall-Fauland, Haifa Echt 1989.

b) 7...e3 8 e3xf3 e5 9 d5 c5 (9...h6 10 d2 h7 11 0-0-0 d7 12 g4 e8 13 g5 hxg5 14 e5 g8 15 h4 f8 16 h5 ± Fletcher-L.Hunt, Victoria 2004) 10 h4!? (10 a3 d7 11 0-0 e8 12 b4 ± Malich-Barczay, Kecskemet 1968) 10...h5 11 g5 d7 12 g4 hxg4 13 e4 g6 14 e4xd7 15 e2 ± Djurić-Ljubisavljević, Genoa 2004.


c) 7...e5 8 d5 and now:

c1) 8...h5 9 h3 e8 10 d2 f5 11 exf5 gxf5 12 g4 f6 (12...f4 13 e4xf4 exf4 14 g5 ± Portisch-B.Gurgenidze, Budapest 1959) 13 gxf5 e5 14 e6 ±.

c2) 8...d7 9 d2 e2 10 e2 a6 11 g4 e8 12 f3 f6? (12...c6 was better, although White still has a clear advantage) 13 h4 b8 14 h5 g5 15 h6 e8 16 d2 f7 17 f1 f8 18 g3 g6 19 f5 f4 20 e4xf4 exf4 21 0-0 1-0 Goormachtigh-Pancras, Haarlem 2004.

c3) 8...c5 9 d2 e2 9...e2 10 e2 h5 11 g3 ± Suetin-Kremenietzky, Moscow 1982) 10 g4 e8 11 g1 e6 12 h4 c7 13 h5 a6 14 a4 ± Azmaiparashvili-Pakkanen, Philadelphia 1994.

d) 7...c6 8 d5 e3 (D) and here:



d1) 9 gxf3!? b8 10 h4 c6 11 d2 cxd5 12 cxd5 d7 13 0-0-0 with good attacking chances. Van Wely-Rogers, Breda 2000 concluded 13...c8 14 b1 b6 15 e6 c4?! 16 e4 c4 17 h5 e6 18 e6 19 bxc3 b6+ 20 a1 e2 21 hxg6 fxg6 22 d1 h5 23 e6 1-0.

d2) 9 e3 e5 (9...a5 10 e2 c5 11 0-0 e8 12 c2 d7 13 e1 a6 14 b3 ± Donchev-F.Portisch, Bratislava 1983) 10 e2 c6 (10...c5?! 11 f4 d7 12 0-0 e8 13 d2 f5 14 exf5 e5 15 g4 f8 16 e6+ h8 17 e4 ± Cekan-Beran, Klatovy 2005) 11 0-0 (11 f4!? d7 12 dxc6 bxc6 13 0-0 a5 14 d2 a4 15 e3 ± Ftačnik-Rogers, Gold Coast 2000) 11...a5 (11...c7 12 f4 d7 13 c1 e6 14 h1 fe8 15 g1 exd5 16 cxd5 ± Petursson-Angantýsson, Reykjavik 1980 or 11...cxd5 12 exd5 c8 13 b3 e4 {13...f4 14 d2 h6 15 c1 ± Yrjölä-Barlov, Sochi 1984}) 14 e4! h6 15 d3 ± Stean-Martinović, Smederevska Palanka 1982) 12 f4 (12 d2 fc8 13 b3 a6 14 a4 e8 {14...c7 15 a5 ± Gavrikov-Balashov, Minsk 1983}) 15 h1 c7 16 a5 e6 17 dxe6 e6 18 b4 d7 19 f3 ± Sosonko-G.Mohr, Cannes 1995) 12...d7 13 a3 fc8 14 b4 d8 15 c1 ± Berkes-Cekro, Plovdiv Echt 2003.

e) 7...d7 8 d2 (8 0-0 c6 9 c2 e5 10 h3 e3 11 e3 e7 12 f1 ± Tiller-Züger, Randers Z 1982) 8...e2 9 e2 c5 (9...c6 10 0-0 e5 11 d5 cxd5 12 cxd5 a6 13 a4 c8 14 e1 ± W.Winter-Eliskases, Folkestone 1933

or 9...e5 10 d5 a6 11 g4 c6 12 f3 cxd5 13 cxd5
 ♖e8 14 h4 f5 15 gxf5 gxf5 16 exf5 ♜f6 17
 0-0-0 ♜xf5 18 ♚d1 ♛c8 19 ♚g5 ♜f7 20 ♖b1
 with good attacking chances, Miles-Kanike-
 vich, Sydney 1991) 10 d5 e6 (10...♚b8 11 0-0
 ♖e5 12 h3 ♖e8 13 f4 ♖d7 14 ♖f3 ♖c7 15 e5
 a6 16 a4 b6 17 ♙f2 ♚e8 18 ♚ae1 ♖f8 19 ♙h4
 ♜d7 20 ♖g5 h6 21 e6 fxe6 22 ♖xe6 ♖xe6 23
 dxe6 ♜c6 24 ♖d5 ♚b7 25 f5 ♙e5 26 fxg6 ♖xe6
 27 ♜h5 1-0 Kasparov-Ferioli, Asiag simul
 1991) 11 0-0 exd5 12 cxd5 a6 13 a4 ♜c7 14
 ♖c4 ♖b6 15 ♖a3 ± Radice-Moyse, Nereto
 2000.


f) 7...c6 8 h3 ♙xf3 9 ♙xf3 ♖bd7 (9...e5 10
 d5 c5 11 g4 ♖e8 12 h4 ± W.Schmidt-S.Nikolić,
 Smederevska Palanka 1981 or 9...♜c7 10 ♜d2
 e5 11 d5 c5 12 g4 a6 13 h4 ♖e8 14 g5 f5 15
 gxf6 ♖xf6 16 h5 ± Xu Jun-Pohle, Shenyang
 1999) 10 0-0 (10 g4!? e5 11 d5 ♖b6 12 b3 cxd5
 13 cxd5 ♚c8 14 ♚c1 ± ♚xc3? 15 ♚xc3 ♖fxd5
 16 exd5 e4 17 ♚c2 exf3 18 ♜xf3 ♖d7 19 0-0 f5
 20 ♜g3 ♙e5 21 f4 ♙g7 22 ♚fc1 ♖c5 23 gxf5
 ♖e4 24 ♜g2 gxf5 25 ♙d4 1-0 Sulava-Gorić,
 Pula 2000) and here:

f1) 10...♜c7 11 ♜d2 (11 ♚c1 ♚ad8 12 g3 e5
 13 ♙g2 ± L.Schmid-Rossetto, Mar del Plata
 1963) 11...♚fe8 12 b4 ♖b6 13 ♙e2 e5 14 dxe5
 dxe5 15 c5 ♖bd7 16 ♙c4 ± Bosiočić-Mihajlo-
 vić, Croatian jr Cht (Sv. Filip i Jakov) 2005.

f2) 10...♜a5 11 a3 ♚ad8 12 b4 ♜c7 13 ♚c1
 ± Madenspacher-Loos, Mulhouse 2004.

As you will have noticed, there were a lot of
 transpositions and promising plans for White in
 the notes above. So, returning to 7...♖f7, we
 have:

8 ♖g1! ♙xe2 9 ♖gxe2 (D)




An important position. The exchange of
 light-squared bishops seems to favour White,

while Black is suffering due to lack of space.
 However, White cannot claim anything more
 than a slight advantage (as usual). Many games
 have been played in this position. Here fol-
 lows a sample of the most important lines:

- A: 9...♖b6 154
 B: 9...♖c6 154
 C: 9...e5 155
 D: 9...c5 155

A)

9...♖b6 10 b3 e6 (D)



11 ♜d2

An interesting alternative is 11 d5!? exd5 12
 cxd5 ♖8d7 13 0-0 ♖f6 14 ♚c1 ♚e8 15 ♜d3 c5
 16 dxc6 bxc6 17 ♚fd1 d5 18 exd5 ♖bxd5 19
 ♖xd5 ♖xd5 20 ♙d4 ♙h6 21 ♚b1 ♜e7 22 ♖c3
 ± Sosonko-Züger, Zurich 1984.

11...d5 12 cxd5 exd5 13 e5 c6

13...♖c6?! is worse, as White's attack seems
 quite strong after 14 h4 f6 15 f4 ♜e7 16 h5
 ♚fe8 17 hxg6 hxg6 18 ♙f2 a5 19 ♜d3 f5 20 g4!
 ± de Firmian-Züger, Biel 1986.

14 0-0 ♖a6

Or 14...f6 15 f4 ± Cebalo-Züger, San Bernar-
 dino 1986.

15 f4

White has a slight advantage.

B)

9...♖c6 10 0-0

White can also play more aggressively with
 10 ♜d2 e5 (10...a6 11 ♙h6?! {11 0-0 is a better
 chance} 11...♙hx6 12 ♜hx6 e5 13 ♜d2 exd4
 14 ♖xd4 ♖de5 15 b3 ♖xd4 16 ♜xd4 ♜g5 ∞
 Lengyel-Bilek, Budapest 1961) 11 d5 ♖e7 12 g4

f5 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 ♖h6 ± Muffang-Robatsch, Moscow OL 1956.


Another interesting alternative is 10 h4!? h5 11 ♖d2 ♗f6 12 f3 a6 13 ♗d5 b5 14 ♜c1 e6 15 ♗xf6+ ♗xf6 16 ♗g5 ♗xg5 17 hxg5 ♗b8 18 g4! ± San Segundo-Friedersdorff, Berlin 1996.

10...a6 11 ♖d2 ♗b8 12 ♜a1 ♞e8 13 f4 ♗a5 14 b3 c6 15 f5 c5 16 ♖h6 ♗c6 17 ♗xg7 ♗xg7 18 ♗d5 e6 19 fxe6 fxe6 20 ♗e3

White has achieved a small advantage, Loncar-Tomerlin, Varazdin 2004.

C)

9...e5 10 0-0 (D)



10...♗c6

Black has also tried:

a) 10...a5 11 ♖d2 ♗c6 12 f3 exd4 13 ♗xd4 ♗c5 14 ♜a1 ± Kasparov-Vukic, Banja Luka 1979.

b) 10...exd4 11 ♗xd4 ♗f6 (11...♗h6?! 12 ♗d5 c6 13 ♗e3 ♞e8 14 ♗g4 ♗f8 15 f3 h5 16 ♗f2 c5 17 ♗c3 ♗c6 18 ♗f4 ± Robatsch-A.David, Debrecen Echt 1992) 12 f3 ♗c6 13 ♗f2 (13 ♗e3 ♗d7 14 ♖d2 ♗de5 15 b3 f5 16 ♜a1 ♖e7 17 ♗d5 ♖f7 18 exf5 gxf5 19 ♗g3 ± Damljanović-S.Mohr, Ljubljana/Portorož 1989) 13...♗d7 14 ♖c2 f5 15 ♜a1 b6 16 exf5 ♞xf5 17 ♗d5 ♗de5 18 b4 ± Schukin-Guseinov, St Petersburg 2000.

11 f3

Or:

a) White achieves a small, mainly spatial advantage after 11 d5!? ♗e7 12 f3 f5 13 ♗c1 ♗h8 14 ♗d3 ♗g8 15 exf5 gxf5 16 f4 ♗g6 17 ♗f2 ± Gofshtein-Ardeleanu, Ubeda 1997.

b) 11 ♖d2 exd4 12 ♗xd4 ♗de5 13 b3 ♗g4 (13...♖f6? fails to 14 ♗d5!., rather than the less

incisive 14 ♗db5 ♜ac8 15 ♗d5 ♖d8 16 ♜a1 ♗g4 17 ♗g5 f6 18 ♖h4 ± Vera-F.Gomez, Las Tunas 2001) 14 ♗xc6 bxc6 15 ♗d4 ♗e5 16 ♜ae1 a5 17 f4 c5 18 ♗f2 ♗c6 19 a4 ♗d4 20 ♗b5 ± Fish-Høi, Germany 2000.

11...exd4

Worse is 11...f5?! 12 exf5 gxf5 13 dxe5 ♗dx5 14 ♖d2 ♗h8 15 b3 ♖d7 16 ♗f4 ± Tiller-Høi, Randers Z 1982, as the black pawn-structure is dangerously damaged.

12 ♗xd4 ♗c5 13 ♖d2 ♖d7

Or 13...♗e6 14 ♗de2 ♞e8 15 ♜a1 a5 16 ♗d5 ♗e5 17 ♖c2 ± Belov-Morozevich, Moscow 1992.

14 ♜a1 ♜ae8 15 ♗xc6 ♖xc6 16 ♗d5 ♗e6 17 b3 b6 18 ♗f1 a5 19 ♗f2

± Bukić-Praznik, Ljubljana 1996.


D)

9...c5 10 0-0 ♗c6

Or:

a) 10...a6 is also possible: 11 dxc5 ♗xc5 12 b4 (12 ♗xc5!? dxc5 13 ♖b3 [13 f4?! ♗d4+ 14 ♗h1 ♗c6 15 e5 f6 ∞ Nemet-Cebalo, Zurich 1999) 13...♗c6 14 ♞fd1 ♗d4 15 ♗xd4 ♗xd4 16 ♗e2 ♖d7 17 ♗xd4 cxd4 18 e5 ♞fd8 19 ♜d2 ♜ac8 20 ♜a1 ♖c7 21 e6 ♖xc4 22 exf7+ ♗xf7 23 ♖xb7 ♗c6 24 b3 ♖b5 25 ♖xb5 axb5 26 f4 ± Lenić-Chadaev, Iraklion 2004) 12...♗cd7 13 ♜c1 ♗c6 14 ♖b3 e6 15 ♞fd1 ± Cebalo-Hug, Biel 1986.

b) The main alternative is 10...cxd4 11 ♗xd4 ♗c6 12 b3 (D), and now:



b1) 12...♖a5 13 ♗d5 ♞fe8 14 b4 ♖d8 15 ♜c1 is slightly better for White, Ftačnik-Züger, Biel 1988.

b2) 12...a6 and here:

b21) 13 a4 ♖e8 14 ♜de2 ♜c5 15 ♖b1 ♜b4 16 f3 ♜c7 17 ♜h1 e6 18 ♜d2 ♞ad8 19 ♞fd1 ♜cd3 20 ♜a2 ♜xa2 21 ♜xd3 ♜b4 22 ♜d2 ± Vescovi-Guseinov, Tripoli FIDE KO 2004.

b22) 13 ♖c1 ♜a5 14 ♜h1!? (14 ♜d2 ♞ab8 15 ♞fd1 ♞fc8 16 f3 ♜d8 17 ♜d5 ♟e5 18 ♜e2 ♜f8 19 ♟g5 ♟g7 20 ♜h1 ± Miles-Korotylev, Alushta 1999) 14...♞fc8 15 f4 ♞ab8 16 e5 ♞e8 17 exd6 exd6 18 ♟g1 ± Belov-Kurmosov, Samara 2004.

11 d5 ♜c5

This looks more harmonious than 11...♜a5 12 b3 a6 13 ♖b1 ♜b8 (13...♜f6 14 ♜d3 ♜g4 15 ♟g5 ± Birnboim-Dzindzichashvili, Netanya 1977) 14 a4 ± Ivkov-Szabo, Amsterdam 1972. Although White's advantage is not tremendous, the black knight is quite misplaced on a5.

12 b3 a6

Black should avoid both the gambit continuation 12...b5? 13 cxb5 a6 14 h3 ♜b6 15 f4 ♜ed7 16 bxa6 ♞xa6 17 a4 ± Summerscale-Barrett, British League (4NCL) 1999/00, and 12...♞b8 13 h3 ♜f6 14 f4 ♜ed7 15 ♜c2 ♜e8 16 ♞ad1 ♜c7 17 e5! with the initiative in Schukin-Tkachenko, Kiev 2004. Then 17...dxe5 is strongly met by 18 f5.

13 h3 ♜f6 14 ♜c2

In Bellon-Fernandez Aransay, Benasque 1990, White tried 14 a4!? ♞e8 15 ♜d2 ♜ed7 16 ♟g5 ♜a5 17 f4 with a slight advantage. The game concluded 17...e6? 18 e5 dxe5 19 fxe5 ♜h5 20 g4 ♜xe5 21 gxf5 exd5 22 h6 ♟h8 23 ♜xd5 ♜c7 24 ♞ad1 ♞ac8 25 ♜e4 ♞e6 26 ♜d6 1-0.


14...e6 15 f4 ♜ed7 16 dxe6 fxe6 17 ♞ad1

White stands slightly better, Volzhin-Hamalainen, Jyväskylä 1994.

5.6 The Exchange Variation

1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♜c3 ♟g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♜f3 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 dxe5 dxe5 8 ♜xd8 ♞xd8 9 ♟g5 (D)

The Exchange Variation is an extra option when Black uses the immediate 6...e5 or the 6...♜a6 7 ♟g5 e5 move-order, which in fact is Black's most common choice. By exchanging on e5, White is not aiming for a draw, but instead to exploit his slight lead in development and benefit from his spatial advantage. Quite importantly, compared to the Classical Exchange



Variation, the move h3 is much more useful than ♟e2, as Black cannot play ...♟g4, winning the battle for the weak d4-square. GM Joe Gallagher comments that "most of the players who play this variation are playing 'scared chess' and are just looking to draw the game". Well, this seems to me a very harsh judgement. I shall note once more that it is not important which opening you play; what is important is what you know and what you are aiming for. Black has chosen:

- A: 9...h6? 156
- B: 9...♜c6? 156
- C: 9...♞f8 157
- D: 9...c6 157
- E: 9...♜bd7 159
- F: 9...♞e8 160
- G: 9...♜a6 163

A)

9...h6?

A bad move, simply blundering away the c-pawn.

10 ♟xf6 ♟xf6 11 ♜d5 ♜d7

The 'active' exchange sacrifice 11...♞xd5? 12 cxd5 c6 13 ♖c1 ♟d7 14 ♟c4 cxd5 15 ♟xd5 ♟c6 16 0-0 ♜g7 17 ♞fd1 a5 18 g3 ♞a6 19 h4 ♞b6 20 b3 a4 21 ♟xc6 ♜xc6 22 bxa4 ♞b4 23 ♞d7 g5 24 a5 1-0 was an easy win for White in P.Schlosser-H.Petersen, Aabybro 1989.

12 ♞d1! ♟g7 13 ♜xc7 ♞b8 14 c5 ♞f8 15 b4 ♜f6 16 ♟d3

White has a more or less winning advantage, Peguret-Clavel, France 2003.

B)

9...♜c6?

Another bad move, like the previous line. Black loses at least one pawn: 10 $\text{d}5$ $\text{d}6$ 11 $\text{xf}6$ $\text{xf}6$ 12 $\text{c}5$ $\text{xd}5$ 13 $\text{exd}5$ $\text{b}4$ 14 0-0-0 $\text{xa}2+$ 15 $\text{cb}1!$! $\text{b}4$ 16 $\text{c}4$ $\text{xf}5+$ in R.Christ-Warkentin, Bavaria 1999) 15... $\text{b}4+$ 16 $\text{cb}3$ $\text{a}5$ 17 $\text{c}4$ $\text{xf}5$ 18 $\text{d}2$ \pm .

C)

9... $\text{f}8$

An idea similar to 9... $\text{e}8$. Black reserves the d8-square for his bishop after the intended 10 $\text{xf}6$ $\text{xf}6$ 11 $\text{d}5$. But still, if Black wants to move his rook I think that e8 is the right square.

10 $\text{d}5$


The alternative is 10 0-0-0 $\text{bd}7$ (and not 10... $\text{c}6?$! 11 $\text{dxe}5$! {11 $\text{c}5?$! $\text{bd}7$ } 11... $\text{dxe}4$ 12 $\text{dxe}4$ $\text{xe}5$ 13 $\text{f}6+$ $\text{g}7$ 14 $\text{d}g4$ $\text{fxg}4$ 15 $\text{hxg}4$ $\text{e}8$ 16 $\text{c}5$ \pm Starke-F.Schmidt, Germany tt 1997/8), which transposes to Line E.

10... $\text{dxd}5$ 11 $\text{cxd}5$ $\text{c}6$

Worse is 11... $\text{f}5?$! 12 $\text{d}d2$ $\text{xf}6$ 13 $\text{xf}6$ $\text{xf}6$ 14 $\text{c}4$ $\text{g}7$ 15 0-0 $\text{c}6$ 16 $\text{a}c1$ $\text{d}6$ 17 $\text{b}3$ \pm Grivas-Fragakis, Georgioupoli 2002.

12 $\text{c}4$ $\text{b}5$ 13 $\text{b}3$ $\text{b}7$ 14 $\text{c}1$! (D)

The strongest continuation, although 14 $\text{d}d1$ $\text{c}5$ 15 $\text{d}d2$ (15 $\text{e}7?$! $\text{c}8$ 16 0-0 $\text{a}5$ 17 $\text{f}e1$ $\text{d}d7$ 18 $\text{g}5$ $\text{xf}8$ 19 $\text{c}2$ $\text{c}4$ ∞ Rubene-Kachiani Gersinska, Groningen 1996) 15... $\text{d}d7$ 16 $\text{e}3$ $\text{f}5$ 17 $\text{f}3$ $\text{f}4$ 18 $\text{f}2$ $\text{f}c8$ 19 $\text{c}1$ $\text{c}4$ 20 $\text{d}d1$ $\text{xf}8$ 21 0-0 $\text{d}d6$ 22 $\text{e}2$ $\text{a}6$ 23 $\text{c}2$ $\text{c}7$ 24 $\text{f}c1$ $\text{ac}8$ 25 $\text{cf}1$ $\text{cf}7$ 26 $\text{e}1$ $\text{g}5$ 27 $\text{cd}1$ $\text{e}7$ 28 $\text{b}1$ $\text{d}c5$ 29 $\text{e}1$ $\text{g}8$ 30 $\text{b}3$ $\text{cxb}3$ 31 $\text{axb}3$ was also slightly better for White in Grivas-Agnos, Athens 1997.



14... $\text{e}8$

14... $\text{cxd}5?$! is wrong: 15 $\text{c}7$! $\text{dxe}4$ 16 $\text{e}7$! $\text{d}a6$ (16... $\text{c}8$ 17 $\text{xc}8+$ $\text{xc}8$ 18 $\text{d}g5$ \pm or 16... $\text{exf}3$ 17 $\text{xf}8$ $\text{fxg}2$ 18 $\text{g}1$ \pm) 17 $\text{xb}7$ $\text{exf}3$ 18 $\text{xf}8$ $\text{fxg}2$ 19 $\text{g}1$ $\text{xf}8$ 20 $\text{xb}5$ \pm .

15 $\text{e}3$ $\text{a}5$ 16 $\text{dxc}6$ $\text{dxc}6$

16... $\text{xc}6?$ 17 $\text{d}g5$ $\text{xc}1+$ 18 $\text{xc}1$ $\text{f}8$ 19 $\text{e}3$ $\text{d}d7$ 20 0-0 $\text{h}6$ 21 $\text{d}d1$ $\text{e}7$ 22 $\text{xf}7$ gave White a decisive advantage in Bruch-Knorpp, Schwäbisch Gmünd 1995. Also unsatisfactory is 16... $\text{xc}6$ 17 $\text{d}d5$ $\text{a}6$ 18 0-0 $\text{h}6$ 19 $\text{f}d1$ \pm .

17 $\text{d}d5$ $\text{d}d8$ 18 $\text{e}2$!

White is slightly better.

D)

9... $\text{c}6$

This is quite a tricky line, where Black temporarily sacrifices his e-pawn in order to take the initiative.

10 $\text{dxe}5$ $\text{h}6$!

The looks best, although Black also manages to keep White's advantage to a minimum with line 'b':

a) 10... $\text{d}a6?$! and now:

a1) 11 $\text{d}g4?$! $\text{fxg}4$ 12 $\text{hxg}4$ $\text{b}4$! (not 12... $\text{dxe}4?$ 13 $\text{dxe}4$! $\text{e}8$ 14 $\text{f}3$ $\text{f}5$ 15 $\text{gxf}5$ $\text{gxf}5$ 16 0-0-0 $\text{fxe}4$ 17 $\text{fxe}4$ $\text{d}c5$ 18 $\text{e}3$ $\text{dxe}4$ 19 $\text{d}d3$ \pm Cvetković-A.Popović, Obrenovac 2004 or 12... $\text{e}8?$ 13 $\text{f}3$ $\text{d}d7$ 14 0-0-0 $\text{d}d5$ 15 $\text{g}3$ $\text{d}e6$ 16 $\text{e}3$ $\text{d}ac5$ 17 $\text{cb}2$ \pm Piket-Rechel, Ostend 1990) 13 $\text{c}1$ $\text{h}6$! 14 $\text{h}4$ $\text{g}5$ 15 $\text{g}3$ $\text{d}xg4$ ∞ Dobosz-Kožul, Groningen 1994.

a2) 11 $\text{d}d3$! $\text{e}8$ 12 $\text{f}3$ $\text{d}h5$ 13 $\text{cf}2$ $\text{e}6$ (13... $\text{d}d4+$ 14 $\text{e}3$ $\text{d}g3$ 15 $\text{g}1$ $\text{xe}3+$ 16 $\text{xe}3$ $\text{e}6$ 17 $\text{b}3$ $\text{d}c7$ 18 $\text{cf}2$ \pm Lukov-Belkhodja, Issy les Moulineaux 1996 or 13... $\text{f}5$ 14 $\text{g}4$ $\text{xc}3$ 15 $\text{bxc}3$ $\text{fxe}4$ 16 $\text{gxh}5$ $\text{exd}3$ 17 $\text{h}xg6$ $\text{hxg}6$ 18 $\text{xd}3$ \pm Grivas-Z.Zahariev, Athens 1998) 14 $\text{g}4$ $\text{d}d4+$ 15 $\text{g}2$ $\text{d}g7$ 16 $\text{d}e2$ $\text{b}6$ 17 $\text{c}1$ $\text{d}c5$ 18 $\text{d}xc5$ $\text{xc}5$ 19 $\text{f}6$ \pm Lukov-Corona Garcia, Nigran 1994.

b) 10... $\text{e}8$!? 11 0-0-0! and now:

b1) 11... $\text{xe}5?$ 12 $\text{d}d8+$ $\text{e}8$ 13 $\text{xf}6$ gives White a clear extra pawn.


b2) 11... $\text{dxe}4?$ is not playable either: 12 $\text{dxe}4$ $\text{xe}5$ 13 $\text{f}4$ (13 $\text{f}6+$ $\text{xf}6$ 14 $\text{xf}6$ $\text{xf}5$ 15 $\text{f}3$ $\text{d}d7$ 16 $\text{c}3$ $\text{ad}8$ 17 $\text{g}4$ $\text{e}6$ 18 $\text{b}3$ \pm Sahitaj-M.Schmidt, Izmir 2004 is also possible) 13... $\text{f}5$ (13... $\text{xf}4+$ 14 $\text{xf}4$ $\text{xe}4$ 15 $\text{d}d8+$ $\text{g}7$ 16 $\text{xc}8$ $\text{xf}4$ 17 $\text{d}d3$ with the idea

♖e1-e8 +-) 14 ♘g3 h6 15 ♙xh6 ♖h7 16 ♗xf5 gxf5 17 ♙g5 f6 18 fxe5 fvg5 19 ♙d3 ♖xe5 20 ♖hf1 + Lukov-McKenna, Velden 1994.

b3) 11...♗bd7? 12 ♗xd7 ♗xd7 13 f3 ♙xc3 14 bxc3 ♗b6 15 h4 ♖g7 16 h5 f6 17 ♙e3 ♙e6 18 ♙e2 ♖ad8 19 ♖xd8 ♖xd8 20 hxg6 hxg6 21 c5 ♗d7 22 ♖c2 ± Grivas-Kanellopoulos, Greek Cht (Ermioni Argolidas) 2005.

b4) Black can look into 11...♖f8!? 12 ♗f3 ♗xe4 13 ♗xe4 ♖xe4 14 ♙d3 ± Dautov-I.Botvinnik, USSR 1986.

b5) 11...♗a6 12 ♗f3 (12 ♖d6!? ♙e6 13 ♙f4 ♗c5 14 f3 ♗h5 15 ♙h2 f5 16 ♗d3! {16 g4?! f4! ∞ Morović-Kožul, Calvia OL 2004} 16...♗xd3+ 17 ♙xd3 ±) 12...♗c5 (D) (12...h6 13 ♙e3 ♗xe4 14 ♗xe4 ♖xe4 15 ♖d8+ ♖h7 16 h4! ± Kekelidze-H.Hoffmann, Seefeld 1999).



