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Foreword

It would probably not be an easy task to find a chess-player who had never heard of the Sicilian Sozin – the famous attacking system for White associated with the move $\mathcal{A}c4$. It has been many decades since club players as well as top grandmasters started playing it, so you should not be surprised to see this book, wherein your obedient servant has aspired to consolidate the entirety of the vast amount of material accumulated on this issue.

Before you there is a standard openings book which has been written with a view to combining the functions of a textbook and a handbook, presenting the necessary theoretical basis for all interested chess-players. The book’s format is more or less typical and the only thing requiring clarification is the author’s understanding of the generally accepted chess assessments. Like many others, I use the term ‘unclear’ to describe something like ‘a complicated position with probably approximately equal chances’. In addition, the assessment ‘±’ is intended to mean something closer to ‘$+$’ than to ‘÷’ (and, respectively, ‘$\mp$’ is closer to ‘$-$’ than to ‘$+$’).

The author has collected together all the essentials that he has managed to discover and establish on the subject, both during 18 years of practice and in the course of writing this book, and hopes that this work will help players seeking landmarks in the hazardous territory of the Sozin Attack.

The accuracy of the assessments and variations was one of my main priorities, but only one who knows very little about chess could aspire to write a Sozin book free from inaccuracies. I would be grateful for any messages about possible errors (addressed to gmi@europe.com) and hope these errors will not be too numerous.

All in all, it is simpler and more intriguing to play the Sozin than to present this system from a theoretical viewpoint, and I am looking forward to successful Sozin games played by my readers!

Mikhail Golubev

*Odessa, Ukraine*

October, 2001
Introduction

My serious acquaintance with the Sicilian Sozin began in 1982 when I chanced upon an interesting though still largely unknown article by the master Mochalov, published in the magazine Shakhmaty, Shashki v BSSR (1980).

The article contained plenty of interesting games and lines where White attacked desperately and Black defended doggedly, but the following piece of analysis constituted the main topic:

1 e4 c5 2  f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4  xd4  
f6 5  c3  c6 6  c4 e6 7  e3  e7  
8  e2 a6 9  b3 0-0 10 0-0-0  c7 11  
g4  d7?! 12 g5  c5 13  hgl b5 14  
 h5 b4?! 15  xc6  xb3+ 16 axb3  
 xc6 17  d4! (D)

17... b7!

This was Mochalov’s main idea (not 17...bxc3? 18  h6! e5 19  xe5! ++). His main line now continued 18  g4 bxc3! 19  h4 cxb2+ 20  xb2  
 xe4! 21  xe4  xe4, when Black has an advantage.

It is not easy to improve on White’s play. This was confirmed both by the subsidiary lines in the article (the most important being 18  f6 bxc3 19  
 h6 cxb2+ 20  xb2  xc2+!! and 21... fc8+ followed by 22...gxh6, Rudnev-Mochalov, USSR 1976) and by the game Chandler-Yudasin, Minsk 1982, where White could not find anything better than the 21... xe4 line. Nevertheless, I managed to find a not-so-complicated solution that had evaded the attention of others: 18  d5!  
exd5 19  d3! with a strong attack (instead of 19  h6  xc2+! as indicated by Mochalov). I was very happy with this finding at the time because it was the first time I had managed to find something of importance to theory.

Since that time I have played about eighty serious games with the move  c4; as it happens, four of them resulted in the position shown in the diagram, and they brought me 3 ½ points. I do not mean to say that events always evolved happily on the board but the ratio of wins to defeats (45-8) proves that my choice was correct. Here is one of my pleasant reminiscences:

Golubev – Mantovani

Biel open 1992

1 e4 c5 2  f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4  xd4  
f6 5  c3 a6 6  c4 e6 7  b3 b5 8
0-0 słb7 9 słe1  słabd7 10  słabg5  słabb6 11 a4 b4 (D)

more – the defence is not easy but it is certainly not hopeless and I shall try to be objective throughout.

Theoretical Basis

Conceptually, the Sicilian Sozin is not a single opening but three opening systems. This generic name describes the entire range of opening lines that arise when, after 1 e4 c5 2  słf3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4  słxd4  słabf6 5  słabc3, White plays 6  słabc4 in response to 5...e6, 5...a6 or 5...słc6. Despite the obvious possibilities for these three lines to transpose, each of them has its own reputation and occupies its own place in opening theory.

6  słabc4 against the Scheveningen Variation

5...e6 6  słabc4 (D)

Actually, the Sicilian Sozin and also this book are intended primarily for those chess-players who, like me, enjoy attacking without a backward glance. Nevertheless, I do not wish to discourage the supporters of Black still

At least half of all games starting this way result in positions from the Fischer Attack or the Sozin/Velimirović Attack because Black plays ...a6 or ... słabc6. However, a stronger plan for Black is 6...słe7! with a quick transfer
of the knight to c5 if White plays 7 \( \text{b3} \) (e.g., 7...\( \text{a6} \)!). Due to this, and also because White has the dangerous Keres Attack (6 g4) in his arsenal, the move 6 \( \text{c4} \) is not in the list of main responses to 5...e6.

\[ \text{6 \( \text{c4} \) against the Najdorf Variation (or Fischer Attack)} \]

\[ \text{5...a6 6 \( \text{c4} \) (D)} \]

This is the version of 6 \( \text{c4} \) that is most difficult to assess. Black does not often take the opportunity to transpose to the lines with ...\( \text{c6} \) and White has to struggle in double-edged lines such as 6...e6 7 \( \text{b3} \) b5 or 6...e6 7 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 8 f4 \( \text{c5} \) where Black has less direct control over the centre but more chances to devalue the bishop on b3 and to organize counterplay quickly through ...b5 and ...b4.

If Black does play ...\( \text{c6} \), he often does not do it at once (6...e6 and 7...\( \text{c6} \)). In such lines as 6...e6 7 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{e7} \) and 6...e6 7 0-0 \( \text{e7} \) the idea ...\( \text{c6} \) remains in reserve.

6 \( \text{c4} \) is one of the four main answers to the Najdorf (the others are 6 \( \text{g5} \), 6 \( \text{e3} \) and 6 \( \text{e2} \)).

The Classical Sozin and Velimirović Attack

\[ \text{5...\( \text{c6} \) 6 \( \text{c4} \) (D)} \]

Now, after 6...e6, we get the starting position of the Sozin/Velimirović complex. White's most aggressive plan, connected with 7 \( \text{e3} \), 8 \( \text{e2} \) and 9 0-0-0 (often with the inclusion of \( \text{b3} \)) is traditionally called the Velimirović Attack, while the other plans, usually involving 0-0 and f4, are called the Classical Sozin Attack.

It is important to know that both Velimirović Attack and Classical Sozin Attack mean not a single specific position but a multiplicity of similar variations. White may aspire to the arrays of the Velimirović Attack by starting from 7 \( \text{e3} \) or 7 \( \text{b3} \), while to prepare the Classical Sozin Attack at least three moves are suitable: 7 \( \text{e3} \), 7 \( \text{b3} \) and 7 0-0. In all instances the lines with a further ...a6 for Black comprise the majority of the accumulated theoretical material.

Besides 6...e6, Black has a rather popular opportunity to make the game atypical for the Sicilian Sozin by playing 6...\( \text{b6} \)!!? (or, also, 6...\( \text{d7} \)??).
6...\textit{c}4 is the second most important answer to 5...\textit{c}6 (after the Richter-Rauzer Attack, 6 \textit{g}5).

So, the Sicilian Sozin exists in three different versions. Theoretically, the most dangerous of them is 5...\textit{c}6 6 \textit{c}4, and the least dangerous is 5...\textit{e}6 6 \textit{c}4. However, all such assessments are made within the range of '=' to '±' and supported by thousands of games, while the outcome of an individual game is decided by quite different factors.

\textbf{Strategic Features}

Even just a quick glance at the Sicilian Sozin shows that the sides do not manœuvre at all, or at least very seldom. The pieces retreat, as a rule, only if the adversary attacks them with pawns and even that happens quite infrequently. The struggle may often become aggravated to such an extent that strategy ceases to exist as an independent category and completely gives way to tactics or, more precisely, fuses with tactics.

Nevertheless, the initial reasons that oblige the sides to struggle in precisely such a manner are found in a purely strategic domain.

Having played 6 \textit{c}4 and then \textit{b}3, White has transferred the bishop to a position where it will, from a certain viewpoint, exert pressure on the centre and, from another viewpoint, be aimlessly set against the defended \textit{e}6-pawn. It is this contradiction that forms the basis for the strategic conflict. White takes on an obligation to create dynamic threats rapidly in the centre and on the kingside. If he succeeds, the value of the active bishop on the a2-g8 diagonal may be exceedingly high (a simple example: 5...\textit{a}6 6 \textit{c}4 \textit{e}6 7 0-0 \textit{d}7 8 \textit{x}e6?! with an attack). In the opposite case, the potential of the \textit{b}3-bishop will not be used and this piece may become a useless extra or a target for Black's attack through ...\textit{b}5, ...\textit{a}5 and ...\textit{a}4. Therefore, the result of the opening struggle is reduced to the question of whether White succeeds in using the bishop in his operations.

Given the above, it is not surprising, for instance, that White's plan connected with \textit{f}3, \textit{g}4 and \textit{g}5, which is not bad in other varieties of the Sicilian, is usually too slow and unsuccessful here as it fails to generate a rapid threat to \textit{e}6 and makes no use of the \textit{b}3-bishop. If the \textit{f}-pawn is to be moved, it should go not to \textit{f}3 but to \textit{f}4 followed by \textit{f}5 or \textit{e}5 – such a scheme corresponds to the classical concept of the Sicilian Sozin.

More advanced schemes envisage the attack without the participation of the \textit{f}-pawn, by means of a quick \textit{g}4 and \textit{g}5 and, in individual cases, e.g., in the line 5...\textit{a}6 6 \textit{c}4 \textit{e}6 7 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}5 8 0-0 \textit{e}7 9 \textit{w}f3, by piece activity only, without the participation of pawns. Still, use of the \textit{b}3-bishop remains an important component of White's idea (e.g., 9...\textit{b}7 10 \textit{x}e6! in the line I have just mentioned).

Black's success depends on how he prepares for his opponent's activity. He has a standard set of ideas of which we mention here just three:

a) Ideally, the best way to neutralize the bishop on \textit{b}3 is to transfer one of the black knights to \textit{c}5, where it defends the \textit{e}6-pawn, attacks the \textit{e}4-pawn
and is ready to exchange itself for the bishop when necessary. However, in practice White quickly mobilizes his forces and often Black cannot afford to lose time with the knight manoeuvre.

b) The other typical manoeuvre for the Sozin, ...\(\text{c6, a5 and xxb3,}\) is generally less dangerous for White, who can count on preserving his advantage in the centre.

c) Black’s universal resource and a component of almost all his plans is the advance of the b-pawn to b4 with a threat to the c4-knight and the e4-pawn. Having spent some time on the transfer of the bishop to b3, White (as a rule!) cannot afford a further loss of time to make defensive moves after ...b5 and has to react by creating threats in another area of the board.

The above explains the strategic predetermination of the rapid aggravation of the struggle in the Sicilian Sozin. An example:

1 e4 c5 2 \(\text{f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 f6 5 c3 a6 6 c4 e6 7 b3 e7 8 f4 b5 (D)}\)

![Chess Diagram](image)

a) 9 a3?! 0-0 10 0-0 \(\text{b7} 11 \text{e2?!}\) (White should try 11 f5?!) 11...\(\text{bd7!}\)

and Black is already better: 12 e5 (too late) 12...\(\text{dxe5} 13 \text{fxe5 c5! 14 e3 wb6!} \times. White should not play like that. The long-term factors favour Black and slow play is disastrous for White – at least until the first manifestation of his activity and the appearance of weak points in his opponent’s centre.

b) The active 9 f5 does not work properly here due to 9...\(\text{e5}\) or maybe 9...\(\text{b4?!}\), but in other cases (for example, 8...\(\text{c7}\) instead of 8...\(\text{b5}\) f5 will probably be the strongest move, while a3 almost never is.

c) 9 e5! dxe5 10 fxe5 \(\text{xd7}\) 11 \(\text{xe6 c5} 12 \text{xc8 wxc8} 13 \text{d5}\) with quite a promising position. An example of strategically correct play by White with the bishop on b3 – not a single ‘preventive’ move was made!

It appears to me that White’s play is in practice reduced to a choice of active continuations and is psychologically easier than the task facing Black, who has to maintain a delicate balance between defensive and counter-attacking actions. Be that as it may, it is high time to start telling you about this practice in more detail.

**Historical Background**

**The Story Begins: Veniamin Sozin**

A participant in four USSR championships, master Veniamin Sozin (1896-1956) was not the first to develop the bishop on \(c4\) in the Sicilian, but the system is rightfully named after him. Sozin was the first to link the bishop’s manoeuvre with an orderly system of attack in the centre and on the kingside.
Sozin – Ilyin-Zhenevsky
USSR Ch (Moscow) 1931

1 e4 c5 2 ∇f3 ∇c6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ∇xd4 ∇f6 5 ∇c3 d6 6 ∇c4 e6 7 0-0 ∇e7 8 ∇e3 a6 (D)

9 f4
That is the beginning of the story of the Sozin Attack. White prepares further assaults that can be associated with three different ideas: e5, f5 or g4.

9... wc7
9...d5!? is also possible. Modern chess-players prevent this by playing 9 ∇b3! first, and only then 10 f4.

10 ∇b3 ∇a5 11 ∇f3! ∇xb3 12 axb3 0-0 13 g4! ∇b8
Not 13...b5? 14 ∇cxb5.

14 g5 ∇d7 (D)

White has a substantial advantage. Sozin continued with 15 ∇h5 g6 16 ∇h6 and his follower, Fischer (in Fischer-Cardoso, New York (2) 1957) preferred 15 f5 ∇e5 16 ∇g3, but probably the most precise line of all is 15 ∇h3 ∇e8 16 ∇f3! ∇f8 17 ∇h4 b5 18 ∇h3 h6 19 gxh6 g6 20 f5 b4 21 ∇f1! (Suetin/Boleslavsky).

Ilyin-Zhenevsky won the game eventually and, possibly because of

that, Sozin’s plan only came into fashion in the 1950s...

1950

This was an important year. White won several spectacular games and the move 6 ∇c4 (primarily as an answer to the plan with ...∇c6) was acclaimed among Soviet masters.

Geller – Vatnikov
Kiev 1950

1 e4 c5 2 ∇f3 ∇c6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ∇xd4 ∇f6 5 ∇c3 d6 6 ∇c4 e6 7 0-0 ∇e7 8 ∇e3 0-0 9 ∇b3 ∇a5 10 f4 b6 (D)

11 e5! ∇e8
Possibly better is 11...dxe5 12 fxe5 \(\mathbb{Q}e8\) (but not 12...\(\mathbb{Q}d7\) 13 \(\mathbb{Q}xf7\)).

12 f5! dxe5

Or: 12...exf5 13 e6!; 12...\(\mathbb{Q}xb3\) 13 \(\mathbb{Q}c6\)!

13 fxe6! f6? 14 \(\mathbb{Q}f5\) \(\mathbb{Q}xb3\) 15 \(\mathbb{Q}d5\)!
\(\mathbb{Q}d4\) 16 \(\mathbb{Q}xe7\) + \(\mathbb{Q}h8\) 17 \(\mathbb{Q}g6+\) ! 1-0

In the 1950s heated discussions began on the Sozin Attack. It was at this time that Fischer appeared on the scene...

Fischer

The eleventh World Champion, Bobby Fischer, used 6 \(\mathbb{Q}c4\) from the very moment he appeared on the international stage in 1957 until he left it in 1972. His contribution to the development of the system cannot be overestimated. He used all the basic varieties of the Sicilian Sozin when playing White, and contested one of them (5...a6 6 \(\mathbb{Q}c4\)), which deservedly bears his name, when playing both colours.

Some of his victories:

Fischer – Bednarski

_Havana OL 1966_

1 e4 c5 2 \(\mathbb{Q}f3\) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \(\mathbb{Q}xd4\) \(\mathbb{Q}f6\) 5 \(\mathbb{Q}c3\) a6 6 \(\mathbb{Q}c4\) e6 7 \(\mathbb{Q}b3\) \(\mathbb{Q}bd7\) 8 f4 \(\mathbb{Q}c5\) 9 f5 \(\mathbb{Q}fxe4\)? (D)

10 fxe6! \(\mathbb{Q}h4+\)

The alternatives are also very bad for Black: 10...\(\mathbb{Q}xe6\) 11 \(\mathbb{Q}xe4\) \(\mathbb{Q}xe4\) 12 \(\mathbb{Q}xe6\) fxe6 13 \(\mathbb{Q}g4\); 10...fxe6 11 \(\mathbb{Q}xe4\) \(\mathbb{Q}xe4\) 12 0-0.

11 g3 \(\mathbb{Q}xg3\) 12 \(\mathbb{Q}f3!\) \(\mathbb{Q}h5\) 13 exf7+ \(\mathbb{Q}d8\) 14 \(\mathbb{Q}g1\) \(\mathbb{Q}f5\) 15 \(\mathbb{Q}d5!\) \(\mathbb{Q}xf7\) 16 \(\mathbb{Q}g5+\) \(\mathbb{Q}e8\) 17 \(\mathbb{Q}e2+\) \(\mathbb{Q}e6\) 18 \(\mathbb{Q}f4\) \(\mathbb{Q}d7\) 19 0-0-0 \(\mathbb{Q}e8\) 20 \(\mathbb{Q}xe6+\) \(\mathbb{Q}xe6\) 21 \(\mathbb{Q}e4!\) g6 22 \(\mathbb{Q}xe6\) 1-0

Fischer – Dely

_Skopje 1967_

1 e4 c5 2 \(\mathbb{Q}f3\) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \(\mathbb{Q}xd4\) \(\mathbb{Q}f6\) 5 \(\mathbb{Q}c3\) \(\mathbb{Q}c6\) 6 \(\mathbb{Q}c4\) e6 7 \(\mathbb{Q}b3\) a6 8 f4 \(\mathbb{Q}a5\) 9 0-0 \(\mathbb{Q}xd4\) 10 \(\mathbb{Q}xd4\) d5? 11 \(\mathbb{Q}e3\) \(\mathbb{Q}xe4\) 12 \(\mathbb{Q}xe4\) dxe4 13 f5 \(\mathbb{Q}b4\) 14 fxe6 \(\mathbb{Q}xe6\) 15 \(\mathbb{Q}xe6\) fxe6 (D)

16 \(\mathbb{Q}xf8+!\) \(\mathbb{Q}xf8\) 17 \(\mathbb{Q}a4+!\) b5 18 \(\mathbb{Q}xe4\) \(\mathbb{Q}d8\) 19 \(\mathbb{Q}c6+\) \(\mathbb{Q}d7\) 20 \(\mathbb{Q}d1\) \(\mathbb{Q}e7\) 21 \(\mathbb{Q}d3\) 1-0

Fischer – Rubinetti

_Palma de Mallorca IZ 1970_

1 e4 c5 2 \(\mathbb{Q}f3\) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \(\mathbb{Q}xd4\) \(\mathbb{Q}f6\) 5 \(\mathbb{Q}c3\) e6 6 \(\mathbb{Q}c4\) a6 7 \(\mathbb{Q}b3\) b5 8
0-0  \texttt{\textsc{b}}7 9  \texttt{\textsc{e}}1  \texttt{\textsc{bd}}7 10  \texttt{\textsc{g}}5  \texttt{h}6 11  \\
\texttt{\textsc{h}}4  \texttt{\textsc{c}}5? (D)

\textbf{Velimirović – Sofrevski}  \\
\textit{Yugoslavia 1965}

1  e4  c5 2  \texttt{\textsc{f}}3  \texttt{\textsc{c}}6 3  d4  \texttt{\textsc{xd}}4 4  \texttt{\textsc{xd}}4  \\
\texttt{\textsc{f}}6 5  \texttt{\textsc{c}}3  \texttt{d}6 6  \texttt{\textsc{c}}4  e6 7  \texttt{\textsc{e}}3  \texttt{\textsc{e}}7 8  \\
\texttt{\textsc{we}}2  a6 9  0-0-0  \texttt{\textsc{c}}7 10  \texttt{\textsc{b}}3 (D)

12  \texttt{\textsc{d}}5!  \texttt{\textsc{exd}}5 13  \texttt{\textsc{exd}}5+  \texttt{\textsc{d}}7 14  \\
\texttt{\textsc{b}}4!  \texttt{\textsc{a}}4 15  \texttt{\textsc{xa}}4  \texttt{\textsc{bxa}}4 16  c4!  \texttt{\textsc{e}}8  \\
17  \texttt{\textsc{wx}}4+  \texttt{\textsc{d}}7 18  \texttt{\textsc{b}}3  \texttt{g}5 19  \texttt{\textsc{g}}3  \\
\texttt{\textsc{h}}5 20  c5  \texttt{\textsc{dx}}5 21  \texttt{\textsc{bxc}}5  \texttt{\textsc{wx}}5 22  \\
\texttt{\textsc{xe}}8+  \texttt{\textsc{d}}7 23  \texttt{\textsc{wa}}4+  \texttt{\textsc{c}}6 24  \texttt{\textsc{xc}}6  \\
1-0

Wonderful games! The 1960s were the heyday of the Sicilian Sozin, due not only to the American champion...

\textbf{The Velimirović Attack}

The Yugoslav grandmaster Dragoljub Velimirović was the second outstanding follower of Sozin. Starting in 1965, Velimirović put into practice a most dangerous attacking scheme against the 5...\texttt{\textsc{c}}c6 system. It featured the development of the queen on e2 and queenside castling, substituting a quick g4 and g5 for Sozin’s basic idea (f4), when the forced retreat of the knight from f6 to d7 nourished White’s mind with various tactical ideas. The concept was taken on at once by a number of chess-players, including Fischer himself.

14  \texttt{\textsc{f}}5!?  \texttt{\textsc{exf}}5 15  \texttt{\textsc{d}}5  \texttt{\textsc{wd}}8 16  \\
\texttt{\textsc{exf}}5 0-0? 17  \texttt{\textsc{f}}6!  \texttt{\textsc{gfx}}6 18  \texttt{\textsc{d}}4  \texttt{\textsc{e}}5 19
gx
xf6 xf6 20 xHg1+ xg7 21 xxe5 dxe5 22 wxe5 f6 23 d7+ w7 24 wH5+ 1-0

The game attracted the glare of publicity in the chess world and some decades passed before the theoreticians came to a more-or-less definite opinion that 16...b7! (instead of 16...0-0?) enables Black to equalize.

Recoil

Fischer is linked to the sharp tumble of popularity of the Sicilian Sozin in the 1970s, as well as its previous peak. The games Fischer-Larsen and Fischer-Spassky (given below) administered a blow to White’s position and raised a lot of questions. Fischer ceased to play chess and the questions remained unanswered. However, the first blow was delivered by Fischer himself in 1967 and it fell upon the system 5...a6 6 c4.

R. Byrne – Fischer
Sousse IZ 1967

1 e4 c5 2 d3 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xxd4 d6 5 c3 a6 6 c4 e6 7 b3 b5 8 f4

A popular plan at the time. The extremely important idea 8 0-0 Hc7 9 wHf3!, used by Fischer against Olafsson in 1960, ironically, was not developed at all in the 1960s.

8...Hb7 9 f5 e5 10 de2 dbd7 11 g5 c7 12 g3 c8 13 0-0 (D)

White is ready to use the resource Hh5 to develop his initiative but he will face a great disappointment.

13...h5! 14 h4 b4 15 xf6 xf6 16 d5 xh4 17 xh5 wH5

Now it is Black who attacks on the kingside and has an advantage.

The reputation of the Velimirović Attack suffered seriously from an innovation by Bent Larsen.

Fischer – Larsen
Palma de Mallorca IZ 1970

1 e4 c5 2 d3 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xxd4 d6 5 c3 c6 6 c4 e6 7 b3 c7 8 c3 0-0 9 wH2 a6 10 0-0-0 wH7 11 g4 (D)

11...d7

This manoeuvre was carried out for the first time in this game and it still remains an important tool for Black against the Velimirović Attack. The immediate 11...b5 is unsuccessful because of 12 g5 d7? 13 d5! +–, so Black
transfers the knight to c5 in advance. After that, ...b5 and ...b4 will become a very serious threat.

12 h4?

Even Fischer’s brilliance was not enough to reject this enticing but utterly inefficient move.

12...c5 13 g5 b5! 14 f3 d7 15 wg2 b4 16 c2 cxb3+ 17 axb3 a5
18 g6 fxg6 19 h5 d4 20 d4
20 xd4 g5! 21 xg5 xg5+ 22 wg5 a4.

20...g5 21 xg5 xg5+ 22 wg5 h6! 23 wg4 d7!

Later Black energetically made use of his advantage and won.

In the 1971 match against Larsen, Fischer managed to take his revenge by turning back to the Classical Sozin with 0-0 and winning twice. And yet, in the 1972 World Championship match—Fischer’s last contest until 1992—the last word was Black’s.

Fischer – Spassky
Reykjavik Wch (4) 1972

1 e4 c5 2 df3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 dxd4 df6 5 dc3 dc6 6 e4 e6 7 db3 de7
8 de3 0-0 9 0-0 a6 10 f4 d4 11 xd4 b5 (D)

This plan, rare at the time, was specially prepared by Spassky.

12 a3 b7 13 wd3 a5!

The point.

14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5 de7 16 xxb5 dc5 17 xex5 xex5+ 18 h1 wg5!?

Black’s chances are somewhat superior. The game ended in a draw on the 41st move, but on the way Spassky missed a good opportunity to pose serious problems for his opponent.

Certainly, the development of ideas in the 1970s did not stop at that. White’s adherents went on with their search. Still, in the absence of Fischer these attempts did not bring the desired results. The Classical Sozin was committed to oblivion. The Velimirović Attack preserved more followers but all attempts in Larsen’s variation 11 g4 xd7 were stuck because of the line 12 g5 dc5 13 dh1 d7!, which was very thoroughly analysed by the Soviet theoretician Nikitin. Finally, in the Fischer Attack, 5...a6 6 c4 e6 7 b3 b5, White persisted with the line 8 0-0 e7 9 f4 although practice proved that Black had no real problems after 9...b7!. “Currently Sozin’s Attack has been completely ousted by Rauzer’s Attack [i.e. the Richter-Rauzer Attack]” wrote Mochalov in his article (1980).

Still, White’s resources were far from being exhausted and the proof appeared quite soon.

Revival

It was the game Sax–Timman, London 1980 that indicated where it was possible to strengthen White’s play in the game Fischer–Spassky. Instead of the
sluggish continuation 12 a3, White should go in for the following forcing variation:

12 e5! dxe5 13 fxe5 ♞d7 14 ♞e4 ♞b7 15 ♞d6! ♞xd6 16 exd6 (D)

This position is of paramount importance for the entire Classical Sozin. The play is complicated and White possesses resources to fight for an advantage after 16...♗g5 17 ♙f2 (or 17 ♙e2). The final verdict has not yet been declared.

The Velimirović Attack was invigorated by a brilliant win by Andrei Sokolov.

A. Sokolov – Salov  
Nikolaev 1983

1 e4 c5 2 ♙f3 ♙c6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ♞xd4 ♙f6 5 ♙c3 d6 6 ♙c4 e6 7 ♙e3 a6 8 ♙e2 ♙c7 9 0-0-0 ♙e7 10 ♙b3 0-0 11 ♙hgl ♙d7 12 g4 ♙c5 (D) 13 ♙f5!

This knight sacrifice had not previously attracted serious theoretical attention. Sokolov and his coach Yurkov did a great job that was fully reflected in this game.

13...b5 14 ♞d5 ♙b7 15 g5 exf5? 16 g6 hxg6 17 ♙xg6 ♙e5 18 ♙xg7+!
+ ♙xg7 19 ♙g1+ ♙g6 20 exf5 ♙h8 21 ♙d4+ ♙f6 22 fxg6 fxg6 23 ♙g4 ♙h6 24 ♙xf6+ ♙h7 25 ♙e1 ♙xd5 26 ♙xd5 ♙c8 27 ♙e7+ ♙g8 28 ♙g7+ ♙f8 29 ♙g8+ ♙xg8 30 ♙e7+ 1-0

In neither the 1980s nor the 1990s could Black find complete security in the Classical Sozin and Velimirović Attack. It is not by accident that one of the chess world leaders of the 1990s, Vladimir Kramnik, invariably avoids these positions by playing 6...♗b6.

Development of the Fischer Attack

Of all the subsystems of the Sozin, the greatest change and commotion in the last 15-20 years of the 20th century were seen in the theory of 6 ♙c4 in the Najdorf system.

First of all, by about 1985 it finally became evident that in the main variation 1 e4 c5 2 ♙f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ♙xd4 ♙f6 5 ♙c3 a6 6 ♙c4 e6 7 ♙b3 b5 White can still fight for the initiative by making use of an old idea of Fischer’s:

8 0-0 ♙e7 9 ♙f3! (D)
Black’s early advance on the queenside has somewhat weakened his position and this allows White to alter his plan completely. In contrast to other lines of the Sicilian Sozin, White is able to create serious threats without any pawn moves.

An example:

9...\(\text{ \textit{b6}}\)

This and 9...\(\text{ \textit{c7}}\) are the main continuations.

10 \(\text{ \textit{e3}}\) \(\text{ \textit{wb7}}\) 11 \(\text{ \textit{g3}}\) 0-0 12 \(\text{ \textit{h6}}\) \(\text{ \textit{e8}}\) 13 \(\text{ \textit{f1}}\) \(\text{ \textit{d7}}\) 14 \(\text{ \textit{ad1}}\) (\(D\))

14...\(\text{ \textit{c6?!}}\) 15 \(\text{ \textit{d5!}}\) \(\text{ \textit{d8}}\) 16 \(\text{ \textit{f5?!}}\) \(\text{exf5}\) 17 \(\text{exf5}\) \(\text{\textit{e5}}\) 18 \(\text{\textit{xe5!}}\) \(\text{dxe5}\) 19 \(\text{f6}\) \(g6\) 20 \(\text{\textit{e7+}}\)

The two lines 20...\(\text{\textit{xe7}}\) 21 fxe7 and 20...\(\text{\textit{h8}}\) 21 \(\text{\textit{xf8}}\) are dismal for Black. The earliest game that ended thus was Gurieli-G. Sakhatova, USSR wom Ch (Erevan) 1985.

Although Black can avoid fatal consequences if he defends accurately, and although 7...b5 has many followers (the most important of them being Boris Gelfand), Black’s chances after 9 \(\text{\textit{f3}}\) are overall a little worse. In the 1980s the question of whether 7...b5 ‘stops’ the Fischer Attack was answered.

Black also has at his disposal a powerful resource, quite logical and undeservedly rejected after the game Fischer-Bednarski, i.e. 7...\(\text{\textit{bd7?!}}\). The year 1989 witnessed a real burst of popularity for this forgotten variation, for two reasons. First, 7...\(\text{\textit{bd7}}\) was played by Kasparov. In Ehlvest-Kasparov, Skelletfast World Cup 1989, Black had no problems at all after 8 \(\text{\textit{g5}}\) h6 9 \(\text{\textit{h4}}\) \(\text{\textit{wa5}}\) 10 0-0 \(\text{\textit{wh5?!}}\). Second, at the same time Ashot Anastasian demonstrated to the chess community how it is possible to fight against Fischer’s recipe 8 f4 \(\text{\textit{vc5}}\) 9 f5:

1 e4 c5 2 \(\text{\textit{f3}}\) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \(\text{\textit{xd4}}\) \(\text{\textit{f6}}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{c3}}\) a6 6 \(\text{\textit{c4}}\) e6 7 \(\text{\textit{b3}}\) \(\text{\textit{bd7}}\) 8 f4 \(\text{\textit{c5}}\) 9 f5 \(\text{\textit{e7}}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{f3}}\) 0-0 11 \(\text{\textit{e3}}\)

In his book My 60 Memorable Games, Fischer assessed this position as advantageous for White.

11...e5?! 12 \(\text{\textit{de2}}\) \(\text{\textit{xb3}}\) 13 axb3 b5! (\(D\))

Now both 14 \(\text{\textit{xb5?!}}\) d5 15 exd5 \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{g3}}\) \(\text{\textit{b7}}\), Akopian-Anastasian, Tbilisi jr 1989, and 14 \(\text{\textit{g5?!}}\) \(\text{\textit{b7}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{xf6}}\) \(\text{\textit{xf6}}\) 16 0-0-0? b4 17 \(\text{\textit{d5}}\) a5 18 \(\text{\textit{b1}}\) a4, Kruppa-Anastasian, USSR Ch (Podolsk) 1989, give Black a big advantage.
The boom for the move 7...\( \text{Nd}b\text{d7} \) was assured and from the beginning of the 1990s this continuation became the main tool against the Fischer Attack. Both White and Black were finding new ideas and the Sicilian Sozin entered a period of active development. The match between Short and Kasparov turned out to be the climax of this period.

**Short – Kasparov**

The 1993 world championship match did not promise any news for the Sicilian Sozin. Short did not use this system at all and the spectacular win by Kasparov when playing White against Gelfand at Linares 1993 (in the line 5...a6 6 \( \text{Nc}4 \) e6 7 \( \text{b}3 \) b5 8 0-0 \( \text{a}7 \) 9 \( \text{gf}3 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 10 \( \text{Wg}3 \) 0-0 11 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 12 \( \text{Ad}1 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 13 \( \text{f}3! \)?) was clearly just an episode in his openings research. A great surprise followed: in Short’s games with White – from the sixth game to the twentieth – the same position emerged:

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{gf}3 \) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{Nxd}4 \) \( \text{Nf}6 \) 5 \( \text{c}3 \) a6 6 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{c}4 \) e6 7 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{D} \)

Kasparov now tried three different moves.

In the first three games (6, 8 and 10) he played 7...\( \text{Nd}b\text{d7} \) 8 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \) and each time Short reacted differently. Three draws followed and the openings were always favourable for Kasparov who, nevertheless, should have lost at least two of these games due to later mistakes.

There followed 7...\( \text{Ne}6 \) in the next two games. After 8 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 9 \( \text{e}3 \) 0-0, Kasparov managed to strike a blow against one of the popular lines in the 12th game (10 \( \text{Wf}3 \)!? \( \text{Nxd}4 \)! 11 \( \text{Nxd}4 \) b5 12 \( \text{Nxf}6 \) \( \text{Nxf}6 \) 13 e5 \( \text{Nh}4+ \) 14 g3 \( \text{Nb}8 \)) but when in game 14 Short chose the classical 10 0-0, Kasparov faced some problems. These two games also ended in draws.

In all three remaining games Kasparov resorted to 7...b5 8 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 9 \( \text{Wf}3 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) and Short never managed to obtain an appreciable advantage, though he won one of the games.

Generally speaking, the Short-Kasparov match proved that defence is not the strongest side of Kasparov’s talent since he clearly underperformed when under attack in these Sozin middlegames. However, from the theoretical viewpoint these games did not yield many answers.
The most significant were the games with 7...\(\text{Q}b\text{d}7\) 8 f4 \(\text{Q}e5\). The move 9 e5 was successfully neutralized in the 8th game (9...dxe5 10 fxe5 \(\text{Q}f4\) 11 \(\text{Q}f4\) \(b5!\)) and Kasparov’s deep concept from the 10th game (9 \(\text{W}f3\) \(b5!\) 10 f5 \(\text{Q}d7?!\)) was developed by Short himself later – 9 f5 \(b5!\) (instead of the very playable 9...\(\text{Q}e7\), as in Short-Kasparov, 6th game) 10 0-0 \(\text{Q}d7\), Istratescu-Short, Erevan OL 1996.

Kasparov probably avoided 7...\(\text{Q}b\text{d}7\) in the course of the match not because of the results of the opening fight but due to the very fact that White has a wide choice. Later he came back to this move and the discussion was resumed in the 1996 Amsterdam tournament: 9 0-0?! \(\text{Q}f4x4!\) 10 \(\text{Q}xe4\) \(\text{Q}xe4\) 11 f5 e5 12 \(\text{W}h5\) with an extremely sharp game (12...\(\text{W}e7?!\), Topalov-Kasparov; 12...d5!?, Topalov-Short).

To all appearances, by about 1996/7 the leading players of the world had decided that Black is close to equality in the line 7 \(\text{Q}b3\) \(\text{Q}b\text{d}7\) and it is not by accident that during their two post-match games, Short selected another (quite rare) sequence of moves when playing against Kasparov – 7 0-0?! (D).

This devalues 7...\(\text{Q}b\text{d}7?!\), which can be answered by 8 \(\text{W}xe6\), 8 \(\text{E}e1\) or 8 \(\text{Q}g5\).

After 7...\(\text{Q}e7\) 8 \(\text{b}3\) 0-0 9 f4 (D), the two Short-Kasparov games went:

```
B

```

a) 9...\(\text{Q}c6\) 10 \(\text{Q}e3\) (the game has moved into Classical Sozin territory) 10...\(\text{Q}xd4\) 11 \(\text{Q}xd4\) \(b5\) 12 e5 dxe5 13 fxe5 \(\text{Q}e8?!\) 14 \(\text{Q}e4\) \(\text{b}7\) 15 \(\text{Q}d3\) ± Short-Kasparov, Amsterdam 1996.

b) 9...b5! (on this occasion Kasparov avoids the Classical Sozin; there appears on the board a double-edged variation, well known as a result of the ‘wrong’ but once popular move-order 7...b5 8 \(\text{Q}b3\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 9 f4 {instead of 9 \(\text{W}f3!\}) 9...0-0 – instead of 9...\(\text{Q}b7!\}) 10 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 \(\text{Q}fd7\) 12 \(\text{Q}e3!\) \(\text{Q}xe5!\) 13 \(\text{W}h5\) \(\text{Q}bc6\) 14 \(\text{Q}xc6\) \(\text{Q}xc6\) 15 \(\text{Q}f3\) \(b4?!\) 16 \(\text{Q}h3\) h6 17 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{W}a5\) 18 \(\text{Q}d5\) exd5 19 \(\text{Q}g3\) d4 20 \(\text{Q}d5\) \(\text{Q}g5\) 21 \(\text{Q}xg5\) \(\text{W}xd5\) 22 \(\text{Q}f6\) \(\text{W}xh5\) 23 \(\text{Q}xg7+\) \(\text{Q}h8\) 24 \(\text{Q}g6+\) \(\text{Q}h7\) 25 \(\text{Q}g7+\) 1/2-1/2 Short-Kasparov, Novgorod 1997.

Perpetual check is quite a logical outcome of the 9...b5 line. Such a result can hardly suit White in the Fischer Attack, so the ball is in his court! One of the interesting ideas is to play 7 0-0 \(\text{Q}e7\) anyway, and now the
rare 8 a4!?, as in Emms-Shipov, Hastings 1998/9: 8...\(\texttt{\texttt{\textbf{\text{\textdollar}\text{c}}}}\)c6 9 \(\texttt{\texttt{\textbf{\text{\textdollar}}}e}3\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textdollar}}}\texttt{c}}\)e3 0-0 10 \(\texttt{\texttt{\textbf{\text{\textdollar}}}h}1\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textdollar}}}d}7\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textf}}}4\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textc}}}e8 12 \(\texttt{\texttt{\textbf{\text{\textdollar}}}a}2\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textdollar}}}c}7\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textw}}}e2\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textdollar}}}e5\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textw}}}d1\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textc}}}c4\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textc}}}c1\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textdollar}}}fd8\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textg}}}4\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textw}}}c5 (D)

17 g5 \(\texttt{\texttt{\textbf{\text{\textdollar}}}e}8\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textf}}}5\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textf}}}f5\texttt{\texttt{\text{\texte}}}5\texttt{\texttt{\text{\texte}}}d5\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textf}}}f8\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textw}}}b4\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textw}}}a7\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textc}}}xc4\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textex}}xd4\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textc}}}d4\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textg}}}6\texttt{\texttt{\text{\texth}}}h8\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textc}}}xf7\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textc}}}c7\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textf}}}f4 1-0.

**History Never Ends!**

With so many games and so much detailed analysis having been performed, it sometimes appears impossible that anything new could be invented. Fortunately, the complexity of chess is vast, as was demonstrated by the lesson that all sceptics received from Dragojub Velimirović in 1997:

**Velimirović – Popović**

*Bar 1997*

1 \(e4\) \(c5\) 2 \(\texttt{\text{\textdollar}f}3\) \(d6\) 3 \(d4\) \(\texttt{\text{\textdollar}c}xd4\) 4 \(\texttt{\text{\textdollar}xd4}\) \(\texttt{\text{\textdollar}f}6\) 5 \(\texttt{\text{\textdollar}c}3\) \(\texttt{\text{\textdollar}c}6\) 6 \(\texttt{\text{\textdollar}c}4\) \(e6\) 7 \(e3\) \(a6\) 8 \(\texttt{\text{\textdollar}b}3\) \(\texttt{\text{\textdollar}e}7\) (D)

This position has occurred hundreds, if not thousands, of times in practice, but nobody chanced to make the following interesting pawn sacrifice: 9

\(g4!? \texttt{\text{\textdollar}xd4}\texttt{\texttt{\textw}}xd4\texttt{\texttt{\text{\texte}}}5\texttt{\texttt{\text{\textw}}}d3 'with unclear play'. History never ends!

We are about to enter the main theoretical part of this book. I have to admit that the work on this theoretical coverage turned out to have some pitfalls, and it might be useful to indicate what these pitfalls (i.e. the peculiar features of the Sicilian Sozin) mean for the reader. Briefly, Sozin theory is a limited set of critical trunk variations and a huge number of theoretically secondary but practically very playable lines (particularly in the move range 7-11) which are very difficult for a theoretician to describe and almost impossible for a player to memorize completely. Additionally, the Sozin features an abundance of possible transpositions – practically all the main lines and plenty of the secondary variations may arise by various routes. Therefore, choose several main variations that you are ready to play, and don't limit your attention to the main lines as given in the book. Then you will know ways to punish your opponents if they make an unusual move, and how you can use move-order tricks to lure them into lines that you like!
1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Qxd4
Qf6 5 c3 e6 6 c4 (D)

6...Qe7!

In this chapter our main focus is on the plan associated with this move and the further rapid transfer of the knight from b8 to c5, if White plays 7 Qb3. According to everything that is currently known, after 6...Qe7 White has fewer chances for an advantage than after 6...a6 or 6...Qc6.

Two other moves need to be mentioned:

a) 6...Qa6!? is a less successful version of the same idea. Until White has played Qb3, it is somewhat premature to transfer the knight, and thus White can fight for the initiative:

a1) 7 Qg5!? Qc5 8 We2 Qe7 (8...a6 9 0-0-0 b5 10 Qd5 exd5? 11 Qc6!) 9 0-0-0 Qfxe4 (9...0-0 10 Qdb5!?) 10 Qb5+.

a2) 7 We2!? is also of some interest.

b) Interestingly, 6...Qbd7!? has almost never occurred. This can be ascribed only to an irrational fear of 7 Qxe6. In fact, 7 Qxe6?! is no better here than in the variation 6...a6 7 Qb3 Qbd7 8 Qxe6?!

7 Qb3 (D)

If White delays Qb3, the effectiveness of the plan with ...Qc5 is less, but with the bishop on c4 Black has some extra possibilities in the centre (...d5 or ...Qxe4) and ideas involving a quick ...a6 and ...b5 at a favourable moment:

a) 7 We2 has no real independent value since after 7...0-0 (7...a6) White plays 8 Qe3 or 8 Qb3.

b) 7 a3?! is likely to transpose to the variations with ...a6 or ...Qc6 and Qa2.

c) 7 g4 0-0!? (7...Qc6?! can be met by 8 g5, with the point 8...Qd7 9 Qxe6) 8 g5 (8 Qb3 – 7 Qb3 0-0 8 g4) 8...Qxe4! 9 Qxe4 d5 10 Qf6+ Qxf6! 11 gxf6 dxc4 12 fxg7 w-e8 with a good game for Black, Svidtov-Kharitonov, Pinsk 1993.

d) 7 0-0 0-0 8 f4 d5 (or 8...Qxe4 9 Qxe4 d5) 9 exd5 exd5 10 Qb3 Qc6 and Black stands at least no worse; e.g., 11 Wh1 Qe8 12 Qe3 Qa3!, Saltaev-Lutsko, Minsk 1994.

e) 7 f4 0-0! 8 Wf3. Now normal variations for White arise following 8...Qc6 9 Qe3 or 8...a6 9 Qe3! Qc6 (9...b5? 10 e5) 10 0-0-0, so Black should choose between 8...Qxe4!? and 8...d5!? – in both cases White will
be in great danger if he accepts the pawn sacrifice.

f) 7 \textit{\textsc{xe}3}!? and now:

f1) 7...\textit{a6} and then:

f11) White can play 8 a4\textsc{e}? with a probable transposition to the positions of Chapter 12 after 8...\textit{\textsc{ac}6}.

f12) Sometimes White is prepared to transpose to a risky side-variation of the Fischer Attack: the position resulting from 8 \textit{\textsc{we}2} b5 9 \textit{\textsc{ab}b3} will be discussed in Line B of Chapter 5 (5...\textit{a6} 6 \textit{\textsc{ac}4} \textit{e6} 7 \textit{\textsc{ab}3} b5 8 \textit{\textsc{we}2} \textit{\textsc{e7}?} 9 \textit{\textsc{ae}3}).

f2) 7...0-0 and then:

f21) 8 \textit{\textsc{we}2} and now:

f211) 8...a6 9 0-0-0 b5 10 \textit{\textsc{ab}3} is again the risky line discussed in Line B of Chapter 5 (5...\textit{a6} 6 \textit{\textsc{ac}4} \textit{e6} 7 \textit{\textsc{ab}3} b5 8 \textit{\textsc{we}2} \textit{\textsc{e7}?} 9 \textit{\textsc{ae}3} 0-0 10 0-0-0).

f212) There is also 8...\textit{d5}?! 9 exd5 exd5 10 \textit{\textsc{ab}3}. It is likely that chances are equal; for example, 10...\textit{\textsc{b}4} 11 0-0-0 \textit{\textsc{xc}3} 12 bxc3 (Nisipeanu-Suba, Romanian Cht 1997) 12...\textit{\textsc{we}7}?! (Nisipeanu/Stoica) or 10...\textit{\textsc{ac}6} 11 0-0 \textit{\textsc{ae}8} 12 \textit{\textsc{wb}5} \textit{\textsc{b}4} 13 \textit{\textsc{ag}5} \textit{\textsc{ad}7} 14 \textit{\textsc{wb}7} \textit{\textsc{bb}8} 15 \textit{\textsc{wx}a7} \textit{\textsc{a}8} with a repetition of moves, Zamora-Yermolinsky, USA Ch (Chandler) 1997.

f22) Another concept for White is 8 \textit{\textsc{ab}3} – see 7 \textit{\textsc{ab}3} 0-0 8 \textit{\textsc{ae}3} (White has avoided 7 \textit{\textsc{ab}3} \textit{\textsc{a6} 8 \textit{\textsc{f}4} \textit{\textsc{d}c}5} 9 \textit{\textsc{ff}3} \textit{a5}?!).

7...\textit{\textsc{a6}}

Or:

a) 7...\textit{\textsc{bd}7}?! looks dubious because of 8 \textit{\textsc{xe}6}.

b) After 7...0-0 the play generally transposes to the lines with 7...\textit{\textsc{a}6}, but there are some independent possibilities:

b1) 8 \textit{\textsc{ae}3} \textit{\textsc{a6} 9 \textit{\textsc{f}4} – 7...\textit{\textsc{a}6} 8 \textit{\textsc{f}4} 0-0 9 \textit{\textsc{ae}3}.

b2) 8 \textit{\textsc{f}4} \textit{\textsc{a}6} – 7...\textit{\textsc{a}6} 8 \textit{\textsc{f}4} 0-0.

b3) 8 \textit{\textsc{g}4}. Now not bad is 8...\textit{d5}?? (less convincing are the lines 8...\textit{\textsc{ac}6} 9 \textit{\textsc{g}5} \textit{\textsc{dx}d} 10 \textit{\textsc{wd}4} \textit{\textsc{d}d} 7 and 8...\textit{\textsc{g}6} 9 \textit{\textsc{h}h} 6 \textit{\textsc{e}8} 9 \textit{\textsc{ex}d} 5 \textit{\textsc{dx}d} 5 10 \textit{\textsc{dx}d} 5 \textit{\textsc{ex}d} 5 with sufficient counterplay for Black; for example, 11 \textit{\textsc{ae}3} \textit{\textsc{c}6} 12 \textit{\textsc{h}3} \textit{\textsc{g}5}, Shaplyko-Kraschil, Zagan jr Ech 1995.

b4) 8 \textit{\textsc{we}2} a6! (8...\textit{\textsc{a}6} involves some risk in view of 9 \textit{\textsc{g}4} \textit{\textsc{c}5} 10 \textit{\textsc{g}5} and 11 \textit{\textsc{ag}1}) 9 \textit{\textsc{ae}3} (9 \textit{\textsc{g}4} \textit{\textsc{c}6}? and now 10 \textit{\textsc{ae}3}?! \textit{\textsc{dx}d} 4! 11 \textit{\textsc{dx}d} 5 \textit{\textsc{e}5} or 10 \textit{\textsc{xc}6} \textit{\textsc{bc}6} 11 \textit{\textsc{g}5} \textit{\textsc{d}d} 7, and Black is at least no worse, Minasian-Sakaev, Frunze 1989) 9...\textit{b} 5 10 0-0-0. If White agrees (or aspires) to play this position, he should start with 7 \textit{\textsc{ae}3} (or with 7 \textit{\textsc{we}2}) – see above.

8 \textit{\textsc{f}4} (D)

After other moves, Black has few problems:

a) 8 0-0?! \textit{\textsc{c}5}? deprives White of activity.

b) 8 \textit{\textsc{we}2} \textit{\textsc{c}5} 9 \textit{\textsc{g}4} \textit{\textsc{g}6}? (threatening 10...e5?) 10 \textit{\textsc{g}5} (alternatively, 10 \textit{\textsc{h}3} \textit{\textsc{h}5} 10...\textit{\textsc{h}5} gives Black a good game. 11 \textit{\textsc{g}1} can be met by 11...a6?! 12 \textit{\textsc{f}4} (12 \textit{\textsc{e}3} is more circumspect) 12...0-0 13 \textit{\textsc{e}3} (Kiefer-Bischoff, Bundesliga 1985/6) 13...\textit{e}5! or 11...0-0 12
c) 8...\text{\textit{\&}}e3 \text{\textit{\&}}c5 9 \text{\textit{\&}}f3 0-0. White’s arrangement is somewhat artificial and Black’s chances are in no way worse. Several examples:

\begin{itemize}
\item c1) 10 \text{\textit{\&}}g4 a5! (10...\text{\textit{\&}}d7 11 \text{\textit{\&}}g5 \text{\textit{\&}}e8 12 \text{\textit{\&}}g1 g6!? 13 0-0-0 \text{\textit{\&}}g7, Al.Sokolov-V.Neverov, Kstovo 1997) 11 a4 (11 g5 \text{\textit{\&}}fd7 \text{\textit{\&}}f7) 11...d5! with an excellent game for Black, Bokan-Rötšagov, Tallinn 1989.
\item c2) 10 0-0-0 \text{\textit{\&}}d7!? (10...a5?! 11 e5!); however, 10...\text{\textit{\&}}c7 is not bad; e.g., 11 g4 a6 12 g5 \text{\textit{\&}}fd7 13 \text{\textit{\&}}h1 b5 14 \text{\textit{\&}}h5 g6 15 \text{\textit{\&}}h6 \text{\textit{\&}}e8 16 \text{\textit{\&}}g3 \text{\textit{\&}}f8 17 \text{\textit{\&}}h4 \text{\textit{\&}}g7 with double-edged play, Rublevsky-Sergienko, Podolsk 1992) 11 g4 \text{\textit{\&}}e8!? (11...a5?!; 11...b5!?) 12 \text{\textit{\&}}h1 \text{\textit{\&}}c7 13 g5!? (13 \text{\textit{\&}}f5! is a better try) 13...b5 14 \text{\textit{\&}}h5 g6 15 \text{\textit{\&}}h6 \text{\textit{\&}}e8 16 \text{\textit{\&}}g3 \text{\textit{\&}}f8 17 \text{\textit{\&}}h4 a5 \text{\textit{\&}}f6 Golu
\end{itemize}

Again Black has to choose between two continuations of almost equal value: 8...\text{\textit{\&}}c5 and 8...0-0. The difference between them is about the same as the difference between the lines 8...\text{\textit{\&}}c5 9 e5 and 8...0-0 9 0-0 \text{\textit{\&}}c5 10 e5.

8...0-0 (D)

Or 8...\text{\textit{\&}}c5, and then:

\begin{itemize}
\item a) 9 \text{\textit{\&}}f3. Now 9...0-0 – 8...0-0 9 \text{\textit{\&}}f3 \text{\textit{\&}}c5. Possibly even more precise is 9...a5!? 10 0-0 0-0 with roughly equal play after 11 a4 e5 12 \text{\textit{\&}}db5 \text{\textit{\&}}xb5! 13 \text{\textit{\&}}xb5 \text{\textit{\&}}e6 or 11 \text{\textit{\&}}e3 a4 12 \text{\textit{\&}}c4 \text{\textit{\&}}cxe4, Kreiman-Ehlvest, New York 1993.
\item b) 9 e5! dxe5 (9...\text{\textit{\&}}fe4 10 \text{\textit{\&}}xe4 \text{\textit{\&}}xe4 11 0-0 0-0 12 c3 \text{\textit{\&}}f6 Skrobek-Pedzich, Warsaw 1989) 10 fxe5 \text{\textit{\&}}fd7 11 \text{\textit{\&}}f4 and then:
\item b1) 11...0-0?? 12 \text{\textit{\&}}g4 \text{\textit{\&}}xb3 (or 12...\text{\textit{\&}}h8 13 0-0-0 a6 14 \text{\textit{\&}}h1 \text{\textit{\&}}c7 15 \text{\textit{\&}}e3 \text{\textit{\&}}f6 Golu
\item b2) 11...a6 transposes to a line of the Fischer Attack that is dangerous for Black (see 5...a6 6 \text{\textit{\&}}c4 e6 7 \text{\textit{\&}}b3 \text{\textit{\&}}bd7 8 f4 \text{\textit{\&}}c5 9 e5 dxe5 10 fxe5 \text{\textit{\&}}fd7 11 \text{\textit{\&}}f4 \text{\textit{\&}}e7?! in Line B21 of Chapter 7).
\item b3) 11...\text{\textit{\&}}f8! 12 \text{\textit{\&}}db5 \text{\textit{\&}}g6 13 \text{\textit{\&}}xd8+ \text{\textit{\&}}xd8 probably leads to equality.
\end{itemize}

9 \text{\textit{\&}}f3

Other possibilities:
5...e6 6  \( \text{Cc4} \) \( \text{Ce7} \)

a) 9 e5?! \( \text{Cd7} \) =.

b) 9 \( \text{Be3} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 10 \( \text{Wf3} \) – 9 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 10 \( \text{Be3} \).

c) 9 f5 \( \text{Cc5} \) (or 9...e5!? 10 \( \text{Qde2} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 11 \( \text{Qg3} \) b5) 10 \( \text{Wf3} \) e5 (10...\( \text{Qd7} \); interesting is 10...d5!? 11 exd5 e5 12 \( \text{Qde2} \) e4, Hendricks-Pliester, Dutch Cht 1994) 11 \( \text{Qde2} \) b5 12 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) (12...b4 13 \( \text{Qd5} \)) 13 \( \text{Qxb3} \) (Hendricks-Timman, Dutch Ch (Amsterdam) 1996)

13...b4 14 \( \text{Qxf6} \) bx3 15 \( \text{Qxe7} \) bx2 16 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Wxe7} \) 17 \( \text{Qxb2} \) with equality – Timman.

d) 9 0-0 \( \text{Cc5} \) 10 e5 (10 \( \text{Wf3} \) is not dangerous – see 9 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 10 0-0) 10...dxe5 (10...\( \text{Qf4} \) 11 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) – 8...\( \text{Cc5} \) 9 e5!? \( \text{Qf4} \) 10 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 11 0-0-0-0 \( \text{Qf7} \))

12 \( \text{Qf4} \) a6 – 5...a6 6 \( \text{Cc4} \) e6 7 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) 8 f4 \( \text{Cc5} \) 9 e5 dxe5 10 fxe5 \( \text{Qf4} \) 11 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qxe7} \) 12 0-0-0-0) 12 axb3 \( \text{Cc5} \) (12...\( \text{Qd5} \) could be considered)

13 \( \text{Qe3} \) and now:

d1) 13...\( \text{Qd5} \) 14 \( \text{Qf2} \). Compared with the position from the Fischer Attack, Black has made the more useful move...0-0 instead of...a6. Still, he has some problems; for example, 14...\( \text{Qxc3} \) 15 bxc3 \( \text{Wc7} \) 16 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 17 \( \text{Qad1} \) \( \text{Qad8} \) (17...\( \text{a5} \)) 18 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 19 \( \text{Qh3} \), K.Müller-Stohl, Munich 1992.

d2) Therefore, 13...\( \text{Qd7} \)! deserves attention.

9...\( \text{Qc5} \) 10 \( \text{Be3} \) (D)

10 f5 is considered under 9 f5 \( \text{Cc5} \) 10 0-0.

After 10 0-0 the most precise is

10...a5! – 8...\( \text{Qc5} \) 9 \( \text{Wf3} \) a5 10 0-0-0-0. Less convincing is 10...e5!? 11 fxe5 dxe5 12 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 13 exf5 e4 14 \( \text{Wc2} \), Liukin-V.Neverov, Ukrainian open Ch (Yalta) 1996.

Now Black faces a major decision.

10...a5

This move seems to be the most critical. Others:

a) 10...a6 transposes to the positions of the Fischer Attack (see Line A of Chapter 3 for 11 0-0, and Line B42 of Chapter 7 for the other moves).

b) 10...d5 11 exd5 exd5 12 f5! \( \pm \) (Beliaovsky/Mikhalschin).

c) 10...e5 remains difficult to assess. 11 \( \text{Qf5} \) (11 fxe5 dxe5 12 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 14 axb3 \( \text{Wc8} \) =) 11...\( \text{Qxf5} \) 12 exf5 and then:

c1) 12...\( \text{axb3} \) 13 axb3 \( \text{Wc8} \) 14 0-0-0! \( \text{Qxf5} \) 15 \( \text{Qxb7} \) exf4 16 \( \text{Qhf1} \) gives White the better chances, Moraru-Dumitrescu, Romanian Cht 1994.

c2) 12...e4 and now:

c21) 13 \( \text{Wc2} \) d5 (other ideas are 13...\( \text{Qa5} \) 14 \( \text{Qxc5} \)?) and 13...\( \text{Qxb3} \)!

14 0-0-0 (14 \( \text{Qxc5} \) is equal – Quinteros) 14...\( \text{Qxb3} \) + 15 axb3 \( \text{Qa5} \) 16 g4 \( \text{Qac8} \) 17 g5 \( \text{Qb4} \) brings Black real counterplay, Garcia Toledo-Donoso, Fortaleza Z 1975.

C22) 13 \( \text{Wh3} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 14 axb3 d5 15 0-0-0, and now 15...\( \text{Qa5} \) is better than 15...h5 16 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qa5} \) 17 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qfd8} \) 18 g4! \( \pm \) Ankerst-Vogt, Baden-Baden 1993.

11 0-0-0
11 e5? dxe5 12 fxe5 \( \bigtriangleup \)fd7 13 \( \bigtriangleup \)f4 a4 14 \( \bigtriangleup \)c4 \( \bigtriangleup \)b6 –+

If 11 a4 then 11...e5! 12 \( \bigtriangleup \)f5 \( \bigtriangleup \)xf5 13 exf5 \( \bigtriangleup \)xb3 (13...e4??) 14 cxb3 exf4, followed by ...d5, gives Black an excellent position, Poutiainen-Balashov, Teesside students Wch 1974.

11 a3 is no better.

11...a4 (D)

11...\( \bigtriangleup \)d7!? 12 \( \bigtriangleup \)c4 (12 e5?! \( \bigtriangleup \)e8) 12...\( \bigtriangleup \)c7 (12...a4??) 13 \( \bigtriangleup \)db5 \( \bigtriangleup \)xb5, Golubev-V.Neverov, Ukrainian open Ch (Yalta) 1996, and now 14 \( \bigtriangleup \)xb5, with the point 14...\( \bigtriangleup \)c6 15 \( \bigtriangleup \)xd6 \( \bigtriangleup \)xd6 16 e5 \( \bigtriangleup \)ce4 17 \( \bigtriangleup \)d3!, looks dangerous for Black.

12 \( \bigtriangleup \)c4 a3 13 b3

Black is better after 13 \( \bigtriangleup \)db5?! axb2+ 14 \( \bigtriangleup \)b1 \( \bigtriangleup \)a5 15 e5 dxe5 16 fxe5 \( \bigtriangleup \)fd7 17 \( \bigtriangleup \)g3 \( \bigtriangleup \)h8 (Istratescu-Stohl, Budapest Z 1993): 18 \( \bigtriangleup \)d4 f6! or 18 \( \bigtriangleup \)g5 f6!.

13 e5 also brings no success to White; e.g., 13...axb2+ 14 \( \bigtriangleup \)b1 dxe5 15 \( \bigtriangleup \)c6 \( \bigtriangleup \)c7 16 \( \bigtriangleup \)xe7+ \( \bigtriangleup \)xe7 17 fxe5 \( \bigtriangleup \)fd7 18 \( \bigtriangleup \)g3 \( \bigtriangleup \)h8 19 \( \bigtriangleup \)d4 \( \bigtriangleup \)a4, Shtyrenkov-Kharitonov, Smolensk 1986.

13...\( \bigtriangleup \)cxe4

Or:

a) 13...\( \bigtriangleup \)fxe4 comes to the same thing.

b) 13...\( \bigtriangleup \)d7!? requires investigation.

c) 13...\( \bigtriangleup \)a5 and now:

C1) 14 \( \bigtriangleup \)db5 \( \bigtriangleup \)d7 15 e5 dxe5 (not 15...\( \bigtriangleup \)c6?!) 16 exf6!, Istratescu-Suba, Romanian Cht 1992) 16 fxe5 \( \bigtriangleup \)d5 leads to complications that are satisfactory for Black:

C11) 17 \( \bigtriangleup \)d4 \( \bigtriangleup \)b6! 18 \( \bigtriangleup \)e2 \( \bigtriangleup \)c6! and 19...\( \bigtriangleup \)bd7.

C12) 17 \( \bigtriangleup \)xd5 \( \bigtriangleup \)c6! \( \bigtriangleup \) (17...exd5?!) 18 \( \bigtriangleup \)xd5 \( \bigtriangleup \)xb5 19 b4!!; 17...\( \bigtriangleup \)xb5 18 \( \bigtriangleup \)xc5 \( \bigtriangleup \)xc5 19 \( \bigtriangleup \)xb7 \( \bigtriangleup \)ad8 20 \( \bigtriangleup \)xb5 (1/2–1/2 Istratescu-Golubev, Romanian Cht 1996; 20 \( \bigtriangleup \)e4 \( \bigtriangleup \)d4 21 c4 \( \bigtriangleup \)e8!!) 20...\( \bigtriangleup \)xb5 with compensation.

C2) However, 14 \( \bigtriangleup \)d2?! may present some danger for Black; for example, 14...\( \bigtriangleup \)b6 (14...\( \bigtriangleup \)c7 15 \( \bigtriangleup \)he1) 15 e5 d5 16 \( \bigtriangleup \)d3 \( \bigtriangleup \)fe4 17 \( \bigtriangleup \)xe4 \( \bigtriangleup \)xe4 18 \( \bigtriangleup \)xe4 \( \bigtriangleup \)xd4 19 \( \bigtriangleup \)f6+! \( \bigtriangleup \)e8! ± Moraru-Parligas, Romanian Cht 2001.

14 \( \bigtriangleup \)xe4 \( \bigtriangleup \)xe4 15 \( \bigtriangleup \)xe4 d5 16 \( \bigtriangleup \)xd5

16 \( \bigtriangleup \)f3? dxc4 17 \( \bigtriangleup \)xe6 \( \bigtriangleup \)xe6 18 \( \bigtriangleup \)xd8 \( \bigtriangleup \)fxd8 gives Black more than enough compensation. D.Gross-Orsag. Czech Cht 1993/4.

16...exd5 17 \( \bigtriangleup \)f3 \( \bigtriangleup \)e8?!

It appears that Black should have sufficient counter-chances; for example, 18 \( \bigtriangleup \)b5 \( \bigtriangleup \)f5 19 \( \bigtriangleup \)xd5 \( \bigtriangleup \)c8.
2 5...a6 6 \( \text{c}4 \): Introduction to the Fischer Attack

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{f}3 \) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 5 \( \text{c}3 \) a6 6 \( \text{c}4 \) (\( D \))

Now 6...e6 is, of course, the main move. 6...e6 7 0-0 will be discussed in the next chapter, and then we shall discuss 6...e6 7 \( \text{b}3 \). Here we consider rare answers to 6 \( \text{c}4 \) and the sidelines for White after 6 \( \text{c}4 \) e6.

**A:** 6...\( b5 \) 27

**B:** 6...\( \text{bd}7 \) 28

**C:** 6...\( e6 \) 29

In Line C, we only discuss lines without 7 0-0 or 7 \( \text{b}3 \).

Other moves:

a) 6...\( g6 \)?! transposes to a dubious variation of the Dragon after 7 \( f3 \)!, followed by \( \text{e}3 \) and \( \text{d}2 \).

b) 6...\( e5 \)?! is strategically dubious. Now of interest is 7 \( f5 \)?! \( \text{xf}5 \) 8 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 9 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 10 0-0 \( \text{c}6 \) 11 \( \text{f}4 \), Minasian-Trifunov, Novi Sad 1988, but in any case the moves 7 \( \text{de}2 \) and 7 \( \text{f}3 \) are sufficient for an untroubled advantage.

c) 6...\( c6 \). As compared with 6...\( e6 \) and 7...\( c6 \), this does not have any advantages, only disadvantages, because 7 \( \text{xc}6 \)! \( \text{bxc}6 \) 8 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 9 \( e6 \) promises White a sustained initiative.

d) 6...\( c7 \)?! 7 \( \text{b}3 \) \( e6 \) – 6...\( e6 \) 7 \( \text{b}3 \) \( c7 \).

**A)**

6...b5 7 \( \text{b}3 \)

White may attempt to punish his opponent by playing 7 \( \text{d}5 \)?! Then 7...\( \text{xd}5 \) 8 \( \text{exd}5 \) appears to be in White's favour but 7...\( a7 \) 8 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}7 \) is stronger. As I see no evident benefits for White there, I advise him to remain unprovoked.

7...\( \text{b}7 \)

Black should play 7...\( e6 \) and be satisfied that he has avoided lines like 6...\( e6 \) 7 a3 and 6...\( e6 \) 7 a4. Further avoidance of ...\( e6 \) is unjustified.

8 0-0! \( \text{bd}7 \) 9 \( \text{e}1 \)

Now:

a) 9...\( e6 \) leads to a promising variation for White (Line E1 of Chapter 5).

b) 9...\( \text{c}5 \) can be answered with the unpleasant 10 \( \text{g}5 \)!

c) 9...\( g6 \) 10 a4 b4 11 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 12 \( \text{xb}4 \)! \( \text{b}6 \) 13 c3 also favours White.
d) 9...c8 10 a4! bxa4 11 axa4 e6 12 d5! also clearly favours White, Kindermann-Hölzl, Haifa Echt 1989.

**B)**

6...bd7 (D)

![Chessboard diagram]

A rare move. The idea can be linked to 7 b3?! c5! or 7 0-0 c7?! (7...c5 8 e1!) 8 e2 b5.

However, a good continuation for White is:

7 g5

This transposes to a rare line of the 6 g5 Najdorf, i.e. 5 a6 6 g5 bd7 7 c4!. In the 1960s this line was often played at high level but later it was discarded by Black in favour of the more reliable 5 a6 6 g5 e6.

7 e6

Black should play extremely cautiously as his adversary's mobilization permanently threatens to become a decisive factor. Otherwise:

a) 7 h6 8 xf6 xf6 9 e2 and 0-0-0! gives White a huge advantage in development.

b) 7 b5 8 d5! is also dangerous for Black.

c) 7 g6 does not give Black equality; e.g., 8 d2 (8 e2 g7 9 0-0-0 0-0 10 f4 is less convincing; then 10...d6 11 e5!? g4 12 f3 might favour White, but 10 c7!? looks stronger) 8 g7 9 f3 h6 10 e3 b5 11 b3 b7 (Howell-Hodgson, British Ch (Plymouth) 1992) 12 0-0-0.

d) 7 a5 8 d2 e6 has been the most frequent choice for Black. Here, either 9 0-0 (see 7 e6 8 0-0 a5 9 d2) or 9 0-0-0 b5 10 b3 is possible (not 10 d5?! in view of 10...b4! 11 x8 bxc3 12 bxc3 d6, which was discovered by Spassky and Rozner) 10 b7 11 e1 0-0-0 12 a3 ±. I think the text-move (7...e6) offers White less choice.

8 0-0

The immediate 8 xe6?! is dubious, so White prepares a better version of this blow. Instead, 8 f4!? leads to another rare line of the 6 g5 Najdorf (5 a6 6 g5 e6 7 f4 bd7 8 c4) where it is very doubtful that White has any advantage after, for instance, 8 b6.

8 a5

Otherwise:

a) 8 b5? is bad due to 9 xe6 fx6 10 xe6 b6 11 d5 xd5 12 xd5 --.

b) 8 e7 9 xe6 gives White a powerful attack

c) 8 c7 9 xe6! fx6 10 xe6 c4 11 d5 assures a strong attack for White, Keres-Sajtar, Amsterdam OL 1954.

d) After 8 h6, a good reply is 9 xf6 xf6 10 b3 ± Stean- Browne, Nice OL 1974.

e) Maybe attention should be paid to 8 c5!? with the point that 9 b4 can be met by 9 b6.

9 d2 e7 (D)
9...b5?! 10 ∆d5! exd5 11 c6 w6
12 exd5 c5 13 e1 c7 14 e3 
15 f4 with an initiative, Mnatsa-
fatal deficiency of the entire system is 
that Black is constantly exposed to 
danger from one of the typical sacri-

10 Ad1 h6
10...0-0 11 c5!.
11 h4
After 11 e3, 11 c5 12 b3! 
gave White an advantage in Ivanchuk-
Ehlvest, Elista 1998, but 11 g4!? 
(Ivanchuk) 12 f4 g5 is less clear.
11 e5 12 e2 g5 13 g3
White continues f4, with the better 
prospects.

C)
6...exd (D)
Out of the secondary moves for 
White, five deserve to be mentioned, 
and two are significant enough to 
deserve their own section:
C1: 7 a4 29
C2: 7 a3 30
The other three are:

a) After 7 w2, White’s priorities 
are 8 e3 (8 g5) and 9 0-0-0. With 
the black knight on b8, this looks rather 
adventurous. As a rule, play now 
develops along the lines 7 b5 8 b3, 
7 e7 8 e3 b5 9 b3 or 7 e7 8 
b3 0-0 9 e3 b5 (all these will be 
discussed under 7 b3 b5 8 w2). 
One more option for Black is 7 w6!?

b) 7 e3 is another risky move:
   b1) 7 e7 is quite normal, but if 
   White plays 8 b3, Black should de-
   lay 8 b5 no further. Instead, 8 0-0 9 
f4 (or 9 g4) and 8 c5 9 f4!? c5 
10 f3 are perilous for Black.
   b2) The main continuation is 7 b5!
   8 b3 – 7 b3 b5 8 e3.
   c) 7 g5 (here this move is harm-
   less as Black is neither weaker nor 
   behind in development) 7 e7!.
   Black wishes to play, primarily, ...
   c6 so as to exert pressure on the centre. 
   He also has the idea of ...b5 and, if possible, 
   the blow ...c4. The g5-bishop is 
   misplaced and Black has no problems. 
   For instance, after 8 b3 c6 9 f4 not 
   bad are 9 w6! and 9 0 10 f3 
(10 w2 h6 11 h4 c4 10...h6 11 
   h4 d5 12 e5 e4 13 c7 w7 xe7,
   Soloviov-Simagin, Gorky 1954.