White should be careful, as not all roads lead to Rome. It is best to return the pawn in exchange for positional advantages:


b51) 13 ♙d3 ♙e6 14 e5 ♗fd7 15 ♖he1 (15 ♙f4 ♗xd3+ 16 ♖xd3 ♗c5 17 ♙d2 ♖ad8 18 ♖hd1 ♖xd2 19 ♖xd2 ♙f5! is unclear, Lukov-B.Werner, Lyons 1995) 15...♗xd3+ 16 ♙xd3 ♗c5 (16...♙f5? 17 ♖de3 ♗c5 18 ♖d1 ± Lukov-Matthaei, Giessen 1994) 17 ♗d2 ♙xc4 =.

b52) 13 ♗d2 h6! (13...♗fd7? 14 f3 ♗e5 15 ♙e3 b6 16 ♖c2 ± Bronstein-D.Ledger, Hastings 1994/5) 14 ♙e3 ♗fxe4 15 ♗dx4 ♗xe4 16 ♗xe4 ♖xe4 17 ♖d8+ ♖h7 18 ♙d3 ♖e6 19 ♙e2 (19 ♙c2 ♙f6 20 ♖d2 ♖e8 21 h4 h5 22 ♙d4 ♙xd4 23 ♖xd4 ♙e6 24 b3 1/2-1/2 G.Mukhin-Shorokhov, St Petersburg 2003) 19...♙f6 20 ♖d2 ♖e8 21 ♙g4 ♖e4 22 ♙xc8 ♖xc4+ 23 ♖b1 ♖xc8 24 ♖d7 ♖b4 25 ♖xf7+ ♙g7 26 b3 = Markosian-Khasanova, Serpukhov 2003.

b53) 13 e5! ♗fd7 14 ♙e3 b6 (14...♗e6 15 ♗e4 ♗xe5 16 ♗xe5 ♙xe5 17 c5 b6 18 ♙c4

♗xc5 19 ♗xc5 bxc5 20 ♙xc5 ± Grivas-Miroshnichenko, Panormo rpd 2002) 15 ♙e2 ♗xe5 16 ♗xe5 ♙xe5 17 ♙f3 ♙f5 18 ♙xc6 ♗d3+ 19 ♖xd3 ♙xd3 20 ♙xa8 ♖xa8 21 c5! (21 ♖d1?! ♙xc4 22 ♙d4 ♙f4+ 23 ♖c2 h5 = Crouch-Arakhmia, Hastings 1991/2) 21...bxc5 22 ♙xc5 ±.

We now return to 10...h6! (D):



Black has scored heavily from this position, but this is probably due to lack of knowledge on White's part.

11 ♙xf6

Other moves:

a) 11 ♙e3?! ♗xe4 12 ♗xe4 ♙xe5 13 ♖d1 ♖xd1+ 14 ♖xd1 ♙xb2 15 ♙xh6 ♗a6 16 ♙g5 ♙e6 17 ♙e7 ♖g7 18 ♖c2 ♙d4 ♢ Stoisavljević-Todorović, Yugoslav Cht (Igalo) 1994.

b) 11 ♙h4 ♖e8 (11...♗a6!? 1/2-1/2 Cvetković-Kožul, Liechtenstein 1988) 12 0-0-0 ♗a6 13 ♗f3 ♗xe4 14 ♗xe4 ♖xe4 15 ♖d8+ ♖h7 16 g4 (16 ♙g5!? ♗c7 17 ♙e3 =) 16...♗c5 17 b3 a5 = Cvetković-Timoshenko, Vrnjačka Banja 1990.

c) 11 ♙f4 ♗a6! (11...♖e8?! 12 0-0-0 ♗a6 13 ♙h2 ♗c5 14 ♙d3 ♗h7 15 f4 ♗f8 16 ♙c2 ♙xe5 17 fxe5 ♗cd7 18 b4 ♗xe5 19 ♙b3 b6 20 ♖b2 ± Hradetzky-Polaczek, corr. 1986) 12 ♙e2 ♗c5 (12...♖e8 should be met by 13 0-0-0! ± instead of 13 ♖d1?! ♗c5 14 ♗d3 ♗cxe4 15 ♗xe4 ♗xe4 16 f3 ♗g5 17 ♖f2 ♗e6 ♢ Stulik-Hlavnicka, Pardubice 1992) 13 f3 (13 ♙f3?! ♙e6 14 0-0 ♗fd7 15 ♗xd7 ♖xd7 ♢ Keitlinghaus-Skembris, Dortmund 1990) 13...♗h5 14 ♙h2 g5! (14...♗e6 15 ♗d3 ♗d4 16 g4 ♗f6 17 ♖d1 {17 0-0-0!? ♙e6 18 b3 ± Lopez Colon-Schekachev, Las Palmas 1993} 17...b5 18 cxb5 cxb5 19 ♙e5 ♗xe2 20 ♖xe2 ♙e6 21 b3 ± Lukov-Gerber, Geneva 1993) 15 ♖d1 ♙e6 16

♖d3 ♜xd3+ 17 ♜xd3 ♜f4 18 ♙xf4 gxf4 with compensation, Keitlinghaus-Mainka, Dortmund 1990.

11...♙xf6 12 ♜f3

12 ♜g4 ♙xg4 13 hxg4 ♜a6 (13...♙xc3+ 14 bxc3 ♜g7 15 ♜d1 ♜d7 16 ♙d3 ♜c5 17 ♙c2 ♜e8 18 f3 ± Stoisavljević-Petrović, Herceg Novi 2000) 14 ♙e2 (14 ♜d1?! ♜b4! ♢ Vecek-H.Krüger, corr. 2001 or 14 f4?! ♙xc3+ 15 bxc3 ♜c5 16 e5 g5 ♢ Cvetković-Kožul, Novi Bečej 1986) 14...♜b4 15 ♜c1 ♙g5 16 ♜d1 ♙f6 17 ♜c1 ♙g5 18 ♜d1 ♙f6 19 ♜c1 1/2-1/2 Kasparian-Boleslavsky, USSR Ch (Leningrad) 1947.

12...♜a6 13 ♜d2


13 e5!? ♙h8 14 ♙e2 ♜c5 15 b4 ♜d3+ (15...♜d7!? 16 0-0-0 ♜e8 17 ♜e4 ♜xe5 18 ♜d6 ♜e7 19 ♜hel ±=) 16 ♙xd3 ♜xd3 17 ♜e4 ♙f5 18 ♜c5 ♜a3 19 ♜xb7 ♜b8 20 ♜d6 ♜xb4 21 ♜xf5 gxf5 22 0-0! (22 0-0-0? ♜xa2 23 c5 ♜b5 24 ♜hf1 ♜h7 25 ♜del f4 26 h4 a5 27 g3 a4 28 ♜d4 ♜bb2 0-1 Vedrunes-Goyvaerts, corr. 1995) and White can claim a small advantage thanks to his superior minor piece and Black's damaged pawn-structure, although the activity of the black rooks should not be underestimated.

13...♜c5 14 0-0-0 ♙e6

Doroshkevich-Loskutov, St Petersburg 1995. Black's compensation lies in the bishop-pair but still, White's extra pawn will be valuable in the endgame. Of course, things are far from easy for both sides and in my opinion White should continue with 15 ♜c2.

E)

9...♜bd7 10 0-0-0 ♜f8! (D)



The only way to avoid a knight fork on c7 and cover the e5-pawn.

11 ♜d5

This is the principled move. Instead, 11 ♙e3 c6 12 ♜d2 ♜e8 13 c5 ♙f8 14 ♜b3 b6 15 ♜d2 ♜h5! was about equal in Nesterov-Michelakis, Groningen 1993.


11...c6 12 ♜e7+

Not, of course, 12 ♜c7? ♜b8 and the white knight is in trouble.

12...♜h8 13 ♙e3!

The immediate 13 ♜xc8?! ♜axc8 (13...♜fxc8 14 ♙xf6 ♜xf6 15 ♜xe5 ♜xe4 16 ♜xf7+ ♜g8 17 ♜d6 ♜xf2 18 ♜xc8 ♜xc8 19 ♙e2 ♜xh1 1/2-1/2 Khuzman-Loginov, Sverdlovsk 1987) 14 ♙e3 (14 ♙d3 ♜c5 15 ♜hel h6 16 ♙h4 g5 17 ♙g3 ♜cd8 = Rist-Herz, Schussenried 1992) 14...♜fd8 15 ♙d3 ♙f8 16 ♙c2 ♜g8 17 ♜hel ♜e8 18 ♙e2 ♙c5 was equal in L.Santos-C.Santos, Portugal 1999.

13...♜e8 14 ♜xc8 (D)



Black has tried both recaptures:

E1: 14...♜exc8 159

E2: 14...♜axc8 160

E1)

14...♜exc8 15 c5!

White gains little from 15 ♙d3 ♙f8 16 ♙c2 ♜e8 17 ♜hel a5 = Sommerbauer-Sinowjew, Austrian Ch (Voitsberg) 1995 but he can play 15 ♜d2 ♙f8 16 ♜b3! ± (rather than 16 ♙e2?! ♜c5 17 f3 ♜e6 18 ♜b3 a5 = J.Přibyl-Ankerst, Prague 1992).

15...♙f8 16 b4 ♜g7

Not 16...a5?! 17 ♜g5! ♜g7 18 ♙c4 ±.

17 ♙c4 ♜e8 18 g4!


White lost his advantage in Lukov-Boix Moreno, La Pobra de Lillet 1996 after 18 ♜d3?! b5 19 ♙b3 a5!.

18...♞e7 19 ♖d2

White has a small advantage.

E2)

14...♞axc8 (D)



15 c5

15 ♖d2?! should be avoided: 15...a5! (better than 15...♙f8?! 16 ♖b3 ♞c7 17 f3 ♖h5 18 c5 ♖f4 19 ♞d2! ♖e6 20 ♞c2 ± Grivas-Poldauf, Panormo ECC 2001) 16 ♙d3 ♙f8 17 ♖b1 a4 18 f3 ♖g7 19 ♖f1 a3 20 b3 ♞e8 = Kyle-Hillarp Persson, Stockholm 1994/5.

On the other hand, a promising line runs 15 g4!? ♞c7 (15...h6?! 16 g5! hxg5 17 ♖xg5 ♖g8 18 c5 ±) 16 ♖d2 ♙f8 17 g5 ♖h5 18 ♖b3 ♖f4 19 h4! ± In my opinion, this untested possibility deserves serious attention.

15...♙f8

Black must force the b4 advance. He should avoid 15...a5? 16 ♙c4 ♖g8 17 ♞d3 ♖f8 18 ♖d2 ± Nepustil-Pletanek, corr. 1986, but possible is 15...b5 16 cxb6 (16 g4!?) 16...axb6 17 ♖d2 ♞c7 18 g4 b5 19 f3 ♖f8 20 h4 ♖e6 21 h5 g5 22 ♖b3 ± J.Rogers-Krakops, Ringsted jr 1992.

16 b4 a5

Or 16...b6 17 ♙c4 ♖g7 18 g4 ♞e7 19 ♖d2 bxc5 20 bxc5 ± Arkhipov-Watson, Moscow 1985.

17 ♙c4

17 g4?! ♞c7 18 ♖g5 ♖g7 19 ♙c4 ♖b8 20 f4 axb4 21 ♞hf1 h6 22 fxe5 hxg5 23 ♞xf6 ♖a6 24 ♞df1 ♙xc5 25 ♞xf7+ ♞xf7 26 ♞xf7+ ♖h6 was unclear in Berube-Pineault, Canada 1985.


17...♖g7

And obviously not 17...axb4? 18 ♖g5! ±
18 a3 axb4 19 axb4 ♞a8 20 ♙b3!

White can claim a small advantage thanks to his bishop-pair. Of course, Black is not without chances either, with threats like ...b6 always in the air. Note though that White also has at his disposal an interesting alternative on the 15th move.

F)

9...♞e8 10 ♖d5! ♖xd5 11 cxd5 (D)



This is one of the most popular lines for Black, who usually avoids the complicated battle that might arise from the alternatives. This line appears safe for Black, but still White can pose him some problems.

11...c6

Black cannot afford to be left with a weak c7-pawn. For example: 11...f6?! 12 ♙e3 ♙f8 13 ♙c4 ♙d6 (13...♖g7 14 ♞c1 c6 15 0-0 b5 16 ♙e2 cxd5 17 ♙xb5 ♙d7 18 ♙xd7 ♖xd7 19 ♞c7 ♞ed8 20 exd5 ± Barre-Libersan, Montreal 2004) 14 0-0 ♙d7 15 ♖d2 a5 16 ♞ac1 ♖a6 17 ♞fd1 ♖g7 18 ♙e2 ± Lukov-de Paola Schettino, Villalba 1996.

12 ♙c4 cxd5

The main alternative is 12...b5 13 ♙b3 (13 ♙d3?! a6 14 dxc6 ♖xc6 15 ♞c1 ♙b7 = Rocabado-Quattordio, San Jorge 1993), and now:


a) 13...a5 14 a3 (14 a4!? b4 15 ♞c1 ♙b7 16 dxc6 ♖xc6 17 0-0 ♞ec8 18 ♙e3 h6 and here White should play 19 ♙d5! ± instead of 19 ♞fd1?! ♖d4! = Marczukiewicz-Mossin, Brno deaf Wcht 1994) 14...a4 (14...♙b7 15 ♞d1 c5?! 16 a4! b4 17 ♖d2 h6 18 ♙e3 ♖d7 19 ♙c4 ± Kersting-Schiffer, Hessen 1999) 15 ♙a2 c5 16 0-0 ♖d7 17 ♞ad1 ♙f8 18 ♙b1 ♞b8 19 ♙c2 ♙d6 20 ♖d2 ♙a6 21 ♞fel ♖b6 22 ♙e3 ± J.Přibyl-Held, Schwäbisch Gmünd 1995.

b) 13...♟b7 and here:

b1) 14 0-0-0?! a5 15 dxc6 ♟xc6 16 ♟d5 ♟c8 (16...♟a7 17 ♟e3 ♟c7 18 ♟b1 a4 19 ♟xc6 ♟xc6 20 ♟c1 ♟ec8 21 ♟hd1 f6 22 ♟d6 ♟b4 23 ♟xc7 ♟xc7 24 ♟b6 ± V.Ivanov-Gutov, Moscow 1996) 17 ♟b1 ♟a6 18 ♟e3 ♟b4 19 ♟xc6 ♟xc6! (19...♟xc6 20 ♟d7 ♟d8 21 ♟b7 ♟ab8 22 ♟xb8 ♟xb8 23 ♟c1 ♟c8 24 ♟c5 b4 25 b3 ± M.Přibyl-Fabiano, Prague 1990) 20 ♟c1 ♟xc1+ 21 ♟xc1 f5 22 ♟c5 ♟d8 23 a3 ♟d1+ 24 ♟c1 ♟xc1+ 25 ♟xc1 ♟d3 26 ♟e3 ♟f6 = Suran-Stryjecki, Czech Cht 1999/00.

b2) 14 ♟c1 ♟c8! (14...h6 15 ♟e3 only helps White, as in Polajzer-Nickl, St Ingbert 1988, and 14...a5?! 15 a4 ♟c8 16 0-0 ♟d7 17 dxc6 ♟xc6 18 ♟fd1! ± M. Vokač-Zvara, Prague 1991 is unacceptable) 15 0-0 ♟d7 16 dxc6 ♟xc6 17 ♟fd1 ♟b6 18 ♟e3 h6 19 ♟c5! (19 ♟d2?! ♟b7 = Kipper-Grube, Ruhrgebiet 1998) 19...♟xe4 20 ♟xb5 ±. White's pieces seem to be better placed.

13 ♟xd5 (D)



This is the standard position of this line. Note that in comparison with the Classical Exchange Variation, here White has an extra tempo, the move h3, which covers the important g4-square, not allowing ...♟g4 or ...♟g4 in several variations. Still, it is not easy at all for White to prove an advantage.

13...♟d7!

This is the best line for Black. Other moves:

a) 13...♟c6?! 14 ♟e2! (14 0-0 ♟e6 15 ♟ac1 ♟xd5 16 exd5 ♟b4 17 d6 f6 18 ♟d2 ♟c6 = Crouch-Britton, Sheffield 1996) and then:

a1) 14...♟b4 15 ♟c4 ♟e6 16 ♟hc1 ♟c6 (16...♟xc4+ 17 ♟xc4 ♟c6 18 ♟d1 f6 19 ♟e3 ♟ed8 20 ♟dcl ♟f8 21 a3 ♟d7 22 b4 ± Nestorov-Zaw Winlay, Asian Cht (Kuala Lumpur

1993) 17 ♟e3 f6 18 ♟d2 ♟f7 19 ♟b5! ♟ec8 20 ♟xc6 ♟xc6 21 ♟xc6 bxc6 22 b3 a5 23 ♟c1 ♟a6 24 a4! ± Grivas-Mastrokoukos, Athens 2001 – see Typical Endgames.

a2) 14...♟e6 15 ♟xe6 ♟xe6 16 ♟hd1 (16 ♟e3 ♟d8 17 ♟hd1 ♟ed6 18 ♟xd6 ♟xd6 19 ♟d2 ♟d7 = Marczukiewicz-Zuev, Brno deaf Wcht 1994) 16...h6 (16...f6 17 ♟e3 ♟f7 18 ♟d5 ♟f8 19 ♟ad1 ♟e8 20 a3 ♟c8 21 g4 ± Keitlinghaus-Zwicker, Porz 1989) 17 ♟e3 f5 18 ♟d7 b6 19 ♟c1 ♟f8 20 ♟c7 ♟d4+ 21 ♟e1 ♟xf3+ 22 gx f3 ♟f7 23 b4 ± Keitlinghaus-D.Janošević, Dortmund 1987.

b) 13...♟a6 14 0-0-0 (14 ♟e2 ♟c7 15 ♟b3 ♟e6 16 ♟hc1 ♟xb3 17 axb3 ♟b5 18 ♟c5 a6 19 ♟d1 f6 20 ♟e3 ♟ad8 21 ♟cd5 ♟xd5 22 ♟xd5 1/2-1/2 Grivas-Kr.Georgiev, Balkaniad (Kavala) 1990) and then:


b1) 14...♟b4?! 15 ♟b3 ♟e6 16 ♟xe6 ♟xe6 17 ♟b1 ♟a6 18 ♟e3 ♟f8 (18...f5 19 ♟d5 b6 20 g4 f4 21 ♟d2 ♟ae8 22 ♟c1 ± Lukov-Apicella, Monte Carlo 1999) 19 ♟d7 (19 ♟d5!? f6 20 ♟hd1 b6 21 a3 ♟c5 22 ♟h6 ♟f7 23 b4! ♟xf2? 24 ♟f1 1-0 B.Popov-Selling, e-mail 2000) 19...♟c5 20 ♟xc5 ♟xc5 21 ♟xb7 ♟xf2 22 ♟d1 ♟b6 23 ♟xb6 ♟xb6 24 ♟xe5 ♟e8 25 ♟d7 ♟d8 26 ♟d4 ± Lukov-Hamdouchi, Cannes 1999.

b2) 14...♟c7 15 ♟b3 ♟e6 16 ♟d3 (16 ♟xe6 ♟xe6 17 ♟e3 f5 18 ♟b1 b6 19 h4 1/2-1/2 Morović-Radjabov, Calvia OL 2004) 16...♟xb3 17 ♟xb3 ♟e6 18 ♟e3 ♟ac8+ 19 ♟b1 b6 20 ♟d1 ♟cd8 21 ♟xd8 ♟xd8 22 ♟c2 ± J.Přibyl-Jansa, Prague 2001.

14 ♟d2

14 0-0 h6 1/2-1/2 Arbakov-Kaiumov, Alushta 2002 or 14 ♟c1?! h6 15 ♟e3 ♟f6 16 ♟b3 ♟xe4 17 ♟c7 ♟e6 18 ♟xe6 ♟xe6 19 ♟xb7 ♟a6 ♣ Verat-Borzakian, Paris 2004.

14...♟c5 (D)



15 ♖c4!?

This is a position very similar to the Classical Exchange Variation. The only difference is the placement of the white pawn on h3. In some variations this is quite important, while in some others it is not a big deal. As many of them are therefore relevant, I shall henceforth cite several games where instead of 6 h3 White had played 6 ♖e2. From the game references that follow, only Grivas-Kantsler, Panormo rpd 2001, Grivas-Gullaksen, Hampstead 1998 and J.Andreasen-Gullaksen, Torshavn 2003 started with 6 h3. All the other games came from 6 ♖e2. I have pointed out the cases where the inclusion of 6 h3 makes an important difference.

It should be mentioned that after any other try Black can equalize:

a) 15 0-0-0 and then:

1) 15...♗e6 16 ♖e3 ♗f4 (16...♗c7 17 ♖b3 ♖e6 18 ♖xe6 ♗xe6 and now I recommend 19 ♖b1! ± with the idea ♖c1 and ♗c4; this is an improvement over 19 ♗b3 b6 20 ♗d7 f5 21 ♗hd1 ♖ac8+ 22 ♖b1 ♗ed8 23 f3 ♖f8 24 ♖xd8+ ♖xd8 25 ♖xd8+ ♗xd8 26 ♖c2 ♖e7 1/2-1/2 Puntunet Roca-Seris Granier Gonzales, e-mail 2002) 17 ♖xf4 exf4 18 ♗b3! ♖b8 (18...♖e6 19 ♖xb7 ♖ab8 20 ♖d5 ♖xd5 21 ♖xd5! {21 exd5 ♖e2 22 ♗d2 ♖xd2 23 ♖xd2 ♗d8 =}) 21...♖xe4 22 ♗hd1 ± or 18...♖e7 19 f3 ♖e6 20 ♖b1 ♖c8 21 ♖c1! ♖xc1+ 22 ♖xc1 b6 23 ♖xe6 fxe6 24 ♖c8+ ♖f7 25 a4! ±) 19 f3 ♖e6 20 ♖xe6 ♖xe6 21 ♗d2 ±

2) 15...♗d3+ 16 ♖b1 ♖e6 (16...♗xf2? 17 ♗hf1 ±) 17 ♖xe6 ♖xe6 18 ♖e3 ± Grivas-Kantsler, Panormo rpd 2001.

3) 15...♖e6! 16 ♖xe6 ♗xe6! (16...♖xe6 17 ♖e3 ♖c6 18 ♖b1 ♖ac8 19 ♖c1 b6 20 ♗hd1 ♖f8 21 f3 ♗e6 22 ♖xc6 ♖xc6 23 ♗b3 ♖d6 24 ♗d5 ♖f8 25 a4 ± Grivas-Gullaksen, Hampstead 1998; White instead a5, creating a new weakness on b6) 17 ♖e3 ♗f4! 18 ♖xf4 exf4 19 ♗he1 ♖ac8+ 20 ♖b1 ♖cd8 21 f3 f5 = D.Berg-Stoerber, Germany 1987.

b) 15 ♖e2 ♗e6! (almost forced, as 15...♖e6?! 16 ♖ac1! ♖ac8 {16...♖xd5 17 exd5 b6 18 b4 ±} 17 b4 ± is not satisfactory for Black) 16 ♖e3 ♗f4+ 17 ♖xf4 exf4 and now:

b1) Black is fine after 18 ♖f3 ♖e6 19 ♗c4 (19 ♗hd1 ♖ac8 20 ♖ac1 ♖xb2 21 ♖xc8 ♖xc8 22 ♖xe6 fxe6 = J.Andreasen-Gullaksen, Torshavn 2003) 19...♖xd5 20 exd5 and then:


b11) 20...♖ad8 21 ♗hd1 f5 22 ♖ac1 ± Uz-nanski-Marusiak, corr. 1990. Here the extra move h3 is important as Black doesn't have easy counterplay with ...g5-g4+.

b12) 20...♖ec8 21 ♖ac1 ♖c5 22 d6 ♗d8 (22...♖ac8 23 d7 ♗d8 24 ♗he1 ♖f6 {24...♖xd7? 25 ♖e8+ ♖f8 26 ♗e5! +-} 25 ♗d6! ♖xc1 26 ♖xc1 ♖xd7 27 ♖c8+ ♗d8 28 ♖xd8+ ♖xd8 29 ♗xb7 ±) 23 b4 ♖cc8 24 ♗a5 ♖xc1 25 ♖xc1 ♖xd6 26 ♗xb7 ±.

b13) The best try is 20...♗ed8! 21 ♗ad1 ♖ac8.

b2) 18 ♖ac1 ♖xb2! (White can claim the advantage after 18...♖e6?! 19 ♖xb7 ♖ab8 20 ♖c6 ♖xb2 21 ♖xe8 ♖xc1 22 ♖xf7+ ♖xf7 23 ♖xc1 ♖xa2 24 ♖a1 ♖f7 {24...♖b2 25 ♖d3} 25 ♖xa7) 19 ♖c7 ♖e6 20 ♖f3! (20 ♖xe6 ♖xe6 21 ♖b1 ♖e5 22 ♖xc7 ♖a6! was not much in Yanin-Schekavadze, Novgorod 1998) 20...♖xd5 21 exd5 ♗ed8! 22 ♗c4 ♖d4 23 d6 b5 24 ♗d1 ♖c3! 25 ♗b6 axb6 26 ♖xc3 ♖xa2 27 ♖c6 with equality.

We now return to 15 ♗c4!? (D):



Black can now play:

F1: 15...♖e6 162

F2: 15...♖f8 163

F1)

15...♖e6 16 ♗d6 ♖eb8

16...♖xd5?! is not viable: 17 exd5 (17 ♗xe8 ♖xe4 {17...♗xe4 18 ♗c7 ♗xg5 19 ♗xd5! ±} 18 ♗xg7 ♖xg7 19 0-0 ±) 17...♖eb8 18 ♖e2 ♖f8 19 ♗c4 b6 20 ♗hd1 ± Markov-Hebden, Isle of Man 1996.

17 ♗d1!?

This is an interesting continuation. Alternatively, 17 0-0-0 and now:

a) 17...f6?! 18 e3 xd5 19 xd5 e6 20 hdl (20 b1 b5? 21 xb5 b7 22 d6 1-0 Secula-Struhar, corr. 1990) 20...f8 21 b1 c7 22 f5d2 b6 23 c1 e6 24 b5 c5 25 xc5 bxc5 and now 26 c3 ± is an improvement over 26 d6?! xb5 27 xe6 d8 28 xf6 ± Karavade-A.Tzermiadianos, Olomouc 2004.

b) 17...f8 18 xe6 xe6 19 e3 (19 f6 g7 20 xg7 xg7 21 b1 b5 {21...f6 22 g3 ± Svirin-A.Krylov, Podolsk 1993} 22 d5 b6 23 hdl d8 24 xf7 xd5 25 exd5 xf7 26 dxe6+ xe6 27 f3 ± Svirin-Ozgebcev, Smolensk 2000) 19...b5 20 b1 a5 21 d2 a6 22 hdl e7 23 g3 c7 24 f4 exf4 25 gxf4 c6 26 e5 ± Jakob-M.Marković, Switzerland 1994.

17...xd5 18 xd5 e6 19 e3 f4 20 xf4 exf4 21 e2

White has a slight advantage, Kolander-Enigk, Germany 1995.


F2)

15...f8 16 d1 (D)

Black has fewer problems after:

a) 16 0-0-0 e6 17 b1 ac8 (17...xe4 18 xe4 xc4 19 xb7 ab8 20 d5 b4 21 e3 ± M.Meyer-Bravo Lutz, Germany 2000) 18 he1 xd5 (18...g7!?, Nava Baro-Peto, e-mail 2002) 19 exd5 d7 20 c1 b4 21 ed1 b5 22 d2 f5 23 b3 xc1+ 24 xc1 b6 25 a3 e7 26 xe7 xe7 = Nava Biro-H.Ivanov, e-mail 2002.

b) 16 0-0 e6 17 xe6 xe6 18 f3 b5! (18...c8 19 b3 d3 20 fd1 b4 21 f1 = Chole-Thipsay, India 1996) 19 e3 h6 20 h4 d3 21 d5 c8 22 b3 c2 23 fd1 b4 = Acebal Muniz-Gallagher, Candas 1992.



16...e6

The alternative is 16...e6 17 f6 f4 (or 17...b4+ 18 f1 f4 19 a3 e7 20 xe5 xd5 21 exd5 xa3 22 g3 f8 23 c7 d7 24 d6 b5 25 e3 ± Netusil-Illetsko, Prague 2002) 18 0-0 xd5 19 exd5 e4 20 fe1! b5 (20...f5? 21 d6 b5 22 e3 d7 23 d5 ±) 21 e5 g7 22 xg7 xg7 23 d3! ±.

17 f3 ac8 18 b3!?

This is definitely better than 18 e3 a4 (18...h6!? 19 h4 {19 f6!?!} 19...a4, Cuesta Navarro-Ferrer Vinas, Cordoba 1995) 19 e2 (19 xb7 b8 20 d5 xd5 21 xd5 xb2 22 d2 b6 23 b3 d8 24 f1 c5 ± Schuster-Vassia, corr. 2002) 19...xb2 20 b1 a3 21 xb7 c7 22 d5 c8 23 b3 a6+ 24 f2 ∞ Brglez-Rotariu, Yugoslavia 1979. The problem White had in all these games is that Black could attack the b-pawn.

18...b5

Maybe 18...xd5 19 xd5 (19 exd5?! e4!) 19...b5 20 d6 xd6 21 xd6 e6 22 e3 c2 (22...d4 23 0-0 ed8 24 xd8+ xd8 25 f2 c8 26 c1 ±) 23 d2 ec8 24 e2 ± is an alternative of equal merit.

19 e3 d7 20 0-0

This is my suggestion. Although White had a slight advantage in Sodomski-Krzyzanowski, Poland 2000 after 20 h4!? h6 21 f6 a5 22 h5 g5 23 g3 b8 24 g4 g7 25 0-0 bc8 26 xg7 xg7 27 e3 c7 28 f2 ec8 29 fd2 f8 30 g2, I am sure that Black can improve.

20...e6

This move looks best. Now White can continue with 21 xe6 (21 g4 c5+ 22 h1 dxg5 23 f6+ g7 24 dx7 e3 25 d3 f4 26 b4 e6 =) 21...xe6 22 d5 xd5 23 xd5, retaining a slight advantage.

G)

9...a6


This line can also arise via the move-order 6...a6 7 g5 e5 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 xd8 xd8.

10 d5 d6 11 xf6 xf6 12 c1!?

(D) A new idea, stemming from Skembris. White wants to gain more space on the queenside.

12...d8

The logical continuation. A blunder would be 12...c5? 13 dxc7 b8 14 b5 a6 15 c3 ± Araz-Tabet, Beirut 2000 or 12...c6? 13



dxf6+! (after $13 \text{ c5?! } \text{fxd5! } 14 \text{ exd5 cxd5 } 15 \text{ exa6 bxa6}$ Black seems to have sufficient compensation for the exchange) $13... \text{exf6 } 14 \text{ c5! } \text{Ne6}$ ($14... \text{dxc7?! } 15 \text{ dxe5! } \text{Ne6 } 16 \text{ f4 f6 } 17 \text{ xc4 fxe5 } 18 \text{ f5 } \pm$) $15 \text{ exa6 bxa6 } 16 \text{ d2 } \pm$ but possible is $12... \text{c5!?}$ ($1/2-1/2$ Nesterov-W.Schmidt, Katowice 1991) $13 \text{ a3 } \text{d8! } 14 \text{ d3 } \pm$.

13 c5 Ne6 14 a3 c6

Black can also play $14... \text{c6g7 } 15 \text{ d3e3!}$ ($15 \text{ h4?! } \text{c6 } 16 \text{ exa6 cxd5 } 17 \text{ d3 dxe4 } 18 \text{ exe4 f5 } 19 \text{ d5 } \text{Ne7} \infty$ Grivas-Ilinčić, Varna 1994) $15... \text{dxb8 } 16 \text{ xc4 } \text{Ne8 } 17 \text{ 0-0 } \pm$.

15 exa6

White didn't get anything after 15 d3e3 b5 (or $15... \text{b6 } 16 \text{ cxb6 axb6 } 17 \text{ xc4 } \text{Ne8 } 18 \text{ exa6 exa6 } 19 \text{ fxc6 } \text{db7 } 20 \text{ Nc4 } 1/2-1/2$ Grivas Mozetić, Karditsa 1994) 16 h4 ($16 \text{ e2 } \text{Ne8 } 17 \text{ 0-0 f6 } 18 \text{ ffd1 } \text{e7 } 19 \text{ b4 } \text{d7} =$ Lukov-Gallego Jimenez, Villalba 1996) $16... \text{c6g7 } 17 \text{ g3 } \text{Ne8 } 18 \text{ dh3 } \text{exh3 } 19 \text{ ffxh3 f6 } 20 \text{ h5 } \text{e7 } 21 \text{ b4 } \text{d7} =$ in Grivas-Boshku, Athens 1993.

15...cxd5

$15... \text{bxa6?!}$ seems worse: $16 \text{ d3e3 } \text{Nb8 } 17 \text{ d4c4 a5 } 18 \text{ 0-0 } \text{a6 } 19 \text{ ffd1 } \text{exc4 } 20 \text{ fxc4 f6 } 21 \text{ d1e1 } \text{cf7 } 22 \text{ cf1 } \text{c7 } 23 \text{ d7+ } \text{Ne7 } 24 \text{ Nxe7+ } \text{Nxe7 } 25 \text{ d3d3 } \pm \pm$ Grivas-Pappas, Athens 2000.

16 d3 Ne7?!

White achieved a slight but pleasant advantage after $16... \text{dxe4 } 17 \text{ exe4 } \text{Ne7 } 18 \text{ 0-0 f5 } 19 \text{ ffd1 } \text{c7 } 20 \text{ d5+ } \text{c6g7 } 21 \text{ d2 } \text{Nb8 } 22 \text{ d4c4 } \text{cf6 } 23 \text{ d2e4 } 24 \text{ dcd1 } \text{f4 } 25 \text{ d4}$ in Grivas-A.Tzermiadianos, Korinthos 1997. Also, after $16... \text{d4 } 17 \text{ xc4 } \text{Ne7 } 18 \text{ d5 } \text{Nb8 } 19 \text{ d2}$ (with the idea d4-d6) White retains pressure and the closed character of the position does not suit Black's bishop-pair.

17 0-0 f5 18 ffd1 cf8!?

Or:


a) $18... \text{dxe4 } 19 \text{ exe4}$ transposes to the previous note.

b) $18... \text{d7?!}$ is risky: $19 \text{ exd5 e4 } 20 \text{ xc4!}$ ($20 \text{ c6? } \text{bxc6 } 21 \text{ xc4 } \text{cf8 } 22 \text{ dxc6 } \text{exc6 } 23 \text{ d4d4 } \text{d7 } 24 \text{ d5d5 } \text{Nb8 } 25 \text{ d2c6 } \text{exc6 } 26 \text{ xc6c6 } \text{a5 } 27 \text{ b4 axb4 } 28 \text{ axb4 } \text{db6}$ is equal, Kapnisis-Kotronias, Athens 2004) $20... \text{exf3 } 21 \text{ c6 bxc6}$ ($21... \text{c6g7 } 22 \text{ d6! } \pm$ or $21... \text{exc6? } 22 \text{ dxc6+ } \text{c6g7 } 23 \text{ cxb7 } \text{fxb7 } 24 \text{ d5 } \text{---}$) $22 \text{ dxc6+ } \text{xe6}$ ($22... \text{c6g7 } 23 \text{ cxd7 } \pm$) $23 \text{ exe6+ } \text{fxc6 } 24 \text{ c7 } \text{exc7 } 25 \text{ fxc7 } \pm$.

c) $18... \text{fxe4 } 19 \text{ exe4 d4 } 20 \text{ e1 } \pm \pm$.

19 exd5 e4 20 d6 Ng7!

Very precise, as after $20... \text{d7?! } 21 \text{ e2! } \text{exf3 } 22 \text{ exf3 (D)}$ we reach the following position.



White has two dangerous pawns and better-placed pieces as compensation for the piece. The main threats are b4-b5 and c6 , winning on the spot, and Nc4-b4 , pressurizing the b7 -pawn. There is no direct continuation enabling us to attach a clear-cut evaluation to the position, but the general feeling is that White is doing well. Here is some sample analysis: $22... \text{g5 } 23 \text{ Nc4 } \text{Ng7}$ ($23... \text{Nd8 } 24 \text{ Nb4 } \text{Nd7 } 25 \text{ c6 bxc6 } 26 \text{ exc6 a5 } 27 \text{ Nb6 } \text{Naa7 } 28 \text{ Nb8 } \text{Nd8 } 29 \text{ d7 } \pm$) $24 \text{ Nb4 a5 } 25 \text{ Nb6 } \text{d8 } 26 \text{ Nb5 a4 } 27 \text{ Nb4 } \text{df6}$ ($27... \text{g5 } 28 \text{ ddd4 } \pm$) $28 \text{ c6 bxc6 } 29 \text{ exc6 } \text{Na6 } 30 \text{ exa4 } \pm$ gives White the advantage.

21 db5

Now it is not possible to continue with $21 \text{ e2? } \text{exf3 } 22 \text{ exf3 } \text{xe6!}$; Black is on top as White has no time for b4-b5 ($23 \text{ b4 } \text{g5!}$).

21...exf3 22 d7 exd7 23 exd7

White has achieved a tiny advantage.

The Exchange Variation is not a terribly dangerous weapon, but a well-prepared opponent

is a hard nut to crack anyway, in any opening. Still, the reader must keep in mind that Black must display extremely good understanding and knowledge to survive White's various possibilities and positional threats.


5.7 7 d5: Introduction and 7...h5

1 d4 f6 2 c4 g6 3 c3 g7 4 e4 d6 5 f3 0-0 6 h3 e5

If Black does not want to play the Modern Benoni with 6...c5 or the systems analysed in Sections 5.4 and 5.5, then he has no other option. 6...c6?! is not good; e.g., 7 d5 b4 8 g5 c6 9 e2 d7 10 0-0 a6 11 e1 e8 12 f1 c8 13 d2 cxd5 14 exd5 c5 15 d4 a5 16 b3 b4 17 dxc5 xc5 18 e3 a5 19 a3 e6 20 b4 c7 21 dxe6 fxe6 22 aac1 b6 23 eed1 f8 24 f4 e5 25 g5 h5 26 d5 b7 27 g4 g7 28 g2 h8 29 f6 c7 30 c5 e6 31 cxb6 1-0 Grivas-Prié, Budapest 1993.

7 d5 (D)

7 dxe5 is of course the Exchange Variation, analysed in Section 5.6.



This is the standard position of the h3 system, where Black must make a major decision. The main moves are considered as follows:

7...h5 – this section (5.7)

7...e8 – Section 5.8

7...a6 – Section 5.9

Lines with ...a5 and ...c5 – Section 5.10


Note that the positions covered in Section 5.10 can arise from various move-orders.

7...h5

There is one other move to be considered here, 7...c6, which is related to the lines covered in Line D of Section 5.4: 8 g5 h6 9 e3 cxd5 10 cxd5 b7 11 e2 a6 12 d2 e8 (12...b5 13 b4 b6 14 a4 ±) 13 0-0 f5 14 exf5 gxf5 15 f4! exf4 (15...e4 16 b3 ±) 16 fxf4 (16 fxf4 ±) 16...b6+! (16...d5 17 b3 h8 (17...g6! 18 e3 f6 ±) 18 d2 f6 19 a4 ± Beliavsky-D.Paunović, Čačak 1996) 17 h1 xb2 18 f3 b6 (18...xc3 19 b1 xa2 20 xc3 with a strong attack) 19 g3 h7 20 c4 (20 h5? d4! {20...ddf6?! 21 g6+ h8 22 xe8 xe8 23 xh6 xh6 24 h5 +-}) 21 f1 b5 ♡) 20...c7 21 c1 with compensation.

With the text-move, Black main idea is to achieve ...f5 as quickly as possible; in some lines ...f4 also comes into consideration. White has to be careful in order to secure the advantage.

8 h2! (D)



8...e8

This is Black's most frequent choice. Not all alternatives are worse (with the obvious exceptions of 'a' and 'b') and should not be underestimated:

a) 8...c5?! 9 e2 (9 g3 a6 10 a4 b6 11 e2 f6 12 g4 gives White a slight advantage, Kunin-Moiseev, Ufa 1996) 9...f4?! (9...df6 ±) 10 f3 f5 11 h4 d7 12 g3 h5 13 exf5 ± Kavalek-Yopez, Caracas 1970.

b) 8...f6?! 9 e2 g7 (9...df4 10 f3 and h4) 10 h4 xh4 11 d2 h5 12 h6 e7 13 g4 g5 14 gxh5 f6 (14...f5 15 d2! f4 16 0-0 ± Larsen-Kavalek, Solingen 1970) 15 g6 e8 16 g4 ±.

c) 8...a6 9 g3 and now:

c1) 9...e8?! 10 e2 f5 11 exf5 f6 12 fxg6 xg6 13 df3 c5 and then:

c11) 14 ♖e3 ♜f4 15 ♚c2! (15 ♜xe4?! ♚xe4 16 ♚h2 b5! {16...♚g6?! 17 ♚d2 ± Krasenkow-Xie Jun, Shanghai 2000}) 17 ♜g5 ♚g6 18 cxb5 e4 ∞ 15...♜xc3 16 ♚xg6 hxg6 17 bxc3 ±.

c12) 14 ♜h4! ♚f7 15 ♖e3 ±.


c2) 9...♜c5 10 b4 ♜a6 11 ♚bl!? (alternatively, White can also try 11 a3 f5 12 ♖e2 ♜f6 13 h4!? c6 14 h5 cxd5 15 cxd5 ♖d7 16 hxg6 hxg6 17 ♖g5 ± Vilela-Bass, Alcobendas 1994) 11...f5 (11...c6 12 ♖e2 ♜f6 13 ♜g4! ±) and now:

c21) 12 ♖g2 ♜f6 (12...f4!? 13 g4 f3 14 ♜xf3 ♜f4 15 ♖xf4 ♚xf4 16 ♜e2 gives White more than enough compensation and thus a small advantage) 13 0-0 f4 (13...fxe4 14 ♖g5 ± or 13...♜xe4 14 ♜xe4 fxe4 15 h4 ♖f5 16 ♖g5! ♖f6 17 ♖e3 ±) 14 ♖a3 ±.

c22) 12 exf5 e4!? (12...♖xf5 13 ♚b3 ♚f6 14 ♖e3! ♜f4!? 15 h4 {15 ♜b5?! ♜hx3 16 ♚d2 ♚ae8 ∞ Ivanchuk-Ponomarev, Shenyang 2000}) 15...♚ae8 16 ♜b5! ±) 13 ♜e2! gxf5 (13...e3 14 ♖xe3 ♖xf5 15 ♚b3 ± or 13...♖xf5 14 ♖e3 ±) 14 ♖g2 c5 15 dxc6 (15 a3! is more to my taste) 15...bxc6 16 0-0 ±.

c3) 9...c6 10 ♖e2 ♜f6 11 ♜g4 (11 h4!? ♜c5 12 ♖f3 ± or 11 g4 cxd5 12 cxd5 ♜c5 13 ♚c2 ♖d7 14 b4 ♜a6 15 a3 ♚c8 16 ♖d2 ± Liang Chong-Wang Pin, Beijing 2001) 11...♜c5 12 ♜xf6+ ♚xf6 13 b4 ♜a6 14 a3 ♜c7 15 h4 ♚e7 16 h5 is slightly better for White, Kosyrev-Ulko, St Petersburg 2001.

d) 8...a5 9 g3 ♜a6 10 ♖e2 (D) and now:



d1) 10...♜f6 11 ♜g4 (11 g4!? ♜c5 12 ♚c2 ♜e8 13 ♖e3 f5 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 0-0-0 ♜xe4 16 ♜xe4 fxe4 17 ♚dgl ♖f5 18 ♖g4 ± Hutters-Presescu, Kitchener 2003) 11...♜c5 12 ♜xf6+ ♖xf6 13 h4 h5 14 ♖e3 ♜g7 15 ♚d2 ♚h8 16


0-0-0 a4 17 f4 ± Krasenkow-P.Cramling, Stockholm 1994.

d2) 10...♜c5! (this pawn sacrifice is aimed at seizing the initiative after 11 ♖xh5 gxh5 12 ♚xh5?! f5! and this actually appears promising) 11 ♖xh5 (two alternatives seem quite interesting and should receive more attention: 11 ♖g4!? ♜f6 12 ♖g5 h6 13 ♖xf6 ♚xf6 14 ♖xc8 ♚axc8 15 h4 h5 16 ♚e2 ♚e7 17 0-0-0 ± Barsov-Maiwald, Purmerend 1993 and 11 ♜g4!? ♜h8 12 ♜e3 ♜f6 13 ♚c2 c6 14 g4 ± Kempinski-Grabarczyk, Sopot 1997) 11...gxh5 12 g4 hxg4 (12...c6!? 13 ♚e2 ♜h8 14 ♖e3 a4 15 ♚gl ±) 13 hxg4 and now:

d21) 13...♚b4 14 ♖e3 h5 15 ♜d2!? (15 gxh5 ♜xe4 16 ♜xe4 ♚xe4 17 ♚gl ♜h7 18 h6 ♖f6 19 ♚e2 ♖f5 20 ♜fl ± ♖h4 21 ♜d2 ♜d3 22 ♚g7+ ♜h8 23 ♚b5?! ♚xe3+ 24 ♜d1 ♚xf2 0-1 M.Grünberg-Sarakauskas, Marijampole 1994) 15...hxg4 16 ♜f3 ♚d8 17 ♚gl f5! (not: 17...gxf3? 18 ♚xg7+ ♜xg7 19 ♚gl+ ♜f6 20 ♖g5+ +-; 17...f6? 18 ♚h2 ♚f7 19 ♚gl +-; or 17...♚f6?! 18 ♜h4 c6 19 f3 ± Bagirov-Shaked, Linares 1997) 18 ♚h2 ♚f6 (18...gxf3? 19 ♚gl +-) 19 ♚h7+ ♜f8 20 ♜g5! (20 ♖xc5? dxc5 21 ♜xe5 ♚aa6!) 20...♜xe4+ (20...♜b3+ 21 axb3 f4 22 ♖b6! cxb6 23 ♜e6+ ♖xe6 24 dxe6 ± or 20...f4 21 ♖xc5 dxc5 22 ♚b5 with a strong attack) 21 ♜cxe4 fxe4 22 ♚h5! ♖f5 23 ♚gl c6 24 ♜h7+ ♖xh7 25 ♚xh7 ±.

d22) 13...c6!? 14 ♖e3 (14 ♚f3?! ♚h4! 15 ♖d2 b5 16 cxb5 cxb5 17 ♜xb5 f5! ∞ Bednarek-Rakowiecki, Lodz 1997) 14...a4 15 ♜fl ±.

We now return to 8...♚e8 (D):



9 ♖e2 ♜f4

The aggressive 9...f5?! 10 exf5 ♜f4 11 ♖xf4 exf4 12 fxg6 ♚xg6 13 ♜f3!? (equally good seems 13 ♜fl ♜a6 14 ♚c1 {14 ♖d3 ♖f5 15

♟xf5 ♖xf5 16 ♜f3 ♜c5 17 ♖d2 ♞ae8 18 ♞d1 ± (Anastasian-Yuferov, Belgorod 1989) 14...♟f5 15 ♜f3 ♖h6 16 ♜g1 ♞ae8 17 ♟d3 ♟xd3 18 ♖xd3 ♜c5 19 ♖c2 is much better for White, Piket-Rohl Montes, Istanbul OL 2000) 13...♖xg2 14 ♞g1 ♖xh3 15 ♟xg7+!! was no fun for Black in H.Leyva-R.Leyva, Holguin 1995 – see Illustrative Games.

10 ♟f3 f5 11 g3 ♜xh3 12 ♟g2 f4

The other try, 12...fxe4, allows White a significant advantage: 13 ♟e3 ♟f5 (13...♜a6 14 ♜xe4 ♟f5 15 f3 ♖e7 16 ♖d2 ♖d7 17 0-0-0 ♖a4 18 b3 ♖a3+ 19 ♜b1 b5 20 cxb5 ♜b4 21 ♜g4 ♟xg4 22 fxg4 ♜f4 23 ♟f1 a6 24 b6 1-0 Hart-Alves, e-mail 2000) 14 ♜g4 h5 (14...♜f4?! 15 gxf4 h5 16 ♜h2 ♜d7 17 fxe5 ♜xe5 18 ♟f1 ± Bagirov-M.Vukić, Banja Luka 1976) 15 ♟xh3 ♖d7 (15...hxg4 16 ♟xg4 ♜d7 17 ♟e2 ♜f6 18 g4 ♟d7 19 g5 ±) 16 ♜xe4 (16 ♜h6+?! ♟xh6 17 ♟xf5 ♖xf5 is unclear) 16...♟xg4 (16...hxg4 17 ♟g2 ±) 17 ♟xg4 ♖xg4 18 ♖xg4 hxg4 19 ♜e2.

13 ♜f3 g5 14 ♞xh3

Also possible is 14 ♟xh3 g4, when 15 ♟g2 transposes to the text (but not 15 ♜h4?! gxh3 16 g4 ♜d7 17 ♜f5 ♜f6 18 ♞xh3 h5 19 f3 ♟xf5 = Borik-Van der Wiel, Bochum 1981).

14...g4 15 ♞h1 gxf3 16 ♖xf3 ♖g6 17 ♟h3 ♟xh3!

Black did not survive after 17...♜a6?! 18 ♟xc8 ♞axc8 19 gxf4 (19 g4!? ♜b4 20 ♜d2 a5 and now 21 a3 ± is stronger than 21 b3?! c6 22 ♟a3 b5 = Beil-Zeleny, Olomouc 2005) 19...exf4 (19...♜b4 20 f5! ♜c2+ 21 ♜d1 ♜xa1 22 ♖h3 ♖f6 23 ♖xh7+ ♜f7 24 ♞h6 +-) 20 ♟d2 ♜h8 21 0-0-0 c6 22 ♞dgl +- in Vyzhmanavin-Chiburdanidze, Moscow 1981. Suba mentions 17...fxg3!? 18 ♖xg3 ±.

18 ♞xh3 ♜d7 19 ♟d2

Now White cannot play 19 gxf4? as the black knight will eventually land on e5.

19...a6 20 0-0-0!

This is much better than 20 ♜e2 ♞f7 21 ♖h5 fxg3 22 fxg3 ♞af8 23 ♟e3 ♜f6 24 ♖xg6 hxg6 25 ♞h4 ♜h5 = Flear-Kaminski, Polanica Zdroj 1992.

20...fxg3!?

Black played the inaccurate 20...b5?! and faced grave problems in Bagirov-Krakops, Riga 1996: 21 gxf4 exf4 (21...b4 22 ♜e2 exf4 23 ♞g1 ♖f6 24 ♟xg7+! ♖xg7 25 ♜xf4 ±) 22

♖h1!! b4 23 ♞g1! bxc3 24 ♟xc3 ♜e5 25 ♟xg6 hxg6 (25...♜xg6 26 ♟xg7 ♜xg7 27 ♞xh7+ ♜f6 28 ♖h5) 26 ♟xe5 dxe5 1-0.

21 ♖xg3 ♖xg3 22 ♟xg3! ♞f7


22...♟xf2? is a blunder: 23 ♞dgl +-.

23 ♟e3

According to Bagirov, White has a slight but secure advantage, as his better bishop and spacial advantage are significant factors.

5.8 7 d5 ♜e8

1 d4 ♜f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♜c3 ♟g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♜f3 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 ♜e8 (D)



As in the previous section, Black aims for a quick ...f5, but this time without having to worry about his exposed knight on h5. However, on e8 his knight no longer is an active piece and some valuable time has been lost by this manoeuvre.

8 g4! f5

The only consistent continuation. Although Black has also tried some other ideas, in those cases I fail to understand why he chose 7...♜e8 in the first place:

a) 8...a5 9 ♟e3 f5 10 gxf5 gxf5 11 exf5 ♟xf5 12 ♜g5 h6 13 ♜ge4 ♖h4 14 ♜g3 ♜d7 15 ♜xf5 ♞xf5 16 ♟d3 e4 17 ♖g4 ♖xg4 18 hxg4 ♞f8 19 ♜xe4 ± Skliba-Bujnoch, Czech Republic 2000.

b) 8...c5 9 ♟e3 (9 ♟d3 a6 10 ♟g5 f6 11 ♟d2 ♟d7 12 a4 ± Wittkugel-Lewandowitz, Brandenburg 2000) 9...f5 10 gxf5 gxf5 11 exf5 ♟xf5 12 ♞g1 ♜h8 13 ♜g5 ♜f6 14 ♟d3 ± e4? 15 ♜cxe4 ♜xe4 16 ♟xe4! ♟xb2 (16...♟xe4 17 ♜e6! +-) 17 ♟xf5 ♞xf5 18 ♖c2 ♖f6 19 ♜e4 ♖e5 20 f4 ♞xf4 21 ♟xf4 ♖d4 22 ♖g2 ♟c3+

23 ♖xc3 ♗xc3+ 24 ♖f2 1-0 Barsov-Gouma, Soest 1995.

c) 8...♖a6 9 ♖g5 ♗d7 10 ♗d2 (10 ♖h4!? ±) 10...f5 11 gxf5 gxf5 12 exf5 ♗xf5 13 ♖h4 ♗f7 14 ♖e4 ♖f5 15 ♖d3 ♖xe4 16 ♖xe4 ♖c5 17 ♖f5 a5 18 0-0-0 ± Gouzmyrn-Olivera Gutierrez, La Pineda 2004.


d) 8...c6 9 ♖g5 f6 (9...♖f6 10 ♖e3 cxd5 11 ♖xd5 ♖g7 12 ♗d2 ♖e6 13 g5 (or 13 0-0-0 ±) 13...♖d7 14 ♖d3 a6 15 a4 ♖c5 16 ♖c2 ± P.Cramling-Landenbergue, Biel 1991) 10 ♖e3 cxd5 (10...c5?! 11 ♖d3 ♗f7 12 ♗c2 a6 13 a3 ♖d7 14 h4 ♗b8 15 h5 g5 16 ♖d2 ♖c7 17 f3 b5 18 b4 ♖f8 19 0-0 cxb4 20 axb4 bxc4 21 ♖xc4 ♗xb4 22 ♖a5 ♗e8? {22...♖b8 23 ♗a2! ±} 23 ♖a2 ♗b5 24 ♗xc7 ♗c5 25 ♖c6 1-0 Dao Thien Hai-Vo Thanh, Hanoi 2002) 11 ♗xd5+ ♖h8 12 0-0-0 ♖d7 13 c5 ♖c6 14 ♗e6 ±± Lisko-Komora, Slovakia 2000.

e) 8...♖d7 9 h4 (9 ♖d3 and 9 ♗g1 are good alternatives, but 9 ♖g5 leads to nothing clear after 9...f6! {9...♖ef6 10 ♗c2 a6 11 ♖g2 ♗b8 12 0-0 h6 13 ♖e3 ♖h8 14 ♗ac1 ♖g8 15 ♖d2 ♖e7 16 b4 f5 17 f3 ± A.Nagy-Decsey, Hungarian Cht 1994/5} 10 ♖e3 ♗e7 11 ♖d3 ♖c5 12 ♖c2 f5 13 ♖d2 f4 14 ♖xc5 dxc5 15 ♖f3 ♖d6 16 ♗e2 a6 ∞ Bawart-Bezler, Frohnleiten 2000) and then:

e1) 9...♖ef6 10 ♖d2 h5 11 ♖e2 hxg4 12 ♖xg4 ♖xg4 (12...♖c5 13 ♖e2 a5 14 ♗c2 a4 15 ♖f1 ±) 13 ♗xg4 ♖c5 14 ♗g3 f5 15 b4! (15 ♗xg6?! ♖d3+ 16 ♖e2?? ♖xc1+?? 17 ♗axc1 ♗f6 18 ♗c1 a6 19 ♗h5 1-0 Jacobs-Halperin, e-mail 1999) 15...♖xe4 16 ♖dxe4 fxe4 17 ♗xg6 ♖f5 18 ♗g3 ±.

e2) 9...c6 10 ♖g5 ♖df6 11 ♖h2 cxd5 12 cxd5 ♗a5 13 f3 ♖d7 14 ♗d2 ♗c8 15 a3 a6 16 ♖e2 ± Borik-Teuchert, Delmenhorst 1986.