C1)
  7 a4 (D)
An atypical idea for the Sicilian Sozin. White nips ...b5 in the bud, but weakens the b4-square and sharply reduces his own capacity for active play.

a) 7...\(\not\)c6 8 0-0 (or 8 \(\not\)e3 and 9 0-0) will be discussed in Line B of Chapter 12.

b) 7...\(\not\)e7 8 0-0-0-0 often also leads to Line B of Chapter 12 because Black plays ...\(\not\)c6 next move. The most common continuation is 9 \(\not\)e3 \(\not\)c6 10 \(\not\)h1 (or 9 \(\not\)h1 \(\not\)c6 10 \(\not\)e3).

c) 7...\(\not\)wc7 is also linked to ...\(\not\)c6 after 8 \(\not\)wc2 or 8 \(\not\)a2.

d) 7...\(\not\)xe4!? 8 \(\not\)xe4 d5 is another solution for Black. It might be enough to equalize. Now:

d1) 9 \(\not\)d3 dxe4 10 \(\not\)xe4 \(\not\)d7 11 0-0 \(\not\)e7 12 c3 \(\not\)c5 13 \(\not\)c2 e5 = Kavalek-Tarjan, USA Ch (South Bend) 1981.

d2) 9 \(\not\)d2 dxc4 10 \(\not\)xc4 \(\not\)c7 11 \(\not\)e2 = Galdunts-Allwerman, Böblingen 1998.

d3) 9 \(\not\)g5 \(\not\)e7! and now 10 \(\not\)xe7 \(\not\)xe7 11 \(\not\)d3 dxe4 12 \(\not\)xe4 e5 and ...\(\not\)wb4+, or 10 \(\not\)g4 \(\not\)xg5 11 \(\not\)xg5 \(\not\)a5+! 12 c3 dxc4.

d4) 9 \(\not\)f3 \(\not\)c6! (better than 9...dxe4 10 \(\not\)xd8+ \(\not\)xd8 11 \(\not\)e5 or 11 \(\not\)g5)

10 \(\not\)ed2 dxc4 11 \(\not\)xc4 \(\not\)xd1+ 12 \(\not\)xd1 \(\not\)c5 13 \(\not\)e3 \(\not\)xe3 14 fxe3 a5 15 c3 f6 16 \(\not\)b6 \(\not\)a6 17 \(\not\)xc8 \(\not\)d7 is equal, V.Gurevich-Dvoiry, Le Touquet 1997.

White can try to avoid the last line by playing 7 0-0, and if 7...\(\not\)e7 (or 7...\(\not\)c6), then 8 a4. Of course, he needs to be ready for 7...b5 8 \(\not\)b3 in this case.

C2)

7 a3 (D)

In the usual lines of the Fischer Attack with \(\not\)b3, there is no advantage at all for White in playing a3 at an early stage. Here this move is more appropriate as White desires to compensate for the time loss by shifting the bishop to a less vulnerable position on a2 (the difference is quite important in some variations).

7...b5

Other possibilities:

a) 7...\(\not\)c6 8 0-0 (or 8 \(\not\)a2 and 9 0-0) will be considered in Chapter 12.

b) 7...\(\not\)e7 8 \(\not\)a2 0-0 9 0-0 and then:

b1) 9...\(\not\)c6 – 7...\(\not\)c6 8 0-0 \(\not\)e7 9 \(\not\)a2 0-0.
b2) The position resulting from 9...b5 will be discussed under 7...b5 8 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}e4}\) 9 0-0 0-0.

b3) 9...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}c7}\) keeps ...b5 and ...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}c6}\) in reserve. However, after 10 f4!, the variation 10...b5 11 f5 e5 12 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}e2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b7}\) 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g3}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}b7}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g5}\), as in Babula-Dabrowski, Koszalin 1998, appears better for White and it is safer for Black to play 10...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}c6}\), thereby meaning that this is no improvement for Black over ...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}c6}\) at an earlier stage.

c) 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) 8 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) d5 9 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g5}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}7}\) and now:

c1) After 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe7}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}xe7}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}d3}\) dxe4 12 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) 0-0 (Saltaev-Roshchina, Moscow 1996) White scarcely has any real advantage.

c2) 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}g4}\)!? \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xg5}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xg5}\) dxc4 12 0-0-0 therefore deserves attention. White has the initiative for a pawn; e.g., 12...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}f6}\) 13 h4! 0-0 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}e4}\), Petrushin-Zhelnin, Sverdlovsk 1985. 12...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}e7}\) is a better method of defence: 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h1}\) 0-0! 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}f5}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}f6}\)! or 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h5}\) g6 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}h6}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}8}\)!? 15 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}h4}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}e7}\).

8 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}2}\) (D)

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

We now discuss:

C21: 8...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}7}\)
C22: 8...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b7}\)

C21)

8...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}7}\) 9 0-0 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b7}\)

The alternative is 9...0-0 (D):

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

a) 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b7}\) – 9...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b7}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}2}\) 0-0.

b) 10 f4 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b7}\) and now:

b1) 11 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}2}\) – 9...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b7}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}2}\) 0-0 11 f4.

b2) White gains nothing by 11 f5, in view of 11...e5 12 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}de2}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}bd7}\) (12...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\)!! 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g3}\)) 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g3}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}c8}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g5}\) (14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h5}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xh5}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}h5}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xc3}\) followed by 16...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}f6}\)) 14...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xc3}\) (Fischer's 14...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}b6}\) is not bad) 15 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}xc3}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe7}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}xe7}\) 18 c4 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}c8}\) with great play for Black, Ermenkov-Portisch, Skara Echt 1980.

b3) No better for White is 11 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}f3}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}bd7}\) 12 f5 e5 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}de2}\) a5!, as in Orendy-Szabo, Hungarian Ch (Budapest) 1959, and other games.

c) 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}3}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}}b7}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g3}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h5}\)!? (11...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe4}\) is unsuccessful due to 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}xe6}\)! 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}}5}\), but Black can try 11...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}c6}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc6}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc6}}}\) 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}}h6}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}}8}\), as in Belikov-V. Neverov, Odessa 1990) 12 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}}h3}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}f6}\) 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}c1}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}}bd7}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}}g5}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}}c8}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}}ad1}\) (Korchnoi-Ribli, Reykjavik 1988) and
now 15...\(\mathcal{D}e5\)! (Korchnoi) gives Black good play.

10 \(\mathcal{W}e2\)

10 f4 \(\mathcal{D}bd7\) 11 f5 e5 12 \(\mathcal{D}de2\) \(\mathcal{A}c8\)!

13 \(\mathcal{G}g3\) h5! is favourable for Black, Westerinen-Lehmann, Palma de Mallorca 1968.

10...0-0

Or:

a) 10...\(\mathcal{D}c6\)?! is risky in view of 11 \(\mathcal{A}xe6\)!

b) 10...\(\mathcal{D}c6\) is an alternative. After 11 \(\mathcal{D}xc6\) \(\mathcal{A}xc6\) 12 f4 0-0 13 f5, Black can choose between 13...e5!? (with the point that 14 \(\mathcal{G}g5\)? runs into 14...\(\mathcal{D}xe4\)) and 13...\(\mathcal{D}xf5\) 14 \(\mathcal{H}xf5\) \(\mathcal{A}d7\) followed by 15...\(\mathcal{A}e6\), Smailbegović-Bobotsov, Sarajevo 1962.

11 f4 \(\mathcal{D}bd7\)

11...\(\mathcal{D}c6\)!!? 12 \(\mathcal{D}xc6\) \(\mathcal{A}xc6\) — 10...\(\mathcal{D}c6\) 11 \(\mathcal{D}xc6\) \(\mathcal{A}xc6\) 12 f4 0-0.

12 e5! dxe5 13 fxe5 \(\mathcal{A}c5\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) \(\mathcal{D}xe5\)

The variation 14...\(\mathcal{W}b6\)? 15 \(\mathcal{A}d1\) \(\mathcal{D}xe5\) 16 b4! is a good illustration of the benefits of the a2-square for the bishop. If the bishop is on b3, 16 b4 is impossible and the assessment is radically altered.

15 \(\mathcal{D}xe6\) \(\mathcal{A}xe3+\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xe3\) \(fxe6\) 17 \(\mathcal{W}xe5\) \(\mathcal{W}b6+\) 18 \(\mathcal{W}h1\)

White has a slight positional advantage, Kupreichik-Shipov, Aalborg 1997.

C222)

8...\(\mathcal{A}b7\) 9 0-0

9 \(\mathcal{W}e2\)!!? \(\mathcal{D}bd7\) 10 g4 (Giaccio-Sunye, Villa Gesell 1998) is interesting.

9...\(\mathcal{D}bd7\)! \(\langle D\rangle\)

There is no need to hurry with 9...\(\mathcal{A}e7\). 9...\(\mathcal{D}c6\) is also possible, but 9...\(\mathcal{D}xe4\)!! 10 \(\mathcal{D}xe4\) \(\mathcal{A}xe4\) 11 \(\mathcal{E}e1\)! is risky for Black.

10 \(\mathcal{W}e2\)

After 10 f4 it is normal to proceed with 10...\(\mathcal{A}e7\) or 10...\(\mathcal{D}c8\), but probably it is better still to grab the pawn with 10...\(\mathcal{D}xe4\)!!.

Complications with roughly equal chances can be obtained after 10 \(\mathcal{E}e1\)!!? \(\mathcal{D}c8\) 11 \(\mathcal{W}f3\) (after 11 f4, both 11...\(\mathcal{D}b6\) and 11...\(\mathcal{D}c5\)!! are good for Black) 11...\(\mathcal{A}e5\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) \(\mathcal{C}c4\) 13 \(\mathcal{H}h1\) \(\mathcal{W}b6\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}f3\) h5!? (Lepeshkin).

10...\(\mathcal{D}c8\) 11 \(\mathcal{G}g5\)

11 f3 = Kavalek-Ree, Eersel (9) 1969.

11...h6 12 \(\mathcal{A}h4\) \(\mathcal{W}b6\) 13 \(\mathcal{C}c1\) \(\mathcal{A}e7\)

White has no advantage; e.g., 14 \(\mathcal{D}xe6\) \(fxe6\) 15 \(\mathcal{A}xe6\) \(\mathcal{C}xc3\) 16 bxc3 g5 Kupreichik-Åkesson, Marienhann 1997, or 14 \(\mathcal{H}h1\) g5 15 \(\mathcal{G}g3\) (Cirić-Velimirović, Yugoslavia 1964) 15...\(\mathcal{C}xc3\)!! 16 bxc3 \(\mathcal{D}xe4\).

To avoid the line with 8...\(\mathcal{A}b7\) and 9...\(\mathcal{D}bd7\), White may try to start with 7 0-0 (7...\(\mathcal{A}e7\) 8 a3 or 7...\(\mathcal{D}c6\) 8 a3).
3 5...a6 6 ²c4 e6 7 0-0

1 e4 c5 2 ²f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ²xd4 ²f6 5 ²c3 a6 6 ²c4 e6 7 0-0 (D)

7...²e7

This is one of three critical replies to 7 0-0 which are stronger now than after 7 ²b3. The other good replies (7...²c6 and 7...²c7!?) tend to transpose to a Classical Sozin.

a) 7...²xe4? 8 ²xe4 d5 9 ²g5!.

b) 7...²c6 - 5...²c6 6 ²c4 e6 7 0-0 a6.

c) 7...b5 8 ²b3 is the same as 7 ²b3 b5 8 0-0 (there 8 0-0 is not forced but it is still the main move, so for adherents of 7...b5 systems there is little difference between 7 0-0 and 7 ²b3).

d) 7...²c7!? 8 ²b3 and now:

d1) 8...²c6 - 5...²c6 6 ²c4 e6 7 0-0 a6 8 ²b3 ²c7. This move-order makes some sense as it avoids the lines 7...²c6 8 a3 and 7...²c6 8 a4.

d2) 8...²e7 (see 7...²e7 8 ²b3 ²c7) is also possible.

d3) 8...²bd7 is risky in view of 9 ²xe6 (9 f4 is best answered by 9...b5!, rather than 9...²c5 - 7 ²b3 ²bd7 8 0-0 ²c5 9 f4 ²c7 in Chapter 7) 9...fxe6 10 ²xe6 ²c4 11 ²d5 ²xd5 12 exd5 ²f7 13 ²b3 with serious compensation, Milu-Vajda, Bucharest 1999.

e) 7...²bd7?! is very risky:

e1) 8 ²g5 - 6...²bd7 7 ²g5 6 e6 8 0-0.

e2) 8 ²e1 is good; e.g., 8...²e7 9 ²xe6, 8...²c7 9 ²xe6! or 8...²c5 9 b4 ²xe4 10 ²xe4 ²xe4 11 ²xe4 d5 12 ²xe6!.

e3) 8 ²xe6 fxe6 9 ²xe6 is also very dangerous: 9...²b6 (9...²a5 10
\( \text{d5!} \), \( \text{xd5} \) 11 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{f7} \) also does not guarantee safety; e.g., 12 \( \text{d2!} \) \( \text{wa4} \) 13 \( \text{e1} \) 10 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 11 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{c5} \) (11...\( \text{f6?} \) 12 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{wa5} \) 13 b4; 11...\( \text{f7} \) 12 \( \text{e3!} \)?) 12 \( \text{xf8!} \) \( \text{xf8} \) (12...\( \text{xf8} \) 13 \( \text{h5+!} \) 13 \( \text{f3+} \) \( \text{g8} \) 14 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d7} \) (14...\( \text{d8} \) 15 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f8} \) 16 \( \text{xf8+} \) \( \text{xf8} \) 17 \( \text{e7+} \) ±) 15 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{f8} \) (15...\( \text{e8?} \) 16 \( \text{h6} \)!) 16 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f7} \) 17 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{xf7} \) 18 \( \text{f4+} \) \( \text{g8} \) 19 \( \text{e3!} \) with an advantage for White, Istrate\-escu-Badea, Romanian Ch (Bucharest) 1994.

8 \( \text{b3} \)

After 8 a3!? 8...\( \text{xe4?!} \) 9 \( \text{xe4} \) d5 is dubious because of 10 \( \text{g4} \) g6 11 \( \text{d1} \); e.g., 11...f5 12 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 13 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{d7} \) (13...\( \text{b6} \) 14 \( \text{xd5!} \) 14 \( \text{d6+} \), and Black would be better to transpose to normal variations with 8...\( \text{b5} \) 9 \( \text{a2} \) (Chapter 2) or 8...\( \text{c6} \) (Chapter 2).

One more option for White is 8 a4!?.

8...0-0

8...\( \text{xc6} \) and 8...\( \text{b5} \) 9 \( \text{f3} \) lead to the other main lines. 8...\( \text{bd7} \) fails to 9 \( \text{xe6} \)!

After 8...\( \text{c7} \) 9 f4, it is again normal to play 9...\( \text{c6} \). However, the much less studied 9...\( \text{b5} \)?? is interesting. Then 10 \( \text{f3} \), 10 \( \text{h1} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{e2} \) (Golubev-\-Alteman, Yaroslavl 1983) and 10 f5 b4 (10...\( \text{e5} \)?) 11 \( \text{xe6} \) (11 \( \text{a4} \) e5! 12 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b7} \) 11...\( \text{xc3} \) 12 \( \text{f7+} \) \( \text{f8} \), Fischer-Blackstone, USA simul 1964, are all unclear.

9 f4 (D)

Other moves don’t make much sense.

Here, Black has a ‘last chance’ to transpose to the Classical Sozin (with 9...\( \text{c6} \)). We shall discuss the other two continuations:

A: 9...\( \text{bd7} \)

B: 9...\( \text{b5} \)

Other alternatives are dubious; e.g., 9...\( \text{c7} \) 10 f5! e5 11 \( \text{de2} \) b5 12 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 13 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 14 \( \text{h5} \) with better chances for White, Gligoric-\-Attard, Madrid 1960.

Note: the plan with f5 and meeting 9...\( \text{d5} \) works better for White if the black queen is on c7 and Black has castled as then Black lacks the resources 8...\( \text{xc3} \) and 8...\( \text{h5} \).

A)

9...\( \text{bd7} \) 10 \( \text{e3} \)

Or:

a) After 10 f5, there is 10...\( \text{e5} \) as well as 10...\( \text{c5} \).

b) 10 \( \text{h1} \)!! has been tried, with the idea of meeting 10...\( \text{c5} \) with 11 e5!; for example, 11...\( \text{xe5} \) 12 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{d7} \) (12...\( \text{d5} \) ±) 13 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g5} \) 14 \( \text{h5} \), K.\-Müller-\-Heinemann, Hamburg 1997. However, 10...\( \text{c7} \) is interesting, as in Ciccaltea-\-Gheorgiu, Bucharest 1961.

c) 10 \( \text{f3} \) is a common alternative. Black can choose to delay 9...\( \text{c5} \) by means of 10...\( \text{c7} \)!!, or else settle for 10...\( \text{c5} \), when 11 f5 and 11 g4 will
be discussed in Chapter 7, while 11 \( \text{e}3 \) is the same as 10 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 11 \( \text{w}f3 \).

10...\( \text{d}c5 \)

Here too, Black can delay this move by playing 10...\( \text{w}c7 \)?, but it is not clear whether he benefits from this.

11 \( \text{w}f3 \)

11 e5!? dxe5 12 fxe5 \( \text{d}f7 \) 13 \( \text{w}h5 \) g6 14 \( \text{w}h3 \) \( \text{d}xe5 \) 15 \( \text{a}d1 \) \( \text{w}c7 \) 16 \( \text{f}4 \) doesn’t promise much for White, Kaidanov-Wojtkiewicz, New York 1994.

The position after 11 \( \text{w}f3 \) is found at the crossroads of three variations (10...a6 11 0-0 in the main line of Chapter 1, 10...0-0 11 0-0 in Line B42 of Chapter 7, and the present line).

11...\( \text{w}c7 \) (D)

Maybe 11...\( \text{d}f7 \)? 12 g4 \( \text{e}8 \) 13 g5 \( \text{f}8 \) is playable, as in D.Frolov-Dvoirys, Russian Ch (Samara) 2000.

Another little-studied move is 11...\( \text{d}d7 \).

![Diagram](image)

12 g4!?

12 f5 transposes to 7 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 8 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 9 f5 \( \text{e}7 \) 10 \( \text{w}f3 \) 0-0 11 0-0 \( \text{w}c7 \) 12 \( \text{e}3 \).

12...\( \text{b}5 \)

After 12...\( \text{d}xb3 \) (see note ‘b24’ to Black’s 11th move in Line C221 of Chapter 9) 13 \( \text{xb}3 \), 13...\( \text{b}5 \) is impossible.

13 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{f}xe4 \)

13...\( \text{d}d7 \)? 14 f5 (14 \( \text{f}5 \)?! \( \text{exf}5 \) 15 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{w}d8 \) 14...\( \text{d}e5 \) deserves serious attention:

a) 15 \( \text{w}h5 \) b4 16 \( \text{c}e2 \) \( \text{xb}3 \) 17 \( \text{axb}3 \) g6! 18 \( \text{w}h4 \) \( \text{exf}5 \) 19 \( \text{exf}5 \) \( \text{e}8 \) \( \text{f}1 \).

b) 15 \( \text{w}h3 \) b4 16 \( \text{c}e2 \) \( \text{d}xe4 \) and now 17 fxe6 \( \text{d}xg5 \)? or 17 f6 \( \text{gxf6} \) 18 \( \text{gxf6} \) \( \text{d}x6 \).

c) 15 \( \text{w}g2 \)!, with the point 15...b4 16 \( \text{c}e2 \) \( \text{xb}3 \) 17 \( \text{axb}3 \) \( \text{exf}5 \) 18 \( \text{d}xf5 \) \( \text{d}x5 \) 19 \( \text{exf}5 \) \( \text{wc}2 \) 20 f6, is probably best.

14 \( \text{d}xe4 \) \( \text{d}b7 \) 15 \( \text{d}xe6! \)

After 15 \( \text{xc}5 \), Black may either get an acceptable endgame through 15...\( \text{xc}6 \) 16 \( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{wc}8 \) 17 \( \text{d}d5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 18 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xe}6 \) 19 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{f}xe6 \) (Golubev-Mowszian, Berlin 1993) or occupy the b7-square with the queen: 15...\( \text{xf}3 \) 16 \( \text{exe}6 \) \( \text{wb}7 \) 17 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{f}xe6 \) (as in Vasiukov-Aronin, Riga 1954).

15...\( \text{f}xe6 \)

15...\( \text{d}xe6 \) 16 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{fd}8 \)? 17 \( \text{d}d5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 18 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{wc}2 \) 19 \( \text{d}d2 \) with an initiative for the pawn.

16 \( \text{xc}5 \)!

16 \( \text{xc}5 \)?? \( \text{dxc}5 \) 17 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{h}8 \) suits Black.

16...\( \text{xf}3 \) 17 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{wc}8 \)

Not: 17...\( \text{d}b7 \) 18 \( \text{c}5 \)+; 17...\( \text{w}b8 \)? 18 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 19 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{g}6 \).

18 \( \text{xf}3 \)

White has more than adequate compensation for the sacrificed material:

a) 18...\( \text{f}5 \) 19 \( \text{d}d4 \)?? (19 \( \text{d}4 \)??

b) 20 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 21 \( \text{f}e3 \) [Stoica]

21...\( \text{d}7 \) 22 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 23 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{h}8 \)
24 f5 \(\text{He}8\) 25 \(\text{Hxd}5\) \(\text{Wc8}\) 19...d5 20 \(\text{Hd}1\)!, Florean-C.Popescu, Romanian Cht 1994.

b) 18...d5 19 \(\text{Ax}d5\) (19 f5!? is possible) 19...\(\text{Wd}7\) 20 \(\text{Ab}3\) \(\text{Ef7}\) 21 g6 (21 f5!? 21...hxg6 22 \(\text{Maf}1\) \(\text{Ah}8\) 23 \(\text{Nh}3+\) \(\text{Ag}8\) = Velker-Vitolinš, corr. 1996.

\[\text{B)}\]

9...b5! (D)

\[\text{W}\]

\[\text{10 e5}\]

Risky, but otherwise Black has nothing to worry about:

a) 10 f5? b4! 11 \(\text{Sa}4\) (after 11 \(\text{Sce}2\) e5 12 \(\text{Sf}3\), Fischer-Smyslov, Bled/Zagreb/Belgrade Cht 1959, Black can play 12...\(\text{Ax}e4\)! 13 \(\text{Sd}5\) \(\text{Ab}7\) \(\text{Sf}5\) Mednis) 11...e5 12 \(\text{Sc}2\) \(\text{Ab}7\) 13 \(\text{Sg}3\) \(\text{Sbd}7\) 14 \(\text{We}1\) a5 with better chances, Anand-Ivanchuk, Linares 1991.

b) 10 a3 (no better than 8 a3 and \(\text{Sa}2\)) 10...\(\text{Ab}7\) (even 10...\(\text{Sbd}7\) 11 f5 \(\text{Sc}5\)!! is not bad) 11 f5 (11 \(\text{Wf}3\) \(\text{Sbd}7\)!; 11 \(\text{We}2\) \(\text{Sbd}7\)! and here, with the bishop on b3, 12 e5 dxe5 13 fxe5 \(\text{Sc}5\) 14 \(\text{Sf}3\) \(\text{Wb}6\) \(\text{Sf}5\) is bad for White) 11...e5 12 \(\text{Sc}2\) \(\text{Sbd}7\) (12...\(\text{Ax}e4\)?! 13 \(\text{Ax}e4\) \(\text{Ax}e4\) 14 \(\text{Sg}3\)) 13 \(\text{Sg}3\) \(\text{Cc}8\) (13...\(\text{Sc}5\)?? 14 \(\text{Sd}5\) \(\text{Sxd}5\) 15 exd5 \(\text{Cc}8\)! 16 \(\text{Sg}5\) \(\text{C}d7\) 17 \(\text{Sxf}6\) \(\text{C}xf6\) 18 \(\text{Cc}e4\) \(\text{Cc}4\), Kotkov-Polugayevsky, Russian Ch 1959) 14 \(\text{Sg}5\), and rough equality is achieved by both 14...\(\text{Sb}6\) 15 \(\text{Sxf}6\) (15 \(\text{S}h5\) \(\text{C}c4\)) 15...\(\text{C}xf6\) 16 \(\text{Sf}3\) and 14...\(\text{Ax}c3\)!! 15 bxc3 \(\text{Ax}e4\) 16 \(\text{Ax}e7\) \(\text{C}xe7\) 17 \(\text{Ax}e4\) \(\text{Ax}e4\) 18 c4, while Gutman's 14...a5 is also playable.

c) 10 \(\text{Sc}3\)!! and now:

c1) 10...\(\text{Ab}7\)?? 11 e5!.

c2) 10...b4 11 \(\text{Sa}4\) \(\text{Ab}7\) (the alternative 11...\(\text{Ax}e4\)!! 12 f5 d5 13 fxe6 fxe6 14 \(\text{Sc}5\) \(\text{Sg}5\) is interesting, Valvo-Browne, San Mateo rp'd 1989) 12 e5 dxe5 13 \(\text{S}x\text{e}6\)! (13 fxe5 \(\text{S}d5\) 14 \(\text{Sc}2\) \(\text{Sd}7\) with good prospects for Black, Golubev-Kadyrov, Baku jr 1984) 13...fexe6 14 \(\text{Sxe}6\) \(\text{Ch}8\), and in this complicated line, White possibly has no advantage: 15 \(\text{Wxd}8\) (15 fxe5 \(\text{Wf}d7\) 16 \(\text{S}x\text{f}8\)+ \(\text{W}x\text{f}8\) 17 \(\text{Wxd}8\) \(\text{S}x\text{d}8\) 18 \(\text{Sc}3\) \(\text{Cc}6\) 19 \(\text{Sc}5\) \(\text{Ab}6\) 20 \(\text{Ce}1\) with compensation, Einarssohn-Lautier, Reykjavik 1988) 15...\(\text{Wxd}8\) 16 fxe5 \(\text{Sc}4\) (16...\(\text{S}e4\)!!?) 17 \(\text{Sc}6\) \(\text{C}a7\), Kaidanovde Firmian, Las Vegas 1994.

c3) 10...\(\text{Wc}7\) is more reliable; e.g., 11 a3 (or 11 f5 b4! 12 \(\text{Sa}4\) e5 13 \(\text{Sc}2\) \(\text{Sbd}7\) = Yakovich-Novikov, Uzhgorod 1987) 11...\(\text{B}b7\) (or 11...\(\text{S}c6\)??, when after 12 \(\text{S}x\text{c}6\) \(\text{Wxc}6\) 13 f5, there is 13...\(\text{S}x\text{e}4\); instead, 12 f5 \(\text{S}x\text{d}4\) 13 \(\text{S}x\text{d}4\) = leads to a position of the Classical Sozin) 12 f5 (12 \(\text{Wf}3\) \(\text{Sbd}7\) 13 f5 \(\text{e}5\) 14 \(\text{Sc}2\) \(\text{S}c5\) 7 \(\text{Sc}3\) \(\text{Sbd}7\) 8 \(\text{Sc}5\) 9 f5 \(\text{W}e7\) 10 \(\text{W}f3\) 0-0 11 \(\text{Sc}3\) \(\text{Wc}7\) 12 0-0 \(\text{b}5\)!! 13 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 14 \(\text{Sc}2\) \(\text{B}b7\), which is approximately equal) 12...\(\text{e}5\) 13 \(\text{Sc}2\) \(\text{Sbd}7\) (13...\(\text{S}g\) 14 \(\text{Sc}2\); 13...\(\text{S}x\text{e}4\)!!? 14 \(\text{S}x\text{e}4\) and 15 \(\text{Sc}3\)) 14 \(\text{Sc}3\) \(\text{C}c5\) 15 \(\text{Sc}5\) \(\text{Sa}4\)!!, D.Hansson-Fridh, Swedish Ch (Skellefteå) 1972.

\[\text{10...dxe}5\] 11 fxe5 \(\text{W}d7\)!}
11...\(\text{c}c5\)?! 12 \(\text{e}e3!\) \(\text{c}c6?!\) 13 \(\text{x}c6!\) \(\text{x}e3+ 14 \text{h}h1 \pm.

12 \(\text{e}e3!\)

Otherwise:

a) Not 12 \(\text{w}f3?\) \(\text{x}e5!\) 13 \(\text{x}a8 \text{w}d4+ 14 \text{h}h1 \text{b}bc6.\)

b) 12 \(\text{f}f4 \text{c}c5!\) 13 \(\text{e}e2 \text{b}b7 is good for Black.

c) After 12 \(\text{w}h5,\) it appears that White risks even more than Black:

c1) 12...\(\text{c}c6 13 \text{xc}c6\) (the alternative 13 \(\text{e}e3\) gives Black a choice between 13...\(\text{d}dxe5,\) transposing to Line B2, and 13...\(\text{xd}d4! 14 \text{xd}d4,\) which is not ‘b’ to White’s 14th move in Line C222 of Chapter 9) 13...\(\text{b}b6+ 14 \text{e}e3 \text{xc}c6 15 \text{f}f3 \text{b}b7,\) and now:

\(\text{c1}1\) Not 16 \(\text{h}h1? b4 17 \text{a}a4 \text{c}c7 18 \text{h}h3 \text{h}6 (\text{Levy}) 19 \text{xe}h6 \text{xe}5 20 \text{g}g5 \text{xe}g2+.

\(\text{c1}2\) 16 \(\text{a}a1 g6?! (16...\text{c}c5 17 \text{h}h1 \text{xe}3 18 \text{xe}3 \infty) 17 \text{g}g3 \text{b}4.\)

\(\text{c1}3\) 16 \(\text{g}g3 g6! (16...\text{c}c5 17 \text{e}e1 \text{ad}8 \{17...g6 18 \text{g}g5!?\} 18 \text{h}h6 \text{g}6 19 \text{d}d5 \text{xd}5 20 \text{h}h3 \text{fe}8 21 \text{h}h7 (\text{Howell-D. Hansson, Reykjavik 1990}) 17 \text{h}h6 \text{c}c5! 18 \text{e}e1 \text{fd}8 with good chances for Black, Milu-Navrotescu, Bucharest 1999.

c2) After 12...\(\text{c}c5 13 \text{e}e3 \text{xd}4 14 \text{xd}4 \text{d}c6 15 \text{e}e3 (15 \text{ad}1 \text{xd}4 16 \text{xd}4 \text{xb}6! 17 \text{f}f4 \text{c}c5 18 \text{d}d5 \text{a}7! 19 \text{h}h4 \text{h}6 20 \text{f}f6+ \text{h}8 is much better for Black, Bareiss-G. Miiiler, corr. 1986) 15...\text{xc}5,\) White’s attacking prospects are unconvincing:

\(\text{c21}\) 16 \(\text{e}e4 \text{w}7 17 \text{ad}1 \text{b}7 18 \text{d}d6 \text{c}c6 19 \text{d}d4 (or 19 \text{g}g5 \text{f}6 20 \text{f}f5 \text{w}e8, Ostojić-Minić, Vrnjačka Banja 1970) 19...\text{g}g6 20 \text{g}g5 \text{f}6, Stisis-Gutman, Biel 1994.

\(\text{c22}\) 16 \(\text{ad}1 \text{b}7 17 \text{d}d4 \text{g}g6 18 \text{c}c2 \text{w}7 (18...\text{c}c7?!) 19 \text{f}f4 and now 19...e5? failed to 20 \(\text{x}g6!!\) in Anand-Kasparov, Moscow rpd 1996. Instead Black should try 19...\(\text{c}c5?\) or Vaîser’s 19...\(\text{f}f6?!\).

12...\(\text{x}xe5!\)

It is too late for Black to opt for a quiet life, as we can see from the following lines:

a) 12...\(\text{g}g5? 13 \text{xe}g5 \text{w}xg5 14 \text{x}e6! is much better for White, Christiansen-Andersson, Hastings 1981/2.

b) 12...\(\text{w}c7? 13 \text{xf}7! \text{xf}7 14 \text{xc}6 \text{w}e5 15 \text{d}d4 \text{w}f5 16 \text{gx}g7 \text{w}f4 17 \text{xe}2 \text{g}5 (17...\text{w}e4 18 \text{f}f1 \text{f}6 19 \text{f}f5! \pm) Rosenberger-Barta, corr. 1983) 18 \text{w}f1!?! \pm.

\(\text{c}\) 12...\(\text{c}c5 13 \text{g}4,\) Golubev-Aliev, Baku jr 1984.

d) 12...\(\text{c}c5 13 \text{e}e4 \text{xd}4 14 \text{xd}4! (14 \text{xd}4 \text{d}c6 15 \text{c}c3 (15 \text{c}3?!) 15...\text{dxe}5 16 \text{h}h5 – 12 \text{w}d4 \text{c}c5 13 \text{e}e3 \text{xd}4 14 \text{xd}4 \text{d}c6 15 \text{e}e3 \text{dxe}5 16 \text{e}4) 14...\text{d}c6 15 \text{c}c3 and now:

d1) 15...\(\text{d}xe5 16 \text{c}c5!.

d2) 15...\(\text{b}7 16 \text{d}6 (16 \text{ad}1?! Gallacher) 16...\text{b}4 and now White should play 17 \text{w}e1!, Bouaziz-Psakhis, Las Palmas 1982, but not 17 \(\text{w}c4 \text{d}xe5!.

d3) 15...\(\text{dxe}5 16 \text{d}4 \text{b}4 17 \text{w}g3?! (Gallacher) 17...\text{g}6 18 \text{d}d6 gives White the initiative.

e) 12...\(\text{b}7 13 \text{h}h5 (not 13 \text{xf}7? \text{xf}7 14 \text{xe}6 \text{w}c8 15 \text{d}d5, Bosch-Golod, Hoogeveen 1998, 15...\text{dxe}5! \mp) and here:

\(\text{e1}\) Not 13...\(\text{c}5? 14 \text{xf}7! \pm.

\(\text{e2}\) 13...\(\text{c}7 14 \text{xf}7 \text{xf}7 15 \text{xe}6 \text{d}xe5 16 \text{f}4 and now 16...\text{f}3+ 17 \text{w}f3 \text{xf}3 18 \text{xc}7 \text{c}5 19 \text{xf}7+ \text{xf}7 20 \text{f}f1 \pm (Nunn) or 16...\text{d}6 17 \text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 18 \text{xf}7+.
e3) After 13...\(\text{c5}\)? White can try 14 \(\text{a}d1\) \(\text{c}e6\) 15 \(\text{h}1\), as in Zviagintsev-Mitikov, Moscow 1989 or 14 \(\text{h}1\), but not 14 \(\text{x}f7\)? \(\text{x}d4\!).

\[e4)\] 13...\(\text{g}6\) 14 \(\text{w}h3\) \(\text{g}5\) (14...\(\text{c}5\) 15 \(\text{x}f7\)! \(\pm\); 14...\(\text{x}e5\) 15 \(\text{x}e6\)!) 15 \(\text{x}f7\) \(\text{x}e3\)+ 16 \(\text{w}x\text{e}3\) \(\text{x}f7\) 17 \(\text{h}6\) (17 \(\text{x}e6\) \(\text{w}b6\)!) 17...\(\text{f}8\) 18 \(\text{x}f7+\) \(\text{x}f7\) 19 \(\text{e}6+\) \(\text{e}8\) (Shipov) 20 \(\text{e}1\)? \(\text{w}7\) 21 \(\text{f}1\), with an attack.

13 \(\text{w}h5\) (D)

The critical position, in which Black can fight back by two methods.

B1: 13...\(\text{c}4\) 38

B2: 13...\(\text{bc}6\) 38

Other moves:

a) 13...\(\text{bd}7\)? is unsuccessful in view of 14 \(\text{xe}6!\).

b) 13...\(\text{f}6\) 14 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{g}4\) 15 \(\text{ad}1\)!! \(\text{xe}3\) 16 \(\text{xe}6\) (Sokrutsof-Sozinov, corr. 1988) also favours White.

c) 13...\(\text{g}6\) is not so easy to refute.

After 14 \(\text{f}3\) (14 \(\text{x}f7\) and 14 \(\text{ad}1\) \(\text{wc}7\) are unclear), 14...\(\text{d}7\)? is weak in view of 15 \(\text{x}f7\) \(\text{x}f7\) 16 \(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{wa}5\) 17 \(\text{wd}5\) \(\text{db}6\) 18 \(\text{wc}6\), but there are 14...\(\text{wd}6\), 14...\(\text{b}4\) and even 14...\(\text{e}5\) (e.g., 15 \(\text{x}f7\) \(\text{x}f7\) 16 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{f}6\) 17 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}8\) to consider.

B1)

13...\(\text{c}4\) 14 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{bxc}4\) 15 \(\text{ad}1\)

Or:

a) 15 \(\text{f}3\)? \(\text{g}6\) 16 \(\text{g}3\) (16 \(\text{wh}6\) \(\text{e}5\)!) 17 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{xd}4\) 18 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{f}6\) is much better for Black) 16...\(\text{d}6\) 17 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{xf}4\) \(\mp\) Tarjan-Byrne, USA Ch (South Bend) 1981.

b) 15 \(\text{w}f3\) \(\text{a}7\) 16 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{d}7\) 17 \(\text{xe}7\)+ \(\text{xe}7\) 18 \(\text{w}f2\)! \(\text{e}8\) 19 \(\text{c}5\) with compensation – Gallagher.

15...\(\text{wc}7\) 16 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 17 \(\text{w}h6\) \(\text{f}6\)

17...\(\text{f}5\) 18 \(\text{f}4\) \(\mp\) (suggested by de Firmian).

18 \(\text{d}e4\)

18 \(\text{d}f1\) \(\text{e}5\) 19 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{d}8\) 20 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 21 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{e}7\) 22 \(\text{x}g6+\) \(\text{hx}g6\) 23 \(\text{w}xg6+\) \(\text{h}8\) ½-½ de Firmian-Ivanchuk, Amsterdam 1996 (here there are more chances to improve Black’s play than White’s). 18 \(\text{de}2\) does not look too convincing either; e.g., 18...\(\text{c}6\)!

18...\(\text{e}5\) 19 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{d}8\) 20 \(\text{f}3\)

20 \(\text{e}6?\) \(\text{xe}6\) (Bouaziz-de Firmian, Tunis IZ 1985) 21 \(\text{d}x\text{d}8\) \(\text{xd}8\) 22 \(\text{x}g6+\) \(\text{h}8\) is much better for Black.

20...\(\text{f}5\)!

20...\(\text{g}7\) 21 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{c}6\) 22 \(\text{h}6\) \(\text{a}7+\) 23 \(\text{f}1\) f5 24 \(\text{xd}8\) gives White an attack.

21 \(\text{d}c5\)

Now 21...\(\text{g}7\) 22 \(\text{h}4!\) \(\text{hx}6\) 23 \(\text{x}h6\) is probably better for White, but after 21...\(\text{e}7!\)? 22 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{xc}2\) or 21...\(\text{e}7\) the chances are equal.

B2)

13...\(\text{bc}6\) (D)

14 \(\text{xc}6\)

After 14 \(\text{ad}1\) \(\text{we}8\) (14...\(\text{wc}7\)?) 15 \(\text{xc}6\) (15 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{b}7\)?) 15...\(\text{xc}6\) 16 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{a}5!?\) (16...\(\text{f}6\)?) 17 \(\text{f}6+\) \(\text{xf}6\)
18 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 19 \( \text{axb3} \) (Golubev-Shushkovsky, Donetsk 1984) 19...\( \text{xb7} \) (or 19...\( \text{we7} \)) Black has excellent prospects.

14...\( \text{dxe6} \) 15 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{wd6} \)!

After this move, White has not yet managed to prove any meaningful advantage. Other moves:

a) 15...b4 16 \( \text{eh3} \) h6 and then:
   a1) 17 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{wa5} \) 18 \( \text{d5} \) exd5 19 \( \text{g3} \) d4 20 \( \text{exg7} \) (or 20 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{g5} \) 21 \( \text{exg5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 22 \( \text{f6} \) = Short-Kasparov, Novgorod 1997) 20...\( \text{exg7} \) 21 \( \text{exh6+} \) (21 \( \text{wh6+} \) =) 21...\( \text{h7} \) 22 \( \text{g5+} \) = (not 22 \( \text{d5} \)? \( \text{xd5} \)!).

   a2) 17 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{a5} \) 18 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{b8} \) 19 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g5} \) 20 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e7} \) 21 \( \text{exg5} \) (Nispero-Stoica) has not been tested.

   a3) 17 \( \text{h6} \)!! \( \text{g6} \) (17...\( \text{g6} \) 18 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{b6} \) 19 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{g5} \) 20 \( \text{e4} \) ++) 18 \( \text{wh3} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 20 \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 21 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 22 \( \text{xf6} \) b1\( \text{w} \) 23 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{b6} \) 24 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xf1} \) 25 \( \text{xf1} \) f6 is slightly better for White, as in the computer game \( MChess8\)-Nimzo99, SSDF 1999.

b) 15...g6 16 \( \text{h6} \) and now:
   b1) 16...f5?! 17 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 18 \( \text{d5} \)!

Ukrainian jr Ch (Lutsk) 1987) 24 \( \text{xd5} \) .

b2) After 16...f6! Black retains defensive resources:
   b21) 17 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{we8} \) and now:
   b211) 18 \( \text{h3} \) is best answered by 18...\( \text{f7} \) (Kengis), rather than 18...\( \text{f7} \) 19 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{a5} \) (19...\( \text{d8} \) ?) 20 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 21 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 22 \( \text{xf6} \).
   b212) 18 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e5} \) (18...\( \text{a5} \) !) 19 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 20 \( \text{xf6} \) ± J.Todorović-D.Lazić, Belgrade 1988) 19 \( \text{h3} \) (19 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{c6} \) Nickoloff) 19...\( \text{f7} \).
   b22) 17 \( \text{g3} \) ? is also very unclear; e.g., 17...\( \text{we8} \) 18 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{f7} \) 19 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{a5} \) 20 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 21 \( \text{h5} \) (Soderberg-Delabie, corr. 1990) and now 21...\( \text{g3} \).

16 \( \text{h3} \) h6 17 \( \text{d1} \)

Or:

a) 17 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{c5} \) .

b) 17 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{we5} \) 18 \( \text{f3} \) ?! (18 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 19 \( \text{h6} \) is better) 18...\( \text{c5} \) ? Kulaots-Nispero, Medellín jr Wch 1996.
   c) 17 \( \text{w5} \) \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{b7} \) and now White can play 18 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c7} \) or 18 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h4} \) (Nispero/Stoica).

17...\( \text{we5} \) 18 \( \text{w5} \) \( \text{c5} \) ! 19 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) + 20 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{b7} \) !

20...\( \text{f5} \) ?! 21 \( \text{d5} \).

21 \( \text{e4} \)

Not 21 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{e5} \) !++. Now, Golubev-Vit.Scherbakov, Novaya Kachovka 1988 ended peacefully after 21...\( \text{we7} \) 22 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{xd7} \) 23 \( \text{f6} \). 21...\( \text{e5} \) 22 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{d4} \) 23 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{xd8} \) ! is no real improvement, but 21...\( \text{f5} \) ! 22 \( \text{xf5} \) exf5 23 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{a5} \) ? forces White to seek a draw with 24 \( \text{xf5} \) !?.

It is not a good idea to make hasty conclusions, but if there is a deadlock, White will have to recollect, for example, 8 a3!? or 8 a4!? after 7 0-0 \( \text{c7} \).
4 5...a6 6  ♖c4 e6 7  ♖b3:  
7... ♔e7 and 7... ♕c7

1 e4 c5 2  ♕f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4  ♕xd4 ♖f6 5  ♕c3 a6 6  ♕c4 e6 7  ♖b3 (D)

Black enjoys a wide choice here. Current theory has three main continuations: 7...b5, 7... ♕bd7 and 7... ♕c6 – these were selected by Kasparov in the 1993 World Championship match. We shall discuss these topics in succession in the chapters to follow and here we concentrate on less current but still interesting directions:

A: 7... ♕c7!? 40
B: 7... ♔e7 40

c) After 7... ♕d7, White may well transpose to the Classical Sozin via 8 f4  ♕c6 9  ♕e3. 8 g4 is also interesting.

A)
7... ♕c7!?
Now:

a) 8 0-0 is the most common but not the most critical move. This position was mentioned in connection with 70-0 ♕c7 8  ♕b3; 8... ♕c6 and 8... ♕e7!? are the normal replies for Black.

The interesting reply 8...b5 may be used when responding to other moves:

b) 8  ♕e3 b5!?.

c) 8 f4 b5 (8... ♕c6 9 f5!) with the idea of meeting 9 f5 with 9...b4 10 ♕a4+ ♕e7!.

d) 8 g4 b5 9 g5 can be met by 9...b4!? 10 gxf6 bxc3 or 9... ♕fd7!?.

7... ♕c7 still awaits a serious test. By the way, 6... ♕c7 7  ♖b3 e6 is one more path via which to achieve this position.

B)
7... ♔e7
Now:

B1: 8 f4 41
B2: 8 g4!? 42

Instead, 8 ♕e3 b5! promises little for White, while 8 0-0 was studied in the previous chapter.
B1)

8 f4 (D)

B

8...0-0

Otherwise:

a) 8...c6!? transposes to the Classical Sozin.

b) 8...w7?! 9 f5! (9 g4!? w6 10 g5 d7? 11 xe6! ± Stein-Chistia-

kov, Leningrad 1960) and then:

b1) 9...e5 10 d6 h6 (10...bd7 11 g5!) 11 g3!, and White wins

the fight for the d5-square.

b2) After 9...exf5 White’s chances are better, as with the queen on c7 it is

hard for Black to arrange...d5.

c) 8...b5 9 e5! dxe5 10 fxe5 d7 11 xe6! xe5 (11...0-0?! 12 d5

a7 is insufficient in view of 13 f3!)

12 xc8 (12 f4 fxe6 13 xe5 0-0 14 e2 b4 15 e4 d5 = Nunn)

12...xc8 13 d5! (13 f4 bc6 = Sax-Nunn, London 1980) 13...c5

(13...a7 14 h5!) 14 b4 and now:

c1) 14...xb4+? 15 xb4 w3+ 16 w2 wxa1 17-0-0.

c2) 14...d7 15 f3 d6 16 0-0 bc6 17 b6 w7 18 e3 a8 19

c4 w7 20xd6+ xd6 21 w1 with an initiative, Yagupov-Moiseev,


c3) 14 a7 15 f4 d7 16 xe5 (16 f3 bc6! 17 xe5 0-0-0 Moro-

zevich/Yurkov) 16 w5 17 xg7 (17 w2? 0-0 18 0-0 f6!) 17...wxg2

18 w3 w2+ wxe2 19 xe2 (Morozevich-Agrest, St Petersburg Z 1993)

19...g8 20 f5 c6 21 ad1! ±.

9 e3!?

Other moves:

a) 9 0-0 is Chapter 3.

b) 9 g4!? has not been studied at all.

c) 9 w3 allows Black to transpose
to satisfactory lines with ...c6:

c1) 9...w7!? 10 f5 (10 e3? b5!)

10 g4 c6 11 xc6 bxc6 12 g5 d7 = Ciocaltea-Jansa, Bad Liebenstein

1963) 10...c6! (10...e5?! 11 d2 b5 12 g4! b4 13 g5 bxc3 14 xc3!,

Soltis-Maeder, Dresden 1969) 11 e3 transposes to note ‘c’ to White’s 11th

move in Line C211 of Chapter 9.

c2) 9...c6!? 10 e3 transposes to Line C21 of Chapter 9.

d) 9 f5 exf5 10 exf5 (10 xf5

xf5 11 xf5 wb6!, Ehlvest-Portisch, Rotterdam 1989) 10...c6 11 0-0 d5

and Black is close to equality; e.g.: 11...a5?

d1) 12 a3 b8 13 h1 a5 (13...e5 14 g5 ±; 13...a3!?) 14

f3 b5! = Balashov-Chistiakov, USSR

1969.

d2) 12 h1 c5 (12...b8!?) 13
c3 a7 14 g1 ± Lombardy-Böök,

Munich OL 1958.

d3) 12 g5!? Lepeshkin.

9...b5

Or:

a) 9...w7 10 g4! is probably un-
safe for Black.

b) 9...c6 is the main line of the

Classical Sozin.

t5 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 f7 Now:
a) 12 0-0 transposes to Line B of Chapter 3. White is not doing so well there, and it is worthwhile to look for an alternative.

b) 12 \textbf{\textit{W}}g4?! \textit{Q}xe5 13 \textit{W}e4 \textit{W}c7 14 \textit{W}xa8 \textit{Q}ec6, Podgaets-Tukmakov, USSR 1975.

c) 12 \textit{W}h5?! \textit{W}c7!?.

d) 12 \textit{Q}xe6 \textit{fxe}6 13 \textit{Q}xe6+ \textit{W}h8 14 \textit{Q}d5 \textit{Q}b6!.

e) Interesting is 12 \textit{W}f3?! \textit{Q}a7, and then 13 0-0 is better than 13 \textit{Q}f5 \textit{Q}c5?! or 13 0-0-0 \textit{Q}c7 14 \textit{W}h3 \textit{Q}xc3.

B2)
8 g4!? (D)

This is a complicated variation, and with only a couple of dozen serious games to work with, it is impossible to do more than outline the theory.

Let us discuss the following:
B21: 8...\textit{Q}c6 42
B22: 8...0-0 42
B23: 8...h6 43

Other moves:
a) 8...\textit{b}5? 9 \textit{g}5 \textit{Q}fd7 10 \textit{Q}xe6 is bad for Black.

b) 8...d5?! 9 \textit{ex}d5 \textit{Q}xd5 (9...\textit{ex}d5 10 \textit{g}5) 10 \textit{Q}xd5 \textit{ex}d5 11 \textit{Q}f5! \textit{Q}xf5 12 \textit{g}xf5 favours White; e.g., 12...d4 13 \textit{Q}g1 \textit{Q}f6 14 \textit{W}h5 ± Istratescu-Arsović, Belgrade 1994.

c) 8...\textit{W}a5!? is possible, and if 9 \textit{W}e2, then 9...\textit{W}b4!, T.Horvath-Gutman, Schoneck 1988. Instead, White should play 9 \textit{f}3 or 9 \textit{W}f3.

B21)
8...\textit{Q}c6 9 \textit{g}5 \textit{Q}xd4
Not 9...\textit{Q}d7? 10 \textit{Q}xe6!.
10 \textit{W}xd4 \textit{Q}h5 11 \textit{Q}g1 \textit{b}5 12 \textit{Q}e3 0-0
12...\textit{Q}d7! 13 0-0-0 a5 14 a3 (the alternative 14 e5! deserves serious attention) 14...\textit{Q}b8(?!?) 15 e5 d5 16 \textit{Q}xd5 exd5 17 \textit{W}xd5 \textit{Q}f8 18 e6! (18 \textit{W}e4 \textit{W}c8! 19 \textit{W}xh7 \textit{Q}f5!) 18...\textit{fx}6 (K.Müller-Kempinski, Hamburg 1999) 19 \textit{W}e5! \textit{Q}f5 20 \textit{W}e4 \textit{e}5 21 \textit{W}d5 \textit{W}c7 22 \textit{W}g8+ \textit{Q}f8 23 \textit{W}xh7 \textit{Q}f4 24 \textit{Q}xf4 \textit{Q}xf4 25 \textit{W}xg7 with an attack – K.Müller.

13 0-0-0
White’s chances are probably better. However, if Black does not permit the strike in the centre (13...\textit{Q}b8 14 e5! d5 15 \textit{W}h4 \textit{g}6 16 \textit{Q}e4 ± Yakovich-Zilbershtein, USSR 1987), but plays 13...\textit{Q}c7 (as in Zapata-Sunye, Linares {Mexico} 1992), he preserves resources for counterplay.

B22)
8...0-0!? (D)
9 \textit{g}5
9 \textit{Q}e3 d5!? (9...\textit{Q}c6 10 g5 \textit{Q}d7 11 \textit{Q}g1!? is risky for Black) 10 \textit{ex}d5 \textit{ex}d5 11 \textit{Q}g1 (11 f3 \textit{Q}e8 and now rather than 12 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}xg4!, White can try 12 0-0!!) 11...\textit{b}4 = Chepurnoi-Pisarev, corr. 1992.

9...\textit{Q}fd7
9...\textit{Q}e8 looks suspicious.
10 $\text{Ag1}$
10 h4!? (as in the game Djurhuus-Van Wely, Gausdal 1994) and especially 10 $\text{Axex6}!!$ are interesting here.

10...$\text{Qc5}$ 11 $\text{Le3}$
11 $\text{Wh5}!!$ g6 (11...b5 12 $\text{Le3}$) 12 $\text{Wh6} \text{Le8}$ 13 $\text{Le3}$ b5 transposes to the main line.

11...b5
Or:

a) 11...g6!? 12 h4 b5 13 h5 $\text{Qd7}$ 14 hxg6 fxg6 15 $\text{Qxe6}!!$.

b) 11...$\text{Wa5}!!$ is also interesting, Nikolenko-V.Neverov, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1991.

12 $\text{Wh5}$ g6
12...b4 13 $\text{Qa4}$ $\text{Qxb3}$ 14 axb3 $\text{Qb7}!!$
15 $\text{Qg4}$ ± $\text{Le8}$ 16 $\text{Qh4}$ h6 17 0-0-0!, Golubev-Watzke, Chemnitz 1998.

13 $\text{Wb6}$ $\text{Le8}$ 14 0-0-0 $\text{Qf8}$ 15 $\text{Wb4}$ $\text{Qbd7}$
Black has good counterplay, Sofronie-Navrotescu, Romanian Cht 1998.

B23)

8...h6 (D)
This is the most frequently chosen continuation for Black.

9 $\text{Qe3}$
9 $\text{Qg1}$ $\text{Wa5}!!$? (9...$\text{Qc6}$ 10 $\text{Qe3}$) 10 $\text{Qd2}$ $\text{Wc7}$ 11 h4 (11 $\text{Le3}$ b5!!) 11...$\text{Qc6}$ (Chuprov-Zagrebelny, Akmola 1995) 12 $\text{Qxc6}!!$ $\text{Wxc6}$ 13 $\text{Wb7}$ Zagrebelny.

9...$\text{Qc6}$
The line 9...$\text{Wc7}$ 10 f4 $\text{Qc6}$ 11 f5 e5 12 $\text{Qxc6}$ bxc6 13 $\text{Wf3}$ (de Firmian-D.Thorhallsson, Reykjavik 1994) is in White’s favour. Instead, 9...b5 and 9...$\text{Qa5}!!$ have hardly been tested.

10 $\text{Qg1}$ $\text{Qa5}$
10...g5 11 $\text{Wb2}$ $\text{Wc7}$ 12 0-0-0 $\text{Qg8}$ favours White after both 13 h3 $\text{Qd7}$ 14 f4, Zapata-Martin del Campo, Linares (Mexico) 1994, and 13 $\text{Qxc6}!!$ bxc6 14 f4 gx4 15 $\text{Qxf4}$ e5 16 g5! Gavrikov.

After 10...$\text{Qa5}$, the line 11 $\text{Wb2}$ b5 12 0-0-0, Stoica-Ghitea, Timisoara 1987, leaves White’s prospects uncertain (e.g., 12...b4! 13 $\text{Qa4}$ $\text{Qxe4}$). Therefore, 11 f4 deserves attention.

11 $\text{Qc6}$
It appears that both 11 f3 $\text{Qd7}$, with the idea of ...$\text{Qh4}$+, and 11 $\text{Wd2}$ g5 12 f3 $\text{Qe5}$ 13 0-0-0 $\text{Qd7}$ 14 h4 $\text{Qg8}$! 15 $\text{Qb1}$ $\text{Qh7}$, Wells-Loginov, Hungarian Cht 1993, are acceptable for Black.

11...$\text{bxc6}$ 12 $\text{Wf3}$ $\text{Qd7}$ 13 0-0-0 $\text{Qb8}$ 14 h4 g5
14...$\text{Qh4}$! 15 $\text{Qxd6}$ $\text{Qe7}$ (Loginov).
15 $\text{Qxd5}$ $\text{Qxd5}$ 16 $\text{Qh1}$ $\text{Qg8}$ 17 $\text{Qh5}$ c5
The game is complicated, Emelin-Loginov, St Petersburg 1998.
5 5...a6 6 .dtdc4 e6 7 .dtdb3 b5: Sidelines

1 e4 c5 2 .dtdf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 .dtdxd4  
.dtdf6 5 .dtdc3 a6 6 .dtdc4 e6 7 .dtdb3 b5 (D)

Historically, 7...b5 was Black's dominant reply and the vast supply of material defined the main sequence of moves: 8 0-0 .dtd.e7 9 .dtdf3. The position after 9 .dtdf3 will be discussed in Chapter 6 and the remaining material is the subject of this chapter. We consider the following lines:

A:  8 f4  
B:  8 .dtdw2  
C:  8 .dtdf3?!  
D:  8 .dtdg5?!  
E:  8 0-0  

After 8 .dtd.e3, the strongest answer is 8...b7!. Then: 9 f3 is very unambitious; 9 f4 - 8 f4  b7! 9 .dtd.e3?!; 9 0-0  
.dtdbd7! 10 f4 - 8 f4  b7! 9 .dtd.e3?!  
.dtdbd7 10 0-0.

A)

8 f4

Fischer played this at the beginning of his career, but he later cast doubt on this move when playing Black against Byrne (1967). Now 8 f4 is obsolete.

8...b7!

8...  
.dtdbd7 is less accurate - see 7...  
.dtdbd7 8 f4 b5.

After 8...b4?! 9  
.dtda4 there are no clear assessments of these two lines:

a) 9...b7!! 10 e5! (10 0-0  
.dtdxe4! favours Black - see note 'a3' to White's 10th move in Line E23) 10...dxe5  
(10...  
.dtdd5 11 0-0  
.dtdc7?! 11 f5 dxe5 13  
.dtdxe6 fxe6 14  
.dtdf5  
.dtdc6 15  
.dtdxg7+! +--) 11  
.dtdxe6  
.dtdd5 12 0-0  
.dtdc6!! (12...  
.dtdh4).

b) 9...exe4!?! 10 0-0 and now:

b1) 10...d5?! 11 f5!.

b2) After 10...b7 both 11 f5 and 11  
.dtd.e3 are dangerous.

b3) 10...f6!?? might be worth investigating.

b4) 10...g6 11 f5 gxf5 12  
.dtdxf5 (Fischer-Tal, Bled/Zagreb/Belgrade Ct 1959) and now 12...b7 (or 12...d5 Fischer).  

9 f5

Or:

a) After 9 0-0, both 9...e7 (see 8
0-0  
.dtd.e7 9 f4  b7!) and 9...  
.dtdbd7 (see 7...  
.dtdbd7 8 f4 b5 9 0-0  
.dtdb7) are good replies. Less convincing is 9...b4 10 e5!, Dely-Szabo, Budapest 1962.
b) 9 \( \text{Qe3}?! \) is dubious:
   b1) 9...\( \text{b4} \) 10 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{xe4} \)! is probably good for Black.
   b2) 9...\( \text{bd7} \) 10 0-0 \( \text{c8}?! \) (there are some alternatives: 10...\( \text{e7}?! \) – 8 0-0 \( \text{e7} \) 9 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{h}7 \) 10 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{bd7} \), 10...\( \text{b4} \) is less precise in view of 11 \( \text{a4} \) with the point 11...\( \text{xe4} \) 12 f5 e5 13 \( \text{xe6} \), Velimirović-Suba, Pinerolo 1987, or 11...\( \text{e7} \) 12 c3?! bxc3 13 \( \text{f5} \), M.Pavlović-Rashkovskij, Vrnjačka Banja 1988) 11 \( \text{we2} \) (11 \( \text{f5} \) e5 \( \text{f2} \) 12 \( \text{xe6} \)?! \( \text{fxe6} \) 13 \( \text{fxe6} \) \( \text{c5} \) – Velimirović-Portisch, Szirak 1978) 11...\( \text{b4} \) 12 \( \text{Qa4} \) (12 e5 dxe5 13 \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{cxe5} \) 14 \( \text{ad1} \), Velimirović-Vaulin, Belgrade 1993, 14...\( \text{bc3} \)?? 15 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{fxe6} \) 16 \( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 17 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c5} \)!! wins for Black) 12...\( \text{xe4} \)? (12...\( \text{a5}?! \) 13 a3 \( \text{bxa3} \) 14 \( \text{xa3} \) \( \text{h5} \) 15 \( \text{wxc8} \) \( \text{hxe5} \) 16 f5 e5 17 \( \text{xe6} \), Velimirović-Gutman, Metz 1988) 13 f5 e5 14 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{e7} \)?? seems to be in Black’s favour, Fetešar-Palac, Pula 1999.
   c) 9 e5 dxe5 10 \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{xe4} \)?? is fine for Black.

9...\( \text{e5} \) 10 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{bd7} \)

10...\( \text{xe4} \) is little-studied; e.g., 11 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 12 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{xd5} \) and now 13 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{h4} \) 14 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{c4} \) 15 \( \text{f2} \) (Boleslavsky) or 13 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 14 \( \text{g5} \)!! \( \text{cc8} \) 15 0-0-0 (Averbakh/Beilin).

11 \( \text{g5} \)

Or 11 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{c8} \).

11...\( \text{e7} \)

In the 1960s it became clear that Black has at least equal chances here.

12 \( \text{xf6} \)

12 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{c8} \) (12...h5?!?) 13 \( \text{xf6} \) (13 0-0-0?? h5? Byrne-Fischer, Sousse 1967; 13 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{gxh5} \) 14 \( \text{wh5} \) 0-0-0 \( \text{f2} \)) 13...\( \text{xf6} \) 14 \( \text{h5} \) (or 14 \( \text{wd3} \) h5?) 14...\( \text{xc3} \)! (14...\( \text{xe4} \)?? is less strong, Shmit-Ma.Tsetlina, USSR 1968) and if 15 \( \text{xc3} \), then 15...\( \text{xe4} \)!!.

After 12 0-0, good is 12...\( \text{xe4} \) 13 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) with the idea of meeting 14 \( \text{g3} \) with 14...\( \text{xc2} \).

12...\( \text{xf6} \) 13 \( \text{wd3} \) \( \text{wb6} \)!

This is more precise than 13...\( \text{c8} \) 14 0-0 (14 0-0-0?? \( \text{b6} \) 15 h3 \( \text{b4} \) = Platonov-Polugaevskiy, USSR Ch (Leningrad) 1971) 14...\( \text{c5} \) 15 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 16 \( \text{xd5} \) 0-0 17 \( \text{c3} \) \( \plus \) Platonov-Tal, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1969.

After the text-move (13...\( \text{wb6} \) 14 h3 0-0 15 0-0 0-0 \( \text{a5} \) 16 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 17 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 18 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{c5} \)? 19 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{fc8} \) is in Black’s favour, Suetin-Platonov, USSR 1971. In the case of other replies he also has nothing to worry about: 14 0-0-0 \( \text{g4} \)!! 15 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e3}+ \) or 14 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 15 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{c8} \).

B)

8 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{e7} \)!

Or:

a) 8...\( \text{b4} \) 9 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{b7} \) 10 \( \text{g5} \) is the same as 8...\( \text{b7} \) 9 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{b4} \) 10 \( \text{a4} \).

b) 8...\( \text{b7} \)?? 9 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{bd7} \) (9...\( \text{e7} \)?) 10 \( \text{xe6} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 9...\( \text{b4} \) 10 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 11 0-0-0 \( \text{a5} \) 12 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 13 \( \text{f3} \) = Radulov-Garcia Martinez, Havana 1969) 10 0-0-0 (10 \( \text{xe6} \)?? \( \text{fxe6} \) 11 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{wa5} \) Schach-Archiv) and now:

b1) Not 10...\( \text{c5} \)?? 11 \( \text{e5} \).

b2) 10...\( \text{b4} \)?? 11 \( \text{d5} \)!! \( \text{exd5} \) 12 \( \text{exd5} \) and now 12...\( \text{e7} \) 13 \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{f8} \) 14 \( \text{he}1 \) \( \text{e5} \) 15 \( \text{wd2} \) or 12...\( \text{we7} \) 13 \( \text{c4} \).

b3) 10...\( \text{b6} \) is best met by 11 \( \text{f4} \)!!.

b4) 10...\( \text{c8} \) and then:

b41) 11 \( \text{he}1 \) \( \text{xc3} \)? (11...\( \text{h6} \) 12 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{g5} \) 13 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 14 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{wa5} \) 15 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d5} \)??, Rossetto-Panno, Buenos
Aires 1968, 16 \( \text{Qxe6!} \) 12 bxc3 \( \text{Wa5} \) with good compensation, Hendriks-Mirumian, Groningen 1997.

b42) 11 \( \text{Qd5} \) exd5 and rather than 12 exd5+ \( \text{We7} \)!, \( \text{f5} \), White could try 12 \( \text{Qf5} \).

9 \( \text{Rxe3} \)

A risky plan. The assessment varies from 'unclear' to 'better for Black'. Instead, 9 g4 b4! is good for Black, while 9 \( \text{Qg5} \) will be examined via the more logical sequence 8 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 9 \( \text{We2} \).

9...0-0!

Or:

a) 9...\( \text{Qb7} \) 10 \( \text{Qxe6} \) fxe6 11 \( \text{Qxe6} \) gives White compensation for the sacrificed piece.

b) 9...\( \text{b4} \) 10 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) (10...\( \text{Qxe4} \) 11 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 12 \( \text{Qb6} \); 10...\( \text{Qb7} \)?)

11 0-0-0 \( \text{Wa5} \) 12 \( \text{Qb6} \) is unsafe for Black, Sandrin-Labin, Ermelo blind Wch 1987.

c) 9...\( \text{Qc7} \) 10 0-0-0 (10 \( f3 \) \( \text{Qc6} \)?) = 10...0-0 - 9...0-0! 10 0-0-0 \( \text{Qc7} \).

10 0-0-0 (D)

The disadvantages of 10 \( f3 \) are stressed not by 10...\( \text{Qb7} \) 11 0-0-0 \( \text{Qbd7} \) 12 g4 \( \text{Qc5} \) 13 g5 with double-edged play, but 10...\( \text{Qd7} \)! 11 \( \text{g4} \) \( b4 \)!, Heuver-Mikhailchishin, Riga 1975.

10...\( \text{b4} \)

Black envisages 11 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{Wa5} \), planning 12...\( \text{Qd7} \). Other tries with the same idea are 10...\( \text{Qd7} \)!? and 10...\( \text{Wa5} \)!. Otherwise:

a) 10...\( \text{Qb7} \)!? is doubtful because of 11 e5!.

b) 10...\( \text{Qc7} \) 11 \( g4 \) (11 \( f3 \) \( \text{Qc6} \)?) is a 'good Velimirović' for Black) 11...\( \text{b4} \) (11...\( \text{Qc6} \) is the 'bad Velimirović' – see note 'b' to Black's 11th move in Line B21 of Chapter 10), and now:

b1) 12 \( g5 \)!? bxc3 13 \( \text{gxf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 14 \( \text{Qf3} \) (or 14 \( \text{Qhg1 g6} \) 14...\( \text{Qd7} \).

b2) 12 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 13 \( \text{Qb6} \) \( \text{Qxb6} \) – 10...\( \text{b4} \) 11 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{Wa5} \) 12 \( g4 \)!

11 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{Wa5} \)

Black plans 12...\( \text{Qd7} \). Other moves:

a) 11...\( \text{Qd7} \) 12 \( e5 \)! suits White.

b) 11...\( \text{Qxe4} \) and then:

b1) 12 \( \text{Qxe6} \)? \( \text{Qxe6} \) 13 \( \text{Qb6} \) \( \text{Qe8} \)!

14 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 15 axb3 \( \text{Qg5} \) +.

b2) 12 \( f4 \) \( d5 \) (12...\( \text{Qd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qxe6} \); 12...\( \text{Qb7} \)?? Stoica) 13 \( f5 \) \( \text{Qoo} \)–\( \text{Suba} \), Romania 1998.

b3) 12 \( \text{Qb6} \) \( \text{Qxb6} \) 13 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 14 \( \text{Qxc5} \) \( \text{Qxc5} \) 15 \( \text{Qxh5} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) (15...\( \text{Qa7} \)?)

16 \( \text{Qxe7} \) \( \text{Qxf7} \) \( \text{Qxf7} \)!

17 \( \text{Qf3} \) + \( \text{f6} \) 18 \( \text{Qxa8} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) \( \text{Qoo} \)–\( \text{Stoica} \).

11...\( \text{Qc7} \) 12 \( f4 \) (12 \( g4 \)!? is possible) 12...\( \text{Qxe4} \) 13 \( \text{Qb6} \) (13 \( f5 \) \( e5 \)!) 13...\( \text{Qxb6} \) 14 \( \text{Qxe6} \) is unclear again, Goossens-Vetemaa, Belgian Ch 1996.

After the text-move, White faces a difficult choice.

12 \( g4 \)!

Other moves are unpromising for White:

a) 12 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \)!, Ljubojević-Polugaievs'ky, Amsterdam 1972.

b) 12 \( \text{c3} \) \( bxc3 \) 13 \( \text{Qxc3} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) !? 14 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \), Bönsch-Adamski, Dečin 1976.


e) 12 f4  dd7 (12...  cxex4 13 .cb6  wbxb6 – 11... wc7 12 fd4  cxex4 13 .cb6  wbxb6) 13 .cb6  wbxb6 14 .cxex6  wb7 15  xf8  xf8 (or 15...  g4!? first) 16
e5  g4 17  wd3  xd1 18  xd1 doesn’t give White serious compensation.

12...  d7

12...  cxex4 13  cb6!  wbxb6 14  cxex6  wb5 15  xb5 axb5 16  xf8  ∞.

13  cb6  wb6 14  cxex6

Now 14...wb7 15  xf8  xf8 16 f3  b5 17  g2 gave chances for both sides in N.Rogers-Byrne, Philadelphia 1992. Possibly 14...wb5! is stronger.

C)

8  wf3!? (D)

This is better than 8 we2. Nevertheless, White can hardly hope for an advantage.

B

8...  b7

Other moves:

a) 8...wc7 9 0-0 (9  g5!? gives Black a choice between 9...e7 – 8

  g5  e7 9  wf3  c7 and Lepeshkin’s

  proposal 9... bb7) 9...e6?! (9...bb7 10  e1!; 9...e7! is Line B of Chapter 6; 9...b4!?) 10  xc6  xc6 11  g5  c7 12  d5! exd5 13  xf6 dxe4 14

  h5  xf6 15  xf7+  d8 16  d5 ± Cheremisin-Makarov, Moscow 1957.

b) 8...wb6!!? 9  e3  wb7 supplies plenty of chances for both sides:

b1) 10 0-0 and now:

b11) 10...e7 is Line A2 of Chapter 6.

b12) 10...cb7!? is little-investigated. After 11  fe1 b4 (11...c5!? has the point 12  g5  e7 13  f5

  exf5 14  xf6  cb3!) 12  a4 (12

  d5! exd5) 12...exe4 13  xex6 fxe6 14  d4 d5 (Kengis-Oll, Pinsk 1986),

  Kengis gives 15 c4!.

b2) 10 0-0-0 and then:

b21) 10...b4 11  a4  cb7 12  he1  e7 13  g3!, Velimirović-Ilinčić, Yugoslav Cht 2001.

b22) 10...e7 11  g4 (11  g3!?)

11...b4 12  a4  cb7 (12...exe4? 13

  b6!) 13  g5  xex4 14  xex6 fxe6 (not 14...  xg5? 15  xd7+ 15  xex6  xg5

  (15...  ec5!? 16  xg7+  d8 17  g3

  (Lerch-Dydyshko, Czech Ch 1994/5)

  17...e4 18  wf4  ∞.

b23) 10...cb7 and now:

b231) 11  he1  e7 12  g3  b4! (12...c5!? 13  f5!!, Doghri-Ilinčić, Istanbul OL 2000.

b232) 11  h3  c5! (11...exe4? 12

  xex6; 11...b4 12  a4  xex4 13  he1

  g4 14  xg4  xg4 15  g5 Emelin)

12 f3  d7!? with good play for Black: 13  g4 a5 14  g5  g8 (or 14...a4!?) 15

  g6 (Emelin-Biriukov, St Petersburg Russia 1998) 15...  f6! ∞ Emelin.

9 0-0

Or:

a) 9 a3  cb7? =.
b) 9 ♖g5 b4!? (9...♗bd7 =; 9...h6!? 10 ♗xf6 ♗xf6) 10 ♗a4 ♗bd7 with the idea 11 ♗a5, R.Byrne-Evans, USA Ch (New York) 1966.

9...♗bd7

Otherwise:

a) Not 9...♖e7? 10 ♗xe6.

b) 9...b4 (this is risky) 10 ♗a4+ (10 ♗xd5 exd5 11 ♗a4+ ♖fd7!? 10...♗bd7 (10...♖fd7?!) 11 ♖d5! exd5 (11...♖xd5 12 exd5 ♖xd5 13 ♖xd5! exd5 14 ♔e1+ ♖e7 15 ♖c6 with compensation – Bezgodov) 12 exd5 ♗e7 (12...♖xd5 13 ♔e1+ ♖e7 14 ♖g3! Lepeshkin) 13 ♖c6 ♖c7 14 ♔e1 ♖xc6 15 ♖xc6± (Bezgodov-Vaulin, Petropavlovsk 1999) and if 15...♖b8 then 16 ♖h6! – Lepeshkin.

c) 9...♖c6?! 10 ♖xc6 ♖xc6 11 ♖e1 ♖e7 12 ♖g3 0-0 13 ♖h6 ♖e8 14 ♖ad1 ♖c7 (Tal-Browne, San Francisco 1989) transposes to note ‘d3’ to White’s 13th move in Line B21 of Chapter 6, which is approximately equal.

10 ♔e1 ♖c5

It is unsafe to play 10...♖c8 11 ♖g5?? or 10...♖b6 11 ♖e3!, Mowski-
szian-Enders, German Ch (Binz) 1994, but 10...♖e7?! 11 ♖xe6 fxe6 12 ♖xe6 ♖e5! deserves attention, as in Lanc-Van Oosterom, corr. 1994.

11 ♖d5

After 11 ♖g5 ♖c7! Black is OK.

Now (after 11 ♖d5), 11...exd5? is weak in view of 12 exd5+ ♖d7 13 b4 ♖a4 14 ♖xa4 bxa4 15 c4 ± Meister-
Svirin, USSR 1987, but after 11...♖c7! or 11...♖b6!, Black has good play.