9 gxf5 gxf5 (D)



10 exf5

Some other moves are possible and also good:

a) 10 ♗g1!? ♖h8 11 ♖g5 ♖f6 (11...fxe4? 12 ♗h5 ♖f6 13 ♖f7+ ♖g8 14 ♗xg7+ ♖xg7 15 ♖h6+ ♖g8 16 ♗g5+ ♖xf7 17 ♗g7+ ♖e8 18 ♗xf8+ ± Zude-Gilbert, Coventry 2005) 12 exf5 ♖xf5 13 ♖d3 ±.

b) 10 ♖g5 and then:

b1) 10...♗d7 11 h4 ♗f7 12 ♖h3 ♖a6 13 ♖e3 h6 14 exf5 (14 ♗e2?! ♖b4! 15 a3 fxe4 16 ♖xc8 should be met by 16...♖d3+! ♖, and not 16...♗xc8?! 17 ♖xe4 ♖c2+ 18 ♗xc2 ♗xf3 19 ♖g3 c6 20 ♗d1 ♗f7 21 ♗g1 cxd5 22 cxd5 ♗c4 23 h5 b5 24 ♗d2 ♖h7 25 ♗d3+ e4 26 ♖xe4 ♗f5 27 ♗g4 ♖c7?? 28 ♗f4 1-0 Iskov-Schaufelberger, Nice OL 1974) 14...♖xf5 15 ♖d2 ±.

b2) 10...♖f6 11 ♗g1 (11 ♖d3?! ♗e8 12 ♗e2 ♗h5 13 ♖xf6 ♗xf6 14 ♖d2 ♗xe2+ 15 ♖xe2 ♖h6 ∞ Kholmov-Lanc, Balashikha 1977) 11...♖h8 12 exf5!? (12 ♗e2 ♗e8 13 ♖d2 ♖a6 14 0-0-0 ♖c5 15 f3 ± Bäurle-Loos, Germany tt 1995/6 or 12 ♖d3 f4 13 ♗e2 ♗e8 14 ♖h4 ♖a6 15 ♖f5 ♖xf5 16 exf5 ♖c5 17 ♖c2 ♗h5 18 ♖xf6 ♗xe2+ 19 ♖xe2 ± Rezasade-T.Keller, Dortmund 2004) 12...♖xf5 13 ♖h4 ♗d7?! (13...♖d7 14 ♖d3 ± is the only acceptable continuation) 14 ♗f3 ♖g6 15 ♖xg6+ hxg6 16 ♖e3 (16 ♖xf6 ♗xf6 17 ♗g3 ♗f5 18 ♖d3 ♗f4 19 ♖xg6 ± R.David-Müller, Germany 1994) 16...♗f5 17 ♗g3 ♖bd7 18 0-0-0 e4 19 ♖e2 ♖e5 20 ♗h4+ ♖g8 21 ♗g5 ♗d7 22 ♖xe4 ♖xe4 23 ♗xe4 and White wins, D.Gurevich-G.Buckley, London 1994.

10...♖xf5 11 ♖e3

This remains the main line, although 11 ♗g1 ♖h8 12 ♖d3 ♗d7 (12...e4? 13 ♖xe4 ♗e7 14 ♗e2 ♖d7 15 ♖g3 ♗xe2+ 16 ♖xe2 ♖g6 17 ♖h4 ± Riazantsev-Flores, Internet 2004) 13 ♖g5 ± is interesting.

11...♖d7

Alternatives:

a) 11...c6 12 ♖g5 h6 13 ♖ge4 ♗a5 14 ♗d2 cxd5 15 cxd5 ♖xe4 16 ♖xe4 ♗xd2+ 17 ♖xd2 ♖d7 18 h4 ♖df6 19 ♖xf6+ ♗xf6 20 ♗c1 ± Bagirov-Hock, Berlin 1993.

b) 11...♖a6 and then:

b1) 12 ♗d2!? ♖b4 13 0-0-0 ♖f6 (13...♖xa2+ 14 ♖xa2 ♖e4 15 ♖g5! or 13...♖c2 14 ♖g5! ♖xd1 15 ♖xd1! ±) 14 ♖g5 ± Uhlmann-Möhring, Zinnowitz 1966.

b2) 12 ♖g5 ♗c5 13 ♜g1 (13 b4 e4! 14 ♜c1 ♗d3+ 15 ♗xd3 exd3 16 ♗e6 ♗xe6 17 dxe6 ♜e7 18 ♜xd3 ♜xe6 19 ♜d5 ♜xd5 20 ♗xd5 c6 21 ♗f4 ♗c7 22 ♜g1 ♗f7 23 ♗e2 = Lima-Gonzalez Rodriguez, Matanzas 1992) 13...♜e7 14 ♗xc5 dxc5 15 ♗ge4 ♗d6 16 ♗d3 ±.

12 ♜g1!?

Of course White can transpose to the note above with 12 ♗g5.

12...♗h8 13 ♗g5 ♜e7 14 ♜d2

White can also try 14 ♗d3!? e4 15 ♗gxe4 ♗e5 16 ♗e2, with enough compensation for a small advantage.

14...e4 15 0-0-0 h6!


15...♗ef6?! 16 ♗b5! ♗e5 17 ♗d4 ♗g6 18 ♗ge6 ± Henrichs-Tkachuk, Dortmund 2005.

16 ♗e6 ♗xe6 17 dxe6 ♜xe6 18 ♜g4!

White has the initiative and consequently the advantage.

5.9 7 d5 ♗a6

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 ♗a6 (D)



This is a flexible move. While it can easily lead to the lines we consider in Section 5.10, it also retains the option of some interesting alternative lines.

8 ♗g5

I strongly believe that this move is 'better' than 8 ♗e3. White wants to provoke the move ...h6, which in my opinion is to his benefit; it makes it more difficult for Black to employ the ...f5 advance due to his more weakened king, while in some lines White can win a tempo by attacking the h-pawn. Last but not least, a possible advance with h4-h5 can pose Black some

difficult problems, as it is inadvisable for him to fix the kingside with ...g5 because this will result in one-way traffic in White's favour on the queenside, thanks to his spatial advantage.

Now Black must make a choice among:

A: 8...h6 169


B: 8...♜e8 171

Note that 8...♗c5?! is very rare as White need not allow a transposition to Section 5.10, but can play 9 b4 with a serious advantage.

A)

8...h6 9 ♗e3 ♗h5 (D)

This is the plan we shall investigate here, as all other tries transpose to Line B or to Section 5.10. For instance, after 9...♗c5 10 ♗d2, 10...a5 brings us to 5.10, but note that 10...c6?! is poor due to 11 b4 cxd5 12 cxd5 ♗cd7 13 ♗c4 ♗e8 14 g4 f5 15 gxf5 gxf5 16 ♜g1 f4 17 ♗d2 ♗b6 18 ♗a5 ♗f6 19 ♜c1 ± Grivas-Haritakis, Nikiti 1991.



Of course, this line is very similar to those we analysed in Section 5.7, but in general the interpolation of ...h6 and ♗e3 seems to favour White.


10 ♗h2

White has tried alternative options here, some of which are quite interesting:

a) 10 ♗g1 ♜e8 11 ♗e2 (11 ♜d2 ♗h7 12 g4 ♗f4 13 ♗ge2 f5 ∞ Lukov-Blees, Krumbach 1991) 11...♗f4 12 ♗f3 f5 (12...♗b4!? 13 ♜b1 f5 ∞ J.Ivanov-Chakov, Bankia 1991) 13 a3 g5 14 g3 fxe4 15 ♗xe4 ♗f5 ∞ J.Ivanov-Tissir, Malaga 2004.

b) 10 ♗d2 ♜e8 (10...♜e7 11 ♗b3 b6 12 g3 ± Pohlens-Seidel, Bad Wörishofen 2000 or

10...♖c5?! 11 b4 ♘a6 12 a3 f5 13 exf5 gxf5 14 ♖xh5 f4 15 ♘de4 fxe3 16 fxe3 c6 17 ♙d3 ± Ramon Perez-Navarro Alonso, Zaragoza 1999) 11 ♘b3 (D) (11 ♙e2 ♘f4 12 ♙f1 f5 13 g3 ♘h5 14 ♘b3 f4 15 gxf4 exf4 16 ♙d4 f3 17 ♙xg7 ♘xg7 18 ♖d2 ♘h7 19 0-0-0 ♖e5 ∞ Krasenkova-Larios Crespo, Internet 2004) and then:



b1) 11...f5!? 12 c5!? f4 (12...fxe4? 13 cxd6 ♘f4 14 dxc7 ♘b4 15 ♘c5 ♙f5 16 ♖b3 ♘bd3+ 17 ♘xd3 exd3 18 ♖xb7 g5 19 g3 ♖d7 20 ♖c6 ♖xc6 21 dxc6 ♘e6 22 ♙g2 e4 23 ♘xe4 ♙xb2 24 ♙d1 ♘xc7 25 0-0 ♙fd8 26 ♙d2 1-0 Bagirov-Agnos, London 1991) 13 ♙d2 ♘xc5 14 ♘xc5 dxc5 15 b4! ♖e7 (15...cxb4? 16 ♘b5 ♙f7 17 ♙c1 ♖d8 18 d6! ±) 16 ♖b3 ♘h8 17 bxc5 ♖xc5 (17...♙f6? 18 ♙c1 ♙h4 19 ♘d1 a5 20 ♙e2 ♘f6 21 ♙f3 ♙d7 22 ♙c3 a4 23 ♖b4 ♙fb8 24 a3 ± P.Cramling-Arakhmia, Biel 1991) 18 ♘b5 ♖b6 19 ♙c1 with compensation.

b2) 11...b6 12 ♙e2 ♘f4 13 ♙f3 f5 (13...♘b4 14 ♘c1) 14 h4! (14 g3!? ♘xh3 15 ♙xh3 f4 ♣) 14...♙d7 (14...g5?! 15 hxg5 hxg5 16 g3 g4 17 gxf4 gxf3 18 ♙g1 ♘c5 19 fxe5 ♘xb3 20 e6!! f4 21 ♙d4! ♘xd4 22 ♖xd4 ♖e7 23 0-0-0 ± Bagirov-Rašik, Brno 1991) 15 g3 ♘h3 16 ♙g2! f4 17 ♙xh3 fxe3 18 fxe3 ♙xh3 19 ♙xh3 ♖d7 20 ♙h2 ♙f7! with compensation.

c) 10 a3 f5 11 b4 c5 (11...fxe4?! is inadvisable due to 12 ♘d2, but 11...♘f4!? is interesting and untested) 12 dxc6 bxc6 13 b5 fxe4 14 ♘xe4 d5 (14...♙f5? 15 ♘c3 e4 16 ♘d4 ♖a5 17 ♙c1 ♘c5 18 g4 +- Atalik-Perelshteyn, Philadelphia 1998) 15 cxd5 cxd5 16 bxa6 dxe4 17 ♙c4+ ♘h7 18 ♖xd8 ♙xd8 19 ♘d2 ♘f4 20 0-0 ♘d5 =

d) 10 g3!? ♖e8 11 ♙e2 f5 12 exf5 gxf5 13 ♘h4 ♘f6 14 ♖d2 ♘h7 15 0-0-0 ± C.Harmon-Zilberstein, McMinnville 2004.


e) 10 ♖d2 ♘h7 11 g4 ♘f4 (11...♖f6?! 12 ♘g5+ hxg5 13 gxh5 ±) 12 0-0-0!? (12 ♙xf4 exf4 13 ♙d3 ♘c5 14 ♙c2 ♙e8 15 ♖xf4 ♖f6 16 ♖xf6 ♙xf6 17 0-0-0 ♘g7 18 ♘d4 a5 19 f3 ♙d7 20 h4 g5 21 h5 ♙e5 22 ♘de2 a4 23 ♙d3 a3 24 b3 ♘a6 25 ♘b1 1/2-1/2 Grivas-Istratescu, Balkaniad (Mangalia) 1992) 12...♙d7 13 ♘b1 f5 14 exf5 gxf5 15 ♙g1 fxf4 16 hxg4 ♖f6 17 ♖c2+ ♘h8 18 ♘e4 ♖e7 19 a3 with a slight advantage for White, Hort-W.Watson, Bundesliga 1996/7.

10...♖e8 11 ♖d2

Black's compensation appears adequate after 11 ♙e2 f5! (11...♘f4 12 ♙f3 f5 13 0-0 ♘h8 {13...♖e7 14 ♘h1 ♘c5 15 b4 fxe4 16 ♘xe4 ♘xe4 17 ♙xe4 ♙f5 18 ♖c2 ± Lev-Svetushkin, Kazan 1997}) 14 a3 ♖f7 15 b4 h5 16 h4 ♙f6 17 ♘h1 ♘xg2 18 ♘xg2 f4 19 ♙d2 ♙xh4 20 ♙xh5 ♙h3+ 21 ♘xh3 ♙h7 22 ♙g4 ♙g3+ 23 ♘g2 ♙xh2+ 24 ♘f3 ♙h4 25 ♖e1 ♘g7 26 ♘e2 ♖e7 27 ♘g1 ♘h8 28 ♘h3 ♙xf2 29 ♘xf2 ♖h4 30 ♙g1 1-0 Flear-Lamoureux, Clichy 1993) 12 exf5 (12 ♙xh5 gxh5 13 g4 hxg4 14 hxg4 f4 = Andonov-V.Georgiev, Bankia 1992) 12...♘f4 13 ♙xf4 (13 ♙f3 ♙xf5 14 ♘e4 g5 ∞ Buri-jovich-Khalafian, Manila OL 1992) 13...exf4 14 fxf6 ♖xg6.

11...♘h7 12 0-0-0 (D)

Unclear is 12 ♘g4 f5! (12...♘f4? 13 g3 f5 14 gxf4 exf4 15 ♙xf4 ♙xc3 16 bxc3 fxf4 {16...♖xe4+? 17 ♖e3!} 17 0-0-0 ♖xe4 18 ♙xh6 ♙f5 19 ♙d3 ♖xd3 20 ♖xd3 ♙xd3 21 ♙xf8 ♙e4 22 hxg4+ ♙xh1 23 ♙xh1+ ♘g8 24 ♙h6 ♘c5 25 ♙e3 is much better for White, Arutunian-Maslak, Olomouc 2005) 13 exf5 gxf5 14 ♙xh6 fxf4 (14...♖g6? 15 ♙xg7 ♘xg7 16 ♘h2 ♘c5 17 0-0-0 ± Lovkov-Lutsko, St Petersburg 2001) 15 ♙xg7 ♘xg7 16 hxg4+ ♘g8.




From this position Black has tried mainly two continuations, but both of them fail to equalize:

a) 12...f5 13 exf5 gxf5 14 $\text{\textcircled{d}}3!$ (much better than 14 g4 f4 {14... $\text{\textcircled{d}}f6!$? 15 gxf5 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf5$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}g4$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}b4$ ∞ but not 14... $\text{\textcircled{d}}f4?$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf4$ exf4 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}c5$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c2$ \pm Høi-Mortensen, Copenhagen 1983) 15 $\text{\textcircled{w}}c2+$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}g8$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}f6$ ∞) 14... $\text{\textcircled{d}}c5$ (14... $\text{\textcircled{d}}f4?$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf4$ exf4 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}hel$ was bad for Black in Semakin-Ikonnikov, Perm 1993) 15 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ (or 15...e4 16 g4 $\text{\textcircled{d}}f6$ 17 f3! \pm Comas Fabrego-Paramos Dominguez, Spain 1991) 16 g4 (16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}del$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}f7$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}g4$ e4 18 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xh6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}g6$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf5$ 20 g4 \pm Lalić-Sundararajan, Calcutta 2000) 16... $\text{\textcircled{d}}f6$ 17 gxf5 a5 18 $\text{\textcircled{d}}hgl$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}h5$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{d}}g4$ \pm Bagirov-Kummerow, Weilburg 1996.

b) 12... $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}g4!$ f5 14 exf5 gxf5 15 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xh6$ fxg4 (no different is 15... $\text{\textcircled{w}}g6$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xg7$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xg7$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e3$ \pm Comas Fabrego-Komljenović, San Sebastian 1991) 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d3+$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}g8$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xg7$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xg7$ 18 hxg4 \pm $\text{\textcircled{w}}e7$ (or 18... $\text{\textcircled{w}}f4$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{d}}hb6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}f8$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{d}}dh1$ \pm) 19 $\text{\textcircled{w}}h6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}f6$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{w}}h7+$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}f7$ 21 $\text{\textcircled{d}}h6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}f4+$ 22 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}g8$ 23 g5 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e7$ 24 $\text{\textcircled{d}}f6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}g4$ 25 $\text{\textcircled{d}}g6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}f7$ 26 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xg7+$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xg7$ 27 $\text{\textcircled{d}}g6+$ 1-0 Krasenkov-Kr.Georgiev, Cappelle la Grande 1992.

B)

8... $\text{\textcircled{w}}e8$ (D)



Black wants to achieve the ...f5 advance by means of ... $\text{\textcircled{w}}h8$, ... $\text{\textcircled{d}}g8$ (or ... $\text{\textcircled{d}}h5!$... $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$) and without weakening his kingside with ...h6. The other black knight can later come to c5 or b4, while ideas like a future ... $\text{\textcircled{d}}h6$, exchanging the bishops, are always an option.

9 g4

This move at least prevents the active 9... $\text{\textcircled{d}}h5$ and reduces the power of the coming ...f5. Now Black has several options:

- B1: 9... $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$** 171
- B2: 9... $\text{\textcircled{d}}c5$** 172
- B3: 9... $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$** 173
- B4: 9... $\text{\textcircled{w}}h8$** 174

It should be mentioned that all of these lines are very similar to one another, and share many common ideas. Thus, one should be very careful to avoid unwelcome transpositions.

B1)

9... $\text{\textcircled{d}}d7$ 10 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d2$

10 a3 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c5$ 11 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf6$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf6$ 12 b4 $\text{\textcircled{d}}a4$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xb5$ 14 cxb5 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b6$ is unclear, Yermolinsky-Kupreichik, Blagoveshchensk 1988.

10... $\text{\textcircled{w}}h8$

10...c6 11 $\text{\textcircled{w}}f3$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}d8$ (11... $\text{\textcircled{w}}e7$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b3!$) 12 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b3!$ (12 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d3!$? h6 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e3$ cxd5 14 cxd5 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c5$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}c8$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{w}}g2$ 1/2-1/2 Grivas-Kotronias, Nikiti 1991) 12...h6 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e3$ cxd5 14 cxd5 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b4$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c1$ a5 16 a3 $\text{\textcircled{d}}a6$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b5!?$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}c8$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd7$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xd7$ 19 0-0 b6 20 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}dc5$ 21 $\text{\textcircled{d}}a7$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}c7$ 22 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xc5$ dxc5 23 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c6$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}d6$ 24 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}b8$ 25 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xb8$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xb8$ 26 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b5$ f5 27 f3 was slightly better for White in Grivas-Cela, Athens 1993.

11 $\text{\textcircled{d}}d3$ (D)



Or:

a) Black is fine after 11 a3 c6! 12 b4 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c7$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b1$ (13 a4 $\text{\textcircled{d}}a6$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b1$ c5! or 13 $\text{\textcircled{w}}b3$ b5!) 13...a6! (13...b5?!? 14 dxc6 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xc6$ 15 cxb5 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xb5$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xb5$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xb5$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xb5$ $\text{\textcircled{w}}xb5$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e2$ \pm) 14 $\text{\textcircled{w}}f3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}g8$ 15 h4 f5 16 gxf5 gxf5 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}h3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}c8!$ ∞ (rather than 17...fxe4?!? 18 $\text{\textcircled{w}}g2$ cxd5 19 cxd5 $\text{\textcircled{d}}f6$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf6$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}xf6$ 21 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xe4$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}g6$ 22 $\text{\textcircled{w}}f3$ \pm Krasenkov-Kr.Georgiev, Kavala 2001).

b) 11 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e3!$? is an interesting alternative: 11... $\text{\textcircled{d}}c5$ 12 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}g8$ (12...a5!? 13 $\text{\textcircled{w}}f1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}g8$ 14 $\text{\textcircled{w}}g2$ b6 15 f3 f5 16 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}h6$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{d}}f2$ fxe4 18 fxe4 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e7$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xc5$ bxc5 20 $\text{\textcircled{w}}d3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}f7$ 21 $\text{\textcircled{d}}hf1$ \pm Grivas-Scholseth, Gausdal 1993) 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}b3$ b6 14 $\text{\textcircled{d}}xc5$ bxc5 15 $\text{\textcircled{w}}d2$ f5 16 f3 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e7$ 17 h4! f4 (17...fxg4?!? 18 fxg4 $\text{\textcircled{d}}f7$ 19 0-0-0 $\text{\textcircled{d}}f6$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{d}}dg1$ \pm Grivas-Tseshkovsky, Cappelle la Grande 1995) 18 $\text{\textcircled{d}}f2$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}ab8$ 19 h5 g5 20 0-0 \pm .

11... $\text{\textcircled{d}}g8$

The alternative is 11...c6 12 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c1$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}c5$ 13 $\text{\textcircled{d}}c2$ a5 14 $\text{\textcircled{w}}e2$ (14 $\text{\textcircled{w}}f3$ $\text{\textcircled{d}}g8$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{d}}e3$ f5 ∞



Dobosz-Shishkin, Poland 1999) 14...cxd5 15 cxd5 b5 16 d1 ♖b8 17 e3 d8 18 b3 bxb3 19 axb3 ± Dobosz-Seidel, Germany 2000.

12 ♖e2 d5

Black can also try 12...e6!? 13 ex6 d6 14 g5 d8 15 h4 ±.

13 e2 f5 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 exf5 e5 f5

Black faces problems after the 'active' 15...e4?! 16 dxe4 dxe4 17 e4 e4 18 exf5 18 exf5 19 e3! c5 20 dxc6! ♖xc6 21 ♖g1 ± Gulko-Mainka, Vienna 1991.

16 exf5 exf5 17 d4

White is slightly better.

B2)

9...d5 10 d2 a5 (D)

Interpolating ...h6 is a possible alternative: 10...h6 11 e3 and now:

a) 11...a5 12 ♖c2 (12 e2!? d7 13 h4! ± Vasilevich-Muse, Berlin 1997) 12...d7 13 ♖g1 e8 14 0-0-0 f5 15 exf5 gxf5 16 ex5 dxc5 17 gxf5 exf5 18 d3 ♗d7 19 exf5 ♖xf5 20 ♖xf5 exf5 21 d4 d5 22 dxg5 hxg5 23 e4 ± Comas Fabrego-Perpinya, Spanish jr Ch 1991 – see Typical Endgames.

b) 11...d7 12 b4 f5 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 exf5 a6 15 a3 d6 16 ♖g1 e8 17 d4 ± Sommerbauer-Schumi, Austria 1997.

c) 11...d7 12 h4 f5 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 ex5 dxc5 15 e3 ♖g6 16 ♖e2 d6 17 0-0-0 dxe4 18 dxe4 fxe4 19 d6 ♗f7 20 ex8 ex8 21 dxe4 ± Andonov-Bailet, Rohde 2004.

d) 11...d7 12 e2 d7 13 b3! (13 ♖c2 c6 14 h4 cxd5 15 cxd5 ex8 16 b3 d4 ∞ Andonov-I.Hausner, Szolnok 1985) 13...d4 14 dxa4 e4 15 h4 ±.

11 ♖f3

A fair alternative is 11 ♖g1!? e8 12 e3 d8 13 b3 (13 h4 f5 14 f3 d6 15 g5 d5 16 ♖c2 c6 17 0-0-0 d7 18 b3 1/2-1/2 Malaniuk-Conquest, Hastings 1995) 13...b6 14 dxc5 bxc5 15 d3 f5 16 f3 ♖e7 (16...d7 17 h4 c6 18 ♖e2 ± Grivas-Moutousis, Athens 1992) 17 ♖e2 ± Larsen-Berg, Grøsted 1990.

11...d7 12 ♖g1!?

White must be on the alert, as after 12 d5 a6 13 ♖c3 b6 14 ♖g1 (14 b3 f5 15 f3 dxc5 16 a3 fxe4 17 fxe4 ♖f4! ∞ Åkesson-Dydyshko, Erevan OL 1996) 14...d5 15 e2 e8 16 h4 f5 17 gxf5 gxf5 18 h5 fxe4! ∞ Ivanisević-Ilinčić, Herceg Novi 2001 or 12 0-0-0 c6! (12...f5?! 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 exf5 d6 15 e3! {15 exf6? exf6 16 d4 exf5 17 ♖g3 dxe4 18 dxe4 e8 1/2-1/2 Lukin-Novik, Moscow 1991} 15...e4 16 ♖g3 ±) 13 h4 h6 14 e3 a4 15 h5 g5 16 e2 ♗d8 17 e1 ♖a5 18 ex1 ♖b4 19 e2 ∞ Krasenkow-Fedorov, Polanica Zdroj 2000 Black can be quite happy.

12...f6!?

Other moves seem worse:

a) 12...f5? 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 e6! ±.

b) 12...c6 13 e2 d6 14 h4 d7 15 h5 f6 16 e3 cxd5 17 cxd5 ex8 18 h6 e8 19 ex5 ex5 20 d3 c7 21 ♖e3 d4 22 ex4 ex4 23 dxa5 e4 24 a3 e3 25 0-0-0 ± Comas Fabrego-Y.Vovk, Pardubice 2005.

c) 12...e8 13 0-0-0 a4 14 d5 a6 15 h4 h6 16 e3 ±/± Avrukh-Kempinski, Biel 2000.

13 e3 f7 14 h4 ♖f8 15 ♖g3 e6 16 g5 f5 17 hxg5 d7 18 e2 f4!? 19 e1!


Accepting the exchange sacrifice will always give Black (at least) some compensation as the monster on g7 will be activated.

19...♖f7 20 0-0-0 d8 21 e4! ex4 22 ♖xh4 d7 23 b3! dxb3+ 24 axb3 b6 25 e4!

White has quite a pleasant position, Bagirov-Podzielny, Eupen 1993.