D)

8 ♖g5!? (D)

This is possibly the most interesting alternative to 8 0-0.

8...♖e7!

Other moves are less reliable:

a) 8...h6 9 ♖xf6! ♖xf6 10 0-0.

b) 8...b4 9 ♖a4 (9 ♖xf6!? ♖xf6 10 ♖a4 ♖d7 11 ♖d2 ♖b8 12 0-0 ♖b7 13 ♖f4!, Meister-Dvoiry, Voronezh 1988) 9...♖e7 10 ♖f3 ♖b7 (10...♖a5?!) 11 ♖xe6! is better for White, Meister-

c) 8...♖bd7 and now:

1) 9 ♖e2 ♖b7! (not 9...b4? 10 ♖d5!) – 8 ♖e2 ♖b7 9 ♖g5 ♖bd7.

2) 9 ♖xe6 fxe6 10 ♖xe6 ♖a5 (10...♖b6?! 11 ♖d5!) 11 0-0 ♖f7 12 ♖xf6 ♖xf6 13 ♖g5+ ∞ K.Müller-
Mirumian, Lippstadt 1999.

c3) 9 0-0! (with the idea of 10 ♖e1) – 8 0-0 ♖bd7 9 ♖g5.

d) 8...♖b7? and now: 9 ♖e2 – 8 ♖e2 ♖b7 9 ♖g5; 9 0-0! – 8 0-0 ♖b7 9 ♖g5.

9 ♖f3! (D)

9 0-0?! 0-0 10 ♖f3 ♖b7!.

9 ♖e2 is not very dangerous:

a) 9...b4 10 ♖a4 ♖d7 11 f4 ♖a5?! (11...0-0 12 0-0-0!) 12 e5! ♖xe5 (or 12...♖xa4 13 exd6!, T.Horvath-Vegh, Hungary 1986) 13 ♖xe5!, Donchev-
Savon, Varna 1982.

b) 9...♖c7 and now: 10 0-0-0-0 0-0 – 9...0-0 10 0-0-0-0 ♖c7; 10 0-0 – 8 0-0 ♖e7 9 ♖f3 ♖c7 10 ♖g5.
c) 9...\textit{wa}5!? 10 f4 (10 \textit{\texttt{a}}d2 \textit{wc}7 = Donchev-Dorfman, Lvov 1983) and now 10...h6 11 \textit{\texttt{b}}h4 g5 (Dorfman) or 10...
\textit{\texttt{b}}b7.

d) 9...h6!?.

e) 9...0-0 and then:

e1) 10 f4 can be met by 10...b4 11 \textit{\texttt{a}}a4 \textit{\texttt{b}}b7 = Vasiukov-Gligorić, Belgrade 1961 or 10...h6!? 11 \textit{\texttt{xf}}6 \textit{\texttt{xf}}6
12 0-0-0 b4 13 \textit{\texttt{a}}a4 \textit{wa}5 14 \textit{wd}2 \textit{\texttt{b}}b7, Radulov-O.Jakobsen, Forssa/Helsinki Z 1972.

e2) 10 0-0-0 \textit{\texttt{xe}}4 (10...\textit{wc}7 11 f4! 10...b4 11 \textit{\texttt{a}}a4 \textit{wa}5 12 f4! \textit{\texttt{d}}d7 13 e5, Romanovich-Vaulin, Dečin 1996; 10...
\textit{\texttt{fd}}7!? 11 \textit{\texttt{e}}e3 b4 12 \textit{\texttt{a}}a4, Ep- pinger-Chandler, Bundesliga 1986/7, 12...
\textit{\texttt{bd}}7) 11 \textit{\texttt{xe}}4 \textit{\texttt{xg}}5+ 12 f4 d5 13 \textit{\texttt{xd}}5 exd5 14 \textit{\texttt{xd}}5 \textit{\texttt{xf}}4+ (14...
\textit{\texttt{xa}}7!?!; 14...\textit{\texttt{e}}e8!?) 15 \textit{\texttt{xf}}7+! 15 \textit{\texttt{b}}b1 \textit{\texttt{a}}a7 16 \textit{\texttt{xf}}4 \textit{\texttt{xd}}5 17 \textit{\texttt{wb}}8
\textit{\texttt{d}}7 = Radulov-Padevsky, Sofia 1970.
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Now:

**D1:** 9...\textit{wb}6!? 49

**D2:** 9...\textit{wc}7 50

**Or:**

a) 9...
\textit{\texttt{b}}b7? is met by 10 \textit{\texttt{xe}}6 ±.

b) If 9...
\textit{\texttt{wd}}7!?, then White can play 10 0-0 (see 8 0-0 \textit{\texttt{e}}e7 9 \textit{\texttt{f}}3 \textit{\texttt{d}}7
10 \textit{\texttt{g}}5) or 10 0-0-0 \textit{\texttt{b}}b7 11 \textit{\texttt{h}}e1!? \textit{\texttt{c}}6 (11...0-0 12 \textit{\texttt{h}}3) 12 \textit{\texttt{g}}3.

\**D1**

9...\textit{wb}6!? 10 0-0-0!?

10 0-0!? leads to Line A1 of Chapter 6.

**10...\textit{\texttt{bd}}7**

\textbf{Or:}

a) 10...0-0 11 \textit{\texttt{e}}e3 (11 g4!?; 11 \textit{\texttt{h}}e1
∞) 11...\textit{\texttt{b}}b7 (11...
\textit{\texttt{c}}7?!?) 12 g4!? and then:

a1) 12...\textit{\texttt{c}}6? 13 g5 \textit{\texttt{xd}}4 14 \textit{\texttt{xd}}4 ± Emelin-Nepomnashay, St Petersburg
1996.

a2) 12...b4 13 g5 \textit{\texttt{fd}}7 14 \textit{\texttt{d}}5.

a3) 12...\textit{\texttt{bd}}7 can be met by 13
\textit{\texttt{f}}5!? or 13 g5 \textit{\texttt{e}}5 14 gxf6 \textit{\texttt{xf}}3 15
\textit{\texttt{fxe}}7 \textit{\texttt{xe}}7 16 \textit{\texttt{xf}}3.

b) 10...
\textit{\texttt{wb}}7 11 \textit{\texttt{h}}e1 (11 \textit{\texttt{g}}3 0-0
12 \textit{\texttt{h}}6 \textit{\texttt{e}}8 13 a3?!, K.Müller-Kempinski, Hamburg 1998) 11...0-0 (not
11...b4? 12 \textit{\texttt{f}}5 ± Lazarev-Moiseev, USSR 1985) 12 a3 \textit{\texttt{bd}}7 ∞ Yakov-ovich/Lazarev.

c) 10...b4 11 \textit{\texttt{f}}5!? ∞ \textit{\texttt{xf}}5 12 \textit{\texttt{xf}}6
\textit{\texttt{xf}}6 13 \textit{\texttt{d}}5 \textit{\texttt{wd}}8.

11 \textit{\texttt{h}}e1

11 \textit{\texttt{e}}e3 \textit{\texttt{wb}}7 12 \textit{\texttt{g}}3 b4 (more reliable is 12...0-0!?) 13 \textit{\texttt{d}}5 \textit{\texttt{c}}5 14
\textit{\texttt{xe}}7+ \textit{\texttt{xe}}7, Trapl-Stohl, Czecho-
slovak Ch (Prague) 1986) 13 \textit{\texttt{d}}5 exd5
14 \textit{\texttt{f}}5! gives White a serious initiative
for the piece, K.Müller-Lutz, German
Ch (Gladenbach) 1997.

11...0-0

11...\textit{\texttt{b}}7!?; 11...b4!? 12 \textit{\texttt{a}}4 \textit{\texttt{c}}7
13 \textit{\texttt{g}}3 0-0, Bereziuk-Mirumian, Par-
dubice 2000, with a possible idea being 14 \textit{\texttt{xe}}6 fx6 15 \textit{\texttt{xe}}6 \textit{\texttt{a}}5!.

12 \textit{\texttt{g}}3

12 \textit{\texttt{h}}3!? Olthof/Hendriks.

12...\textit{\texttt{c}}5 13 \textit{\texttt{h}}6
Now:

a) 13...\(\triangle e8?!\) 14 \(\triangle f5!\) (14 \(\triangle d5!\)? Bangiev) 14...exf5 15 exf5 \(\triangle d8\) 16 \(\triangle xe7 \triangle xe7\) 17 \(\triangle d5 \triangle d8\) 18 \(\triangle e1 \triangle e6\) 19 fxe6 fxe6 20 \(\triangle g5 \pm\) Hendriks-Van Wely, Dutch Cht 1999.

b) 13...\(\triangle h5?!\) 14 \(\triangle g4 \triangle h8\) 15 \(\triangle xh5\) gxh6 16 \(\triangle xh6 \triangle g8\) with compensation for Black, Meister-K.Grigorian, Togliatti 1985.

D2)

9...\(\triangle c7\) 10 0-0-0

Or:

a) 10 \(\triangle xf6?!\) \(\triangle xf6\) 11 e5 \(\triangle xe5\)!

b) 10 e5!? (a new idea) 10...\(\triangle b7\)

b1) 12...\(\triangle bd7\) 13 \(\triangle xe6!\).

b2) 12...0-0 13 0-0-0! h6 14 \(\triangle db5!\)

b) 13 \(\triangle e5?!\) 13 0-0-0 \(\triangle bd7\) and now, rather than 14 \(\triangle xe6?!\) fxe6 15 \(\triangle xe6 \triangle b6\) 16 \(\triangle h3 \triangle f7\) 17 \(\triangle xf6\) \(\triangle xf6\) 18 \(\triangle g5+ \triangle g6\) 19 \(\triangle d3+ \triangle xg5\) 20 h4+ \(\triangle h6\) 21 \(\triangle f5\) g6 22 \(\triangle xe5 \triangle hd8\)

\(\mp\) Jose-Gual, Badalona 2001, White should play 14 f4!.

b4) 12...\(\triangle c5\) 13 0-0-0 (13 \(\triangle xf6\) gxf6 \(\mp\)) 13...\(\triangle c6!\) (13...\(\triangle bd7\) 14 \(\triangle xe6!\)

0-0 15 \(\triangle b3 \pm\) K.Müller-Wahls, German Ch (Gladenbach) 1997) 14 \(\triangle x f 6\) gxf6 15 \(\triangle e4?!\) (15 \(\triangle d5 \triangle d8\) 16 c3 \(\triangle d5\) 15...\(\triangle xd4!\) (15...\(\triangle e7?\) 16 \(\triangle f5!\)

\(\triangle x d 4\) \(\triangle x d 4\) 17 \(\triangle x f 6+\) \(\triangle f 8!\) 18 \(\triangle x d 4\) \(\triangle d 8!\)

\(\mp\) Lobron-Novikov, Bad Wiessee 1999.

10...\(\triangle bd7\)

10...0-0?! 11 e5 dxe5 (11...\(\triangle b7\) 12 exf6! \(\pm\)) 12 \(\triangle xf6!\) (12 \(\triangle db5 \triangle c6!\) = Bakhmatov-Bangiev, Simferopol 1986) 12...exd4 (or 12...\(\triangle x f 6\) 13 \(\triangle x e 6!\);

12...gxf6 13 \(\triangle f 5!\)!) 13 \(\triangle xe7 \triangle xe7\) 14 \(\triangle x a 8 \pm\) Meister-Kuporosov, USSR 1986.

If 10...\(\triangle c 6\), then not 11 e5 \(\triangle xd4!\) or 11 \(\triangle xc6 \triangle xc6\) 12 \(\triangle xf6 \triangle xf6\) 13 \(\triangle d5 \triangle e5!\), but 11 \(\triangle xf6!\) \(\triangle xf6\) 12 \(\triangle d5! \pm\).

11 \(\triangle he1\)

Alternatively:

a) 11 \(\triangle g3?!\) \(\triangle c5!\) 12 \(\triangle d5 \triangle b8!\) 13 \(\triangle c6+ \triangle f8 \mp\) Illescas-Gelfand, Linares 1990.

b) 11 \(\triangle x f 6 \triangle x f 6!\) 12 e5?! \(\triangle b7\) 13 \(\triangle h3\) dxe5 14 \(\triangle x e 5 \triangle x e 6\) 14 f4 is quite doubtful.

11...0-0

Or:

a) 11...b4?! 12 \(\triangle xf6! \triangle x f 6\) (or 12...\(\triangle xf6\) 13 \(\triangle a 4+ \triangle d 7\) 14 \(\triangle d 5! \pm\))

13 e5 \(\triangle b 7\) 14 \(\triangle d 5 \triangle g 5+\) 15 \(\triangle b 1 \pm\) Bangiev.

b) 11...\(\triangle c 5?!\) 12 \(\triangle f 5!\) exf5 13 \(\triangle x f 6\) gxf6 14 \(\triangle d 5\).

11...\(\triangle a 5?!\)

12 \(\triangle h 3\)

12 \(\triangle g 3 \triangle c 5\) 13 \(\triangle h 6\) (13 f4? b4!)

13...\(\triangle e 8\) 14 \(\triangle d 5\) b4 (14...\(\triangle b 8?!\)) 15 \(\triangle cb 5\) axb5 16 \(\triangle xa 8 \triangle d 7\) 17 e5 dxe5 offers Black good compensation, Garcia Martinez-Pigusov, Havana 1986.

12...\(\triangle c 5\)

Not very good is 12...b4 13 \(\triangle x e 6\)

(13 \(\triangle a 4 \triangle c 5!\) Bangiev) 13...fxe6 14 \(\triangle x e 6+ \triangle h 8\) 15 \(\triangle xe 7\) bxc3 16 \(\triangle xd 6!\)
or 12...\(\triangle e 5\) 13 f4.

13 f4

Now:

a) 13...b4 14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5 bxc3 16 exf6 \(\triangle xb 3+!\)? (16...\(\triangle x f 6\) 17 \(\triangle xf 6\) \(\triangledown f 4+\) \(\triangle b 1 \triangle xf 6\) 19 \(\triangle xc 3 \pm\) Timmerman-Wojtkiewicz, Antwerp 1994)
17 \( \text{Q} \times \text{b3}\) \( \text{Q} \times \text{f6} \) 18 \( \text{Q} \times \text{f6} \) \( \text{g} \times \text{f6} \) 20 \( \text{Q} \times \text{c3} \) \( \text{b} \times \text{b7} \) is complicated, Timmerman-Soltau, corr. 1988-91.

b) 13...\( \text{Q} \times \text{b7} \) 14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5 \( \text{Q} \times \text{e4}?! \) Schach-Archiv.

\( \text{E1) \ 8 0-0 (D) } \)

\( \text{E1) \ 8...\text{Q} \times \text{b7} (D) } \)

Now:
\( \text{E1: \ 8...\text{Q} \times \text{b7} } \) 51
\( \text{E2: \ 8...\text{b}4?! } \) 53
\( \text{E3: \ 8...\text{Q} \times \text{e7} } \) 58

In Line E3, we only discuss the alternatives to 9 \( \text{Q} \times \text{f3} \).

Or:

a) 8...\( \text{Q} \times \text{c7} \) is rare. Then 9 \( \text{Q} \times \text{f3}?! \) (− 8 \( \text{Q} \times \text{f3} \) \( \text{Q} \times \text{c7} \) 9 0-0) is probably best.

b) 8...\( \text{Q} \times \text{d7} \) is also unusual. Ideas for White then include 9 a3 and 9 f4! b4, when White can play 10 e5?! (or 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{a4} \) 8...\( \text{b}4?! \) 9 \( \text{Q} \times \text{a4} \) \( \text{Q} \times \text{d7} \) 10 f4).

c) 8...\( \text{Q} \times \text{d7} \) should lead to the same positions as 8...\( \text{Q} \times \text{b7} \). Flinching will bring no advantage to Black:

\( \text{c1) \ 9 \text{Q} \times \text{g5} \text{Q} \times \text{c5} (9...\text{b}7 \ 10 \text{Q} \times \text{e1} \) 8...\( \text{b}7 \) 9 \( \text{Q} \times \text{e1} \) \( \text{Q} \times \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{g5} \) 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{e1} \) \( \text{Q} \times \text{b3} \) 10...\( \text{h}6 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \times \text{d5} \) 11 \( \text{cxb3} \) \( \text{b} \times \text{b7} \) (11...\( \text{d}7 \) 12 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 13 \( \text{d}5 \) ! \( \text{e}5 \) ? 14 e5! +−) 12 a4?! \( \text{bxa4} \) 13 \( \text{Q} \times \text{d5} \) with an initiative for White, Golubev-Gohil, Schwäbisch Gmünd 1994.

\( \text{c2) \ 9 \text{Q} \times \text{e1}, \text{and if} \) 9...\( \text{Q} \times \text{c5} \) (better is 9...\( \text{Q} \times \text{b7} \) − 8...\( \text{b}7 \) 9 \( \text{Q} \times \text{e1} \) \( \text{Q} \times \text{d7} \), then there is 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{d5} \), besides 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{g5} \).

\( \text{9 \text{Q} \times \text{e1}! } \)

Black must now be constantly on the alert to the ideas \( \text{Q} \times \text{d5} \) and \( \text{Q} \times \text{d5} \), as he lacks the time to hide his king away (see the next note for, e.g., the consequences of 9...\( \text{Q} \times \text{d7} \)?). Other moves:

a) The immediate 9 \( \text{Q} \times \text{e6} \) \( \text{fxe6} \) 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{e6} \) is too unclear; e.g., 10...\( \text{Q} \times \text{d7} \) (10...\( \text{Q} \times \text{c8} \) is also possible) 11 \( \text{Q} \times \text{d5} \) \( \text{f}7 \) 12 \( \text{Q} \times \text{g5} + \text{Q} \times \text{g8} \) 13 \( \text{Q} \times \text{b6} \) \( \text{Q} \times \text{c6} \) 14 \( \text{Q} \times \text{xa8} \) \( \text{h}6 \), Volchok-Kopylov, corr. 1984.

b) 9 \( \text{Q} \times \text{g5} \) ? and then:

\( \text{b1) \ Not} \) 9...\( \text{h}6 \) 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{f6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 11 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 12 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{Q} \times \text{g7} \) 13 \( \text{Q} \times \text{xb5} \) ± Ivanchuk-Ljubojević, Moscow blitz 1993.

\( \text{b2) \ If} \) 9...\( \text{b}4 \), then 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{d5} \) ? is interesting.

\( \text{b3) \ 9...\text{Q} \times \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{e1} \) 9 \( \text{Q} \times \text{e1} \) \( \text{Q} \times \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{Q} \times \text{g5} \).}

\( \text{b4) \ 9...\text{Q} \times \text{c6} \) ? is stronger, when Black has chances for equality.
9...\(\Boxbd7\)!

Other moves do not promise equality:

a) 9...\(\Boxwc7\)? 10 \(\Boxxe6\) fxe6 11 \(\Boxxe6\) \(\pm\).

b) 9...b4? 10 \(\Boxbd5\) \(\pm\).

c) 9...\(\Boxec7\)? 10 \(\Boxxe6\)! e.g., 10...f6e6 11 \(\Boxxe6\) \(\Boxwd7\) 12 \(\Boxxg7+\) \(\Boxxd8\) 13 \(\Boxxd5!\) \(\Boxxd5\) 14 exd5 \(\Boxwg4\) 15 \(\Boxxg4\) \(\Boxxg4\) 16 \(\Boxdf5\) \(\pm\) Golubev-Kottke, Deizisau 1997.

d) 9...\(\Boxdc6\) and now 10 \(\Boxxc6\) \(\Boxxc6\) 11 \(\Boxxd5!\) or 10 a4 b4 11 \(\Boxxc6\) \(\Boxxc6\) 12 \(\Boxxd5!\).

e) 9...h6 can be met by 10 \(\Boxwf3\) \(\pm\) or 10 a4!?.

10 \(\Boxgg5!\)

Other moves:

a) 10 \(\Boxxe6\) fxe6 11 \(\Boxxe6\) \(\Boxwc8\) 12 \(\Boxf4\) \(\Boxf7\)! = Barden-Kottnauer, Helsinki OL 1952.

b) 10 \(\Boxxd5\) leads to unclear play after 10...\(\Boxxe7\)??, 10...\(\Boxxc5!?\) 11 \(\Boxgg5\) exd5 12 exd5+ \(\Boxd7\) and maybe also 10...exd5!?.

c) 10 a4 b4 11 \(\Boxdc5\) and now 11...\(\Boxwd5!?\) 12 \(\Boxgg5!\) gives White the initiative, Cukier-Sunye, Brazilian Ch 1995. 11...\(\Boxdc5\) is better though, with unclear play.

10...h6

Other moves:

a) 10...b4? 11 \(\Boxdc5\) \(\pm\).

b) 10...\(\Boxxe7\) 11 \(\Boxxe6!\) fxe6 12 \(\Boxxe6\) \(\Boxwa5!?\) 12 \(\Boxgg5!\) gives Black the initiative, Cukier-Sunye, Brazilian Ch 1995. 11...\(\Boxdc5\) is better though not completely clear.

c) 10...\(\Boxwc8\) 11 a4 bxa4 (11...b4 12 \(\Boxdc5\) 12 \(\Boxxf6!\) \(\Boxxf6\) 13 \(\Boxxa4\) \(\Boxc7\) 14 \(\Boxdf3\) \(\Boxe7\) 15 e5 \(\pm\) del Rio-Shirov, Madrid rp 2000.

d) 10...\(\Boxdc5\) 11 \(\Boxdc5!\) \(\Boxwc7\) (11...b4 12 \(\Boxxb7\) \(\Boxxb7\) 13 \(\Boxdc5\) exd5 14 exd5+ \(\Boxd7\) 15 c3! = Tal-Mukhin, USSR Ch (Baku) 1972 or 11...exd5 12 exd5+ \(\Boxd7\) 13 b4 \(\Boxad4\) 14 \(\Boxxa4\) bxa4 15 c4 \(\pm\) 12 \(\Boxxf6\) gxf6 13 b4! \(\Boxdc7\) 14 \(\Boxxb7\) \(\Boxxb7\) 15 \(\Boxh5\) with an initiative, Palermo-Najdorf, Mar del Plata 1965.

e) 10...\(\Boxwb6\) 11 a4! b4 12 \(\Boxdc5\) (12 a5!? 12...exd5 13 exd5+ \(\Boxd8\) (or 13...\(\Boxdc5\) 14 a5 \(\Boxwc5\) 15 \(\Boxee3!\) \(\pm\) Adams-Sadler, Dublin Z 1993) 14 a5! (14 \(\Boxdc6!\)??, Golubev-Mantovani, Biel open 1992, 14...\(\Boxxc6\)! 15 dxc6 \(\Boxwc6\) \(\infty\)) and now 14...\(\Boxwc7\) 15 c3 with an attack (Adams) or 14...\(\Boxwc5\) 15 c4!.

f) After 10...\(\Boxwc7?!\), it appears to me that 11 \(\Boxxe6\) fxe6 12 \(\Boxxe6\) \(\Boxwc4\) 13 \(\Boxxf8\) \(\Boxxf8\) 14 \(\Boxxd6\) 0-0-0 15 \(\Boxdc5\) (Nei-Tolush, Riga 1959) 15...\(\Boxxd5!\) 16 exd5 \(\Boxdb8\) and 11 a4!? b4 12 \(\Boxdc5\) (Nei) 12...exd5! are not clear.

11 \(\Boxxf6!\)

11 \(\Boxh4\) g5!? 12 \(\Boxg3\) \(\Boxec5\) 13 \(\Boxwd2\) (13 \(\Boxxe6??\) fxe6 14 \(\Boxxe6\) \(\Boxwd7\) 15 \(\Boxdc5\) \(\Boxf7!\); 13 \(\Boxdf3\) \(\Boxwc7\)) 13...\(\Boxec7\) 14 \(\Boxad1\) \(\Boxwb6\) 15 \(\Boxdf3\) \(\Boxwc7\) is satisfactory for Black, Ferrera-Sunye, Mexico 1991.

11...\(\Boxxf6\)

11...\(\Boxxf6\) 12 a4 b4 13 \(\Boxda2\) \(\Boxac5\) (13...a5 14 c3! = Boleslavsky) 14 \(\Boxxb4\) a5 15 \(\Boxbc6\) (15 \(\Boxda2!\) \(\Boxxe4\)) 16 \(\Boxwe2\) 0-0-0?! 17 \(\Boxwc4+\) \(\Boxdc5\) 15...e5 16 \(\Boxdc5\) exd4 (Golubev-Zagorskis, Karvin 1992/3) 17 \(\Boxa3!\) with an attack for White.

12 \(\Boxwd3\)

Or:

a) 12 \(\Boxwf3\) \(\Boxwb6!\) 13 \(\Boxad1\) 0-0-0 14 a4 b4 15 \(\Boxda2\) \(\Boxd7!\), as Dvoirys has played as Black three times, is unclear.

b) One dangerous idea is 12 a4!? b4 13 \(\Boxdc5\) exd5 14 exd5+ \(\Boxd7\) 15 a5 (15 c3!? bxc3 16 a5) 15...\(\Boxwc7\) (15...\(\Boxec7\) 16 \(\Boxa4+\) \(\Boxec7\) 17 \(\Boxac6\) – del Rio) and now 16 c3 (del Rio-Aranda Martin,
Madrid 1995) or 16 a4+ c8 17 c6 (del Rio).

12...d7

12...g4 13 w3 e2 ±.
13 w7 c5 14 d5 c7 15 x7 b7 wxb7 16 b4

E2)
8...b4!?
This move has recently come into fashion.

9 a4 (D)

Other moves are seldom played. Just an example: 9 c2 e2 4x e4 10 c x 4 c5 11 c e1 a7!? 12 x6 b6 1x e6 13 c x e6 1c x 6 14 c x e6 fxe6 15 c x e6+ d7! 16 g4 c7 ± Breno-Julienčić, Vrnjačka Banja 1998.

E23: 9...b7 54
E24: 9...d7 56

In all these lines (except 9...c x 4?) no orderly theory exists as many promising continuations around the 10th and 11th moves have not been actually tested as yet.

E21)
9...c4 e4 10 e1! d5
Or:

a) 10...c5? 11 c x 5 d x 5 12 a4+ d7 13 x e6 fxe6 14 c x e6+ wins for White, Soltis-T. Müller, New York 1965.

b) 10...b7 11 f3! f6 (11...c5 12 x c5 d x 5 13 a4+ d7 14 c x e6 fxe6 15 c x e6+ f7 16 x d7) 12 c x e6 fxe6? 13 c x e6 a5 14 c x f8+! f7 15 w x d6 ++.

c) 10...f6 11 g5 e7 12 c f5!
± Jovčić-Slatau, corr. 1957.

11 c4!

Another known idea is 11 c4!?, but then 11...bxc3 12 c x c3 b4 13 a4+ d7 14 c x e4 d x e4 is not so clear.

11...c7
Or:

a) 11...d7? 12 x d5 exd5 13 e6 ++.

b) 11...f6? 12 c x e6 f x e6 13 x d5 ++ d’Amore-Bonatti, corr. 1978.

11...b7 12 c x e6 (or 12 h5! ± Suetin) 12...f x e6 13 h5+ (13 c x e4 d x e4 14 h5+ g6 15 e5 d x d6!) 13...g6 14 w e5 w d6 15 f3! ± Pieretti-La Rosa, corr. 1972.

d) 11...d6 12 x e4! (12 x d6 w x d6 13 f x 5 [not 13 f3? f6 14 c x f5 w d8!]) 13...x f5 14 w d5 w x d5 15 x d5 ± 12...d x e4 13 c x e6 c x e6 14 c x d6 ± Boleslavsky.
e) 11...d7 12 c4! and now:
   e1) 12...dxc4 13 cxc4 \( \text{\#f6} \) (alternatively, 13...c5 14 cxc5 \( \text{\#xc5} \) 15 \( \text{\#xe6} \) \( ++ \)) 14 \( \text{\#xe6} \) fxe6 15 cxe6 dxe6 16 cxe6+ fxe7 17 \( \text{\#xd8} + \text{\#xd8} \) 18 \( \text{\#b6} + \text{\#b6} \).

   e2) 12...bxc3 13 dxc3 \( \text{\#xc3} \) \( \text{\#xc3} \) (or 13...\( \text{\#e7} \) 14 \( \text{\#xd5} \) \( ++ \)) 14 bxc3 \( \text{\#e7} \) 15 \( \text{\#xd5} \) (even 15 \( \text{\#f5} \) 0-0 16 \( \text{\#xd5} \) is much better for White, Nei-Chukkaev, USSR Ch 1955) 15...exd5 16 \( \text{\#d6} \) \( \text{\#e6} \) 17 \( \text{\#xe6} \) fxe6 18 dxe6 and White wins, Schindler-Schulz, Germany 1981.

   e3) 12...\( \text{\#f6} \) 13 \( \text{\#e3} \) dxc4 14 c2! c5 15 b6 a7 16 cxc4 c7 17 \( \text{\#f3} \) d8 18 g5 \# Guaimare-Simon, corr. 1997.

12 \( \text{\#xb8} \)

12...\( \text{\#f5} \) exf5 13 \( \text{\#xd5} \) is also good.

12...\( \text{\#xb8} \) 13 c6 \( \text{\#c7} \) 14 cxb8 \( \text{\#xb8} \) 15 c4

White has a large advantage.

**E22**

9...\( \text{\#e7} \) 10 f4

With the knight on a4, after e5 and the exchange of pawns, Black has no...c5 resource, and White wants to make use of this...

Black experiences no problems after 10 \( \text{\#b7} \) 0-0-0 and 10 \( \text{\#e3} \) 0-0-0 11 f3 \( \text{\#b7} \), while 10 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#b7} \) 11 \( \text{\#e1} \) c6 12 \( \text{\#e3} \) 0-0 13 \( \text{\#ad1} \) \( \text{\#e5} \) 14 \( \text{\#h3} \) \( \text{\#xe4} \) 15 \( \text{\#xe6} \) fxe6 16 c5 \( \text{\#h8} \) left Black better in Magomedov-Kupreichik, Daugavpils 1989.

10...\( \text{\#c7} \)!

Or:

a) 10...dxe4? 11 f5 exf5 (11...d5 12 fxe6 fxe6 13 dxe6! \( \text{\#xe6} \) 14 \( \text{\#h5} \) + Delanoy-Touzane, Montpellier 1997) 12 dxe5 \( \text{\#xf5} \) 13 dxe5 dxe5 14 \( \text{\#f6} \) \( \text{\#xf7} \) + is much better for White, Larsen-Olsen, corr. 1983.

b) 10...\( \text{\#b7} \) 11 e5! \( \text{\#d5} \) 12 \( \text{\#f5} \) !

c) 10...0-0 11 e5! \( \text{\#e4} \) (11...dxe5? 12 fxe5 \( \text{\#e4} \) 13 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#c7} \) 14 \( \text{\#g4} \) \( \text{\#xe5} \) 15 \( \text{\#f3} \) ± Giles-Gratz, USA 1982) 12 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#c7} \) (12...\( \text{\#b7} \) ?! 13 \( \text{\#g4} \) \# IIć), and now 13 \( \text{\#h5} \) \( \text{\#d7} \) 14 \( \text{\#ae1} \) g6 15 \( \text{\#h6} \) (Mirumian-Dao, Erevan OL 1996) 15...dxe5! 16 fxe5 \( \text{\#b7} \) is unclear, but 13 \( \text{\#g4} \) \( \text{\#h8} \) (Gallagher-V. Atlas, Wohlen 1993) 14 \( \text{\#ad1} \) ! (V. Atlas) favours White.

The position occurring after the text-move (10...\( \text{\#c7} \)) requires serious testing:

a) 11 \( \text{\#h1} \), 11 \( \text{\#e2} \) and 11 c3 have not been investigated at all.

b) 11 \( \text{\#e3} \) 0-0-0! (11...dxe4? 12 f5 wins for White; 11...\( \text{\#bd7} \) 12 c3 bxc3 13 dxc3 \( \text{\#c5} \) 14 \( \text{\#c2} \) 0-0 15 e5! with an advantage, de Firmian-Van Wely, Buenos Aires 1995), and now 12 f5 leads to a good position for Black (7 0-0 \( \text{\#e7} \) 8 \( \text{\#b3} \) 0-0 9 f4 b5 10 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#c7} \) 11 f5 b4! 12 \( \text{\#a4} \)).

c) The main line runs 11 e5 dxe5 (11...\( \text{\#fd7} \) ?! 12 \( \text{\#xe6} \); 11...\( \text{\#d4} \) ?! 12 f5!) 12 fxe5 \( \text{\#xe5} \), when 13 \( \text{\#b6} \) \( \text{\#c5} \) looks quite satisfactory for Black and 13 f4 \( \text{\#e4} \) 14 \( \text{\#d2} \) 0-0? (or 14...\( \text{\#c6} \) 15 c3 Ovseevich) is very unclear.

**E23**

9...\( \text{\#b7} \) (D)

10 \( \text{\#e1} \)

The other possibilities include two moves that offer White little and several interesting but under-explored ideas:

a) 10 f4 has not justified White’s hopes:
a1) 10...\(\mathcal{D}\)xe4? 11 f5! (11 \(\mathcal{A}\)e3!? \(\mathcal{D}\)d7 12 f5 e5 13 \(\mathcal{D}\)e6!) 11...e5 12 \(\mathcal{D}\)e6! ±.

a2) 10...\(\mathcal{A}\)c6!? could be considered.

a3) 10...\(\mathbb{Q}\)xe4! and then:

a31) 11 \(\mathbb{Q}\)e3 d5!? 12 f5 (12 c3 bxc3 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc3 \(\mathcal{A}\)c5 = Cousso-Äström, Stockholm 1994) 12...e5 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)bd7 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g5 \(\mathbb{W}\)c7! (14...\(\mathcal{A}\)e7?! 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4 dxe4 16 \(\mathbb{W}\)f2 \(\mathbb{W}\)c7 17 g4! h6 18 h4, Velimirović-Ilinčić, Jagodina 1993) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4 (15 c3 h6! Ilinčić) 15...dxe4 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d3 \(\mathbb{Q}\)bd7?! 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g5 d5 18 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4 dxe4 19 \(\mathcal{A}\)e3 \(\mathbb{W}\)c7?! ±.

a32) 11 f5 e5 and now:

a321) 12 \(\mathbb{A}\)e1 \(\mathbb{A}\)e7!?

a322) 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)bd7?! 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g5 d5 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4 dxe4 15 \(\mathcal{A}\)e3 \(\mathbb{W}\)c7! 16 \(\mathbb{W}\)e2 (16 g4?! h6 = Todorović-Marjanović, Kavala 1998) 16...h6?! 17 \(\mathbb{A}\)ac1 \(\mathbb{A}\)e7 (18 c3 \(\mathbb{W}\)b7 19 c4 0-0 = Sofronic-Marjanović, Bucharest 1998).

a323) 12 \(\mathbb{Q}\)g5! \(\mathcal{Q}\)bd7 (12...\(\mathcal{A}\)e7?! 13 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xf6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xf6! [13...\(\mathbb{Q}\)xf6?? 14 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xf7+ ++ Iljić] 14 \(\mathbb{W}\)e1 d5 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c6 16 \(\mathbb{A}\)d1 0-0 17 c4 = Browne-Saidy, Atlanta 1967) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e1 (13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e6? fxe6 14 fxe6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b6!) 13...\(\mathcal{A}\)b7! (13...\(\mathcal{A}\)e7?! 14 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xf6 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xf6 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4!; 13...\(\mathbb{W}\)c7?! 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4! \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b5! ++) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e6 fxe6 15 fxe6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b8 and White’s chances are questionable, Kaps-Novak, Ljubljana 1999.

b) 10 \(\mathbb{Q}\)e3 \(\mathbb{Q}\)xe4 11 \(\mathbb{A}\)e1 is also unconvincing:

b1) 11...\(\mathcal{Q}\)bd7!.

b2) 11...\(\mathbb{A}\)e7?! and now 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6 fxe6 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6 \(\mathbb{W}\)d7! or 12 \(\mathbb{Q}\)b6 \(\mathcal{A}\)a7!? 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6?! \(\mathbb{B}\)b7!.

b3) 11...d5 12 f3 \(\mathcal{A}\)g6 13 f4 (13 \(\mathcal{A}\)f4!?) 13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d6 with good chances for Black, Olesen-Äström, Stockholm 1994.

c) 10 c3 bxc3 (10...\(\mathcal{A}\)e7 11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6?) 11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)bd7 12 \(\mathcal{A}\)a4 \(\mathbb{A}\)e7? =.

d) 10 f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)bd7 11 \(\mathbb{A}\)e1!? has hardly been investigated.

e) 10 \(\mathbb{W}\)e1!? (also rare) 10...a5 11 e5 ∞ Gurieli-Smagin, Bad Wiessee 1999.

f) 10 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g5!? deserves serious attention: 10...\(\mathcal{Q}\)bd7 (10...\(\mathcal{A}\)e7 11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6) 11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e1 \(\mathbb{A}\)e7 12 a3 (12 c3!? bxc3 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6, Borik-Bouaziz, Dortmund 1979) 12...bxa3 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xa3 0-0 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6! fxe6 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6 \(\mathbb{W}\)e8 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g3 with an advantage for White, Short-Van Wely, Garmisch rp6 1994.

10...\(\mathcal{Q}\)bd7

It is likely that there is a better move here:

a) 10...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c6 11 c3 (11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc6!? \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc6 9...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d7 10 \(\mathbb{A}\)e1 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c6 11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc6) 11...\(\mathcal{Q}\)e7? ±. 12 cxb4 \(\mathbb{A}\)xb4 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c3 0-0 (13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c6?!) 14 \(\mathcal{A}\)a4? and now 14...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c8 15 \(\mathcal{W}\)b3 d5 16 \(\mathcal{A}\)d1 \(\mathcal{A}\)c5 17 a3 dxe4 18 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xf2+ 19 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f1 \(\mathcal{W}\)a5 20 \(\mathcal{W}\)xb4 \(\mathcal{W}\)f5 21 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f4 may favour White, Shtyrenkov-Dvoiryos, Kursk 1987.

b) 10...\(\mathbb{A}\)e7 11 c3 (11 a3!? is possible) 11...bxc3 (11...0-0 12 cxb4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4 13 f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6! ± Virostko-Paramonov, Plzen 1998) 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc3 0-0 13 f4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)bd7 (13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c6!?) 14 e5 dxe5 15
fxe5 \( \text{\&} e8 \) 16 \( \text{\&} x e 6 \) fxe6 17 \( \text{\&} x e 6 + \text{\&} h 8 \), and, instead of 18 \( \text{\&} x d 7 \text{\&} c 5 + \) 19 \( \text{\&} e 3 \) \( \text{\&} b 6 \) with a draw, Yakovich-Dvoiry, Kursk 1987, it is worth studying 18 \( \text{\&} x d 7 \text{\&} c 5 + \) 19 \( \text{\&} e 3 \) \( \text{\&} g 5 \) 20 \( \text{\&} d 2 \text{\&} f 3 \) 21 \( \text{\&} d 1 \).

11 \( \text{\&} c 3 \)

Otherwise:

a) 11 f4?! \( \text{\&} x e 4 \)!

b) 11 a3 bxa3 (11...\( \text{\&} x e 4 \) 12 \( \text{\&} x e 6 \) fxe6 13 \( \text{\&} x e 6 \) \( \text{\&} d f 6 \) 14 f3 d5 15 fxe4 \( \pm \) de Firman-Hort, Baden-Baden 1981) 12 \( \text{\&} x e 6 \) fxe6 13 \( \text{\&} x e 6 \) is exceedingly unclear.

c) 11 \( \text{\&} g 5 - 10 \text{\&} g 5 \)?? \( \text{\&} b d 7 \) 11 \( \text{\&} e 1 \).

d) 11 \( \text{\&} d 2 \) also deserves attention.

11...\( \text{\&} x e 4 \) 12 f3 \( \text{\&} e c 5 \) 13 \( \text{\&} x c 5 \) \( \text{\&} x c 5 \) 14 \( \text{\&} a 4 + \)?? \( \pm \) Savon-Simović, Ljubljana 1961.

12 \( \text{\&} x c 3 \) \( \text{\&} c 5 \)

12...\( \text{\&} e 7 \)?? 13 \( \text{\&} x e 6 \) fxe6 14 \( \text{\&} x e 6 \) \( \text{\&} c 8 \) 15 \( \text{\&} x g 7 + \) \( \text{\&} f 7 \) 16 \( \text{\&} f 5 \) \( \text{\&} c 5 \) 17 \( \text{\&} x e 7 \) \( \text{\&} x e 7 \) 18 \( \text{\&} g 5 \) \( \pm \).

13 \( \text{\&} d 5 \)!! \( \text{\&} c 7 \) 14 \( \text{\&} g 5 \) \( \text{\&} e 7 \) 15 b4! White is better, Istratescu-Van Wely, Moscow OL 1994.

E24)

9...\( \text{\&} d 7 \) (D)

This continuation was introduced by Dvoiryš in 1987, and has become very popular recently.

10 f4

Or:

a) 10 \( \text{\&} g 5 \) \( \text{\&} e 7 \) (10...\( \text{\&} a 5 \)?? Ilić), and now 11 \( \text{\&} f 5 \)?? is dubious in view of 11...\( \text{\&} x f 5 \) 12 \( \text{\&} x f 6 \) \( \text{\&} x f 6 \) 13 \( \text{\&} d 5 \) 0-0 (or 13...\( \text{\&} c 7 \) 14 \( \text{\&} x a 8 \) \( \text{\&} e 8 \)!!.

There are three other, more serious, alternatives:

b) 10 \( \text{\&} e 3 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 \) (10...\( \text{\&} x e 4 \)!! 11 f4 \( \text{\&} f 6 \) 12 f5 e5 13 \( \text{\&} c 6 \) fxe6 14 \( \text{\&} b 6 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 15 fxe6 \( \text{\&} e 7 \) 16 \( \text{\&} x f 6 \)!, Velimirović-Ilinčić, Cetinje 1991; 10...\( \text{\&} e 7 \) 11 \( \text{\&} b 6 \)??) 11 \( \text{\&} e 1 \) (11 f3 \( \text{\&} e 7 \) 12 \( \text{\&} c 1 \) \( \text{\&} b 8 \) 13 c4 \( \text{\&} x c 3 \) 14 \( \text{\&} x c 3 \) \( \text{\&} a 5 \) 15 \( \text{\&} c 2 \) e5 = Lautier-Sadler, Tilburg 1998; 11 f4!! - 10 f4 \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 11 \( \text{\&} e 3 \) 11...\( \text{\&} c 8 \) (11...\( \text{\&} e 7 \) 12 \( \text{\&} b 6 \) \( \text{\&} x b 6 \) 13 \( \text{\&} x e 6 \) \( \text{\&} a 5 \) 14 \( \text{\&} x g 7 + \) \( \text{\&} f 8 \) 15 \( \text{\&} h 6 \) \( \text{\&} g 8 \) 16 \( \text{\&} d 5 \) \( \text{\&} x d 5 \) 17 \( \text{\&} x d 5 \) 18 \( \text{\&} e 5 \) 18 \( \text{\&} e 6 \) \( \pm \) Caminade-Boudre, Creon 1998) 12 c3 and here Black should play 12...\( \text{\&} b 3 \) 13 \( \text{\&} x c 3 \) \( \text{\&} e 7 \) =.

c) 10 \( \text{\&} e 1 \) and then:

\( \text{c1) } \) 10...\( \text{\&} c 6 \) 11 \( \text{\&} x c 6 \)?? (11 c3 - 10 c3 \( \text{\&} x c 6 \) 11 \( \text{\&} e 1 \); 11 \( \text{\&} e 3 \) - 10 \( \text{\&} e 3 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 11 \( \text{\&} e 1 \) ) 11...\( \text{\&} x c 6 \) 12 \( \text{\&} d 4 \) \( \text{\&} b 8 \) with a possible continuation 13 \( \text{\&} g 5 \) \( \text{\&} e 7 \) 14 \( \text{\&} x d 1 \) \( \text{\&} a 5 \) 15 e5 dxe5 16 \( \text{\&} x e 5 \) \( \text{\&} b 5 \) =.

\( \text{c2) } \) 10...\( \text{\&} e 7 \) and now:

\( \text{c21) } \) 11 c3 a5 12 \( \text{\&} f 3 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 13 \( \text{\&} g 3 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{\&} h 6 \) \( \text{\&} e 8 \) is slightly better for Black, Jukić-Jaworski, Moravian Cht 1998/9.

\( \text{c22) } \) 11 f4 \( \text{\&} c 6 \) 12 e5 dxe5 13 fxe5 \( \text{\&} x d 4 \) 14 \( \text{\&} x d 4 \) \( \text{\&} d 5 \) and Black is OK, Cetković-Ilinčić, Becić 1993.

\( \text{c23) } \) 11 a3 a5 12 axb4 axb4 13 \( \text{\&} d 2 \) \( \text{\&} a 6 \) = Dekić-Ilinčić, Yugoslav Cht 1992.
c24) 11 \( \mathcal{d} \)d2 \( \mathcal{d} \)c6?! (11...a5 is better) 12 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc6 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc6 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb4 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe4 14 \( \mathfrak{w} \)d4 with an advantage, Golubev-Balcerak, Bundesliga 1996/7.

d) 10 c3 and then:

d1) 10...\( \mathcal{d} \)xe4? 11 \( \mathfrak{w} \)f3 d5 12 c4! \( \mathfrak{w} \)f6 (or 12...\( \mathcal{d} \)c6 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe6! ++) 13 cxd5 \( \mathfrak{w} \)xd4 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3 \( \mathcal{d} \)e5 15 \( \mathcal{d} \)f4 \( \mathfrak{w} \)f5 16 \( \mathcal{d} \)fe1 ++ Lautier-Sadler, Enghien-les-Bains 1999.

d2) 10...a5 11 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3?! \( \mathcal{d} \)e7 12 \( \mathcal{d} \)b6 \( \mathfrak{w} \)xb6 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe6 with compensation, Nijboer-Janssen, Dutch Ch 2000/1.

d3) 10...bxc3 is probably a bit premature: 11 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc3 \pm.

d4) 10...\( \mathcal{d} \)c6 11 \( \mathcal{d} \)e1 (11 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc6 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc6 12 f3 d5 13 exd5 \( \mathcal{d} \)xd5 = Pokorna-Lakos, Ostrava 1999; 11 cxb4?! \( \mathcal{d} \)xb4 12 \( \mathcal{d} \)g5, Schwartz-Gorissen, Dutch jr Ch (Nijmegen) 2001) 11...\( \mathcal{d} \)b8 (11...\( \mathcal{d} \)e7 12 cxb4 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb4 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3 0-0 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)c1! ± Berzinsh-Kulaots, Latvia-Estonia 2000; 11...bxc3?! 12 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc3 \( \mathcal{d} \)e7) and here:

d41) 12 cxb4 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb4 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc6 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc6 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)c3 \( \mathcal{d} \)e7 is equal, Sieiro-Gonzalez – Ortega, Holguin 1989.

d42) 12 f3 \( \mathcal{d} \)e7 (12...\( \mathcal{d} \)a5?!?) 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc6 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc6 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb4 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb4 15 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3 0-0 16 \( \mathcal{d} \)c1! ± Rogić-Pavasović, Dresden Z 1998.

d43) 12 f4 bxc3!?(12...\( \mathcal{d} \)e7? 13 e5 dxe5 14 fxe5 \( \mathcal{d} \)d5 15 \( \mathfrak{w} \)g4 ± Badii-Relange, Villerescies 1998) 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc3 \( \mathcal{d} \)xd4 14 \( \mathfrak{w} \)xd4 \( \mathcal{d} \)e7 15 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3 0-0 16 \( \mathcal{d} \)h1 \( \mathcal{d} \)e6 with an acceptable position, Malakhov-Berezin, Ukrainian Ch (Alushta) 1999.

We now return to 10 f4 (D):

10...\( \mathcal{d} \)c6

10...\( \mathfrak{w} \)a5 11 c3 is risky for Black.

11 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3

Others:

a) 11 e5?! dxe5 12 fxe5 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe5 13 \( \mathfrak{w} \)e2 \( \mathfrak{g} \)g6?.

b) 11 c3!?

c) 11 f5 is quite dangerous, but it looks like Black holds on: 11...e5! (11...\( \mathcal{d} \)xd4?! 12 \( \mathfrak{w} \)xd4 e5 13 \( \mathfrak{w} \)xb4!) 12 \( \mathcal{d} \)e6 (12 \( \mathcal{d} \)e2 \( \mathcal{d} \)e7 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3 \( \mathcal{d} \)b8 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)g3 0-0 15 \( \mathcal{d} \)h5 \( \mathcal{d} \)d4! with a slight advantage for Black, West-Blumenfeld, New York 1989; 12 \( \mathcal{d} \)f3!? h6 13 \( \mathfrak{w} \)e1 \( \mathcal{d} \)e7 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)g3 \( \mathcal{d} \)f8 15 \( \mathfrak{w} \)e1 \( \mathcal{d} \)b8 is slightly better for Black, Reinderman-Andan, Wijk aan Zee 1999) 12...fxe6 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe6 \( \mathcal{d} \)c8, and here White has tested two possibilities:

c1) 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)xf6?! \( \mathfrak{w} \)xf6 15 \( \mathfrak{w} \)d5 and then:

c11) After 15...\( \mathcal{d} \)d4 16 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3 \( \mathcal{d} \)b8 17 \( \mathcal{d} \)xd4 (Ardeleanu-Marjanović, Preliminary 1999) Black can, at least, rely on a draw: 17...\( \mathcal{d} \)xd4?! 18 \( \mathfrak{w} \)c6+ \( \mathcal{d} \)d8 19 \( \mathcal{d} \)f1 \( \mathcal{d} \)g5 20 \( \mathcal{d} \)e5 \( \mathcal{d} \)e7 21 \( \mathcal{d} \)b6 \( \mathfrak{w} \)f8! (21...\( \mathcal{d} \)xe6 22 \( \mathcal{d} \)a8!) 22 \( \mathfrak{w} \)xf8+ \( \mathfrak{w} \)xf8 23 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc8 \( \mathfrak{w} \)e3+ =.

c12) 15...\( \mathcal{d} \)g7 16 \( \mathcal{d} \)c5 \( \mathcal{d} \)e7! (not 16...\( \mathcal{d} \)d4? 17 \( \mathcal{d} \)a4+ \( \mathcal{d} \)d8 18 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb7+ \( \mathcal{d} \)c7 19 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe6 20 \( \mathcal{d} \)a5+ \( \mathcal{d} \)xb7 21 c3!!; 16...0-0-0? 17 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb7 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb7 18 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3 followed by 19 a3!! – Ardeleanu) 17 \( \mathcal{d} \)e3 0-0 18 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb7 \( \mathfrak{w} \)d4 with the following possibilities:
c121) 19 \( \text{xe}4 \text{exd}4 \) 20 \( \text{c}4 \) (20 \( \text{h}3 \text{f}2+ \) 21 \( \text{h}1 \text{g}3 \) 22 \( \text{a}5 \), Echavarria-Borges, Cali 2000, 22...\( \text{g}5!! \) \( \Rightarrow \) Echavarria.

\( c122 \) 19 \( \text{h}3 \text{e}2+ \) and again Black has good chances.

\( c2 \) 14 \( \text{g}5 \) and then:

\( c21 \) 14...\( \text{xe}7 \) 15 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 16 \( \text{xf}6! \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 17 \( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 18 \( \text{b}6 \) gives Black problems:

\( c211 \) 18...\( \text{xe}6 \) 19 \( \text{xe}6! \) (19 \( \text{xa}8 \) \( \text{e}2+ \) 20 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{g}3+ \) 21 \( \text{hx}3 \) \( \text{h}6+ \) 22 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{e}3+ \) = {Kalegin-Dvoirys, USSR 1988} 23 \( \text{f}1? \) \( \text{xf}8+ \) 24 \( \text{xf}8+ \) \( \text{xf}8 \) 25 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{h}6! \) 19...\( \text{xe}6 \) (19...\( \text{d}8 \) 20 \( \text{d}7+ \) \( \text{f}7 \) 21 \( \text{d}5+! \) del Rio) 20 \( \text{xc}6+ \) \( \text{xe}6 \) 21 \( \text{xa}8 \) \( \pm \).

\( c212 \) 18...\( \text{e}2+ \) 19 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{g}3+ \) 20 \( \text{hx}3 \) \( \text{h}6+ \) 21 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{e}3+ \) 22 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{f}8+ \) 23 \( \text{xf}8+ \) \( \text{xf}8 \) 24 \( \text{e}7+ \) \( \text{e}8 \) 25 \( \text{a}4+ \) \( \text{d}7 \) 26 \( \text{xd}7+ \) \( \text{f}7 \) 27 \( \text{xa}8 \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 28 \( \text{d}1! \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 29 \( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{xc}2 \) 30 \( \text{a}4 \) (Kalegin-Dvoirys).

\( c22 \) 14...\( \text{h}5(!) \) 15 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{gxf}6 \) 16 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 17 \( \text{c}3 \) (Anand is sceptical about White's chances here) 17...\( \text{h}8 \) \( 1/2-1/2 \) Milu-Marjanović, Bucharest 1999.

\( 11...\text{b}8! \)

Not: 11...\( \text{xe}4?! \) 12 \( \text{f}5; \) 11...\( \text{e}7?! \) 12 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{e}5 \) (12...\( \text{xd}4 \) 13 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 14 \( \text{xb}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 15 \( \text{e}1! \) \( \pm \) Anand) 13 \( \text{e}6! \) \( \pm \) Ciocaltea-Creulescu, Romanian Ch (Bucharest) 1955.

\( 12 \text{f}3 \)

Or:

a) 12 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{dxe}5 \) 13 \( \text{f}xe5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 14 \( \text{f}4 \) and now, instead of 14...\( \text{wc}7 \) 15 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 16 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 17 \( \text{xc}3 \) \( \text{wa}7 \) 18 \( \text{h}1 \) 0-0 19 \( \text{xe}6! \) \( \pm \) (A.Kovačević-Ilinčić, Arandjelovac 1993), Black should play 14...\( \text{g}6! \).

b) 12 \( \text{c}3 \) and then:

b1) 12...\( \text{xc}3 \) 13 \( \text{xe}7 \) 14 \( \text{e}2 \) (14 \( \text{c}1 \) 0-0 15 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \pm \) 14 \( \text{f}3 \) 0-0 15 \( \text{e}5?! \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 16 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{dxe}5 \) 17 \( \text{fxe}5 \) \( \text{c}6! \) 14...\( \text{wa}5 \) 15 \( \text{f}5 \) (15 \( \text{ac}1 \) \( \pm \) 15...\( \text{xd}4 \) 16 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{b}4! \) = Gormally-Rosson, British Ch (Scarborough) 1999.

b2) 12...\( \text{e}7 \) 13 \( \text{e}5?! \) (13 \( \text{xb}4 \) \( \text{xb}4 \) 14 \( \text{c}3 \) 0-0 = Anand; 13 \( \text{c}1?! \) 0-0!) 13...\( \text{dxe}5 \) 14 \( \text{fxe}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 15 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{g}6! \) with the better chances for Black, Lautier-Andan, Biel 1997.

12...\( \text{c}7 \)

Otherwise:

a) Not 12...\( \text{wa}5?! \) 13 \( \text{e}5! \).

b) 12...\( \text{xd}4 \) 13 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 14 \( \text{xf}6! \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 15 \( \text{c}3 \) (15 \( \text{w}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \); 15 \( \text{ae}1?! \) Bruzon/Y.Gonzalez) 15...\( \text{g}6 \) 16 \( \text{ae}1 \) \( \text{bxc}3 \) 17 \( \text{xc}3 \) is slightly better for White, Y.Gonzalez-Lesiege, Havana 1999.

13 \( \text{ae}1 \)

Now, instead of 13...\( \text{xd}4 \) 14 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 15 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 16 \( \text{g}3 \) 0-0 17 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \pm \) Y.Gonzalez-Borges, Cuban Ch (Santa Clara) 2000, 13...\( \text{e}7 \) deserves attention.

Summing up: currently, 9...\( \text{d}7 \) looks playable while 9...\( \text{b}7 \) is more risky, and 9...\( \text{e}7 \) should be checked very thoroughly.

E3)

8...\( \text{e}7 \) (D)

Now there is currently no serious alternative to 9 \( \text{f}3 \) (see the next chapter), so in this section we are just tying up a few loose ends.

9 \( \text{f}4 \)

White gains nothing by 9 \( \text{e}3 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{f}4 \) (see note 'c' to White's 10th move in Line B of Chapter 3).
9 a4!? b4 10 Qa2 is playable but it is hardly possible to talk about an advantage for White; e.g., 10...0-0 11 Qxb4 Qb7 12 c3 Qxe4 (or 12...a5 13 Qd3 Qxe4 14 Qe1 Qa6 15 Qg5 Qxd3 16 Qxd3 Qc5 = Kavalek-Andersson, Tilburg 1980) 13 a5 d5 14 Qc2 Qd6 15 Wh5 Qd7 16 f3 Qef6 17 Wh4 Qc8 18 Qa4 Qe8 with a good position for Black, Velimirović-M.Pavlović, Yugoslav Ch (Belgrade) 1999.

9...Qb7!

Or:

a) 9...b4 10 Qa4!? transposes to Line E22.

b) 9...0-0!? transposes to Line B of Chapter 3.

10 e5?!

10 f5 is harmless in view of 10...e5 11 Qde2 Qbd7 12 Qg5 - 8 f4 Qb7 9 f5 e5 10 Qde2 Qbd7 11 Qg5 Qe7 12 0-0.

10 Qe3 is the main alternative, but Black has a variety of good replies:

a) 10...0-0?! is weak in view of 11 e5! (here this move is good).

b) 10...Qc6 is, on the whole, satisfactory for Black.

c) 10...b4!? 11 e5 (11 Qa4 Qxe4!) 11...bxc3 12 exf6 Qxf6 leads to quite unclear play. In his Easy Guide to the Najdorf, Kosten assesses the lines 13 Qa4+?! Qd7 14 f5 0-0!, 13 bxc3 0-0 14 Whd2 Qc7 15 Qad1 d5! and 13 f5 e5 14 Qa4+ Qe7! as in Black’s favour.

d) 10...Qbd7 appears simpler, with the idea 11 Qxe6 fxex6 12 Qxe6 Qc8 13 Qxg7+ Qf7 14 Qf5 b4! (14...Qf8 is not bad either) 15 Qxe7 Qxe7 16 e5 Qc6!, Galla-Cordara, Turin 1984.

10...dxe5 11 fxe5 Qc5! 12 Qe3 Qc6

12...Qxd4!? (recommended by Kosten) is good enough; e.g., 13 Whd4 Qxd4 14 Qxd4 Qc6 15 Qc5 Qd7! (Kosten) or 13 Qxd4 Qc6 14 Qf4 (14 Qc5 Qxe5!, Sus-Kaluza, corr. 1994) 14...Qc7 15 Qe2 0-0-0 16 Qe3 Qxe5 17 Qf2 h5 18 Qb6 Qg4 19 Qg3 Qd7?!

13 Qxf6 Qxd4! 14 Qxg7

Even if the sacrifice is incorrect, it is at least dangerous in practice. After the timid 14 Qe1 Qxe3+!? 15 Qxe3 Qd4 (as in Stein-Bobotsov, Bulgaria-Ukraine 1965 and other games) Black has no problems at all.

14...Qxe3+ 15 Qh1 Qg8 16 Qxe6 16 Qf3 Qxg7 17 Qxe6 (17 Qxe3 Qd4!) 17...Qe7 18 Qd5 Qd4 19 Qh3 Qd2!! and Black wins, Inkiov-Ribli, Plovdiv 1986.

16...Qxg7

The position has been assessed in Black’s favour many times, although it is not so easy to prove it exhaustively. The variations are:

a) 17 Qh5 Qxe5! 18 Qd5 Qg5 = (Nunn).

b) 17 Qxf7+ Qxf7 18 Qh5 Qd7 19 Qe4 Qf8 20 Qxh7 (20 Qd6 Qf2! Nunn) 20...Qd4.

c) 17 Qd5!? Qd4 18 Qh5 Qd7!.
6 5...a6 6 Ʌc4 e6 7 Ʌb3 b5 8 0-0 Ʌe7 9 Ʌf3!

1 e4 c5 2 Ʌf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Ʌxd4 Ʌf6 5 Ʌc3 a6 6 Ʌc4 e6 7 Ʌb3 b5 8 0-0 Ʌe7 9 Ʌf3! (D)

Main Lines
Currently, 9...Ʌc7 and 9...Ʌb6 are of about equal importance. 9...Ʌc7 with the main variations 10 Ʌg3 0-0 and 10 Ʌg3 Ʌc6 is considered more reliable and 9...Ʌb6 braver, as it leaves Black the chance to continue with ...Ʌbd7 (with the queen on c7 this is precluded by the threat of Ʌxe6!). After 9...Ʌb6, the main continuation is 10 Ʌe3 Ʌb7 11 Ʌg3, when Black has a choice of several lines, the main one being 11...b4 12 Ʌa4 Ʌbd7. Lately, 10 Ʌg5!? has become popular instead of 10 Ʌe3.

Transpositions
9 Ʌf3 is a genuine subsystem that is almost unconnected by transposition to other lines of the Sozin. However, it is inherently somewhat entangled as the sides have many standard moves. The greatest number of transpositions occur in the positions with ...Ʌc6, Ʌxc6 Ʌxc6, that arise, as a rule, in various lines after 9...Ʌc7 but may sometimes be obtained even after 9...Ʌb6 10 Ʌe3 Ʌb7 (if Black rejects ...Ʌbd7 in favour of ...Ʌc6).

General Assessment
Black’s delay in development precludes him from organizing quick counterplay and his real strategic aim is to neutralize his adversary’s activity...
gradually. If Black defends accurately, he may get an acceptable game. The chances of the sides in the position after 9 $\mathcal{W}f3$ may be assessed as in the initial position: somewhere between ‘=’ and ‘±’.

As usual in the Sozin, in the variations with ...$\mathcal{W}b6$ and ...$\mathcal{Q}bd7$, White bears relatively greater strategic risk than in the variations with ...$\mathcal{W}c7$ and ...$\mathcal{Q}c6$, and, at the same time, the ever-increasing lag in Black’s mobilization makes his own risk no less.

We shall discuss:

A: 9...$\mathcal{W}b6$ 61
B: 9...$\mathcal{W}c7$ 73

Sometimes, two other moves by Black occur:

a) 9...$\mathcal{Q}a7$ 10 a4!? (the alternative is 10 $\mathcal{W}g3$ 0-0 11 $\mathcal{Q}h6$ $\mathcal{Q}e8$ 12 $\mathcal{Q}e3$ $\mathcal{X}c7$ 13 a4 b4 14 $\mathcal{Q}a2$, Mukhutdinov-Agrest, Budapest 1991) 10...b4 11 $\mathcal{Q}a2$ $\mathcal{X}b7$ (in White’s favour is 11...d5 12 exd5 $\mathcal{Q}xd5$ 13 $\mathcal{Q}f5$ Gallagher, or 11...a5 12 c3!) 12 $\mathcal{Q}d2$ e5 13 $\mathcal{Q}f5$ ± Sion Castro-Vera, Mondaz 1995.

b) 9...$\mathcal{W}d7$ and now:

b1) 10 $\mathcal{W}g3$ does not reveal the drawbacks of Black’s idea since after 10...$\mathcal{Q}c6$!? 11 $\mathcal{Q}xc6$ $\mathcal{W}xc6$ transposes to Line B22, while 11 $\mathcal{Q}e3$ is hardly stronger.

b2) 10 $\mathcal{Q}g5$!? $\mathcal{Q}b7$ 11 $\mathcal{Q}ad1$ $\mathcal{Q}c6$ 12 $\mathcal{W}g3$ enables White to hope for a small advantage, Lerch-Ftačnik, Czechoslovak Cht 1988.

b3) A similar assessment applies to 10 $\mathcal{Q}d1$!? $\mathcal{W}b7$ (10...$\mathcal{Q}b7$ 11 $\mathcal{W}h3$?) 11 $\mathcal{W}g3$, Zapata-Infante, San Salvador Z 1998.

b4) Possibly the main continuation here is 10 a4 b4 11 a5 0-0 12 $\mathcal{Q}a4$ $\mathcal{Q}d8$

(12...$\mathcal{Q}c6$ 13 $\mathcal{Q}b6$! $\mathcal{Q}xd4$ 14 $\mathcal{W}d1$ Bangiev), and now 13 $\mathcal{W}d1$?.

A)

9...$\mathcal{W}b6$ (D)

W

Now:

A1: 10 $\mathcal{Q}g5$!? 61
A2: 10 $\mathcal{Q}e3$ 74

A1)

10 $\mathcal{Q}g5$?!

This interesting move attracted attention only after the game Ivanchuk-Kamsky, Monaco Amber rpd 1996, but it was first played by Brooks in 1982 (by the way, the position after 10 $\mathcal{Q}g5$ may also arise via 8 $\mathcal{Q}g5$ $\mathcal{Q}e7$ 9 $\mathcal{W}f3$ $\mathcal{W}b6$ 10 0-0).

Let us consider:

A11: 10...$\mathcal{Q}bd7$ 62
A12: 10...0-0 63

Other moves:

a) 10...$\mathcal{W}xd4$? 11 e5 ±.

b) 10...b4?! 11 e5 $\mathcal{Q}b7$ 12 $\mathcal{Q}a4$ $\mathcal{W}c7$ (12...$\mathcal{W}a7$ 13 $\mathcal{W}d1$ dxe5 14 $\mathcal{Q}xe6$! +-) 13 exd6 $\mathcal{Q}xd6$ 14 $\mathcal{W}h3$ with an initiative, Alvim-Valiente, corr. 1989.

c) 10...$\mathcal{Q}b7$ 11 $\mathcal{Q}e3$ $\mathcal{W}a5$ (but not 11...$\mathcal{W}c7$? 12 $\mathcal{Q}xe6$!) 12 a3 $\mathcal{Q}c6$ 13
\[ \text{The Sicilian Sozin} \]

\[ \text{Wg3} \text{0-0} 14 \text{f4} \pm \text{Ganguly-Farkas, Szeged 1998.} \]

d) 10...h6. Now White can play 11 \text{\textit{Le}3} \text{\textit{Wb}7} 12 \text{\textit{Wg}3} or 11 \text{\textit{Lxf}6}!? \text{\textit{Lxf}6} 12 \text{\textit{e5} \textit{Lb}7} 13 \text{\textit{Qd}5} \text{exd}5 14 \text{\textit{exf}6} \text{\textit{Wxd}4} 15 \text{\textit{Qf}e1+} (Alvim) 15...\text{\textit{Qd}8} 16 \text{fxg}7 \text{\textit{Wxg}7} 17 \text{\textit{Lxd}5} \text{\textit{Lxd}5} 18 \text{\textit{Wxd}5} followed by \text{a4}, with compensation.

e) 10...\text{\textit{Wb}7}!? is playable:

e1) 11 \text{\textit{a}3} 0-0 (11...\text{\textit{Qbd}7}) 12 \text{\textit{Wg}3} \\
\text{\textit{Qbd}7} 13 \text{\textit{Qfe1} \textit{Qe}5} (13...\text{\textit{Qh}8}!??) 14 \\
\text{\textit{Mad}1} \text{\textit{Qd}7} 15 \text{f4} \pm \text{Ciemiak-Kempinski, Polish Jr Ch (Czestochowa) 1992.} \\

e2) 11 \text{\textit{Qfe1}} and now:

\[ \text{e21) 11...\text{\textit{Qbd}7} and then: 12 \text{\textit{Wg}3} \text{0-0} 13 \text{\textit{Qh}6} \text{\textit{Qh}5} 14 \text{\textit{Wh}3} \text{\textit{Qhf}6} 15 \\
\text{\textit{Qg}5} \text{\textit{Qc}5} = \text{Alvim-Vujanović, corr. 1999; 12 \text{\textit{Mad}1}!} \text{transposes to Line A11.} \]

\[ \text{e22) 11...0-0 12 \text{\textit{Wg}3} (12 \text{\textit{Mad}1}!? \text{b4} 13 \text{\textit{Qa}4} – 10...0-0 11 \text{\textit{Mad}1} \text{b4 12} \\
\text{\textit{Qa}4} \text{\textit{Wb}7} 13 \text{\textit{Qfe1}) 12...b4 13 \text{e5} (13 \\
\text{\textit{Qa}4}? \text{\textit{Qxe}4) 13...dxe5 14 \text{\textit{Lxf}6} \text{\textit{Lxf}6} 15 \text{\textit{Qe}4 \textit{Qe}7} (15...\text{\textit{exd}4}!? 16 \text{\textit{Qxf}6+} \\
\text{\textit{Qh}8} \text{Van der Weide}) 16 \text{\textit{Wxe}5} \text{\textit{Qc}6 17} \\
\text{\textit{Qxc}6} \text{\textit{Wxc}6} = \text{Mirmian-A.Petrosian, Armenian Ch (Erevan) 1996.} \]

A11)

\[ 10...\text{\textit{Qbd}7} 11 \text{\textit{Mad}1} \text{\textit{Wb}7} \]

Or:

a) 11...0-0 – 10...0-0 11 \text{\textit{Mad}1} \text{\textit{Qbd}7}.

b) 11...\text{\textit{Qc}5}!? 12 \text{\textit{Qxf}6}! \text{\textit{gxf}6} 13 \\
\text{\textit{Qfe}1} (\text{Nunn recommended 13 \text{e}5 \text{\textit{Qb}7} \\
14 \text{\textit{Qd}5}! \text{exd}5 15 \text{\textit{exf}6}) 13...\text{\textit{Qa}7} (\text{Ivan-} \\
\text{chuk-Kamsky, Monaco Amber rpd 1996}; 13...\text{\textit{Wb}7} 14 \text{\textit{Qf}5} \pm) 14 \text{\textit{Wg}4!} \\
\text{Nunn.} \]

c) 11...\text{\textit{Qe}5} 12 \text{\textit{Wg}3} \text{b4} 13 \text{\textit{Qa}4} \text{\textit{Wb}7} and now both 14 \text{\textit{Qfe}1} (\text{Nijboer-Tim-} \\
\text{man, Amsterdam 2000}) and 14 \text{\textit{Qxf}6 are dangerous for Black.} \]

d) 11...\text{\textit{Qb}7}!? is another relatively rare option; e.g., 12 \text{\textit{Qfe}1} (both 12 \\
\text{\textit{Qxe}6 and 12 \text{\textit{Qe}3 should be investigated}) 12...\text{\textit{Qc}5} (12...0-0?! – 10...0-0 \\
11 \text{\textit{Mad}1} \text{\textit{Qb}7} 12 \text{\textit{Qfe}1 \textit{Qbd}7) 13 \text{\textit{Wg}3} \\
(13 \text{\textit{Wh}3!), and now:

\[ d1) 13...0-0-0?! 14 \text{\textit{Qe}3, Jaracz-} \\
\text{Smirin, Groningen 1996.} \]

d2) 13...0-0! – 10...0-0 11 \text{\textit{Mad}1} \text{\textit{Qb}7} 12 \text{\textit{Qfe}1 \textit{Qbd}7 13 \text{\textit{Wg}3} \text{\textit{Qc}5}!.} \\

\[ e1) 11...b4 12 \text{\textit{Qa}4} \text{\textit{Wb}7 13 \text{\textit{Qfe}1} – \\
11...\text{\textit{Wb}7 12 \text{\textit{Qfe}1 \textit{b4} 13 \text{\textit{Qa}4}.} \]

12 \text{\textit{Qfe1} (D)}

12...b4

Or 12...0-0 13 \text{\textit{Wg}3 \text{\textit{Qh}8}:

a) 14 \text{\textit{a}3} and now:

\[ a1) 14...\text{\textit{Qc}5} 15 \text{\textit{Qxf}6 \text{\textit{gxf}6} 16} \\
\text{\textit{Qd}5!? \pm \text{Lang-Kask, corr. 1994.} \]

\[ a2) 14...\text{\textit{h}6!} 15 \text{\textit{Wh}4 \text{\textit{Qe}5} 16 \text{f}4 \\
\text{\textit{Qg}6 17 \text{\textit{Wh}3 e}5 18 \text{\textit{Qf}5 \text{\textit{Qxf}4} = \text{Snar-} \\
\text{heim-Leskiewicz, Gausdal 2000.} \]

\[ b) 14 \text{\textit{Qe}3} \text{b4} 15 \text{\textit{Qce}2 (15 \text{\textit{Qd}5}?! \\
\text{\textit{exd}5 16 \text{\textit{Qf}5} \text{\textit{Qh}5} 17 \text{\textit{Wh}4 \text{\textit{Qxg}5} 18} \\
\text{\textit{Wxg}5 \text{\textit{Qdf}6) 15...\text{\textit{Qxe}4} 16 \text{\textit{Qxe}4} \text{\textit{Qxg}5}, and Black has at least equality; e.g., 17} \\
\text{\textit{Qxe}6 (Nunn-Ftačník, British League (4NCL) 1999/00) 17...\text{\textit{Qf}6}! or 17 \text{\textit{Qg}4} \\
\text{\textit{Qe}7!? 18 \text{\textit{Qxg}7 \text{\textit{Qf}6}! \pm \text{Van der Weide.} \]

c) Interesting is 14 \text{\textit{Qd}5?! \text{\textit{exd}5 15} \\
\text{\textit{Qf}5 \text{\textit{Qh}5} 16 \text{\textit{Wh}4 \text{\textit{Qxg}5} 17 \text{\textit{Wxh}5.} \]
13 \( \textipa{a}4 \) 0-0

Two other ways to reach this position are 10...\( \textipa{b}7 \) 11 \( \textipa{e}f1 \) 0-0 12 \( \textipa{a}d1 \) \( \textipa{b}4 \) 13 \( \textipa{a}4 \) and 10...0-0 11 \( \textipa{a}d1 \) \( \textipa{b}4 \) 12 \( \textipa{a}4 \) \( \textipa{b}7 \) 13 \( \textipa{e}f1 \) \( \textipa{b}d7 \).

14 \( \textipa{g}3 \)

Or:
   a) 14 \( \textipa{h}3 \) \( \textipa{e}8 \) 15 f4? \( \textipa{c}xe4 \) \( \textipa{f}xe4 \) \( \textipa{e}8 \) \( \textipa{P}eter-Amigues, Besancon 1999. \n   b) 14 c3! \( \textipa{e}5 \) (14...\( \textipa{b}xc3 \) 15 \( \textipa{a}xc3 \) \( \textipa{c}5 \) 16 e5!! \( \textipa{D} \); 14...a5!) 15 \( \textipa{w}2 \) \( \textipa{b}xc3 \) 16 \( \textipa{a}xc3 \) with an advantage, Srebnić-Gruskovnjak, Ljubljana 2000.

14...\( \textipa{e}8 \)

14...\( \textipa{c}xe4 \) fails to 15 \( \textipa{c}xe4 \) \( \textipa{g}xg5 \) 16 \( \textipa{a}xe6! \) \( \textipa{f}6 \) 17 \( \textipa{e}e1 \) – Van der Weide.

14...\( \textipa{h}8 \) 15 c3 (15 \( \textipa{f}3! \) \( \textipa{w}c7 \) 16 \( \textipa{d}4 \) a5 17 \( \textipa{xf6} \) \( \textipa{gxf6} \), Prokopchuk-Kempinski, Koszalin 1997, 18 c3!?) 15...a5 (15...\( \textipa{c}xe4 \)!) 16 \( \textipa{c}2 \) \( \textipa{e}5 \) 17 f4 \( \textipa{g}6 \) (Nijboer-Van Wely, Dutch Ch (Rotterdam) 2000) 18 e5 (Van Wely) \( \textipa{D} \).

15 f3 \( \textipa{h}8 \) 16 \( \textipa{h}1 \)

\( \textipa{D} \) Reinderman-Danailov, Wijk aan Zee 2000.

A12)

10...0-0 11 \( \textipa{a}d1 \) (D)

Not 11 e5? \( \textipa{d}xe5 \).
15 c3 (Alvim is not bad) 14 h6 e8 15 h1 h8 16 g5 xg5 17 xg5 f6 = M. Sorin-Lefebvre, French Cht 1999.

d) 11...bd7 and now:

d1) 12 g3 c5 (12...h8) and then:

d11) 13 fe1 h5 (13...b7! transposes to line ‘c3’) 14 h4 xg5 15 xg5 f6 16 e3 h6 17 h4 a6 18 a3 ± del Rio-Gyimesi, Siofok jr Ech 1996.

d12) 13 h6!? e8 14 d5! exd5 15 xd5 d8 (15...b7?! 16 c6 h8 17 cxe7 gxh6 18 f4 Van der Weide) 16 c6 h4! 17 de7! xe7 18 xe7+ xe7 (Brooks-Browne, USA 1982) 19 fe1 ∞.

d2) 12 fe1 and here:

d21) 12 e5 13 g3 (Robović-Danner, Oberwart 1996) and now both 13...h8!? and 13...g6!? are possible.

d22) 12...b7 transposes to the note to Black’s 12th move in Line A11.

d23) 12...b7!? transposes to line ‘c3’.

d24) 12 c5 13 h3!? b7 14 a3 (14 e3 b4!) 14...c7 15 h4 fe8 16 e3 offers White the better chances, del Rio-R. Fernandez, Leon 1997.

Summary: Apart from 10...0-0 11 ad1 c6, Black’s possibilities may be subdivided into:

1) Variations with ...b7 (here White has had some success).

2) The arrangement...b7,...bd7,...0-0. In this case there exist three ways to proceed: 10...bd7 11 ad1 b7??, 10...0-0 11 ad1 b7 and 10...0-0 11 ad1 bd7/10...bd7 11 ad1 0-0. It is not yet clear which is best.

A2) 10 e3 w7 11 w3 (D)

Other moves are quite harmless; e.g., 11 a3 0-0 12 fe1 bd7 and now:

a) 13 g5 c5 14 a2 c7 15 ad1 b7 16 b4 cd7 17 wh3 e5 18 f4 c4 with counterplay, Mowszisz-Gelfand, Minsk 1986.

b) 13 g3 c5 (13...h8 =) 14 h6 e8 15 d5 (15 f5?! can be met by 15...f6 16 ad1 {Gobet-Ftačnik, Biel 1984} 16...e5! or even 15...exf5??) 15...xb3 = G.Kuzmin-Perun, Ukrainian Ch (Alushta) 1997.

We shall consider:

A21: 11...c6?! 65
A22: 11...0-0 65
A23: 11...bd7?! 67
A24: 11...b4! 69

Other moves:

a) 11...h5? 12 f5! is much better for White.

b) 11...d7? 12 f5! exf5 (12...b4 13 xg7 g8 14 xf6!) 13 xg7 f8 14 g5! ± Ivanchuk-Shakhvorostov, USSR jr Ch (Jurmala) 1985.

c) 11...g6 12 f3!? bd7 13 ad1 with a slight advantage for White, Zaid-Anikaev, Lvov 1978.
A21)

11...\(\square c6?!\)

This move is inconsequential - if Black wants to play this way, then why not 9...\(\mathcal{W}c7\) 10 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) \(\square c6\), when the white bishop is still on c1? Now:

a) 12 \(\mathcal{A}f5\) exf5 13 \(\mathcal{W}xg7\) \(\mathcal{A}f8\) is unclear.

b) 12 \(\mathcal{A}d1\) 0-0 13 \(\square x e6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) \(\mathcal{A}e8\) and now there are various transpositions to Line B2:

b1) 15 \(\mathcal{A}d5?!\) \(\mathcal{A}d8\) 16 \(\mathcal{F}e1\) - 9...\(\mathcal{W}c7\) 10 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) \(\square c6\) 11 \(\square x c6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 12 \(\mathcal{A}e1\) 0-0 13 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) \(\mathcal{A}e8\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}d5\) \(\mathcal{A}d8\) 15 \(\mathcal{A}ad1\)!?.

b2) 15 \(\mathcal{F}e1\) - 9...\(\mathcal{W}c7\) 10 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) \(\square c6\) 11 \(\square x c6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 12 \(\mathcal{A}e1\) 0-0 13 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) \(\mathcal{A}e8\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}d8\) 15 \(\mathcal{A}ad1\)!?.

b3) 15 a3 - 9...\(\mathcal{W}c7\) 10 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) \(\square c6\) 11 \(\square x c6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 12 \(\mathcal{A}e1\) 0-0 13 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) \(\mathcal{A}e8\) 12 a3 \(\mathcal{A}c6\) 13 \(\square x c6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}ad1\).

c) 12 \(\mathcal{F}e1\) \(\mathcal{A}d7\) (12...0-0 13 \(\square x c6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) - 9...\(\mathcal{W}c7\) 10 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) \(\square c6\) 11 \(\square x c6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 12 \(\mathcal{A}e1\) 0-0 13 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) 13 \(\mathcal{A}ad1\) (13 a3 0-0 gives Black satisfactory play, while after 13 f4 b4!, the sacrifice 14 \(\mathcal{A}d5\) exd5 15 e5 is very inconclusive) 13...\(\mathcal{B}4\)!, but he should avoid 13...0-0? 14 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) \(\mathcal{A}e8\), transposing to note 'b' to Black's 14th move in Line A22) 14 \(\mathcal{A}e2\) 0-0 15 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) \(\mathcal{A}e8\) with a defensible position, Bouaziz-Marin, Szirak IZ 1987.

d) 12 \(\mathcal{B}ae1\)!! \(\mathcal{A}d7\) (12...0-0 13 \(\square x c6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) \(\mathcal{A}e8\) 15 \(\mathcal{A}d5\) \(\mathcal{A}d8\) deserves attention) 13 f4 b4?! (13...g6?! Beliavsky/Mikhalchishin) 14 \(\mathcal{A}d5\)! exd5 15 e5!, and, with the rooks on e1 and f1, White's initiative is very dangerous. A.Sokolov-Armas, Wijk aan Zee 1993.

e) 12 \(\square x c6\)!! \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) and now:

13 \(\mathcal{A}f1\) is inaccurate in view of 13...\(\mathcal{B}b7\)! (13...0-0 14 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) - 9...\(\mathcal{W}c7\) 10 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) \(\square c6\) 11 \(\square x c6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 12 \(\mathcal{A}e1\) 0-0 13 \(\mathcal{A}h6\)?) 14 \(\mathcal{A}d1\) (14 f3?!)

14...\(\mathcal{A}e4\)! 15 \(\mathcal{A}xe4\) \(\mathcal{W}xe4\) 16 \(\mathcal{F}f4\) (16 \(\mathcal{W}xg7\) \(\mathcal{W}g6\)!) 16...\(\mathcal{A}h4\)? (16...\(\mathcal{W}g6\) 17 \(\mathcal{A}h3\)?) 17 \(\mathcal{W}g4\) h5 18 \(\square x e4\) \(\mathcal{H}x g4\) 19 \(\mathcal{A}e1\) = (Armas).

e2) White should prefer 13 f3! 0-0 14 \(\mathcal{A}e2\) with some advantage, Hübner-Armas, Bundesliga 1989/90.

f) 12 f4?! 0-0 (12...\(\mathcal{A}xd4\) 13 \(\mathcal{A}xd4\) b4 14 \(\mathcal{E}5\)!, Anand-Badea, Manchester 1990, and 12...\(\mathcal{A}a5\) 13 \(\mathcal{A}e5\) \(\mathcal{A}h5\) 14 \(\mathcal{W}h3\) \(\mathcal{A}xb3\) 15 \(\mathcal{A}xb3\) g6 16 \(\mathcal{A}ad1\)!! are both dangerous for Black) 13 a3 (13 \(\mathcal{E}5\) is critical) 13...\(\mathcal{A}a5\) 14 e5 \(\mathcal{A}e4\) 15 \(\mathcal{A}xe4\) \(\mathcal{W}xe4\) 16 f5 (Mirumian-Movesesian, Tbilisi 1993) 16...\(\mathcal{W}xe5\) with good play (Mirumian/Nadanian).

A22)

11...0-0

Here, the knight also usually goes to c6, but only after \(\mathcal{A}h6\) and \(\mathcal{A}e8\) (by which White 'returns' the tempo gained by 10 \(\mathcal{A}e3\)).

12 \(\mathcal{A}h6\)

After 12 f3, 12...\(\mathcal{A}c6\) 13 \(\mathcal{A}x c6\) \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) transposes to 11...\(\mathcal{A}c6?!\) 12 \(\mathcal{A}x c6\)!! \(\mathcal{W}xc6\) 13 \(\mathcal{F}f3\) 0-0 \(\mathcal{F}f\), but 12...\(\mathcal{A}h8\)? and 12...\(\mathcal{A}d7\)? are both possible.

12...\(\mathcal{A}e8\) (D)

The same position, but with Black's queen on c7, results from the important variation 9...\(\mathcal{W}c7\) 10 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) 0-0 11 \(\mathcal{A}h6\) \(\mathcal{A}e8\). With the queen on b7, White has to defend the e4-pawn more carefully, but Black needs to supervise his d6-pawn. My general appraisal is that Black has slightly fewer resources with the queen on b7.

13 \(\mathcal{A}d1\)!
Other moves:

a) 13 REDENTIAL1 REDENTIAL2, with the possibility of 14 REDENTIAL3 REDENTIAL4 15 REDENTIAL5 ransition 16 REDENTIAL6 REDENTIAL7 and 17...EXCHANGE8, is good for Black.

b) 13 REDENTIAL9 REDENTIAL10! (an important idea; 13...EXCHANGE11 is weaker owing to 14 REDENTIAL12!) 14 REDENTIAL13 (14 REDENTIAL14 b4!; 14 REDENTIAL15 REDENTIAL16!) 14...EXCHANGE17 15 REDENTIAL18 a5 and Black has strong counterplay, Gdanski-Kempinski, Polish Ch playoff (Warsaw) 1997.

c) If 13 REDENTIAL19, then 13...EXCHANGE20 is again possible.

d) After 13 a3 redential, there is 14 REDENTIAL21 but, on the whole, 13 a3 does not make much sense as 13 REDENTIAL22 also prevents 13...EXCHANGE23 (albeit indirectly).

13...EXCHANGE24

Or:

a) 13...EXCHANGE25 14 REDENTIAL26 Credential7 15 REDENTIAL8! with an unpleasant initiative, Ardeleanu-Floreanu, Romanian Cht 1999.

b) 13...EXCHANGE27 14 REDENTIAL28! (more logical than 14 redential1 = or 14 redential3 REDENTIAL29!?) 15 f3 redential3 16 a3 redential4 = A.Ivanov-Kaminsky, USA Ch (Los Angeles) 1991) 14...EXCHANGE30 (14...EXCHANGE31 is answered by 15 roleum5 credential6! (Gallagher proposed 15...EXCHANGE32) 16 credential7 (16 f4!? credential8 17 credential9  petroleum10 18 EXCHANGE33, Palac-Beran, Toulouse 1990) 16...EXCHANGE34 17 credential11, and instead of 18 f3 credential12! 19 roleum13 20...EXCHANGE35! 20...EXCHANGE36! 21 credential14! 22 credential15 = Gudrun-Hellers, New York 1993, 18...EXCHANGE37! 19...EXCHANGE38 19 EXCHANGE39 is enticing (±).

14 credential16

Or:

a) 14 a3 credential4 15 credential5 credential6 16 EXCHANGE40 EXCHANGE41 17 EXCHANGE42 EXCHANGE43 = Tisdall-Browne, Lone Pine 1976.

b) 14 f4!? is a double-edged alternative:

b1) 14...EXCHANGE44 15 credential4 (15 f5?! EXCHANGE45) 15...EXCHANGE46 (15...EXCHANGE47 is more demanding) 16 EXCHANGE48 with better chances for White, Reefat-Malishauskas, Dhaka 1997.

b2) 14...EXCHANGE49 15 f5 EXCHANGE50 16 EXCHANGE51 EXCHANGE52 (17...EXCHANGE53 18 EXCHANGE54 EXCHANGE55 with unclear play; e.g., 19 EXCHANGE56 (19 EXCHANGE57) 19...EXCHANGE58 20 EXCHANGE59 (20 EXCHANGE60 (20 EXCHANGE61) ±)

b3) 14...EXCHANGE62 15 f5!? (15 EXCHANGE63 EXCHANGE64 16 f5 EXCHANGE65 17 EXCHANGE66 (17...EXCHANGE67 18 EXCHANGE68 EXCHANGE69 19 EXCHANGE70 EXCHANGE71 20 EXCHANGE72 21 EXCHANGE73 22 EXCHANGE74, Najer-Birukov, St Petersburg 1998, 21...EXCHANGE75! with counterplay) 15...EXCHANGE76 16 EXCHANGE77 f6 (16...EXCHANGE78 17 f6!) 17 EXCHANGE79 (17 EXCHANGE80) 17...EXCHANGE81 (17...EXCHANGE82) 18 EXCHANGE83 EXCHANGE84 19 EXCHANGE85 EXCHANGE86 20 EXCHANGE87 EXCHANGE88! (20 EXCHANGE89 is better), and now 20...EXCHANGE89 21 EXCHANGE90 + Golubev-Lambert, Bundesliga 1997/8 is wrong, but 20...EXCHANGE91! ± is very strong, with the point that 21 EXCHANGE92 can be met by 21...EXCHANGE93!!

14...EXCHANGE94

Not:

a) 14...EXCHANGE95! 15 EXCHANGE96!

b) 14...EXCHANGE97! 15 EXCHANGE98 16 EXCHANGE99 EXCHANGE100 17 EXCHANGE101 18 EXCHANGE102 19 EXCHANGE103 (Gurieli-G.Sakhatova, USSR wom Ch (Erevan) 1985.

15 credential5!  Credential61?
15...\textit{x}xg5 16 \textit{wx}xg5 \textit{de}c6 17 \textit{e}3! is also slightly better for White, Snape-Twitchell, corr. 1995.

16 \textit{d}xe6
16 \textit{e}3?! f6!

16...\textit{d}xc6 17 \textit{d}xe7 \textit{w}xe7
White has a slight advantage, Auer-V.Neverov, Porz 1993.

A23)

11...\textit{b}d7!? (D)

The most critical move and a risky one at the same time. Attempts to refute it lead to utterly mad positions.

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

12 \textit{f}e1

Frankly speaking, I find it hard to state the strongest move for White, and I have defined the main line in accordance with the amount of accumulated material — at least it is convenient to read it this way...

a) 12 \textit{d}f5 exf5 13 \textit{wx}xg7 \textit{f}f8 14 \textit{d}d5 is recommended by Gallagher in view of 14...\textit{d}xd5 15 \textit{d}xd5 \textit{w}b8 16 \textit{w}f5! \textit{h}6! f4 18 \textit{w}xh7 \textit{f}f6 (alternatively, 18...\textit{d}e5 19 \textit{w}xf4!?) 19 \textit{w}f5 \textit{g}8 20 \textit{g}5 \textit{g}6 21 h4 ± Firnhaber-Eliseev, corr. 1994. I would regard 14...\textit{d}xe4 15 \textit{d}xe7 \textit{wx}xe7 16 \textit{d}al1 \textit{w}c6 17 \textit{g}5 \textit{b}7 18 \textit{f}e1 \textit{c}5 — Boudy-Novikov, Villa Clara 1987 as more of a problem.

b) 12 f4!? and then:

b1) 12...\textit{d}xe4 13 \textit{d}xe4 \textit{w}xe4 14 \textit{a}e1! \textit{b}7 15 f5 \textit{h}4 16 \textit{w}h3 \textit{e}1 17 \textit{x}xe6 0-0, Golubev-Kruppa, Kiev 1995. After several weeks of analysis of the game I came to the conclusion that it is only 18 \textit{w}f4! that gives a chance for an advantage.

b2) 12...b4 13 \textit{d}d5!? (as far as I can determine, other moves promise White nothing; after 13 f5, 13...\textit{b}xc3 14 \textit{d}xe6 \textit{w}xe6 15 \textit{d}xe6 \textit{d}e5 is possibly satisfactory for Black, but 13...\textit{c}c5! is even stronger; 13 \textit{a}a4 allows Black an excellent game — 11...b4! 12 \textit{a}a4 \textit{d}bd7 13 f4?!) 13...\textit{e}d5 14 c5 \textit{x}xe5 15 \textit{f}xe5 \textit{d}xe5 16 \textit{a}4+ (it was not worth starting all that just to settle for 16 \textit{w}xe5 0-0 17 \textit{d}d7 (16...\textit{d}ed7 17 \textit{a}e1!) 17 \textit{w}xe5 \textit{w}xa4 (17...0-0 18 \textit{w}xe7 \textit{f}e8 19 \textit{d}d6 \textit{w}xa4 20 \textit{w}xf6!) 18 \textit{f}5 with the point 18...\textit{d}d8 19 \textit{d}d4. This line awaits testing.

c) 12 f3!? and then:

cl) 12...b4 13 \textit{c}e2! 0-0 14 \textit{h}6 \textit{e}8 15 \textit{a}4 ± Semeniuk-Moiseev, USSR 1987.

cl) 12...0-0 13 \textit{d}d5 (with the pawn on f3, 13 \textit{h}6? is bad in view of 13...\textit{d}h5!, though 13 a4!? b4 14 \textit{d}d5 is possible) 13...\textit{d}xd5 (no better is 13...\textit{d}8 14 \textit{d}xf6+ \textit{d}f6 15 \textit{a}d1 or 13...\textit{e}5) 14 exd5 \textit{c}5 15 \textit{d}6 ± Repkova-Novikov, Cairo 1997.

cl) 12...\textit{c}5!? 13 \textit{f}d1 (13 \textit{w}xg7 \textit{g}8 14 \textit{w}h6 is important; then 14...\textit{a}6 15 \textit{w}h3 \textit{d}7 [Seirawan] seems to be stronger than the alternative 14...e5 15 \textit{f}5 \textit{x}xf5 16 exf5 \textit{d}xb3 17 axb3 \textit{w}g2+ 18 \textit{w}xg2 \textit{d}g4 19 \textit{w}xh7 \textit{d}xe3+ 20 \textit{h}1) 13...\textit{d}d7 14 \textit{h}1 (14 \textit{w}xg7


The Sicilian Sozin

Therefore, it is very important to examine the alternatives:

a) 12...\( \text{cxe4?} \) 13 \( \text{cxe4} \) \( \text{wxe4} \) 14 \( \text{cxe6 fxe6} \) 15 \( \text{g5 w6} \) 16 \( \text{exf6} \) 17 \( \text{exf7+!} \).

b) 12...0-0 13 \( \text{d5} \) ± (13 \( \text{h6} \) - 10 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{b7} \) 11 \( \text{hfe1} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 12 \( \text{g3} \) 0-0 13 \( \text{h6} \)).

c) 12...g6 13 \( \text{g6} \) !? ±.

d) 12...b4!? is possibly critical:

d1) The unpretentious 13 \( \text{d4} \) transposes to 11...\( \text{b4} \) 12 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 13 \( \text{hfe1} \).

d2) After 13 \( \text{h4} (?) \) bxc3, Grilc-Gruskovnjak, Ljubljana 2000, I see nothing good for White.

d3) Only 13 \( \text{d5 exd5} \) remains. As of now, I assess 14 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{e5} \) 15 \( \text{g7+} \) \( \text{d8} \) more likely to be in Black’s favour, and the same assessment applies to 14 \( \text{g5} \) dxe4?!, Roese-Neurohr, Bundesliga 1988/9. 14 \( \text{a4} \) appears to be more dangerous, however.

13 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{xb3} \)

13...\( \text{xf5} \) 14 \( \text{xc5} \) dxc5 15 \( \text{wxg7} \) \( \text{f8} \) 16 \( \text{d5} \) ! (16 exf5 \( \text{e6} \)!) 16...\( \text{d5} \) ±.

14 \( \text{gxh7+} \! \! \!

14 \( \text{cxe7} \) \( \text{c1} \) 15 \( \text{wxg7} \) \( \text{f8} \) (or 15...\( \text{xc2} \) ? 16 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e1} \) 17 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{d7} \) 18 \( \text{hx8} \) b4) 16 e5 \( \text{xc2} \) (not 16...dxe5? 17 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{d7} \), Ki.Georgiev-Zaichik, Palma de Mallorca 1989, 18 \( \text{f5} \) ±; 16...\( \text{h5} \) !? 17 \( \text{hxh7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 18 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c2} \) 19 \( \text{xd6+} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 20 exd6 \( \text{xe1} \) 21 \( \text{e4} \) followed by \( \text{h4} \) – Ki.Georgiev) 17 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{exe1} \) 18 \( \text{fx8} + \) \( \text{d7} \) 19 \( \text{e6} \! = \! \text{Ki.Georgiev}.

14...\( \text{f8} \)

14...\( \text{d7} \) 15 \( \text{ad1} \!) (di Luca; after this move White is much better)

15...\( \text{g8} \) (15...\( \text{xe4} \) 16 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 17 \( \text{f4} \); 15...\( \text{a5} \) 16 e5 \( \text{d5} \) 17 exd6

\( \text{c5} \)

If my further analysis is correct, this move leads to problems for Black.
\( \text{\#xd6 18 \#f4!} \) 16 axb3 \#e8!!? 17 \#x6e! \#xg3 18 \#c5+ \#c7 19 \#xb7 \#xe3 20 \#d5+.

15 \#h6!

15 axb3? h6!.

15...\#xa1! 16 e5! \#xc2

Or:

a) 16...\#g8 17 \#xe6++ \#e8 18 \#g7+ \#d8 19 exd6 \#f6 20 \#e8+ \#d7 21 \#h3+ \#c6 22 \#f3+ \#d7 23 \#f5+ \#c6 24 \#e4+ \#d7 25 \#d8+!!

b) 16...dxe5 17 \#d1! \#d7 (17...\#d7 18 \#f5+!! \#e8 19 \#g7 \#f8 20 \#xe7 \#xc2 21 \#g8! \#d4 22 \#f6+ \#e7 23 \#ce4) 18 \#h5+ \#e8 19 \#g7 \#g8! 20 \#xf6+ \#xf6 21 \#xg8+ \#e7 22 \#g4 and White is better!

17 \#d1 \#d7 18 \#xe6+ \#e8 19 \#g7+ \#d8

19...\#f8 20 \#f5+ \#e8 21 exd6 ±.

20 exd6 \#f6 21 \#g5 \#g8

Or: 21...\#xg5? 22 \#xg5+ winning for White; 21...h6 22 \#xf6+ \#xf6 23 \#h4 \#d7 24 \#xf6+ \#c8 25 \#c1; 21...\#c6?! 22 \#d5!.

22 \#h4!! ±


A24)

11...\#b4! \( (D) \)

Nowadays this is the main move.

12 \#a4

Otherwise:

a) 12 \#ce2 is suspicious in view of 12...\#xe4.

b) Zapolskis has tried 12 \#f5 here: 12...bxc3 13 \#xg7+ \#d7 14 e5 \#d5 15 bxc3 and now 15...\#xc3 16 \#fe1 d5 17 \#d2 \#b5 (Zapolskis-Ki.Georgiev, Batumi Echt 1999) can hardly be considered as a refutation, but possibly stronger is 15...\#g8 (as in Zapolskis-Vöker, Cuxhaven 2000).

12...\#bd7

Or:

a) 12...\#xe4 13 \#xg7 gives White a development advantage.

b) 12...\#d7 13 \#b6 (after 13 f3, Black should try 13...0-0!? rather than 13...\#c6 14 \#xc6 \#xc6 15 \#b6 \#b8 16 \#c4 ±) 13...\#xb6 14 \#xe6 with a dangerous attack for White, Krueger-Penna, corr. 2000.

c) 12...0-0!? is seldom played: 13 \#h6 (after 13 f3, 13...\#bd7 transposes to the main line, while 13...\#c6!? is possible) 13...\#e8 14 \#ad1 (14 \#fe1 and now there is 14...\#h8!? 15 \#g5 ±, 14...\#f6! or 14...\#d7 – 12...\#bd7 13 \#fe1 0-0 14 \#h6 \#e8) 14...\#d7 (or 14...\#h8 15 \#g5 with a slight advantage for White) 15 \#fe1 – 12...\#bd7 13 \#fe1 0-0 14 \#h6 \#e8 15 \#ad1.

13 f3

Other moves are rare:

a) 13 f4?! 0-0! ⊕ Giacco-Quinteros, Trelew 1995.

b) 13 \#xg7!? deserves attention.

c) 13 \#ae1 (this and, to a greater extent, 13 \#fe1 are interesting in view of the move-order 11...\#bd7 12 \#fe1/12 \#ae1 b4 13 \#a4) 13...0-0
(13...\texttt{Wxe}4 14 f4, Kudrin-Yedidia, Maryland 1993, and 13...\texttt{Qxe}4 14 \texttt{Wxg}7 \texttt{Qf}6 15 \texttt{Wg}4, Kudrin-Freeman, Philadelphia 1991, are dangerous for Black) 14 \texttt{Qh}6 \texttt{Qe}8 with good play (15 f4? \texttt{Wc}7).

d) 13 \texttt{Qfe}1 and then:

d1) 13...\texttt{Qxe}4?! is met by 14 \texttt{Wxg}7.

d2) 13...\texttt{Wxe}4?! . Now, instead of 14 \texttt{Qxe}6?! fxe6 15 \texttt{Qf}4 \texttt{Wg}6 16 \texttt{Wf}3 \texttt{Qb}8 17 \texttt{Qxe}6 \texttt{Qe}5 18 \texttt{Qxe}5 dxe5 19 \texttt{Qxe}5 ± Tabatadze-Gelfand, Leningrad 1985, I suggest 14 \texttt{Qad}1!? with the point 14...\texttt{Wg}4 15 \texttt{Wxg}4 \texttt{Qxg}4 16 \texttt{Qd}2 ±.

d3) 13...0-0 14 \texttt{Qh}6 \texttt{Qe}8 (another idea is 14...\texttt{Qh}5!? 15 \texttt{Qad}1 (15 \texttt{Qxe}6!? \infty Byrne/Mednis). Now 15...\texttt{Qc}5 is weak due to 16 \texttt{Qxc}5 dxc5 17 \texttt{Qa}4. 15...\texttt{Qh}8 16 \texttt{Qg}5 \texttt{Qxg}5 17 \texttt{Wxg}5 \texttt{Qe}f6 transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 13th move in Line A22. 15...\texttt{Qe}5!? is critical and unclear; e.g., 16 f4 \texttt{Qg}6 17 \texttt{Qg}5 \texttt{Qxg}5 18 fxg5, Borge-Djurhuus, Gausdal 1995.

d4) Strangely, nobody has yet tried 13...\texttt{Qe}5!?

13...\texttt{Qe}5!? (D)

13...\texttt{Qe}5!? is dubious; e.g., 14 \texttt{Wxg}7 \texttt{Qg}8 15 \texttt{Wh}6 \texttt{Qxe}4 16 \texttt{Qb}6 (Emms) 16...\texttt{Wxb}6 17 \texttt{Qxe}6.

This is one of the key positions for 9...\texttt{Wb}6 and the entire 9 \texttt{Qf}3 system.

The struggle is above all strategic. Black’s plan consists not of 14...\texttt{Qc}5 (following which 15 \texttt{Qxc}5 dxc5 16 \texttt{Qe}2 gives White a structural advantage), but of 14...\texttt{Qe}5! and 15...\texttt{Qd}7. After ...\texttt{Qe}5 Black will be ready to counter White’s \texttt{Qb}6 not only with ...\texttt{Qab}8 but also with ...\texttt{Qh}5!. The development of White’s play should be linked to c3, or c4 in the advantageous version, sooner or later.

14 \texttt{Qfd}1

White enjoys a very wide choice:

a) 14 \texttt{Qh}6? \texttt{Qh}5! 15 \texttt{Wh}3 gxh6 16 \texttt{Wxh}5 \texttt{Wa}7 ± J.Polgar-Gelfand, Dos Hermanas 1994.

b) 14 c3 (this is a bit premature) 14...bxc3 15 bxc3?! (15 \texttt{Qxc}3 \texttt{Qc}5! =; 15 \texttt{Qab}1 \texttt{Qe}5! =) 15...\texttt{Qe}5 (15...\texttt{Qc}5 16 \texttt{Qxc}5 dxc5 17 \texttt{Qc}2 ± Morozevich-Nefostruev, Ore 1992; not wholly clear is 15...\texttt{Wc}7 16 \texttt{Qxe}6 \texttt{Qh}5) 16 \texttt{Qab}1 \texttt{Wc}7 17 \texttt{Qb}6 (17 f4?! \texttt{Qxe}4 18 \texttt{Wh}3, Chapman-Freeman, Melbourne 1996, 18...\texttt{Qg}6!) 17...\texttt{Qb}8 18 \texttt{Qxc}8 \texttt{Wxc}8!, and Black is no worse.

c) 14 \texttt{Qh}1 (I do not see any real advantage in such a preventive step) 14...\texttt{Qh}8 (14...a5?! 15 c4; 14...\texttt{Qe}5 15 \texttt{Qb}6 \texttt{Qb}8 leads to unclear play, for instance, 16 a3 \texttt{Wxb}6!? 15 \texttt{Qac}1 (no advantage is gained by 15 c4 bxc3 16 bxc3, when Black can choose between 16...\texttt{Qe}5 or 16...\texttt{Wc}7?) 15...\texttt{Qe}5 16 c3 bxc3 (16...\texttt{Qd}3 17 \texttt{Qcd}1 \texttt{Qh}5 18 \texttt{Wg}4 \texttt{Qh}4? 19 \texttt{Qxf}4 e5! 20 \texttt{Qd}5! does not work for Black) 17 \texttt{Qxc}3 \texttt{Qd}7. Now after 18 \texttt{Qb}6 there is the reply 18...\texttt{Wxb}6! 19 \texttt{Qxe}6 (by the way, with the kings on g1 and g8, \texttt{Qf}5! is winning) 19...\texttt{Qh}5!.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{center}
d) 14 ℵa1!?! (straightforward and interesting) 14...('=) 5! (14...'=c5 15 ℵxc5 dxc5 16 ℵe2, 14...a5 15 c4 and 14...h8 15 c3 bxc3 16 ℵxc3 are somewhat better for White) and then:
d1) 15 ℵb6 ℵb8 (15...'=h5?! 16 ℵh3 ℵf4 17 ℵxf4 ℵxb6 18 ℵe3 ℵf6 19 ℵfd1 ℵc6! (Gallagher) 16 ℵxc8 ℵxc8 17 ℵxe6 fx6 18 ℵxe6+ ℵh8 19 ℵxc8 ℵxc8 gives Black good play, Ayapbergenov-Ki.Georgiev, Komoto-
tini 1993.
d2) 15 ℵfd1 is not dangerous for Black; see 14 ℵfd1 ℵe5 15 ℵac1.
d3) 15 c3?! and now:
d31) 15...'=d3 16 ℵcd1 ℵh5 17 ℵg4 (with the point 17...'=hf4 18 ℵxf4 e5 19 ℵf5 ℵxf5 20 exf5 ℵxf4 21 f6 ℵxf6 22 ℵxd6) somewhat favours White.
d32) 15...bxc3 16 ℵxc3 ℵd7 17 ℵb6 ℵh5 (17...'=xb6? 18 ℵf5) 18 ℵh3 ℵf4 19 ℵxf4 ℵxb6 20 ℵe3 ℵb7 21 f4 is also quite good for White, Gi.Hernandez-Morović, Havana 1997.
d33) 15...'=d7! probably equalizes; e.g., 16 ℵb6 ℵh5 17 ℵh3 ℵxb6!
(17...'=f4 18 ℵxf4 ℵxb6 19 ℵe3 ℵd3 20 ℵf5 exf5 21 ℵxb6 ℵf4 22 exb4)
18 ℵh5 ℵd3 19 ℵf5 exf5 20 ℵxb6 ℵf4 21 ℵa4 ℵh5 22 ℵxd6 bc3, or
16 exb4 ℵxb4 17 ℵc2 ℵb7, German-
d4) 15 c4?! ℵd3 (15...bxc3 – 15 c3 bxc3) 16 ℵcd1 ℵh5 17 ℵg4 ℵhf4 18 ℵxf4 e5 19 ℵf5 ℵxf5 20 exf5 ℵxf4 21 f6! ℵxf6 22 ℵxd6 deserves to be
investigated.
e) 14 ℵe2!? (so as to ensure ...'=e5 can be met by ℵb6):
e1) 14...'=b8 15 c4 bxc3 16 ℵexc3 ±; e.g., 16...'=a8 17 ℵfd1 a5 18 ℵh1 ℵa6 19 ℵh6!, Istratescu-Röder, Gron-
e2) 14...'=e5 15 ℵb6?! (15 ℵad1 –
14 ℵad1 ℵe5 15 ℵe2).
e3) 14...a5?! 15 c4 bxc3 (15...'=a6! (Gallagher) 16 ℵxc3 (16 ℵxc3!?),
and now 16...'=b8 (Gallagher) seems quite playable for Black.
e4) The immediate 14...'=b8?! is interesting (generally, this is a typical answer to an early ℵe2); for example,
15 c4 bxc3 16 ℵxc3 ℵb7?! with equality, Macieja-Vasilchenko, Zlin 1995.
f) 14 ℵad1!?! (D) (White refuses to
attack solely on the c-file but instead amasses his forces across the en-
tire board). Now:

f1) 14...a5?! 15 c4!.
f2) 14...'=e5 and then:
f21) Black experiences no problems after 15 ℵf6 16 ℵd6 ℵh5
17 ℵh3 ℵf4 18 ℵxf4 ℵxb6 19 ℵe3 ℵc7 20 f4 ℵc4, Petelin-Galkin, St Peters-
burg 1993.
f22) 15 ℵd2 is also answered by
15...'=d7!, with the same ideas.
f23) 15 ℵb6 ℵh5 16 ℵh3 ℵf4
(16...'=xb6?!) 17 ℵxf4 ℵxb6 with
good chances for equality: 18 ℵg3
Amy 19 ℵg5 (19 ℵe3 can be met by
19...'=f6 or 19...'=c4) 19...'=xg5 20
\[ \text{We now return to 14 \texttt{f}d1 (D):} \]

\[ B \]

14...\texttt{e}5!

Other moves:

a) 14...\texttt{e}8 15 \texttt{a}c1 \texttt{f}8 16 c4 ± Mikhatchishin-A.Petrosian, Lviv 1994.

b) 14...a5 15 c4 bxc3 16 bxc3 \texttt{w}a6 17 c4 ± Bouazizi-Ady, Erevan OL 1996.

c) 14...\texttt{b}8 15 \texttt{a}c1 \texttt{e}5 16 c4! (16 c3 \texttt{d}7! = Firnhaber-Schmidt, corr. Berlin 1996) 16...bxc3 17 \texttt{d}xc3 (17 \texttt{d}xc3 \texttt{e}d7 18 \texttt{b}6 \texttt{x}b6?! 19 \texttt{xe}6 \texttt{x}e6+ 20 \texttt{xe}3 \texttt{xe}6 is a less convincing line) 17...\texttt{d}7 18 f4 with an initiative, Veröci-Farkas, Hungarian Cht 1997.

d) 14...\texttt{h}8 15 \texttt{a}c1 (15 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{b}8! 16 \texttt{a}c1 a5 17 c4 bxc3 18 \texttt{xc}3 \texttt{b}7 ½-½ Istratescu-A. Petrosian, Berlin 1996; 15 \texttt{d}2?! 15...\texttt{e}5 (15...\texttt{e}5 16 \texttt{d}xc5 \texttt{xc}5 17 \texttt{e}2 ±) and now:

d1) 16 \texttt{e}2 a5 (16...\texttt{b}8?! Fritz-Van Wely, Eindhoven rd2 2000) 17 c4 bxc3 18 \texttt{xc}3 18 \texttt{xc}3?? \texttt{a}6 19 f4 \texttt{g}6 20 \texttt{c}4 \texttt{c}6 21 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{b}8 22 \texttt{f}3 with a complicated game and possibly some advantage for White, Zapata-Morovic, Yopal 1997) 18...\texttt{d}7 (Gallagher suggests 18...\texttt{a}6??, with the point 19 \texttt{dc}1 \texttt{d}7 20 \texttt{c}7 \texttt{b}4) 19 \texttt{b}6 \texttt{a}6 20 \texttt{xd}7 \texttt{exd}7 21 \texttt{dc}1 a4

\[ \text{\texttt{d}3} \]

f) 3) 14...\texttt{h}8 is the most frequent answer:

f31) 15 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{e}5!? with a normal game.

f32) 15 \texttt{f}e1 \texttt{b}8 (15...\texttt{e}5!?!) 16 \texttt{h}1 (16 c3 bxc3 17 \texttt{xc}3 \texttt{e}5!?) 16...\texttt{e}5 17 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{c}7 18 c3 \texttt{d}7 and Black stands at least no worse, Short-Kasparov, London rd2 (2) 1993.

f33) 15 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{e}5 (15...\texttt{b}8!?) 16 \texttt{e}1 \texttt{a}8 17 c4 bxc3 18 \texttt{xc}3 \texttt{b}7 gave Black a good game in Hamdouchi-Topalov, Cap d’Agde 1994) 16 \texttt{b}6 \texttt{h}5 17 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{f}4 18 \texttt{xf}4 \texttt{xb}6 19 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{c}7 followed by \texttt{c}4 =.

f34) 15 \texttt{e}2 and then:

f341) After 15...a5 16 c4 (16 \texttt{d}2!! is also interesting) 16...\texttt{xc}3 White has 17 \texttt{dxc}3 (17 \texttt{exc}3 \texttt{b}8 transposes to line ‘f342’) 17...\texttt{h}8 18 \texttt{d}4!?.

f342) 15...\texttt{b}8! 16 c3 bxc3 17 \texttt{xc}3 a5 18 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{a}6 19 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{e}5 20 \texttt{d}4 \texttt{e}6 21 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{e}5 = Mitkov-Gelfand, Moscow OL 1994.

f35) 15 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{e}5 16 \texttt{e}2 (16 \texttt{b}6 \texttt{b}8 17 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{c}6 =) 16...a5 17 \texttt{fd}1 \texttt{d}7 is possibly also satisfactory for Black, Pinus-D.Popovic, corr. 1999.
22 \( \text{c2} \) ± Zapata-Morović, Havana 1997.

d2) 16 c4!?

d3) 16 c3 \( \text{d7} \) 17 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{h5} \) 18 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{xb6} \) 19 \( \text{wh5} \) \( \text{b7} \) 20 \( \text{g5} \) is slightly better for White, Neelakanthan-King, Calcutta 1993.

15 c4

Or:

a) 15 \( \text{ac1} \) \( \text{d7} \)! gives Black good play: 16 c4 \( \text{bxc3} \) 17 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{xa4} \) (17...\text{xf8}!?) 18 \( \text{xa4} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 19 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{b4} \) or 16 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{h5} \) 17 \( \text{wh3} \) (Emms-Gallagher, Bundesliga 1996/7) and now Gallagher gives 17...\( \text{xb6} \) 18 \( \text{wh5} \) \( \text{b7} \).

b) 15 a3 \( \text{bxa3} \) 16 \( \text{xa3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 17 \( \text{e2} \) (17 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{h5} \)?) 17...\( \text{b5} \) 18 \( \text{ec3} \) \( \text{ed7} \) and Black is OK, K.Müller-Wahls, Hamburg 1995.

c) 15 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b8} \) (Gallagher's idea 15...a5!? is better; e.g., 16 a3 \( \text{a6} \) \( \infty \)) 16 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{c7} \) 17 \( \text{xc8} \) \( \text{xc8} \) 18 c4 (18 c3 \( \text{c4} \)?) 18...\text{bxc3} (18...\text{xc4} 19 \( \text{ac1} \) ±) 19 \( \text{ac1} \) ± Zapata-Herrera, Santa Clara 1996.

d) 15 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{h5} \) (15...\text{b8}!?) 16 \( \text{wh3} \) \( \text{f4} \) (16...\text{xb6}!?) 17 \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xb6} \) 18 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c7} \) with roughly equal chances: 19 c3 \( \text{c4} \)! (19...\text{bxc3} 20 \( \text{ac1} \) \text{b7} 21 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 22 \text{f4}) 20 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 21 \text{cxb4} \( \text{f6} \), Vujadinović-Schoonhoven, corr. 2000.

e) 15 c3 \text{bxc3} transposes to the main line.

15...\text{bxc3}

15...\text{d7} 16 c5!?.

16 \( \text{xc3} \)

16 \( \text{bxc3} \) (Hakki-Gallagher, Istanbul OL 2000) 16...\text{c7}!?.

16...\text{g6}!

16...\text{d7} 17 \text{f4} ±.

17 \( \text{ac1} \)

17 \text{f4}? \( \text{xe4} \) 18 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 19 \( \text{ac1} \) \( \text{h4} \) ±.

17...\text{d7} 18 \( \text{ec2} \) \( \text{fc8} \) 19 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{c7} \) 20 \( \text{dc1} \) \( \text{ac8} \)

The chances are equal, Kobaliya-Gallagher, Biel 1997.

Therefore, after 9...\text{b6} 10 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 11 \( \text{g3} \), both the extremely risky 11...\text{bd7}! and the reliable 11...b4! appear to be viable. As regards 10 \( \text{g5} !? \), Black has to work out the most precise move-order.

B)

9...\text{c7} (D)

Now, after 10 \( \text{g3} \), Black has two main possibilities. The first is 10...0-0 11 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{e8} \), and then 12 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{d7} \). The second is 10...\( \text{c6} \) 11 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 12 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{b7} !. \)

The tricky move 10 \( \text{e1} !? \) slightly devalues the early ...\text{c6} but provides Black with other good possibilities, such as 10...0-0 11 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h8} \) (or 11...b4).

Thus, we shall discuss:

B1: 10 \( \text{e1} !? \) 74

B2: 10 \( \text{g3} \) 76

White's alternatives are less interesting:
a) 10 e5?! \(\text{\&}b7\) (10...dxe5? is met by 11 \(\text{\&}dxb5\)!) 11 exd6 \(\text{\&}xd6\) 12 \(\text{\&}h3\) 0-0.

b) 10 a3 allows Black to play 10...\(\text{\&}bd7\)! 11 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}c5\) = in addition to the standard 10...\(\text{\&}c6\) and 10...0-0.

c) 10 \(\text{\&}g5\) \(\text{\&}bd7\)! = Lutikov-Polugaevsky, USSR Ch (Leningrad) 1960. Now 11 \(\text{\&}f1\) 0-0 – 10 \(\text{\&}e1\) 0-0 11 \(\text{\&}g5\) \(\text{\&}bd7\).

B1)

10 \(\text{\&}e1\)!?? 0-0

Other moves:

a) 10...\(\text{\&}b7\)! 11 \(\text{\&}xe6\) fxe6 12 \(\text{\&}xe6\) \(\text{\&}d7\) 13 \(\text{\&}xg7+\) \(\text{\&}f7\) 14 \(\text{\&}f5\) ±.

b) 10...\(\text{\&}bd7\) 11 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}c5\)? (Black should try 11...b4!?) 12 \(\text{\&}f5\)! ± Emmers-Rashkovsky, Hastings 1995/6.

c) 10...\(\text{\&}c6\) 11 \(\text{\&}xc6\) (11 e5?! \(\text{\&}xd4\) 12 \(\text{\&}xa8\) dxe5 13 \(\text{\&}g5\) 0-0, Vink-Najer, Groningen 1999) 11...\(\text{\&}xc6\) and then:

1) 12 \(\text{\&}g3\) transposes to Line B22.

2) 12 a3 \(\text{\&}b7\)! (12...0-0 transposes to note ‘c1’ to White’s 11th move) 13 \(\text{\&}g3\) again transposes to Line B22.

3) 12 \(\text{\&}g5\)! and now:

31) 12...0-0? 13 \(\text{\&}d5\)! exd5 14 \(\text{\&}xd5\)! ±.

32) 12...\(\text{\&}b7\) 13 \(\text{\&}xf6!\) gxf6 14 \(\text{\&}e3?!\) \(\text{\&}c5\) looks dubious though there is no straightforward win. 15 \(\text{\&}d5\) and 15 \(\text{\&}d5\) are both answered by 15...exd5 16 exd5 \(\text{\&}d8\), while 15 a4 \(\text{\&}g8\) (or 15...\(\text{\&}f5\)?, but not 15...b4? 16 \(\text{\&}d5\) exd5 17 exd5 \(\text{\&}d8\) 18 \(\text{\&}ae1\) \(\text{\&}e8\) 19 \(\text{\&}xe7\) \(\text{\&}xe7\) 20 \(\text{\&}xf6\) \(\text{\&}c7\) 21 a5 ++) isn’t clear-cut either.

33) 12...\(\text{\&}b8\) 13 \(\text{\&}ad1\) is slightly better for White.

34) 12...\(\text{\&}a7\)?? 13 a4 b4 14 a5 0-0 15 \(\text{\&}a2\), followed by 16 \(\text{\&}d2\), gives White slightly the better chances.

d) 10...b4 11 \(\text{\&}a4\) 0-0 12 c3 (12 \(\text{\&}g3\)/12 \(\text{\&}g5\) transposes to 10...0-0 11 \(\text{\&}g3\)! 11 \(\text{\&}g5\) b4 12 \(\text{\&}a4\) but 12 e5!? = K.Müller-Lutz, Berlin 1989.

e) 10...\(\text{\&}d7\) is interesting; e.g., 11 \(\text{\&}d5\)? exd5 12 exd5 \(\text{\&}g4\); 11 a3 \(\text{\&}c6\) 12 \(\text{\&}xc6\) \(\text{\&}xc6\) =; 11 e5!? dxe5 12 \(\text{\&}f4\); or 11 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}c6\)!!.

11 \(\text{\&}g3\)

Otherwise:

a) 11 a4 b4 12 \(\text{\&}a2\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 13 \(\text{\&}d2\) \(\text{\&}b6\) 14 c3 with roughly equal chances, Bronstein-Slutsky, Moscow 1979.

b) 11 \(\text{\&}g5\) is not strong here:

b1) 11...b4 12 \(\text{\&}a4\) \(\text{\&}c6\) (Black can investigate 12...\(\text{\&}d7\)? and 12...\(\text{\&}bd7\)!! with the point 13 e5 dxe5 14 \(\text{\&}xe6\) fxe6 15 \(\text{\&}xa8\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 16 \(\text{\&}a7\) \(\text{\&}c5\)!) 13 \(\text{\&}xc6\) \(\text{\&}xc6\) 14 c3 ± del Rio-Van Zyl, Medellin jr Wch 1996.

b2) 11...\(\text{\&}bd7\) is enough for equality: 12 e5? dxe5 13 \(\text{\&}xe6\) fxe6 14 \(\text{\&}xa8\) \(\text{\&}b7\) --; 12 \(\text{\&}ad1\) \(\text{\&}e5\) (12...\(\text{\&}c5\)!!); 12 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}e5\) 13 \(\text{\&}ad1\) b4?!, Ma.Ankerst-Shneider, Pula 1994.

c) 11 a3 gives Black a satisfactory choice:

1) 11...\(\text{\&}c6\) 12 \(\text{\&}xc6\) \(\text{\&}xc6\) and then:

11) 13 \(\text{\&}g5\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 14 \(\text{\&}ad1\) \(\text{\&}fd8\) 15 \(\text{\&}g3\) a5 16 \(\text{\&}h6\) \(\text{\&}f8\) 17 \(\text{\&}g5\) \(\text{\&}e7\) = Vasiukov-Polugaevsky, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1969.

c12) 13 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}h8\) (13...\(\text{\&}h5\)?? 14 \(\text{\&}h3\) \(\text{\&}f6\) 15 \(\text{\&}g5\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 16 \(\text{\&}e3\), Short-Ehlvest, Moscow rpd 1994) – 11 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}h8\) 12 a3 \(\text{\&}c6\) 13 \(\text{\&}xc6\) \(\text{\&}xc6\).

c2) 11...\(\text{\&}d7\)?? 12 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}c6\) 13 \(\text{\&}xc6\) \(\text{\&}xc6\) 14 \(\text{\&}h6\) \(\text{\&}e8\) – 10 \(\text{\&}g3\) 0-0 11 \(\text{\&}h6\) \(\text{\&}e8\) 12 a3 \(\text{\&}d7\) 13 \(\text{\&}fe1\) \(\text{\&}c6\) 14 \(\text{\&}xc6\) \(\text{\&}xc6\).
c3) 11...b7?! 12 \(\text{Wh}3 \, \text{Qc}6 \) =.
c4) 11...\text{Qd}d7?! 12 \(\text{Wh}3 \, \text{Qc}5\) with good play after 13 \text{f}4 (or 13 \text{f}h6 \text{Qh}5 14 \(\text{Wh}3 \, \text{Qf}6\) 15 \(\text{Qg}3 \, \text{Qg}6\), Emmers-Lutz, Hamburg 1995) 13...\text{Qc}4 14 \text{Qxe}c4 \text{Qxc}4 15 \text{Qe}3 \text{Qb}7, Ardi-

We now return to the position after 11 \(\text{Wh}g3\) (D):

f) 11...b4!? is probably a good option: 12 \text{Qa}4 (12 \text{Qd}1 \text{Qc}6 13 \text{Qxc}6 \text{Qxc}6 14 \text{Qh}6 \text{Qe}8 15 c3 \text{Qh}8 = Rep-
kova-Vasilchenko, Zlin 1995) 12...\text{Qd}7 (12...\text{Qc}6 13 \text{Qxc}6 \text{Qxc}6 14 \text{Qh}6 \text{Qe}8 15 c3 \pm Riegler-Grosar, Maribor 1993; 12...e5 13 \text{Qf}5 \pm 13 c3 (13 \text{Qh}6 \text{Qh}5!; 13 a3?!) 13...\text{Qa}5 14 \text{cx}b4 \text{Qxb}4 and Black is no worse, Van Riems-

12 \text{Qg}5

12 f4?! is weaker in view of 12...b4 13 \text{Qa}4 \text{Qc}6!.

12 a3 is not bad, however:

a) 12...\text{Qc}6 13 \text{Qxc}6 \text{Qxc}6 14 \text{Qg}5 \text{Qh}5 (14...\text{Qb}7?! 15 \text{Qad}1 \text{Qd}8 is roughly equal) 15 \text{Wh}4 \text{Qxg}5 16 \text{Qxg}5 \text{Qf}6 17 \text{Qad}1 \text{Qb}7 transposes to note ‘d’ to Black’s 15th move in Line B221.

b) 12...\text{Qd}7 13 \text{Qg}5 \text{Qc}6 14 \text{Qxc}6 (14 \text{Qad}1!? – 12 \text{Qg}5 \text{Qd}7 13 \text{Qad}1 \text{Qc}6 14 a3) 14...\text{Qxc}6 15 \text{Qad}1 and there followed 15...\text{Qf}d8!? 16 \text{Qd}3 a5 17 \text{Wh}4 \text{Qg}8 with sharp play in Dab-

12...b4

Alternatively:

a) 12...\text{Qc}6? 13 \text{Qxc}6 \text{Qxc}6 14 \text{Qd}5 \pm.

b) 12...h6 13 \text{Wh}4 b4 14 \text{Qa}4 \text{Qa}5 (14...\text{Qd}7!; 14...\text{Qg}8?! 15 \text{Qxh}6 \text{gxh}6 16 \text{Qxh}6 \text{Qg}4 17 \text{Wh}5 \text{Qf}6) 15 f4 e5 (15...\text{Qg}8 16 \text{Qxh}6 \text{gxh}6 17 e5!) 16 \text{Qf}5 with an initiative, G.Hernandez-Pigusov, Santa Clara 1991.

c) 12...\text{Qd}7 13 \text{Wh}4?! (13 \text{Qad}1 \text{Qc}6 14 a3 brought White success in one game: 14...\text{Qa}5 15 \text{Qe}3 \text{Qh}5 16 \text{Wh}4 \text{Qxg}5 17 \text{Qxg}5 \text{Qf}6 18 \text{Qg}3 \text{Qg}8 19 \text{Qh}3 \text{Qc}5?! 20 \text{Qf}3 \text{Qxb}3 21 e5! \pm Motylev-Leitão, Guarapuava jr Wch
1995) 13...\(\mathcal{c}6\) 14 \(\mathcal{e}e2\) (14 \(\mathcal{x}c6\ \mathcal{x}c6\) 15 \(\mathcal{e}e3\) \(\mathcal{g}8\) 16 \(\mathcal{x}e7\) \(\mathcal{x}e7\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}d1\) a5 is unclear, Liepold-Kuczynski, Erlangen 1990) 14...h6 (14...\(\mathcal{d}e5\)?) Mikhailchishin) 15 \(\mathcal{a}d1\) \(\mathcal{e}e5\) 16 f4! \(\mathcal{g}6\) 17 \(\mathcal{w}h3\) gives White the initiative, Minasian-Zagorskis, Frunze 1989.

13 \(\mathcal{d}a4\) \(\mathcal{d}d7\)

13...\(\mathcal{c}6\) 14 \(\mathcal{x}c6\) \(\mathcal{w}x\)c6 15 c3 (or 15 \(\mathcal{w}h4\)?) is insufficient for equality, but 13...\(\mathcal{b}7\)!? is interesting.

14 c3 \(\mathcal{c}6\)!

Black has good play, Drozdov-Shneider, Voroshilovgrad 1987.

B2)

10 \(\mathcal{w}g3\) (D)

Now:

**B21:** 10...0-0 77

**B22:** 10...\(\mathcal{c}c6\) 85

Other moves seldom occur:

a) After 10...\(\mathcal{d}d7\), it is necessary to take into account not only 11 \(\mathcal{w}xg7\) but also 11 \(\mathcal{f}f5\)!? \(\mathcal{x}f5\) 12 \(\mathcal{w}xg7\) \(\mathcal{f}f8\) 13 \(\mathcal{g}5\) \(\mathcal{w}d8\) 14 \(\mathcal{e}f5\).

b) 10...g6 11 \(\mathcal{e}e1\) (11 \(\mathcal{h}6\)!? is possible) 11...\(\mathcal{d}d7\) 12 \(\mathcal{w}f3\)!? gives White the better chances, Mortensen-Frick, Manila OL 1992.

c) 10...\(\mathcal{b}7\) 11 \(\mathcal{x}e6\)! (11 \(\mathcal{e}e1\) \(\mathcal{c}6\)! =; 11 f3 \(\mathcal{c}e2\) 12 \(\mathcal{x}c6\) \(\mathcal{w}x\)c6 13 \(\mathcal{w}xg7\) \(\mathcal{g}8\) 14 \(\mathcal{w}h6\) 0-0-0 = A. Sokolov-Net, Clichy 1993) 11...\(\mathcal{f}x\)e6 12 \(\mathcal{e}x\)e6, and Black has problems:

c1) 12...\(\mathcal{w}c4\) 13 \(\mathcal{d}xg7+\) \(\mathcal{d}d8\) 14 \(\mathcal{g}5\) \(\mathcal{b}d7\) 15 \(\mathcal{a}d1\) \(\mathcal{g}8\) (15...\(\mathcal{c}7\)? 16 \(\mathcal{a}f6\) \(\mathcal{x}f6\) 17 \(\mathcal{e}5\) 16 \(\mathcal{b}5\) ±,

c2) 12...\(\mathcal{d}d7\) 13 \(\mathcal{d}xg7+\) \(\mathcal{d}d8\) (or 13...\(\mathcal{f}f8\) 14 \(\mathcal{f}5\) \(\mathcal{g}8\) 15 \(\mathcal{g}5\)!? \(\mathcal{b}4\) 16 \(\mathcal{e}x\)e7 \(\mathcal{x}e7\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}d5\) 14 \(\mathcal{g}5\) (but not 14 \(\mathcal{e}5\)! \(\mathcal{g}8\)!)

d) 10...b4!? and now:

d1) 11 \(\mathcal{d}c2\) and then:

d1) 11...\(\mathcal{d}x\)e4 12 \(\mathcal{w}xg7\) \(\mathcal{f}6\) 13 \(\mathcal{w}h6\)! is good for White.

d2) 11...\(\mathcal{w}b7\) 12 f3 \(\mathcal{g}6\) 13 \(\mathcal{g}5\)! is also better for White, Mitkov-Sorena, Olot 1993.

d3) 11...0-0 12 \(\mathcal{h}6\) \(\mathcal{d}8\) 13 c3 \(\mathcal{bxc3}\) 14 \(\mathcal{d}x\)c3 \(\mathcal{f}6\) (14...\(\mathcal{d}d7\)? 15 \(\mathcal{d}x\)e6! \(\mathcal{x}e6\) 16 \(\mathcal{d}x\)e6 \(\mathcal{w}c4\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}xg7\) \(\mathcal{d}d7\)+) 15 \(\mathcal{d}e3\) ±.

d4) 11...g6 12 \(\mathcal{h}6\)! (Fischer; 12 c3? \(\mathcal{d}x\)e4 13 \(\mathcal{w}e3\) \(\mathcal{f}6\)!? 14 \(\mathcal{x}b4\) 0-0 \(\mp\) Fischer-F.Olafsson, Buenos Aires 1960; 12 \(\mathcal{f}3\)? \(\mathcal{e}5\) ?; not wholly clear is 12 \(\mathcal{w}e3\) 0-0 13 c3 a5 14 \(\mathcal{f}x\)b4 \(\mathcal{a}x\)b4 15 \(\mathcal{d}d2\) \(\mathcal{w}b7\) 16 \(\mathcal{d}g3\), Pikula-Kuczynski, Katowice 1991) 12...\(\mathcal{d}x\)e4 (or 12...\(\mathcal{e}5\) 13 \(\mathcal{g}7\) \(\mathcal{g}8\) 14 \(\mathcal{x}f6\) \(\mathcal{f}6\) 15 \(\mathcal{d}f5\) Mikhailchishin) 13 \(\mathcal{w}e3\) \(\mathcal{d}c5\) (13...\(\mathcal{d}d5\) 14 \(\mathcal{c}4\)!) 14 \(\mathcal{g}7\) \(\mathcal{g}8\) 15 \(\mathcal{w}h6\) \(\mathcal{f}f8\) 16 \(\mathcal{d}xf8\) \(\mathcal{x}f8\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}f4\) with an initiative, Dementiev-Mukhin, USSR 1974.

d15) 11...\(\mathcal{c}c6\)!? appears quite playable.

d2) 11 \(\mathcal{d}a4\) and now:

d21) 11...\(\mathcal{d}x\)e4 12 \(\mathcal{w}xg7\) \(\mathcal{f}6\) 13 \(\mathcal{g}4\) 15 \(\mathcal{d}d5\) 13...\(\mathcal{b}7\) 14 \(\mathcal{d}x\)e6! \(\mathcal{x}e6\) 15 \(\mathcal{e}1\) 14 \(\mathcal{e}3\) \(\mathcal{h}5\) (14...\(\mathcal{d}d7\) 15 \(\mathcal{c}4\)! \(\mathcal{bxc3}\) 16 \(\mathcal{d}xc3\) \(\mathcal{d}c3\) 17 \(\mathcal{a}c1\) ± M. Hoffmann-Rechel, Bochum jr 1989) 15 \(\mathcal{w}e2\)
with an advantage, Jaracz-Van der Stricht, Arnhem jr Ech 1990.

d22) 11...g6 12 f3 \( \text{\#c6} \) 13 cxd6 \( \text{\#xc6} \) 14 \( \text{\#e3} \) is clearly better for White, Kapic-Klalic, corr. 1996.

d23) 11...0-0 12 \( \text{\#h6} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) 13 c3 (13 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#d7}?! \) 14 \( \text{\#b6} \) \( \text{\#xb6} \) 15 \( \text{\#xe6} \) \( \infty \) 13...\( \text{\#f6} \) (13...\( \text{\#xc3} \) 14 \( \text{\#xc3} \) – 11 \( \text{\#ce2} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{\#h6} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) 13 c3 \( \text{\#xc3} \) 14 \( \text{\#xc3} \) \pm, 13...\( \text{\#c6} \) 14 \( \text{\#xc6} \)!! \( \text{\#xc6} \) 15 \( \text{\#e1} \) \pm 14 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#b7} \) 15 f3 \pm.

d24) 11...\( \text{\#c6} \) 12 \( \text{\#xc6} \) (12 c3 should be met not by 12...\( \text{\#d7} \) 13 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{\#xc3} \) 14 \( \text{\#xc6} \) \( \pm \), but 12...\( \text{\#b7} \)!! with good play; e.g., 13 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{\#xd4} \) 14 cxd4 \( \text{\#xe4} \) 15 \( \text{\#xc5} \) \( \text{\#f5} \) 16 \( \text{\#a4} \) + \( \text{\#f8} \), Bosboom-Vanheste, Dutch Ch (Hilversum) 1988 12...\( \text{\#xc6} \) 13 f3 (13 \( \text{\#e1} \) Ehvest) 13...0-0 14 \( \text{\#h6} \) (14 \( \text{\#e3} \)!!) 14...\( \text{\#h5} \) (14...\( \text{\#e8} \) 15 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#b8} \) 16 \( \text{\#f2} \) \( \text{\#d8} \), Ehvest-Timman, Reykjavik 1988, 17 \( \text{\#ad1} \) f5 18 e5!? \( \pm \) 15 \( \text{\#g4} \) g6 16 \( \text{\#xf8} \) \( \text{\#xf8} \) 17 e5! dxe5 18 \( \text{\#fe1} \) \( \pm \) (Nikitin).

B21)

10...0-0 11 \( \text{\#h6} \)

Or:

a) 11 \( \text{\#e1} \) – 10 \( \text{\#e1} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{\#g3} \).

b) 11 a3 is seldom played. Then:

b1) 11...\( \text{\#c6} \) 12 \( \text{\#xc6} \) \( \text{\#xc6} \) 13 \( \text{\#h6} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) – 11 \( \text{\#h6} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) 12 a3 \( \text{\#c6} \) 13 \( \text{\#xc6} \) \( \text{\#xc6} \).  

b2) 11...\( \text{\#d7} \) 12 \( \text{\#h6} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) – 11 \( \text{\#h6} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) 12 a3 \( \text{\#d7} \).

b3) 11...\( \text{\#h8} \)? is one more option; e.g., 12 \( \text{\#e3} \) (12 \( \text{\#e1} \) – 10 \( \text{\#e1} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{\#g3} \) \( \text{\#h8} \) 12 a3) 12...\( \text{\#c6} \) 13 \( \text{\#xc6} \) (13 f4 transposes to note ‘b2’ to White’s 10th move in Line B3 of Chapter 14) 13...\( \text{\#xc6} \) 14 \( \text{\#d4} \) with double-edged play, Waitzkin-Fedorowicz, New York 1992.

11...\( \text{\#e8} \) (D)

Many grandmasters, headed by Gelfand, prefer this line where Black has a very compact position and plans, above all, to complete his mobilization (e.g., 12...\( \text{\#d7} \) and 13...\( \text{\#c6} \)).

12 \( \text{\#ad1} \)

White has made plenty of other attempts to maintain the initiative:

a) 12 \( \text{\#e3} \) retreats the bishop prematurely; e.g., 12...\( \text{\#b7} \) (12...\( \text{\#d7} \)!!) 13 f3 \( \text{\#c6} \) 14 \( \text{\#ad1} \) \( \text{\#a5} \) with good play for Black.

b) 12 \( \text{\#g5} \) = is also premature.

c) 12 a4 \( \text{\#f6} \)!! (12...b4) 13 \( \text{\#fd1} \) b4 14 \( \text{\#ce2} \) \( \text{\#h8} \) 15 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#d7} \) 16 c3 \( \text{\#xc3} \) 17 \( \text{\#xc3} \) (Donges-Davis, corr. 1995) 17...\( \text{\#b8} \) with counterplay.

d) 12 \( \text{\#h1} \) is Morozevich’s move; the idea is f4. Then:

d1) After 12...\( \text{\#f6} \), 13 \( \text{\#ad1} \) is a logical reply, with the point 13...\( \text{\#e5} \) 14 f4.

d2) 12...\( \text{\#c6} \) and now neither 13 \( \text{\#xc6} \) \( \text{\#xc6} \) 14 a4 b4 15 \( \text{\#d5} \) \( \text{\#d8} \) 16 \( \text{\#b7} \) nor 13 \( \text{\#d5} \) exd5 14 \( \text{\#xc6} \) dxe4 15 \( \text{\#xe7} \) + \( \text{\#xe7} \) 16 a4 is wholly clear.

d3) 12...b4! is an interesting possibility.
d) 12...♗b7!? has the point 13 ♢xe6?! ♤f6! 14 ♢d5 ♤d8.

d5) 12...♕d7 13 ♤f4 ♤c6 and now:

d51) 14 ♤xc6 ♤xc6 15 f5!? ♤h8
16 ♣xe6 gxh6 17 ♤xf7 ♤xf7 18 ♥xf7 ≈ Morozevich.

d52) 14 ♤ad1 ♤xd4!? (14...b4) 15 ♤xd4 and now Black should continue 15...a5! 16 ♤f5 ♤f6. Weaker is 15...♕f6
16 ♤d3!; e.g., 16...♕e8 (16...b4 17 e5!; 16...a5 17 e5!) 17 ♤g5 b4 (or 17...♕xg5 18 fxg5! b4 19 ♤df3!? 18 ♤xf6 ♤xf6 19 e5!)

d53) 14 ♤f3 b4 (or 14...♕a5!? 15 e5 ♤c6 16 ♤f5 ♤xe5 17 ♤xe5 ♤xb3 18 ♤xb3 ♤xf5 19 ♤xf5 b7 with good play, Kobaliya-Vaulin, Krasnodar 1997) 15 ♤e2 ♤a5 (15...a5!? 16 ♤ed4 (16 e5 ♤xb3 17 ♤xb3 ♤c2 18 ♤ed4 ♤g6 Morozevich) 16...♕b7 (16...♕xb3 17 ♤xb3 ♤h8 18 ♤g5 f6 19 ♤h4 e5 ≈ Morozevich-Gelfand, Madrid 1996.

B)

d4) 14 ♤ce2 ♤h8 15 ♤g5 ♤f6 16 ♤h4 ♤ae8 17 f5 ♤xd4 18 ♤xd4 exf5 19 ♤ae1 ♤d8 20 ♤xf5 ♤xf5 21 ♤xf5 ♤e5 = Morozevich-Vaulin, Krasnodar 1997.

e) 12 a3 (D) (this has no advantages over 12 ♤ad1 ♤d7 13 a3), and now:

e1) Inexact is 12...♕h8 13 ♤e3 (13 ♤g5!?) 13...♕c6 (13...♕f6 14 f4 and now 14...♕c6 15 f5 ± or 14...♕b7 15 f5! 14 ♤xc6 (14 ♤d5?? ♤xd4!; 14 f4 ♤a5!?) 14...♕xc6 15 f4! with better chances for White.

e2) 12...♕c6 13 ♤xc6 ♤xc6 14 ♤ad1 (14 ♤d5 ♤d8! suits Black; instead, 14 ♤fe1 ♤b7 transposes to Line B221) 14...a5 (14...♕b7 is better; then 15 ♤fe1 again transposes to Line B221) 15 ♤fe1 a4 16 ♤a2 ♤b8 17 ♤d4 ♤d4 ± ♤f6?! 18 e5!, Mowsziszian-Bangiev, Simferopol 1985.

B)

e3) 12...♕f6!? 13 ♤e3 ♤c6 is playable, since Black need not worry about 14 ♤xc6 ♤xc6 15 ♤d5 ♤d8 16 ♤b6 ♤d7.

e4) 12...♕d7 13 ♤fe1 (13 f4? ♤c5 --; the main move 13 ♤ad1 transposes to Line B211) 13...♕c6 (also good here is 13...♕f6) 14 ♤xc6 (14 ♤ad1 = 12 ♤ad1 ♤d7 13 a3 ♤c6 14 ♤fe1 =) 14...♕xc6 15 ♤e3?! (Arizmendi-Pelletier, Bermuda 1999; 15 ♤ad1 transposes to note 'c' to White’s 15th move in Line B211; 15 ♤g5 =) 15...♕h8! 16 ♤g5 f6 Ptačník.

It remains only to discuss the moves of the rooks:

f) 12 ♤ae1 ♤h8 (12...♕f6!? 13 ♤e3 ♤d7 (13...b4!?) 14 f4 (14 a3!?) 14...b4 15 ♤ce2 ♤c6 16 f5 e5 17 ♤xc6 ♤xc6 18 ♤f3 ♤f6 19 ♤g3 (Baciuv-Vasiesiu, Bucharest 1998) 19...♕b7 with unclear play.

g) 12 ♤fd1 ♤d7 and then:

g1) 13 ♤f3 ♤c6 (13...b4! is playable) 14 ♤e2 ♤e5!? (14...♗d8 15 ♤f4 ♤h8 16 ♤g5 ± Waitzkin-Lesiege, Bermuda 1995) 15 ♤fd4 ♤h8 16 ♤c1 ♤f6 17 f3 ♤c4 with good play, Ashley-Wojtkiewicz, New York 1994.
5...a6 6 c4 e6 7 b3 b5 8-0 e7 9 f3!

g2) 13 c2 b7 14 f3 a5 15 a3 c6 16 xc6 xc6 17 c3 (Zapata-
Paramos Dominguez, Varadero 2000) and I see no advantage for White after 17...b4!?

h) 12 fe1 (Kasparov played this in the first of his games against Gel-
fand but in the next two he chose the more useful 12 ad1). Now:

h1) 12...c6?! can be countered by 13 d5!

h2) 12...b7 appears risky but no direct refutation can be found; e.g., 13 xe6 f6 14 d5 d8 15 e5 h4!

h3) 12...b4 has not yet been played.

h4) 12...h8 13 g5 (13 c3 f6 =) 13...f6 (13...xg5 14 xg5 and now, rather than 14...h6 15 h4 c6 16 xc6 xc6 17 a4 b4 18 d5! ±
T.Thorhallsson-Arnason, Hafnarfirdi 1992, 14...c5?! gives Black chances of equalizing, Coleman-Arnason, Philadelphia 1993) 14 ad1 ± (14 f4? a7) transposes to 12 ad1 h8 13 g5 f6 14 fe1.

h5) 12...d7 (we were interested in this position in connection with 10 e1 0-0 11 g3 d7) and now:

h51) 13 a3 – 12 a3 d7 13 fe1.

h52) 13 ad1 – 12 ad1 d7 13 fe1.

h53) 13 f5 is at best unclear: 13...exf5 14 d5 d8 15 exf5, and now Black can play 15...f6!?.

h54) No advantage is achieved after 13 g5 xg5 14 xg5 c6 15 xc6 xc6 16 a3 f6 17 ad1 ad8 =, as in Kutuzovic-Wojtkiewicz, Nova Gorica 1997.

h55) 13 c2 c6 14 xc6 xxc6 15 f4 h8 16 g5 xg5 17 xg5 f6 = Minasian-Am.Rodriguez, Lu-
cerne Wch 1993.

h56) 13 a4!? b4 (13...f6!? is another idea) 14 c2 c6 (14...b7 15 ad1!; 14...h8 15 g5 xg5 16 xg5 f6 17 g3 c6 18 xc6 xc6 19 ad1 ± Kasparov-Gelfand,
Paris rpd 1991) 15 xc6 xc6 16 d4 b7 17 ad1 and now, instead of 17...f6?! 18 c1! with an advantage, Magomedov-Vaulin, Cheliabinsk 1990,
better is 17...h8 18 g5 xg5 19 xg5 f6 (Magomedov).

h6) 12...f6(!) and now:

h61) 13 ad1? e5! is most likely winning for Black; e.g., 14 g4 xd4 (14...h8!? 15 xd4 e5 16 g5 exd4
17 d5 c5 18 e5 (18 f6+ h8 19 xg7+ xg7 20 h6 f5 wins for
Black) 18...h8! 19 e4 (Gdanski-
Kempinski, Polish Ch (Gdansk) 1994)
and now 19...gxh6! 20 xh6 g8 21
f5! or 19...e6!.

h62) 13 e3 leads to approximately equal play.

h63) If 13 f3, then Black should avoid 13...xc3 14 bxc3 xxc3 15
d1 b7 16 d3 c7 17 g5! ±
Instead, 13...d7 or 13...b4!? gives
Black good chances.