B3)

9...d7 (D)



10 ♖g1

This is my main preference. Alternatives:

a) 10 d2?! f5 11 gxf5 gxf5 12 ♖g1 (12 exf5 dxc5 13 f6 = Shirov-Badea, Moscow 1991) 12...c8 13 d3 (13 exf5 dxc5 {13...xf5!? 14 d3 e4! ∞} 14 f6 dxf6 15 d6 ♖g8 ♯ San Segundo-Shirov, Madrid 1994) 13...dxc5 14 d6 fxe4! (14...g6?! 15 ♖g3 ♗f7 16 ♗f3! ♗e8 17 ♗f1 fxe4 18 ♗g2 ♗h5 ∞ Gulko-Hjartarson, Reykjavik 1991) 15 dxc4 dxe4 16 dxe3 dxf5 17 dxc5 dxc5 18 dxf5 ♗xf5 19 dxc5 dxc5 20 dxe4 ♗f4 ♯.

b) 10 ♗d2 dxc5 11 0-0-0 d7 12 d2 e2 (12 d3 should be met by 12...c6! ∞ rather than 12...f5?! 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 exf5 dxf5 15 ♖g1 c8 16 d4! ± San Segundo-Illescas, Madrid 1994) 12...c6 13 d6 cxd5 14 dxc7 cxc7 15 ♗d5 c6 16 ♗d6 dxe4 17 dxe4 dxe4 18 d6 ± Anka-Gallagher, Biel 1992.

10...c8


This seems a better try than 10...dxc5 11 a3 (11 d6 d7 12 b4 d4 13 d5 d6 14 a4 ∞) 11...d7 (11...f5?! 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 d6 ♗f7 14 exf5 dxf5 15 d4 d7 {15...d7 16 b4 d4 17 dxe4 dxe4 18 ♗e2 d5 19 ♗e3 c8 20 dxc7+ ♗g7 21 ♗g7 cxc7 22 0-0-0 ♗f8 23 d2 d6 24 ♖g1 ± Conquest-M.White, British Ch (Douglas) 2005} 16 b4 d4 17 d4 ±) 12 b4 d4 13 d5 d6 14 d3 c8 15 d2 f6 16 d2 ± Krasenkow-Smirin, Belgrade 1999.

11 d2

Once again White can vary:

a) 11 d2?! f5 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 a3! d6 14 ♗c2 d5 15 d3! dxc4 16 dxe4 fxe4 17 0-0-0! d5 18 d2 a6 (18...d3 19 dxe4 d5 20 d3 ±) 19 h4 ± Bagirov-Lingnau, Cuxhaven 1994 – see Typical Endgames.

b) 11 ♗d2 dxc5 (D) (11...f5?! 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 d6 ♗g8 14 dxc7+ ♗g7 15 ♗g7 cxc7 16 exf5 ± J.Ivanov-Jovanović, Arandjelovac 1993 or 11...f6 12 d3 dxc5 13 0-0-0! d4 14 d5 d7 15 ♗a5 dxb5 16 cxb5 d6c5 17 d2 ± Van Wely-O.Popovych, Philadelphia 1992) and now:



b1) 12 d4 c6 13 d6 cxd5 14 exd5?! (14 cxd5?! d7 15 ♖g3 c8 16 b4 d4 17 dxa4 dxa4 18 c3 d7 19 dxc8 dxc8 ♯ P.Cramling-Fedorov, Katrineholm 1999) 14...e4 15 d5 and then:

b11) 15...f6?! 16 d3 ♗e7 17 b4 d3+ 18 dxd3 exd3 19 ♗f1 d7 20 ♗xd3 f5 21 g5 ♗ae8 22 d2 (1/2-1/2 Poluliakhov-Drozdov, Rostov 1998) 22...f4 23 dxf4 dxf4 (23...d5 24 ♗b3 dxb1 25 ♗xb1 d7 26 dxc7 ♗xc7 27 ♗d3 ±) 24 dxf4 d5 25 ♗b3 dxb1 26 ♗xb1 ♗e2+ 27 c2 ♗xc4 28 dxd6 ♗d5+ 29 c3 ± King.

b12) 15...d7?! 16 d6 ♗e5 17 d4 ♗e7 18 d2 f5! ∞.

b2) 12 0-0-0 d7 (12...f5? 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 d6 ♗g8 15 d2 ♗e7 16 dxc7+ ♗g7 17 ♗g7 ♗g7 18 ♖g1 ♗f6 19 d5 d7 20 f4! d4 21 fxe5 dxe5 22 ♗e3 b6 23 exf5 ♗f8 24 a3 d6 25 b4 d3+ 26 c2 d4 27 dce4 1-0 Gulko-Shaked, Philadelphia 1993) and here:

b21) 13 h4?! f5 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 d6 dxc6 16 ♗xc6 ♗e7 17 d5 ♗f6 (17...fxe4 18 dxc4 dxe4 19 dxe4 ♗f4 ∞ San Segundo-Cvitan, Moscow OL 1994) 18 ♗h5 ♗af8 ∞ Kavalek-R.Byrne, Chicago 1973.

b22) 13 ♖b1 f6 14 ♙e3 ♚g8 15 ♙e2 f5 16 gxf5 gxf5 17 ♖h4 fxe4 18 ♙g4 ± Krasenkov-Sinowjew, Dortmund 1992.

b3) 12 ♙e2 ♙d7 and then:


b31) 13 h4 f5 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 h5 (15 ♙h6 ♙xh6 16 ♚xh6 ♚e7 = Sakalauskas-Gullaksen, Manhem 1999) 15... ♖xe4 16 ♖xe4 fxe4 17 ♖h4 ♚f7 18 0-0-0 ♖c5 19 ♖b1 ♖d3 20 ♙xd3 exd3 21 ♙h6 ♚g8 22 ♖g6+!? hxg6 23 hxg6 ♚f3 24 ♚g5 ♙g4? (24... ♚ge8! 25 ♚h1 ♚g4 26 ♙xg7++ ♖xg7 27 ♚h7+ ♖g8 28 ♚h8+ ♖g7 =) 25 ♚h1 ♚f5 26 ♙xg7++ 1-0 Krasenkov-Obodchuk, Pardubice 1993.

b32) 13 ♖h4 ♖a4 14 ♖xa4 ♙xa4 15 b4 b5 16 ♚c1 bxc4 17 ♙xc4 ♖b8 18 ♚g3 f6 19 ♙h6 ♚e7 20 ♚gc3 ♚c8 21 ♙e2 ± Krasenkow-Yrjölä, Stockholm 1995.

11...♙dc5 (D)

The active 11...f5? proves catastrophic: 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 ♖h4 ♖dc5 (13... ♖f6 14 ♖xf5 ♙xf5 15 exf5 e4 16 ♚d2 ± P.Varga-Ramesa, Rijeka 2004) 14 ♙h5 ♖d3+ 15 ♖d2 ♖xb2 (15... ♖xf2 16 ♚e2+-) 16 ♚e2 ♖xc4+ 17 ♖c2 ♚d7 18 ♖g6+! hxg6 19 ♙xg6 ♖g8 20 ♚h5 ♙f6 21 ♙xf6 ♚xf6 22 ♙xf5+ 1-0 Krasenkow-Duman, Batumi Ech 2002.

11...f6!? is interesting: 12 ♙e3 f5 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 exf5 ♖dc5 15 ♖h4 ♙xf5 (15... ♙f6? 16 ♙h5! ♖d3+ 17 ♖f1 ♚d7 (17... ♖xb2 18 ♚g4 +-) 18 ♖g6+! hxg6 19 ♙xg6 +- Karatorossian-A.Toth, Budapest 1998 or 15... ♚e7 16 ♙g5 ♙f6 17 ♚d2 ± Zemerov-Drozdov, Budapest 1995) 16 ♖xf5 ♚xf5 17 ♚d2 ♚f8 18 0-0-0 ±± Kosyrev-Korneev, Moscow 1996 and J.Ivanov-Akopian, Ubeda 2001.



12 a3! f5 13 gxf5

Unclear positions arise after 13 b4?! ♖xe4 14 ♖xe4 fxe4 15 ♖d2 ♚f4!, Kosyrev-A.Kovaliov,

Minsk 2000, or 13 ♖d2?! fxe4 14 ♙e3 ♖d3+ 15 ♙xd3 exd3 16 ♖de4 ♖c5!, Avrukh-A.Kovaliov, Batumi Echt 1999.

13...gxf5 14 exf5

An interesting suggestion is 14 ♖h4!? ♖xe4 (14... fxe4?! 15 b4! ♖d3+ 16 ♙xd3 exd3 17 ♖e4! ±) 15 ♖xe4 fxe4 16 ♙h5 ♚d7 17 ♙g6! with the initiative; this idea is worth trying in the future.

14...♙xf5 15 ♖h4 e4!?

An 'active' continuation, as 15... ♚f7?! 16 ♙e3 e4 17 ♖xf5 ♚xf5 18 ♖d2! ♙e5 19 ♖c2 c6 (1/2-1/2 Poluliakhov-Timoshenko, Koszalin 1999) 20 b4! ♖d3 (20... ♖d7 21 ♙g4 ♚f7 22 ♙e6 ♚e7 23 ♖xe4 ±) 21 ♙xd3 exd3+ 22 ♚xd3 cxd5 23 ♖xd5! ± is of course unacceptable for Black. Another try is 15... ♙d7?! 16 ♚c2 e4 17 0-0-0 ♙a4 (17... ♚xf2? 18 ♙e3 ♚h2 19 ♙xg7 ♖xg7 20 ♚g1+ ♖f8 21 ♙h6+ ♖e7 22 ♙g5+ ♖f8 23 ♚d1! +-) 18 ♖xa4 ♖xa4 19 ♙e3 ♙f6 20 ♚d4! (20 ♙d4?! ♙xd4 21 ♚xd4 ♖6c5 = Tyomkin-Ramesh, Andorra 2000) 20... ♖6c5 21 ♖f5 ± J.Ivanov-Sande Edreira, Concello de Ortigueira 2002.

16 ♖xf5 ♚xf5 17 ♙e3 ♚e5

Another suggestion is 17...c6!? 18 dxc6 (18 ♚c2!? ± seems OK) 18... bxc6 19 ♚xd6 ♚f6 20 ♚h2, when Black has some compensation, but White has the material. Also good for White is 17... ♚f7 18 ♚c2 ♖d3+ 19 ♙xd3 exd3 20 ♚xd3 ♖c5 21 ♚c2 ♚f3 22 0-0-0 ± Anka-Nevednichy, Hungary tt 2003.

18 ♖d2 ♚af8 19 ♚g2! c6 20 ♖c2

White has achieved a slight advantage, which became a large advantage in Lazarev-Nevednichy, Saint Vincent 2000 after 20... cxd5?! 21 ♚xd5! ±.


B4)

9...♖h8 (D)

10 ♖d2

This appears most attractive, although White has also tried:

a) 10 ♙e2 ♙d7 (10... ♖g8?! 11 ♚d2 h6 {11... f5 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 exf5 ♙xf5 14 ♖h4 ♖c5 15 ♖xf5 ♚xf5 16 ♙e3 e4 17 ♚g1 ± Bagirov-Ardeleanu, Berlin 1997}) 12 ♙e3 f5 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 exf5 ♙xf5 15 0-0-0 ± Wendt-Dembo, Budapest 2003) 11 ♖d2 ♖g8 12 ♚g1 ♖c5 13 h4 f5 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 exf5 e4 (15... ♙xf5!? 16



Qb3 Qe4 ∞) 16 ♖e3 ♗xf5 17 Qb3 Qd3+ 18 ♗xd3 exd3 19 ♖f3 ♗g6 ∞ Krasenkow-Sutovsky, Pamplona 1998/9.

b) 10 a3 Qg8 11 b4 f5 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 Qh4 ♗h6 14 ♗xh6 Qxh6 15 ♗d3 ♖f7 16 ♗gl fxe4 (16...f4?! 17 Qf3 ♖h5 18 Qg5 ±) 17 Qxe4 ♗xh3 18 ♖h1 and now 18...♗d7! ∞ (rather than 18...♗g4?! 19 f3 ♗h5 20 ♖d2 ♖f4 21 Qg2 ♖xd2+ 22 ♗xd2 ♗xf3 23 ♗xh6 ♗xg2 24 Qg5 e4 25 ♗gl ♖f2+ 26 ♗e2 ♗e8 27 ♗xh7+ ♗g8 28 ♖h2 e3+ 29 ♗d3 ♗xd5 30 Qe4+ 1-0 Krasenkow-Schmaltz, Germany 2000).

c) 10 ♗gl! Qg8 (10...c6 11 Qd2 ♗d7 12 Qb3 cxd5 13 cxd5 ♖c8 14 f3 b5 15 a4 Qc7 16 axb5 Qxb5 17 ♗xb5 ♗xb5 18 ♖xa7 is slightly better for White, I.Nikolaidis-Kotronias, Volos 1996) and then:

c1) 11 ♗e2 ♗d7 12 ♖d2 Qc5 13 b4 Qa4 14 Qxa4 ♗xa4 15 ♖c1 ♗d7! (15...♖d7 16 ♗g3 c6 17 Qh4 cxd5 18 exd5! f6 19 ♗e3 f5 20 gxf5 gxf5 21 ♗g5 a6 ∞ Krasenkow-Xie Jun, Pamplona 1998/9) 16 Qh4 c6 ∞ Dziuba-Dobrowolski, Krakow 2000.

c2) 11 ♖d2 f5 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 exf5 ♗xf5 (13...Qc5?! 14 Qh4 ± Zysk-Panzer, Bundesliga 1992/3) 14 Qh4 ♗d7 (14...♖d7?! 15 0-0-0 e4 16 ♗e3 ± Jovanić-Grobelsek, Portorož 2004) 15 Qe4 Qc5 16 Qxc5 dxc5 17 0-0-0 e4 (17...b5!? 18 cxb5 ♗xb5 19 ♗xb5 ♖xb5 20 ♗g4 Qf6 {20...♖ab8? 21 Qg6+! hxg6 22 ♖h4+ ± Krasenkow-Barcenilla, Subic Bay 1998 – see Illustrative Games} 21 ♗xf6 ♖xf6 22 ♗b1 ♖f4! 23 ♖xf4 exf4 24 Qf5 ♗f6 25 d6! cxd6 26 Qxd6 ♖b4 27 ♖xb4 cxb4 28 ♗d5! ±) 18 ♗e3 ♖e7 19 Qg2 ♖d6 20 Qf4 ± P.Cramling-Barrero Garcia, Huelva 2002.


10...Qg8 11 h4 (D)

Probably the only 'decent' try for White. The alternatives are unclear:

a) 11 ♗d3 f5 (11...♗h6?! 12 ♗xh6 Qxh6 13 ♖e2 f5 14 exf5 gxf5 15 0-0-0 ± Yermolinsky-Tsemekhman, Columbus 1995) 12 exf5 (12 f3 ♗f6 13 ♗xf6+ {13 ♗e3?! ♗h4+ 14 ♗e2 Qf6 ♖ Markos-Flasik, Bratislava 2001} 13...Qxf6 14 ♖e2 =) 12...gxf5 13 ♗xf5 ♗xf5 14 gxf5 Qe7 ∞.

b) 11 f3 f6 12 ♗e3 ♗h6 13 ♗xh6 Qxh6 14 a3 c6! (14...c5? 15 ♗d3 f5 16 exf5 gxf5 17 ♖e2 Qg8 18 0-0-0 ± Jobava-Kotronias, Warsaw Ech 2005) 15 h4 Qc7 ∞.

c) 11 ♗e2 f6 12 ♗e3 f5 (12...♗h6 13 Qf1 f5 14 exf5 ♗xe3 15 Qxe3 gxf5 16 ♖d2 f4 17 Qc2 f3 18 ♗d3 Qc5 19 0-0-0 ♗d7 ∞ V.Georgiev-Banikas, Athens 1998) 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 exf5 Qe7 15 ♗h5 ♖d7 16 f6 ♗xf6 17 Qde4 ♗g7 18 ♖e2 Qf5 ∞ Khomiakov-Isupov, Moscow open 1994.



11...f5

White has good chances after both 11...h6 12 ♗e3 f5 13 gxf5 gxf5 14 exf5 ♗xf5 15 ♗h3 ± Almeida-Mena Crespo, Santa Clara 2005 and 11...f6 12 ♗e3 f5 13 f3 (13 gxf5 gxf5 14 exf5 Qh6 ∞) 13...fxg4 (13...♗d7?! 14 ♗e2 Qf6 and now 15 h5 ± is far superior to 15 Qb3?! ∞ Lazarev-M.Röder, Übach 1996) 14 fxg4 Qf6 15 ♗e2 h5 16 gxh5! gxh5 (16...Qxh5 17 Qb3 Qf4 18 ♗d2! ±/±) 17 Qf3! Qc5 18 Qg5 Qg4 19 ♗xc5! dxc5 20 ♖d2 ± Bagirov-Rosenthal, Berlin 1992.

12 gxf5 gxf5 13 ♗h3!

A painful lesson was effected after 13 exf5? e4! 14 Qb3 Qb4 15 ♗e3 Qh6 16 a3 Qd3+ 17 ♗xd3 exd3 18 ♖xd3 ♗xf5 19 ♖d2 Qg4 ♖ in Grivas-Atalik, Katerini 1993, while 13 ♖e2 fxe4 14 Qdxe4 Qh6 15 ♗h3 ♗xh3 16 ♖xh3 ♖c8 17 ♖f3 Qf5 18 0-0-0 ♖d7 19 ♗gl c6 was unclear in Simeonidis-Kotronias, Athens 2005.

13...♠c5

Or 13...f4?! 14 ♖xc8 ♜xc8 15 h5 ♙f6 16 ♜f3 ♜g4 17 ♙h4 ♙xh4 18 ♜xh4 ± Kožul-Tratar, Nova Gorica 2002.

Another idea is 13...♗b4!?, when White can keep his opening advantage with 14 ♜b1!:

a) 14...h6 15 a3 ♘a6 16 ♙xf5 ♙xf5 17 exf5 ±.

b) 14...♜f7 15 a3 ♘a6 16 exf5 e4 17 ♜dx4 ♙xf5 18 ♙xf5 ♜xf5 19 ♜c2 ♜f3 20 ♜g1 ♜ae8 21 ♙e3 ± ♙xc3+ 22 ♜xc3 ♜xe3+?! 23 fx3 ♜xe3+ 24 ♘e2 ±.

c) 14...♜h5!? 15 a3 ♘a6 16 ♜d1! ♜xd1+ 17 ♜xd1 h6 (17...f4 18 h5 h6 19 ♙h4 ±) 18 exf5 ♙xf5 19 ♙xf5 ♜xf5 20 ♘de4 ±.

d) 14...fxe4 15 ♜dx4 (or 15 ♜cx4 ♜a4 {15...♙xh3?! 16 ♜xh3 ♜a4 17 ♜b3 ±} 16 b3 ♜a3 17 ♙xc8 ♜axc8 18 ♜g1! h6 19 ♙e3 ♘e7 20 ♘g3 ±) 15...♜h5 (15...♜f3?! 16 ♙g2 ♜h5 17 a3 ♘d3+ 18 ♘d2 ♜xf2+ 19 ♜xf2 ♜xf2 20 ♜f1 ± or 15...♙xh3?! 16 ♜xh3 ♘f6 17 a3 ♘a6 18 ♜xf6 ♙xf6 19 ♘e4 ±) 16 ♙xc8 ♜axc8 17 a3 ♜f3 18 ♘d2 ♘a6 19 ♜d3 ±.

14 ♜e2 ♘f6 15 exf5!

Effectively the only move, as 15 ♙xf5 ♙xf5 16 exf5 e4 17 0-0-0 ♜e5 18 ♙xf6 ♜xf6 19 ♜dx4 ♘e4 20 ♜xe4 ♜xf5 21 ♜xe5 ♙xe5 22 ♘e4 ♜f4 23 ♜de1 ♜g8 24 b3 ♜gg4 25 ♜c5 1/2-1/2 Bagirov-Lukin, Leningrad 1989 was nothing special.


15...♜h5 16 ♘de4 ♜xe4 17 ♜xe4 ♙xf5 18 ♙xf5 ♜xf5 19 0-0-0

White stands slightly better, according to Bagirov.

7...♜bd7 8 ♙g5 h6 9 ♙e3 ♜c5 10 ♘d2 a5 transposes, while 7...♘a6 8 ♙g5 h6 9 ♙e3 ♜c5 is another very common route to this line.

8 ♙g5 ♘a6 9 ♘d2 h6

Black cannot really do without this move. On the immediate 9...♜c5 White can even 'simplify' with 10 ♘b3!? b6 (10...♜cd7 11 ♙e2 a4 12 ♘d2 ♜c5 13 b4 axb3 14 axb3 ♜xal 15 ♜xal ♙d7 16 b4 ± Poschke-D.Hamburg, Ruhrgebiet U-17 Ch 1995 or 10...♜xb3 11 axb3 b6 12 g4 h6 13 ♙e3 ♘h7 14 h4 f5 15 gxf5 gxf5 16 exf5 ♙xf5 17 ♜h5 ♜e8 18 ♜xe8 ♜axe8 19 ♙h3 ± Grivas-Kummerow, Dortmund 1992) 11 ♜xc5 bxc5 12 ♙e2 ♙d7 13 0-0 h6 14 ♙e3 ♘h7 15 ♜d2 h5 16 a4! ± (16 a3?! a4 17 b4 axb3 18 ♜fb1 f5 19 f3 f4 20 ♙f2 g5 ∞ Grivas-Kotronias, Athens 1995) or try 10 g4 ♘d7 11 ♜f3!? h6 12 ♙h4 g5 13 ♙g3 ♘e8 (13...c6!? or 13...♘h7?! 14 ♙e2 ♜f6 15 ♜e3 ± J.Ivanov-Gonzalez Acosta, Tenerife 1999) 14 ♙e2 ♙f6 15 ♘f1 ♘g7 16 ♜e3 ♙e7 17 0-0-0 ± Skembris-A.Kofidis, Komotini 1993.

10 ♙e3 ♜c5 (D)

We have reached the basic position of this line. White can now choose among three different plans, according to his taste and style. However, he must always keep in mind that there are a lot of transpositions:

- A:** 11 ♙e2 176
B: 11 a3 177
C: 11 g4 180

A)**11 ♙e2 c6**

Black has some interesting alternatives:

- a) 11...♘h7!? 12 ♘b3 (12 0-0 f5 is unclear) 12...♜xb3 13 axb3 ♙d7 14 ♜d2 h5 15 0-0 ♙f6

5.10 The Main Line 7 d5 a5 with ...♘c5

This is considered the principal set-up for Black. He brings his knight to c5, secures it with ...a5, and prepares kingside activity with the standard advance ...f5 and queenside activity with ...c6 and ...a4; all these plans appear natural and good. Still, White has his share of the chances. It should be mentioned that there are a lot of transpositions, as Black can play this line from several different move-orders.

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 ♙g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♘f3 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 a5

16 c5 ♖g5 17 cxd6 cxd6 18 ♜b5 ♙xb5 19 ♙xb5 ♙xe3 20 ♚xe3 ± Hjartarson-Hellers, Östersund Z 1992.

b) 11...♜e8 12 0-0 f5 13 exf5 gxf5 14 f4 ♜d7 15 ♜f3 ♜ef6 (15...b6 16 ♚d2 ♜h7 17 ♚ael ± 1/2-1/2 Jedlicka-J.Novotny, Czech Cht 1996/7) 16 ♚d2 ♜e4 17 ♜xe4 fxe4 18 ♜h2 ± Gofshtein-di Paolo, Genoa 1998.

12 0-0

The immediate 12 a3 should lead to nothing special:

a) 12...♜e8?! 13 b4 axb4 (13...♜d7 14 ♜b3 cxd5 is best met by 15 ♜xd5! ±, instead of 15 cxd5 axb4 16 axb4 ♚xa1 17 ♚xa1 f5 18 ♙f3 ♜df6 ∞ Bagirov-Nataf, Ubeda 1997) 14 axb4 ♚xa1 15 ♚xa1 ♜a6 16 ♚a3 cxd5 17 cxd5 f5 and now 18 ♜c4! ± Suba-Dolmatov, Seville 1993 or 18 b5 ± Zayats-Zatulovskaya, Rethym-wom ECC 2003.

b) 12...♜fd7! 13 b4 f5 (13...axb4!? 14 axb4 ♚xa1 15 ♚xa1 ♜a6 16 ♚a3 c5! ∞) 14 exf5 gxf5 15 dxc6 bxc6 16 bxc5 f4 17 ♜de4 fxe3 18 0-0 exf2+ 19 ♚xf2 ♚xf2 20 ♜xf2 ♜xc5 21 ♜xc5 1/2-1/2 Speelman-Spraggett, Hastings 1989/90.

12...♙d7 13 ♚b1

White can vary with the interesting 13 a3!?:

a) 13...a4?! 14 ♙xc5 dxc5 15 ♜xa4 cxd5 16 ♜xc5 dxe4 17 ♜dxe4 (17 ♜xd7 ♚xd7 18 ♜xe4 ♚xd1 19 ♜xf6+ ♙xf6 20 ♚axd1 e4 21 ♚d2 ±) 17...♜xe4 (17...♙c6 18 ♙f3 ♜e8 19 ♚xd8 ♚xd8 20 ♜c3 ♙xf3 21 gxf3 ♜d6 22 b3 e4 23 ♚ac1 exf3 24 ♚fd1 ± Poluliakhov-Dashko, Krasnodar 2001) 18 ♜xd7 ♚e8 19 c5! (19 ♚d5 ♜g5 20 ♚xb7?! ♜e6 21 c5 e4! ∞ Yermolinsky-E.Meyer, New York 1991) 19...♚e7 20 ♚d5 ♜g5 21 ♚ad1 ±.

b) 13...cxd5 14 cxd5 a4 15 ♚c1 ± Ramos Aguilar-Santos MartinMoreno, Tenerife 2003.

13...♚e8

White also keeps a small advantage after 13...♚e7 14 b3 ♜e8 15 a3 f5 16 b4 axb4 17 axb4 ♜xe4 18 ♜dxe4 fxe4 19 c5, Petre-Sekelj, Bajmok 2001, 13...♜e8 14 f3 f5 15 exf5 gxf5 16 f4, Kempinski-I.Nikolaidis, Pula Echt 1997, or 13...cxd5 14 cxd5 ♜e8 15 ♙b5!, Zviagintsev-Mortensen, Moscow OL 1994.

14 b4

Also good is 14 a3 cxd5 15 cxd5 b5 (15...a4!? 16 ♚c1 ±) 16 b4 axb4 17 axb4 ♜a4 18 ♚b3 ± Zviagintsev-Dominguez Gonzalez, Terrassa 1996.

14...cxd5 15 cxd5

The complications resulting from 15 bxc5 d4 16 ♜d5 dxe3 17 fxe3 ♜xd5 18 cxd5 ♚b8! 19 cxd6 b5 20 ♜b3 ♚d8 21 ♜c5 b4 22 ♙c4 ♚c8 only lead to equality.

15...♜a4 16 ♚b3 axb4 17 ♚xb4 ♜xc3 18 ♚xc3 ♚xa2


The alternative 18...b5 19 a3 is also slightly better for White.

19 ♚xb7 ♚a8 20 ♚fb1 ♚c8 21 ♚b4 ♙f8 22 ♚b8

± Gulko-Fedorowicz, USA Ch (Durango) 1992 – see Typical Endgames.