We now return to the position after 12 ad1 (D):
12...\textit{d}d7

Other moves have occurred much less frequently:

a) 12...\textit{b}b7?! 13 \textit{x}xe6! ±.

b) 12...\textit{c}c6 13 \textit{d}d5! \textit{xd}4 (alternatively, 13...\textit{xd}5 14 \textit{xc}x6 \textit{dxe}4 15 \textit{xe}7+ \textit{w}xe7 16 \textit{g}5 \textit{wd}7 17 \textit{wh}4!) 14 \textit{xe}7+ \textit{w}xe7 15 \textit{xd}4 is slightly better for White, Velička-Hybl, Pardubice 1995.

c) 12...\textit{f}6 13 \textit{g}5 (13 \textit{f}4? \textit{xd}4+! 14 \textit{xd}4 \textit{wa}7; 13 \textit{ce}2!? \textit{dc}6 14 \textit{c}3 \textit{h}8 15 \textit{g}5 \textit{b}7 16 \textit{fe}1 \textit{xg}5 17 \textit{wg}5 \textit{df}6 is satisfactory for Black, Macieja-Kempinski, Warsaw 1995; 13 \textit{e}3?! could be tried) 13...\textit{fg}5 14 \textit{xd}5 \textit{wc}5 15 \textit{wd}2 (15 \textit{we}3!? Ehlvest) 15...\textit{d}7 16 \textit{fe}1 with a slight advantage for White, Ehlvest-Gavrikov, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1988.

d) 12...\textit{h}8 13 \textit{g}5 (13 \textit{e}3!? is an idea) 13...\textit{ef}6 (13...\textit{fg}5 14 \textit{wg}5 ±; 13...\textit{b}4 14 \textit{x}e7 \textit{xe}7 15 \textit{a}4, and now 15...\textit{a}7 16 \textit{fe}1 ± or 15...\textit{b}7 16 \textit{f}6 \textit{a}7 17 \textit{we}3 \textit{df}6 18 \textit{dd}5 ±) and now:

d1) 14 \textit{wh}4 is unclear; for example, 14...\textit{e}8 (14...\textit{b}4!?) 15 \textit{d}3 \textit{db}7, and now 16 \textit{f}4 \textit{b}4! was good for Black in Rudensky-Cabarkapa, blind 1980.

d2) Calmer is 14 \textit{fe}1 \textit{b}4 (14...\textit{e}8 15 \textit{a}3!? 15 \textit{a}4 with some advantage.

d3) Or 14 \textit{a}3 ±; e.g., 14...\textit{bd}7?!


e) 12...\textit{b}4?! has not been sufficiently studied:

e1) 13 \textit{ce}2 \textit{cc}6 (13...\textit{f}6!?) 13...a5 is weaker in view of 14 \textit{f}4!, Bennedik-Cijs, corr. 1999) 14 \textit{f}3 (14 \textit{fe}1 \textit{e}5?! and 14 \textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6 15 \textit{dd}4 \textit{xe}4 are both unclear) 14...\textit{f}6

15 c3 bxc3 16 \textit{xc}3 (Macieja-Warszawski, Brzeg Dolny 1995) 16...\textit{a}5? is unclear.

e2) 13 \textit{a}4 and now:

e21) 13...\textit{c}6 14 \textit{e}3 (14 \textit{xc}6!? \textit{xc}6 15 \textit{fe}1 14...\textit{b}8 (14...\textit{f}6 is well answered by 15 \textit{b}6!; 14...\textit{d}7 1...\textit{d}7 14 \textit{e}3 \textit{c}6) 15 \textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6 16 \textit{f}3 ± Tokmachev-Ottenburg, corr. 1999.

e22) 13...\textit{d}7 14 \textit{c}3 \textit{c}6 and now nothing is gained by 15 \textit{f}3 \textit{b}8! (15...\textit{f}6 16 \textit{b}6! ±). Instead, 15 \textit{c}4!? deserves attention.

We now return to the position after 12...\textit{d}7 (D):

![Diagram]

We have reached another important crossroads. We shall discuss these three moves separately:

B211: 13 \textit{a}3 81

B212: 13 \textit{f}4 82

B213: 13 \textit{f}3 84

There remain:

a) 13 \textit{h}4 (Lepeshkin) does not appear very logical.

b) 13 \textit{e}3 \textit{c}6! (13...\textit{b}4 14 \textit{a}4 – 12...b4 13 \textit{a}4 \textit{d}7 14 \textit{e}3), and after 14 \textit{f}4 \textit{b}4! Black takes over the initiative.
c) 13 \( \texttt{h1} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 14 \( \texttt{f4} \) – 12 \( \texttt{h1} \) 
\( \texttt{d7} \) 13 \( \texttt{f4} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 14 \( \texttt{ad1} \).

d) 13 \( \texttt{cfe1} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) (13...\( \texttt{h8} \) 14 \( \texttt{g5} \);
13...\( \texttt{b4} \))\), and now:

d1) 14 \( \texttt{h1} \)\!? \( \texttt{a5} \) 15 \( \texttt{f4} \) \( \texttt{xb3} \) 16
\( \texttt{axb3} \)? \( b4 \) \( + \) Ruisinger-de Firmian,
Ticino 1993.

d2) 14 \( \texttt{a3} \) – 13 \( \texttt{a3} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 14 \( \texttt{f1} \).

d3) 14 \( \texttt{x6} \) \( \texttt{x6} \) 15 \( \texttt{g5} \) (15 \( \texttt{a3} \)
– 13 \( \texttt{a3} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 14 \( \texttt{x6} \) \( \texttt{x6} \) 15 \( \texttt{f1} \))
15...\( \texttt{xg5} \)! (less convincing is 15...\( b4 \)
16 \( \texttt{d5} \) 16 \( \texttt{w}xg5 \) \texttt{b4}?! = Veròci-Ruck,
Hungary 1993.

d4) 14 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{xg5} \) 15 \( \texttt{w}xg5 \) \( b4 \)
(15...\( \texttt{h6} \) has also occurred) 16 \( \texttt{a4} \) (16
\( \texttt{c2} \) \( \texttt{xd4} \) and 17...\( \texttt{a5} \)) 16...\( \texttt{b8} \) 17
\( \texttt{c3} \) \( \texttt{xd4} \) 18 \( \texttt{xd4} \) \( \texttt{xa4} \) 19 \( \texttt{xa4} \)
\( \texttt{bxc3} \) 20 \( \texttt{b3} \) with approximately equal
play, Oll-Gelfand, Sverdlovsk 1987.

d5) 14 \( \texttt{c2} \)! \( \texttt{e5} \) (14...\( \texttt{h8} \) 15
\( \texttt{g5} \) gives White some advantage;
14...\( \texttt{a5} \) 15 \( \texttt{f4} \); 14...\( \texttt{xd4} \) 15 \( \texttt{xd4} 
\( \texttt{a5} \) 16 \( \texttt{a3} \); 14...\( \texttt{b4} \)?) 15 \( \texttt{c3} \) \( \texttt{\infty} \) Collas-

e) 13 \( \texttt{c2} \)? (this is little studied,
like line 'd5') 13...\( \texttt{c6} \) (13...\( \texttt{h8} \) 14
\( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{xg5} \) 15 \( \texttt{w}xg5 \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 16 \( \texttt{g3} \)
\( \texttt{c6} \) 17 \( \texttt{c3} \) was the actual move-order
of Lautier-Gelfand) 14 \( \texttt{c3} \) (14 \( \texttt{f3} \) –
13 \( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{d6} \) 14 \( \texttt{e2} \); 14 \( \texttt{f1} \) – 13 \( \texttt{f1} 
\( \texttt{c6} \) 14 \( \texttt{e2} \)) 14...\( \texttt{h8} \) (14...\( \texttt{e5} \)?)
15 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{xg5} \) 16 \( \texttt{w}xg5 \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 17 \( \texttt{g3} 
\( \texttt{a5} \) (17...\( \texttt{ad8} \) 18 \( \texttt{f4} \) \( \pm \); 17...\( \texttt{e5} \) 18
\( \texttt{f1} \) ! \( \texttt{ad8} \) 19 \( \texttt{h5} \) Lautier) 18 \( \texttt{f1} 
(18 \( \texttt{f4} \) \( \texttt{c5} \)! leads to equality – Lautier)
18...\( \texttt{b6} \)? (18...\( \texttt{ad8} \) Lautier)
19 \( \texttt{f3} \)! \( \texttt{=} \) Lautier-Gelfand, Las Vegas
FIDE 1999.

B211)

13 \( a3 \) (D)

13...\( \texttt{c6} \) 14 \( \texttt{xc6} \)

Otherwise:

---

B

---

a) Not 14 \( \texttt{f4} \)? \( \texttt{b6} \) –.

b) 14 \( \texttt{g5} \) is best met by 14...\( \texttt{f6} \) =
(rather than 14...\( \texttt{g5} \) 15 \( \texttt{w}xg5 \)
and now 15...\( \texttt{e5} \) 16 \( \texttt{f4} \) \( \texttt{c4} \) 17 \( \texttt{xc4} 
followed by 18 \( \texttt{f3} \), or 15...\( \texttt{a5} \) 16
\( \texttt{d3} \) \( \texttt{c4} \) 17 \( \texttt{h3} \) \( \texttt{xb2} \)? 18 \( \texttt{f5} +\)
Lepeshkin).

c) 14 \( \texttt{f1} \) promises White little
after 14...\( \texttt{f6} \) !? 14...\( \texttt{a5} \) 15 \( \texttt{f4} \)? or
14...\( \texttt{xd4} \)!? 15 \( \texttt{xd4} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 16 \( \texttt{d3} 
\( \texttt{a5} \) 17 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( b4 \).

d) 14 \( \texttt{e3} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) (14...\( \texttt{a5} \)!) 15 \( \texttt{f5} \);
14...\( \texttt{xd4} \) 15 \( \texttt{xd4} \) \( \texttt{a5} \) 16 \( \texttt{e5} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 17
\( \texttt{f1} \) \( \texttt{=} \) Emms-Coleman, Gausdal 1996;
14...\( \texttt{f6} \) ?) 15 \( \texttt{xc6} \) \( \texttt{xc6} \) 16 \( \texttt{d4} 
\( \texttt{d8} \) 17 \( \texttt{w}e3 \) \( \texttt{xd4} \) 18 \( \texttt{xd4} \) \( \texttt{f6} 
\( \texttt{f1} \) gives White a small advantage,

14...\( \texttt{xc6} \) 15 \( \texttt{f4} \)

First used by Short against Kasparov. Other possibilities:

a) 15 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{g5} \) 16 \( \texttt{w}xg5 \) \( \texttt{f6} \)=.

b) 15 \( \texttt{f4} \) \( \texttt{h8} \) (15...\( \texttt{f6} \) !?) 16 \( \texttt{f5} \) {16
\( \texttt{g5} \) is answered by 16...\( \texttt{wa7} \) ! and
17...\( \texttt{xc3} \) } 16...\( \texttt{w}e7 \) 17 \( \texttt{w}g4 \) \( \texttt{h8} \) 18
\( \texttt{d2} \), Shetyrenkov-Vaulin, Budapest
1991, 18...\( \texttt{xd4} \) !? 19 \( \texttt{h1} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) \( \infty \) 16
\( \texttt{g5} \) and then:

b1) 16...\( \texttt{g5} \) ?! 17 \( \texttt{fxg5} \).

b2) After 16...\( \texttt{f6} \) White can try
17 \( \texttt{h4} \) ?, rather than 17 \( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{xe4} \)=
Cabello-Roiz, Asturia 1995 or 17 e5 dxe5 18 fxe5 \(a\)c5+=.

b3) 16...a5 17 f5 b4 18 axb4 axb4 19 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2 (19 fx6? bxc3 20 exf7 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xg5! 21 \(\mathcal{W}\)xg5 cxb2 \(\mathcal{\Xi}\)tr Istratescu-Kuczynski, Budapest Z 1993). Now 19...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xg5 20 \(\mathcal{W}\)xg5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 21 fx6, Skrobek-Engel, corr. 1990-1, is slightly better for White, and 19...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4 is not wholly clear. Instead, 19...\(\mathcal{Q}\)f6! gives Black good play.

c) An important position arises after 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)fe1 a5:

c1) 16 f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xg5 18 \(\mathcal{W}\)xg5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 = Martin del Campo-Sunye, Merida 1993.

c2) 16 \(\mathcal{A}\)e3 b4 17 axb4 axb4 18 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2 \(\mathcal{A}\)a5 = Macieja-Vaulin, Warsaw 1992.

c3) 16 \(\mathcal{A}\)d3 b4 (16...\(\mathcal{Q}\)f6?!?) 17 axb4 axb4 18 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a2 = J.Polgar-Csonkics, Hungarian Ch 1988.

c4) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f4 b4! is probably good for Black.

c5) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xg5 17 \(\mathcal{W}\)xg5 and now 17...\(\mathcal{A}\)b8 is roughly equal, Gobet-Pinter, Thessaloniki OL 1984, whereas 17...b4 18 axb4 axb4 19 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a2 \(\mathcal{A}\)a4 20 \(\mathcal{W}\)g3!, Alvim-Webre, corr. 1999, and 17...\(\mathcal{W}\)b7 18 \(\mathcal{A}\)d4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 19 \(\mathcal{A}\)xd6!? are less convincing.

15...\(\mathcal{A}\)d8

This is the latest attempt to improve Black's play. The previous main line ran: 15...\(\mathcal{W}\)b7 (15...a5 16 e5!) 16 \(\mathcal{A}\)fe1! (16 e5 dxe5 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe5 \(\mathcal{A}\)d8 transposes to the main line) 16...a5 (not 16...\(\mathcal{A}\)d8?! 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d5!) 17 e5 (17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d5? \(\mathcal{A}\)d8) 17...dxe5 (17...d5 \(\mathcal{\Xi}\)) 18 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 (18...b4 19 axb4 axb4 20 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2 \(\mathcal{\Xi}\), 18...\(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 19 \(\mathcal{A}\)d4; 18...a4 19 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a2 b4 20 axb4 and 21 \(\mathcal{A}\)d4!; 18...\(\mathcal{A}\)d8!?) 19 \(\mathcal{A}\)d4! \(\mathcal{A}\)d8 (19...b4 20 axb4 axb4 21 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a2 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe5 22 \(\mathcal{W}\)xe5 \(\mathcal{A}\)xg2 23 \(\mathcal{X}\)xb4

\(\mathcal{W}\)c6 24 \(\mathcal{W}\)c3 \(\pm\) Short) 20 \(\mathcal{X}\)xd8 \(\mathcal{X}\)xd8

21 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2! a4 (21...\(\mathcal{Q}\)f6!?) 22 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a2 b4 23 axb4 (23 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d4?! \(\mathcal{A}\)d5? 24 \(\mathcal{A}\)xd5 \(\mathcal{W}\)xd5

25 axb4 f6 26 \(\mathcal{W}\)h3) 23...\(\mathcal{A}\)xb4 24 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c3 \(\pm\) Short-Kasparov, London PCA Wch (20) 1993.

16 e5 dxe5 17 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe5 \(\mathcal{W}\)b7 18 \(\mathcal{X}\)xd8 \(\mathcal{X}\)xd8 19 \(\mathcal{A}\)d1 \(\mathcal{A}\)e7

19...\(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 is also possible.

20 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 21 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f4 \(\mathcal{A}\)d8

= Mirumian-Vaulin, Minsk 1997.

It might be concluded that Black can reach equality after 13 a3, if he proceeds accurately.

B212)

13 f4 (D)

Most likely, this interesting continuation is not stronger than 13 a3.

\[ \]

\[ \]

13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c6

Or:

a) 13...b4 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)ce2 (14 f5? bxc3 15 fx6 fxe6 16 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe6 \(\mathcal{A}\)xe6 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6+ \(\mathcal{W}\)h8 18 \(\mathcal{A}\)xf8+ \(\mathcal{A}\)xf8 19 \(\mathcal{A}\)f1 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d7? 20 \(\mathcal{A}\)xd7 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 21 \(\mathcal{A}\)e6 cxb2 = Oliver-Dunis, Monaco 2000) 14...\(\mathcal{W}\)h8 15 \(\mathcal{A}\)g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c6 16 f5!? (16 \(\mathcal{A}\)d3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 =; 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe7 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe7 is unclear) 16...\(\mathcal{A}\)xd4

(16...e5!?) 17 \(\mathcal{A}\)xd4 \(\mathcal{A}\)g5 (17...\(\mathcal{Q}\)f6 18 \(\mathcal{W}\)h4!, Almasi-Vaulin, Kecskemet
1993, with the point 18...e5? 19 ♙f3) 18 fxe6 ♙f6 19 exd7 ♙xd7 20 ♙h1 ± Voitsekhovsky-Vaulin, Kstovo 1994.

b) 13...♘h8?! 14 ♙g5 ♙c6 (the inferior 14...♗xg5?! should be met by 15 fxg5! rather than 15 ♙xg5?! ♙c6 16 ♙xc6 ♙xc6 17 f5 transposing to note 'c' to White's 16th move) 15 ♙xe7 ♙xe7 16 f5 (16 a3 a5) 16...e5 17 ♙e6 fxe6 18 fxe6 ♙xf1+ 19 ♙xf1 ♘f6! = Tischbierek-H.-Grünewald, East German Ch (Zittau) 1989.

14 ♙xc6

Or:

a) 14 ♙h1 - 12 ♙h1 ♙d7 13 f4 ♙c6 14 ♙ad1.

b) 14 ♙g5 ♙xg5 15 fxg5 ♙xd4 16 ♙xd4 ♙c5 (Morozevich-Gelfand, Istanbul OL 2000) is good for Black.

15 f5!! ♙xf5 15 ♙c4 and now:

c1) 15...b4 should be met by Kasparov's 16 e5! (instead of 16 fxe6 fxe6 17 ♘xf8+? ♙xf8! or 16...♕e2 exf5! 17 exf5 ♙xf6 = Hage-Alvebrant, corr. 1999).

c2) 15...♗f6 16 ♙xh6 and then:

16...♗h8 17 ♘x6 (17 ♙f4!? Shipov) 17...f6 18 ♙e3 (18 e5?! dxe5 19 ♙g5 b4!) 18...b4 19 ♙e2 (Maciejew-Wołkiewicz, Warsaw 1995) 19...♗c6! = Nisipeanu/Stoica.

16...♗e5 17 ♘g4 (17 ♙g5?! b4! 18 ♘f6 ♙c5+ 19 ♙h1 ♗xf6=; 17 ♙f4 ♙f6! =; very interesting is 17 fxe6?? ♙xg3 and now 18 exf7+ or possibly even 18 e7 - Morozevich) 17...b4 18 f6! g6! 19 ♙e2 (19 ♙d1!? Shipov) 19...a5! 20 ♙x8 (20 ♙h4 a4 21 ♙g5 h5! 22 g4♡) 22...hxg4!! 23 ♙xg4 ♙b5! Morozevich) 20...♗xf8 21 ♙h4 (21 c3! Shipov) 21...a4 22 ♙xh7 ♙a7+ (the alternative is 22...♕xf6?! 23 ♙h8+ ♙g8 24 ♙df3? f5 Kasparov) 23 ♙h1 ♙xf6 24 ♙h6+ ♙e7 gave Black good compensation in Morozevich-Kasparov, Astana 2001.

15...♗h8 16 ♙e3

Or:

a) 16 f6 ♙xf6 (16...gxh6??) 17 ♙xf6 b4!? = Manker-Golmon, theme corr. 1994.

b) 16...♗f6! 17 ♙xf7 (17 exf7 ♙f6??) 17...♗xf7 18 exf7 ♙g7 is probably satisfactory for Black, Kelleherde Firmian, Woburn 1994.

c) 16 ♙g5 ♙xg5 (16...b4!?) 17 ♙xg5 ♙f6 18 fxe6 fxe6 19 ♙xe6 ♙a7+ 20 ♙h1 ♙xe4 21 ♙xe4 ♙xe4 = Sieiro-Gonzalez – Vera, Cuban Ch (Sagua la Grande) 1981/2.

16...b4 17 ♙a4

17 ♙e2?! e5!.

17...♗f6!

The simplest. 17...♗b8?? 18 fxe6 fxe6 19 ♙xf8+ ♙xf8 20 ♙h1 ♙e7 (not 20...♗f6 21 ♙c5) 21 e5 with an advantage, A.Sokolov-Gelfand, USSR Ch (Odessa) 1989. Not quite clear are 17...e5 18 ♙b6 ♙f6?! and 17...♗xe4.

18 fxe6 ♙xe4 19 ♙h3 fxe6 20 ♙xe6 ♙f6
20...\textit{xf}6 21 \textit{xf}6 \textit{x}f6 is possibly satisfactory, since 22 \textit{db}6 \textit{e}8 23 \textit{d}5 seems suspicious.

21 \textit{b}6

Or 21 \textit{c}4 \textit{b}7 22 \textit{b}6 \textit{e}8 23 \textit{xb}4 \textit{xb}2 = Damaso-Arnason, Novi Sad OL 1990.

21...\textit{ae}8 22 \textit{d}5 \textit{d}8 23 \textit{g}4 \textit{d}7 24 \textit{e}2

= Olivier-Polak, Baden 1999.

\textbf{B213)}

13 \textit{f}3!? (\textit{D})

This was introduced by Kasparov against Gelfand (1993) where White achieved a spectacular win. After a small boom, the fashion for playing 13 \textit{f}3 shrunk by the end of the 1990s.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{b213.png}
\end{center}

13...\textit{c}6

Or:

a) 13...\textit{c}6 has not yet been tested.

b) 13...b4 14 \textit{e}2 a5?! (14...\textit{c}6 15 \textit{f}4! \textit{h}8 16 \textit{g}5 gives White an advantage, Abashev-Kostin, Russia 1996; 14...\textit{b}5 15 \textit{fd}4!; 14...\textit{h}8??) 15 \textit{f}4! \textit{h}8 (not 15...a4? 16 \textit{g}x\textit{f}6 +--) 16 \textit{g}5 \textit{f}6 (16...f6? 17 \textit{xe}6 +--; 16...\textit{x}g5 17 \textit{g}x\textit{f}6 ± a4 18 \textit{h}4 (alternatively, 18 \textit{h}3) 18...\textit{xf}6 19 \textit{xe}6! 17 \textit{h}4! (17 e5? \textit{xe}4), and instead of 17...\textit{b}5? 18 \textit{d}4! += Kasparov-Gelfand, Linares 1993 or 17...a4?! 18 \textit{h}5! ±, Black should try 17...\textit{c}6 with the idea 18 \textit{h}5 \textit{xe}5 19 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 20 \textit{xe}7 \textit{ae}8! 21 \textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6 22 \textit{xd}6 \textit{b}5 (Bönsch) or 17...\textit{d}8? (Nikitin).

(1) 14 e5?! gives White a draw at the most: 14...a4 15 \textit{d}4 axb3 (Black may try to improve via 15...g6!? 16 \textit{d}5 \textit{a}5 or 15...\textit{h}8??, but not 15...dxe5 16 \textit{g}4 \textit{f}6 17 \textit{e}4 g6 18 \textit{xf}8! 16 \textit{g}x\textit{g}7 \textit{g}x\textit{g}7 17 \textit{g}4 bx\textit{a}2 18 \textit{g}x\textit{g}7+ \textit{h}8 19 \textit{e}4?! (19 \textit{xe}7+=), and now 19...\textit{xc}2? = is simpler than 19...a1 \textit{w} 20 \textit{xe}7\textit{h}7+ \textit{xe}7 21 \textit{de}5+ \textit{xe}5 22 \textit{g}x\textit{g}5+ \textit{g}6 23 \textit{xe}6+?! \textit{f}5 24 \textit{xc}7.

(2) 14 a3 b4 (14...\textit{f}6 15 e5!?) 15 axb4 axb4 16 \textit{e}2 \textit{f}6 (or 16...\textit{c}6 17 \textit{f}4 \textit{a}5! Makarychev) 17 \textit{g}5 \textit{b}5! is good for Black, Zapata-Renteria, Bogota 1995.

(3) 14 a4 b4 15 \textit{e}2 (15 \textit{b}1 \textit{a}6! 16 e5 \textit{c}5 with counterplay, Gelashvili-Banikas, Zagan Jr Ech 1995) 15...\textit{c}6 (Black has several risky but interesting alternatives: 15...\textit{a}6?!, 15...\textit{c}6? or 15...\textit{f}6?! with the point 16 \textit{g}5 \textit{xf}2 17 \textit{e}7 \textit{b}5 18 \textit{xf}8 \textit{xe}2 19 \textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6 20 \textit{xd}6 \textit{a}6) 16 \textit{f}4 (16 \textit{ed}4 \textit{xd}4 17 \textit{xd}4 =; 16 \textit{g}5 \textit{g}5 17 \textit{g}x\textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 18 \textit{xf}3 \textit{d}8 = Berndt-Jacoby, Hamburg 1997) 16...\textit{f}6 (16...\textit{h}8 17 \textit{g}5 gives White the initiative) 17 \textit{d}3! (17 \textit{h}5? \textit{xb}2 18 e5? \textit{xe}5!; 17 \textit{g}5? \textit{c}7? +; 17 c3?! \textit{h}8 18 \textit{g}5 \textit{bx}3) 17...e5! 18 \textit{e}3, Short-Kasparov, London PCA Wch (18) 1993. The knight on d3 looks strange, but White still might have a slight plus.
14 $\mathcal{A}f4$

Or:

a) 14 $\mathcal{A}$fe1 $b4$!? (14...$\mathcal{A}$f6) 15 $\mathcal{Q}$xe2 $\mathcal{A}$f6 with counterplay, Hamdouchi-A. Luft, Sitges 1995.

b) 14 $\mathcal{A}$g5 $\mathcal{A}$xg5 (14...$\mathcal{A}$c8 15 $\mathcal{A}$f4!? Gallagher) 15 $\mathcal{A}$xg5 $\mathcal{A}$d8 (15...h6 16 $\mathcal{A}$h3!? Bangiev) 16 f4?! (16 $\mathcal{A}$d2!? Shipov) 16...h6 17 $\mathcal{A}$f3 b4 18 $\mathcal{Q}$e2 $\mathcal{A}$f6 19 e5 $\mathcal{A}$e4 $\mp$ Sax-Wojtkiewicz, Budapest Z 1993.

c) 14 $\mathcal{Q}$e2, and now Black can play 14...a5 15 c3 (15 a4!? ) 15...a4 16 $\mathcal{A}$c2 e5 17 $\mathcal{A}$d2 $\mathcal{A}$e6 = Ashley-Arnason, St Martin 1993, or 14...$\mathcal{A}$e5 15 $\mathcal{Q}$ed4 $\mathcal{A}$xf3+ 16 $\mathcal{A}$xf3 $\mathcal{A}$c6 17 $\mathcal{A}$fe1 $\mathcal{B}$b7 = Rublevsky-Vaulin, Kurgan 1993.

14...$\mathcal{A}$d8

Otherwise:

a) 14...$\mathcal{B}$b7! 15 $\mathcal{A}$fe1 (15 $\mathcal{A}$g5!? Beliavsky/Mikhailchishin; 15 e5 dxe5 16 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 17 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 $\mathcal{A}$c6 =) 15...b4 (15...$\mathcal{A}$a5 16 e5!) 16 $\mathcal{Q}$e2 (16 $\mathcal{Q}$a4 $\mathcal{Q}$a5! Shipov) 16...e5 (16...$\mathcal{A}$f6!? 17 $\mathcal{A}$xd6 $\mathcal{A}$xd6 18 $\mathcal{B}$xd6 $\mathcal{A}$fd8 19 e5! $\mathcal{A}$xe5 20 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 $\mathcal{A}$e8! 21 $\mathcal{C}$c5 $\mathcal{A}$xd1 22 $\mathcal{A}$xd1 $\mathcal{B}$e4 or 16...$\mathcal{A}$c5 17 e5 dxe5 18 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 $\mathcal{A}$b5 19 $\mathcal{A}$xd4 $\mathcal{A}$xb3 20 axb3 $\mathcal{A}$f6! $\infty$ Nikitin) 17 $\mathcal{A}$g5 $\mathcal{A}$e6 (17...$\mathcal{A}$xg5 18 $\mathcal{W}$xg5 $\mathcal{A}$e6 19 $\mathcal{Q}$g3! Shipov) 18 $\mathcal{A}$h4! $\pm$ Kasparov-Gelfand, Moscow OL 1994.

b) 15 $\mathcal{A}$f4!!

15 $\mathcal{A}$fe1 $\mathcal{A}$c8 16 e5 dxe5 17 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 $\mathcal{A}$xd1 (17...$\mathcal{A}$d6 = Lamoureaux-Wojtkiewicz, Cannes 1998) 18 $\mathcal{A}$xd1 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 19 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 $\mathcal{W}$c6 = Winants-Wojtkiewicz, Wijk aan Zee 1994.

After the text-move (15 e5), Black has some problems:

a) 15...dxe5 16 $\mathcal{Q}$xe5 is risky for Black:

1) 16...$\mathcal{A}$d6 17 $\mathcal{A}$xd6! $\mathcal{Q}$xd6 and now rather than 18 $\mathcal{A}$g4 e5 19 $\mathcal{Q}$d5 $\mathcal{W}$b7 20 $\mathcal{A}$gf6+ $\mathcal{A}$h8 21 $\mathcal{W}$h4 $\mathcal{A}$f5 22 $\mathcal{A}$xh7 $\mathcal{A}$xh7 23 $\mathcal{F}$f6 = or 18 $\mathcal{A}$xc6 $\mathcal{A}$xc6 19 $\mathcal{A}$d1 b4! $\infty$ Istratescu-Wojtkiewicz, Odorhei Secuiesc Z 1995, Istratescu recommends 18 $\mathcal{A}$d1! b4 19 $\mathcal{A}$xf7! $\mathcal{B}$xf7 20 $\mathcal{A}$xd6 $\mathcal{A}$wa7 21 $\mathcal{A}$e4.

b) 16...$\mathcal{A}$xe5 17 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 $\mathcal{W}$b7 18 $\mathcal{A}$d4 $\mathcal{A}$c6 (or 18...$\mathcal{A}$f6 19 $\mathcal{A}$e4 $\mathcal{Q}$h5 20 $\mathcal{W}$h3 $\mathcal{A}$c6 21 $\mathcal{A}$d6) 19 $\mathcal{A}$g4 $\mathcal{A}$h8 (or 19...g6 20 $\mathcal{A}$xe6 fxe6 21 $\mathcal{A}$xg6+ $\mathcal{A}$f7 22 $\mathcal{A}$h6 $\mathcal{A}$g8 23 $\mathcal{A}$f4+ $\mathcal{A}$f6 24 $\mathcal{A}$xf6+ $\mathcal{W}$e8 25 f3) 20 $\mathcal{A}$xg7 f6 21 $\mathcal{A}$xh7+ $\mathcal{A}$xh7 22 $\mathcal{A}$h3+ $\mathcal{G}$g3 23 $\mathcal{A}$g4+$\mathcal{A}$h7 24 $\mathcal{W}$h5+$\mathcal{A}$g7 25 $\mathcal{A}$f4! with a strong attack for White.

b) 15...$\mathcal{A}$c8 16 exd6 (16 $\mathcal{A}$e4 dxe5 17 $\mathcal{A}$xe5 $\mathcal{A}$d4!?) 16...$\mathcal{A}$xd6 17 $\mathcal{A}$xd6 (17 $\mathcal{A}$xd6 $\mathcal{A}$xd6 18 $\mathcal{A}$d1 b4! is much better for Black) 17...$\mathcal{A}$xd6 18 $\mathcal{A}$e4 gives White some advantage.

Overall, the line 10 $\mathcal{W}$g3 0-0 11 $\mathcal{A}$h6 $\mathcal{A}$e8 remains interesting for both sides.

B22)

10...$\mathcal{A}$c6 (D)

Another major option. Black wishes to simplify the position.

11 $\mathcal{A}$xc6

Otherwise:

a) 11 $\mathcal{Q}$xe2 (nothing is gained by retreating the knight) 11...0-0 12 $\mathcal{A}$h6 $\mathcal{A}$e8 13 $\mathcal{A}$ad1 $\mathcal{A}$a5 (Kosten).

b) 11 $\mathcal{A}$f3 0-0 12 $\mathcal{A}$h6 $\mathcal{A}$e8 13 $\mathcal{A}$ad1 $\mathcal{B}$b7, Vavra-Neumann, Bundesliga 1998/9.
c) 11...\(\text{g}f5\) (this sacrifice is not considered to work here) 11...\(\text{exf}5\) 12 \(\text{Wxg}7\) \(\text{Hf}8\) and then:

  c1) 13 \(\text{g}5\) b4!? (13...\(\text{Wd}8\)?? is an alternative; 13...\(\text{Qx}e4\) 14 \(\text{Qd}5\) is unclear) 14 \(\text{Qd}5\) \(\text{Qxd}5\) 15 \(\text{Qxd}5\) (or 15 \(\text{exd}5\) \(\text{Qe}5\) 16 \(\text{Qxe}7\) \(\text{Wxe}7\) 17 f4 f6! Kosten) 15...\(\text{Qx}g5\) 16 \(\text{Wxg}5\) \(\text{Qf}4\) \(\pm\) Gu- seinov-Magerramov, Baku 1986.

  c2) 13 \(\text{exf}5\) \(\text{Qxf}5\) (13...\(\text{Qe}5\) 14 \(\text{Qd}5!;\) 13...b4!?) 14 \(\text{g}5\) b4 15 \(\text{Qxf}6\) bxc3 16 \(\text{Qae}1\) 0-0-0!? 17 \(\text{Qxe}7\) \(\text{Qxe}7\) 18 \(\text{Qe}3\) cxb2 19 \(\text{Wf}6\) (19 \(\text{Wxb}2!?)\) 19...\(\text{Qe}6\) \(\pm\) Mukhutdinov-Shneider, St Petersburg 1993.

d) 11...\(\text{Qe}3\) gives Black a choice:

  d1) 11...\(\text{Qa}5\) 12 \(\text{Wxg}7\) (12 \(\text{Qf}5??\)?) 12...\(\text{h}8\) 13 \(\text{Qh}6\) \(\text{Qxb}3\) 14 axb3 \(\text{Qb}7\) 15 f3 b4 16 \(\text{Qa}4\) \(\text{Qg}6\) 17 \(\text{Wf}3\) d5 18 f4!, Alvim-Kiese, corr. 1999.

  d2) 11...\(\text{Qxd}4\) 12 \(\text{Qxd}4\) 0-0 (alternatively, 12...\(\text{b}7\) 13 \(\text{Qad}1!?\) b4 14 \(\text{Qa}4\), and instead of 14...\(\text{Qf}8\) 15 e5 \(\text{Qh}5\) 16 \(\text{Wf}3\) with a dangerous initiative, Ivanović-Marjanović, Yugoslav Ch (Subotica) 1984, Black should play 14...\(\text{Qc}6\) – Marjanović) 13 a3 (13 e5 dxe5 14 \(\text{Qxe}5\) \(\text{Wc}6\) 15 \(\text{Qf}1\) \(\text{b}7\) 16 \(\text{Qe}4\) \(\text{Qh}8\) with a defensible position, Gara-Khukhashvili, Oropesa del Mar Jr Wch 1999) 13...e5 (13...\(\text{b}7\) is better) 14 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 15 \(\text{Qg}5\) with an advantage for White, Raud-Ilić, Bela Crkva 1990.

d3) 11...\(\text{b}7!\).

d4) 11...0-0 (now \(\text{h}6\) will lose a tempo) 12 \(\text{Qxc}6\) (12 a3 =) 12...\(\text{Wxc}6\) 13 \(\text{h}6\) (13 \(\text{Qd}4\) \(\text{b}7\) = 14 \(\text{Qad}1??\) b4!), V.Ivanov-Zhidkov, USSR 1977) 13...\(\text{Qe}8\) 14 a4 (14 \(\text{Qfe}1\) \(\text{b}7\) 15 \(\text{Qad}1\) – 11 \(\text{Qxc}6\) \(\text{Wxc}6\) 12 \(\text{Qg}5\) \(\text{b}7\) 13 \(\text{Qad}1\) 0-0 14 \(\text{h}6\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 15 \(\text{Qfe}1\); 14 \(\text{Qad}1\) \(\text{b}7\) – 11 \(\text{Qxc}6\) \(\text{Wxc}6\) 12 \(\text{Qg}5\) \(\text{b}7\) 13 \(\text{Qad}1\) 0-0-0 14 \(\text{h}6\) \(\text{Qe}8\); White achieves nothing by 14 \(\text{Qd}5\) \(\text{Qd}8!\)) and now:

  d41) 14...b4 15 \(\text{Qd}5\) \(\text{d}8\) 16 a5 (16 \(\text{Qfe}1??\)?) 16...\(\text{Wb}7\) 17 \(\text{Qd}2\) exd5 (17...\(\text{Qd}7\) 18 \(\text{Qxb}4\) \(\pm\)) 18 \(\text{Qxd}5\) \(\text{Qa}7\) 19 \(\text{Qxa}8\) \(\text{Qxa}8\) 20 e5!, J.Polgar-H.Olausson, Egilsstadir 1988.

  d42) 14...\(\text{Qd}7!\).

  d43) 14...\(\text{b}7\) is probably best: 15 axb5 axb5 16 \(\text{Qxa}8\) \(\text{Qxa}8\) followed by 17...\(\text{Qf}6\) = Nikolenko-Yuferev, Moscow 1990.

11...\(\text{Wxc}6\) (D)

12 \(\text{Qe}1\)

Other moves:

a) 12 \(\text{Wxg}7??\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 13 \(\text{Wh}6\) \(\text{Qxe}4\) 14 \(\text{Qxe}4\) \(\text{Qxe}4\) \(\pm\).
b) 12 a3  \( \Box \text{xe}4! ?. \\
\text{c) 12 } \Box \text{g}5 (\text{as in the case of 11 } \Box \text{e}3, \\
\Box \text{h}6 \text{ will now lose a tempo) 12... } \Box \text{b}7 \\
\text{12...0-0? 13 } \Box \text{d}5 ! \text{ and then:} \\
\text{c1) 13 } \Box \text{fe}1 0-0 (13...0-0-0?! 14} \\
a4) \text{and now:} \\
\text{c11) 14 a3 gives Black a choice of} \\
\text{transpositions: 14... } \Box \text{ad}8 - 12 \Box \text{e}1 \Box \text{b}7 \\
13 a3 \Box \text{d}8 14 \Box \text{g}5 0-0; 14... \Box \text{fd}8?! 15 \\
\Box \text{ad}1 \text{ transposes to note 'c11' to} \\
\text{White's 11th move in Line B1, which is} \\
\text{equal.} \\
\text{c12) 14 } \Box \text{ad}1 - 13 \Box \text{ad}1 0-0 14 \\
\Box \text{fe}1. \\
\text{c13) 14 } \Box \text{h}6 \Box \text{e}8 = \text{gives Black an} \\
\text{extra tempo compared to Line B221.} \\
\text{c2) 13 } \Box \text{ad}1 0-0! (13... \Box \text{d}8 14 \Box \text{fe}1 \\
\text{0-0, transposing to line 'c241', has its} \\
\text{disadvantages) and then:} \\
\text{c21) 14 a3 =.} \\
\text{c22) 14 } \Box \text{xf}6 \Box \text{xf}6 15 \Box \text{xd}6 \Box \text{c}5! \\
\text{gives Black compensation.} \\
\text{c23) After 14 } \Box \text{h}6 \Box \text{e}8 15 \Box \text{fe}1, \text{a} \\
\text{good reply is 15... } \Box \text{h}8! (\text{less convincing} \\
is 15... \Box \text{f}6 16 \Box \text{g}5 \Box \text{xg}5 - 12 \Box \text{e}1 \\
0-0 13 \Box \text{h}6 \Box \text{e}8 14 \Box \text{ad}1 \Box \text{b}7 15 \\
\Box \text{g}5 \Box \text{xg}5) 16 \Box \text{g}5 \Box \text{xg}5 17 \Box \text{xg}5 \\
\Box \text{f}6 = 18 \Box \text{d}3? b4!, \text{Moutousis-Cvet-} \\
ković, Vrnjačka Banja 1990.} \\
\text{c24) 14 } \Box \text{fe}1 \text{ and here:} \\
\text{c241) 14... } \Box \text{ad}8 \text{ is well met by 15} \\
\Box \text{d}3! (\text{nothing is gained by 15 } \Box \text{d}5 \Box \text{c}7 =). \\
\text{Then Black must avoid 15... } \Box \text{h}8? \\
16 \Box \text{h}4 +-, 15... \Box \text{h}5? 16 \Box \text{h}4 \Box \text{xg}5 \\
17 \Box \text{xg}5 \Box \text{f}6 18 \Box \text{g}3 +-, 15... \text{b}4? 16 \\
\Box \text{d}5 \text{ exd}5 17 \text{exd}5 \Box \text{c}7 18 \Box \text{xex}7! \text{ and} \\
15... \text{a}5 16 \text{a}4?! \text{b}4 17 \Box \text{d}5. \text{There} \\
\text{remains only 15... } \Box \text{wc}5, \text{when 16 } \Box \text{wh}4 \\
(\text{Pawlak-Ferens, corr. 1996}) \text{is not} \\
\text{convincing in view of 16...h6!, so 16} \\
\Box \text{e}3?! \text{deserves attention.} \\
\text{c242) 14... } \Box \text{fd}8?! \text{. Now 15 } \Box \text{d}3?! \\
\text{does not work because of 15... } \text{b}4! 16 \\
\Box \text{d}5 \text{ exd}5 17 \text{exd}5 \Box \text{d}7! 18 \Box \text{xe}7 (18 \\
\Box \text{de}3 \Box \text{e}8) 18... \Box \text{xe}7 19 \Box \text{e}3 \Box \text{f}8! \\
(\text{the difference!}) 20 \Box \text{xf}6 \Box \text{e}8. \text{Also} \\
dubious is 15 \text{f}4?! (G. Kuzmin-Polugaevsky, \\
USSR Ch (Leningrad 1977), \text{when Black can play, e.g., 15... } \text{b}4?! \\
(\text{Kosten}). \text{Better is 15 } \text{f}3 \text{ or 15 } \text{a}3, \\
\text{transposing to note 'c11' to} \\
\text{White's 11th move in Line B1 (=).} \\
\text{d) 12 } \text{f}3?! \text{ (this occurs much more} \\
seldom than 12 \Box \text{e}1 \Box \text{b}7 13 \text{f}3), \text{and now:} \\
\text{d1) 12... } \Box \text{c}5?! 13 \Box \text{h}1 0-0. \\
\text{d2) 12...0-0 13 } \Box \text{h}6 (13 \Box \text{h}1!; 13 \\
\Box \text{e}3?! \Box \text{b}7 - 12... \Box \text{b}7 13 \Box \text{e}3 0-0) \\
13... \Box \text{e}8 (13... \Box \text{h}5! =) 14 \Box \text{e}3 (14 \\
\Box \text{e}2 \Box \text{c}5+ 15 \Box \text{h}1 \Box \text{h}8 = \text{Labuckas-} \\
Zagorski, \text{Lithuanian Ch (Vilnius} \\
1994; 14 \Box \text{h}1!?) 14... \Box \text{f}6 15 \Box \text{h}1 \Box \text{b}7 \\
16 \text{a}4 \Box \text{fd}8 17 \Box \text{e}2 \text{e}5 18 \Box \text{g}5 \text{b}4 19 \\
\Box \text{e}1! \text{with an advantage for White,} \\
Gdanski-Brustman, \text{Aegina 1993.} \\
\text{d3) 12... } \Box \text{b}7 13 \Box \text{e}3 0-0 (13... \Box \text{g}8 \\
14 \text{a}4 \text{b}4 15 \text{a}5 \pm) \text{with a complicated} \\
game after both 14 \Box \text{fd}1 \Box \text{fd}8 15 \Box \text{d}2 \\
\Box \text{d}7 16 \Box \text{e}2 (\text{Bereziuk-Kalod, Czech} \\
Cht 1998) \text{ and 14 } \Box \text{fe}8 (14... } \text{b}4?!?) \\
15 \Box \text{e}2 \text{e}5 16 \Box \text{c}3 \text{b}4 17 \Box \text{d}5 \Box \text{xd}5 \\
18 \text{exd}5 \Box \text{d}7 19 \text{a}5!, \text{Morozевич-} \\
Hohn, \text{Moscow 1991.} \\
\text{We now return to 12 } \Box \text{e}1 (D):}
12...\textbf{b7}!

There is at least one important alternative, but the majority of the rare continuations look dubious:

a) 12...a5? 13 a4 b4 14 \textbf{d}5 exd5 15 \textbf{w}xg7 \textbf{f}8 16 exd5 \textbf{d}x5 17 \textbf{g}5 ±.

b) 12...g6?? 13 \textbf{g}5!?.

c) 12...\textbf{c}e5?! 13 \textbf{e}3 \textbf{h}5 14 \textbf{f}4 e5 15 \textbf{d}5 ±.

d) After 12...\textbf{d}7?! White is able to choose between 13 \textbf{g}5 \textbf{c}5 ±, 13 \textbf{w}xg7 \textbf{g}8 14 \textbf{h}6 b4? 15 \textbf{d}5 and 13 \textbf{d}5?! exd5 14 \textbf{w}xg7 0-0 15 exd5 \textbf{d}x5 16 \textbf{w}xf7 \textbf{f}6 17 \textbf{e}3 \textbf{h}g8 18 g3.

e) 12...\textbf{c}7!? is interesting; e.g., 13 a4 b4 14 \textbf{a}2 \textbf{b}7 \smallfrown Mirumian-Mozny, Czech Cht 1996/7.

f) 12...0-0 13 \textbf{h}h6! \textbf{e}8 has occurred rather frequently. Now:

f1) 14 a3 \textbf{b}7 transposes to Line B221.

f2) 14 \textbf{d}d1!? and then:

f21) 14...\textbf{c}7 15 a3 \textbf{f}6 16 \textbf{d}d3 \textbf{b}7 transposes to note ‘a’ to Black’s 15th move in Line B221 (±).

f22) 14...\textbf{b}7 15 a3 ±.

f23) 14...\textbf{h}8 15 \textbf{g}5 (or 15 \textbf{e}3!?) 15...\textbf{f}6? 16 \textbf{x}f6 is much better for White, H.Olafsson-Teitsson, Icelandic Cht 1995.

f24) 14...\textbf{b}7 and then:

f241) 15 a3 again transposes to Line B221.

f242) 15 \textbf{d}3 \textbf{h}8!? (15...\textbf{d}8 16 \textbf{g}5 \textbf{c}7 17 \textbf{x}e7 \textbf{x}e7 18 f3 ± Canda-Vera, Bayamo 1989) 16 \textbf{g}5 \textbf{x}g5 17 \textbf{x}g5 b4 and 18...\textbf{f}6, Yurtaev-Rashkovsky, USSR 1985.

f243) 15 \textbf{g}5!? \textbf{x}g5 16 \textbf{x}g5 \textbf{f}6 (16...b4 17 \textbf{a}4 \textbf{f}6 18 \textbf{d}4 ±) gives White some chances on the kingside; e.g., 17 \textbf{e}3 h6 18 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{d}ad8 19 \textbf{dd}3 b4? 20 \textbf{g}3 – or 17 \textbf{d}3 h6 18 \textbf{h}4 \textbf{fd}8 19 \textbf{g}3 \textbf{f}8 (Mariano-Browne, Las Vegas blitz 1995) 20 \textbf{ee}3!.

f3) 14 a4!? ensures a slight advantage: 14...\textbf{b}7 (or 14...\textbf{h}8 15 axb5!? axb5 16 \textbf{xa}8 \textbf{xa}8 17 \textbf{g}5 ±) 15 axb5 axb5 16 \textbf{xa}8 \textbf{xa}8 (J.Polgar-Schandorff, Abenrâ rpd 1989) 17 \textbf{a}2!?.

Practice has shown that White is often tempted to advance the knight:

f4) 14 \textbf{d}5 \textbf{d}8! and, so far, Black has managed to defend very successfully in this position:

f41) 15 \textbf{g}5?! \textbf{x}g5 16 \textbf{x}g5 exd5 17 \textbf{x}d5 \textbf{c}5! 18 b4 \textbf{a}7.

f42) 15 c3 \textbf{d}7! (15...\textbf{b}7!? 16 \textbf{d}4 \textbf{h}8 17 \textbf{g}5 \textbf{x}g5 18 \textbf{x}g5 \textbf{f}6) 16 a4 \textbf{b}7 = Zsó.Polgar-Browne, New York 1989.

f43) 15 \textbf{e}3 \textbf{d}7 16 \textbf{d}4 \textbf{b}7! = Bach-Szuhanek, Timisoara 1993.

f44) 15 a3 \textbf{b}7 16 \textbf{ad}1 \textbf{h}8 17 \textbf{b}4 \textbf{c}7 18 \textbf{f}4 a5 19 \textbf{d}d3 e5 was good for Black in Brooks-Kraai, Los Angeles 1991.

f45) 15 \textbf{ad}1 and then:

f451) 15...\textbf{b}7 and now: 16 a3 – 15 a3 \textbf{b}7 16 \textbf{ad}1; 16 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{h}8 17 \textbf{g}5 – 15...\textbf{h}8 16 \textbf{g}5 \textbf{b}7 17 \textbf{f}4.

f452) 15...\textbf{h}8 16 \textbf{g}5 (16 \textbf{c}1 is equal) 16...\textbf{b}7 17 \textbf{f}4 (17 \textbf{x}d8 \textbf{x}d8 18 \textbf{h}4 \textbf{d}7 = Browne-Ghitescu, Rovinj/Zagreb 1970) 17...\textbf{g}5 18 \textbf{x}g5 \textbf{f}6, and there is nothing special for White.

f453) 15...a5!? is possibly even stronger; e.g., 16 \textbf{f}4? \textbf{h}8! ± Raud-Zagreblny, Tallinn 1988, with the point 17 \textbf{d}5 exd5 18 exd5 \textbf{xc}2! –. 

f46) 15 a4 \textbf{h}8 (15...\textbf{b}7 16 axb5 axb5 17 \textbf{xa}8 \textbf{xa}8 18 \textbf{b}4! ±
Mikhailchishin; 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}b7 16 axb5!?; 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d7!? is playable) 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f4 (16 axb5? axb5 =; 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}b4!; 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5!?)
16...\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d7 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c3 b4 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}a2 = Tomescu-Minasian, Decin 1996.

f47) 15 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f4 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f6 (not 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8?
16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d5!; 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}a7 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h5!? f6 =; 15...
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c5 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d3 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}h5 = 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d3 (16
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d5 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d8 is a repetition; after 16 c3, instead of 16...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5 =, 16...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e5!
is strong, Maciejka-Kempinski, Poland 1991) 16...a5!? (16...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}b7 17 a4! =

f48) 15 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e3 is popular though very unclear:

f481) 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}b7? is bad in view of 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c3! \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d7 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c7!.

f482) 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}b7 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f4 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 17
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}b6? (17...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xg5 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xg5 h6
19 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h3?! \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xe4 = Hislop-Hughson, corr. 1995) 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f3 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xe4 19 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f1! =
de Firmian-Browne, USA Ch (Long Beach) 1989.

f483) 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d7 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f4 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}e7 (not 16...
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f6? 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h5! = 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h5 f6 =
Gdanski-Jasnikowski, Polish Ch (Cetniewo) 1991.

f484) 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5 f6?! (other ideas are 16...
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xg5 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xg5 = and 16...
\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d7 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f4 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}a7!?, Love-Kask, corr. 1995), and instead of 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f3?!
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d7 (17...a5!?) 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f4 (or 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}h4
exd5 19 g4! \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e6! 20 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h3 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g8)
18...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c7! (Szuhanek), the correct move is 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}f3 =.

f485) 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}a7! 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f4 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f6 17
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h5? (17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d3) 17...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xb2 18 c3 f6 =

f486) 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c5?! is important; for example, 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f4? \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 or 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}ae1
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c3 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d4, and there seems nothing concrete for White, Korneev-

We now return to 12...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}b7! (D):

\begin{center}
\textbf{W}
\end{center}

13 a3

13 a4? b4 14 a5 0-0 is bad for White and 13 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5 has already been discussed under 12 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}b7 13 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}fe1.

There are two more options for White:

a) 13 f3 (not very dangerous for Black) 13...0-0 (both 13...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g8!? and
13...h5! are interesting) 14 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h6 (14
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e3 =) 14...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e8 and here:

a1) In the case of 15 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h1, instead of 15...
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xg5 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xg5
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f6 18 a4 b4 19 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e2 with a slight advantage
for White, Movsesian-Jirovsky, Mlada Boleslav 1993, 15...
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f6 is interesting; e.g., 16
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}ad1 a5? \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}} Sluka-Jirovsky, Plzen 1996 or 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xc3 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xc3 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}c7!?

a2) 15 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xg5 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xg5 is adequately met by 16...
\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c5+! 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e3 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c7, Bielczyk-Kuczynski, Bydgoszcz
1990.

a3) 15 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}ad1 and then:

a31) 15...b4 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e2 (16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}a4! \pm
Magerramov) 16...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c5+ 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h1 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f6
= Rublevsky-Magerramov, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1991.

a32) 15...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f4 (16 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g5!?)
16...\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d8 17 a3 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f6 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e3 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d7 (not
obligatory) 19 \text{d}4! \text{f}6 20 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 \text{f}6 \pm Gormally-Kosten, British Ch (Scarborough) 1999.

a33) Interesting is 15...\text{xf}6!? 16 \text{g}5 (16 \text{d}3 \text{b}4 17 \text{a}4 \text{a}5 with strong counterplay, Boll-Van Oosterom, corr. 1991) 16...\text{xc}3 17 \text{xc}3 \text{a}5 with unclear consequences, Y.Hernandez-Martine del Campo, Havana 1993.

a34) 15...\text{d}8 16 \text{h}1 (16 \text{d}3 \text{h}8 =) and then:

a341) 16...\text{h}8 17 \text{g}5 \text{g}5 18 \text{g}x \text{f}6 and now:

a3411) 19 \text{e}5?! is met by 19...\text{dxe}5 with the point 20 \text{xd}8 \text{xd}8 21 \text{c}4 \text{h}6 22 \text{wh}4 \text{c}7! 23 \text{xf}6 \text{we}7.

a3412) 19 a3 transposes to note ‘b’ to White’s 16th move in Line B222 (=).

a3413) 19 a4?! \text{h}6 20 \text{w}d2 \text{b}4 (Magomedov-Magerramov, USSR 1991) 21 \text{e}2.

a3414) 19 \text{d}2!?! Magerramov.

a3415) 19 \text{d}4! \text{d}7 20 a4 ± Magomedov-Isaev, Dushanbe 1999.

a342) 16...\text{f}6 17 \text{g}5 \text{d}7 (or 17...\text{g}x \text{g}5 18 \text{g}x \text{g}5 \text{f}6 19 \text{e}5! ±) 18 \text{d}5!?. Now both 18...\text{c}8 19 \text{b}7 \text{w}x \text{b}7 20 \text{f}6 \text{xf}6 21 \text{xd}6 \text{h}5 22 \text{e}5 \text{c}7 23 \text{ed}1 \text{b}4, Magomedov-Magerramov, USSR Ch 1991, and 18...\text{xd}5(!) are probably satisfactory for Black.

b) 13 \text{w}x \text{g}7?! \text{g}8 14 \text{w}h6 0-0-0. Black has acquired a sustainable initiative on the kingside for the pawn. Some variations:

b1) 15 a3? d5!.

b2) 15 f3 \text{g}6 (15...b4!? 16 \text{d}2 (16 \text{h}4?! \text{g}4! 17 \text{xe}7 \text{c}5+ 18 \text{a}3 \text{xe}3 19 \text{h}1 \text{d}7 20 \text{e}8+ \text{c}7 \pm A.Pachmann-Cermak, corr. 1995; 16 \text{h}3 \text{b}8 - 15 \text{h}3 \text{b}8 16 f3 \text{g}6) 16...\text{dg}8 (16...b4!? 17 \text{e}2 \text{d}8 (17...\text{c}5+!? 18 \text{e}3 \text{h}5) 18 \text{d}3 \text{h}5 \text{f}4 \text{c}7 = Vavra-Kalod, Prague 1995.

b3) 15 \text{w}h3 \text{b}8 (15...\text{g}4?! 16 \text{a}5! Sutovsky) and then:

b31) 16 a3 and now 16...\text{g}6 17 \text{e}2 \text{dg}8 18 f3 transposes to line ‘b32’, while 16...h5!? is also possible.

b32) If 16 \text{w}d3 \text{g}6 17 f3 \text{dg}8 18 \text{e}2, then Black can play 18...\text{d}7! or 18...h5 19 \text{f}4 h4 20 \text{d}1 \text{h}5, Lupkowski-Warszawski, Brzeg Dolny 1995.

b33) 16 f3 \text{g}6 and now:

b331) 17 a3 \text{dg}8 18 \text{e}2 h5 and then:

b3311) 19 \text{e}3 - 17 \text{e}3 \text{dg}8 18 \text{e}2 h5 19 a3.

b3312) 19 \text{d}2 can be met by 19...\text{d}7!!, intending ...\text{e}5, Wanke-Hodges, corr. 1992. If instead 19...h4, 20 \text{w}x \text{h}4! is interesting.

b3313) 19 \text{h}1 \text{c}7 and now, instead of 20 \text{d}1? h4 21 \text{e}3 \text{h}5 22 \text{g}4 \text{w}d8 23 \text{d}2 \text{g}5 24 g3 f5? \text{K}.Georgiev-Ivanchuk, Tilburg 1993, Bönsch recommends 20 \text{f}4 or 20 \text{e}3.

b332) 17 \text{e}3 \text{dg}8 (17...h5 allows 18 a4!? b4 19 \text{e}2 \text{dg}8 20 \text{f}4, Klauner-Koenike, corr. 1991) 18 \text{e}2 h5 (18...\text{d}7? 19 \text{d}5! ± Ivanchuk-Polugayevsky, Monaco blindfold 1993; 18...b4!? 18...\text{d}8?! 19 a4 b4 20 \text{d}1 gives Black a choice between 20...d5 21 \text{f}4+ \text{a}8 22 \text{e}5 \text{d}7 = Krueger-Kissinger, corr. 1999, and 20...\text{a}8?) 19 \text{d}1 (19 a4?! b4 20 \text{a}2 Psakhis; after 19 a3 Black can play either 19...\text{c}7 or 19...\text{d}8 20 \text{h}1 h4 21 \text{g}1 \text{e}8!?, Kalod-Jirovsky, Czech U-16 Ch (Svetla) 1994) and now:
b3321) 19...\(\text{D}d7\) fails to 20 \(\text{D}d5\)!, Nijboer-Shneider, Ohrid Ech 2001.

b3322) 19...\(\text{W}c7\) can be met by 20 a4 b4 21 \(\text{Q}a2\) d5 22 e5 \(\text{Q}h7\)!? 23 \(\text{W}xh5 \text{Q}g5\) with compensation or 20 \(\text{Q}h1\) h4 21 \(\text{E}ed2 \text{Q}h5\) (Olivier-V.Gurevich, Cappelle la Grande 1999) 22 g4 \(\text{Q}f6\) 23 a3 with chances for both sides.

b3323) 19...\(\text{W}e8\)!? 20 a4 b4 21 \(\text{Q}a2\) e5! 22 \(\text{Q}xb4\) (22 \(\text{Q}c1\) a5! Sutovsky; 22 \(\text{E}ed2 \text{Q}c8\) 23 \(\text{W}h4 \approx \text{Psakhis}\)) 22...a5 23 \(\text{Q}d5\)!(23 \(\text{Q}d3 \text{Q}c8\) 24 \(\text{W}h4 \text{Q}g4 \approx \text{Nijboer-Sutovsky, Essen 2001}) 23...\(\text{Q}c8\) (23...\(\text{Q}xd5\)!! 24 \(\text{Q}xd5 \text{Q}c8\) 25 \(\text{W}xh5 \text{Q}h8\) 26 \(\text{Q}xh7 \text{W}xh7\) 27 \(\text{W}xh8 \text{Q}f6\) 28 \(\text{W}h6 \approx \text{Ftačnik}\)) 24 \(\text{Q}xf7\) \(\text{W}xf7\) 25 \(\text{W}xh5 \text{Q}h8\) 26 \(\text{W}xg5\) fxg5 27 \(\text{E}xd6 \text{Q}d8\) 28 \(\text{E}ed2 \approx \text{Psakhis}\).

We now return to 13 a3 (D):

The last big crossroad:

B221: 13...0-0 91
B222: 13...\(\text{E}d8\)?? 93

Other moves:

a) 13...\(\text{W}c5\) 14 \(\text{Q}e3 \text{W}h5\) 15 \(\text{f}3\) (15 \(\text{Q}f4 \text{W}c5\)) 15...0-0 16 \(\text{E}ad1\) (or 16 \(\text{Q}e2\)) 16...\(\text{E}ad8\) 17 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{W}e5\) 18 \(\text{W}xh5\) dxe5 19 \(\text{Q}c1 \pm \) Vrenego-G-Van der Stricht, Dutch Cht 1996.

b) 13...\(\text{W}c7\)?? has not been tested.

B221)

13...0-0 14 \(\text{Q}h6 \text{W}e8\)
14...\(\text{Q}h5\)!! 15 \(\text{W}g4 \text{W}c5\) 16 \(\text{E}ad1\)!!.

15 \(\text{E}ad1\)

15 \(\text{Q}g5 \text{Q}xg5\) 16 \(\text{W}xg5 \text{Q}f6\) (or 16...\(\text{h}6\)!! 17 \(\text{W}e3 \text{Q}f6\) 18 \(\text{E}ad1 \text{E}fd8 = \) Matsura-Mecking, Americana 1994) 17 \(\text{E}ad1 \text{E}fd8\) and...\(\text{W}c5 = (17...) \text{E}ad8\) transposes to note 'd2' to White's 14th move in Line B222, which is equal).

15...\(\text{E}d8\)

Other moves:

a) 15...\(\text{W}e7\) 16 \(\text{E}d3 \text{Q}f6\) 17 \(\text{Q}g5 \text{E}d8\) (17...\(\text{W}e7\) 18 \(\text{Q}xf6 \text{W}xf6\) 19 \(\text{f}4\)!) 18 \(\text{E}ed1 \text{Q}xg5\) 19 \(\text{W}xg5\) h6 20 \(\text{W}d2 \pm \) Shytrenkov-A.Petrosian, Sevastopol 1986.

b) 15...\(\text{Q}f6\) 16 \(\text{E}d3\) (16 \(\text{Q}f4 \text{Q}xc3\) 17 \(\text{bxc}3 \pm\) 16...\(\text{Q}e5\) 17 \(\text{f}4\) (17 \(\text{Q}f4\)) 17...\(\text{W}c5 + 18 \text{Q}h1 \text{Q}d4\) 19 \(\text{Q}d1\) is slightly better for White, Macieja-Mikulcik, Zlin 1995.

c) 15...a5 16 a4 b4 17 \(\text{Q}b5 \pm \) de la Riva-Lesiège, Parana jr Wch 1991.

d) 15...\(\text{Q}h8\) (slightly less reliable than 15...\(\text{E}d8\)) 16 \(\text{Q}g5\) (16 \(\text{Q}f4 \text{E}d8\) and now 17 \(\text{E}d3 \text{Q}f6\) 18 \(\text{Q}g5 \text{Q}h5\)!! 19 \(\text{W}h4 \text{Q}xg5\) 20 \(\text{W}xg5 \text{Q}f6\) transposes to 15...\(\text{E}d8\) 16 \(\text{E}d3 \text{Q}h8\) 17 \(\text{Q}g5 \text{Q}xg5\) 18 \(\text{W}xg5 \text{Q}f6\), while 17 \(\text{W}e3\) can be met by 17...\(\text{Q}d7 = \) or 17...\(\text{W}c7\)!) 16...\(\text{Q}xg5\) (16...\(\text{W}c7\) 17 \(\text{Q}xe7 \text{W}xe7\) 18 \(\text{E}d3 \text{E}c8\) 19 \(\text{E}ed1 \pm \) Macieja-Stypka, Polish Cht 1995) 17 \(\text{W}xg5\) \(\text{Q}f6\) (17...\(\text{Q}c8\) can be met by 18 a4 b4 19 \(\text{Q}a2\) {19 \(\text{Q}e2\)!!} 19...\(\text{Q}f6\) or 18 \(\text{W}f4\)!! \pm) and now:

d1) 18 \(\text{E}d3\) is the most popular move:

d11) 18...\(\text{W}c5\) 19 \(\text{W}d2\)!! \pm.

d12) 18...\(\text{Q}ac8\) 19 \(\text{W}d2 \text{E}fd8\) 20 \(\text{f}3\) h6 (20...\(\text{Q}d7\) transposes to the note to White's 20th move) 21 \(\text{Q}h1 \text{W}b6? \)
22 $\text{A}d1$ with an advantage for White, Sulskis-Nordahl, Gausdal 1995.

d13) 18...h6 19 $\text{W}d2$ (19 $\text{W}f4$ $\text{A}d8$ 20 f3 $\text{A}d7$) 19...$\text{A}fd8$ 20 f3 $\text{A}d7$ 21
$\text{A}d1$ $\text{A}d8$ 22 $\text{A}h1$ (22 $\text{W}f2$?! $\text{W}c5$ 23 $\text{O}e2$ with a minimal advantage for White, Emms-H.Olafsson, Hillerød 1995) 22...$\text{W}c7$ (22...$\text{W}g8$ 23 $\text{O}e2$ $\text{W}c7$
24 $\text{W}e3$ ± Dembo-Carstensen, Budapest 1999) and now, instead of playing 23 $\text{O}e2$?! d5!, as in Shtyrenkov-Titlianov, USSR 1987, 23 $\text{W}f4$ $\text{W}c6$ 24
$\text{W}g3$ a5 25 $\text{A}d4$ (∞ Dembo) or 23 $\text{W}e1$?! is interesting.

d14) 18...$\text{A}ad8$ transposes to the main line.

d2) 18 $\text{A}e3$!? has the point that
18...$\text{A}ad8$? is bad in view of 19 $\text{W}g3$!
$\text{W}g8$ 20 e5 $\text{O}e4$ (20...h6? 21 exf6 +–)
21 $\text{O}xe4$ $\text{W}xe4$ 22 $\text{A}e3$.

d3) 18 $\text{A}d4$?! ±.

16 $\text{A}d3$

Or: 16 $\text{O}e2$!? $\text{W}h8$ 17 $\text{d}d4$ $\text{W}c8$ 18
$\text{A}g5$ $\text{A}xg5$ 19 $\text{W}xg5$ $\text{O}f6$ with an acceptable
game, Garber-Freeman, Philadelphia 1991; 16 f3 transposes to
Line B222.

16...$\text{W}h8$

16...$\text{A}f6$?! 17 $\text{A}g5$ $\text{A}d7$ (17...$\text{A}xg5$
18 $\text{W}xg5$ $\text{O}f6$? 19 $\text{A}g3$ +–) 18 $\text{A}xf6$
$\text{A}xf6$ 19 f3 (19 $\text{A}f3$?; 19 $\text{W}h4$?!) 19...
$\text{A}fd8$ 20 $\text{A}ed1$ $\text{W}c5$+ = Ciemi-
niak-Skalik, Polish Ch (Bielsko-Biała)

17 $\text{A}g5$ $\text{A}xg5$ 18 $\text{W}xg5$ $\text{O}f6$ (D)

19 $\text{W}d2$

Other attempts:

a) 19 $\text{A}f3$ $\text{W}c5$ 20 $\text{O}d5$?! exd5 21
$\text{A}xf6$ dxe4! ∞ Velimirović-Tukmakov, Amsterdam 1974.

b) 19 f3 and now 19...$\text{W}c5$+ 20 $\text{W}e3$
$\text{A}d7$ 21 $\text{A}ed1$ $\text{A}fd8$ transposes to Line
B222. The alternative is 19...$\text{A}d7$!?

c) 19 $\text{W}e3$ a5 (19...$\text{A}d7$ is A.Soko-
lov’s suggestion; Black should avoid 19...$\text{W}c5$ 20 $\text{A}ed1$! and 19...$\text{A}d7$ 20
$\text{A}d5$!) 20 f3 $\text{A}d7$ 21 $\text{A}ed1$ $\text{O}c5$ 22
$\text{A}d4$ and White’s chances are possibly better, Vavra-Anapolsky, 1991.

d) 19 $\text{W}h4$ $\text{W}c5$ 20 $\text{A}ed1$ (20
$\text{A}ee3$?!) 20...a5 21 $\text{W}f4$ b4 22 $\text{A}a4$
$\text{W}c7$ 23 f3 $\text{A}c6$ = Halwick-Reichardt, corr. 1999.

e) 19 $\text{A}ee3$?! $\text{W}c5$ 20 $\text{W}h4$ (20 e5
h6!).

f) 19 $\text{A}g3$ $\text{A}g8$ and now:

f1) 20 $\text{W}f3$ $\text{W}c5$ 21 $\text{A}d5$?! $\text{O}xe4$!
22 $\text{W}xe4$ $\text{A}xd5$ is much better for
Black.

f2) 20 $\text{A}h3$ $\text{W}c5$ and now 21 $\text{W}h4$
a5?! (21...g5?!) or 21 $\text{W}f4$ $\text{W}e5$! with
a good game for Black.

f3) 20 $\text{W}h4$ a5 (20...$\text{W}c5$ 21 $\text{A}g5$
$\text{W}b6$ 22 $\text{A}e3$?) 21 $\text{A}g5$ (21 $\text{A}ee3$ b4
22 $\text{A}e2$ bxa3 23 bxa3 a4 ¼ Mowsz-
ziw-Sneider, Tallinn 1988) 21...b4
(21...a4?! 22 $\text{A}a2$ b4; 21...$\text{A}a6$?!) 22
AXB4 AXB4 23 $\text{A}a2$ $\text{W}b6$ (Hamdouchi-
James, Moscow OL 1994) 24 e5!.

g) 19 $\text{A}d4$?!

19...$\text{A}ed7$

19...$\text{W}b6$?! 20 $\text{A}d1$, Ki.Georgiev-
Ftačnik, Budapest Z 1993.

20 $\text{A}d1$
20 f3 \( \text{c}8!\) (20...\( \text{d}8\)! 21 \( \text{d}1 - 20 \text{d}1\) \( \text{fd}8\) 21 f3) 21 \( \text{d}1\) \( \text{e}8\) 22 \( \text{f}2\) = Dolmatov-Polugaevsky, Moscow TV 1987.

20...\( \text{d}8\)
20...\( \text{d}4\) 21 \( \text{c}4\) \( \text{d}4\) 22 f3 ±.

21 f3
White has some advantage:

a) 21...\( \text{c}7\) (with the idea of 22...d5)
22 \( \text{e}1\) (22 \( \text{e}3\) \( \text{c}5\) transposes to Line B222) 22...\( \text{g}8\) 23 \( \text{h}1\) \( \text{c}5\) 24 a4 (Golubev-Jirovsky, Hamburg 1999; 24 \( \text{e}2\)?) 24...b4 25 \( \text{e}2\) a5 26 \( \text{d}4\) \( \text{d}5\) 27 \( \text{e}3\).

b) 21...\( \text{c}5\)+ 22 \( \text{f}2\) (22 \( \text{h}1\)! with the idea of \( \text{d}4\)) 22...\( \text{g}8\) 23 \( \text{e}2\) \( \text{f}2+\) (23...\( \text{e}5\) 24 \( \text{d}4\) ± A.Sokolov-Portisch, Rotterdam 1989) 24 \( \text{xf}2\) ± Golubev-Zagorskis, Senden 1994.

c) 21...\( \text{g}8\) yields equality after 22
\( \text{e}2\) \( \text{c}5\)= = or 22 \( \text{f}2\) \( \text{c}7\) =, but White can try 22 \( \text{d}4\)? or 22 \( \text{h}1\)!?.

B222)
13...\( \text{d}8\)!? (D)

This move of Magerramov’s is aimed at transposing to positions similar to but slightly safer than the previous line.