B)

11 a3 (D)



11...♜e8

There are a lot of alternatives for Black at this point:

a) 11...a4? 12 ♙xc5 dxc5 13 ♜xa4 b6 14 ♜c3 as in Elianov-Kostiuk, Alushta 2000, does not promise any compensation for Black, as he no longer has at his disposal the move ...♙h6; this detail justifies White's ♙g5-e3.

b) 11...b6?! 12 b4 ♜b7 (12...axb4 13 axb4 ♚xa1 14 ♚xa1 is also much better for White Krasenkova-Grzybowski, Krynica 1998) 13 ♙e2 ♜h7 14 0-0 f5 15 f3 f4 16 ♙f2 g5 17 c5 ± Miljković-Savić, Belgrade 2004.


c) 11...♙d7?! 12 b4 axb4 (other moves are less good: 12...♜a6 13 ♚b1 axb4 14 axb4 ♚c8 15 c5 c6 16 dxc6 bxc6 17 ♜c4 ± Chiong-N.Rogers, Penn State 2002; 12...♜cxe4 13 ♜cxe4 ♜xe4 14 ♜xe4 f5 15 ♜c3 [15 b5 fxe4 16 ♚c2 g5 17 g4 ± Lalev-Chakov, Plovdiv 2003] 15...f4 16 ♙d2 axb4 [16...e4 17 ♜xe4 ♚e7 18 ♙d3 ♙f5 19 f3 ±] 17 ♜e4 bxa3 18

♠d3 ♠f5 19 ♖b3 is much better for White, Ibragimov-Yurtaev, Kstovo 1997) 13 axb4 and now:

c1) 13...♗xal 14 ♖xal ♘a6 (14...♙cxe4 15 ♙dxe4 ♙xe4 16 ♙xe4 f5 17 ♙c3! {17 ♙d2? f4 18 ♠a7 ♠f5 ∞ Volzhin-Høi, Hamburg 1999} 17...f4 18 ♠d2 e4 19 ♖a3 ±) 15 ♖a3 (15 c5!?) 15...♖a8 16 ♙b3 b6 17 ♠e2 ♗b8 18 0-0 ♠c8 19 ♗a1 ± Wallace-Stojić, Gold Coast 2001.

c2) 13...♙a6 14 ♖b3 (14 ♗b1 ♙h7 15 c5 f5 16 ♠xa6 ♗xa6 17 ♙c4 ♖f6 18 b5 ♗aa8 19 b6 f4 20 ♠d2 dxc5 21 bxc7 ♖a6 22 ♙b6 1-0 J.Ivanov-Casanova Nunez, Mondariz Balneario 2002) 14...♙h5 (14...♖e7 15 ♗a5 c5 16 dxc6 bxc6 17 ♠b6 ♠e6 18 ♖a3 ♖b7 19 c5 dxc5 20 bxc5 ♠c8 21 ♠e2 ♙d7 22 ♙c4 ♖b8 23 0-0 ♠b7 24 ♙d6 ♙c7 25 ♙xb7 1-0 Loxine-Kiessling, Dresden 2005) 15 c5 ♠c8 16 ♗a3 f5 17 cxd6 cxd6 18 ♙c4 ± Jovanić-Bosnjak, Bizovac 2004.

d) 11...c6 (D) and now:



d1) 12 ♠e2 should be met by 12...♙fd7!, transposing to Line A. Instead, 12...♠d7?! is bad: 13 b4 axb4 14 axb4 ♗xal 15 ♖xal ♘a6 16 ♖a3 c5 (16...♙c7 17 0-0 ♙fe8 18 ♗a7 ♠c8 19 dxc6 bxc6 20 b5 ± Bagirov-P.Hell, Selestat 2000) 17 bxc5 ♙xc5 18 0-0 (18 ♠xc5!? dxc5 19 ♖xc5 ±) 18...♙h7 19 ♗b1 ± Klimov-Soloviov, St Petersburg 1999.

d2) 12 b4 axb4 (12...cxd5 13 cxd5 axb4 14 axb4 ♗xal 15 ♖xal ♘a6 {15...♙cd7 16 ♙c4 ♙e8 17 ♙b5 ± Minelga-Asauskas, Platelia 2000} 16 ♖a3 ♙e8 17 b5 ± Lazarev-Safranska, Paris 1998) 13 axb4 ♗xal 14 ♖xal ♘a6 15 ♖a3 c5 16 bxc5 dxc5 17 ♠e2 ± M.Röder-Muhren, Belgium 2004.

e) 11...♖e8 12 b4 ♙a6 (12...axb4?! 13 axb4 ♗xal 14 ♖xal ♘a6 15 ♖a3 ♙h5 16 c5 f5

{16...dxc5 17 bxc5 f5 18 c6 f4 19 ♠a7 ± Lazarev-Hausrath, Belgium 2004} 17 c6 ♙c5 18 g4 ♙f6 19 f3 ± Siebrecht-Tattersall Rodriguez, Son Servera 2004) 13 c5! (13 ♙b3?! axb4 14 axb4 ♠d7 15 b5 ♙b4 16 ♠e2 ♗xal 17 ♙xal ♖a8 18 0-0 ♙a2 19 ♙a4 ♖a5 20 ♖b3 ♗a8 21 ♠d1 and now 21...♙c3! = is correct, rather than 21...c6? 22 ♙b6 ♗b8 23 ♙xd7 ♙xd7 24 ♠g4 ± Bareev-Svidler, Elista (5) 1997) 13...♖e7 14 cxd6 cxd6 15 ♙c4 ± Deshmuth-Saravanan, Nagpur 1999.

f) 11...♙h5 12 g3 (12 b4 axb4 13 axb4 ♗xal 14 ♖xal ♘a6 15 ♖a3 f5 16 ♙b3 f4 {16...♖h4? 17 b5 ♙b8 is best met by 18 b6! ± rather than 18 ♖a7 ± Potapov-Salinnikov, Minsk 1998} 17 ♠a7 ♠d7 18 b5 ♖a8 = Stojanov-Kazhgaleev, Cannes 2000) and here:

f1) 12...f5? 13 exf5 ♖e8 (13...♖f6 14 fxg6 ♖xg6 15 ♠xc5 dxc5 16 ♙de4 ± Kuleshova-Mololkina, St Petersburg 1998) 14 ♙b5 ♖f7 15 ♠e2 ♙f6 16 fxg6 ♖xg6 17 ♙xc7 ♗b8 18 ♙b5 ♙d3+ 19 ♠xd3 ♖xd3 20 ♖b1 +– Gadeo Colomina-Lietor Fernandez, Linares 2005.

f2) 12...♖e8 13 ♠e2f5 (13...♙f6 14 b4 axb4 15 axb4 ♗xal 16 ♖xal ♘a6 17 ♖a3 ♙h7 18 c5 dxc5 19 bxc5 f5 20 c6 ± Krasenkova-M.Babula, Koszalin 1997) 14 exf5 e4 15 ♠xc5 dxc5 16 ♠xh5! (16 ♙f1?! ∞ C.Harmon-S.Farago, Budapest 2003) 16...gxh5 17 ♖e2 ±.

f3) 12...♠d7 13 ♠e2 ♙f6 14 b4 axb4 15 axb4 ♗xal 16 ♖xal ♘a6 17 ♖a3 ♖c8 18 g4 (or 18 c5 dxc5 19 bxc5 ♙b8 20 g4 ± Moranda-Priborsky, Urgup 2004) 18...♙h7 19 c5 dxc5 (19...f5? 20 gxf5 gxf5 21 c6 f4 22 cxd7 ♖xd7 23 ♠g4 ♖e7 24 ♠a7 +– Lalić-Piot, Auberwilliers 2000) 20 bxc5 ♙b8 21 ♙c4 ±.


g) 11...♙fd7 12 b4 (12 g4?! a4! 13 ♗gl ♙h7 14 ♖f3 c6 ∞ Van Doeland-Apicella, Cappelle la Grande 2003) and now:

g1) 12...axb4 13 axb4 ♗xal 14 ♖xal ♘a6 15 ♖a3 f5 16 ♙b3 ♙f6 17 c5 ♙b8 (17...♙xe4 18 ♙xe4 fxe4 19 ♠c4 ± Shast-Y.Vovk, Alushta 2002 or 17...fxe4 18 ♙d2 ± Agrest-J.Hall, Rönneby 1998) 18 ♖a7 f4 19 ♠d2 ♙bd7 20 ♙a5 dxc5 21 bxc5 ♙xc5 22 ♖xc5 b6 23 ♖a3 bxa5 24 ♖xa5 ± Jovanić-Delchev, Zadar 2002.

g2) 12...f5!? 13 ♠e2 (13 f3?! axb4 14 axb4 ♗xal 15 ♖xal ♘a6 16 ♖a3 {1/2-1/2 Breier-Juhnke, Neukloster 2000} 16...♠f6! ∞ Dolinsky-Hristodorescu, Eforie Nord 1999) 13...axb4 (13...f4 14 ♠xc5 dxc5 15 bxc5 ♙xc5 16 ♙b3!

♖d6 17 ♜xc5 ♗xc5 18 ♜a4 ♗e7 19 ♟g4 ±) 14 axb4 ♜xa1 15 ♗xa1 f4 (15...♜a6 16 ♗a3 f4 17 ♟a7!) 16 ♟xc5 dxc5 17 ♗a3! +; e.g., 17...♗e7 18 bxc5 ♗xc5 19 ♗xc5 ♜xc5 20 0-0 with the idea ♜a1 and ♟g4.

We now return to 11...♜e8 (D):



12 b4 axb4 13 axb4 ♜xa1 14 ♗xa1 ♜d7

Or 14...♜a6 15 ♗a3 f5 16 ♜b3 b6! (16...♜b8? is poor: 17 c5 ♜d7 18 ♜a5 ♜df6 19 c6! bxc6 { 19...b6 20 ♜b7 ♗e7 21 ♗a8 f4 22 ♟d2 ♟h8 23 ♗xc8 ♜g7 24 ♜d8 ♗xd8 25 ♗b7 ±} 20 ♜xc6 ♗d7 21 ♗a8 ♜h7 22 ♟b5! ± Beliaevsky-Khalifman, Ubeda 1997) 17 c5 bxc5 18 bxc5 ♜xc5 19 ♜xc5 dxc5 20 ♟xc5 ♜d6, and now:

a) 21 ♟d3?! ♗g5! ∞ Kuraszkiewicz-Schultz, 2nd Bundesliga 1998/9.

b) 21 ♟a6 ♟xa6 (21...♟d7 22 0-0 f4 23 f3 ♗g5 24 ♜h1 ♗h5 25 ♜e2 ±) 22 ♗xa6 ♗a8! (22...♟f6 23 ♟xd6 ♗xd6 { 23...♟xd6 24 ♗c4 ±} 24 ♗xd6 ♗xd6 25 ♜d2 c6 26 ♜d3 ±) 23 ♗xa8 ♗xa8 24 ♜e2 ♜xe4 25 ♜xe4 fxe4 26 ♗c1 ♗d8 =.

c) 21 ♟e2!? ♗g5 22 0-0 f4 (22...fxe4?! 23 ♜b5! ±) 23 ♜a4! and White stands better, as the following demonstrate:

c1) 23...♜xe4!? 24 ♟e7! (24 ♟xf8 ♟xf8 25 ♗c1 ♟xh3 26 ♟f3 ♜f6 27 ♜c3 ♟f5 28 ♗e1 ±) 24...♜f6 (24...♗f5 25 ♟g4 ♗f7 26 ♟xf8 ♟xf8 27 ♗d3 ±) 25 ♜c5 ♟f5 (25...♗e8 26 ♟c4! ♜h7 27 d6! cxd6 28 ♜e4 ♗h4 29 ♗a7 ±) 26 ♟g4! ♗e8 (26...♟xg4 27 ♜e4! ±) 27 ♜e6 ♟xe6 28 ♟xe6+ ±.

c2) 23...f3 24 ♟xf3 ♟xh3 25 ♜b2! ±.

c3) 23...♟d7 24 ♟xd6 cxd6 25 ♜b6 f3 26 ♟xf3 ♟xh3 27 ♜h2! ±.

15 c5

15 g4!? f5 (15...♜h7?! 16 ♟e2 ♟f6 17 ♜f3 ± Jovanić-Zelenika, Opatija 2003) 16 gxf5 gxf5

17 exf5 ♜df6 18 ♗g1 ♜h7 19 ♟d3 e4 20 ♜dx4 ♜xe4 21 ♟xe4 ♟xf5 22 ♟xf5+ ♗xf5 23 ♗c1 ± Soppe-Slaby, Internet 2004 or 15 ♟d3 f5 16 f3 ♜df6 17 0-0 f4 18 ♟a7 g5 19 c5 ∞ Deshmukh-R.Philips, India 1999.

15...f5 16 c6!

I believe this move promises White a slight advantage. 16 ♜c4 has been more extensively analysed:

a) 16...♜df6!? 17 exf5 gxf5 (17...♟xf5 18 g4 ♜xd5 19 gxf5 e4 20 ♟d2 ♗f6 ∞) 18 ♗a8 f4 19 ♟d2 dxc5 20 bxc5 ♜xd5 21 ♜xd5 ♗xd5 22 ♗xc8 ♜f6 23 ♗xc7 ♗e4+ 24 ♟e2 ♗b1+ =.

b) 16...dxc5!? 17 bxc5 ♜df6 18 exf5 (18 f3 fxe4 19 fxe4 ♜h5 20 ♟f2 ♗g5 ♢) 18...gxf5 (18...♟xf5? 19 g4 ♜xd5 20 gxf5 e4 21 ♟d2 ♗f6 22 ♜e3 ♜xc3 23 ♜g4 ♗d4 24 f6 ♟xf6 25 ♜xf6+ ♗xf6 26 ♗xc3 ♗xf2+ 27 ♜d1 ±) 19 ♗a8 e4 ∞.

c) Radjabov suggests 16...fxe4 =.

d) 16...f4 17 ♟c1 dxc5 18 bxc5 ♜xc5 19 ♟a3 b6 20 ♟xc5! bxc5 21 ♗a5 f3 (21...♟f6!? 22 ♜xe5 ♗b6 23 ♜c6 ♗xc6!? { 23...♗h4!?) 24 dxc6 ♗d4 25 ♜e2 ♗xe4 26 f3 ♗xc6 27 ♜xf4 ♗f6 with compensation) 22 g3 ♗e7 (22...♟f6!?) 23 ♟d3 h5 24 h4 ♟h6 25 ♜a4 ♜d6 26 ♜xc5 g5!? 27 hxg5 (27 ♜e6? ♟xe6 28 dxe6 ♜xc4 29 ♟xc4 gxh4 30 ♗xh4 ♗b8! → Krasenkow-Radjabov, Dos Hermanas 2001) 27...♗xg5 28 ♜b3!? (28 ♗c3 ♗e8 ∞) 28...♟d7! (Radjabov suggests 28...♟g4 ∞) 29 ♗xc7 (29 ♗d2 ♗xd2+ 30 ♜bx2 ♜xc4 31 ♜xc4 ♗a8 32 0-0 ♟g7 ∞ or 29 ♜cd2 ♟g4 30 ♗xc7 ♗c8! 31 ♗a5 ♟f8 with compensation) 29...♜xc4 30 ♗xd7 (30 ♟xc4 ♗a8 31 0-0 ♗g4 32 ♗a1 ♗c8 33 ♗b6 ♟f8 ∞) 30...♜a5 (30...♜d2 31 ♗e6+ ♜h8 32 ♗xh5 ♗xh5 33 ♜xd2 ♗a8 34 ♟b1 =) 31 ♗e6+ ♜h8 32 ♗xh5 ♗xh5 33 ♜xa5 ♗b8 34 ♗f6+ = with the idea 34...♟g7 35 ♗h4. This analysis, stemming from GMs Teimour Radjabov, Michal Krasenkow and Sergei Shipov, is a good example of the various possibilities that both sides have at their disposal.

16...bxc6 17 dxc6 ♜df6

17...♜b6 18 ♟xb6 cxb6 19 ♟c4+ ♜h8 20 0-0 ± or 17...♜c5 18 bxc5 f4 19 ♜c4 fxe3 20 ♜xe3 ±.

18 ♟c4+ ♜h8 19 ♗a5 ♜xe4


19...f4 20 ♟a7 ±.

20 ♜dx4 fxe4 21 ♜xe4 ♟f5 22 ♟d5

± Chytilék-Slaby, Brno 2004.

C)

11 g4 (D)



This line is White's sharpest attempt to gain the advantage. It fits well with the ideas explained at the start of the chapter, although White must be very precise so as not to lose control of the position. Black has tried four main continuations:

- C1: 11...h5? 180
 C2: 11...e8 180
 C3: 11...h7 181
 C4: 11...c6 182

In my opinion Black's best option is the last variation, C4. Before we move on, the following (inadvisable) alternatives should be mentioned:

a) 11...h5?! 12 e2 (12 Bg1!? hxg4 13 hxg4 e2 14 f3 c6 15 a3 Bc8 16 Bc1 a6 = Minnebo-Tkachev, Geneva 1997 or 12 Wc2 h5 13 f3 (13 g5 h7 14 Bg1 f6! 15 gxf6 Bxf6 16 0-0-0 Wf8! = D. Werner-Kozul, Frankfurt 1990) 13...h7 14 gxf6 Wh4+ 15 e2 Wh5 16 e2 Wh6 17 f1 f6 18 e3 Wh4+ 1/2-1/2 Gheorghiu-Stein, Hastings 1967/8.

b) 11...h7?! 12 e2 e8 13 h4 f5 14 h5 f4 15 hxg6+ xg6 16 xc5 dxc5 17 f3 e6 18 d2 h7 19 g5 xg5 20 B5 d7 21 Qxg5+ g8 22 Wg1! hxg5 23 Wxg5 e2 (23...xg5 24 Bxg5 e8 25 Ag1 e7 26 d6! cxd6 27 d5 f7 28 e5 +-) 24 Bg1 f7 25 Wh6 f8 26 d6 cxd6 27 Wh8+ e7 28 d5+ 1-0 Poluliahkhov-Sivokho, Polanica Zdroj 1999.

C1)

11...e2

In this section we shall examine this move without a later ...c6; that will be covered in Line C4.

12 e2

White hasn't got anything with 12 b3 h7 13 e2 f5 14 f3 c6 15 a3 Bc8 16 Bc1 a6 = Minnebo-Tkachev, Geneva 1997 or 12 Wc2 h5 13 f3 (13 g5 h7 14 Bg1 f6! 15 gxf6 Bxf6 16 0-0-0 Wf8! = D. Werner-Kozul, Frankfurt 1990) 13...h7 14 gxf6 Wh4+ 15 e2 Wh5 16 e2 Wh6 17 f1 f6 18 e3 Wh4+ 1/2-1/2 Gheorghiu-Stein, Hastings 1967/8.

12...h7 13 h4! f5 14 gxf5

Also good is 14 h5 f4 (14...dxe4 15 dxe4 fxe4 16 dxe4 g5 17 f3 ± Khadzhaev-Pautov, Novokuznetsk 2001) 15 xc5 dxc5 16 hxg6 g5 17 f3! ±; e.g., 17...xg4 18 Qxg5 xe2 19 xe2 Wxg5 20 Wf3! ±.

14...gxf5 15 exf5 e2 16 xc5 dxc5 17 e2 g4 xg4


Or 17...e2 18 B3 e4 19 dxe4 e2 20 dxe4 e2 21 e6+ h8 22 B1 e2 23 Wd2! ± and 17...g6 18 e6+ h8 19 Wg4! ±.

18 Wxg4 Bf4 19 Wg3 Wf8 20 f3 a4 21 a3 B6 22 0-0-0

White has a pleasant advantage, Grivas-K.Markidis, Athens 2000 – see Illustrative Games.

C2)

11...e8 (D)



As in many lines of this system, the f6-knight leaves its place to make way for the ...f5 advance. Here it goes directly to e8.

12 h4

The standard follow-up, though White has also tried 12 b3! b6 (12...f5? 13 gxf5 gxf5

14 dxc5 dxc5 15 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc5 d6}$ and now I recommend 16 $\text{exf5} \pm$ as an improvement over 16 $\text{\textcircled{u}d3?!} \pm$ Grivas-Elsness, Gausdal 1993) 13 h4 f5 14 g5 f4 15 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc5 bxc5}$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{m}g1 hxg5}$ 17 $\text{hxg5 \textcircled{c}f7}$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{u}e2 \textcircled{m}h8}$ 19 d2 $\text{\textcircled{u}f8}$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{u}g4 \textcircled{u}e7}$ 21 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc8 \textcircled{w}xc8}$ 22 d3 $\text{\textcircled{m}h5}$ 23 $\text{\textcircled{c}e2} \pm$ Shtyrenkov-Lahiri, Alushta 2005.

12...f5 13 gxf5

The alternative 13 g5 h5! ? (13...f4? 14 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc5 dxc5}$ 15 $\text{gxh6 \textcircled{u}xh6}$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{w}f3 d6}$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{u}h3 \textcircled{c}h7}$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc8 \textcircled{m}xc8}$ 19 0-0-0 d5 20 $\text{\textcircled{c}b1 \textcircled{w}f6}$ 21 d3 b6 22 d5 $\text{\textcircled{c}f7}$ 23 $\text{d6} \pm$ Barsov-Guliev, Abu Dhabi 1999) 14 $\text{exf5 \textcircled{u}xf5}$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc5 dxc5}$ 16 d4 d6 17 $\text{\textcircled{u}d3} \pm$ also seems OK for White, but 13 h5?! fxg4 14 hxg6 (14 $\text{\textcircled{u}e2 gxh5!}$ {14...g5? 15 d1 $\text{\textcircled{w}e7}$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{w}c2 \textcircled{u}d7}$ 17 d3 $\text{\textcircled{u}f6}$ 18 0-0-0 $\text{\textcircled{m}ab8}$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{m}d2 \textcircled{m}fc8}$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc5 dxc5}$ 21 d1 d8 22 e3 d6 23 $\text{\textcircled{u}xg4 \textcircled{u}xg4}$ 24 d4 $\text{\textcircled{w}d7}$ 25 $\text{e3} \pm$ Szelenyi-Kulcsar, Hungary tt 2003) 15 $\text{\textcircled{m}xh5}$ $\text{\textcircled{u}f6}$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{m}h2 h5}$ $\text{\textcircled{w}f6}$ is unclear.

13...gxf5 14 \textcircled{w}e2 a4

Other moves are worse:

a) 14...f4? 15 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc5 dxc5}$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{u}h3} \pm$.

b) 14...d6? 15 dxe6 f4 16 $\text{\textcircled{u}h3!}$ (16 0-0-0 fxe3 17 $\text{fxe3 \textcircled{u}xe6}$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{u}h3} \pm$ Bagirov-Troyke, Neu Isenburg 1992) 16...fxe3 17 $\text{\textcircled{w}xe3} \pm$.

c) 14...dxe4 15 dxe4 fxe4 16 $\text{\textcircled{w}d2!}$ $\text{\textcircled{w}f6}$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{u}g2 \textcircled{u}f5}$ 18 0-0-0 $\text{\textcircled{w}g6}$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{m}dg1 \textcircled{w}h7}$ 20 $\text{\textcircled{u}h3} \pm$ Jagodzinski-L.Krzysztof, Polish Cht (Lubniewice) 1981.

15 a3 c6 16 0-0-0 cxd5 17 \textcircled{u}xc5 dxc5

17...d4 is wrong: 18 $\text{\textcircled{u}b4 dxc3}$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc3} \pm$.

18 \textcircled{u}xd5 \textcircled{u}e6 19 \textcircled{u}c3 \textcircled{u}d6 20 \textcircled{u}h3 \textcircled{w}e7 21 \textcircled{u}xf5 \textcircled{u}xf5

After 21...dxf5?! 22 $\text{\textcircled{u}xf5 \textcircled{u}xf5}$ 23 d4 and 24 d5 White will have a clear advantage.

22 \textcircled{u}d5

\pm Lerner-Høi, Copenhagen 1990.

C3)


11...d7 (D)

The same idea as in the previous lines, but the knight moves to a different square. The advantage of this move is that the black knight can come to g5 in some lines. Still, White seems to be spoilt for choice:

C31: 12 \textcircled{u}e2 181

C32: 12 \textcircled{m}g1 181

C33: 12 h4 182



C31)

12 \textcircled{u}e2 f5 13 gxf5

Black managed to get a pleasant position after 13 exf5 gxf5 14 $\text{\textcircled{m}g1}$ (14 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc5 dxc5}$ 15 $\text{gxf5 \textcircled{u}xf5}$ 16 $\text{\textcircled{u}g4}$ seems slightly better for White but is untested) 14...d5! (14...d8?! 15 $\text{\textcircled{w}c2 d4}$ {15...c6?! 16 0-0-0 cxd5 17 $\text{cxd5} \pm$ A.Mista-Valev, Tallinn U-14 Ech 1997) 16 gxf5 d4 17 $\text{\textcircled{w}b1 \textcircled{u}xf5}$ 18 d4 $\text{\textcircled{w}h4}$ 19 $\text{\textcircled{u}g4} \pm$ Gabriel-Xie Jun, Bad Wiessee 1997) in Radziejewicz-Dworakowska, Cisna 1997.

A fair alternative is 13 $\text{\textcircled{w}c2 d8}$ (13...d6? 14 exf5 d4 15 $\text{\textcircled{u}xd4 exd4}$ 16 fxg6 dxc3 17 gxh7+ d8 18 $\text{bxc3 \textcircled{u}d7}$ 19 $\text{d4} \pm$ Leitão-Flores, Buenos Aires 2000) 14 0-0-0 \pm (14 f3?! $\text{\textcircled{w}h4+}$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{u}f2 \textcircled{w}e7} \infty$ Soshnikov-Tikhonov, Minsk 1996).

13...gxf5 14 exf5

14 $\text{\textcircled{m}g1 d8}$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{w}c2 d4}$ 16 d3 a4 17 d1 fxe4 (17...f4?! 18 $\text{\textcircled{u}d2 a3} \infty$) 18 d4 $\text{\textcircled{w}h4}$ 19 d3 d6 20 d3 c6 21 a3 cxd5 22 $\text{cxd5 \textcircled{u}f5}$ 23 0-0-0 $\text{\textcircled{u}h7}$ 24 $\text{\textcircled{u}g4 d7}$ 25 $\text{\textcircled{m}g3 \textcircled{c}f7}$ was unclear in Kempinski-Irzhonov, Medellin jr Wch 1996.

14...uxf5 15 d3 d4 16 dxe4 uxe4 17 \textcircled{m}g1 \textcircled{w}h4 18 d2 \textcircled{u}f5 19 \textcircled{u}g4

\pm Grebionkin-Khamatgaleev, Ekaterinburg 1996.

C32)

12 \textcircled{m}g1 d8 13 \textcircled{w}c2

13 d3?! b6 14 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc5 bxc5}$ 15 $\text{\textcircled{u}d3} \pm$ Kosyrev-Motylev, Internet 2004 and 13 $\text{\textcircled{w}f3 f5}$ 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 0-0-0 f4 16 $\text{\textcircled{u}xc5 dxc5}$ 17 $\text{\textcircled{w}h5 \textcircled{w}e8}$ 18 $\text{\textcircled{w}xe8 \textcircled{m}xe8}$ 19 d5 $\text{\textcircled{m}e7}$ 20 $\text{d3} \pm$ Shabalov-Stanec, Oberwart 1992 are decent alternatives.

13...b6

Worse is 13...f5?! 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 ♖xc5 dxc5 16 exf5 ♗xf5 (16...e4 17 ♜dxe4 ♗xf5 18 0-0-0 ± Spacek-Karnik, Pardubice 1992) 17 ♗d3 ±.

14 0-0-0 ♗d7 15 ♗e2 ♜g5 16 ♜h1! f5 17 h4 ♜h7 18 exf5

White can even try 18 h5!? f4 19 ♗xc5 bxc5 20 hxg6 ♜g5 21 ♜f3 ♗xg4 22 ♜xg5 ♜xg5 23 ♗xg4 ♜xg4 (23...f3+? 24 ♜d2 ♜xg4 25 ♜xh6+ +-) 24 ♜dgl ±.

18...gxf5 19 g5 a4 20 a3 ♜e7 21 f4 exf4

21...e4? 22 ♜f1! with the idea ♜g3-h5 ±.

22 ♗xf4 ♗e5

Now:

a) 23 ♜df1?! ♗xf4 24 ♜xf4 hxg5 25 hxg5 ♜xg5 26 ♜fh4 ♜f7 ∞ Alterman-Smirin, Tel Aviv 1999.

b) 23 ♗e3! is superior. White stands slightly better, as 23...f4!? is inadequate due to 24 ♗xc5 bxc5 25 ♜f3 ±.

C33)**12 h4!? f5**

Maybe Black should avoid this advance, but then what's the point of ...♜h7? White's play also seems easy after 12...c6 13 h5!? ± (13 ♗e2 f5 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 ♜c2 ± J.Ivanov-Ianchev, Pavlikeni 1995).

13 gxf5


Another good option is 13 exf5 gxf5 14 g5 e4 15 ♜g1! ± Kunz-Neuman, Germany 2003.

13...gxf5 14 ♗xc5 dxc5 15 ♜e2 ♜f6 16 ♗h3 f4 17 0-0-0 ♗xh3 18 ♜xb3

White had the typical advantage of the better minor piece and control of the light squares in C.Santos-A.Ferreira, Gaia 2004.

C4)**11...c6 (D)**

This is the most popular continuation. As Black does not succeed in creating any real counterplay on the kingside by direct means, he plays on the queenside first! According to Gallagher it is useful to play ...c6 only in reply to White's g4, as it will be necessary to create attacking possibilities on the queenside in case the white king stays in the centre or settles on that flank. If he opts for the kingside, Black will



create some initiative there with a future ...h5 and ...f5. Overall, White is for preference due to his spatial advantage, but things are far from easy. A complicated battle will take place.

12 ♗e2

Other continuations don't seem to favour White:

a) 12 a3 ♗d7 13 b4 axb4 14 axb4 ♜xa1 15 ♜xa1 ♜a6 16 ♜a3 ♜c7 (16...c5!? ∞) 17 ♗e2 ♜c8 18 ♜b3 cxd5 19 cxd5 b5 20 f3 ♜h7 21 0-0 ♜fe8 22 ♜c1 = P.Cramling-Fernandez Aguado, Barcelona 1990.

b) 12 ♜f3 ♜b8 13 ♗e2 ♗d7 14 ♜f1 cxd5 15 cxd5 b5 16 ♜g3 b4 17 ♜d1 ♗b5 18 ♗xb5 ♜xb5 19 ♜e2 ♜b8 20 f3 ♜c8 21 h4 ♜fd7 22 ♜f2 b3! ∞ L.Johannessen-A.Hunt, Patras jr Ech 1999.

c) 12 ♜g1 cxd5 13 cxd5 ♗d7 14 h4 (14 ♜f3 ♜e8 15 a4 ♜c8 ∞ K.Movsziszian-Chemeris, Torres Novas 2005) 14...♜e8 15 h5 g5 16 f3 ♜b8 ∞ Ni-Paulauskaite, Herceg Novi 2005.

12...♗d7

The main continuation. Of course Black can also play 11...♗d7 and 12...c6, as was the case in a lot of the games that follow. The following alternatives are inferior:

a) 12...b5? 13 dxc6 (13 cxb5!? cxd5 14 exd5 ♗b7 15 ♜c4 ± Grivas-Karapanos, Porto Carras 1998) 13...b4 14 ♜d5! (Black would be happy after 14 ♜b5?! ∞ Berezina-Rutherford, Sydney 1995 or 14 c7?! ♜xc7 15 ♜d5 ♜d8 1/2-1/2 Neffe-K.Andersen, Lyngby 1991) 14...♜fxe4 (14...♜a6 15 ♗xc5 dxc5 16 ♜a4 ±) 15 c7 ♜e8 16 ♜xe4 ♜xe4 17 ♗f3 ±.

b) 12...♜e8?! 13 ♜g1 ♗d7 14 h4 cxd5 15 cxd5 b5 16 g5 hxg5 17 hxg5 ♜h7 18 ♗xc5 dxc5 19 a4! ± Grivas-Amendola, Athens 1992.

c) 12...♜e8?! 13 ♜b3 cxd5 14 cxd5 b6 15 h4 f5 16 exf5 (16 gxf5?! gxf5 17 exf5 ♗xf5 18

♖xc5 bxc5 19 ♕d3 e4 20 ♜e4 ♞b8 21 ♔g3
 ♙xd3 22 ♜xd3 and here 22...♞xb2! ∞ im-
 proves over 22...♞b6?! ± Raetsky-Gallagher,
 Hastings 1993/4) 16...gxf5 17 g5 ♜xb3 (17...f4!?
 18 ♙xc5 dxc5 19 ♕g4! ± might be a decent try
 for Black) 18 ♜xb3 f4 19 ♙xb6 ♞e7 20 f3 ♙f5
 21 gxf6 (21 ♞a4?! ♞b8 22 ♙xa5 ♞xb2 23
 ♞a3! {23 ♜e4? ♞a7 24 ♞a3 ♙xe4 ♢ V.Georg-
 giev-Nataf, Andorra 1997) 23...♞b8 is unclear)
 21...♙xh6 22 ♞a3! ± e4 23 0-0-0.

d) 12...♜fd7?! and now:


d1) 13 0-0 ♞e7 14 ♜g2 ♜h8 15 ♞h1 f5 16
 f3 ♜f6 17 b3 ∞ Grivas-I.Nikolaidis, Athens
 1995.

d2) 13 a3 a4 14 h4 ♞a5 15 ♜f1 ♞e8! 16 h5
 (16 ♜g2 f5 17 gxf5 gxf5 18 exf5 e4 ∞) 16...g5
 17 ♜g2 ♙f6 18 ♜a2! ♙d8 19 ♜b4 ♜b8 20
 ♜d3 ♜xd3 (20...♙b6? 21 ♜xc5 ♙xc5 22 b4 ±
 or 20...♜ba6?! 21 b4 axb3 22 ♜xb3 ±) 21
 ♙xd3 ♜d7 (21...♙b6?! 22 b4 axb3 23 ♜xb3
 ♞a7 24 c5! dxc5 25 ♙c4 with the initiative)
 22 ♜f1 ♙b6 (22...♜c5?! 23 ♙c2 ♙b6 24 ♔g3
 ♞a6 25 ♞e2 ± Krasenkov-Van Wely, Las Pal-
 mas 1993) 23 ♞f3 ♙xe3 24 fxe3 ♜c5 25 ♙c2
 ♞c7 26 ♔g3 ♜g7 27 ♞hf1 ♞e7 28 ♞f2 f6 29
 ♞af1 ♞g8 ∞.

d3) 13 ♞c2 a4 (13...♞b8?! 14 h4 cxd5 15
 cxd5 b5?! 16 ♜xb5 ♙a6 17 ♜xd6 ♙xe2 18
 ♜xe2 ± Kryschilovski-Fedorov, Moscow 2000)
 14 h4 (14 ♞b1?! ♞a5 15 f3 ♜a6! ∞ Schlamp-
 Prescha, 2nd Bundesliga 1995/6) 14...♞a5 15
 a3 ♜b6 16 h5 cxd5 (16...g5!?) 17 cxd5 f5
 (17...g5 18 0-0 ♙d7 19 b4! ±±) 18 hxg6! (18
 gxf5?! gxf5 19 f3 f4 20 ♙f2 ♙d7 21 0-0-0 ♙f6
 22 ♜b1 ♞ac8 23 ♞c1 ♜h7 24 ♞dl ♞g8 with an
 unclear position, I.Sokolov-Van Wely, Tilburg
 1994) 18...f4 19 ♙xc5 ♞xc5 20 b4 axb3 21
 ♜xb3 ±.

e) 12...a4?! 13 ♙xc5 (13 b4 axb3 14 axb3
 ♞xa1 15 ♞xa1 ♜a6 16 ♞a3 c5! ∞ Comas
 Fabrego-Khalifman, Linares 1997) 13...dxc5
 14 ♜xa4 b5 (14...♜d7 15 ♜c3 f5 16 gxf5 gxf5
 17 ♞c2 ♞h4 18 0-0-0 ± Shabalov-Anka, Biel
 1992) 15 cxb5 (15 ♜xc5 bxc4 16 dxc6 ♞b6 17
 ♜d7 ♙xd7 18 cxd7 ♞xb2 ∞) 15...cxd5 16
 ♜xc5 ♞e7 17 b4 dxe4 (17...♜xe4? 18 ♜dxe4
 dxe4 19 ♞b3 ♙e6 [19...♜h7 20 a4 f5 21 a5 ±])
 20 ♜xe6 fxe6 21 0-0 ♞f4 22 ♞ac1 ♞af8 23 b6!
 ♜h8 24 ♞c7 ♞d6 25 ♞e3 ♞xb4 26 b7 ♞4f7 27
 ♞xf7 ♞xf7 28 ♙a6 ♙f8 29 ♞b3 1-0 Kosyrev-
 Nayer, Samara 2000) 18 ♞b3! (18 ♜c4 ♞d8

19 ♞b3 ♜d5 with compensation, Krasenkov-
 Hanko, Dortmund 1992) 18...♞d8 19 ♙c4 ±±.
 We now return to 12...♙d7 (D):



13 h4

A logical follow-up, trying to fix the king-
 side. White has also tried some other lines:

a) 13 0-0 and now there is no point anymore
 in Black playing only on the queenside:

a1) 13...a4?! 14 ♞b1 ♞a5 15 ♜g2!? (15 f3
 ♞ab8 16 a3 cxd5 17 cxd5 b5 18 ♜a2 ♞fc8
 {18...♞d8 19 ♜b4 ♜h7 20 ♜d3 ♜xd3 21
 ♙xd3 ± Poluliakhov-Soloviov, Moscow 1999})
 19 ♜g2 ♞d8 20 ♜b4 ♜h7 21 ♞c1 ± Grivas-
 Kotronias, Karditsa 1995) 15...cxd5 16 cxd5 b5
 17 a3 ± Grivas-Sirigos, Katerini 1993 – see Il-
 lustrative Games.


a2) 13...h5!?! 14 ♜g2 cxd5 15 exd5 (15 cxd5
 b5) 15...hxg4 16 hxg4 ♜h7 17 ♜de4 ♜xe4 18
 ♜xe4 f5 19 ♜xd6 b6 20 c5! (20 f3?! f4 21 ♙f2
 ♙xg4! ♢ Barsov-Gallagher, Calcutta 2001)
 20...f4 21 ♙d2 bxc5 22 ♜e4 ∞.

b) 13 f3 ♞b8!? (13...a4 14 ♜f1 ♞a5 15
 ♞d2 ♞fc8 16 ♞b1 ♜h7 17 ♔g3 ∞ Grivas-Van
 Wely, Dortmund 1992) 14 ♜b3 (14 ♜f1 h5 15
 ♙g5 cxd5 16 cxd5 ♞b6 17 ♞d2 ♜h7 18 ♙h4
 ♙f6 19 ♙xf6 1/2-1/2 Grivas-Smirin, Katerini
 1992) 14...b6! (14...♜xb3?! 15 ♞xb3 cxd5
 should be met by 16 cxd5 ±, and not 16 ♙b6?!
 dxc4 17 ♙xc4 ♞e7 ♢ Candela Perez-Suarez
 Real, Seville 2004) 15 ♞d2 cxd5 16 cxd5 a4!
 (16...♜e8?! 17 h4 ♜h7 18 h5 g5 19 0-0 ±
 Hawelko-Nowak, Bytom 1986) 17 ♜xc5 bxc5
 18 ♜b1 ♞b4 19 ♜a3 ♞b8 20 ♞b1 ♜h7 21 0-0
 ♔g8 22 ♞fc1 f5 23 ♞c4 fxe4 24 fxe4 ♜f6 =
 Grivas-Ehlvest, Komotini 1992.

c) 13 a4!? ♞c8 (13...cxd5 14 cxd5 ♞c8 15
 h4 ♜e8 16 h5 g5 17 0-0 ♙f6 18 f3 ± A.Hoff-
 man-Mendoza, Cali 2000) 14 h4!?! (14 ♜f1

♖b6 15 ♖a2 ♗b4 16 f3 ∞ Bagirov-Termirbaev, Manila OL 1992) 14...♗b6 15 g5 hxg5 16 hxg5 ♘e8 17 ♖a3!? ±.

We now return to the position after 13 h4 (D):



13...a4

Best, as other moves have proven pleasant for White:

a) 13...♗xg4? 14 ♗xc5 +-.

b) 13...♗xg4? 14 ♗xg4 ♘d3+ 15 ♖f1 ♗xb2 16 ♗b3 ♗xg4 17 ♗b6 ♗xc4 18 ♗xc4 ♗d7 19 h5 ±.

c) 13...♗b6? 14 ♗a4 ♗a7 15 ♗xc5 dxc5 16 g5 ♗h7 (16...hxg5 17 hxg5 ♗e8 ±) 17 gxh6 ♗f6 18 ♗g4 ♗ad8 19 ♗xd7 ♗xd7 20 ♗g4 ♗dd8 21 h5 g5 22 ♗f3 ♖h8 23 ♗f5 ♗de8 24 ♗xg5 ♗xg5 25 ♗xg5 ♗xg5 26 ♗f6+ 1-0 Kosyrev-Balabaev, Internet 2004.

d) 13...♗c8 14 h5 cxd5 15 exd5!? (15 cxd5 ±) 15...g5 16 ♗xc5 ♗xc5 (16...dxc5 17 ♗de4 ±) 17 ♗de4 ♗xe4 18 ♗xe4 ♗c7 (18...f5?! 19 gxf5 ♗xf5 20 ♗xc5 dxc5 21 ♗g4 e4 22 ♗xf5 ♗xf5 23 ♗g4 ♗f6 24 ♗d1 ♗f4 25 ♗e6+ ♗xe6 26 dxe6 ♗d4 27 ♗d2 ♖f8 28 ♗h3 +- Grivas-Cela, Athens 1995) 19 ♗b3! ♗c8 20 ♗a3 ♗d7 21 0-0 ±.

e) 13...cxd5 14 cxd5 b5?! (14...a4 transposes to the main line) 15 g5 hxg5 16 hxg5 ♗h7 17 ♗xb5 ♗xb5 (17...♗xg5? 18 ♗xd6 +- Shishkin-E.Ragozin, Alushta 2000 or 17...♗e7 18 ♗g1 a4 19 ♗xc5 dxc5 20 d6 ± D.Gurevich-Lein, Dallas 1996) 18 ♗xb5 ♗b8 19 a4 ♗xg5 20 ♗g4 f6 21 ♖a3 ♗c8 22 ♗g2 ± Khalifman-Borriss, German Cup 1992.

f) 13...♗h7 14 ♗b3 (14 h5! seems fine) 14...cxd5 15 ♗xc5 d4 16 ♗xd7 ♗xd7 17 ♗xh6 (17 ♗d5!? dxe3 18 fxe3 ±/±) 17...dxc3 18 ♗xg7 cxb2 19 ♗xe5 dxe5 20 ♗b1 ♗e7 21

♗xb2 ♗fd8 22 ♗b3 ♗d7 23 ♗g3 ♗d4 24 0-0 ± Poluliakhov-Loginov, Samara 2000.

g) 13...♗e8 and then:


g1) 14 ♗b3 ♗xb3! (14...cxd5 15 cxd5 ♗a4 16 ♗xa4 ♗xa4 17 ♗d2 ♖h7 18 h5 g5 19 f3 ♗f6 20 0-0 ± Polak-Slaby, Brno 2003) 15 axb3 c5 = Grivas-Brustman, Iraklion 1993.

g2) 14 ♗f1 cxd5 15 cxd5 ♗b8 16 a4 ♗c7 17 ♖a3 b5 (17...♗7a6 ±) 18 axb5 ♗xb5 19 ♗xb5 ♗xb5 20 ♗xc5 ♗xf1 21 ♗xd6 ♗xd6 22 ♖xf1 ± Conquest-Saravanan, British Ch (Scarborough) 1999.

g3) 14 h5! cxd5 15 cxd5 g5 (15...gxh5? 16 ♗xh5 ♗c8 17 f3 ♗f6 18 ♗f1 ♗b8 19 ♗d2 b5 20 ♗g3 b4 21 ♗d1 ± Piven-A.Ferreira, Internet 2003) 16 f3 ♗b8 17 ♗b3 b6 18 ♖f2 ± Chytilek-Schumi, Austria 2003.

14 g5 (D)

As Black's developing initiative on the queenside is dangerous, White has no time for 14 h5?! cxd5 15 cxd5 ♗a5 (15...a3?! 16 b4 ♗a4 17 ♗xa4 ♗xa4 18 ♗c1 {18 ♗b1?! ♗c7?! 19 ♗c1! ♗e7 20 g5! ± and not 20 f3? ♗fc8! ± Grivas-Agnos, Kavala 1999) 18...g5 19 f3 ±) 16 f3 a3 17 ♗c2 axb2 18 ♗xb2 b5 19 ♗b1 ♗fc8 20 hxg6 fxg6 21 ♗xh6 ♗d3+ 22 ♗xd3 ♗xc3 with compensation, Lukov-Tkachev, Cappella la Grande 1994 and J.Ivanov-V.Georgiev, Salou 2000.



14...hxg5 15 hxg5

Black was fine in Chiburdanidze-Nunn, Linares 1988 after 15 ♗xg5 ♗a5 16 ♗b1 cxd5 17 cxd5 b5 18 a3 ♗fb8.

15...♗b7 16 ♗g1

Black has no need to worry after 16 ♗f3 cxd5 17 cxd5 ♗a5 18 ♗d2 ♗fc8 19 ♖f1 b5 20 ♗h4 b4! (20...a3?! 21 b4! ♗xb4 22 ♗b1 ♗a5 and now 23 ♗xb5! ± rather than 23 ♗xb5?!

♠xe4 24 ♠xe4 ♠h3+ ♣ Åkesson-Gallagher, Istanbul OL 2000) 21 ♠d1 a3 22 b3 f5! 23 gxf6 ♠xf6 24 ♠xc5 ♣xc5 25 ♠h2 ♠g7 =.

16...♣a5

This is more precise than 16...cxd5 17 ♠xd5 ♠c6 18 ♣c2 a3 19 b4 ♠e6 20 ♠f3 ♠xd5 21 cxd5 ♠f4 (21...♠d4?! 22 ♣d2 ♣b6 23 ♠d1 ♣xb4 24 ♣xb4 ♠c2+ 25 ♠d2 ♠xb4 26 ♠b1 ♠a6 27 ♠xb7 ± Siebrecht-Zude, Bundesliga 2004/5) 22 ♠b5 ♠c8 23 ♣b3 ±.

17 ♣b1!?

White neutralizes both ...♠xe4 and ...a3 ideas. Other moves promise nothing:

a) 17 ♠c1 cxd5 (or 17...♠fc8 18 f3 ♠f8 {18...♣d8 ∞ Grinshpun-Yeke, Tel Aviv 1998} 19 ♠f2 ♠e7 20 ♠g3 ♣d8 ∞ Zeller-Schmaltz, Stauffer 1994) 18 cxd5 b5 19 f3 ♠fc8 20 a3 (20 ♠f2 ♠f8 21 ♠h1 ♠ab8 ∞ Zeller-Poldauf, Berlin 1993) 20...♠ab8 ∞ Almeida Quintana-Moreno Ruiz, Galapagar 2005.

b) 17 ♣c2 and now:


b1) 17...♠fc8 18 ♠xc5! (18 ♠g4? ♠f8? {18...♠xg4! 19 ♠xg4 a3 ∞} 19 ♠xc5 dxc5 20 a3 ± Döttling-Zude, Germany 2004 or 18 ♠b1 ♠f8 19 ♠h1 ♣d8 ∞ I.Ivanov-Lepeshkin, Gelendzhik 1975) 18...dxc5 (18...♣xc5 19 ♠xa4 ♣a5 20 ♠c3 ±) 19 ♠g4! ±.

b2) 17...a3! 18 b3 ♠a6 19 ♠c1 ♠b4 20 ♣d1 is unclear.

17...cxd5

If Black avoids this exchange and tries 17...♠fc8, then White continues 18 f3 and ♠f2, with a small but pleasant advantage.

18 ♠xd5 ♠fe8 19 f3 (D)



A complicated position has arisen, where White has more space and somewhat better placed pieces; this ensures him a slight advantage. Play might continue:

a) 19...♣d8?! 20 ♣c1! ♠c6 21 ♠b1! ♠e6 22 ♠bc3 ♠d4 23 ♣d2 ♠c8 24 ♠f2 ♠f8 25 ♠g3 ± Sadler-Gallagher, Bundesliga 2001/2.

b) 19...♠e6 20 ♠f2 ♣d8 (20...b5? 21 b4!? {21 cxb5 ♠xd5 22 exd5 ± J.Ivanov-Minero Pineda, Mondariz 2002}) 21...axb3 22 axb3 ♣xa1 23 ♣xa1 ♠xa1 24 ♠xa1 ±) 21 b4 axb3 22 axb3 ♠xa1 23 ♣xa1 ±.

c) 19...♠c6!?! 20 ♣c1!! (20 ♠f2 ♠e6 ∞) and White can claim a small advantage, as his queen comes to c3 and, in case of a queen exchange, the recapture bxc3 will always be a good move. Some examples:

c1) 20...b5? 21 ♣c3! ♠xd5 (21...♣d8 22 ♠b4! ♠b7 23 cxb5 ± or 21...♣xc3 22 bxc3! ♠xd5 23 cxd5 ±) 22 ♣xa5 ♠xa5 23 cxd5 ±.

c2) 20...♠e6?? 21 ♠b6! ♣a6 22 c5 ♠b5 23 ♠b4 +.

c3) 20...♠ac8! 21 ♣c3 ♣d8 22 ♠xc5! dxc5 (22...♠xd5?! 23 exd5 ♠xc5 24 ♠e4 ±) 23 ♣e3 ♠f8! 24 0-0-0 (24 ♣xc5? ♠xd5 25 ♣xd5 ♣b6! ♣) 24...♠e6 25 ♠b1 ♠d4 (25...♠xd5 26 ♠c3!) 26 ♠bc3 ± with the idea of doubling rooks on the h-file.

5.11 Illustrative Games

Completing our survey of the King's Indian Defence, here are four illustrative games that present highly important strategic and tactical motifs for both sides.

Game 1



H. Leyva – R. Leyva
Holguin 1995

1 d4 ♠f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♠c3 ♠g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♠f3 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 ♠h5 8 ♠h2 ♣e8 9 ♠e2 f5 10 exf5 ♠f4 11 ♠xf4 exf4 12 fxg6 ♣xg6 13 ♠f3! ♣xg2 14 ♠g1 ♣xh3 15 ♠xg7+!!

For more information on this line, see Section 5.7.

15...♠xg7 16 ♣d4+ ♠g8 (D)

16...♠h6 17 ♠d2! ♠g4 (17...♠f5 18 ♣xf4+ ♠g7 19 ♠g1+ ♠g6 20 ♣d4+ ♠f6 21 ♠e4 ±) 18 ♠g1 ♠g8 (18...♠d7 19 ♠g5 +-) 19 ♣xf4+ ♠h5 20 ♣f7+ ♠g6 21 ♣xh7+ ♠h6 22 ♣f5+!! ♠xf5 23 ♠g5# or 16...♠f6 17 ♠e4 ♣f5 18 ♠d2 ♠d7 19 ♠g1+ ♠f7 (19...♠h8 20 ♠g5 +-) 20 ♠d3 ♠e7 21 ♠eg5 +-.



17 ♖d2!! ♙f5

17... ♗g4 18 ♗g1 h5 19 ♜e4 ♞f6 20 ♒g5 +-.

18 ♗g1+ ♗g6 19 ♒g5 ♜h6?!

Black should try 19... ♜f5 20 ♒e6 ♞f7 (or 20... ♜c2+ 21 ♖e1 ♜f7 22 ♗d3 ♜c1+ 23 ♒d1 c5 24 ♜e4 ♞g7 25 ♜h1! f3 26 ♒xg7 ♖xg7 27 ♜h5 ♜h6 28 ♜g4 ±) 21 ♗d3 c5 22 dxc6 ♜xe6 (22... ♒xc6? 23 ♗xf5 ♒xd4 24 ♒xd4 +-) 23 cxb7 ♞xb7 24 ♗e4! ♞xb2+ 25 ♖c1 ♒c6 26 ♗xc6 ♞c2+ 27 ♖d1 ♜e5 28 ♜xe5 dxe5 29 ♞xg6+ hxg6 30 ♖xc2 ♞c8 31 ♗d5+ ±.

20 ♗g4 ♞e8 21 ♜f6 ♒a6 22 ♗e6+ ♞xe6 23 ♜xe6+ ♖g7 24 ♒ce4 ♞f8 25 ♜e7+ ♖h8

25... ♖g8 26 ♒f6+ ♖h8 27 ♒e6 +-.

26 ♞h1! 1-0

26... ♜g7 27 ♜xg7+ ♖xg7 28 ♒e6+ ♖f7 29 ♒xf8 ♗xe4 30 ♞h4 +-. A true masterpiece!

Game 2

Grivas – Sirigos

Katerini 1993

1 d4 ♒f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♒c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 h3 0-0 6 ♗g5 ♒bd7 7 ♒f3 e5 8 d5 a5 9 g4 ♒c5 10 ♒d2 ♗d7 11 ♗e2 c6 12 0-0 a4 13 ♞b1 ♜a5 14 ♖g2 h6 15 ♗e3

For more information on this line, see Section 5.10, Line C4.

15... ♗xd5 16 cxd5 b5 17 a3 ♒e8 (D)

Black could also try 17... b4!? 18 axb4 ♜xb4 19 f3 ±.

18 b4?!

White should continue with 18 ♜c2 ♞c8 19 b4! axb3 20 ♒xb3 ♒xb3 21 ♞xb3 f5 22 f3 ±. In making the text-move he clearly overestimated his chances.

18... axb3 19 ♒xb3 ♒xb3?

Black could question White's plan by continuing 19... ♜xc3! 20 ♗d2 ♒xe4 21 ♗xc3

♒xc3 22 ♜d2 ♒xb1 23 ♞xb1 ♞xa3 24 ♒a5 f5!, creating a position where only he can have winning chances.

20 ♞xb3

Now White has obtained a pleasant and lasting advantage.

20... ♒c7 21 ♜d2 ♖h7 22 ♞fb1 ♞fb8 23 ♜b2

Suddenly the black b5-pawn is under fire.

23... ♞c8?!

23... ♗f6 is more tenacious and should have been tried.

24 ♒xb5! ♒xb5 25 ♗xb5 ♗xb5 26 ♞xb5 ♜xa3 27 ♜xa3 ♞xa3 28 ♞b7

White's advantage has grown. The 7th rank and the better minor piece guarantee him superiority.

28... ♖g8 29 ♞d7 ♞a6 30 ♞bb7 ♞f8 31 ♗b6! 1-0

Black resigned as the threat of ♗c7xd6 cannot be stopped.

Game 3

Krasenkow – Barcenilla


Subic Bay 1998

1 d4 ♒f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♒c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♒f3 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 ♒a6 8 ♗g5 ♜e8 9 g4 ♖h8 10 ♞g1 ♒g8 11 ♜d2 f5 12 gxf5 gxf5 13 exf5 ♗xf5 14 ♒h4 ♗d7 15 ♒e4 ♒c5 16 ♒xc5 dxc5 17 0-0-0 b5!? 18 cxb5 ♗xb5 19 ♗xb5 ♜xb5 20 ♞g4 ♞ab8? (D)

For more information on this line, see Section 5.9, Line B4.

21 ♒g6+!

This is a typical combination in this pawn-structure. If I am not mistaken, Michal Krasenkow has executed it (in similar positions) at least three times!



21...hxg6 22 ♖h4+ ♜h6 23 ♙xb6 ♜f5 24 d6?!