14 f3
Other possibilities:

a) 14 \( \text{xg}7\)? \( \text{g}8\) 15 \( \text{h}6\) d5! 16 \( \text{f}3\) dxe4 ±.

b) After 14 \( \text{d}5\) exd5 15 exd5 \( \text{d}5\) 16 \( \text{xf}7\) \( \text{d}7\) 17 \( \text{g}4\)+ (17
\( \text{xf}7\) ? \( \text{de}8\)?) 17...\( \text{c}7\) (17...\( \text{e}8\)! 18
\( \text{h}6\)) 18 \( \text{xd}5\) \( \text{xd}5\) 19 \( \text{xe}7\)+ \( \text{b}8\)
20 \( \text{f}3\), White gets no more than a draw.

c) 14 a4!? b4 15 \( \text{d}5\) exd5 16
\( \text{xf}7\) \( \text{d}7\)! (D) doesn’t promise White any advantage either:

\( \text{xf}7\)!
(18
\( \text{xf}7\) ? \( \text{d}8\)!) 19 a5 \( \text{c}7\) 19
\( \text{xd}5\) \( \text{xd}5\) 20 \( \text{xe}5\)+ \( \text{b}8\) 21 \( \text{f}3\)?
\( \text{xf}3\) 22 \( \text{xf}3\) \( \text{e}8\)+ 23 \( \text{f}1\) a5!.

c) 17 a5 \( \text{c}5\) 18 exd5 and then:

13) 18...\( \text{d}5\) 19 \( \text{g}4\)+ \( \text{c}7\)! 20
\( \text{xd}5\) \( \text{xd}5\) 21 \( \text{xe}7\)+ \( \text{b}8\) 22 \( \text{xb}7\)+
(not 22 \( \text{f}3\)? \( \text{xf}3\) 23 \( \text{xf}3\) \( \text{g}8\)+ 24
\( \text{f}1\) \( \text{e}6\); 22 c4 bxc3 23 bxc3 \( \text{g}8\)
24 c4 \( \text{e}6\)?) 22...\( \text{xb}7\) 23 \( \text{d}4\) with
compensation.

c3) 18...\( \text{e}8\)! 19 \( \text{xf}7\) \( \text{de}8\) 20
\( \text{e}6\)+ (20 \( \text{e}3\)? \( \text{xd}5\)!; 20 \( \text{a}4\)?
\( \text{c}8\)!?) 20...\( \text{c}7\) 21 \( \text{e}3\) \( \text{b}5\) 22 \( \text{b}6\)+
\( \text{b}8\) 23 \( \text{a}4\) \( \text{xd}5\) (23...\( \text{c}4\)?) 24
\( \text{xd}5\) \( \text{xd}5\) 25 \( \text{xe}8\) \( \text{g}2\)! =.
d) 14 \text{g5} 0-0 and then:
\text{d1}) 15 \text{h6} \text{e8} 16 \text{ad1} (this is Line B221 but with White a tempo down) 16...\text{h8} 17 \text{g5} (17 \text{c1} \text{f6} 18 \text{d3} a5!) 17...\text{xf5} 18 \text{xf5} \text{f6}, etc.

\text{d2}) 15 \text{ad1} \text{h5} (15...a5!? 16 \text{h6} \text{e8} 17 \text{d3} \text{h8} 18 \text{g5} \text{xf5} 19 \text{xf5} \text{f6} has also been played) 16 \text{h4} \text{xf5} 17 \text{xf5} \text{f6} 18 \text{d3} h6 (18...\text{h8} transposes to Line B221; 18...\text{c5}?) 19 \text{h4} (19...\text{d2}!? is another idea) 19...\text{c5} 20 \text{f4} (20 \text{g3} \text{h7}!) 20...\text{d7} = \text{Kudrin-Browne, USA Ch (Modesto) 1995.}

14...0-0 (D)

\text{15 h6}

15 \text{e3} \text{d7} 16 \text{d4} \text{f6} 17 \text{xf6} \text{xf6} 18 \text{ad1} \text{d7} 19 \text{d2} \text{f8} 20 \text{ed1} \text{c5}+ 21 \text{h2} \text{f8} = \text{Lamoureux-Renet, French Ch (Nantes) 1993.}

15...\text{e8} 16 \text{ad1}

Or:

\text{a}) 16 \text{e2} \text{c5}+ 17 \text{h1} \text{f6} (17...\text{h8}!?) 18 c3 \text{e5} 19 f4 \text{xf6} 20 \text{d4} = \text{Shtyrenkov-Magerramov, Smolensk 1991.}

\text{b}) 16 \text{h1} \text{h8} (\text{Short’s 16...\text{f6} is simpler}) 17 \text{g5} \text{xf5} 18 \text{xf5} \text{f6} 19 \text{ad1} (19 a4!? b4 20 \text{d1}) 19...\text{d7} (19...\text{c5}?) 20 \text{d3} \text{f8} 21 \text{ed1} (21 a4!? 21...\text{c5} 22 \text{e3} (22 \text{d2}?!) 22...\text{g8}! with an equal position, Short-Kasparov, London PCA Wch (16) 1993.

16...\text{h8}

16...\text{f6} 17 \text{g5} (more interesting is 17 \text{d3}! a5 18 \text{g5}, \text{Kissinger-Krueger, corr. 1999}) 17...\text{xf5} 18 \text{xf5} \text{f6} 19 \text{d3} \text{c5}+ 20 \text{e3} (\text{Zapata-Mecking, San Jose do Rio Preto 1995}) 20...\text{d7} =.

17 \text{g5} \text{xf5}

17...\text{f6} 18 \text{h1} \text{h5} 19 \text{h4} \text{xf5} 20 \text{xf5} \text{f6} 21 \text{d4} h6 (\text{Van Blitterswijk-Rowson, Wijk aan Zee 2000}) 22 \text{d2} is slightly better for White.

18 \text{xf5} \text{f6}

Now Mirumian-Kaufman, Olomouc 1999 continued 19 \text{e3} \text{d7} (alternatively, 19...\text{c5} 20 \text{d3}) 20 \text{d3} \text{f8} 21 \text{ed1} \text{c5} 22 \text{e2}! \text{xe3}+ 23 \text{xe3} \text{g8} 24 a4, and Black still had some problems.

Generally speaking, White definitely appears to be more comfortable after 10 \text{g3} \text{c6} 11 \text{xc6} \text{xc6} 12 \text{e1} \text{b7}! 13 a3 but Black’s position has a reasonable safety margin. Alternatively, 13 \text{xf7}!? still seems to be risky for White.
7 5...a6 6 c4 e6 7 b3 bd7!

1 e4 c5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 f6 5 c3 a6 6 c4 e6 7 b3 bd7!

(D)

Having played 7 b3, White not only ensures a wide choice of further plans but, at the same time, introduces a certain delay, so that after 7...bd7 his most aggressive ideas do not work very effectively. Surely, 7...bd7 is the most important move.

We shall discuss the following separately:

A: 8 e2 96
B: 8 f4 97

Other moves:

a) 8 xe6?! fxe6 9 xe6 is dubious; e.g., 9 b6 10 e3 c5 11 xf8 xf8.

b) 8 g4 c5 9 f3? b5 10 g5? xe4! 11 xe4 b7 12 c6 wd7! +-.

c) 8 e3 c5 9 f3. I do not like this interpretation of the Sozin at all.

Here, I do not see any difficulties for Black after, for instance, 9...b5.

d) 8 0-0?! c5 and then:

d1) 9 e1?! (it is extremely important for Black to hide the king)
10 f3 (after 10 f4 0-0 11 f3, one of the good ideas is 11 wc7 12 e3 b5
- Gallagher) 10...0-0 11 g3 h8 (or
11...d7? 12 h6 e8 13 ad1? xb3 14 xb3 h4 = Gallagher) 12
g5 (12 f3?! d5!!), Re.Gonzalez-Herrera, Cuban Ch (Matanzas) 1997)
12...h6 (de Firmian-Ivanchuk, Lucerne
Wch 1989) 13 h3 g8 14 h4 d7 (Ivanchuk) with a good game.

d2) 9 f3? e7 10 g3 0-0 11
h6 e8, and bad is 12 ad1? xb3
13 xb3 h4 14 g4 f5, Magomedov-Dvoirys, Cheliabinsk 1991.

d3) 9...f4 will be discussed under
8 f4 c5 9 0-0 (note that the move
order here, 8 0-0 c5 9 f4, makes it possible to avoid the line 8 f4 b5?).

e) 8 g5 and then:

e1) 8...h6?! 9 h4 (9 xf6?!) 9...
a5 10 0-0 (10 d2 e7! or 10 f3
e7 11 e2 c5 12 0-0 d7 13
ad1 b5 14 e5 dx e5 15 xex5 b4 =
Ehlvest-Tal, Skellefteå World Cup
1989) 10...h5! = Ehlvest-Kasparov,
Skellefteå World Cup 1989.

e2) 8...c5 and now:

e21) 9 e2 - 8 e2 c5 9 g5.

e22) After 9 f3 e7, Black gets
a good game; e.g., 10 0-0 ad7 and
now 11 h4 c8 12 b1 b5, Gdanski-
Adorjan, Polanica Zdroj 1991, or 11
\[ \text{He1} \text{wc7 12 \text{b1} 0-0 13 g4 b5, Ivanović-Rashkovsky, Skopje 1991.} \]

9 f4 \text{e7} (9...b5!? 10 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 \text{wc7}, L. Steiner-Najdorf, Warsaw 1937). Now 10 \text{we2} transposes to Line A, and the idea 10 \text{wf3} \text{wc7} 11 0-0-0 b5 12 \text{xf6 xf6} 13 \text{f5 xb3+} 14 axb3 exf5 15 \text{d5 wb7} 16 exf5 0-0 (Istratescu-Akopian, Mamaia jr Wch 1991) 17 \text{xf6+ xg6} 18 \text{g4+ wh8} 19 \text{wh4 we7} 20 \text{He1 wd8} 21 g4 (Stoica/Istratescu) has not found followers.

\text{A)} 8 \text{we2} \text{c5 (D)}

8...b5 9 \text{g5 c5} – 8...\text{c5} 9 \text{g5 b5.}

9 \text{g5}

9 g4 is worth mentioning:

a) It is probably premature to play 9...d5 in view of 10 \text{g5!}, Borkowski-Kr.Georgiev, St John 1988.

b) 9...g6!? (Marin/Stoica) is quite good.

c) Also good is 9...b5 10 g5 \text{fd7} (10...b4?!); e.g., 11 \text{d5} (11 \text{d5}?! \text{b7}?!; 11 f4 \text{b7}!; 11 f3 \text{b7} 12 \text{h4 b4} 13 \text{d1 wc7} 14 \text{e3 xb3} 15 axb3 d5 16 exd5 \text{c5} 17 dxex6 \text{e5 with compensation, Rigo-Balinov, Austrian Cht 1995/6}) 11...exd5! (less convincing is 11...\text{b7} 12 \text{xb7 xb7} 13 a4) 12 \text{c6 wb6} 13 exd5+ \text{e5} 14 f4 \text{g4} 15 \text{e3} (Fierro-Bruzon, Havana 1997) and now 15...\text{cd3}+!? is at least sufficient.

9...\text{e7}

9...h6?!; 9...b5 10 \text{d5}!, Velimirović-Bertok, Yugoslavia 1974.

10 f4

10 0-0-0 \text{fxe4}! 11 \text{xe7 xc3} 12 \text{xd8 xe2}+ 13 \text{xe2 xd8} 14 \text{xd6+} is slightly better for Black.

10...\text{b6}

This is still the main move but it is not necessary to create weaknesses in the kingside. After 10...0-0 11 0-0-0 \text{wc7} Black is OK in the following examples:

a) 12 \text{b1 b5} (12...h6 13 h4) 13 e5 dxe5 14 fxe5 \text{e8} 15 \text{d5 b7}, Dobos-Baburin, Györ 1990.

b) 12 g4 b5 13 \text{xf6 xf6} 14 g5 \text{e7}, Veröci-Wang Pin, Subotica wom IZ 1991.

c) 12 h4 \text{e8} (12...b5?! 13 e5 \text{e8}) 13 g4 b5 14 e5 (14 \text{xf6 xf6} 15 g5 \text{d8}!?, Boros-Purtov, Zalakaros 1992) 14...dxe5 15 fxe5 \text{fd7} 16 \text{xe7 xe7}, Sax-Dao, Balatonbereny 1996.

11 \text{xf6}

Not 11 \text{h4}? \text{fxe4}!.

11...\text{xf6} 12 0-0-0 \text{wc7}

Or:

a) 12...\text{xb3+} 13 axb3 \text{w5} 14 \text{b1 cd7} 15 g4 (15 \text{He1}?! 0-0-0 16 e5 dxe5 17 dxe5 \text{e7}) 15...0-0-0 16 h4 \text{b8} with chances for both sides, S.Farago-Mas, Budapest 1997.

b) 12...\text{d7} and now:

b1) 13 \text{b1 wc7} – 12...\text{wc7} 13 \text{b1 d7}.
b2) Interesting is 13 e5 dxe5 14 fxe5 \( \mathcal{g}5+ \) 15 \( \mathcal{b1} \) \( \mathcal{c}7 \) 16 \( \mathcal{e}4? \) (16 h4 \( \mathcal{f}4! \); 16 \( \mathcal{h}f1? \)) 16...\( \mathcal{w}xe5! \) 17 \( \mathcal{x}c5 \) \( \mathcal{w}xc5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{xe}6! \) \( \mathcal{xe}6 \) 19 \( \mathcal{xe}6 \) \( \mathcal{fxe} \) 20 \( \mathcal{w}xe6+ \) \( \mathcal{w}e7 \) 21 \( \mathcal{w}f5 \) \( \mathcal{w}f7 \) 22 \( \mathcal{w}c5 \) \( \mathcal{w}e7 \) 23 \( \mathcal{w}h6 \) \( \mathcal{h}f8 \) 24 \( \mathcal{w}c7 \) \( \mathcal{h}8 \) Krogh-Hutters, Denmark 1992.

13 \( \mathcal{h}e1 \)

Other moves:

a) 13 \( \mathcal{b}1 \) \( \mathcal{d}7 \) (not 13...b5?! 14 \( \mathcal{d}xb5! \) axb5 15 \( \mathcal{d}xb5 \) \( \mathcal{w}a5 \) 16 \( \mathcal{d}xd6+ \) \( \mathcal{w}e7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{c}4! \), Balinov-Nagel, Austria 1993) and then:

1) 14 \( \mathcal{h}h1 \) 0-0-0! (unsafe for Black is 14...0-0 15 g4!, as in Pilnik-Rubinetti, Argentine (Ch Buenos Aires) 1972) 15 e5 \( \mathcal{h}e7 = \mathcal{b} = \) Balac-Padea, Khania 1989.

a2) 14 g4. Now 14...b5?! is inaccurate due to 15 a3 \( \mathcal{d}xb3 \) (15...0-0-0 16 \( \mathcal{a}2 \) 16 \( \mathcal{x}b3 \) \( \mathcal{g}8 \) 17 h4 \pm Istratescu-Votava, Rishon-le-Zion 1991. Black should play 14...g5!? or 14...0-0-0, when White can choose between 15 f5?! and 15 h4 (Marin/Stoica).

b) 13 g4?! \( \mathcal{d}7 \) 14 h4 0-0-0 15 \( \mathcal{w}f2 \) (15 \( \mathcal{b}1 \) Marin/Stoica; 15 \( \mathcal{f}3 \) \( \mathcal{b}8 \) 16 g5 \( \mathcal{d}xd4 \) 17 \( \mathcal{x}d4 \) \( \mathcal{e}6 \) gives Black a satisfactory game, S. Farago-Roehrich, Budapest 1995) 15...b5 16 g5 \( \mathcal{h}7 \) 17 a3 \( \mathcal{b}6 \) 18 \( \mathcal{a}2 \) a5 with a good game for Black, A. Kovačević-Tringov, Arandjelovac 1993.

13...0-0

13...\( \mathcal{d}7 \) is more cautious. For example, 14 \( \mathcal{b}1 \) transposes to 13 \( \mathcal{b}1 \) \( \mathcal{d}7 \) 14 \( \mathcal{h}e1 \).

14 g4

After 14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5, 15...\( \mathcal{e}7 \) gives Black a good game, Medvegy-Zhu Chen, Erevan won OL 1996. Less convincing is 15...\( \mathcal{g}5+ \) 16 \( \mathcal{b}1 \) b5 17 h4!? \( \mathcal{x}h4 \) 18 \( \mathcal{h}1 \) with compensation, Golubev-Serebrjanik, Novy Bečej 1991.

14...b5 15 g5? \( \mathcal{h}xg5 \) 16 e5 dxe5 17 \( \mathcal{f}x e5 \) \( \mathcal{h}e7 \) 18 \( \mathcal{w}h5 \) \( \mathcal{d}8 \)

Possibly Black can maintain the balance after 19 \( \mathcal{e}4 \) (or 19 \( \mathcal{e}3 \) g6 20 \( \mathcal{w}h6 \) \( \mathcal{f}8 \) 21 \( \mathcal{x}g5 \) \( \mathcal{b}7 \) Serebrjanik) 19...\( \mathcal{e}4 \) 20 \( \mathcal{e}x e4 \) 20 \( \mathcal{e}x e4 \) g6 21 \( \mathcal{w}h6 \) a5 22 \( \mathcal{d}3 \) \( \mathcal{f}8 \), Mitkov-Serebrjanik, Vrnjačka Banja 1991.

B)

8 f4

This is White’s main choice.

8...\( \mathcal{c}5 \) (D)

Black usually plays this. Alternatively:

a) 8...\( \mathcal{w}c7 \) is possible:

1) 9 f5 \( \mathcal{c}5 - 8...\( \mathcal{c}5 \) 9 f5 \( \mathcal{w}c7 \).

a2) 9 0-0 and then: 9...b5 8...b5 9 0-0 \( \mathcal{c}7 \) 9...\( \mathcal{c}5 \) 8...\( \mathcal{c}5 \) 9 0-0 \( \mathcal{c}7 \).

b) 8...b5?! is possibly no worse than the main continuation:

b1) 9 f5 \( \mathcal{c}5 \) transposes to Line B32 (9...e5 is weaker in view of 10 \( \mathcal{c}6 ! \) – Fischer).

b2) After 9 \( \mathcal{e}3 \), it is a good idea to play 9...\( \mathcal{b}7 \) (see 7...b5 8 f4 \( \mathcal{b}7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{e}3 \) \( \mathcal{b}d7 \) !).

b3) 9 0-0 and then:

b31) 9...\( \mathcal{c}5 \) – 8...\( \mathcal{c}5 \) 9 0-0 b5.

b32) 9...b4 10 \( \mathcal{a}4 \) (10 \( \mathcal{d}5 ? ! \) exd5 11 \( \mathcal{e}d5 \) \( \mathcal{e}7 \) 12 \( \mathcal{e}e1 \) \( \mathcal{b}8 \) 10...\( \mathcal{b}7 \) (10...\( \mathcal{e}e4 \) 11 f5!), and now:

b321) 11 f5 e5 12 \( \mathcal{e}6 \) fxe6 13 fxe6 \( \mathcal{h}8 \) is hard to assess.

b322) 11 \( \mathcal{e}3 \) ! – 7...b5 8 f4 \( \mathcal{b}7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{e}3 \) \( \mathcal{b}d7 \) 10 0-0 b4 11 \( \mathcal{a}4 \).

b33) 9...\( \mathcal{w}c7 \) is less logical than 9...\( \mathcal{b}7 \). White may proceed with 10 \( \mathcal{e}1 \) \( \mathcal{c}5 \) 11 e5 or 10 f5 e5 11 \( \mathcal{d}2 \).

b34) 9...\( \mathcal{b}7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{a}1 \) (10 f5 e5! and 10 \( \mathcal{e}3 \) \( \mathcal{c}8 \) result in lines that
are advantageous for Black) 10...\(\mathcal{Q}c5\) 11 \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) and here 11...\(\mathcal{W}c8\), or even 11...exd5 12 exd5+ \(\mathcal{Q}d7\) 13 b4 \(\mathcal{W}c8\)!, as in the game Hoogendoorn-Bosch, Dutch Cht 2000/1, appears satisfactory for Black.

\[\text{Diagram:}\]

\(W\)

At this point there are four interesting moves:

- **B1**: 9 0-0 98
- **B2**: 9 e5 101
- **B3**: 9 f5 105
- **B4**: 9 \(\mathcal{W}f3\) 114

9 \(\mathcal{Q}e3\) has also occurred:

a) 9...b5 10 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 \(\mathcal{Q}fd7\) (11...\(\mathcal{Q}xb3\) transposes to the Classical Sozin – Line C2 of Chapter 8) 12 0-0 (12 \(\mathcal{W}f3\) \(\mathcal{Q}b7\) 13 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) \(\mathcal{Q}f3\) Jaracz-Jasnikowski, Polish Ch (Cetniewo) 1991; after 12 \(\mathcal{W}e2\), 12...\(\mathcal{Q}b7\) 13 0-0-0 \(\mathcal{W}c7\) is good for Black) 12...\(\mathcal{Q}b7\) 13 \(\mathcal{W}h5\) (13 \(\mathcal{W}xf7\) \(\mathcal{W}xf7\) 14 \(\mathcal{W}f1+\) \(\mathcal{Q}e8\) looks dubious for White) 13...g6 14 \(\mathcal{W}h3\) \(\mathcal{W}e7!\) Schach-Archiv.

b) 9...\(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 10 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 \(\mathcal{Q}fd7\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}h5\) 0-0 (12...\(\mathcal{W}g6?!\) 13 \(\mathcal{W}e2\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe5\) 14 0-0-0 \(\mathcal{W}c7\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}h6!\), Velimirović-Wojtkiewicz, Palma de Mallorca 1989) 13 0-0-0 \(\mathcal{W}a5\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}f4\) \(\mathcal{W}f4\) Lejlić-Grilc, Bled 1993.

c) The likelihood is that the simple 9...\(\mathcal{Q}xe4!\) 10 \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) favours Black; e.g., 11 0-0 \(\mathcal{Q}f6?!\) or 11 \(\mathcal{W}f3\) \(\mathcal{Q}c5?!\). The optimistic recommendation of Mikhalchishin (1991), 11 f5?! with the ideas 11...\(\mathcal{W}h5\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}h6\) (?! 13 \(\mathcal{W}g4\) and 11...\(\mathcal{W}h4\) 12 \(\mathcal{Q}f1\) \(\mathcal{Q}g3\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}g1\), has not yet found followers.

**B1**

9 0-0

Now:

- **B11**: 9...\(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 99
- **B12**: 9...\(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 100

There are two other possibilities:

a) 9...b5 10 e5! (10 f5?! – 9 f5 b5 10 0-0) 10...dxe5 11 fxe5 \(\mathcal{Q}xb3\) (this position may also arise from the Classical Sozin) 12 axb3 \(\mathcal{Q}c5\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}e3\) \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) 14 \(\mathcal{W}f3!\) 0-0 15 \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) \(\mathcal{W}xd5\) (not 15...exd5? 16 \(\mathcal{Q}c6\) ± Gheorghiu-Basman, Hastings 1967) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xd5\) exd5 17 b4 ± Mikhalchishin-Ubilava, Kubişhev 1986. I am not sure that White has serious winning chances.

b) 9...\(\mathcal{W}c7?!\) and now:

- **b1**: 10 f5?! e5.
- **b2**: 10 \(\mathcal{Q}e3!\) can be answered by 10...\(\mathcal{Q}cxe4?!\) or 10...b5?!.

b) 10 e5?! dxe5 11 fxe5 \(\mathcal{W}xe5\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}e1\) \(\mathcal{W}c7\) (12...\(\mathcal{W}d6?!\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}g5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xb3\) (and not 13...\(\mathcal{Q}e7?!\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}f5!\), as in Vavra-Votava, Czech Ch (Luhaćovice) 1993).

- **b4**: 10 \(\mathcal{W}f3\) – 9 \(\mathcal{W}f3\) \(\mathcal{W}c7\) 10 0-0.

b5) 10 \(\mathcal{W}e2!\) \(\mathcal{Q}e7\) (10...b5? 11 e5) 11 e5 (11 \(\mathcal{W}h1\) 0-0 12 e5 \(\mathcal{Q}fd7!\); 11 g4?!) and then 11...\(\mathcal{Q}xb3\) 12 axb3 dxe5 13 fxe5 \(\mathcal{Q}c5\) 14 exf6 \(\mathcal{Q}xd4+\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}h1\) with compensation, Caruso-Pentinen, Tallinn 1991, or 11...dxe5 12 fxe5 \(\mathcal{Q}fd7\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}f4\) 0-0, when White
may play 14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h1 or 14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3 (14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)ad1 b5 15 \( \text{\textbullet} \)d5 exd5 16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xd5 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e6! is very unclear, Tkaczkyk-Rogaliewicz, corr. 1994).

B11)

9...\( \text{\textbullet} \)e7 (D)

![Chess Diagram]

W

10 e5

Or:

a) 10 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3!? – 9 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e7 10 0-0.

b) 10 f5 – 9 f5 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e7 10 0-0.

c) 10 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e3 \( \text{\textbullet} \)c7 (10...\( \text{\textbullet} \)fxe4??) 11 e5 (11 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3 – 9 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e7 10 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e3 \( \text{\textbullet} \)c7?? 11 0-0??) 11...dxe5 12 fxe5 \( \text{\textbullet} \)x e5 13 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f5 (a beautiful but dubious idea) 13...\( \text{\textbullet} \)g4! 14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)d6+ \( \text{\textbullet} \)xd6 (14...\( \text{\textbullet} \)xd6??) 15 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f4 \( \text{\textbullet} \)d3! 15 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xg4 0-0 0 16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h6 (better is 16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)ad1!? – Peng Zhaoqin) 16...\( \text{\textbullet} \)e5 17 \( \text{\textbullet} \)ae1 f5! = Velimirović-Peng Zhaoqin, Pozarevac 1995.

10...dxe5

10...\( \text{\textbullet} \)fxe4 11 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe4 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe4 12 c3! ±.

11 \( \text{\textbullet} \)fxe5 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xb3

11...\( \text{\textbullet} \)fd7 and then:

a) 12 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xf7?? \( \text{\textbullet} \)xf7 13 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe6 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe6 14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe6+ \( \text{\textbullet} \)e8 -- Sandler.

b) 12 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h5 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f6! (12...g6 13 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e2 ± Gi.Hernandez-Browne, Linares (Mexico) 1994; 12...0-0 13 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3!? Minasian) and now 13 \( \text{\textbullet} \)d1 \( \text{\textbullet} \)fd7 repeats,

Sandler-Danailov, Adelaide 1990. Instead, both 13 exf6 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xd4+ 14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h1 gxf6! (Sandler) and 13 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xf6 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xd4+!? 14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f2 0-0 15 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f4 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xb3 16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)d1 \( \text{\textbullet} \)b4! are unconvincing for White.

c) 12 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e2!?.

d) 12 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f4!? transposes to note ‘a1’ to Black’s 11th move in Line B21.

12 axb3 \( \text{\textbullet} \)c5 13 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e3 \( \text{\textbullet} \)d5 14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f2!

14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3 0-0 15 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xd5 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xd5 16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xd5 exd5 = Kunze-Stohl, Munich 1992.

After the text-move (14 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f2), White enjoys some advantage:

a) 14...0-0 15 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e4 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e7 16 c4 (16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3 f6 = Rogers-Dao, Erevan OL 1996; 16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)g4 f5 Shipov) 16...\( \text{\textbullet} \)f4 17 \( \text{\textbullet} \)g4 \( \text{\textbullet} \)g6 (17...\( \text{\textbullet} \)d3 18 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3!? Shipov), and now:

a1) 18 \( \text{\textbullet} \)ad1 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe5 19 \( \text{\textbullet} \)g3 (19 \( \text{\textbullet} \)wh5 \( \text{\textbullet} \)a5 20 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e1 \( \text{\textbullet} \)c7 21 \( \text{\textbullet} \)g3 f6 22 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h1 b5! Shipov) 19...\( \text{\textbullet} \)c7 (19...\( \text{\textbullet} \)d7??) 20 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e3 f6 21 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h6 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f7 22 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f4 \( \text{\textbullet} \)d7 = Velimirović-Shipov, Belgrade-Moscow 1998.

a2) An attempt to improve is 18 \( \text{\textbullet} \)f3!? \( \text{\textbullet} \)c7 (18...f5??) 19 \( \text{\textbullet} \)ad1 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe5 20 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe5 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe5 21 \( \text{\textbullet} \)d4 h5 (or 21...f5 22 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe5 fxg4 23 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xf8+) 22 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e2 \( \text{\textbullet} \)a5 23 \( \text{\textbullet} \)c3 \( \text{\textbullet} \)b6+ 24 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h1 e5 25 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xh5 f6 (Shipov) 26 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xe5!.

b) 14...\( \text{\textbullet} \)xc3 15 bxc3 and then:

b1) 15...\( \text{\textbullet} \)c7 and here:

b11) 16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h5 0-0 (or 16...\( \text{\textbullet} \)d7 17 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h4!) 17 \( \text{\textbullet} \)ae1 (17 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h4!?) 17...\( \text{\textbullet} \)d7 18 \( \text{\textbullet} \)e4 f5! with a good game, Arakhamia-Ftačnik, Sydney 1991.

b12) 16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)g4 0-0 17 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h4 (17 \( \text{\textbullet} \)ae1!? is better) 17...\( \text{\textbullet} \)xe5 18 \( \text{\textbullet} \)ae1 \( \text{\textbullet} \)xd4+ 19 cxd4 f5!, and Black holds on, Velimirović-Aleksić, Yugoslav Cht 1992.

b2) 15...0-0 0 16 \( \text{\textbullet} \)h5 (other possibilities are 16 b4!?) {Ftačnik} and 16
\[\text{Wg4} 16...\text{e7} 17 \text{Ad1 Wc7} 18 \text{d3 g6} 19 \text{We2 with a slight advantage for White, Gdanski-Rötsagov, Manila OL 1992.}\]

**B12)**

9...\(\text{dxe4}\)

Or 9...\(\text{cxe4}\).

10 \(\text{dxe4} \text{dxe4} 11 f5 e5! 12 Wh5!}\)

(D)

Other moves are dubious for White:

12 \(\text{We2 f6}\); 12 \(\text{f3 f6!}\); 12 \(\text{d6 Wb6+!}\) 13 \(\text{h1 fxe6!} 14 \text{Wh5+ Ad8}\) 15 \(\text{g5+ Ac7!}\) 16 fxe6 \(\text{xf2+}\) (or 16...\(\text{exe6!}\) 17 \(\text{exe6} \text{xf2+} 18 \text{xf2 xf2}\) \(\text{xf2}\) Marin/Stoica) 17 \(\text{xf2 xf2}\) 18 \(\text{we8}\) (18 e7 \(\text{d7}\) ), and White cannot get real compensation after, for example, 18...\(\text{Wf5!}\) ?.

\[\text{B}\]

This is an amazingly rich and very unclear position.

12...\(\text{We7}\)

The most uncompromising continuation, but nobody knows whether it is the best. 12...\(\text{b6?!} 13 \text{xf7+ Ad8 14 c3! exd4 15 Ael (Stoica) and 12...Ac7?}\) 13 \(\text{d6}\) have been unsuccessful.

The alternative is 12...d5!? 13 \(\text{d1}\) (13 \(\text{f3?! d6?!}\); 13 \(\text{e6?! dxe4} 14 \text{f6x6 Wb6+!}; 13 \text{f4?! exf4!} 14 \text{Ae1}\) \(\text{f6}\) 15 c3 \(\text{c5}\) and Black wins, Aстраханцев-Stoica, Romanian Cht 1970) 13...\(\text{c5!} 14 \text{xf4, and then:\}

a) 14...\(0-0\) 15 \(\text{g4!}\) (15 \(\text{h4?! dxf5!}\) T; 15 \(\text{g5 Wb6}\) ) 15...\(\text{xd4+}\) 16 \(\text{h1}\) offers substantial compensation for White:

a1) 16...\(\text{h8}\) 17 \(\text{xd5! Wxd5}\) 18 \(\text{h4 xf5}\) 19 \(\text{xf5 g6}\) 20 \(\text{f6+ Aa8}\) 21 \(\text{xh4 +.}\)

a2) 16...\(g6\) and now, rather than 17 \(\text{fxg6}\) \(\text{fxg6}\) 18 \(\text{Ag6+ hXg6 =, maybe}\) 17 c3 is stronger.

a3) 16...\(e4\) 17 \(\text{g5}\) is dangerous for Black according to Stoica’s analysis; e.g., 17...\(\text{d7}\) (17...\(\text{f6}\) 18 \(\text{Wh6!}\) ±) 18 \(\text{f1 b5}\) (18...\(\text{g6}\) 19 \(\text{g3! Wb5}\) 20 \(\text{d1}\) ) 19 \(\text{gf4}\) 16...\(\text{g6}\) (19...\(\text{f6}\) 20 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{wc5}\) 21 \(\text{h4!}; 19...\(\text{xb2}\) 20 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{wc6}\) 21 \(\text{f6}\) ) 20 \(\text{f6}\) \(\text{hxg6}\) 21 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{c5}\) 22 \(\text{xd5!}\).

b) 14...\(\text{xd4+}\) and then:

b1) 15 \(\text{h1}\) \(\text{xf6!}\) (15...\(0-0\) 16 \(\text{h4!}\) \(\text{xf5}\) 17 \(\text{xd4!? g6}\) 18 \(\text{g4}\) ) 16 \(\text{e6}\) (not 16 \(\text{xd5?! xf5}\) 17 \(\text{g5 g6}\) ) 16...\(\text{xf5}\) (16...\(\text{xf5}\) 17 c3 is unclear) 17 \(\text{xf5}\) 18 c3 =.

b2) 15 \(\text{e3}\) 0-0 (15...\(\text{xb2}\) is hazardous for Black) 16 \(\text{xd4}\) (16 \(\text{xd4?}\) \(\text{dxe4}\) 17 \(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{b6}\) 18 \(\text{h1}\) \(\text{h6}\) ) 16...\(\text{xd4}\) 17 \(\text{xd4}\). Black is no worse: 17...\(\text{f6}\) (17...\(\text{e8}\)? [Short] 18 \(\text{f6}\) \(\text{e4}\) 19 c3 \(\text{xd4?!}\) ) 18 \(\text{c5}\) (18 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{h8}\) I.Rogers; 18 \(\text{xf3}\) \(\text{h8}\) 19 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{wc7}\) ) Kavalek) 18...\(\text{e8}\) ! 19 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{h8}\), Topalov-Short, Amsterdam 1996.

b3) 15 \(\text{xd4}?\) \(\text{b6}\) ! (15...\(\text{exd4}\) 16 \(\text{g5}\) ) 16 c3! (16 \(\text{g5}\) 0-0 17 \(\text{f6}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 18 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{g4}\) ) 16 \(\text{a4+? f8}\) 17 \(\text{fxd4+}\) 18 \(\text{h1}\) \(\text{h6}\) ) 16...\(\text{xd4}\) (16...0-0 17 \(\text{xe3}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 18 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{h6}\) 19 \(\text{xf6!}\) \(\text{gxh6}\) 20 \(\text{xf1}\) Stoica) 17 \(\text{we2+}\). White has compensation:
b31) 17...\textit{d}8 18 \textit{e}5 \textit{d}xc3+ (alternatively, 18...\textit{d}7 19 \textit{w}g7 \textit{d}xc3+ 20 \textit{a}h1 \textit{e}8 21 \textit{g}5+ \textit{e}8 22 \textit{w}xc3+ \textit{w}c7 23 \textit{d}d2 \textit{c}6 24 \textit{c}c1) 19 \textit{e}3 \textit{w}6?! 20 \textit{e}xd5 \textit{e}8 (20...\textit{w}f6 21 \textit{g}5!!) 21 \textit{d}d4 is analysis by Stoica. b32) 17...\textit{f}8 18 \textit{e}5!! (Stoica and Stanciu) 18...\textit{w}f6 (another possibility is 18...\textit{d}7 19 \textit{c}xd4! \textit{e}8 20 \textit{f}4 with compensation) 19 \textit{w}xd5 (or maybe 19 \textit{w}xf6?!) 19...\textit{h}6! 20 \textit{f}4 \textit{xf}5 with very unclear play (Stoica).

13 \textit{w}f3!

13...\textit{e}3 14 \textit{w}f3 \textit{c}7 \mp.

13...\textit{d}5

If 13...\textit{d}6, then 14 \textit{g}5! (rather than 14 ...\textit{a}4+?! \textit{d}8 15 \textit{d}d2 \textit{w}c7). Stoica and Marin suggested 13...\textit{w}h4? 14 \textit{a}4+ \textit{d}8 15 \textit{c}c6+ \textit{c}7 16 \textit{b}b4 \textit{f}6.

14 \textit{c}c6

14...gxf6 15 ...\textit{c}6 \textit{c}7 16 \textit{w}xf6 \textit{xb}3 17 \textit{w}xh8 \textit{x}c1!.

14...\textit{w}c7 15 \textit{d}d5

15 \textit{b}4 \textit{xb}3 16 \textit{xb}3 \textit{b}5 17 ...\textit{d}5 \textit{w}c6 18 \textit{f}6 \textit{b}7! \mp is given by Topalov.

After the text-move (15 ...\textit{d}5) the situation is rather complex:

a) 15...\textit{d}7 16 \textit{b}4 \textit{e}7 (16...\textit{a}5? 17 \textit{e}f7+! \textit{xf}7 18 ...\textit{d}5 \mp Kasparov), and now attention should be paid to 17 \textit{e}f7+! \textit{xf}7 18 ...\textit{d}5 \textit{w}d8 19 \textit{b}4 \textit{a}4 (19...\textit{h}5 20 \textit{w}h5+ and 21 \textit{f}6) 20 \textit{w}h5+ \textit{g}8 21 \textit{f}6 \textit{xf}6 (21...\textit{gx}f6 22 \textit{g}5!) 22 \textit{g}5 \textit{e}8 23 \textit{h}3! – Stoica/Marin.

b) 15...\textit{e}7? and now 16 \textit{e}f7+?! \textit{xf}7 17 \textit{w}h5+ \textit{g}8 18 \textit{w}e8+ (18 \textit{f}6 \textit{gx}f6 19 \textit{w}e8+ \textit{g}7!) 18...\textit{f}8 19 \textit{e}6! favours Black, but 16 \textit{xe}7 \textit{w}xe7 17 \textit{e}3! is better.

c) 15...\textit{a}5 16 \textit{g}5 (16 ...\textit{e}3 \textit{a}6 17 \textit{d}d4 is dubious, TV viewers-Kasparov, Spain 1991 – although the game later turned in the viewers’ favour) 16...\textit{d}7 (16...\textit{a}6? 17 \textit{d}8! \pm Topalov-Kasparov, Amsterdam 1996) 17 ...\textit{d}7 (17 ...\textit{f}6? g6 18 ...\textit{d}7 demands attention, Areshchenko-Averianov, Ukrainian jr Ch (Kiev) 1999), and Stoica gives 17...\textit{xe}7! (17...\textit{f}6? 18 \textit{w}h5+! \textit{d}8! 19 \textit{g}6 \textit{e}8 20 \textit{e}3! with an initiative) 18 ...\textit{xe}7 (18 ...\textit{f}6 \textit{d}6! 19 ...\textit{xe}6! 20 ...\textit{g}7 \textit{g}8) 18...\textit{f}6! 19 ...\textit{g}4 \textit{e}6!, with unclear play.

B2)

9 e5 (D)

This thrust can give Black practical worries but, generally speaking, it appears to be poorly prepared.

B21: 9...\textit{d}xe5 101

B22: 9...\textit{d}fd7!? 104

The only other possibility is 9...\textit{d}e4 10 \textit{d}xe4 \textit{d}xe4 11 0-0 \pm.

B21)

9...\textit{d}xe5 10 \textit{f}xe5 \textit{d}fd7!

A weaker line is 10...\textit{d}b3 11 \textit{a}xb3: 11...\textit{d}d5 12 0-0 (12 ...\textit{g}4?! Pugachov) 12...\textit{d}c3 (12...\textit{e}7 13 ...\textit{g}4 g6 14 ...\textit{h}6 \pm Rublevsky – Har-Zvi, Oakham...
1992) 13 bxc3 \( \text{d}5 \) 14 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \pm \) or
11...\( \text{c}5 \) 12 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 13 \( \text{xe}6! \) \( \pm \)

11 \( \text{f}4 \)
11 \( \text{e}2? \) \( \text{h}4+ \).

11...\( \text{b}5! \)

Other moves:

a) 11...\( \text{e}7?! \) is risky for Black:
   a1) 12 0-0 with chances for both sides:

   a11) 12...0-0?! 13 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 14 \( \text{xf}6 \)
   \( \text{xd}4+ \) 15 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 16 \( \text{ad}1 \) is much better for White, Mowsziszian-Anastasion, Erevan 1987.

   a12) 12...\( \text{b}5! \)? is an interesting idea, Gdanski-Pieniazek, Slupsk 1992. The
   point is 13 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 14 \( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{xb}3+ \).

   a13) 12...\( \text{f}8 \) 13 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) (but
   not 13...\( \text{xd}4+?! \) 14 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 15 \( \text{xf}7+ \) \( \text{d}8 \) 16 \( \text{ad}1+ \) \( \text{fd}7 \) 17 \( \text{d}4 \)
   14 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 15 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \pm \) Borulia-Yezersky, Karvina 1992/3.

   a2) 12 \( \text{h}5 \) should probably be met
   by 12...g6?!, since 12...\( \text{f}8?! \) (Velimirović-Ninov, Ulcinj 1998) 13 \( \text{i}5! \)
   (Burgess) is good for White.

   a3) 12 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 13 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 14 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 15 \( \text{d}1 \) b5 16 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \pm \) Gi.Hernandez-Nedobora, Benasque 1993.

   a4) 12 \( \text{g}4?! \) \( \pm \) g5 (12...g6 looks
   good for White) 13 \( \text{xe}6! \) (13 \( \text{g}3 \) h5
   14 \( \text{e}2 \) h4 is unclear) 13...\( \text{xe}6 \) (or
   13...\text{fxe6} 14 \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{f}8 \) 15 0-0 \( \text{g}7 \) 16 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xf}7 \) 17 \( \text{f}7+ \) \( \text{g}8 \) 18 \( \text{f}5!) \)
   14 \( \text{xe}6 \), with an advantage after both
   14...\( \text{xf}4 \) 15 \( \text{xf}7+! \) (Vavra-Golod,
   Ostrava 1993) and 14...\text{fxe6} 15 \( \text{h}5+ \)
   \( \text{f}8 \) 16 0-0 \( \text{g}7 \) 17 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 18 \( \text{xf}7 \)
   \( \text{g}8 \) 19 \( \text{af}1 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 20 \( \text{e}4 \) h6
   21 \( \text{f}6+ \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 22 \( \text{xf}6 \)

   b) 11...g5 and now:

   b1) 12 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{xe}6 \) 13 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{gxf}4 \) 14 \( \text{xf}7+ \) (14 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 15 \( \text{xe}6 \)
   16 \( \text{h}8 \) f3! Sokolov) 14...\( \text{xf}7 \) 15 \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{g}7 \) ensures Black a draw,

   b2) Therefore, 12 \( \text{g}3! \) h5 13 h4
   \( \text{g}7 \) 14 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 15 \( \text{f}4 \) is stronger,

   c) 11...\( \text{xb}3 \) 12 \( \text{axb}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 13 \( \text{e}4 \)
   \( \pm \) Mikhailchishin-Stangl, Dortmund 1991.

   d) 11...g6 12 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 13 0-0-0?!
   \( \text{xe}5 \) (13...\( \text{e}7 \) 14 \( \text{he}1 \) 0-0 15 h4!
   has also occurred) 14 \( \text{h}6! \) gives
   White a serious initiative for the pawn;
   e.g., 14...b5 15 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 16 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{xc}3 \)
   17 bxc3 \( \text{b}7 \) 18 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 19 \( \text{d}5! \),

12 \( \text{e}2 \)

12 \( \text{g}4 \) h5! (12...\( \text{b}7 \) 13 0-0-0 is
   unclear) 13 \( \text{g}3 \) h4 14 \( \text{g}4 \), and now:

   a) 14...g5?! 15 0-0-0!, and now both
   15...\( \text{e}7 \) 16 \( \text{c}6! \) \( \text{xb}3+ \) 17 axb3
   \( \text{c}5 \) 18 \( \text{e}4! \) \( \text{xc}6 \) 19 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 20
   \( \text{d}6! \), Short-Kasparov, London PCA
   Wch (8) 1993, and 15...\text{xf4} 16 \( \text{xe}6 \)
   (for example, 16...\( \text{xe}6 \) 17 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{e}7 \)
   18 \( \text{xd}7+ \) \( \text{xd}7 \) 19 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{a}7 \) 20
   \( \text{he}1 \) are dangerous for Black. After
   15...\( \text{h}6 \) (Kasparov) 16 \( \text{e}3! \) White
   also preserves his attacking chances:
   16...\( \text{xe}5 \) 17 \( \text{c}6 \) or 16...\( \text{b}7 \) 17 \( \text{f}3 \)
   (P.H.Nielsen).

   b) 14...h3!? (Short) has not been
   tested.

   c) 14...\( \text{f}6 \) 15 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 16 \( \text{g}7 \)
   \( \text{w} \) 17 \( \text{e}2 \) (\( \pm \) Hübner) 17...\( \text{e}7 \)
   18 \( \text{e}5 \) f6 19 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{xb}3 \) 20 axb3 e5 21
   \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 22 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 23 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{f}7 \)

12...\( \text{b}7 \)

Possibly 12...\( \text{h}4+ \) 13 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}3 \) (as
in Figlio-Frost, corr. 2000) deserves
some attention.
13 0-0-0 (D)

13 0-0!? b4 14 Qa4 Qxb3 15 axb3 Qc5 16 Qad1 Qxa4 17 bxa4 Qc5 (Zapolskis-Slekys, Mariampole 1992) 18 Qh1 (Zapolskis).

This position is hard to play for both sides. The white pieces are concentrated in the centre and Black should be very careful. However, if Black manages to squirm out of his adversary’s threats, then in five to ten moves the e5-pawn might develop into a real weakness.

13...Qb6

Or:

a) 13...Qc7?! 14 Qg4 g6 15 Qh6!.

b) 13...Qa5 is a risky but interesting move:

   b1) 14 a3 Qxb3+ 15 Qxb3 Qc7 16 Qhf1 is equal, Reefat-Wojtkiewicz, Dhaka 1999.

   b2) 14 Qhe1 leads to unclear play after 14...Qc8 or even 14...b4!?

   b3) Schach-Archiv suggests 14 Qg5?! b4 (or 14...h6 15 Qxe6 hxg5 16 Qxg5) 15 Qa4 with the variations 15...Qxa4 16 Qxe6 fxe6 17 Qxe6 Qac5 18 Qg4!+-- and 15...Qxb3+ 16 axb3 Qxe5 17 Qd2 followed by Qhe1.

   b4) 14 Qhf1 and here:

      b41) 14...Qe7?! 15 Qg4 g6 (15...g5 16 Qxg5 and now either 16...Qxe5 17 f4 Qxg5 18 Qxg5 b4 19 Qd5! or 16...Qg8 17 Qxe6!) 16 Qh6! (16 Qg3 Qb6 is unclear) 16...Qxe5 (16...b4 is risky due to 17 Qxf7!?; e.g., 17...Qxf7 18 Qxe6+ Qe8 19 Qxd7+ Qxd7 20 Qe6 or 17...Qxc3 18 Qxe7+ Qxe7 19 Qxe6 with the point 19...Qb6 20 Qg5+ Qe8 21 Qxd7+ Qxd7 22 Qxb5 Qxe5 23 Qb4 +++) 17 Qf4 b4 (Vavra-Ftačník, Czech Cht 1994/5) and now Ftačník gives 18 Qcb5! Qed3+ 19 cxd4 Qxb3+ 20 Qxb3 Qxb5 21 Qxf7+ Qd7 22 d4 with an attack.

      b42) 14...Qxb3+!? 15 Qxb3 (15 cxb3 – Gallagher; 15 axb3?!) 15...Qc7 16 Qd4 (16 Qe4) 16...Qc5 = Motwani-Pigott, British Ch (Plymouth) 1989.

      b43) 14...b4!? is interesting; e.g., 15 Qd5 Qxd5 16 Qxd5 exd5 17 e6 Qf6 18 e7 Qce4!, Vavra-V.Popov, Pardubice 2000.

   c) 13...Qc7 14 Qhf1 b4 and now 15 Qa4 Qxb3+ 16 axb3 transposes to line ‘d’, while 15 Qd5 Qxb3+ 16 Qxb3 Qxd5 17 Qxd5 exd5 18 e6 Qd6 19 exd7+ Qf8 20 Qg4 is not clear.

   d) 13...b4?! 14 Qa4 Qxb3+ 15 axb3 Qc7 16 Qhf1 (16 Qhe1!?) and now:

      d1) 16...Qe7?! 17 Qf5.

      d2) 16...g6? 17 Qg5!, Kobaliya-Verner, Moscow 1995.

      d3) 16...Qc8!? and then: 17 Qf5 exf5 18 e6 Qxc2+!; 17 Qd2 Qc5 18 Qxc5 Qxc5 19 Qf5? exf5 20 e6 Qe7 21 Qd7 Qxe6; 17 Qb1 Qc5 – 16...Qc5 17 Qb1 Qc8!?.

      d4) 16...Qc5 and here:

      d41) 17 Qf5?! exf5 18 e6 Qxb3+ 19 Qb1 Qc6 20 Qb6?! (Emms-A.Petrosian, London 1991) 20...fxe6? ≠ A.Petrosian.
d42) 17 \( \text{\textbf{g}}5 \text{\textbf{e}}4!? \).

d43) 17 \text{\textbf{b}}1 \text{\textbf{c}}8!? (17...\text{\textbf{x}}a4 18 \text{\textbf{x}}a4 \text{\textbf{c}}5 19 \text{\textbf{w}}g4 0-0-0 and now 20 \text{\textbf{g}}3 was unclear in Riegler-Osterman, Slovenian Ch 1992, but maybe 20 \text{\textbf{b}}3?! is stronger still) 18 \text{\textbf{f}}5 \text{\textbf{x}}f5 (18...\text{\textbf{x}}a4!?) 19 e6 \text{\textbf{w}}e7!? (19...\text{\textbf{w}}c6 20 \text{\textbf{x}}f7+ \text{\textbf{w}}x7 21 \text{\textbf{d}}xc5 \text{\textbf{d}}xc5 22 \text{\textbf{w}}c4+) 20 \text{\textbf{x}}xc5 \text{\textbf{d}}xc5 21 \text{\textbf{d}}d7 \text{\textbf{w}}xe6 22 \text{\textbf{w}}xe6+ \text{\textbf{f}}xe6 23 \text{\textbf{d}}xb7 g5.

14 \text{\textbf{h}}f1

Other options are:

a) 14 \text{\textbf{b}}1 \text{\textbf{e}}7 15 h4 and now:

a1) 15...0-0-0 16 \text{\textbf{a}}3 (according to Ftačnik, the line 16 \text{\textbf{h}}f1 b4 17 \text{\textbf{a}}a4 \text{\textbf{x}}a4 18 \text{\textbf{a}}x4 \text{\textbf{c}}5 19 \text{\textbf{b}}3 \text{\textbf{d}}xd4 20 \text{\textbf{d}}xd4 \text{\textbf{e}}xb3 21 \text{\textbf{c}}4+ \text{\textbf{c}}c5 is unclear) 16...\text{\textbf{b}}8 17 \text{\textbf{e}}3 \text{\textbf{c}}6 18 \text{\textbf{a}}2 \text{\textbf{d}}xd4 19 \text{\textbf{d}}xd4 \text{\textbf{w}}c6 was roughly equal in Topalov-Anand, Wijk aan Zee 1996.

a2) 15...0-0! and now Topalov assesses both 16 \text{\textbf{g}}5 \text{\textbf{e}}ae8 and 16 \text{\textbf{w}}g4 \text{\textbf{h}}8 as ‘?’.

b) 14 \text{\textbf{h}}el!? \text{\textbf{e}}7 15 \text{\textbf{w}}g4 g5 (or 15...g6 16 \text{\textbf{h}}6) 16 \text{\textbf{g}}3 h5 17 \text{\textbf{w}}e2 with very unclear play, Macieja-Kaminski, Polish Ch (Lubniewice) 1994.

14...\text{\textbf{c}}7 15 \text{\textbf{w}}g4 \text{\textbf{g}}6

The alternative 15...g5 16 \text{\textbf{x}}g5 \text{\textbf{g}}8 17 h4 \text{\textbf{e}}x5 18 \text{\textbf{f}}4 gives White an advantage, Oral-Tkebuchava, Mlada Boleslav 1994.

16 \text{\textbf{h}}6!?.

Topalov gave this as unclear. For example, 16...\text{\textbf{x}}e5 17 \text{\textbf{f}}4 f6 18 \text{\textbf{g}}7 0-0-0 (Yu Ting-Wang Pin, Hei Bei wom Z 2001) 19 \text{\textbf{d}}xf6.

B22)

9...\text{\textbf{f}}d7!? (D)

This move differs in principle from 9...dxe5. Black endeavours to obtain a position with a greater safety margin.

10 exd6

Scarcely justified is 10 \text{\textbf{e}}3 dxe5 11 fxe5 \text{\textbf{x}}e5 12 \text{\textbf{h}}5 \text{\textbf{d}}6!? or 10 f5 \text{\textbf{x}}e5 11 0-0 (11 fxe6 \text{\textbf{h}}4+) 11...\text{\textbf{e}}7 (11...exf5!!) 12 fxe6 fxe6.

10...\text{\textbf{f}}6! 11 \text{\textbf{e}}3

11 \text{\textbf{w}}e2 \text{\textbf{x}}d6 12 \text{\textbf{f}}5 0-0 13 \text{\textbf{x}}d6 \text{\textbf{x}}d6 is good for Black, Velimirović-Popović, Belgrade 1998.

11...\text{\textbf{d}}xd6! 12 \text{\textbf{w}}f3 0-0

12...\text{\textbf{w}}c7 13 0-0-0 \text{\textbf{d}}7 (or 12...\text{\textbf{d}}7 13 0-0-0 \text{\textbf{c}}7), and then:

a) An approximately equal game can be obtained after 14 \text{\textbf{h}}el 0-0-0 (14...\text{\textbf{x}}b3+ 15 axb3 0-0-0 16 \text{\textbf{b}}1 e5!? Moiseev) 15 h3 \text{\textbf{b}}8 16 \text{\textbf{b}}1 h5!, Vavra-Timoshenko, Topolcianky 1994.

b) 14 \text{\textbf{b}}1 0-0!? (14...0-0-0 15 g4 \text{\textbf{x}}xb3 16 cxb3 \text{\textbf{c}}6 17 \text{\textbf{x}}c6 \text{\textbf{w}}xc6 18 \text{\textbf{w}}e2 {Gallagher} 18...\text{\textbf{w}}b8!? 15 g4 \text{\textbf{x}}xb3 (Saulin-Shipov, Moscow 1995) 16 axb3 \text{\textbf{f}}e8! = 17 g5 \text{\textbf{d}}5 (Shipov).

c) 14 g4!? 0-0-0 15 g5 \text{\textbf{x}}xb3+ 16 axb3 \text{\textbf{d}}5 17 \text{\textbf{x}}d5 exd5, and now 18 \text{\textbf{d}}3, as in Florean-Bekker Jensen, Hallsberg 1997, preserves a slight advantage for White.

13 0-0-0 \text{\textbf{w}}c7

Otherwise:

a) 13...e5? 14 fxe5 \text{\textbf{g}}4 15 \text{\textbf{g}}3 +. 
b) 13...\(\text{\texttt{b}xb3+} \) 14 axb3 (14 \(\text{\texttt{b}xb3} \) \(\text{\texttt{w}c7} \) 15 \(\text{\texttt{e}exd6} \) \(\text{\texttt{w}xd6} \) 16 \(\text{\texttt{c}c5} \) \(\text{\texttt{w}c7} \) 17 \(\text{\texttt{xf}xf8} \) \(\text{\texttt{xf}xf8} \) 18 \(\text{\texttt{d}d1} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}d7} \) = Morozevich-Mukhtadinov, Moscow 1992) 14...\(\text{\texttt{w}c7} \) (14...\(\text{\texttt{a}a5?!} \) 15 \(\text{\texttt{b}b1} \) \(\text{\texttt{b}b4} \) T.Thorhallsson-Van Wely, Akureyri 1994) and now:

b1) Nothing is achieved by continuing 15 f5 exf5 16 \(\text{\texttt{x}xf5} \) \(\text{\texttt{e}e5} \) 17 \(\text{\texttt{d}d4} \) \(\text{\texttt{xd}4}! \) 18 \(\text{\texttt{xd}4} \) \(\text{\texttt{w}e5} \), Lopez-Gongora, Cuba 1996.

b2) 15 \(\text{\texttt{d}d1} \) is better.

b3) 15 g4?! is interesting: 15...b5?! 16 \(\text{\texttt{w}xa8} \) \(\text{\texttt{b}b7} \) 17 \(\text{\texttt{w}a7} \) \(\text{\texttt{c}c5} \) (17...\(\text{\texttt{a}a8} \)? 18 \(\text{\texttt{d}xe6} \) 18 \(\text{\texttt{d}xex6} \) \(\text{\texttt{xa}7} \) 19 \(\text{\texttt{d}xc7} \) \(\text{\texttt{xe}3}+ \) 20 \(\text{\texttt{b}b1} \) \(\text{\texttt{xe}1h} \) 21 \(\text{\texttt{xe}1h} \) \(\text{\texttt{xf}4} \) 22 \(\text{\texttt{d}xa6} \) \(\text{\texttt{x}xg4} \) 23 h3 (Kobaliya-Sadvakasov, Gala Galdana jr Wch 1996) 23...\(\text{\texttt{d}d2} \) 24 \(\text{\texttt{d}xf2} \) 24 \(\text{\texttt{d}xf1} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}xd3} \) 25 \(\text{\texttt{d}f3} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}e8} \) 26 \(\text{\texttt{d}c5} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}d6} \) 27 \(\text{\texttt{d}e4} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}g1} \) 28 \(\text{\texttt{d}f1} \) \(\text{\texttt{h}h2} \) (Gallagher) 29 \(\text{\texttt{d}xb5} \).

14 g4?

Probably 14 \(\text{\texttt{b}b1} \) is better as it prevents 14...b5? in view of 15 \(\text{\texttt{w}xa8} \) \(\text{\texttt{b}b7} \) 16 \(\text{\texttt{a}a7} \) \(\text{\texttt{a}a8} \) 17 \(\text{\texttt{d}xb5} \) ++. Instead, 14...\(\text{\texttt{d}d7} \) transposes to note 'b' to Black’s 12th move.

14...b5!

14...\(\text{\texttt{d}d7} \) 15 g5 ±.

15 \(\text{\texttt{h}hf1} \)

15 \(\text{\texttt{w}xa8} \) \(\text{\texttt{b}b7} \) 16 \(\text{\texttt{a}a7} \) \(\text{\texttt{a}a8} \) ±.

15...\(\text{\texttt{b}b7} \) 16 \(\text{\texttt{d}h3} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}d8} \)

After 17 g5 \(\text{\texttt{d}d4} \) 18 f5 (Bezgodov-Solodovnichenko, Ukrainian open Ch (Alushta) 1999), Black's position must be close to winning; for example, 18...\(\text{\texttt{d}xb3}+? \) 19 axb3 exf5 20 \(\text{\texttt{xf}xf5} \) \(\text{\texttt{xc}c3} \) 21 \(\text{\texttt{d}xd6} \) \(\text{\texttt{e}e4} \).

**B3)**

**9 f5 (D)**

For a long time it was believed that 9 f5 discredited the entire plan of

7...\(\text{\texttt{d}d7} \) owing to the game Fischer-Bednarski (9...\(\text{\texttt{f}xe4?} \)) and the variation suggested by Fischer (9...\(\text{\texttt{e}e7} \) 10 \(\text{\texttt{d}f3} \) 0-0 11 \(\text{\texttt{d}e}3 \) d5 12 exd5 \(\text{\texttt{d}xb3} \) 13 \(\text{\texttt{d}xb3} \) exd5 14 0-0-0 0—0—0). Nowadays it is clear that Black has a great number of sufficiently reliable alternatives.

**B31**: 9...\(\text{\texttt{e}e7} \) 106

**B32**: 9...b5?! 112

The other continuations are:

a) 9...\(\text{\texttt{f}xe4?} \) 10 fxe6! ± Fischer-Bednarski, Havana OL 1966.

b) 9...exf5?! has not been played.

c) 9...e5 (this is probably premature) 10 \(\text{\texttt{d}d2} \) and then:

1) 10...h6 11 \(\text{\texttt{g}g3!} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}d7} \) 12 \(\text{\texttt{h}h5} \) ± Cirić-Bogdanović, Kraljevo 1967.

2) 10...b5 11 \(\text{\texttt{g}g5}!\).

3) After 10...\(\text{\texttt{e}e7}?! \), 11 0-0 transposes to 9...\(\text{\texttt{e}e7} \) 10 0-0 0-0 11 \(\text{\texttt{d}de2} \), while 11 \(\text{\texttt{g}g3} \) h5 and 11 \(\text{\texttt{e}e3} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}xb3} \), followed by 12...b5, are unclear.

4) 10...\(\text{\texttt{d}xb3} \) 11 axb3 and then:

41) 11...\(\text{\texttt{f}f6} \) 12 \(\text{\texttt{g}g5!} \).

42) 11...h6 12 \(\text{\texttt{g}g3!} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}d7} \) 13 \(\text{\texttt{h}h5} \) \(\text{\texttt{d}xh5} \) 14 \(\text{\texttt{x}xh5} \) \(\text{\texttt{c}c6} \) 15 \(\text{\texttt{e}e3} \) ± Zapata-Fedorowicz, Philadelphia 1993.

43) 11...b5 12 \(\text{\texttt{g}g5} \) \(\text{\texttt{b}b7} \) ±. Now 13 0-0?! is inaccurate due to 13...\(\text{\texttt{b}b6}+! \), 13 \(\text{\texttt{g}g3} \) and 13 \(\text{\texttt{xf}6}?! \) are better.
c44) 11...d5 12 ♗g5 (12 ♗xd5?!) 12...d4 13 ♗xf6 gxf6 14 ♗d5 ♗d7 (Siegro-Gonzalez-Vilela, Santa Clara 1983) 15 ♗g3! ♗c6 16 c4 ± Polugayevsky.

d) 9...♗c7?! occurs very rarely, although 10 0-0 (!9 0-0?! ♗c7?! 10 f5) and 10 ♗f3 (–9 ♗f3 ♗c7 10 f5) both appear quite good for Black. 10 fx6 fx6 doesn’t seem bad for Black either; e.g., 11 0-0 ♗e7 or 11 ♗f3 ♗e7.

e) 9...♗d7?! is another interesting move. 10 fx6 fx6 11 0-0 ♗e7 is good for Black. After 10 ♗f3, 10...b5 transposes to Line B41 and 10...e5 11 ♗de2 ♗c6 deserves attention. After 10 0-0, besides 10...b5 and 10...♗e7, there is also 10...e5?! followed by 11...♗c6.

B31)
9...♗e7 10 ♗f3

Instead:

a) 10 fx6 proves premature. After 10...fx6 11 0-0, Black has a pleasant choice between 11...♗xb3! 12 axb3 0-0, Akopian-Ivanchuk, Erevan 1989, and 11...♗d7?! with good play for Black, Grünfeld-Wojtkiewicz, Palma de Mallorca 1989.

b) 10 0-0 is quite popular (and harmless!):

b1) 10...♗xb3?! 11 axb3 0-0 (11...e5 12 ♗de2 b5 13 ♗g5! – 10...e5 11 ♗de2 b5 12 ♗g5 ♗xb3 13 axb3) 12 ♗f3! (not wholly clear is 12 ♗e2 ♗d7 13 g4 e5 14 ♗f3 ♗xg4 15 ♗d5, Shytrenkov-Dvoiry, Budapest 1991) – 10 ♗f3 0-0 11 0-0 ♗xb3 12 axb3.

b2) 10...♗d7?! is an good option:

b21) 11 fx6 fx6 12 ♗g5 b5 transposes to note ‘b3’ to White’s 11th move in Line B32 (=).

b22) 11 ♗g5 b5!? (11...0-0 is also satisfactory) 12 ♗f3 transposes to note ‘b’ to White’s 12th move in Line B41.

b23) 11 ♗e2 0-0 – 10...0-0 11 ♗e2 ♗d7.

b24) 11 ♗f3 and now: 11...b5 – 9...b5 10 f5 ♗d7 11 0-0 ♗e7; 11...0-0 – 10 ♗f3 0-0 11 0-0 ♗d7?; 11...e5?! 12 ♗de2 ♗c6 13 ♗d5 is unclear.

b3) 10...e5 11 ♗de2 and then:

b31) 11...h6 12 ♗e3?! ♗xb3 13 axb3 0-0 14 ♗g3 b5 15 ♗h5 with an advantage for White, Anand-King, Calcutta 1992.

b32) 11...♗d7?! 12 ♗g3? (White should try 12 ♗e3?! 12...h5! 13 ♗g5 h4 14 ♗xf6 (Sluka-Shytrenkov, Pardubice 1997) 14...♖hxg3! ⊕ (e.g., 15 ♗xe7 ♗b6 16 ♗d5 ♗xe4+! and mate in two).

b33) 11...b5 12 ♗g5 b4!? (12...♗xb3 13 ♗xb3 ♗b7 14 ♗xf6 ♗xf6 15 ♗d5 0-0 16 b4!, Istratescu-Vasiesiu, Romanian Ch (Bucharest) 1994, and 12...0-0 13 ♗xf6, Istratescu-Genov, Mangalia 1992, both favour White) 13 ♗xf6 ♗xf6 14 ♗xf7+(14 ♗d5 ♗b8 15 ♗c6+ ♗f8 16 ♗d5 ♗xe4 ⊕ Ninov/Kostakiev; 14 ♗d5!? ♗xe4 15 ♗d4 is interesting; for example, 15...♗d7 16 ♗xe6) 14...♗xf7 15 ♗d5+ ♗e8 16 ♗xa8 bxc3 (Telbis-Ninov, corr. 1994) 17 b4! ♗a4 18 ♗xc3 with unclear play (Gallagher).

b4) 10...0-0 11 fx6 (11 ♗f3?! – 10 ♗f3 0-0 11 0-0; 11 ♗e2 is inaccurate; e.g., 11...e5?! 12 ♗f3 ♗xb3! 13 axb3 h6, Cirić-Bogdanović, Titograd 1965, or 11...♗d7 12 fx6 fx6 13 ♗f5 b5 14 a3 ♗xb3, etc., J.Polgar-Wojtkiewicz, Budapest Z 1993) 11...fxe6 12 ♗f5 (otherwise Black has not a shadow of a problem), and then:
b41) 12...\( \text{Q} \text{fxe4?!} \) 13 \( \text{W} \text{g4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf5} \) 14
\( \text{W} \text{xf5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xc3?!} \) 15 \( \text{W} \text{f7+} \) \( \text{Q} \text{h8} \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} 
\text{+-} \).

b42) 12...\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{xe7+} \) \( \text{W} \text{xe7} \)
14 \( \text{axb3} \) and then:

b421) 14...\( \text{Q} \text{d7} \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{f4!} \) (15 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \)
\( \text{Q} \text{c6 =} \) 15...\( \text{e5} \) (15...d5!??) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) ±
Istratescu-Gutkin, Biel open 1993, with the point 16...\( \text{Q} \text{e6} \)
17 \( \text{Q} \text{d5!} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xd5} \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \).

b422) 14...\( \text{h6} \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{d7} \) (another idea is 15...\( \text{e5} \)!!?) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{f4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{g3} \)
\( \text{Q} \text{c6} \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{ad1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{ad8} \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{h4!} \) with better chances for White, Vlad-Ceteras, Bucharest 1992.

b423) 14...b5 15 \( \text{Q} \text{f4} \) (15 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) may come to the same thing after 15...\( \text{Q} \text{b7} 
16 \( \text{Q} \text{d4} \) \( \text{e5} \)!!? 17 \( \text{Q} \text{d3} \)) 15...\( \text{e5} \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \)
\( \text{Q} \text{b7} \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{d3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{d6} \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{x6f} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) 19
\( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) 20 \( \text{Q} \text{d5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{h4} \) with good chances for a draw, German-Kasparov, Buenos Aires simul 1997.

b43) 12...b5 and then:

b431) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{f4?!} \) \( \text{Q} \text{fxe4!} \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{xe4} \)
(14 \( \text{g4} \) is met by 14...\( \text{Q} \text{xf5!} \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{xf5} \)
\( \text{Q} \text{xc3} \)) 14...\( \text{Q} \text{xf5!} \) – Gallagher.

b432) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) b4?! (13...\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) is liable to transpose to line ‘b423’) 14
\( \text{Q} \text{xe7+} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xe7} \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d5} \) (15 \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} 
16 \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{d5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{d8} \) !) Topalov)
15...\( \text{exd5} \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) \( \text{Q} \text{gx6} \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{xd5+} \)
\( \text{Q} \text{e6} \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{xa8} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xa8} \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{d4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{e8} \) with chances for both sides, S.Nikolov-

b5) 10...b5?! is an interesting possibility.

We now return to 10 \( \text{W} \text{f3} \) (D):

10...0-0

This is logical, but nevertheless Black has several alternatives:
a) 10...\( \text{W} \text{a5} \) is interesting.
b) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{d7?!} \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{e3!} \) (11 0-0 – 10
0-0 \( \text{Q} \text{d7} \) 11 \( \text{W} \text{f3} \)), with interesting play:

b1) 11...b5?! 12 \( \text{fxe6} \) \( \text{fxe6} \) transposes to note ‘e1’ after Black’s 11th
move in Line B32.

b2) 11...\( \text{Q} \text{c8} \) 12 g4!?.

b3) 11...0-0 – 10...0-0 11 \( \text{Q} \text{e3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{d7} \).

b4) 11...\( \text{W} \text{c7} \) 12 g4!? e5 (Black can also continue 12...\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \)!!?) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \)
\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 14 \( \text{axb3} \) (14 \( \text{cxb3} \)!!?) 14...\( \text{Q} \text{c6} \)
15 0-0 (Vombek-Balinov, Austrian Ch 1995/6) 15...\( \text{h6} \) – Gallagher.

b5) 11...\( \text{e5} \) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) (12...\( \text{Q} \text{c6} 
13 \( \text{Q} \text{xc5} \)!) 13 \( \text{axb3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{c6} \) 14 0-0-0 (14
0-0 \( \text{h5} \)!!?) 14...\( \text{h6} \)!!? 15 g4 \( \text{b5} \) with great complications, Anka-Purtov, Budapest
1993.

c) 10...\( \text{W} \text{c7} \) and then:

c1) 11 g4 \( \text{d5} \)!!?.

c2) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) Gallagher.

c3) 11 0-0-0 \( \text{e5} \)!!? 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 13
\( \text{axb3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) \( \text{b7} \)!!?.

c4) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{e3} \) \( \text{e5} \)!!? (11...\( \text{b5} \) 12 \( \text{fxe6} 
\( \text{e5} \) \( \text{b7} \) 14 \( \text{h3} \) ± Goloschavov-Zso.Polgar, Pardubice 1995; better is 11...\( \text{d7} \) – 10...\( \text{d7} \)!!? 11 \( \text{Q} \text{e3} \)
\( \text{W} \text{c7} \), or 11...0-0– 10...0-0 11 \( \text{Q} \text{e3} 
\( \text{W} \text{c7} \) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 13 \( \text{axb3} \) (13 \( \text{cxb3} 
b5 14 \( \text{Q} \text{e1} \) \( \text{b7} \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} 
\( \text{dxf6} \) 17 0-0-0 ± Martens-Boriss, Santiago jr Wch Wch 1990) 13...\( \text{d7} \) (or 13...\( \text{h6} 
14 \( \text{g4} \)!!?) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) with an advantage, Magomedov-Mahmud, Doha 1992.
d) 10...e5 11 \( \text{Q} \)de2 and then:
   d1) 11...\( \text{W} \)a5 12 \( \text{Q} \)d2 (12 \( \text{Q} \)d5 \( \text{Q} \)xd5 13 exd5 b5 \( \text{Q} \) 12...\( \text{Q} \)xb3 13 cxb3 b5 14 \( \text{Q} \)d5 (14 g4 b4 15 g5 \( \text{Q} \) 14...\( \text{W} \)d8 15 \( \text{Q} \)xe7 \( \text{W} \)xe7 16 \( \text{Q} \)g5 \( \text{A} \)b7 17 \( \text{Q} \)g3 h6 18 \( \text{Q} \)xf6?! (18 \( \text{Q} \)h4! is stronger) 18...\( \text{W} \)xf6 is fine for Black, Volta-
   d2) 11...\( \text{A} \)d7 and now 12 \( \text{A} \)g5!? (Veličković) or 12 \( \text{A} \)e3 – 10...\( \text{A} \)d7 11
   \( \text{A} \)e3 e5 12 \( \text{Q} \)de2.
   d3) 11...\( \text{Q} \)xb3 12 axb3 b5 13 \( \text{Q} \)g5 \( \text{A} \)b7 14 \( \text{Q} \)xf6 \( \text{Q} \)xf6 15 0-0-0-0?! (15 0-0
   0-0 transposes to note ‘b21’ to White’s 11th move) 15...0-0 16 \( \text{Q} \)d5 a5 17
   \( \text{Q} \)ec3 a4 18 b4 a3 19 b3 turned out to be better for White in Mortensen-
   Browne, Reykjavik 1990.

11 \( \text{A} \)e3

11 g4 is quite well met by 11...\( \text{Q} \)fd7 followed by ...\( \text{Q} \)e5, while 11...d5 12
   exd5 e5! might be even stronger.

   The better-known alternative is 11
   0-0-0, and then:

   a) After 11...\( \text{W} \)h8, 12 g4 \( \text{Q} \)fd7 13
   \( \text{A} \)e3 \( \text{Q} \)e5 afforded Black good counterplay in Honfi-Vogt, Trnava 1982,
   but 12 \( \text{A} \)e3 and 12 \( \text{A} \)g5 are probably stronger.

   b) 11...e5 12 \( \text{Q} \)de2 and then:

   b1) 12...b5!? and then: 13 \( \text{A} \)g5
   \( \text{Q} \)xb3 14 axb3 – 12...\( \text{A} \)xb3 13 axb3 b5 14 \( \text{A} \)g5; 13 g4 \( \text{A} \)b7!; 13 \( \text{A} \)d5!.

   b2) 12...\( \text{A} \)xb3 13 axb3 (13 cxb3!?)
   13...b5 and here:

   b21) 14 \( \text{A} \)g5 \( \text{A} \)b7 is OK for Black;
   e.g., 15 \( \text{A} \)xh6 \( \text{A} \)xh6 16 \( \text{A} \)g3 \( \text{A} \)c8!.

   b22) 14 \( \text{A} \)e3 – 11 \( \text{A} \)e3 e5 12 \( \text{Q} \)de2
   \( \text{Q} \)xb3 13 axb3 b5! 14 0-0-0.

   b23) 14 g4?! b4 (14...h6! Vera) 15
   g5 bxc6 (15...\( \text{Q} \)e8 16 \( \text{Q} \)d5 \( \text{Q} \)xg5 17
   \( \text{A} \)xg5 \( \text{W} \)xg5+ 18 \( \text{A} \)h1 with compensation, Istratescu-Olimid, Romanian
   Cht 1993) 16 gxf6 \( \text{A} \)xf6 (16...cxb2 17
   fxe7 bxal \( \text{W} \) 18 exd8 \( \text{A} \)xd8 19 \( \text{A} \)h6
   or 19 \( \text{W} \)g3 \( \text{A} \)xc3 \( \text{A} \)b7 18 \( \text{A} \)e3
   \( \text{A} \)c8 19 \( \text{A} \)ad1 with an advantage, Zap-
   ata-Vera, Matanzas 1993.

   c) 11...\( \text{Q} \)xb3 12 axb3 e5 (12...\( \text{A} \)d7!?
   13 g4! – 11...\( \text{A} \)d7 12 g4 \( \text{Q} \)xb3?! 13
   axb3 \( \text{A} \)e3; 12...\( \text{W} \)c7 13 \( \text{A} \)e3 transposes to note ‘b12’ to Black’s 11th move in Line C221 of Chapter 9, where White is a little better) 13 \( \text{Q} \)de2 – 11...e5 12
   \( \text{Q} \)de2 \( \text{Q} \)xb3 13 axb3.

   d) 11...\( \text{W} \)c7 and now:

   d1) 12 \( \text{A} \)e3 – 11 \( \text{A} \)e3 \( \text{W} \)c7 12 0-0.

   d2) 12 \( \text{A} \)g5 b5 13 a3 \( \text{Q} \)xb3 14 axb3 h6 15 \( \text{A} \)e3 (15 \( \text{Q} \)h4! may also be tried) 15...e5 (15...\( \text{A} \)d7! 16 \( \text{A} \)ac1 \( \text{W} \)b7
   Beliavsky/Mikhailchishin) 16 \( \text{Q} \)de2
   b4 (16...a5!?) 17 axb4 \( \text{W} \)b7 18 \( \text{A} \)g3 \( \text{A} \)Mortensen-Hölzl, Novi Sad OL 1990,
   with the point 18...\( \text{W} \)xb4 19 \( \text{A} \)h5!.

   d3) Critical is 12 g4!? \( \text{Q} \)xb3
   (12...d5 13 exd5 e5 14 \( \text{Q} \)de2 \( \text{Q} \)xb3 15
   axb3 \( \text{A} \)c5+ 16 \( \text{A} \)h1; 12...h6 13 g5 hxg5
   14 \( \text{A} \)xg5 \( \text{A} \)Honfi-Cirić, Čačak 1969)
   13 axb3 d5 14 exd5 \( \text{A} \)c5 15 \( \text{A} \)e3, when
   15...e5 16 \( \text{Q} \)db5 (16 \( \text{Q} \)de2?! e4!)
   16...\( \text{W} \)b6 17 \( \text{A} \)xc5 \( \text{W} \)xc5+ 18 \( \text{A} \)h1
   probably favours White, Christoffel-
   Herschel, corr. 1991. After 15...\( \text{W} \)e5,
   White has, for example, 16 \( \text{A} \)h1!?.

   e) 11...\( \text{A} \)d7!? seems to be the most reliable:

   e1) 12 \( \text{A} \)g5 \( \text{Q} \)xb3 (or 12...b5) 13
   axb3 b5 creates no problems for Black.

   e2) 12 \( \text{A} \)e3 – 11 \( \text{A} \)e3 \( \text{A} \)d7 12 0-0.

   e3) 12 g4!? e5! (12...\( \text{Q} \)xb3? 13
   axb3 \( \text{A} \)h6 14 g5!, Istratescu-Ghiteșcu,
   Romanian Cht 1992) 13 \( \text{Q} \)de2 \( \text{A} \)c6?
   gives Black excellent play; e.g., 14
   \( \text{A} \)d5 \( \text{Q} \)cxe4! 15 \( \text{A} \)xe4 d5, R.Pert-

   We now return to 11 \( \text{A} \)e3 (D):
11...e5

Other possibilities:

a) 11...d5 12 exd5 e5 13 \textit{Q}de2 e4 14 \textit{Q}h3 (14 \textit{Q}g3 is unclear) 14...\textit{Q}xb3 (14...g6 15 0-0!, Matulović-Bogdanović, Yugoslavia 1969) 15 axb3 \textit{Q}xd5 (15...b5 16 \textit{Q}d1 \pm Yakovich-Vaulin, Kursk 1987). Now, instead of 16 0-0-0?! \textit{Q}xf5!, Romanishin-Dorfman, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1976, Black experiences some problems after 16 0-0! (Dorfman) or 16 \textit{Q}xd5?! \textit{Q}xd5 17 0-0, Badri-Dorfman, French Ch 1995.

b) 11...\textit{Q}xb3 12 axb3 and now:

b1) 12...\textit{Q}d7 is somewhat better for White after 13 0-0 \textit{Q}e5 14 \textit{Q}h3 or 13 0-0-0 \textit{Q}e5 14 \textit{Q}h3.

b2) 12...\textit{Q}d7 13 g4! e5 14 \textit{Q}de2 - 11...\textit{Q}d7 12 g4 e5 13 \textit{Q}de2 \textit{Q}xb3 14 axb3.

b3) 12...e5! 13 \textit{Q}de2 - 11...e5 12 \textit{Q}de2 \textit{Q}xb3 13 axb3.

c) 11...\textit{Q}d7 12 g4! (12 0-0 b5! gives Black a good game, as 13 a3 is forced; 12 0-0-0?!). Now:

   c1) 12...\textit{Q}a5 13 0-0-0 e5 14 \textit{Q}de2 \textit{Q}xb3+ 15 cxb3 \textit{Q}c6 16 \textit{Q}g3 is much better for White, Winants-Christianse, Wijk aan Zee 1993.

   c2) 12...b5 13 g5 \textit{Q}e8 14 \textit{Q}g1 b4 (Kuksoy-Yudasin, USSR 1989) 15 \textit{Q}ce2! \textit{Q}xb3 16 axb3 e5 17 f6 exd4 18 \textit{Q}xd4 gives White an advantage.

   c3) 12...e5 13 \textit{Q}de2 \textit{Q}xb3 14 axb3 d5 (14...\textit{Q}c6 15 g5! \{15 0-0-0 \textit{Q}a5\} 15...\textit{Q}xe4 16 \textit{Q}xe4 d5 17 f6 \textit{Q}b4+! 18 c3 dxe4 19 \textit{Q}f2 \pm Tomescu-Ungureanu, Wattens 1997) 15 exd5 e4 16 \textit{Q}g2 \pm Fischer-Bielicki, Mar del Plata 1960.

   c4) 12...\textit{Q}e8?! 13 0-0-0 (13 g5?! \textit{Q}xg5 14 0-0-0 Yudasin) 13...b5 gives Black counterplay.

c5) 12...d5?! is possibly playable: 13 exd5 \textit{Q}xb3 14 axb3 \textit{Q}xd5 15 \textit{Q}xd5 \textit{Q}h4 \pm Infante-H.Leyva, San Salvador 1997.

d) 11...\textit{Q}c7 is a very important alternative, especially due to transpositions from other lines:

   d1) 12 g4 b5! 13 g5 \textit{Q}fxe4 14 \textit{Q}xe4 \textit{Q}b7 15 fx6 (both 15 f6?! \textit{Q}xe4 16 fx6 \textit{Q}xe7 17 \textit{Q}f1 and 15 \textit{Q}xe6?? fx6 16 \textit{Q}xc5 dxc5 17 \textit{Q}xe6+ \textit{Q}h8 18 0-0! \textit{Q}xg5 19 \textit{Q}a1 are unclear - Shipov) 15...\textit{Q}xe4 16 exf7+ \textit{Q}h8. Now, instead of 17 \textit{Q}h3?! \textit{Q}xg5! \mp Bezgudov-Shipov, Russian Ch (Elista) 1994, 17 \textit{Q}h5 is better. However, Black is no worse in any case.

d2) Of possible interest is 12 0-0-0?! b5 13 fx6 fx6 14 \textit{Q}h3 \textit{Q}xb3+ 15 axb3 e5 16 \textit{Q}e6, as in Hendriks-Van Blitterswijk, Netherlands 1994.

d3) 12 0-0 and now:

   d31) 12...\textit{Q}d7 13 g4!.

   d32) 12...\textit{Q}h8 13 g4 b5 14 g5 \textit{Q}fxe4 (I.Rogers-Baburin, Erevan OL 1996) 15 fx6! \textit{Q}b7 (15...\textit{Q}xc3 16 \textit{Q}xa8 \textit{Q}b7 17 \textit{Q}xf8+!) 16 \textit{Q}d5 \textit{Q}xd5 17 \textit{Q}xd5 fx6 18 \textit{Q}xe6 - Baburin.

   d33) 12...e5 13 \textit{Q}de2 \textit{Q}xb3 transposes to note 'b13' to Black's 11th move in Line C221 of Chapter 9.
d34) 12...\text{Q}x\text{b}3 transposes to note 'b12' to Black's 11th move in Line C221 of Chapter 9.

d35) 12...b5! is the most precise move:

d351) 13 fxe6 fxe6 and now one possibility is 14 \text{Q}xf5 \text{Q}xb3 15 \text{Q}xe7+ \text{W}xe7 16 axb3 \text{Q}b7 = Istratec-Cetereas, Bucharest 1992. There has also occurred 14 \text{W}h3 \text{Q}xb3 15 axb3 (or 15 cxb3) 15...e5! 16 \text{Q}xf5 b4, when Black stands at least no worse.

d352) 13 a3 is playable, given the position of the black queen. Then:

d3521) 13...e5!? 14 \text{Q}de2 (also possible is 14 \text{Q}d5!? 14...\text{Q}b7 15 \text{Q}g3 \text{Q}xb3 (Black can deviate with 15...\text{Q}c6 16 \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}a4, Veroci-Kotronias, Greece 1985) 16 cxb3 – 13...\text{Q}xb3 14 cxb3 e5 15 \text{Q}de2 \text{Q}b7 16 \text{Q}g3.

12 \text{Q}de2 (D)

12...\text{Q}xb3

It is well-known that in his 1993 match Kasparov played 12...b5!? here only after long thought. Other players have also hesitated to play it, as there is almost no fresh material on this topic at all:

a) Nothing is gained by 13 \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}xb3 14 \text{Q}xf6+ \text{Q}xf6 and 15...d5!, Bogdanović-Matulović, Sarajevo 1960.

b) 13 g4 \text{Q}b7 (13...b4!? 14 \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}fxe4; 13...\text{Q}xb3) 14 \text{Q}xc5 dxc5 15 g5 c4! 16 gxf6 \text{Q}xf6 (unclear, Kasparov).

13 0-0-0 \text{Q}xb3+! 14 cxb3. Now, instead of 14...\text{Q}b7 15 \text{Q}b1 (Mikhailchishin), 14...a5! is stronger.

d) 13 \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}b8 and then:

d1) 14 \text{Q}xc5 dxc5 15 0-0-0 and now 15...\text{Q}b6 gives Black counterplay – Kasparov. Instead, 15...\text{Q}a5 16 g4 b4 17 g5 is unclear.

d2) 14 b4 \text{Q}d7 (14...\text{Q}a4!? 15 0-0 \text{Q}xd5 (15...\text{Q}b6! \approx Kasparov) 16 \text{Q}xd5 \text{Q}b7 17 ...\text{Q}ec3 with complications and roughly equal chances, Short-Kasparov, London PCA Wch (6) 1993.

13 axb3 b5!

Or 13...d5, and now:

a) 14 \text{Q}xd5 is possible.

b) 14 0-0-0!? (Dorfman/Perelshtein).

c) 14 exd5 e4 and now 15 \text{Q}h3 transposes to note 'a' to Black's 11th move, while 15 \text{Q}f3!? and 15 \text{Q}xe4!? are also possible.

14 g4

This sharp idea of Mikhailchishin's (linked with 14...b4 15 \text{Q}a4) might
possibly allow Black to obtain a better endgame by force. Let us see what else there is:

a) 14  שאb5?! d5!, Akopian-Anastasian, Tbilisi 1989.

b) 14 שאg5?! שאb7! (14...b4?!?) 15 שאxf6 שאxf6 16 0-0-0? b4 17 שאd5 a5 ± Kruppa-Anastasian, Podolsk 1989.

c) 14 0-0-0?! b4! 15 שאd5 (15 שאa4 שאb7!) 15... שאxd5 16 exd5 a5!.

d) 14 שאd5?! שאxd5 15 exd5 e4!?? 16 שאf2 שאf6 17 c3 שאb7 18 שאf4? (18 שאd1!!) 18... שאc8 ± Lastin-Loskutov, Moscow 1995.

e) 14 שאd1 שאb7 (14...b4?! 15 שאd5 שאxd5 16 שא xd5 שאb7 17 שאd2 שאh4+!? 18 g3 שאe7; 14... שאa5!?) and now:

   e1) 15 0-0 - 14 0-0 שאb7 15 שאad1.

   e2) 15 שאg3 b4! with good counterplay, Kuczynski-Stempin, Polish Ch 1989.

f) 14 0-0 שאb7 15 שאad1 שאc8 (or 15...b4?! 16 שאd5 שא xd5 17 exd5 שאb8, Bakhmatov-Kabatiansky, USSR 1991) 16 שאd2 שאa5 (16...b4 17 שאd5 and now, rather than 17... שאxd5 18 exd5 ± Golubev-G.Ginsburg, Ukrainian Ch (Simferopol) 1992, Black could try instead 17... שאxd5?!) 17 g4 (17 שאg3 b4 ∞ Somborski-Timm, corr. 1998-2000) 17... שאb4! (17...b4 18 g5 bxc3 19 gxf6 cxd2 20 fxe7 שאe8 21 f6 ± Gudmundsson; 17...d5?!) 18 שאg3 d5 19 שא xd5 שא xd5 20 exd5 שאc5 ∞ Gudmundsson-Gislon, corr. 1990-2.

14... שאb4 (D)

15 שאa4

Neither 15 שאd5 שאxd5 16 exd5 שאh4+ nor 15 g5 bxc3 is much good for White.

15... שאb7

Or 15...d5?! 16 שאg3 (16 0-0-0!?) 16... שאxe4 (16...dxe4?!) 17 שאe2 17

0-0-0 שאd6 (17... שאxg3 18 hxg3!?) 18 f6!, with an utterly unclear position:

a) 18... שאxf6 19 שא xd5 שאxg4 20 שא xd6 שא xd1 (Zapatia-Van Wely, Wijk aan Zee 1995) 21 שא xd1!? (Zapatia).

b) 18... שאxf6 19 שאf5!? (there are five or six other ideas as well) 19... שאb7 20 שאhg1 f4 (20... שאh8? 21 שאb6!) 21 שאh3 שאh8 (21...dxe3?! 22 שא xd6 ++ Ank-erst-Wojtkiewicz, Amsterdam 1994) and now 22 שאg3 is met by 22... שאe4!, but 22 שאc5? is interesting.

16 שאg3 שאc7!

A better-known continuation for Black is 16...d5 17 0-0-0 (17 g5 dxe4 18 שאe2 שאd5 19 f6 שאxf6 20 gxf6 שא xf6 21 0-0-0 שאg5 22 שאf5 שא xe3 23 שא xd8 שא xf5+ 24 שאb1 שא xd8 25 שאg4 שאf6! 26 שאxf5 e3 27 שאe1 is unclear according to Veličković), and then:

a) 17... שאxe4? 18 שא xe4 dxe4 19 שא xd8 שא xf3 20 שאd7 ++.

b) 17...dxe4? 18 שאe2 שאa5 19 g5 ±.

c) 17...d4?! 18 שאd2 (18 g5? שאxe4 19 שא xe4 שאd5 ++ Winants) 18... שאc8 19 שאb1 שאd7 (19... שאc7 20 שאc1) 20 h4, Yedidia-Akopian, Las Vegas 1994, favours White according to Akopian.

d) 17... שאc7?! 18 g5 (18 שאb6 d4?! 19 שא xa8 שאxa8, Sluka-Vasilchenko, Zlin 1995). Now 18... שאa8 19 שאd2
transposes to note ‘a’ after White’s 18th move. Alternatively, Nedobora recommended the immediate 18...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 19 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 dxe4.

e) 17...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)c8! 18 g5 (Veličković gave the line 18 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)b6 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)c7! 19 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xc8 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)xc8, with the point 20 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d2 d4 21 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)f2 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4!! 22 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)g5 —++; following 20 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)e2 Black has 20...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xg4 or 20...d4) 18...\(\text{\textit{W}}\)c7 and now:

   e1) 19 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)e2 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 20 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 is bad in view of 20...d4!! 21 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)f2 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)xc2+! — Veličković.

   e2) 19 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d2 transposes to note ‘a’ after White’s 18th move.

17 0-0-0
17 g5? \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 18 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)c6 19 f6 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d8.

17...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)ac8!
Better than 17...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 18 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)c6?! 19 f6.

18 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d2
Black now has two options:

a) 18...d5 19 g5, and now not 19...d4? 20 gx6f dxe3 21 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)xe3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xf6 22 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)h5 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)e7 23 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)g1 ± Vega-Lopez Gomez, corr. 1995-7, but 19...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4! 20 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 dxe4 with a little-studied position, Barr-Russell, corr. 2000. If the next variation is correct, however, it will not be necessary to study it!

b) 18...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 19 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)c6 20 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)b6 (20 f6 gx6f seems dubious for White) 20...\(\text{\textit{W}}\)xe4 21 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)xe4 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xe4 22 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xc8 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)xc8 23 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)e1 d5 with a better ending for Black, Kobaliya-Sotnikov, Moscow 1995.

B32)
9...b5!? (D)
Short played this move against Istratescu at the Erevan Olympiad in 1996, probably based on analysis of a similar variation, 9 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)f3 b5 10 f5 (Line B41), that occurred in his 1993 match versus Kasparov.

10 fxe6
Otherwise:

a) The main alternative is 10 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)f3 – 9 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)f3 b5 10 f5; see Line B41.

b) 10 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)g5 is not a very good idea; for example, 10...b4!? 11 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)a4 (11 fxe6?! \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xb3!) 11...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xb3 12 axb3 e5!, Tomescu-Vajda, Bucharest 1995.

c) 10 0-0 is rather harmless:

   c1) 10...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xb3?! – 5...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)c6 6 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)c4 e6 7 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)b3 a6 8 0-0 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)a5 9 f4 b5 10 f5 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xb3.

   c2) 10...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d7?! and then:

   c21) 11 fxe6 fxe6 – 10 fxe6 fxe6 11 0-0 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d7.

   c22) 11 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)f3 – 10 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d7 11 0-0. c3) 10...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)e7!?.

   c4) 10...e5(?) 11 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)f3 (11 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)de2 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)b7!) 11...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)xb3 12 axb3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)b7 with a good game for Black, Vink-Lautier, Antwerp 1998.

10...fxe6 11 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)f3
Or:

a) 11 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)g5 can be well answered by 11...b4!?.

b) 11 0-0 and now:

   b1) 11...\(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d7?! 12 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)f3 – 11 \(\text{\textit{W}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{Q}}\)d7?! 12 0-0.
b2) 11...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{d7}} \text{\textit{\texttt{d7}}}} \) is possible: 12 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \)
(12 \( \text{\texttt{wf3}} - \text{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{d7}} \text{\textit{\texttt{d7}}}} \) 12 0-0) 12...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}} \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}}} \) - 11...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{d7}}} \).

b3) After 11...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} \)? 12 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{d7}}} \)
Black suffers no problems:

b31) 13 \( \text{\texttt{h1}} \) b4 14 \( \text{\texttt{a4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xh3}} \),

b32) 13 \( \text{\texttt{wf3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb3}} \)!
14 axb3 0-0, 

11...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{d7}}} \)! (D)

Or: 11...\( \text{\texttt{c7}} \)?! 12 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) (12 \( \text{\texttt{xe6}} \)!

is interesting) 12...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} \) 13 e5! \( \text{\texttt{b7}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{wh3}} \); 11...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{d7}}} \)?! 12 0-0 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{b7}}} \) (12...b4 13 \( \text{\texttt{a4}} \); 12...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{xe6}} \)?)
13 \( \text{\texttt{wh3}} \)
14 \( \text{\texttt{xe6}} \) ± Balashov-Zlotnik, Moscow 1969;
11...e5, 11...\( \text{\texttt{xb3}} \) and 11...b4 have not been tested.

This is the critical position. Should Black manage to complete his development without trouble (12...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} \),
13...0-0), his chances may improve. White should look for active possibilities connected, first of all, with the advance e5.

It is difficult to single out a main line as yet:

a) 12 \( \text{\texttt{wh3}} \)?
e5 13 \( \text{\texttt{f5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb3}} \) 14 axb3 b4 –.

b) 12 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} \)!
(12...b4? 13 e5!

\( \text{\textit{\texttt{dxe5}}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{gxf6}} \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{xd1}} \)!) 13 0-0-0.

(13 e5 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{dxe5}}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc6}} \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{xc6}} \)

\( \text{\texttt{xf7}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{f7}}} \), 13 0-0 transposes to note ‘b3’

White’s 11th move) 13...0-0!

the alternative 13...\( \text{\texttt{xc8}} \) is unclear) 14 e5

\( \text{\texttt{d5}} \)!
(14...\( \text{\texttt{xe4}} \)!
15 \( \text{\texttt{xe7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe7}} \) 16

\( \text{\texttt{xe4}} \)!
\( \text{\texttt{xf3}} \) 17 exd6, Short-Kasparov,
London PCA Wch (10) 1993) 15

\( \text{\texttt{xe7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe7}} \)!
and 16...d5! with an advantage for Black, Doghri-Dao,
Budapest 1996.

11c) After 12 \( \text{\texttt{f1}} \), good enough is

12...b4! (12...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} \)!

13 e5) 13 \( \text{\texttt{a4}} \)!

\( \text{\texttt{xa4}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc5}} \) 15 e5 \( \text{\texttt{dxe5}} \) 16

\( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{gxf6}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{d1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{g7}} \)!
18 \( \text{\texttt{f5}} 

0-0

19 \( \text{\texttt{g4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f7}} \) –.

d) 12 0-0!? and then:

d1) 12...b4!?! 13 \( \text{\texttt{ce2}} \) and now

13...\( \text{\texttt{xb3}} \) 14 axb3 e5 15 \( \text{\texttt{f5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xf5}} 

16 \( \text{\texttt{xf5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d7}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) seems promising for White, Repkova-Chilingr

ova, Chrudim 1994, but Black may try to improve via, for example, 13...e5 or

13...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} \).

12d) 12...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} \) and now:

d21) 13 \( \text{\texttt{g3}} \) b4 (13...\( \text{\texttt{xb3}} \) is OK)

14 \( \text{\texttt{dxe2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc4}} \)!
15 \( \text{\texttt{xd6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd6}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{wh6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \) – Waitzkin-Jaracz, Matinhs


d22) 13 e5 \( \text{\texttt{dxe5}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{dxe6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{dxe6}} \) 15

\( \text{\texttt{xf7}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{e4}} \)!(16 \( \text{\texttt{e3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c8}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{f4}}} \) Istratescu-Short, Erevan OL 1996;

after 16 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) possibilities include

16...\( \text{\texttt{d4}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{h1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{g4}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{f4}}} \) Istratescu)

16...\( \text{\texttt{d4}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{h1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe4}} \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{xe6}} +

\( \text{\texttt{d6}} \) 19 \( \text{\texttt{f5}} + \) \( \text{\texttt{xf5}} \) 20 \( \text{\texttt{xf5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xf5}} \) 21

g4+ \( \text{\texttt{g6}} 

22 g5. All this was forced. After 22...\( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) (or 22...\( \text{\texttt{c8}} \)) 23 \( \text{\texttt{g2}} 

and 24 b4! White might have good chances.

d3) 12...\( \text{\texttt{c8}} \) 13 g4 is unstudied.

d4) 12...\( \text{\texttt{c8}} \) is also worth investigating.

e) 12 \( \text{\texttt{e3}} \) and then:
e1) 12...\(\mathcal{A}e7\)?! 13 e5! \(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3 (after 13...dxe5 White continues 14 \(\mathcal{Q}c6\) 14 exf6!? \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd4 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd4 is much better for White, Ardeleanu-Badea, Romanian Ch (Bucharest) 1994.

e2) 12...b4 and here:

e21) 13 e5? dxe5 14 \(\mathcal{Q}c6\) \(\mathcal{W}c8\) and Black wins.

e22) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)ce2 opens up good possibilities for Black; for example, 13...
\(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3; 13...e5; 13...
\(\mathcal{A}e7\) 14 0-0 0-0 (14...
\(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3?!?) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f4 (Kotsur-Neverovskij, Smolensk 1997) 15...d5?; or 13...
\(\mathcal{W}c8\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}g3\) \(\mathcal{A}e7\) 15 0-0 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3 16 axb3 0-0 \(\mathcal{Q}\) Macieja-Spisak, Brzeg Dolny 1995.

e23) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}a4?!\) \(\mathcal{Q}xa4\) (13...
\(\mathcal{A}xa4?\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}xa4+\) \(\mathcal{Q}xa4\) 15 e5!; playable is 13...
\(\mathcal{Q}xb3?!\) 14 axb3 \(\mathcal{A}e7\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}xe6!\) \(\mathcal{A}xe6\) (14...
\(\mathcal{W}c8?!\) 15 e5 \(\pm\) 15 \(\mathcal{A}xe6\), and Black must defend with 15...
\(\mathcal{A}c8\).

e3) 12...
\(\mathcal{A}c8?!\) 13 0-0 b4?! 14 \(\mathcal{Q}ce2\) \(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3 followed by 15...e5 with a double-edged game, Meister-Goled, Hlohovence 1994.

e4) 12...
\(\mathcal{W}c8!\) 13 g4 (13 a3 \(\mathcal{Q}xb3!\) {13...
\(\mathcal{A}e7?!\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}a2!\), Macieja-Dao, Budapest 1996} 14 \(\mathcal{Q}xb3\) \(\mathcal{A}e7\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}c1\) \(\mathcal{W}b7 \mp\) Macieja) 13...h5?! (another unclear possibility here is 13...h6 14 h4 b4 15 \(\mathcal{Q}ce2\) \(\mathcal{W}b7\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}g3\) e5 17 \(\mathcal{Q}df5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xb3\), Garcia Martinez-Zhang Zhong, Linares open 2001) 14 h3 (14 gxh5 \(\mathcal{A}hx5 \mp\); 14 g5 \(\mathcal{Q}g4 \approx\) Vera) 14...hxg4 15 hxg4 \(\mathcal{A}xh1+\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xh1\) b4 with a complicated game, Re.Gonzalez-Vera, Cuban Ch (Matanzas) 1997.

B4)

9 \(\mathcal{W}f3\) (D)

Quite often the game transposes to variations with f5, but if Black develops straightforwardly via 9...
\(\mathcal{A}e7\) and

10...0-0, White can transpose to the interesting Line A of Chapter 3.

We shall discuss the following separately:

B41: 9...b5 115
B42: 9...\(\mathcal{A}e7\) 117

The first move is critical, beyond all doubt, while the second is the most reliable.

Black has two other possibilities:

a) 9...
\(\mathcal{W}d7\). Generally speaking, it seems almost impossible that such a move could be the strongest, but the verdict has not yet been returned:

a1) 10 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) b5 11 e5 \(\mathcal{A}b7\) is good for Black.

a2) 10 0-0 b5! 11 f5! (11 e5 \(\mathcal{A}b7\), Cirić-Bogdanović, Novi Sad 1965) 11...e5! (11...b4? 12 fxe6 fxe6 13 \(\mathcal{Q}a4\) 12 \(\mathcal{Q}de2\) has not yet been studied.

a3) 10 f5!? e5 11 \(\mathcal{Q}de2\) \(\mathcal{Q}xb3\) 12 axb3 d5, and 13 \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) 14 exd5 \(\mathcal{W}xf5\) turned out to be good for Black in Jansa-Cirić, Sochi 1965. White would do better to choose 13 \(\mathcal{W}g3\) or 13 0-0 d4 14 \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) 15 exd5, Re-fft-Alzate, Elowan OL 1996.

b) 9...
\(\mathcal{W}c7\) is quite a playable alternative:

b1) 10 \(\mathcal{A}e3?!\) b5.
b2) 10 f5 e5!? (10...b5?! – 9...b5 10 f5 \(\mathcal{W}c7?!); 10...\(\mathcal{A}c7?! 11 g4!; 10...\(\mathcal{D}e7 – 9...\(\mathcal{A}e7 10 \mathcal{W}f3 \(\mathcal{W}c7; 10...\(\mathcal{D}xb3!?)
11 \(\mathcal{D}de2 \(\mathcal{D}xb3 (11...b5?! 12 \(\mathcal{D}d5!), and now:
\par
b21) 12 axb3 b5! 13 \(\mathcal{D}xb5?! (13 \(\mathcal{A}g5?! b4!) 13...\(\mathcal{W}xc2 14 \(\mathcal{D}ec3. Now
the continuation 14...axb5!? (which is not necessary at all) 15 \(\mathcal{A}xa8 \(\mathcal{W}xc1+ 16 \(\mathcal{A}f2 \(\mathcal{W}xh1! (16...\(\mathcal{W}xb2+?! 17 \(\mathcal{D}e2, H.Olafsson-Gis
dason, Icelandic Cht 1995; 16...\(\mathcal{W}c2+ 17 \(\mathcal{W}e2) 17 \(\mathcal{A}xc8+ \(\mathcal{D}d7 18 \(\mathcal{D}xb5 \(\mathcal{W}b1 19 \(\mathcal{A}c7+ \(\mathcal{D}d8 20 \(\mathcal{A}c8+ looks like a draw.
\par
b22) Better is 12 cxb3! b5 13 \(\mathcal{A}g5 b4 \(\approx (Belavsky/Mikhalchishin).
\par
b3) 10 0-0 b5 (10...\(\mathcal{A}c7 – 9...\(\mathcal{A}e7 10 0-0?! \(\mathcal{W}c7?!)) 11 f5! e5?! (11...b4?! 12 fxe6 fxe6 13 e5!; 11...\(\mathcal{D}xb3 12
axb3 b4 13 \(\mathcal{D}cb5?!)) 12 \(\mathcal{D}d5 \(\mathcal{A}xd5 13 \(\mathcal{A}xd5 \(\mathcal{D}d7 14 \(\mathcal{A}e2 \(\mathcal{A}xd5 15 exd5
with good prospects for White, Kim
elfeld-Chistiakov, Moscow 1966.

**B41)**

9...b5 10 f5 (D)

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{chessboard.png}
\end{center}

Forced! This position also arises after 9 f5 b5 10 \(\mathcal{W}f3, but there White
may choose another 10th move.

10...\(\mathcal{A}d7

This is similar to Line B32. However,
with the pawns on f5 and f7, Black enjoys a much more interesting
choice. First, two unsuccessful lines:

a) 10...\(\mathcal{W}c7?! 11 fxe6 fxe6 – 9 f5
b5 10 fxe6 fxe6 11 \(\mathcal{W}f3 \(\mathcal{W}c7?!.

b) 10...\(\mathcal{W}d7?! 11 fxe6 (11 \(\mathcal{A}g5 and
now 11...b4 12 fxe6 fxe6 13 \(\mathcal{A}a4!
Stoica, or 11...\(\mathcal{A}e7?!, P.Andersen-Psa
khis, Copenhagen 2000) 11...fxe6 – 9
f5 b5 10 fxe6 fxe6 11 \(\mathcal{W}f3 \(\mathcal{W}d7?!.

Three other moves are very inter
esting and barely investigated:

c) 10...b4?! and now:

\par
c1) 11 \(\mathcal{A}a4 and then:

\par
c11) 11...e5 12 \(\mathcal{D}c6 (12 \(\mathcal{D}xc5?! 
\(\mathcal{D}xc5 13 \(\mathcal{D}e2) 12...\(\mathcal{W}c7 13 \(\mathcal{D}xb4 \(\mathcal{W}a5?! 
(13...\(\mathcal{D}xe4?! 14 \(\mathcal{D}d5!; 13...\(\mathcal{A}b7 14
\(\mathcal{D}xc5 \(\mathcal{W}xc5 15 \(\mathcal{D}d5) 14 \(\mathcal{D}d2 \(\mathcal{D}xe4 15
0-0-0 \(\mathcal{W}b5?! (15...\(\mathcal{A}b7?! 16 \(\mathcal{D}d5)

is difficult to assess.

\par
c12) 11...\(\mathcal{D}xb3 and then:

\par
c121) 12 axb3 e5! 13 \(\mathcal{D}c6 \(\mathcal{W}c7 14
\(\mathcal{D}xb4 a5 doesn’t seem bad for Black:
15 \(\mathcal{A}c3 \(\mathcal{W}b7 or 15 \(\mathcal{A}c3 axb4 16 \(\mathcal{A}xa8
\(\mathcal{B}xc3 17 \(\mathcal{A}xc3 \(\mathcal{D}d7.

\par
c122) 12 cxb3 \(\mathcal{A}b7?! (12...e5?! 13
\(\mathcal{A}c6; 12...\(\mathcal{D}d7! is playable) 13 fxe6
f6 14 \(\mathcal{A}g5 b8 15 \(\mathcal{W}h3 \pm Golubev-
Shevchenko, Ukrainian Ch (Alushta)
1997).

\par
c2) 11 fxe6!? \(\mathcal{D}xb3! (11...fxe6 12
\(\mathcal{A}a4) 12 axb3 bxc3 13 e5 dxe5 14
\(\mathcal{W}c6+ \(\mathcal{D}d7 15 exd7+ \(\mathcal{D}xd7 16 \(\mathcal{D}f5
\(\mathcal{B}e8 17 \(\mathcal{W}xa6 cxb2 18 \(\mathcal{A}xb2 \(\mathcal{W}xc2 19
\(\mathcal{A}a3?! is very unclear.

\par
d) 10...\(\mathcal{D}xb3!? 11 axb3 (11 cxb3
e5!) 11...b4. Now 12 \(\mathcal{A}a4 transposes
to line ‘c121’ while 12 fxe6 transposes
to line ‘c2’.

\par
e) 10...e5?! 11 \(\mathcal{A}c6 (better than 11
\(\mathcal{D}de2?! \(\mathcal{A}b7) 11...\(\mathcal{W}d7! (11...\(\mathcal{W}c7?! 
12 \(\mathcal{D}d5!?) 12 \(\mathcal{A}b4 and then:
e1) 12...\(\cong\)xb3 13 axb3 \(\cong\)b7 14 \(\cong\)e3!? (not 14 \(\cong\)g5? \(\cong\)xe4!, Bebchuk-Kalinsky, USSR 1966; 14 \(\cong\)bd5 is possible, however) 14...a5!? 15 \(\cong\)bd5 \(\cong\)xd5 16 \(\cong\)xd5 \(\cong\)xd5 17 exd5 \(\cong\)e7 18 0-0 0-0 19 \(\cong\)h5?! favours White, Golubev-Bliumberg, Odessa 1995.

e2) 12...\(\cong\)b7! and now:

e21) 13 \(\cong\)d5 is bad in view of 13...\(\cong\)cxe4! 14 \(\cong\)xb7 \(\cong\)xb7 15 \(\cong\)g5 \(\cong\)xb8 16 \(\cong\)xf6 \(\cong\)xc3!.

e22) After 13 \(\cong\)cd5 \(\cong\)cxe4/\(\cong\)fxe4 14 \(\cong\)b6 \(\cong\)d8 15 \(\cong\)xa8 \(\cong\)xa8! Black has menacing compensation.

e23) Instead, 13 \(\cong\)bd5 \(\cong\)cxe4!? 14 \(\cong\)xe4 (14 \(\cong\)b6 \(\cong\)xc3!) 14...\(\cong\)xd5 15 \(\cong\)g5!? (15 \(\cong\)g5 \(\cong\)f4! 16 \(\cong\)xf7+ \(\cong\)e7?!; 15 f6?! \(\cong\)xf6 16 \(\cong\)xf6+ gxf6 17 \(\cong\)xf6 \(\cong\)xg2?! 15...\(\cong\)b6 16 0-0-0 is critical. Possibly White has compensation. If not, and if 12...\(\cong\)b7 favours Black, then both 9 \(\cong\)f3 and 9 f5 b5 10 \(\cong\)f3 may not be playable!

11 \(\cong\)g5?!

Or:

a) 11 fxe6 fxe6 transposes to Line B32.

b) 11 a3?! e5 (or 11...\(\cong\)xb3!) 12 \(\cong\)de2 \(\cong\)xb3!.

c) 11 \(\cong\)e3 can be met by 11...e5?! or 11...\(\cong\)c8?! 12 a3 (12 fxe6 fxe6 transposes to Line B32) 12...\(\cong\)xb3 13 cxb3 \(\cong\)b7 14 Reafat-Short, Dhaka 1999.

d) 11 0-0 and then:

d1) After 11...\(\cong\)e7, 12 \(\cong\)g5 transposes to 11 \(\cong\)g5 \(\cong\)e7 12 0-0. More interesting is 12 fxe6(!) fxe6, transposing to note ‘d2’ to White’s 10th move in Line B32.

d2) 11...b4?! 12 fxe6 fxe6 transposes to note ‘d1’ to White’s 10th move in Line B32.

d3) 11...e5 12 \(\cong\)de2 can be met by 12...b4!?, winning the pawn (rather than 12...\(\cong\)xb3 13 axb3 b4 14 \(\cong\)d5 ± D.Frolov-V.Popov, St Petersburg 1995).

11...\(\cong\)e7

11...b4? 12 fxe6 fxe6 13 e5!.

12 e5?!

I found this idea over the board in 1995 but later discovered that Crouch had recommended it as early as 1993. The alternatives are:

a) 12 fxe6?! fxe6 transposes to note ‘b’ to White’s 10th move in Line B32.

b) 12 0-0 \(\cong\)xb3 (12...0-0?) 13 axb3.

Here both 13...0-0 (Istratescu-Jaracz, Duisburg jr Wch 1992) and 13...b4 14 \(\cong\)a4 e5 (Istratescu-Timoshenko, Calimanesti 1992) are not bad for Black.

12...dxe5 13 \(\cong\)c6! \(\cong\)xe6!

13...e4?! 14 \(\cong\)xe4 \(\cong\)c7 (14...\(\cong\)b6 15 \(\cong\)xf6+!? \(\cong\)xf6 16 \(\cong\)e5 \(\cong\)c6 17 \(\cong\)x6 \(\cong\)xg5 18 fxe6 ±) 15 \(\cong\)xe7! \(\cong\)fxe4! (15...\(\cong\)e5? 16 \(\cong\)xf6 gxf6 17 fxe6 fxe6 18 0-0 \(\cong\)xe4 19 \(\cong\)ae1 f5 20 \(\cong\)xe6 +--; 15...\(\cong\)cxe4? 16 \(\cong\)xf6 ±) 16 0-0-0! (16 fxe6? \(\cong\)xg5 17 \(\cong\)xa8+ \(\cong\)xe7 18 \(\cong\)xh8 \(\cong\)e5+ --+) and Black is in danger.

14 \(\cong\)xc6+

Here, Black does not have the usual f7-square for the king...

14...\(\cong\)f8

14...\(\cong\)fd7? 15 \(\cong\)xe7 \(\cong\)xe7 16 fxe6 fxe6 17 \(\cong\)xe6! \(\cong\)xe6 18 0-0-0 ± Golubev-Borić, Kiev 1995.

15 fxe6 b4!

...instead, there is time to drive back the white knight (15...\(\cong\)c8?! 16 \(\cong\)f3! e4 17 \(\cong\)e2, Istratescu-Badea, Bucharest 1997).

16 \(\cong\)e2

Not 16 \(\cong\)d5? \(\cong\)c8! --.

The text-move (16 \(\cong\)e2), gives White an opportunity to fight (for example,
16...\(\text{wc8}\) 17 \(\text{wf3}\) e4 18 \(\text{we3}\) or 16...\(\text{xc8}\) 17 \(\text{wf3}\) \(\text{dxex6}\) 18 \(\text{xf6}\) but we can hardly talk about an advantage.

**B42)**

9...\(\text{xe7}\) (D)

\[ \text{W} \]

**10 \(\text{xe3}\)**

Otherwise:

a) 10 \(\text{g4}\) d5!? 11 e5 (11 exd5 exd5 12 f5 \(\text{dfe4}\)! Akopian) 11...\(\text{dfe4}\) 12 0-0 \(\text{wc7}\)! is satisfactory for Black, Filipenko-Akopian, Rostov 1993.

b) 10 0-0?! 0-0 11 \(\text{xe3}\) transposes to Line A of Chapter 3. An alternative for Black is 10...\(\text{wc7}\)!? (10...\(\text{b5}\)? 11 \(\text{c6}\)! and 10...e5 11 fxe5 dxe5 12 \(\text{f5}\) are weaker) and now 11 f5 transposes to note ‘c3’ to Black’s 10th move in Line B31 (where 11...e5 is possibly more precise than 11...0-0 12 \(\text{g4}\)!). 11 \(\text{xe3}\)! is dubious because of 11...\(\text{b5}\) and 11 \(\text{g4}\) should be verified; e.g., 11...\(\text{b5}\) 12 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{fxe4}\) 13 \(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{b7}\) 14 \(\text{e1}\) or 11...\(\text{fd7}\)!.

\[ \text{10...wc7?!} \]

10...0-0 and then:

a) 11 f5 transposes to Line B31.

b) 11 \(\text{g4}\) d5 (11...\(\text{b5}\)!! 12 \(\text{c6}\) \(\text{wc7}\) 13 \(\text{xe7}\) is an interesting idea,

Grilc-A.Pachmann, Stockerau jr 1991)

12 exd5 (12 e5 \(\text{dfe4}\) 13 \(\text{dxe4}\) dxe4 14 \(\text{w3}\) \(\text{a5+}\)!, Bednarski-Malich, Skopje OL 1972) 12...\(\text{xb3}\) 13 \(\text{xb3}\) exd5 14 \(\text{f5}\) (14 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{e4}\) =) 14...\(\text{b4}\) with chances for both sides, Kakabadze-Nasybullin, Moscow 1991.

c) 11 0-0-0 \(\text{wc7}\) 12 \(\text{b1}\) (12 \(\text{g4}\)! b5!; 12 \(\text{f5}\)! transposes to note ‘d2’ to Black’s 11th move in Line B31) 12...\(\text{b5}\) 13 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{b7}\)! (13...\(\text{dxe5}\)! 14 \(\text{d6}\)! \(\text{golubev-Zagrebelsny, Pavlikeni 1990}\) 14 \(\text{fxe6}\) \(\text{xf3}\) 15 \(\text{fxe7}\) \(\text{xd1}\) 16 \(\text{fxe8}\) \(\text{w}\)+ \(\text{xf8}\) 17 \(\text{xzd1}\) \(\text{b7}\), with good prospects for Black, Panchenko-Suba, Sochi 1977.

d) 11 0-0 transposes to Line A of Chapter 3 (11...\(\text{wc7}\) 12 \(\text{g4}\)!, etc.).

\[ \text{11 0-0?!} \]

11 \(\text{g4}\)! b5 12 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{fxe4}\) 13 \(\text{dxe4}\) \(\text{b7}\) favours Black, Wagner-H.Schuh, Walldorf 1986. Better is 11 \(\text{f5}\)(!), transposing to note ‘c4’ to Black’s 10th move in Line B31.

\[ \text{11...b5} \]

12 \(\text{e5}\) (12...\(\text{xb3}\) 13 \(\text{xb3}\) \(\text{e5}\)?) 14 \(\text{dxb5}\) 13 \(\text{de2}\) (difficult to assess is 13 \(\text{d5}\) \(\text{xd5}\) 14 \(\text{xd5}\) exd4 15 \(\text{xd4}\) Shipov) 13...\(\text{xb3}\) 14 \(\text{cxb3}\) \(\text{b7}\) Shipov; e.g., 15 \(\text{a3}\) \(\text{c8}\)!!.

\[ \text{12...b7} \]

13 \(\text{w3}\) \(\text{dxe5}\)!

Better than 13...\(\text{xb3}\)?? or 13...\(\text{h5}\) 14 \(\text{d4}\) (14 \(\text{g3}\) or 15 \(\text{exd6}\) (15 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{xf4}\)!!) 15...\(\text{xd6}\) 16 \(\text{ad1}\) \(\text{wc7}\) =) 14...\(\text{g6}\) 15 \(\text{f5}\) – Shipov.

14 \(\text{fxe5}\) \(\text{h5}\) 15 \(\text{w2}\) 0-0 16 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{b4}\)!

This recommendation of Shipov’s gives Black a very good game. Instead, 16...\(\text{xb3}\)?? (Emms-Shipov, Thessaloniki 1996) transposes to the Classical Sozin (note ‘b342’ to Black’s 10th move in Line C12 of Chapter 9).
8 5...\textit{c6} 6 \textit{c4} e6 7 \textit{b3} a6

1 e4 c5 2 \textit{f3} d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{xd4} \textit{ff6} 5 \textit{c3} \textit{c6} 6 \textit{c4} e6 7 \textit{b3} a6 (D)

Now we start discussing the lines of the Classical Sozin and the Velimirović Attack, continuing the theme of the Fischer Attack. It is obvious that the position in the diagram can also be achieved after 5...a6 6 \textit{c4} e6 7 \textit{b3} \textit{c6}. The most important lines of the Sozin and Velimirović can originate from that position, and we shall start their discussion in this chapter (including the plan 8...\textit{wc7} and 9...\textit{a5} for Black, and other lines). We will continue our discussion of these systems in two separate chapters to follow:

Chapter 9: 8 \textit{e3} \textit{e7} (including 9 0-0 and the main lines of the Classical Sozin);

Chapter 10: 8 \textit{e3} \textit{e7} 9 \textit{we2} (including the main lines of the Velimirović Attack).

Note that with the Classical Sicilian move-order, 5...\textit{c6} 6 \textit{c4} e6, the continuation 7 \textit{b3} a6 is no more than one of the possible set-ups. We shall have a chance to discuss all the associated nuances in the introductions to Chapters 11, 12 and 13.

So:

A: 8 f4!? 118
B: 8 0-0 119
C: 8 \textit{e3} 121

A)

8 f4!?

This works successfully against the plan with 8...\textit{wc7}. However, we shall see that Black gets an additional possibility...

a) 8...\textit{e7}. Here it is normal to play 9 \textit{e3} or 9 0-0 with the usual variations. The only line of note is 9 f5. After 9...\textit{xd4} (9...\textit{wb6}!? 10 \textit{e3? e5} 10 \textit{xd4} exf5 11 exf5 \textit{xf5} 12 0-0 \textit{e6} White has a certain amount of compensation for the pawn; e.g., 13 \textit{g5} \textit{a5} 14 \textit{xe6} fxe6 15 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 16 \textit{xd6} \textit{e5} \infty Korzubov-Kovaliov, Byelorussia 1987.

b) 8...\textit{a5} 9 0-0, and instead of 9...\textit{xd4} 10 \textit{xd4} d5 11 \textit{e3!} \± Fischer-Dely, Skopje 1967, Fischer recommended 9...d5 10 \textit{xc6} (I propose 10 \textit{a4}!?) 10...bxc6 11 f5 \textit{c5+} 12 \textit{h1} 0-0.

c) 8...\textit{a5} 9 f5!? (9 \textit{e3} – 8 \textit{e3} \textit{a5} 9 f4; 9 0-0 – 8 0-0 \textit{a5} 9 f4) 9...\textit{xb3}, and we transpose to the
variations that have been described earlier in Line B3 of Chapter 7; e.g.,
10 axb3 \( \mathcal{A} \) e7 11 \( \mathcal{W} \) f3 0-0 and now 12
\( \mathcal{A} \) e3 e5 13 \( \mathcal{Q} \) de2 b5 or 12 0-0.

d) 8...\( \mathcal{Q} \) d7 and now:

d1) 9 f5 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xe4! 10 fx6 fx6 11
\( \mathcal{Q} \) xe6 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xe6 12 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xe4 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xb3 and then
13...\( \mathcal{W} \) h4+! = (Donaldson/Tangborn).

d2) 9 \( \mathcal{A} \) e3! transposes to Line C1.

e) 8...\( \mathcal{W} \) c7 9 f5! (Fischer’s idea, and
the main point of the move-order 8 f4)
9...\( \mathcal{Q} \) xd4 (here 9...\( \mathcal{W} \) b6 is clearly worse
than in line ‘a’) 10 \( \mathcal{W} \) xd4 and now:

e1) 10...\( \mathcal{Q} \) d7 11 fx6 fx6 12 \( \mathcal{Q} \) g5
\( \mathcal{A} \) e7 13 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{W} \) ± Golubev-Gutkin, Biel
1994.

e2) After 10...exf5, White is able to
choose between 11 exf5 \( \mathcal{A} \) xf5 12
0-0 with an attack (Fischer), and 11
0-0?! (Schach-Archiv), when 11...d5 12
\( \mathcal{Q} \) xd5 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xd5 13 \( \mathcal{W} \) xd5 \( \mathcal{W} \) ± does not solve
all Black’s problems.

e3) 10...\( \mathcal{Q} \) e7 and now:

e31) 11 g4 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xg4!? 12 \( \mathcal{W} \) xg7 \( \mathcal{A} \) f6
appears inconclusive.

e32) 11 \( \mathcal{A} \) e3 exf5!? leads to
nothing obvious for White either.

e33) 11 fx6 fx6 (11...\( \mathcal{Q} \) xe6 12
\( \mathcal{Q} \) g5) 12 \( \mathcal{Q} \) g5 (12 0-0?! \( \mathcal{W} \) c5 13 \( \mathcal{W} \) xc5
dxc5 14 a4), and Black must defend
by 12...h6! (12...b5?! 13 a4!, Dvoiry-
Lesiege, Koszalin 1999; 12...\( \mathcal{W} \) c5 13
\( \mathcal{W} \) d2 \( \mathcal{Q} \) g4?! 14 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xe7 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xe7 15 0-0-0!\)
± Golubev-Istratescu, Romanian Chpt
1996) 13 \( \mathcal{A} \) h4 \( \mathcal{W} \) c5!, as 14 \( \mathcal{W} \) d2?! can
be answered either with 14...\( \mathcal{Q} \) g4 or
with 14...\( \mathcal{Q} \) xe4!??.

e34) 11 0-0 0-0 (11...\( \mathcal{W} \) c5?! and
maybe also 11...d5!? deserve attention)
12 \( \mathcal{W} \) d3 (12 \( \mathcal{A} \) h1 – 8 0-0 \( \mathcal{W} \) c7 9 \( \mathcal{A} \) h1
\( \mathcal{A} \) e7 10 f4 0-0 11 f5 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xd4 12 \( \mathcal{W} \) xd4)
12...b5 13 fx6 \( \mathcal{A} \) xe6 14 \( \mathcal{Q} \) f4 favours

e35) 11 \( \mathcal{W} \) d3!?.

f) 8...d5?!. It is possible that this
unusual move exploits the drawbacks
of 8 f4. After 9 exd5 exd5 10 \( \mathcal{A} \) e3
\( \mathcal{Q} \) b4! Black stands well. After 9 e5,
Black may play 9...\( \mathcal{Q} \) d7 10 \( \mathcal{A} \) e3 \( \mathcal{Q} \) c5
11 \( \mathcal{W} \) d2 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xd4 12 \( \mathcal{Q} \) xd4 b5 = Mikhail-
chishin-Lerner, Leningrad 1983. In-
stead, a tense game may result after
9...\( \mathcal{Q} \) xd4 10 \( \mathcal{W} \) xd4 \( \mathcal{Q} \) d7 11 f5!; e.g.,
11...\( \mathcal{W} \) c7 12 \( \mathcal{A} \) f4 \( \mathcal{Q} \) c5 13 \( \mathcal{W} \) d2 \( \mathcal{Q} \) b4 14
0-0-0 \( \mathcal{A} \) xc3 15 bxc3 \( \mathcal{Q} \) c5 16 \( \mathcal{W} \) d4 \( \mathcal{A} \) a5
17 f6, Mortensen-Van der Wiel, Århus
1983.

B) 8 0-0 (D)

Having played this, White will have
less choice (as compared to 8 \( \mathcal{A} \) e3) af-
fter both 8...\( \mathcal{W} \) c7 and 8...\( \mathcal{A} \) e7. Still, this
does not have any fatal consequences,
and besides, the position is important
for the line 5...a6 6 \( \mathcal{A} \) c4 e6 7 0-0 \( \mathcal{Q} \) c6
(or 7...\( \mathcal{W} \) c7?! 8 \( \mathcal{A} \) b3 \( \mathcal{Q} \) c6) 8 \( \mathcal{A} \) b3.

Now:

B1: 8...\( \mathcal{A} \) a5 120
B2: 8...\( \mathcal{W} \) c7 120
B3: 8...\( \mathcal{A} \) e7 121

Other moves:
a) 8...\(\Box\)xd4 9 \(\Box\)xd4 \(\Box\)e7 10 \(\Box\)g5!?? ± (10 f4 – 8...\(\Box\)e7 9 f4 \(\Box\)xd4 10 \(\Box\)xd4).

b) After 8...\(\Box\)d7?!, White may play 9 \(\Box\)e3 b5 10 f4, which transposes to note ‘a’ to White’s 10th move in Line C1, or 9 f4. Probably the latter is more precise; e.g., 9...b5 10 f5! ± (10 \(\Box\)xc6 \(\Box\)xc6 11 f5, Fischer-Gadja, Mar del Plata 1960, 11...b4?!).

**B1)**

8...\(\Box\)a5 9 f4

Now:

a) 9...b5 and then:

a1) 10 \(\Box\)e3 transposes to note ‘b’ to White’s 10th move in Line C2.

a2) 10 f5 e5 11 \(\Box\)de2 \(\Box\)xb3 12 axb3 \(\Box\)b7 (12...b4 13 \(\Box\)d5 \(\Box\)xe4 14 \(\Box\)e3 \(\Box\)b8 15 \(\Box\)d3 with an initiative, Daum-Morlo, Bundesliga 1995/6; 12...\(\Box\)b6+ 13 \(\Box\)h1 \(\Box\)b7 14 \(\Box\)d5 \(\Box\)xd5 14...\(\Box\)xd5 15 exd5 ± Vasiukov-Kotov, Erevan 1955) 15 exd5 \(\Box\)c5 {15...\(\Box\)e7?!} 16 c4 bxc4 17 \(\Box\)c3 \(\Box\)e7 18 \(\Box\)g5 with compensation, Suetin-Ilivitsky, Erevan 1955) and here:

a21) 13 \(\Box\)g3?! can be answered by 13...h5! (Boleslavsky) or 13...b4!?.

a22) 13 \(\Box\)d3 \(\Box\)b6+ 14 \(\Box\)h1 \(\Box\)c6! 15 \(\Box\)g3 h5! (Boleslavsky).

a23) 13 \(\Box\)g5 \(\Box\)b6+ 14 \(\Box\)h1 \(\Box\)xe4!.

a24) 13 \(\Box\)d5 \(\Box\)xe4 (for the continuations 13...\(\Box\)c6 14 exd5 \(\Box\)b6+ see 12...\(\Box\)b6+), and now 14 \(\Box\)ef4! (Nunn) gives White more hope than 14 \(\Box\)e3 \(\Box\)c8 (Kasparov/Nikitin).

a3) 10 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 \(\Box\)c5 12 \(\Box\)e3 \(\Box\)xb3 (12...\(\Box\)c6 is well met by 13 \(\Box\)f3 or 13 \(\Box\)xe6!) 13 axb3 transposes to note ‘a’ to Black’s 9th move in Line B1 of Chapter 7 (±).

b) 9...\(\Box\)c7 is more precise. Then 10 \(\Box\)e3 transposes to Line C32, while 10 f5?! e5 11 \(\Box\)de2 \(\Box\)xb3 12 axb3 b5 has not been studied.

**B2)**

8...\(\Box\)c7 9 \(\Box\)h1!?

This particular idea of 8 0-0 hardly promises anything. Otherwise:

a) The main move 9 \(\Box\)e3 will be examined under 8 \(\Box\)e3 \(\Box\)c7 9 0-0 (Line C3).

b) White seldom plays 9 f4 because of the hazard of 9...d5?!; e.g., 10 \(\Box\)xc6 bxc6 11 f5 (11 e5?! \(\Box\)d7, Suetin-Tal, USSR Cht 1953) 11...\(\Box\)d6 12 fxe6 \(\Box\)xe6 13 \(\Box\)h1 0-0 14 \(\Box\)g5 \(\Box\)h8 15 exd5 exd5 16 \(\Box\)d4 \(\Box\)e5 17 \(\Box\)h4 (Parma-F.Olafsson, Bled 1961) 17...\(\Box\)e6 =. There are many other little-studied variations (9...\(\Box\)a5 transposes to Line B1; 9...b5?!; 9...\(\Box\)xd4 10 \(\Box\)xd4 d5 11 \(\Box\)e3 dxe4 12 \(\Box\)xe4 \(\Box\)e7; 9...\(\Box\)d7?!).

9...\(\Box\)e7

Or:

a) 9...b5?! is a good possibility for Black.

b) 9...\(\Box\)a5?! is more critical:

b1) 10 f4 b5 and now:

b11) 11 e5 dxe5 12 fxe5 \(\Box\)xe5 13 \(\Box\)f4 and now 13...\(\Box\)h5 14 \(\Box\)d5?! exd5 15 \(\Box\)e1+ \(\Box\)e6 16 g4 led to unclear play in Tal-Gurgenidze, Poti 1970. It is also not obvious how Tal would have attacked after 13...\(\Box\)c5.

b12) It appears dubious to follow 11 f5 \(\Box\)xb3 (11...e5 12 \(\Box\)d5!) 12 axb3 b4 13 \(\Box\)cb5?! \(\Box\)b7.

b2) White may try 10 \(\Box\)a4+!?.

10 f4 0-0

10...\(\Box\)a5 is not very logical here; e.g., 11 f5 \(\Box\)xb3 (11...e5 12 \(\Box\)de2 \(\Box\)xb3 13 axb3 ±) 12 cxb3!? b5 13 \(\Box\)e3 e5 (13...b4 14 \(\Box\)a4 \(\Box\)b7 15 \(\Box\)c1 \(\Box\)d7 16 fxe6 fxe6 17 \(\Box\)b6! \(\Box\)xb6 18 \(\Box\)f5,
Langner-Dončević, Prague 1986) 14
\( \text{c2} \text{Wb7} \) (14...\( \text{d7} \) 15 \( \text{b4}! \)) 15 \( \text{g5}! \),
11 f5 \( \text{xd4} \) 12 \( \text{xd4} \) b5!
12...\( \text{d7} \) 13 \( \text{g5} \) \( \pm \) Sidorov-Ban-
nik, USSR Ch 1952.

Now (after 12...b5):
a) 13 a4?! b4! \( \mp \) Ivanchuk-Salov,

b) 13 \( \text{xe3} \) exf5 14 \( \text{d5} \) (or 14 exf5
\( \text{b7} \) = Minasian-Akopian, Erevan
1996) 14...\( \text{xd5} \) 15 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 16 \( \text{b6} \)
\( \text{xb6} \) 17 \( \text{xb6} \) \( \text{b7} \) – Ivanchuk.

B3)
8...\( \text{e7} \) (D)

9 f4
Or:
a) 9 \( \text{xe3} \), followed by 10 f4, is the
most popular move-order – see Line B
of Chapter 9.

b) Quite harmless here is 9 \( \text{h1} 
0-0 \) 10 f4 \( \text{xd4} \) (10...\( \text{d7} \) 11 f5;
10...\( \text{c7} \) – 8 \( \text{c7} \) 9 \( \text{h1} \) !? \( \text{e7} \) 10 f4
0-0) 11 \( \text{xd4} \) b5!; for example, 12 f5
(12 a4 \( \text{b7} \) !?; 12 a3 \( \text{d7} \) !) 12...exf5!?
(12...\( \text{c7} \) transposes to Line B2, while
12...\( \text{g4} \), 12...b4 and 12...\( \text{b8} \) are all
playable) 13 exf5 \( \text{b7} \) = Honfi-Spas-
ssov, Vrnjačka Banja 1976.

9...0-0

Or:
a) 9...\( \text{c7} \) 10 \( \text{xe3} \) transposes to
Line C12 of Chapter 9 (10 f5? \( \text{b6} \) !;
10 \( \text{h1} \) transposes to Line B2).

b) 9...\( \text{xd4} \) 10 \( \text{xd4} \) 0-0 11 f5
\( \text{h8} \) (11...\( \text{c7} \) – 8 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c7} \) 9 f5 \( \text{xd4} 
10 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 11 0-0 0-0; 11...b5?)
12 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 13 \( \text{g5} \) \( \pm \) Illescas-And-
dersson, Ubeda 1997.

C) 8 \( \text{xe3} \) (D)

The most flexible continuation.

White has in mind both Sozin’s plan
with 9 f4 and Velimirović’s 9 \( \text{e2} \), fol-
lowed by 10 0-0-0.
To my mind, 9 \( \textit{\text{W}} \textit{e}2 \) is sound after 8...\( \textit{\text{d}}7 \) (and, additionally, after the untried 8...\( \textit{\text{xd}}4 \) 9 \( \textit{\text{xd}}4 \) \( \textit{\text{b}}5 \), when 10 \( \textit{\text{W}} \textit{e}2!? \) transposes to note ‘a’ to White’s 8th move in Chapter 11), but not in other lines.

We consider:

**C1:** 8...\( \textit{\text{d}}7 \) 122

**C2:** 8...\( \textit{\text{a}}5 \) 122

**C3:** 8...\( \textit{\text{W}} \textit{c}7 \) 124

The main continuation, 8...\( \textit{\text{e}}7 \), will be discussed in Chapters 9 and 10.

**C1)**

8...\( \textit{\text{d}}7 \) 9 f4!

9 \( \textit{\text{W}} \textit{e}2 \) and here:

a) 9...\( \textit{\text{g}}8!? \) and then:

a1) 10 0-0-0 \( \textit{\text{a}}5 \) 11 \( \textit{\text{g}}5 \) \( \textit{\text{e}}7 \) 12 f4 0-0, Timmermann-S.Larsen, Copenhagen 1995.

a2) 10 f4 b5! 11 0-0-0 \( \textit{\text{a}}5 \) 12 e5 \( \textit{\text{xc}}3 \), Istratescu-Porper, Rishon-le-Zion 1990.

a3) 10 0-0! b5 11 \( \textit{\text{xc}}6 \) !?.

b) 9...b5! 10 0-0-0 and now with 10...\( \textit{\text{a}}5 \)! Black quickly organizes counterplay, Ricardi-I.Rogers, Spanish Cht 1999. 10...b4 is less accurate because of 11 \( \textit{\text{a}}4 \) \( \textit{\text{xe}}4 \) 12 \( \textit{\text{xc}}6 \) \( \textit{\text{xc}}6 \) 13 \( \textit{\text{b}}6 \).

9...b5

9...\( \textit{\text{W}} \textit{c}7 \) – 8...\( \textit{\text{W}} \textit{c}7 \) 9 f4 \( \textit{\text{d}}7 \) ±; the alternative 9...\( \textit{\text{e}}7 \) transposes to note ‘c’ to Black’s 9th move in Line C of Chapter 9.

**10 f5!**

Otherwise:

a) 10 0-0 and then:

a1) 10...h5!? 11 f5 \( \textit{\text{c}}8 \) 12 fxe6 fxe6 ±; then 13 \( \textit{\text{xf}}6 \) gxf6 14 \( \textit{\text{f}}3 \) \( \textit{\text{e}}7 \) is hardly dangerous for Black, Brenko-Ilinčić, Yugoslav Cht 2000.

a2) 10...b4 11 \( \textit{\text{a}}4 \) \( \textit{\text{b}}8 \)! transposes to a variation of the Fischer Attack (Chapter 5, Line E24) that is difficult to assess.

b) 10 \( \textit{\text{f}}3 \) \( \textit{\text{xd}}4 \) (10...\( \textit{\text{c}}8 \)!! 11 0-0 \( \textit{\text{e}}7 \) 12 \( \textit{\text{ae}}1 \) 0-0 13 a3 \( \textit{\text{b}}8 \), Hendriks-Kupreichik, Groningen 1995; 10...\( \textit{\text{c}}8 \)!!) 11 \( \textit{\text{xd}}4 \) \( \textit{\text{c}}6 \) (11...b4!? has been played) 12 0-0-0 b4 (Mikhailchishin) is unclear.

**10...\( \textit{\text{xd}}4 \)**

10...b4 11 fxe6 fxe6 12 \( \textit{\text{xc}}6 \)!! \( \textit{\text{xc}}6 \) 13 \( \textit{\text{e}}2 \).

10...\( \textit{\text{c}}8 \)!! 11 fxe6 fxe6 12 0-0, and now 12...\( \textit{\text{e}}7 \) – 8...\( \textit{\text{e}}7 \) 9 f4 \( \textit{\text{d}}7 \) 10 0-0 b5 11 f5 \( \textit{\text{c}}8 \) 12 fxe6 fxe6 ±; 12...h5 – 10 0-0 h5!? 11 f5 \( \textit{\text{c}}8 \) 12 fxe6 fxe6 ±.

**11 \( \textit{\text{xd}}4 \) \( \textit{\text{e}}7 \) 12 fxe6**

12 g4!? Mikhailchishin.

**12...\( \textit{\text{xe}}6 \)**

12...fxe6 13 e5!!.

**13 0-0-0 0-0 14 \( \textit{\text{xe}}6 \) fxe6 15 e5**


**C2)**

8...\( \textit{\text{a}}5 \) 9 f4!

9 0-0 b5 10 f4 – 9 f4 b5 10 0-0.

Not clear is 9 g4; e.g., 9...h5 10 g5 \( \textit{\text{g}}4 \) 11 g6 fxg6 12 \( \textit{\text{xe}}6 \).

9...b5 (D)
More reliable is 9...\textit{c7!} (Line C32).

\textbf{b311)} 13...\textit{d7} 14 \textit{wh5} \textit{g6} 15 \textit{wh3 c7} 16 \textit{ad1} (16 \textit{ae1}!? is similar to line ‘b3214’) 16...\textit{g7} 17 \textit{g5 \textit{xg5}} 18 \textit{xf7}? (18 \textit{xe6! \textit{fxe6} 19 \textit{xd7 xd7} 20 \textit{f7+ de8} 21 \textit{d3+ \textit{d5}} 22 \textit{xd5 e8} 23 \textit{f6+ =}) 18...\textit{xf7} 19 \textit{xe6+ \textit{f8} =} Damjanović-Krogius, Sochi 1967.

\textbf{b312)} 13...\textit{d5} 14 \textit{f3 \textit{d7}} 15 \textit{e4}?! (15 \textit{xd5}) 15...\textit{xe3} 16 \textit{exe3 d5} (possibly better is the alternative 16...\textit{d8}?) 17 \textit{f2} 0-0-0 18 \textit{ac1+ \textit{b8} 19 \textit{fd1} (Voigt-Wahls, Hamburg 1993) 19...\textit{d7}! with unclear play.

\textbf{b32)} 11 axb3 \textit{b7} (11...\textit{b4}?! 12 \textit{c6}!) 12 e5! (12 f5 can be met by Nunn’s 12...\textit{b4}! or 12...e5) 12...\textit{dxe5} (12...\textit{d5} 13 \textit{xd5 \textit{xd5} 14 c4!) 13 \textit{fxe5} and then:

\textbf{b321)} 13...\textit{d7} 14 \textit{wh5} (14 \textit{xf7}? \textit{xf7} 15 \textit{xe6 c7}?) 14...\textit{g6} 15 \textit{h3 \textit{e7} (15...\textit{xe5} 16 \textit{ad1 c7} looks risky, but should be checked) and now:

\textbf{b3111)} 16 \textit{dxb5? axb5 17 \textit{xb5 does not work because of 17...\textit{dxe5}! 18 \textit{ad1 g7 19 \textit{d6+ f8} 20 \textit{c5 g8.}

\textbf{b312)} 16 \textit{ad1 g7 17 \textit{g5 \textit{xg5}} 18 \textit{xe6 fxe6 19 \textit{xd7 xd7} 20 \textit{f7+ d8} 21 \textit{d3+ d5} 22 \textit{xd5 leads to a draw.

\textbf{b3123)} 16 \textit{f3 g7 and then:

\textbf{b31231)} 17 \textit{g5 \textit{xe5} 18 \textit{ce4 (18 \textit{ge4 0-0!) and now Black should avoid 18...\textit{h6? 19 \textit{xe6! (Kotov), and play 18...\textit{c8?!.

\textbf{b31232)} 17 \textit{h6 0-0! 18 \textit{g5? (18 \textit{ae1} 18...\textit{h6 19 \textit{xh6 f6 is slightly better for Black, Kakabadze-Dzhandzhgava, Tbilisi 1992.

\textbf{b3124)} The last word is 16 \textit{ae1! g7 17 h6 xe5 (17...0-0 18 \textit{xg7 \textit{xg7} 19 \textit{g4!) 18 \textit{xe5 gxe5} 19}
a) $16\text{\textbf{Q}}xb5?$ is bad due to $16...\text{\textbf{W}}d7$.

b) $16\text{\textbf{W}}f2 \text{\textbf{B}}b7?$ (16...\text{\textbf{B}}4 Sokolov;
16...\text{\textbf{Q}}e4!?!) 17 $\text{\textbf{Q}}xb5 +=$ A. Sokolov-
Timoshenko, Moscow 1990.

b) 16 $\text{\textbf{W}}g3$ h5 (16...g6 17 c4!, Bed-
narski-Gromek, Poland 1970; 16...\text{\textbf{B}}b7 17
$\text{\textbf{W}}f2!$, Bednarski-Mittelp, Varna 1972) 17 c4 bxc4 18 bxc4 $\text{\textbf{W}}xc4$ 19
$\text{\textbf{Q}}ac1 \text{\textbf{W}}d3$ 20 $\text{\textbf{H}}c7$ h4 21 $\text{\textbf{W}}f2$ f5 22
exf6 gxf6 (de Firmian-D. Gurevich, San Francisco 1987), and it is likely
that 23 $\text{\textbf{Q}}g5!$ wins; e.g., 23...$\text{\textbf{H}}g8$ 24
$\text{\textbf{Q}}xe6!$ (but not 24 $\text{\textbf{W}}xf6\text{\textbf{W}}e3+!=$), or
23...$\text{\textbf{R}}d6$ 24 $\text{\textbf{W}}xf6! \text{\textbf{Q}}xh2+ 25 \text{\textbf{Q}}h1,$ etc.

C3)

8...$\text{\textbf{W}}c7$ (D)

This is the most popular alternative to 8...$\text{\textbf{Q}}e7$. It has independent value,
since Black is not obliged to follow up
with 9...$\text{\textbf{Q}}e7$. Now:

C31: 9 $\text{\textbf{W}}e2$ 125
C32: 9 f4 127

Or:

a) 9 0-0 is possible, but it has no
advantages compared to 9 f4, and only
narrows the choice for White on move 10:
a) 9...\(\text{\#c}\)e5 10 \(\text{\#w}\)e2 \(\text{\#d}\)eg4 11 f4 and rather than 11...\(\text{\#d}\)xe3 12 \(\text{\#w}\)xe3 \(\text{\#c}\)c5 13 \(\text{\#a}\)d1 \(\text{\#e}\)7 14 e5! ± Liberson-Portisch, Erevan 1965, Black could try 11...b5!?

a2) 9...b5!? 10 f4 – 9...f4 b5 10 0-0

a3) 9...\(\text{\#c}\)a5 10 f4 (10 \(\text{\#d}\)a4+!? \(\text{\#d}\)7! 11 \(\text{\#x}\)d7+ \(\text{\#w}\)xd7! 12 \(\text{\#e}\)2, Adams-Wolff, Biel IZ 1993, 12...\(\text{\#e}\)7 = Wolff) 10...b5 transposes to Line C32.

b) Maybe 9 g4 \(\text{\#x}\)xd4 10 \(\text{\#x}\)xd4 e5 11 \(\text{\#e}\)3 \(\text{\#x}\)g4 12 \(\text{\#d}\)5!? deserves attention.