Or:

a) White can only draw with 24 ♙xg7++ ♙xg7 25 ♜gl ♜f4 26 ♜xf4 exf4 27 ♛c3+ ♙f7 28 ♛e5 ♛c4+ 29 ♙b1 ♜e8 30 ♛xc7+ ♜e7 31 ♛d6 ♛e4+ 32 ♙c1 ♛c4+.

b) 24 ♜gl ♙f6 25 ♙g5+ (25 ♙xg6? ♛fl+ 26 ♙c2 ♙xh4 27 ♙g7+ ♙g8 28 ♙xe5+ ♙f7 29 ♜g7+ ♙f8 -+ or 25 ♙g7++? ♙xg7 {25...♙g8? 26 ♜h8+ ♙f7 27 ♙xb8 ♙xb8 28 ♛h6} 26 ♛h6+ ♙f7 27 ♛xg6+ ♙e7 28 ♜h7+ ♙d6 29 ♛xf5 ♛xb2+ -+) 25...♙g8 is nothing special for White.

c) But White had the winning move 24 b3!, stopping any counterplay on the b-file.

24...cxd6 25 ♜gl

White must be careful, as the over-optimistic 25 ♙xg7++ ♙xg7 26 ♛h6+ ♙f7 27 ♛h7+ ♙f8 28 ♛h8+? (28 b3!) 28...♙e7 29 ♜h7+ ♙e6 is even losing for him.

25...♙f6 26 ♙xg6! ♙xh4? (D)

A fatal mistake. Black should try 26...♛fl+ 27 ♙c2 ♙xh4 (27...♙xb2+? 28 ♙xb2 ♛b5+ 29 ♙c2 +-) 28 ♙g7+ ♙g8 and now:


a) Not 29 ♙f6+? ♙f7 30 ♜g7+ ♙e6 31 ♜e7+ ♙xf6 32 ♛xd6+ ♙g5 33 ♜g7+ ♙f4 34 ♜g4+ (34 ♛d2+ ♙e4 35 ♛e3+ ♙d5) 34...♙f3 35 ♛d5+ ♙xf2 36 ♛xc5+ ♙f3 =.

b) 29 ♙xe5+ ♙f7 30 ♜g7+ ♙e8 (30...♙f8 31 ♛xd6+) 31 ♜g8+ ♜f8 (31...♙f7 32 ♛d5+) 32 ♜xf8+ ♙xf8 33 ♛xd6+ ♙f7 34 ♛d5+ and here:

b1) 34...♙g6? 35 ♛e6+.

b2) 34...♙e8 35 ♙xb8 (35 ♛c6+ ♙f7 36 ♛f3+) 35...♛xf2+ (35...♛e2+ 36 ♛d2 ♛c4+ 37 ♙d1) 36 ♙b3 ♙f6 37 ♙e5 ♛e3+ (37...c4+ 38 ♙a4 ♛c2+ 39 ♙b5) 38 ♙c3 ♙xc3 39 bxc3 ♛xh3 40 ♙c4 +-.

b3) 34...♙f8 35 ♛f3+! (35 ♙xb8 ♛xf2+ 36 ♛d2 ♛f5+ 37 ♛d3 ♛f2+ 38 ♙b3 ♙f6 39 ♙d6+ ♙e8 40 ♛e4+ ♙d7 41 ♙e5 ♙xe5 42 ♛xe5 ♛f3+ 43 ♙c4 ♛xh3 =) 35...♙g8 (35...♙e7 36 ♙xb8 ♛c4+ 37 ♛c3 ♛e2+ 38 ♛d2 ♛c4+ 39 ♙d1 +-) 36 ♙xb8 (36 ♛g4+ ♙f7 37 ♙xb8 ♛xf2+ 38 ♙b3 ♙f6 ±) 36...♛c4+ 37 ♙d1 ♛d4+ (37...♛f1+ 38 ♙d2) 38 ♙e1 ♙b4+ 39 ♙f1 ♙xb8 40 ♛g4+ ♙f8 41 ♛xh4 ♙xb2 42 ♛c4 and although White will win, it is quite uncertain that he could have found all these lengthy variations over the board. In other words, Black should resist as toughly as possible, not allowing White an easy ride to victory.



27 ♙g7+ ♙g8 28 ♙f6+! ♙f7

28...♙f8 is impossible due to 29 ♛xd6+.

29 ♜g7+ ♙e6 30 ♜e7+ ♙xf6 31 ♛xd6+ ♙g5 32 ♜g7+ ♙f4 33 ♜g4+ ♙f3 34 ♛d5+ ♙e2

34...♙xf2 35 ♛g2+ ♙e3 36 ♜e4+ ♙d3 37 ♛e2#.

35 ♛d1+ ♙xf2 36 ♛g1+ ♙e2 37 ♜e4+ ♙f3 38 ♛e3+ 1-0

Black resigned due to 38...♙g2 39 ♜g4+ ♙h2 40 ♛g1+ ♙xh3 41 ♛g2#. A fantastic king-hunt, showcasing the high class of GM Michal Krasenkow.

Game 4

Grivas – Markidis

Athens 2000

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♘c3 ♙g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♘f3 0-0 6 ♙e2 e5 7 d5 a5 8 h3 ♘a6 9 ♙g5 h6 10 ♙e3 ♘c5 11 ♘d2 ♙d7 12 g4 ♘h7?!

For more information on this line, see Section 5.10, Line C1.


13 h4! f5 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 exf5 ♙xf5 16 ♙xc5!

The e4-square is of great importance, especially now that the black knight cannot reach its ideal square, d6.

16...dxc5 17 ♖g4 ♗xc4?!

This facilitates White's task. More stubborn was 17...♗d3 18 ♖ce4 ♗xe4 (18...♗f4 19 ♖xc5 ♗xc4 20 ♖xc4 ♗xc4 21 ♖e6 ♖e7 22 ♗g1 ±) 19 ♖xe4 ♖e7 20 ♖e2 ♖f6 21 ♗e6+ ♖h8 22 ♖g3 ±/±.

18 ♖xg4 ♗f4 19 ♖g3 ♖f8 20 f3 a4 21 a3! ♗a6 22 0-0-0 ♖f6 (D)



White's advantage on the light squares is undisputed. Just look at the poor g7-bishop!

23 ♖g1!?

23 ♗dg1! ♖h5 24 ♖e1 ±.

23...e4! 24 ♖dx4?!

Black's understandable sacrifice was easy to predict, but White's reaction is wrong. Correct was 24 ♖e3 ♖h5 25 fx4 ♗d4 26 ♖h3 ±.

24...♖xe4 25 ♖xe4?

A really bad move. He should play 25 fx4 ♖h7 26 ♗h3 and, although White still stands better, Black has good counterchances.

25...♗xf3 26 ♖xc5?

Many mistakes in a row! White had to opt for approximate equality with 26 ♖g4.


26...♖f4+ 27 ♗d2 ♖xc4+?

Returning the favour! With 27...♗b6! Black could commence the harvest, but now White is better again.


28 ♗c2 ♖f4+ 29 ♖b1 ♗b6 30 ♖e6 ♖e5 31 ♖xg7+ ♖xg7 32 ♖xg7 ♖xg7 33 ♗xc6+ ♖f6 34 ♗d1 ♗f2 35 ♗c2?

35 b4! would be deadly.

35...♗xc2 36 ♖xc2 ♖e5 (D)



Black's well-centralized king saves the day. **37 h5 ♖d6 38 ♗d4 ♗b5 39 ♗g4 ♗c5+ 40 ♖b1 ♖xd5 41 ♗xa4 ♖d6 42 ♗h4 b5 43 ♖a2 ♗f5 44 ♖b3 ♖c5 45 ♗h3 ♗g5 46 ♖c3 (D)**



White cannot win, as his rook is passive and his king cannot invade into the opponent's camp.

46...♗d5 47 ♖c2 ♖b6 48 ♖b3 ♖c5 49 a4 ♖b6 50 ♖a3 bxa4 51 ♖xa4 ♗d4+ 52 ♖b3 ♖b5 53 ♖c3 ♗d5 54 ♗h4 ♖c5 55 ♗h2 ♖b5 56 ♗h1 ♖c5 57 ♗a1 ♖b5 58 b4 ♖b6 59 ♗a5 ♗xa5 60 bxa5+ ♖xa5 61 ♖d4 ♖b6 62 ♖e5 ♖c7 63 ♖f6 ♖d7 64 ♖g7 ♖e7 65 ♖xh6 ♖f8 66 ♖h7 ♖f7 67 h6 ♖f8 68 ♖h8 ♖f7 69 h7 ♖f8 (stalemate) 1/2-1/2

This was a game full of mistakes, but it is quite illustrative of the various possibilities, ups and downs and in general the typical battle that usually takes place in this system. Things don't always run as smoothly as we want!

Index of Variations

Section Guide

1 d4 $\mathcal{Q}f6$

1...g6 (Chapter 3) 2 c4 $\mathcal{Q}g7$ 3 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ d6 (other moves – 3.3) 4 e4 and now:

- a) 4...e5 5 $\mathcal{Q}c3$ $\mathcal{Q}d7$ 6 $\mathcal{Q}e2$ $\mathcal{Q}gf6$ – 5.3
- b) Other lines – 3.4

2 c4 g6

2...c5 3 d5 and then:

- a) 3...b5 (Chapter 2) 4 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ and now: 4...b4 – 2.3; 4... $\mathcal{Q}b7$ – 2.4; 4...bxc4 – 2.5; 4...g6 – 2.6; 4...e6 – 2.7
- b) 3...e6 (Chapter 4) 4 $\mathcal{Q}c3$ exd5 (4...d6 5 e4 g6 6 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ $\mathcal{Q}g7$ 7 h3 0-0 8 $\mathcal{Q}d3$ $\mathcal{Q}a6$ – 4.3) 5 cxd5 d6 (5... $\mathcal{Q}d6$ – 4.4) 6 e4 g6 7 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ $\mathcal{Q}g7$ (7...a6 8 a4 $\mathcal{Q}g4$ – 4.5) 8 h3 0-0 9 $\mathcal{Q}d3$ and now:
 - b1) 9...b5 – 4.7
 - b2) Other moves – 4.6

3 $\mathcal{Q}c3$

Now:

- a) 3...d5 (Chapter 1) 4 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ $\mathcal{Q}g7$ 5 $\mathcal{Q}g5$ $\mathcal{Q}e4$ (other moves – 1.3) 6 $\mathcal{Q}h4$ and now:
 - a1) 6... $\mathcal{Q}xc3$ 7 bxc3 c5 8 cxd5 $\mathcal{W}xd5$ 9 e3 $\mathcal{Q}c6$ 10 $\mathcal{Q}e2$ cxd4 11 cxd4 0-0 12 0-0 and then: 12...e5 – 1.6; other moves – 1.5
 - a2) Other lines – 1.4
- b) 3... $\mathcal{Q}g7$ (Chapter 5) 4 e4 d6 5 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ 0-0 (5... $\mathcal{Q}g4$ – 5.5; other moves – 5.4) 6 h3 e5 (other moves – 5.4) 7 d5 (7 dxe5 – 5.6) and now: 7... $\mathcal{Q}h5$ – 5.7; 7... $\mathcal{Q}e8$ – 5.8; 7... $\mathcal{Q}a6$ – 5.9; Black plays ...a5 and ... $\mathcal{Q}c5$ – 5.10

1: Grünfeld Defence

1.3 Early Deviations

- 1 d4 $\mathcal{Q}f6$ 2 c4 g6 3 $\mathcal{Q}c3$ d5 4 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ (4 $\mathcal{Q}g5$ 16)
4... $\mathcal{Q}g7$ 5 $\mathcal{Q}g5$ 17
A: 5...c6 18
B: 5...c5 19 6 dxc5 $\mathcal{W}a5$ 7 cxd5! $\mathcal{Q}xd5$ 8 $\mathcal{W}xd5$ $\mathcal{Q}xc3$ + 9 $\mathcal{Q}d2$ 19; 9... $\mathcal{Q}xd2$ + 20;
9... $\mathcal{Q}e6$ 20
C: 5...dxc4 22

C1: 6 e4 22

C2: 6 $\mathcal{W}a4$ + 25; 6... $\mathcal{Q}bd7$ 25; 6... $\mathcal{Q}fd7$ 26;
6... $\mathcal{Q}c6$ 26; 6...c6 26

1.4 The 5... $\mathcal{Q}e4$ Continuation

- 1 d4 $\mathcal{Q}f6$ 2 c4 g6 3 $\mathcal{Q}c3$ d5 4 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ $\mathcal{Q}g7$ 5
 $\mathcal{Q}g5$ $\mathcal{Q}e4$ 28 6 $\mathcal{Q}h4$ $\mathcal{Q}xc3$ 7 bxc3 28
A: 7...dxc4 29 8 $\mathcal{W}a4$ + 29
A1: 8...c6?! 29
A2: 8... $\mathcal{Q}d7$ 30
A3: 8... $\mathcal{W}d7$ 31 9 $\mathcal{W}xc4$ b6 10 e3 $\mathcal{Q}a6$ 11
 $\mathcal{W}b3$ $\mathcal{Q}xf1$ 12 $\mathcal{Q}xf1$ 32
A31: 12... $\mathcal{Q}c6$ 33
A32: 12...c5 33
A33: 12...0-0 34 13 $\mathcal{Q}e2$ 34; 13...c5 34;
13... $\mathcal{Q}c6$ 34
B: 7...c5 35 8 cxd5 $\mathcal{W}xd5$ 9 e3 $\mathcal{Q}c6$ 10 $\mathcal{Q}e2$
cxd4 11 cxd4 36; 11...e5 36; 11... $\mathcal{W}a5$ + 37

1.5 Black's 12th-Move Deviations

- 1 d4 $\mathcal{Q}f6$ 2 c4 g6 3 $\mathcal{Q}c3$ d5 4 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ $\mathcal{Q}g7$ 5
 $\mathcal{Q}g5$ $\mathcal{Q}e4$ 6 $\mathcal{Q}h4$ $\mathcal{Q}xc3$ 7 bxc3 c5 8 cxd5
 $\mathcal{W}xd5$ 9 e3 $\mathcal{Q}c6$ 10 $\mathcal{Q}e2$ cxd4 11 cxd4 0-0 12
0-0 38
A: 12... $\mathcal{W}a5$?! 38
B: 12... $\mathcal{Q}d8$?! 39
C: 12...e6 39
D: 12...a6 39
E: 12... $\mathcal{Q}d7$ 39
F: 12... $\mathcal{Q}e8$ 40
G: 12...h6 40; 13 $\mathcal{Q}g3$ 40; 13 $\mathcal{Q}d2$ 40
H: 12... $\mathcal{Q}g4$ 41
I: 12... $\mathcal{Q}f5$ 42 13 $\mathcal{Q}d2$! 42; 13... $\mathcal{Q}ac8$ 43;
13...e5 44
J: 12...b6 44

1.6 The 12...e5 Central Break

- 1 d4 $\mathcal{Q}f6$ 2 c4 g6 3 $\mathcal{Q}c3$ d5 4 $\mathcal{Q}f3$ $\mathcal{Q}g7$ 5
 $\mathcal{Q}g5$ $\mathcal{Q}e4$ 6 $\mathcal{Q}h4$ $\mathcal{Q}xc3$ 7 bxc3 c5 8 cxd5
 $\mathcal{W}xd5$ 9 e3 $\mathcal{Q}c6$ 10 $\mathcal{Q}e2$ cxd4 11 cxd4 0-0 12
0-0 e5 47 13 dxe5 47
A: 13... $\mathcal{W}xd1$ 47
B: 13... $\mathcal{W}a5$ 49

2: Benko/Volga Gambit

2.3 The 4...b4 Variation

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♗f3 b4 5 8 5 a3!
58: 5...♗a6 59; 5...a5 59; 5...g6 60

2.4 The 4...♗b7 Variation

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♗f3 ♗b7 61 5
♗fd2! 61

A: 5...g6?! 61

B: 5...b4?! 61

C: 5...e6 62

D: 5...♖a5?! 62

E: 5...d6?! 62

F: 5...bxc4 63 6 e4 63; 6...d6 63; 6...e6! 63

2.5 The 4...bxc4 Variation

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♗f3 bxc4 65 5
♗c3 d6 6 e4 66: 6...♗a6 66; 6...♗g4 66;
6...g6 67; 6...♗bd7 69

2.6 The 4...g6 Variation

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♗f3 g6 70 5
♗fd2!? ♗g7 6 e4 bxc4 7 ♗c3 d6 71: 8 ♗xc4
71; 8 ♗xc4 72

2.7 The Blumenfeld Gambit

1 d4 ♖f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♗f3 e6 73 5 ♗g5
73

A: 5...♖a5+ 74 6 ♖d2 ♖xd2+ 7 ♗bxd2 75

A1: 7...exd5 75

A2: 7...bxc4 75 8 e4 ♗b7 9 ♗xf6 gxf6 10
♗xc4 ♗a6 76; 11 0-0 76; 11 0-0-0!? 77

B: 5...h6 77 6 ♗xf6 ♖xf6 77: 7 ♗c3 78; 7
♖c2 79

C: 5...exd5 80

3: Modern Defence

3.3 Black's 3rd-Move Deviations

1 d4 g6 2 c4 ♗g7 3 ♗f3 88

A: 3...f6 88

B: 3...e6 88

C: 3...b6 88

D: 3...f5 89

E: 3...♗c6 89

F: 3...c6 89 4 ♗c3 d5 5 e3 89; 5...e6 90;

5...♗h6 90; 5...♗f6 90

3.4 The 3...d6 Variation

1 d4 g6 2 c4 ♗g7 3 ♗f3 d6 93 4 e4 93

A: 4...♗c6 93

B: 4...♗d7 94 5 ♗c3 e5 6 ♗e2 94; 6...c6 94;

6...♗e7 94; 6...♗h6 95

C: 4...e5 96 5 ♗c3 96

C1: 5...♗c6 96

C2: 5...exd4 97 6 ♗xd4 97; 6...♗e7 98;

6...♗c6 98

D: 4...♗g4 99 5 ♗e2 99

D1: 5...c6 99

D2: 5...e5 100

D3: 5...♗xf3 100 6 ♗xf3 ♗c6 7 ♗e3 e5 8 d5

♗d4 101; 9 ♗c3 101; 9 ♗xd4 101

4: Modern Benoni

4.3 Black Avoids ...exd5

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♗c3 d6 5 e4 g6 6
♗f3 ♗g7 7 h3 0-0 8 ♗d3 ♗a6 107 9 0-0 ♗c7
10 dxe6!? ♗xe6 11 ♗e3 108: 11...♗h5?! 108;
11...b6 108; 11...♗d7 108; 11...♗d7 109

4.4 The Snake Benoni

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♗c3 exd5 5 cxd5
♗d6 109 6 ♗f3 0-0 7 ♗g5!? 110

A: 7...♗c7 110; 8 ♗d2 111; 8 e3 111; 8 d6!?
111

B: 7...♗e8 111 8 e3 111; 8...a6 111; 8...h6
112

4.5 The 8...♗g4 Variation

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♗c3 exd5 5 cxd5
d6 6 e4 g6 7 ♗f3 a6 113 8 a4 ♗g4 9 ♗e2 114

4.6 The Main Line without 9...b5

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♗c3 exd5 5 cxd5
d6 6 e4 g6 7 ♗f3 ♗g7 8 h3 0-0 9 ♗d3 115

A: 9...♗a6 116

B: 9...b6 118

C: 9...♗e8 119 10 0-0 c4 11 ♗c2 b5 12

♗xb5 ♗xe4 13 ♗xe4 ♗xe4 119: 14 ♗d2 120;
14 ♗g5! 121

D: 9...a6 121

E: 9...♗d7 124

F: 9...♗h5 125 10 0-0 ♗d7 11 ♗e1 126:

11...♗e8 126; 11...a6 126; 11...♗e5 127

4.7 The Main Line with 9...b5

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ♗c3 exd5 5 cxd5
d6 6 e4 g6 7 ♗f3 ♗g7 8 h3 0-0 9 ♗d3 b5 128

10 ♗xb5 ♗xe4 11 ♗xe4 ♖a5+ 12 ♗fd2

♖xb5 13 ♗xd6 128

A: 13...♖d7?! 128
 B: 13...♖d3 129 14 ♘2c4 ♖xd1+ 15 ♗xd1
 129: 15...♗d7 129; 15...♗a6! 129
 C: 13...♖a6 130

5: King's Indian Defence

5.3 The Early ...♗bd7 Variation

1 d4 g6 2 c4 ♗g7 3 ♗f3 d6 4 e4 e5 5 ♗c3
 ♗d7 6 ♗e2 ♗gf6 7 0-0 0-0 142 8 ♖c2 143:
 8...♗h5 143; 8...h6 143; 8...exd4 144; 8...c6
 144

5.4 Black's 5th-Move Deviations

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3
 146
 A: 5...e5?! 146
 B: 5...♗c6?! 147
 C: 5...♗bd7 147
 D: 5...a6 148
 E: 5...c5 149 6 d5 149; 6...b5 149; 6...e5 150
 F: 5...♗a6 151

5.5 The 5...♗g4 Variation

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3
 ♗g4 152 6 ♗e2 0-0 7 ♗e3 ♗fd7 8 ♗g1!
 ♗xe2 9 ♗gxe2 154; 9...♗b6 154; 9...♗c6
 154; 9...e5 155; 9...c5 155

5.6 The Exchange Variation

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3
 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 dxe5 156 7...dxe5 8 ♖xd8 ♗xd8
 9 ♗g5 156
 A: 9...h6? 156
 B: 9...♗c6? 156
 C: 9...♗f8 157

D: 9...c6 157
 E: 9...♗bd7 159 10 0-0-0 ♗f8! 11 ♗d5 c6 12
 ♗e7+ ♗h8 13 ♗e3! ♗e8 14 ♗xc8 159:
 14...♗exc8 159; 14...♗axc8 160
 F: 9...♗e8 160 10 ♗d5! ♗xd5 11 cxd5 c6 12
 ♗c4 cxd5 13 ♗xd5 ♗d7! 14 ♗d2 ♗c5 15
 ♗c4! 162; 15...♗e6 162; 15...♗f8 163
 G: 9...♗a6 163

5.7 7 d5: Introduction and 7...♗h5

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3
 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 165 7...♗h5 8 ♗h2! 165

5.8 7 d5 ♗e8

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3
 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 ♗e8 167 8 g4! 167

5.9 7 d5 ♗a6

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3
 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 ♗a6 169 8 ♗g5 169
 A: 8...h6 169
 B: 8...♖e8 171 9 g4 171; 9...♗d7 171;
 9...♗c5 172; 9...♗d7 173; 9...♗h8 174

5.10 The Main Line 7 d5 a5 with ...♗c5

1 d4 ♗f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 ♗g7 4 e4 d6 5 ♗f3
 0-0 6 h3 e5 7 d5 a5 176 8 ♗g5 ♗a6 9 ♗d2 h6
 10 ♗e3 ♗c5 176
 A: 11 ♗e2 176
 B: 11 a3 177
 C: 11 g4 180
 C1: 11...♗d7 180
 C2: 11...♗e8 180
 C3: 11...♗h7 181; 12 ♗e2 181; 12 ♗gl 181;
 12 h4 182
 C4: 11...c6 182

Other Books from Gambit Publications

Chess Explained: The Classical Sicilian

Alex Yermolinsky

Former US Champion Yermolinsky reveals the key plans and ideas of one of his favourite openings.

112 pages, 248 x 172 mm; \$19.95 / £12.99

Chess Explained: The Queen's Indian

Peter Wells

An opening rich in nuances. Many of the modern main lines involve moves that look extravagant, but are backed up by a deep underlying logic. ²

128 pages, 248 x 172 mm; \$19.95 / £12.99

How to Beat 1 d4

James Rizzitano

A repertoire for Black based on the counterpunching Queen's Gambit Accepted. It also covers lines where White sidesteps the gambit.

160 pages, 248 x 172 mm; \$27.50 / £15.99

An Explosive Chess Opening Repertoire for Black

Jouni Yrjölä & Jussi Tella

A hugely popular repertoire book. Based around the move 1...d6, Black has a complete answer to any white first move.

272 pages, 210 x 145 mm; \$23.95 / £15.99

Play the Open Games as Black

John Emms

Shows how Black can counter any attempt by White to avoid the Ruy Lopez. Emms explains precisely how to deal with the Scotch, King's Gambit, Italian Game, Four Knights, etc.

224 pages, 210 x 145 mm; \$23.95 / £15.99

Play the 4 f3 Nimzo-Indian

Yuri Yakovich

The surprise weapon 1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 e6 3 ♘c3 ♙b4 4 f3! could have your opponent worried after just four moves.

128 pages, 210 x 145 mm; \$23.95 / £13.99

King's Indian and Grünfeld: Fianchetto Lines

Lasha Janjgava

By calmly fianchettoing his king's bishop, White aims to draw the sting from some dynamic black defences.

320 pages, 210 x 145 mm; \$22.95 / £15.99

The Gambit Guide to the Benko Gambit

Steffen Pedersen

Superb coverage of 1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 b5. "If you play the Benko or play against it, you will want this book" – International Master John Watson.

176 pages, 210 x 145 mm; \$19.95 / £14.99

Understanding the Grünfeld

Jonathan Rowson

True to form, Rowson's coverage is both readable and inspiring. The Grünfeld was a natural favourite of two exciting World Champions, Fischer and Kasparov.

240 pages, 210 x 145 mm; \$24.95 / £15.99

Understanding the King's Indian

Mikhail Golubev

A realistic and informative guide to the King's Indian. Grandmaster Golubev has played it for the whole of his chess career, scoring many devastating victories.

208 pages, 248 x 172 mm; \$27.50 / £15.99

About the Publisher: Gambitchess opening books are designed to be different. We recruit the finest authors, writing on their specialist systems. Our editorial team is obsessive about double-checking variations and spotting tricky transpositions. We believe trustworthy analysis is important, and that an openings book should remain an asset over many years.

GAMBIT

www.gambitbooks.com

Grivas provides a full and detailed repertoire for White against five important openings: the Grünfeld, King's Indian, Benoni, Benko and Modern. In each case, he has recommended a line in which he has a wealth of experience, and has played a significant personal role in developing over many years:

- King's Indian: 4 e4 d6 5 ♟f3 0-0 6 h3
- Grünfeld: 4 ♟f3 ♟g7 5 ♟g5
- Benko: 4 ♟f3
- Benoni: 6 e4 g6 7 ♟f3 ♟g7 8 h3
- Modern: 1 d4 g6 2 c4 ♟g7 3 ♟f3

The recommendations are geared towards posing Black unconventional problems: your opponents will not be able to churn out lengthy memorized variations, but will need to solve problems at the board in positions that are somewhat different in character from those normally reached in these openings. Grivas has also chosen the repertoire so that it forms a seamless whole, and will fit alongside an English or Réti move-order, in addition to a standard 1 d4 repertoire.

This is an unusually deeply researched and creative repertoire book. Grivas reveals many 'secret' ideas and gives abundant strategic guidance on how to handle the middlegame positions that result.

Grandmaster **Efstratios Grivas** lives in Athens and is also an International Arbiter and Organizer. He has represented his country on a great many occasions, winning an individual gold medal at the 1989 European Team Championship and an individual silver medal at the 1998 Olympiad. He is a FIDE Senior Trainer and an experienced writer. This is his second book on chess openings for Gambit.

Gambit Publications Ltd is:

Managing Director: Murray Chandler GM
Chess Director: Dr John Nunn GM
Editorial Director: Graham Burgess FM

For further information about Gambit Publications, send an e-mail to: info@gambitbooks.com
<http://www.gambitbooks.com>

Other titles from Gambit Publications include:

A Complete Guide to the Grivas Sicilian

Efstratios Grivas

Chess College 1: Strategy

Efstratios Grivas

French: Advance and Other Lines

Steffen Pedersen

Chess Explained: The Classical Sicilian

Alex Yermolinsky

How to Beat 1 d4

James Rizzitano

Mastering the Najdorf

*Julen Arizmendi and
Javier Moreno*

Play the Sicilian Dragon

Edward Dearing

Understanding the Chess Openings

Sam Collins

Win with the London System

*Sverre Johnsen and Vlatko
Kovačević*

The English Attack

Tapani Sammalvuo

£15.99

\$26.95

ISBN-13: 978-1-904600-48-0

ISBN-10: 1-904600-48-4



9 781904 600480 >