C31)

9 \(\text{\#w}\)e2 \(\text{\#c}\)a5!

One of the variations that might be called 'Anti-Velimirović'. Other moves:

a) 9...\(\text{\#e}\)7 transposes to Line B of Chapter 10.

b) 9...\(\text{\#d}\)7 is unsafe in view of 10 \(\text{\#x}\)xe6?! fx6 11 \(\text{\#x}\)xe6 \(\text{\#w}\)a5 12 0-0-0.

c) 9...b5 is suspect; e.g., 10 \(\text{\#x}\)xc6 \(\text{\#w}\)xc6 11 \(\text{\#d}\)d4 (11 \(\text{\#g}\)5 \(\text{\#b}\)7 12 \(\text{\#d}\)d5 {12 \(\text{\#x}\)xf6??} 12...\(\text{\#d}\)7 13 0-0-0 h6!?, A.Frolov-Ryskin, Budapest rpd 1992) 11...\(\text{\#e}\)7 (11...\(\text{\#b}\)7 can be met by 12 \(\text{\#x}\)xf6?!, 12 \(\text{\#d}\)d5!? or 12 0-0-0!? \(\text{\#e}\)xe4 13 \(\text{\#h}\)el!)), and White has two promising possibilities: 12 \(\text{\#d}\)5 (when Black must play 12...\(\text{\#b}\)7, since 12...\(\text{\#x}\)xd5? fails to 13 \(\text{\#x}\)xf6 dxe4 14 0-0-0!), and 12 0-0-0 – 8...\(\text{\#e}\)7 9 \(\text{\#w}\)e2 \(\text{\#c}\)7 10 0-0-0 b5?! 11 \(\text{\#x}\)xc6! \(\text{\#w}\)xc6 12 \(\text{\#d}\)4.

d) 9...\(\text{\#d}\)d7!? 10 0-0-0 (I am not sure whether the pawn sacrifice 10 g4 \(\text{\#x}\)xd4 11 \(\text{\#x}\)xd4 e5 12 \(\text{\#x}\)e3 \(\text{\#x}\)g4 13 \(\text{\#e}\)6 14 \(\text{\#g}\)1 is correct), is interesting:

  d1) 10...\(\text{\#a}\)a5 11 g4! b5 12 g5 and here:

    d11) 12...b4 and now: 13 gxf6 is liable to transpose to 'd12'; 13 \(\text{\#x}\)d5 \(\text{\#x}\)xd5 14 exd5 e5 15 f4 exd4 16 \(\text{\#x}\)d4+ = Ilinčić-Madl, Balatonbereny 1988.

    d12) 12...\(\text{\#x}\)xb3+ 13 axb3 b4 14 gxf6 bxc3 15 fxg7 \(\text{\#x}\)xg7 16 \(\text{\#h}\)g1 \(\text{\#f}\)6 (16...\(\text{\#x}\)xb2+ 17 \(\text{\#x}\)xb2 \(\text{\#f}\)6 18 \(\text{\#g}\)5!?) 17 bxc3 (17 \(\text{\#g}\)5? \(\text{\#w}\)a5 –; 17 \(\text{\#d}\)3!?) 17...\(\text{\#w}\)xc3 18 \(\text{\#b}\)b1 a5 19 \(\text{\#g}\)3 (19 \(\text{\#c}\)c1 \(\text{\#x}\)d4?!?) 19...\(\text{\#b}\)4 20 \(\text{\#c}\)c1 a4 21 \(\text{\#c}\)b2 (Velimirović-Ivanović, Vrbas 1980) 21...\(\text{\#e}\)5! = Krišć.

  d2) 10...b5 and now:

    d21) Black need not fear 11 \(\text{\#h}\)el \(\text{\#e}\)7!.

    d22) 11 \(\text{\#g}\)5 \(\text{\#e}\)7 12 f4 (12 \(\text{\#x}\)xf6 gxf6!) 12...0-0 13 f5 \(\text{\#a}\)5 is also fine for Black, Ulybin-Sher, Smolensk 1987.

    d23) Probably White should go down the road of unclear sacrifices; e.g., 11 \(\text{\#x}\)c6 \(\text{\#x}\)c6 12 \(\text{\#d}\)d5 exd5 13 exd5 \(\text{\#b}\)7 14 \(\text{\#d}\)+.

    d24) 11 g4!? is another such idea, with variations like 11...b4 12 \(\text{\#a}\)4 (12 \(\text{\#d}\)5?! exd5 13 g5) 12...\(\text{\#b}\)8!? or 11...\(\text{\#x}\)xd4 12 \(\text{\#x}\)xd4 (12 \(\text{\#x}\)xd4?! e5 13 g5 exd4 14 \(\text{\#x}\)xd4) 12...e5 13 \(\text{\#e}\)3 (13 \(\text{\#d}\)5 \(\text{\#x}\)xd5 14 \(\text{\#x}\)xd5?! \(\text{\#c}\)8 15 \(\text{\#c}\)3 b4!; 13 g5?! exd4) 13...\(\text{\#x}\)g4 14 \(\text{\#d}\)5 \(\text{\#x}\)xd5 15 \(\text{\#w}\)xg4.

  10 g4!

Or:

  a) 10 0-0-0?! transposes to the note to White’s 10th move in Line B of Chapter 11, which is good for Black.

  b) 10 \(\text{\#a}\)4+ \(\text{\#d}\)7 11 \(\text{\#x}\)xd7+ \(\text{\#x}\)d7! 12 0-0 \(\text{\#c}\)4 = Rogić-Sax, Bled 1994.

  c) 10 a4 \(\text{\#e}\)7 11 0-0 0-0 = Liu-kin-Morozovitch, Ukrainian Cht (Al-ushta) 1994.

  10...b5

Or:

  a) 10...h6 is inaccurate: 11 0-0-0 b5 12 f3 ± Velimirović-Stein, Kapfenberg Echt 1970.
b) 10...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3?! 11 axb3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e7 (11...h5
12 g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g4 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d2 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c5 14 h3!, Vavra-
Borik, Czech Ch 1994/5) 12 g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d7
13 h4!, Planinc-Ungureanu, Bucha-
rest 1970.

c) After 10...h5?! 11 g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g4, 12
g6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe3 is OK for Black, while White
may consider 12 0-0-0 or 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d2?!
.d) 10...g6?! 11 g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)h5 12 f4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g7
13 f5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3 14 axb3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e5 is unclear,

11 g5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d7 (D)

11...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3?! 12 axb3 b4 (otherwise
13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)cxb5) 13 gxf6 bxc3 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b5!.

11...b4?! and now:

a) 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)cb5?! axb5 13 gxf6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3
14 cxb3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d7.

b) 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd5 leads to unclear
play:

b1) 13 \(\mathcal{A}\)a4+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)d7 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd7+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd7
15 exd5 and now 15...e5 (Kupreichik-
Anikaev, Kiev 1970) or 15...\(\mathcal{Q}\)b7.

b2) 13 exd5 and then 13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3 14
cxb3?! \(\mathcal{Q}\)b7 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c6 (Tatai-Belotti,
Reggio Emilia 1996/7) or 13...e5 14
\(\mathcal{Q}\)c6?! \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc6 15 dxc6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc6 16 0-0-0,

c) 12 gx6f! bxc3 (12...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3 13
\(\mathcal{Q}\)d5! exd5 14 axb3 dxe4 15 0-0-0
Ribli) 13 \(\mathcal{A}\)a4+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)d7 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd7+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd7
15 fxg7 (15 b3?! gx6f 16 0-0-0 Ribli)
15...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xg7 16 b3 ± Korchnoi-Ribli,
Skellefteå World Cup 1989.

The text-move (11...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d7) brings us
to the critical position.

12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6?!

This is very unclear, but in the other
lines White has not achieved much:

a) 12 a3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b6 13 0-0-0, and instead
of 13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)b8 14 f4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)bc4 15 f5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xa3 16
fxe6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3+ 17 cxb3, Velimirović-
Ivanović, Yugoslav Ch (Vrbas) 1982,
stronger is 13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)bc4! (Nunn).

b) 12 h4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b7 (unclear is 12...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c5
13 f3 b4 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d1; 12...b4?! 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a4
\(\mathcal{Q}\)b7 14 f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3 15 cxb3 d5) 13 f3
\(\mathcal{Q}\)c4 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc4 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc4 bxc4
with an acceptable position for Black,
Ljubojević-Ivanchuk, Monaco Amber
blindfold tour 1994.

c) 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6 fxe6 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c4! 14
\(\mathcal{Q}\)xc4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc4 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c7+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)d8 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xa8
\(\mathcal{Q}\)xe3 17 fxe3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b7 with a good end-

b) 12 f4 and now:

d1) 12...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3?!.

d2) 12...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c5 13 f5 b4 (13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d7?!) 14
\(\mathcal{Q}\)a4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3 15 cxb3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)b7 16 fxe6
fxe6 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc5 dxc5 18 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f3, and now
18...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xe4 19 0-0-0 is unclear, while
18...\(\mathcal{Q}\)e7 is sufficient for equality, Lju-
bojević-Salov, Belgrade 1987.

d3) 12...b4 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a4 (13 \(\mathcal{D}\)d5?!

\(\mathcal{Q}\)d5 14 exd5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c5 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc6 16
\(\mathcal{Q}\)xc5+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)e7 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)a4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d7! 18 dxc6
\(\mathcal{Q}\)xc6 19 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xa4! 20 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xa8+ \(\mathcal{Q}\)d7
Kasparov/Nikitin) and here:

d31) 13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c5?! 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xc5 dxc5 15
\(\mathcal{Q}\)a4±.

d32) 13...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3 14 cxb3 and then:

d321) 14...\(\mathcal{Q}\)b7 15 f5 e5 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)c1 is
good for White after 16...\(\mathcal{Q}\)a5?! 17
\(\mathcal{Q}\)e6!, Vlad-Istrateșcu, Bucharest 1992,
or 16...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c5 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f3.
d322) 14...\[\text{b7} 15 \[\text{c2} \[\text{c5} 16 \\
\[\text{xc5} \text{dxc5} 17 \[\text{f3} \pm \text{Baimuratov-Serper, Bishkek Z 1993.}

333) 13...\[b7! and now:

3331) 14 \[d2 e5 15 \[f5 g6 16 \[g3 and rather than 16...\text{exf4} 17 \[xf4 \\
\[xb3 18 \[xb3 \[e7 19 0-0-0 0-0 0-0 20 \[h4 \\
\[c5 \pm \text{Gdanski-Istratec, Manila OL 1992, probably stronger is 16...\[xb3 17} \\
\[xb3 \[xc2 18 \[f5 \[xf5 19 0-0-0 \[xe4?}

3332) 14 \[f5 e5 15 \[e6 (15 \[xf7+ \\
\[xf7 16 \[h5+ \[g8 17 \[f6 \[c4!? \{or \[f1 \[f7 \pm \text{Ardeleanu-Istratec, Romanian Ch (Herculane) 1996\} 15...\text{fxe6} 16 \text{fxe6} \[c5 17 \[xc5} \\
\[xc5 18 \[d5 0-0-0 19 0-0-0 (Kasparov) – I am not sure that White has real compensation here.

c) 12 0-0-0 and then:

e1) 12...\[xb3+ 13 \[xb3 \[e7 transposes to Line B of Chapter 10 (an alternative is 13...\[b7?! 14 \[f3 g6).

e2) 12...\[b7 13 \[xe6 \[xe6 14 \[xe6 \[c4 15 \[g4 gives White compensation, Smagacz-Sher, Koszalin 1999.

e3) 12...\text{b4}?! 13 \[a4 \[xb3+ 14 \\
\[xb3 \[c5 15 \[xc5 (15 \[c4 \[d7?! 16} \\
\[xb4 \[b8 17 \[c3 \[xa4 18 \[xa4 \[b7) 15...\text{dxc5} 16 \[f3 (16 \[f5 \text{exf5} \\
17 \[xf5 \[xf5 18 \[f3 \[c8 19 \[h1 \[e6 -- Marić) 16...\[e7 17 \[d2 (17} \\
\[d2 a5?! 18 \[f4 \[f7; 17 \[f4 a5!, \\
\[\text{Juarez-Polugaevsky, Mar del Plata 1971, 18 \[e5 0-0! 19 \[f4 \[d6) \\
17...a5 18 \[c4 a4 19 \[a1 \[a6 20 \[f3} \\
0-0 21 \[h4 \[a7 with strong counterplay, Zapata-Am.Rodriguez, Cienfuegos 1997.

e4) 12...\[c5 and here:

e41) Not 13 \[f3? \[b4 -- +.

e42) 13 a3 \[b7 (13...\[b8?! – Lerner; 13...\[xb3+!? \} 14 \[a2 \[xe4 \\
(Arakhamia-Lerner, Helsinki 1992) 15 \[xe4 \[xe4 16 \[h1 \[d5 17 \[f3 \[g6} \\
18 \[xd5 \[c8 with counterplay.

e43) 13 \[h1 \[b4 14 \[d5 \text{exd5} (14...\[xc5 \{?! 15 \text{exd5} (15 \[xd5?!)} \\
15...\[e7 (A.Frolov-Lerner, Simferopol/Alushta 1992) 16 \[f4! \[a7 17} \\
\[xe7+ \[xe7 18 \[xd6 \

e44) 13 \[d5 \text{exd5} (13...\[b8?! 14 \[b4} \\
and now Black should play 14...\[d7!, but not 14...\[a4? 15 \[xa4 \[xa4 16 \[xa4 \[e5 17 \text{exd5} \\
\[f7 18 \[c6 0-0 19 \[f4!, Rechel-Lerner, Metz 1998) 14} \\
\[xd5 \[b7 15 \[b4 (15 \[f5 \[c6 16 \[h4} \\
\[e6 \pm \text{Minasian-Lerner, USSR Cht 1991) 15...\[xe4 (15...\[c4 16} \\
\[xc5 17 \[f5 \[e6 \pm \text{Maksimenko) 16} \\
\[xb5 \[xb5 17 \[b6 \[c4 (I don’t see} \\
why Black should avoid 17...\[e6?! 18} \\
\[xe4 \[c6) 18 \[xe4+ \pm \text{Kozakov-Maksimenko, Liv 1991.}}

12...\[xe6 13 \[xe6 \\
The position remains difficult to assess. For instance:

a) 13...\[b6 14 \[xb6 \[xb6 15 \[d5 (15 \[g4! \text{Milos}) 15...\[c6 16 \[f6+ \\
(16 \[g4 \[d8?! \pm \text{Lima) 16...\[gxf6 17} \\
\[d5 \[c5 18 \[h5+ \[d8 19 \[f7 \[wd4!} \\
\pm \text{Milos-Lima, Brazilian Ch 1995.}

b) 13...\[e5 14 \[d5 \[c6 (14...\[b7 \\
15 \[h5+ \[g6 16 \[h3, Kozakov-Nevednichy, France 1999) 15 \[xc8 \[xc8} \\
16 \[h5+! with compensation (Kozakov; 16 0-0-0 \[c4!).}

C32) 

9 \[f4 (D) 

Now, after 9...\[c7, the ‘Velimirović’ can no longer be obtained, but 
White may play, besides 10 0-0 (the ‘normal’ Classical Sozin), also 10 
\[f3?! and 11 0-0-0 – both of which 
will be discussed in Chapter 9.
9...\(\text{a}5\)

Or:

a) 9...\(\text{d}7\) is inaccurate, as White can reply with 10 \(f5\)\(±\) (or 10 0-0 \(b5?!\) 11 \(f5\)).

b) 9...\(b5\) is the favourite move of GM Serper:

b1) 10 \(\text{c}6\)? \(\text{xc}6\) 11 \(f5\)! is not bad, and 11...\(\text{e}4\) (after 11...\(\text{e}7\), 12 0-0 transposes to Line C12 of Chapter 9, while White could try 12 \(\text{fxe}6\)!?) 12 \(\text{fxe}6\) \(\text{xc}3\) 13 \(\text{exf}7+\) \(\text{d}8\) 14 \(\text{bx}c3\) \(\text{xc}3+\) 15 \(\text{f}2\) favours White.

b2) 10 \(f5\) \(b4!!\)? (10...\(\text{d}4\) 11 \(\text{xd}4\) allows White to struggle for an advantage) 11 \(\text{a}4?!\) (11 \(\text{fxe}6\) \(\text{bx}c3\) 12 \(\text{exf}7+\) \(\text{d}8\) \(\text{Tkachev-Babula, Calicut} \text{jr} Wch 1993; NCO suggests} 11 \(\text{c}e2?!\) \(e5\) 12 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{xc}6\) 13 \(\text{g}5\) \(±\) ) 11...\(e5\) 12 \(\text{f}3\) (12 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{xc}6\) 13 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{b}8\) \(\text{Willemze-Cvek, Cala Galdana} \text{jr} Wch 1996, and} 12 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{b}8\)!, \text{Mitkov-Granda, Moscow OL 1994, are no better}) 12...\(\text{b}8\) 13 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}7\) 14 0-0-0!? \(\text{d}5\) 15 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{g}4!\) 16 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xb}3+\) 17 \(\text{axb}3\) \text{h}6! with good play for Black, \text{Gi.Hernandez-Serper, Los Angeles} 1996.

b3) 10 0-0 \(b4!!\)? (10...\(\text{b}7\) 11 \(f5\) \(\text{xd}4\) 12 \(\text{xd}4\) \(e5\) 13 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}7\) 14 \(\text{g}5\) \(±\) \text{Lukin-Serper, St Petersburg 1995; instead,} 10...\(\text{a}5\) 10 0-0 \(b5\)! 11 \(\text{a}4\) (11 \(\text{ce}2\) \(\text{e}7\)!? 12 \(\text{g}3\) 0-0 13 \(f5\) \(\text{xd}4\) 14 \(\text{xd}4\) \(e5\) 15 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{b}7\) 16 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{xe}4\) is good for Black, \text{Nenashev-Dautov, Frunze 1988}) 11...\(\text{b}8\) 12 \(c3\) \(\text{a}5\) (12...\(\text{xe}4\) 13 \(\text{xb}4!\) \text{Serper}) 13 \(\text{xb}4\) \(\text{xb}3\) 14 \(\text{xb}3\) \(\text{b}7\)! 15 \(e5\) \(\text{dxe}5\) 16 \(\text{f}xe5\) \(\text{g}4\) 17 \(\text{a}3\) (possibly better is 17 \(\text{h}3\)!? – \text{de Firmian}) 17...\(\text{e}4\) 18 \(\text{ae}1\) \(\text{b}7\) 19 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{xe}5\) 20 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{xc}5\) 21 \(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{xf}3+\) 22 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{d}5\) and Black holds the position, \text{de Firmian-Serper, New York} 1996.

10 0-0

It is a big question whether White should really play this. He has a number of alternatives:

a) 10 \(\text{f}3\) \(b5\)! has been studied little. It seems that Black has good chances.

b) 10 \(g4?!\) \(\text{c}4\) (also of interest are 10...\(d5\) and 10...\(b5\) 11 \(g5\) \(b4\) 12 \(\text{gxf}6\) \text{bxc3} 13 \(\text{a}4+\) \(\text{d}7\) 14 \(\text{fxg}7\) \(\text{g}7\) 15 \(\text{xe}6?\) \(\text{f}xe6\) 16 \(\text{wh}5+\) \(\text{e}7\) and Black wins, \text{Müller-Mantovani, Montecatini Terme 1993}) 11 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{xc}4\) 12 \(g5\) (12 \(\text{f}3?!\) \(\text{e}7–8...\(\text{e}7\) 9 \(\text{f}4\) 10 \(\text{f}3\) 11 \(\text{g}4\) \(\text{c}4\) 12 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{xc}4\)) 12...\(\text{d}7\) 13 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 14 0-0-0 \(b5\) 15 \(\text{h}1\) with double-edged play, \text{Canda-A.M.Rodriguez, Bayamo 1989}.

c) 10 \(f5\) is rather important:

c1) 10...\(\text{c}4?!\) and here:

\(c11\) 11 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{xc}4\) 12 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{e}7\) (or 12...\(e5?!\) 13 0-0 0-0 14 \(\text{de}2\) \(b5\) 15 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 16 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{b}7\) 17 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 18 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{c}8\)! \(\text{∞} \text{Reinderman-Van der Weide, Hoogeveen 1999})

\(c12\) 11 \(\text{fxe}6\) \(\text{xe}3\) 12 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{eg}4\) 13 \(\text{exf}7+\) \(\text{d}8\) 14 \(\text{h}3\) (\text{Shytrenkov-Petrushin, Russia 1984}) 14...\(\text{e}5\) deserves attention.
c2) 10...e5 11 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \). Now, instead of 11...\( \text{Q} \text{c4} \) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{xc4} \) \( \text{W} \text{xc4} \) 13 b3 \( \text{W} \text{c6} \) 14 \( \text{W} \text{d3} \), 11...b5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{d5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xd5} \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{xd5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b7} \) 14 b3 b4 15 c3 \( \text{Q} \text{c6} \) 16 a3 \( \text{Schach-Archiv} \) or 11...\( \text{Q} \text{d7} \) !? 12 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \), it is better to play 11...\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \): 12 axb3 – 10...\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 11 axb3 e5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \); 12 cxb3 – 10...\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 11 cxb3 e5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \).

C3) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) and now:

C31) 11 cxb3 and then:

C311) 11...\( \text{Q} \text{e7} \) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{c1} \) \( \text{W} \text{a5} \) 13 0-0 ±.

C312) 11...b5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{c1} \) (12 0-0 – 10 0-0 b5 11 \( \text{Q} \text{f5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 12 cxb3).

C313) 11...e5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \) (12 \( \text{Q} \text{c2} \) d5?!?) 12...b5! (12...\( \text{Q} \text{d7} \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{e7} \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d5} \) ± Morovic-Am.Rodriguez, Cienfuegos 1997; 12...\( \text{W} \text{a5} \) 13 0-0 h5 14 \( \text{Q} \text{d5} \) ± Mikhailchishin–Chechelian, Moscow 1979) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{c1} \) (13 0-0?! – 10 0-0 b5! 11 \( \text{Q} \text{f5} \) e5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 13 cxb3) 13...\( \text{W} \text{a5} \) 14 0-0 (very unclear is 14 b4?? \( \text{W} \text{xb4} \) 15 a3 \( \text{W} \text{a5} \) 16 b4 \( \text{W} \text{d8} \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \), as I analysed with Istratescu) 14...\( \text{Q} \text{b7} \) – 10 0-0 b5 11 \( \text{Q} \text{f5} \) e5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 13 cxb3 \( \text{Q} \text{b7} \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{c1} \) \( \text{W} \text{a5} \) !.

C32) 11 axb3 e5! (11...\( \text{W} \text{xf5} \) 12 0-0 ± Ehlvest-Rashkovsky, USSR 1986; 11...\( \text{Q} \text{e7} \) !? 12 \( \text{W} \text{f3} \)!) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \) b5! and now:

C321) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{xb5} \) ? fails to 13...\( \text{W} \text{c6} \).

C322) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \)? b4 is bad for White.

C323) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{d5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xd5} \) 14 \( \text{W} \text{xd5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b7} \) 15 \( \text{W} \text{d3} \) and now 15...b4 and 15...\( \text{Q} \text{e8} \) are both quite reasonable for Black.

C324) 13 0-0?! – 10 0-0 b5 11 \( \text{Q} \text{f5} \) e5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 13 axb3.

C325) Another try is 13 \( \text{W} \text{d3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b7} \) (½-½ Golubev-Istratescu, Bucharest 1996), with a complicated game.

Or:

a) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{e7} \) transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 10th move in Line C12 of Chapter 9 (±).

b) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{c4} \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{xc4} \) \( \text{W} \text{xc4} \) 12 \( \text{W} \text{f3} \)!


c) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \) 11 cxb3 b5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{c1} \) \( \text{W} \text{b7} \) 13 e5 \( \text{Q} \text{d5} \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{xd5} \) \( \text{W} \text{xd5} \) 15 exd6 \( \text{Q} \text{b7} \) (15...\( \text{Q} \text{xd6} \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{f5} \) 16 d7+ \( \text{W} \text{xd7} \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{f5} \) e5 (17...\( \text{W} \text{d5} \) 18 \( \text{W} \text{e2} \) e5 19 \( \text{Q} \text{fd1} \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{e6} \) ± Pelikan-Marini, Argentina 1985.

11 \( \text{Q} \text{f5} \) (D)

11 \( \text{W} \text{f3} \)?! \( \text{Q} \text{b7} \)!

One more important position for the plan with ...\( \text{W} \text{c7} \) and ...\( \text{Q} \text{a5} \).

11...\( \text{Q} \text{xb3} \)!

Obliging White to take with the c-pawn. Otherwise:

a) 11...b4 is risky due to 12 \( \text{Q} \text{a4} \).+

b) 11...\( \text{Q} \text{c4} \) ?! 12 \( \text{Q} \text{xc4} \) \( \text{W} \text{xc4} \) 13 \text{fxe6} \text{fxe6} 14 \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) \text{gxf6} 15 \( \text{Q} \text{h5} + \) (Ciocaltea-Soos, Romania 1954) 15...\( \text{Q} \text{b8} \) 16 \( \text{W} \text{f3} \) !? \( \text{Q} \text{e7} \) 17 e5 d5 18 exf6 is also treacherous for Black.

C) Black’s alternative is 11...e5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{de2} \), and now:

C1) 12...\( \text{Q} \text{c4} \)?! 13 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b7} \) (Black should avoid 13...\( \text{Q} \text{g4} \)?) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{xc4} \) \( \text{W} \text{xc4} \)
15 \( \texttt{Wd5!} \), A.Kuzmin-K.Orlov, Pančevo 1989; 13...b4!? Lalić 14 \( \texttt{Axxf6} \) gxf6 15 \( \texttt{Axc4} \) \( \texttt{Wxc4} \) 16 \( \texttt{cd5} \) (Palac-Kožul, Slovenian Cht 2000) 16...\( \texttt{Axd5} \) 17 \( \texttt{exd5} \) \( \texttt{Ac8} \) = Lalić.

\( \texttt{c2}) \) 12...\( \texttt{Axb3} \), and again it is not clear how to recapture:

\( \texttt{c21}) \) 13 \( \texttt{AXB3} \) \( \texttt{Ab7} \) 14 \( \texttt{Ac1} \) \( \texttt{Wa5!} \) (14...\( \texttt{Wd8} \) 15 \( \texttt{Ag5!} \)?) with an important and unclear position; e.g., 15 a3 (15 \( \texttt{Ag3} \) h5!? 15...\( \texttt{Ae7} \) 16 \( \texttt{Ag3} \) (16 \( \texttt{Ag5!} \)?) 16.h5 17 b4 \( \texttt{Wd8} \) 18 \( \texttt{Af3} \), T.Horvath-Zeller, Bundesliga 1992/3.

\( \texttt{c22}) \) 13 axb3 \( \texttt{Ab7} \) 14 \( \texttt{Ad5} \) (14 \( \texttt{Ag3} \) h5! 15 \( \texttt{Ag} \) \( \texttt{xd5} \) 16 \( \texttt{exd5} \) h4 17 \( \texttt{Ae1} \) \( \texttt{Af2} \) \( \texttt{Wb7} \) 19 c4 \( \texttt{Ad8} \) is good for Black, Ghizdavu-Honfi, Timisoara 1972) 14...\( \texttt{Axd5} \) 15 \( \texttt{exd5} \) \( \texttt{Ae7} \) 16 \( \texttt{Ac3} \)!? 0-0 17 \( \texttt{Ag5} \) \( \texttt{Wc5} \) 17...b4! 18 \( \texttt{Axxf6} \) bxc3 19 \( \texttt{Axe7} \) \( \texttt{cxh2} \) 20 \( \texttt{Ab1} \) \( \texttt{Wxe7} \) 21 \( \texttt{Af6} \)? is probably critical) 18 \( \texttt{Ah7} \) \( \texttt{Axd5} \) 19 \( \texttt{Axe7} \) \( \texttt{Axe7} \) 20 f6 with an advantage for White, Lalić-S.Pedersen, London 1997.

\( \texttt{c3}) \) 12...\( \texttt{Bb7} \) 13 \( \texttt{Ad5} \) (13 \( \texttt{Ag3} \) \( \texttt{Ac4} \)! \( \texttt{\textdagger} \) Bena-Mir.Pavlov, Bucharest 1969; 13 \( \texttt{Ag5} \)?! \( \texttt{Axb3} \) 13...\( \texttt{Axd5} \) (13...\( \texttt{Axd5} \) 14 \( \texttt{Axd5} \) \( \texttt{Ac8} \) 15 b3! \( \texttt{+} \) Palac-Kožul, Croatian Cht 2000, with the point 15...\( \texttt{Wxc2} \)? 16 \( \texttt{Ac1} \)\( \texttt{\pm} \) 14 \( \texttt{Axd5} \) \( \texttt{Ac4} \) and here:

\( \texttt{c31}) \) 15 \( \texttt{Wc1} \) \( \texttt{Axd5} \) 16 \( \texttt{exd5} \) \( \texttt{Ac8} \)!

17 \( \texttt{Af2} \) \( \texttt{Ae7} \)! (17...h5! 18 b3 \( \texttt{Ab6} \) 19 \( \texttt{Ad1} \) \( \texttt{+} \) Honfi-Tarjan, Majdanpek 1976) 18 b3 \( \texttt{Ab6} \) \( \texttt{\oplus} \) Pelletier.

\( \texttt{c32}) \) 15 \( \texttt{Ac1} \) \( \texttt{Wc5} \) 16 \( \texttt{Ah1} \) \( \texttt{Axd5} \) 17 \( \texttt{exd5} \) \( \texttt{Ab6} \) 18 \( \texttt{Ac3} \) (18 \( \texttt{f6} \)? \( \texttt{Wxd5} \) 19 \( \texttt{Ac3} \) with compensation, Palac-Kožul, Croatian Ch (Pula) 2001) 18...\( \texttt{Ae7} \) and now:

\( \texttt{c321}) \) 19 \( \texttt{Ac4} \) is weak: 19...\( \texttt{Wxd5} \) 20 \( \texttt{Af3} \) \( \texttt{Ac8} \) 21 \( \texttt{Ae3} \) \( \texttt{Ad7} \)\( \texttt{\textdagger} \) de Firmian-Salov, New York 1996.

\( \texttt{c322}) \) 19 \( \texttt{Wd3} \)? \( \texttt{Ac4} \) 20 \( \texttt{Ac3} \) is also possible.

\( \texttt{c323}) \) 19 f6 \( \texttt{gxf6} \) 20 \( \texttt{Af3} \) \( \texttt{Ad7} \) 21 \( \texttt{Ac4} \) \( \texttt{Wc7} \) 22 \( \texttt{Ac3} \) \( \texttt{Ag8} \) 23 \( \texttt{Ac1} \) \( \texttt{Ac8} \) 24 c4 bxc4 25 b3 \( \texttt{Wxa5} \) 26 bxc4 \( \texttt{Wxa2} \) 27 \( \texttt{Ah1} \) with a draw, A.Kovačević-Popović, Yugoslav Ch (Nikšić) 1997.

\( \texttt{c324}) \) Instead, 19 \( \texttt{Af3} \)! (Salov) appears to be very strong.

We now return to 11...\( \texttt{Axb3} \) (\( \texttt{D})\):
b21) 13...\(\text{\texttt{f}}\)\text{b}7 14 fxe6 (14 \(\text{\texttt{f}}\)\text{f}3 \(\text{\texttt{d}}\)\text{d}7 15 g4 b4!, Khenkin-Fridshtein, USSR Cht 1954) 14...f\=x6 15 b4 0-0 16 \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}3 d5 (Tolush-Taimanov, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1952; 16...\(\text{\texttt{d}}\)\text{d}7!? is better) 17 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}6! \pm Koblenc.

b22) 13...\(\text{\texttt{d}}\)\text{d}7 and then:

b221) 14 fxe6 fxe6 15 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}6 (15 b4 0-0 16 \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}3 \(\text{\texttt{h}}\)\text{h}8 17 h3 e5! = Keres-Taimanov, Zurich Ct 1953) 15...\(\text{\texttt{xc}}\)\text{c}6! 16 \(\text{\texttt{d}}\)\text{d}5 \(\text{\texttt{x}}\)xd5 (maybe 16...\(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}7 is possible) 17 \(\text{\texttt{xc}}\)\text{c}6 \(\text{\texttt{xe}}\)xe3 18 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}1 \(\text{\texttt{d}}\)\text{d}7 \& Ekström-Roos, corr. 1964.

b222) 14 \(\text{\texttt{f}}\)\text{f}3! and then:

b2221) 14...e5 15 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}6! \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}7 16 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)\text{a}5 \pm Boleslavsky.

b2222) 14...\(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}7!? 15 fxe6 fxe6 16 \(\text{\texttt{h}}\)\text{h}3 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}8 17 \(\text{\texttt{cd}}\)\text{d}1!? (17 \(\text{\texttt{f}}\)\text{f}3 0-0 18 e5 dxe5 19 \(\text{\texttt{x}}\)xe5 \(\text{\texttt{w}}\)\text{d}6 20 \(\text{\texttt{g}}\)\text{g}3 \pm Onischchuk) 17...0-0 18 b4 \pm F. Olafsson-Johansson, Reykjavik (2) 1959.

b2223) 14...0-0 15 g4 (or 15 e5! \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}7 16 exf6 \(\text{\texttt{xf}}\)\text{f}3 17 fxe7 \(\text{\texttt{w}}\)\text{e}7 18 \(\text{\texttt{xf}}\)\text{f}3 Suetin) 15...e5 (15...\(\text{\texttt{e}}\)\text{e}8 16 g5 \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}7 17 \(\text{\texttt{h}}\)\text{h}5 \pm Vasiukov-Veiland, Lyons 1955; 15...b4 16 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)\text{a}4 \(\text{\texttt{w}}\)\text{b}7 17 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}6 \pm Onischchuk) and now Khenkin recommends 16 \(\text{\texttt{de}}\)\text{e}2! (instead of 16 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}6?! \(\text{\texttt{wx}}\)\text{c}6 17 g5, Geller-Taimanov, USSR Ch (Kiev) 1954).

13 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{a}4 e5! (D)

13...\(\text{\texttt{xe}}\)\text{e}4 can be met by 14 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}1 \pm (Koblenc) or 14 fxe6 fxe6 15 \(\text{\texttt{w}}\)\text{h}5+ g6 16 \(\text{\texttt{f}}\)\text{f}3 \pm (Nunn).

Now:

a) 14 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}1 \(\text{\texttt{w}}\)\text{b}7 15 \(\text{\texttt{f}}\)\text{f}3 (15 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}6? \(\text{\texttt{d}}\)\text{d}7 \& 15...\(\text{\texttt{wx}}\)\text{e}4!)? (15...\(\text{\texttt{xe}}\)\text{e}4 16 \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}6 \(\text{\texttt{f}}\)\text{f}6! 17 \(\text{\texttt{xa}}\)\text{a}8 \(\text{\texttt{xa}}\)\text{a}8 \pm Serper; 15...\(\text{\texttt{e}}\)\text{e}7 16 \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}6 \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}8 17 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}4! \pm de Firmian-Serper, Los Angeles 1997) 16 \(\text{\texttt{w}}\)\text{d}2 and now 16...\(\text{\texttt{d}}\)\text{d}5? 17 \(\text{\texttt{fe}}\)\text{1} \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)\text{b}7 18 \(\text{\texttt{c}}\)\text{c}5!! dxc5 19 \(\text{\texttt{xc}}\)\text{c}5 and 16...\(\text{\texttt{w}}\)\text{b}7 17 \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}6 \(\text{\texttt{b}}\)\text{b}8 18 \(\text{\texttt{xb}}\)\text{b}4 (Serper) both favour White, but I hesitate to recommend this for White due to 16...\(\text{\texttt{xf}}\)\text{f}5!?.

b) 14 \(\text{\texttt{f}}\)\text{f}3!!?, with a tense game, is worthy of attention.
9 5...\(\text{c}c6\) 6 \(\text{c}c4\) e6 7 \(\text{a}b3\) a6
8 \(\text{a}e3\) \(\text{e}e7\) without 9 \(\text{e}e2\)

1 e4 c5 2 \(\text{f}f3\) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \(\text{xd}4\)
\(\text{f}f6\) 5 \(\text{c}c3\) \(\text{c}c6\) 6 \(\text{c}c4\) e6 7 \(\text{b}b3\) a6 8
\(\text{e}e3\) \(\text{e}e7\) \((D)\)

9 \(\text{e}e2\) is considered in Chapter 10,
so we are left with these three moves:
A: 9 g4?! 132
B: 9 0-0 132
C: 9 f4 133

A)
9 g4!?
A curious and fresh idea. There are
not many examples of it as yet:
    a) 9...\(\text{xd}4\) 10 \(\text{xd}4\) and then:
        a1) 10...e5 (certainly, this is the
            most critical) 11 \(\text{d}d3\) (11 \(\text{c}c4\) \(\text{e}e6\)
            should be good for Black) 11...\(\text{x}xg4\)
            (11...\(\text{x}xg4\)?) 12 \(\text{g}g1\) 0-0 13 \(\text{g}g5\) (13
            \(\text{d}d5\)?) \(\text{Popović}\) 13...\(\text{h}h5\) 14 \(\text{h}h3\)
            \(\text{g}g6\) 15 \(\text{x}xf6\) (15 \(\text{h}h4\)?) 15...\(\text{x}xf6\)
            16 0-0-0 \(\text{c}c8\) (\(\text{Velimirović-Popović,}\)

Bar 1997) 17 \(\text{g}g4!\) with compensa-
tion – \(\text{Popović}\).

    a2) 10...0-0!? 11 \(\text{g}g1\) (not 11 g5?
            \(\text{g}g4\)!) 11...b5 12 g5 \(\text{d}d7\) 13 0-0-0 \(\text{b}b8\)
            (13...\(\text{c}c5\)?) 14 e5!) 14 f4 a5 15 a4 (15
            a3 \(\text{d}d5\)!) 16 e5 b4 \(\text{Sokolov}\) 15...\(\text{b}xa4\)
            16 \(\text{xa4}\) \(\text{b}b4\) 17 \(\text{a}a2\) a4! 18 \(\text{x}xa4\)
            \(\text{c}c7\) 19 f5 \(\text{c}c5\) 20 f6 \(\text{d}d8\) offers
            compensation for Black, \(\text{Velimirović-}\)
            A.\(\text{Sokolov}\), Yugoslavia 1998.

b) 9...\(\text{a}a5\)!? 10 f3 \(\text{xd}7\) (similar
    positions may arise in the variation 5...a6
    6 \(\text{c}c4\) e6 7 \(\text{b}b3\) \(\text{e}e7\) 8 \(\text{g}4\)), and now:

    b1) 11 \(\text{d}d2\) \(\text{c}c5\) 12 0-0-0 0-0 13
        \(\text{b}b1\) \(\text{xd}4\) 14 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{c}c7\) (14...b5 15
        \(\text{d}d5\)!) 15 g5 b5 16 h4, \(\text{Velimirović-}\)
        \(\text{Popović, Yugoslavia Ch (play-off) 1997}\)
        \((\pm \text{Informer})\).

    b2) 11 h4 0-0 (11...\(\text{c}c5\) 12 \(\text{d}d2\)
        0-0 13 0-0-0 \(\text{xd}4\) 14 \(\text{xd}4\) b5 15
        \(\text{b}b1\) b4 16 \(\text{e}e2\) \(\text{xb}3\) \(\text{Ivanović-}\)
        \(\text{Popović, Bar 1997}) 12 \(\text{e}e2\) \(\text{c}c5\) 13
        0-0-0 \(\text{xd}4\) 14 \(\text{xd}4\) b5 15 e5 \(\text{c}c7\) 16
        f4 11-11 \(\text{Velimirović-Popović, Yugoslavia}\)
        Ch 1999.

We see that 9 g4 has not as yet ac-
quired any followers outside Yugoslavia,
as the new variations are very
unclear while the old continuations
are still attractive for White. Neverthe-
less, it is one more worry for Black.

B)
9 0-0
White has to continue 10 f4 after all Black’s main answers, so the immediate 9 f4, preserving the possibility of 10 $\text{Wf3}!$, is more flexible. Still I have no great objections to 9 0-0; for example, Black can gain no benefit from 9...$\text{Dc}a5$ 10 f4 $\text{Dxb}3$ (10...b5? 11 e5; 10...$\text{Wc}7$ transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 10th move in Line C12) 11 axb3 0-0 12 $\text{Wf}3!$ and White achieves the optimal arrangement of pieces.

The difference between 9 f4 and 9 0-0 may, however, be of importance after:

9...$\text{Dxd}4$!? 10 $\text{Dxd}4$ b5

Usually this follows one move later (after 9...0-0 10 f4). One possible idea in playing the move here is that after 11 f4 (– 9 f4 $\text{Dxd}4$!? 10 $\text{Dxd}4$ b5 11 0-0), Black can play 11...$\text{b}b7$!? With the pawn on f2, 11 a4!? is possible, when 11...b4 12 a5 0-0! (not 12...$\text{bxc}3$? 13 $\text{b}b6$! ++) seems satisfactory for Black.

C)

9 f4 (D)

The two main moves here are:

C1: 9...$\text{Wc}7$!? 134
C2: 9...0-0 137

Other moves:

a) 9...d5?! 10 e5 $\text{Dd}7$ 11 0-0!? $\text{Cc}5$ 12 $\text{h}1$ gives White the better prospects, Minić-Klemenč, Oberhausen Echt 1961.

b) 9...$\text{Dxa}5$. Now 10 e5 is unconvincing in view of 10...dxe5 11 fxe5 $\text{Dd}7$ 12 $\text{xe}6$ $\text{xe}5$ 13 $\text{h}5$ $\text{Dac}4$! (Therrell-Melvin, Alabama 1995) but 10 0-0 is normal, or maybe 10 $\text{Wf}3$!? b5 11 e5 $\text{b}7$ 12 exf6, as in Estring-Kletsel, Moscow 1962.

c) 9...$\text{Dd}7$ contains few noteworthy ideas:

   c1) 10 $\text{Wf}3$ and now:

   c11) 10...b5? is weak due to 11 e5.

c12) After 10...$\text{Dxd}4$ 11 $\text{Dxd}4$ $\text{Cc}6$, both 12 g4 and 12 f5 e5 13 $\text{f}f2$ seem good.

   c13) 10...0-0 transposes to note ‘c’ to Black’s 10th move in Line C21.

c2) 10 0-0 b5!? (10...$\text{Cc}7$ – 9...$\text{Cc}7$

10 0-0 $\text{Dd}7$; 10...0-0 – 9...0-0 10 0-0

$\text{Dd}7$; 10...$\text{Cc}8$?! 11 f5!) 11 f5 (11 a3 has fewer pretensions) 11...$\text{Cc}8$ 12 $\text{fxe}6$ (12 $\text{Wf}3$ $\text{Dxd}4$ 13 $\text{Dxd}4$ 0-0 14 $\text{a}3$ $\frac{1}{2}$-$\frac{1}{2}$ de Firmian-Ftačnik, Polanica Zdroj 1995) 12...$\text{fxe}6$ 13 $\text{Cc}6$ $\text{Wxc}6$.

Now, instead of 14 $\text{Wd}4$ 0-0! = Kaidanov-Ehlvest, New York 1994, White should try something else; for example, 14 $\text{Dd}3$!? (14 $\text{Wh}1$!? or even 14 $\text{Wf}4$) 14...b4 15 $\text{Cc}4$ $\text{Dxe}4$ 16 $\text{h}1$.

c3) 10 f5!?.

d) 9...$\text{Dxd}4$!? (continuing the theme of 9 0-0 $\text{Dxd}4$!), and then:

   d1) 10 $\text{Dxd}4$ b5 and now:

   d11) 11 0-0 can be met by 11...0-0, transposing to Line C222, or 11...$\text{b}7$!? 12 e5 $\text{dxe}5$ 13 $\text{fxe}5$ $\text{Dd}7$!? – 11 e5

$\text{dxe}5$ 12 $\text{fxe}5$ $\text{Dd}7$ 13 0-0 $\text{b}7$!?.

   d12) 11 e5 $\text{dxe}5$ 12 $\text{fxe}5$ $\text{Dd}7$ 13 0-0 (13 $\text{Wf}3$!? $\text{b}8$; 13 $\text{Wg}4$ 0-0), and
instead of 13...0-0 (which transposes to Line C222), 13...♗b7?! (preventing 14 ♕e4) is interesting. Surprisingly, I do not see anything for White:

      d121) After 14 ♘h5, possible is
               14...♗xf6 15 exf6 ♗xd4+ 16 ♘h1 ♘xf6
               17 ♘xe6 0-0 or 14...0-0 with the point
               15 ♘xf7 (15 ♘ad1 ♘c5) 15...♗xf7 16
               ♘xe6 ♘xe5 17 ♘xe5 ♘f6 18 ♘xf7+ ♘h8!=.

      d122) Or 14 ♗g4 0-0! (14...♘c5
               15 ♘e3!), and after 15 ♘xf7 ♘xf7 16
               ♘xe6+ ♘e8, the known continuation
               is 17 ♗h5+(?) g6 18 ♗xh7 ♘xe5 --.
               Better but still not convincing is 17
               ♘e4!? ♘xe4 18 ♗xe4 g6 (possibly
               even stronger is 18...♗c8; e.g., 19 ♗xh7
               ♘xe5!) 19 ♘xd7+ ♘xd7 20 e6+ ♘c7
               21 ♘d1 ♘f5 22 ♘e5+ ♘xe5 23 ♘xe5+
               ♘d6=.

      d2) After 10 ♘xd4! 0-0 11 0-0-0
           Black has suffered difficulties: 11...♗c7
           (11...b5 12 e5 dxe5 13 ♘xe5 ± Varavin-Zagreblny, Alma-Ata 1995) 12
           ♘h1 (or 12 ♗b6!? ♗b8 13 ♘h1 ♘d7
           14 ♘d4 ♘c5 15 f5 with an advantage,
           Varga-Meissner, Altensteig 1993)
           12...b5 13 f5 ± Kindermann-H.Schuh,
           Bundesliga 1993/4.

C1)

9...♗c7!? (D)

By playing this, Black rejects the
popular plan of 9...0-0 10 0-0 ♘xd4
but keeps the possibility of 10 0-0 0-0
(9...0-0 10 0-0 ♗c7). Here it is im-
portant which of the moves (9...♗c7
or 9...0-0) works better against 10 ♗f3
- the question still remains unan-
swered.

In addition, the position is im-
portant due to the move-order 8...♗c7 9
f4 ♘e7.

As in the main variation 9...0-0, here
White has two main moves:

C11: 10 ♗f3

C12: 10 0-0

Other ideas:

a) 10 ♗e2 (a rare hybrid of Sozin
and Velimirović) 10...b5!? (10...0-0
9...0-0 10 ♗e2 ♗c7; 10...♘a5!?)
11 f5
11 0-0 10 b5 11 ♗e2; 11 0-0-0!?

is unclear) 11...♘xd4 12 ♘xd4 b4 13
e5 with complications where White
has no apparent advantage, Nijboer-

b) 10 f5!? has not been played at a
serious level.

C11)

10 ♗f3 ♘xd4?!

Other moves:

a) 10...0-0 11 0-0-0, transposing to
Line C211, might represent a micro-
concession by Black.

b) 10...b5 11 e5 ♗b7 (11...♘xd4?!
12 ♗xa8) 12 ♘xe6 fxe6 13 exf6 ♗xf6
14 ♗h3 is better for White, Khas-
dovsky-Siddikov, Uzbekistan 1969.

c) 10...♘d7 11 0-0-0 (11 f5 is also
good; e.g., 11...♘xd4 12 ♘xd4 e5 13
♗e3 ♘c6 14 g4 b5 15 g5 ♘xe4 16
♗xe4 ♗b7 17 f6! +- Plaskett-Krush,
Hampstead 2001) 11...c8 (11...0-0 – 10...0-0 11 0-0 0-0 0-0 d7) 12 g4! with an advantage, Howell-Bologan, Biel open 1993.

d) 10...a5 11 g4! (11 0-0 – 10 0-0 a5 11 a5 b3 11 0-0-0 b5!? 12 e5 a7 13 a5 dxe5 14 fx e5 a7 15 a4+!?; 11 f5!?) with somewhat superior chances for White:

d1) 11...h6 12 0-0 b5 13 g5 a5 x b3+ 14 a x b3 hxg5 15 fxg5 a7 16 g6 ± Istratescu-Nevednicny, Bucharest 1994.

d2) 11...d5 12 exd5 a5 xb3 13 a5 b5 a5 d7 14 a5 x d5 exd5 15 0-0-0 ± Ostojic-Parma, Yugoslav Ch (Umag) 1972.

d3) 11...c4 12 a5 x c4 a5 x c4, and now 13 0-0-0!? b5 14 e5 is possibly more accurate than 13 g5 a5 d7.

d4) 11...0-0 12 g5 (12 0-0-0 – 9...0-0 10 a5 c7 11 0-0-0 a5 12 g4) 12...d7 13 0-0-0 (13 x e6 e5! Kasparov/Nikitin) 13...xd5+ (alternatively, 13...b5 – 9...0-0 10 a5 c7 11 0-0-0 a5 12 g4 b5 13 g5 a5 d7) 14 axb3 b5 – 9...0-0 10 a5 c7 11 0-0-0 a5 12 g4 b5 13 g5 a5 d7+ 14 axb3 d7 ±.

11 a5 x d4 b5 12 a3

Other moves are:

a) 12 0-0-0 a7 b7 with strong counterplay.

b) 12 e5 dxe5 13 fxe5 a7 b7 14 a5 g3 a4! 15 a5 a5 h7 0-0-0 16 a5 f1 (16 0-0-0 a5 d8 ++) 16 a5 x e4 a5 x e4 17 a5 f1 a5 g6 16 a5 h8 17 a5 f1 18 a5 x e6+ a8 19 0-0-0 a5 g5+ 20 a5 b1 a5 d2+ 21 a5 d2 a5 d2 22 a5 b6 a5 c3!! 23 a5 d8 a5 f3!! ++ Madl-Chiburianidze, Batumi wom Echt 2000.

c) 12 f5?!, and now 12...0-0 transposes to note ‘c’ to White’s 11th move in Line C211. Black has two unclear alternatives: 12...b4 and 12...e5 13 a5 f2 (13 a5 e5?!) 13...a5 b7 14 0-0 b4 15 a5 d5 a5 x d5 16 a5 x d5 (16 a5 x d5?!) 16 a4+??) 16...0-0, Blees-Lanka, Ljubljana 1994.

12...0-0

12...a5 b7 13 0-0 (13 0-0-0!!) 13...0-0 transposes to note ‘c’ to White’s 13th move in Line C221.

13 0-0-0

13 0-0-0 9...0-0 10 0-0 a5 c7 11 a5 c7 12 a5 d4 b5 13 a3?! =.

13...d7?!

According to Stoica and Istratescu, both 13...a5 b7 14 f5! and 13...a5 b7 14 e5! favour White.

After the text-move (13...d7??), 14 a5 c7?! is dubious in view of 14...a5 b7 (14...a5 b7?! Kupreichik) 15 f5 e5 16 e5 c3 and now either 16...a5 = Schandorff-Kupreichik, Copenhagen 1993 or 16...a5? (Kupreichik). White should choose among 14 f5, 14 e5?! dxe5 15 fxe5 a5 c6 16 exf6 and 14 g4?! e5 15 g5.

C12)

10 0-0 (D)

| B |

Now 10...0-0 is the main move; see 9...0-0 10 0-0 a5 c7 (Line C221).
10...b5

Played by Larsen, Tal and Anand. The other options are:

a) 10...d7 does not contain any meaningful ideas (besides 11...0-0):
   a1) 11 w3f3 cxd4?! 12 cxd4 cc6 13 f5 e5 14 e3 b5 15 g5 xe4 16 e4 xe5 17 c5 f7+!, Benderac-Gnjatovic, Yugoslavia 1996.
   a2) 11 f5 cxd4 (11...e5? 12 c6! fxe6 13 fxe6 c8 14 c7f6 ++) 12 cxd4 (12 cxd4?) 12...b5 12...0-0 10 0-0 c7 11 f5 cxd4 12 cxd4 d7 ±) 13 a3 (13 fxe6??). Now, 13...0-0!? transposes to note ‘b12 to White’s 11th move in Line C221. Instead, 13...e5 14 e3 c6 15 g5! (after 15 d5, rather than 15...xd5
   16 cxd5 ±Fischer-Cardoso, New York (4) 1957, Black should play 15...b7!, as in Golubev-Liu-barsky, Ukrainian jr Ch (Evpatoria) 1984) 15...e4 16 e7! favours White.
   b) 10...a5 contains ideas, but they work rather poorly:
   b1) 11 a4+ d7 12 cxd7+ wxd7! 13 e5?! dxe5 14 fxe5 c4! ±.
   b2) 11 w2b5 (11...0-0!?) =) 12 f5 cxb3 (12...e5) 13 cxb3 (13 axb3 b4!) ± Lipnitsky-Taimanov, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1951) 13...e5 14 c2 ± Ivanovic-Cebalo, Pula 1991.
   b3) 11 w3f3 b5! on the whole suits Black:
   b31) 12 a3 can be met by 12...cxb3 or 12...b7 =.
   b32) Unclear is 12 g4 b4!? (12...h5 13 g4 g4 14 g6! Khenkin) 13 ce2 cxb3 14 axb3 b7 15 g3 d7 Boleslavsky.
   b33) 12 f5?? e5 (12...dxb3!? 13 axb3 b4 14 e5? c7) 13 d5 cxd5 14 cxd5 exd4 15 cxd4 f6 (15...b7 is critical) 16 xf6 gxf6 17 xa8 w7+ 18 f2 xa8 19 c3 ± Adorjan-Ribli, Hungary 1969.
   b34) 12 e5 b7 13 g3 dxe5! (13...xb3 14 cxb3; 13...h5 14 h3 b3 15 cxb3 g6 16 ac1! Boleslavsky) 14 fxe5 h5 (14...xb3!? and now:
   b341) 15 wh3 cxb3 (15...xe5? 16 e6!, Averbakh-Taimanov, Zurich Ch 1953) 16 cxb3 w5 17 a5 b4! is good for Black, Bannik-Taimanov, USSR Ch (Kiev) 1954.
   b342) Double-edged play results after 15 w2f2 0-0 16 g4 cxb3; e.g., 17 axb3 f6!? (17...wxe5 18 gxh5 wh5 19 c2!) 18 gxh5 fxe5 19 wh3 c5 20 h6 g6 21 f8=wh8 = Emms-Shipov, Thessaloniki 1996.
   b343) 15 e6 cxb3 15...f6? (16...h3 ±) 16 f7+ d7 17 e6+ e8 (17...d8? 18 ad1!!) is a draw.
   b4) 11 g4!.
   b5) 11 f5! and then:
   b51) 11...e5 12 c2d2 c4 (12...b5 13 g5!; 12...d7 13 h1!!?) 13 d5!? (13...e4 wh4 and now 14 b3! Schach-Archiv or 14 g5!!?) 13...xd5 14 whd5 cxe5 15 wh7+ d8 16 whxg7 ee8 17 f3 wb6 18 h1 d5 (Akhmadeev-Ragozin, Russian Ch (Elista) 1994) 19 cxd5 with an advantage – Cu.Hansen.
   b52) 11...c4 12 cxb4 cxc4 13 w3f3 0-0 (13...e5 can be answered by Kaidanov’s 14 c2b3! b5 15 d2 or 14 d2 b5 15 b3! wb6 16 d5!, Ciocaltea-Halic, Romanian Ch (Bucharest) 1954) 14 ad1 b5? (14...b8 15 g4!; 14...e5 ±; 14...d7!! – Kaidanov) 15 fxe6 fxe6 16 e5 ± Kaidanov-Smirin, Groningen PCA qual 1993.

We now return to 10...b5 (D):
11 \( \text{\#xc6} \)

Otherwise:

a) 11 \( \text{\#e2} \) can be answered by 11...\( \text{\#xd4}!? = (\text{Akopian}) \) or 11...\( \text{\#a5} - 10...\( \text{\#a5} \) 11 \( \text{\#xe2} \) \( \text{\#b5} \).

b) 11 \( \text{\#f3} \) gives Black a choice between 11...\( \text{\#b7}!? \) and 11...\( \text{\#a5} - 10...\( \text{\#a5} \) 11 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#b5} \).

c) After 11 a3, 11...0-0 (11...\( \text{\#b7} \) 12 f5 e5 13 \( \text{\#xc6} \) \( \text{\#xc6} - 10...\( \text{\#d7} \) 11 f5 \( \text{\#xd4} \) 12 \( \text{\#xd4} \) b5 13 a3 e5 14 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#c6} \) \( \pm \) 11...\( \text{\#a5}!? \) ) is OK; e.g., 12 f5 \( \text{\#xd4} \) 13 \( \text{\#xd4} - 9...0-0 \) 10 0-0 \( \text{\#c7} \) 11 f5 \( \text{\#xd4} \) 12 \( \text{\#xd4} \) b5 13 a3.

d) 11 f5 is popular: 11...\( \text{\#xd4}! \) (11...b4? 12 \( \text{\#a4} \) \( \text{\#b7} \) 13 \( \text{\#xe6} \) \( \text{\#b3} \) 14 \( \text{\#xf7} \)) and now:

d1) 12 \( \text{\#xd4}!? 0-0 \) and now, rather than 13 \( \text{\#xe6} !\) (13...\( \text{\#xe6} \) 14 \( \text{\#d5} \) \( \text{\#xd5} \) 15 \( \text{\#exd5} \) \( \pm \) 14 \( \text{\#ad1} \) \( \text{\#ac8} = \text{Ab.Khasin-Tal, USSR Ch (Leningrad) 1956, Tal recommended 13 \( \text{\#ad1} \).}

d2) 12 \( \text{\#xd4} \) e5?! (12...b4?! 13 \( \text{\#a4} \) \( \text{\#b8} \) = Bitansky-Lerner, Tel-Aviv 2001; 12...0-0 - 9...0-0 10 0-0 \( \text{\#c7} \) 11 f5 \( \text{\#xd4} \) 12 \( \text{\#xd4} \) b5 13 \( \text{\#f2} \) (13 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#b7} \) 14 \( \text{\#g5} \) [14 \( \text{\#d5}!? \) ] 14...\( \text{\#xe4} \) 15 \( \text{\#xe4} \) \( \text{\#xe4} \) 16 \( \text{\#g4} \) d5 with a double-edged game, Veröci-Liu Shihan, Thessaloniki wom OL 1984) 13...\( \text{\#b7} \) 14 a3 (14 \( \text{\#h4} \) \( \text{\#xe4} \) 15 \( \text{\#xe4} \) \( \text{\#xe4} \) 16 \( \text{\#g4} \) d5 17 \( \text{\#g4} \) d5 17 \( \text{\#xe7} \) 0-0-0 with counterplay – Anand) 14...0-0 15 \( \text{\#f3} \) transposes to note ‘c31’ to White’s 13th move in Line C221 (=).

11...\( \text{\#xc6} \) 12 \( \text{\#f5} \) 0-0

12...\( \text{\#d7} \) 13 \( \text{\#xe6} \) \( \text{\#xe6} \) transposes to note ‘c2’ to Black’s 9th move in Line C.

13 \( \text{\#xe6} \) \( \text{\#xe6} \)

13...\( \text{\#xe6} \) 14 \( \text{\#d5} \).

14 \( \text{\#d5} \) \( \text{\#xd5} \) 15 \( \text{\#xd5} \) \( \text{\#d7} \) 16 \( \text{\#f4} \) \( \pm \) Golubev-Belotti, Grächen 1999.

C2)

9...0-0 (D)

Now:

C21: 10 \( \text{\#f3} \) 138

C22: 10 0-0 142

10 \( \text{\#e2}!? \) continues the topic of hybrids:

a) 10...\( \text{\#xd4} \) 11 \( \text{\#xd4} \) b5 12 0-0-0 \( \text{\#b4} \) (12...\( \text{\#b7} \) can be met by 13 e5 or 13 \( \text{\#f5}!? \) \( \pm \) Nikitin) 13 \( \text{\#a4} \) \( \text{\#b7} \) (13...\( \text{\#e5} \) 14 \( \text{\#xe5} \) \( \text{\#g4} \) 15 \( \text{\#e3} \)! \( \text{\#xd1} \) 16 \( \text{\#xf6} \) \( \text{\#xf6} \) 17 \( \text{\#xd1} \) \( \text{\#c7} \) 18 \( \text{\#b6} \) \( \text{\#ae8} \) 19 \( \text{\#e5} \) with an advantage, Klimov-Eriks-

son, Stockholm 1998; 13...\( \text{\#d7}!? \) 14 \( \text{\#xf6}!? \) \( \text{\#xf6} \) 15 \( \text{\#c5} \) \( \text{\#c6} \) (15...\( \text{\#c8}!? \) Leshpin) 16 e5 \( \text{\#xe5} \) 17 \( \text{\#xe6} \) =

b) 10...\textbf{F}a5 11 g4!? gives White attacking chances.

c) 10...\textbf{Q}d7 11 f5 (11 0-0-0 transpose to note ‘b’ to White’s 11th move in Line A1 of Chapter 10; 11 0-0) 11...\textbf{Q}xd4 12 \textbf{Q}xd4 exf5 13 0-0 fxe4 14 \textbf{Q}xe4 \textbf{Q}e5 15 \textbf{Q}xd6 = Kovaliov-Filipenko, USSR 1986.

d) 10...\textbf{W}c7 11 f5!? (11 0-0-0 transpose to note ‘b’ to White’s 11th move in Line B2 of Chapter 10) 11...\textbf{Q}xd4 (11...exf5 12 \textbf{Q}xf5 \textbf{Q}xf5 13 exf5 d5 14 0-0-0 = A.Ivanov-Kovaliov, USSR 1986) 12 \textbf{Q}xd4 b5 (12...exf5 13 0-0! is slightly better for White, Mikhailchishin-Tukmakov, Rostov 1980) 13 fxe6 fxe6 (13...\textbf{Q}xe6!? 14 0-0 \textbf{Q}h8 (14...b4!? 15 \textbf{Q}a4 \textbf{Q}b8 16 e5 Belikov) 15 a3 \textbf{Q}d7 (15...e5 16 \textbf{Q}e3 =) 16 e5 with a slight advantage for White, Belikov-Mäki, Dresden 2000.

\textbf{C211): 10...\textbf{W}c7} 138

\textbf{C212): 10...\textbf{Q}xd4} 141

Other moves:

a) 10...\textbf{W}a5 11 0-0-0 \textbf{Q}xd4 12 \textbf{Q}xd4 \textbf{Q}d7?! (12...\textbf{Q}d7??) 13 g4! e5 14 \textbf{Q}d5 (14 \textbf{Q}d5 \textbf{W}d8! Yakovich) 14...exd4 15 \textbf{Q}xe7+ \textbf{Q}h8 16 \textbf{Q}xd4 ± Mitkov-Kožul, Skopje open 1991.

b) 10...\textbf{Q}d7 11 0-0-0 (11 0-0!!) 11...\textbf{Q}c5 12 g4 \textbf{Q}d7 13 g5 b5 14 \textbf{Q}b1 \textbf{Q}xb3 15 axb3 \textbf{Q}xd4 16 \textbf{Q}xd4 b4 17 \textbf{Q}a4 ± Kupreichik-Mukhin, USSR 1973.

c) 10...\textbf{Q}d7 11 0-0-0! (11 0-0 – \textbf{Q}d7 11...\textbf{W}f3), and Black faces problems: 11...\textbf{W}c7 – 10...\textbf{W}c7 11 0-0-0 \textbf{Q}d7; 11...\textbf{Q}xd4 12 \textbf{Q}xd4 \textbf{Q}c6 13 g4 or 13 f5! with an advantage; 11...\textbf{W}b8 12 g4 \textbf{Q}xd4 13 \textbf{Q}xd4 e5 14 g5 \textbf{Q}g4 15 \textbf{W}g3 ±; 11...\textbf{Q}a5 12 g4! with an initiative; 11...\textbf{Q}c8 12 g4! (12 f5?! \textbf{Q}xd4! 13 \textbf{Q}xd4 e5 ∞ J.Polgar-I.Ivanov, New York 1989).

d) 10...\textbf{Q}a5 11 0-0-0 (11 g4 b5 12 g5 \textbf{Q}d7 is unclear; e.g., 13 \textbf{Q}g1 b4 14 \textbf{Q}ce2 \textbf{Q}xb3 15 axb3 \textbf{Q}b7 16 f5, Atanasov-Suba, 1978, 16...e5) 11...b5!? (11...\textbf{W}c7 – 10...\textbf{W}c7 11 0-0-0 \textbf{Q}a5; 11...\textbf{Q}xb3+ 12 axb3 \textbf{W}a5 13 \textbf{Q}b1 \textbf{W}h5 14 \textbf{W}f2 ± Enders-Vogt, East German Ch (Nordhausen) 1986) 12 e5 \textbf{Q}b7 13 exf6 \textbf{Q}xf3 14 fxe7 \textbf{W}xe7 with a complicated game, Filipowicz-Gromek, Polish Ch (Rzeszow) 1966.

\textbf{C211): 10...\textbf{W}c7 11 0-0-0}

Otherwise:

a) 11 g4? \textbf{Q}xd4 12 \textbf{Q}xd4 e5.

b) 11 0-0 – 10 0-0 \textbf{W}c7 11 \textbf{W}f3.

c) 11 f5?! \textbf{Q}xd4! (11...d5? 12 fxe6 fxe6 13 exd5 ±; 11...\textbf{Q}h8?! 12 0-0-0;
11...e5 12 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{e} \text{e} \text{2} \) (possibly 12 \( \text{Q} \text{c} \text{x} \text{c} \text{e} \text{6} \) ?) 12...b5 13 g4 b4 14 \( \text{Q} \text{a} \text{4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{7} \) 15 g5 with an attack, Cheremisin-Bakulin, Moscow 1957; 11...\( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{e} \text{5} \) 12 \( \text{W} \text{e} \text{2} \) exf5 13 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{x} \text{f} \text{5} \) and now 13...\( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{f} \text{5} \) 14 exf5 ± Zuckerman-Schön, New York 1987, or 13...d5 14 \( \text{Q} \text{e} \text{x} \text{e} \text{7} \) + \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{e} \text{7} \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{g} \text{5} \) ± Stefansson-Shirov, Reykjavik 1992) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} \text{4} \) b5 (12...e5 13 \( \text{Q} \text{e} \text{3} \) b5 14 a3?!), and now:

c1) 13 a3 and then:

c11) 13...exf5?! 14 exf5 \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \) ±.

c12) 13...\( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{7} \) is well met by 14 g4!.

c13) 13...e5 and then:

c131) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{f} \text{2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \) 15 0-0 transposes to note 'c31' to White's 13th move in Line C221.

c132) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{e} \text{3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \) and now 15 0-0 transposes to note 'c32' to White's 13th move in Line C221, but 15 0-0-0?! is interesting, Zeller-Haist, Württemberg Ch 1995.

c14) 13...\( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{8} \)! and now:

c141) 14 0-0-0 b4 15 axb4 \( \text{K} \text{x} \text{b} \text{4} \) 16 g4 – 14 g4 b4 15 axb4 \( \text{K} \text{x} \text{b} \text{4} \) 16 0-0-0.

c142) Black has good play after 14 0-0 b4! 15 axb4 \( \text{K} \text{x} \text{b} \text{4} \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{e} \text{3} \) exf5 17 exf5 \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \), del Rio-Lerner, Metz 1998.

c143) 14 fxe6 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{e} \text{6} \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} \text{5} \) 16 exd5 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{7} \) is also fine for Black, Apicella-Avrukh, Albufeira ECC 1999.

c144) 14 g4 b4 15 g5 (or 15 axb4 \( \text{K} \text{x} \text{b} \text{4} \) 16 0-0-0 e5 17 \( \text{Q} \text{f} \text{2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{e} \text{1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{8} \)!, Bednarski-Lombard, Skopje OL 1972, with the point 19 g5 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{e} \text{4} \) –)) 15...\( \text{Q} \text{e} \text{8} \)! 16 axb4 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{g} \text{5} \) 17 0-0 \( \text{Q} \text{f} \text{6} \) favours Black, Vera-Lechtinsky, Bratislava 1983.

c2) 13 g4?! b4 (13...\( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \)?! 14 g5 ±; 13...e5?! 14 \( \text{Q} \text{f} \text{2} \) b4 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} \text{5} \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} \text{5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \) ) 14 g5 \( \text{Q} \text{e} \text{8} \). Here, Black may be happy with 15 f6 bxc3 16 fxe7 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{e} \text{7} \) as in Minić-Jansa, Budva 1963, and other games, but 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{5} \)?! exd5 16 \( \text{Q} \text{h} \text{5} \) (Baljon) deserves serious attention.

c3) 13 0-0-0?! b4 14 \( \text{Q} \text{a} \text{4} \). Now 14...exf5 15 exf5 \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{g} \text{3} \), Soffer-Loginov, Budapest 1994, and 14...\( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{8} \) 15 g4 e5 16 \( \text{Q} \text{f} \text{2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{h} \text{e} \text{1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{c} \text{6} \) 18 g5, A.Ivanov-Wessman, Reykjavik tt 1990, do not yield equality. Also dubious seems 14...\( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{e} \text{4} \) 16 exf7+, and now 16 \( \text{Q} \text{g} \text{3} \)!. There remains 14...e5?! with unclear play; e.g., 15 \( \text{Q} \text{f} \text{2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{e} \text{1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{c} \text{6} \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{6} \) \( \text{Q} \text{a} \text{8} \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} \text{5} \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} \text{5} \) a5.

We now return to 11 0-0-0 (D):

![Diagram](image-url)

11...b5(!)

Others:

a) 11...\( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} \text{4} \)?! is hardly successful:

a1) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} \text{4} \) b5 and then:

a11) 13 f5 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{7} \)?! (13...exf5 14 exf5 \( \text{Q} \text{b} \text{7} \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{f} \text{2} \) probably favours White, J.Polgar-Maxwell, Weimar 1989, as does 13...b4 14 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{b} \text{4} \) d5 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{4} \) dxe4 16 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{e} \text{4} \) exf5 17 \( \text{Q} \text{g} \text{5} \) ?) 14 g4 a5 15 g5 a4 16 gxf6 \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{f} \text{6} \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{d} \text{5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{c} \text{8} \)
Medvegy-Somogyi, Hungarian Ch 1992/3, and it appears that Black is ready for complications; e.g., 18 \( \text{w}g2 \) a3 19 \( \text{b}b1 \) axb2 20 \( \text{f}xe6 \) fxe6 21 \( \text{c}xb5 \) \( \text{w}c5 \).

\[ a2) \text{12 \( \text{a}xd4! \) b5 (12...e5 13 \( \text{f}xe5 \) dxe5 14 \( \text{w}g3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 15 \( \text{e}e3 \) ± Khenkin-Zlotnik, Moscow 1965; 12...\( \text{d}d7 \) 13 \( \text{w}g3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 14 \( \text{a}he1 \) ±) 13 \( \text{a}xf6! \) \( \text{x}f6 \) (13...gxf6 14 \( \text{a}d3 \) ± Rublevsky-Ionov, Russian Ch (Elista) 1994) 14 e5 \( \text{b}b7 \) 15 \( \text{d}5! \) ± Votava-Bagaturov, Brno 1991.} \]

\[ b) 11...\( \text{a}a5 \) 12 g4! (12 f5!? 12...b5 (12...\( \text{a}xb3+ \) 13 axb3 b5 will come to the same thing; 12...\( \text{c}c4 \) 13 g5 \( \text{d}d7 \) 14 \( \text{f}5! \) ± Tringov-Letelier, Havana 1971) 13 g5 \( \text{xb3+} \) (13...\( \text{d}d7 \) 14 \( \text{e}e6! \) \( \text{e}5 \) 15 fxe5 fxe6 16 \( \text{w}h3 \)) 14 axb3 \( \text{d}7 \) 15 f5 b4 (15...\( \text{e}5 \) 16 \( \text{g}3! \) is given by Kasparov and Nikitin) 16 \( \text{a}4! \) (16 \( \text{c}e2 \) e5 is unclear) 16...\( \text{e}5 \) 17 \( \text{w}g2 \) ± Yakovich-Ionov, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1991.} \]

\[ c) 11...\( \text{d}d7 \) 12 g4! \( \text{xd}4 \) and then:

\[ c1) 13 \( \text{a}xd4 \) e5 (13...\( \text{c}6?! \) 14 f5!; 13...b5!? 14 f5 b4 15 g5 \( \text{e}8 \) 16 f6 \( \text{d}8 \)) 14 fxe5 dxe5 15 \( \text{w}g3! \) \( \text{x}g4 \) (15...\( \text{d}6 \) 16 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 17 \( \text{w}f3 \) ±) 16 \( \text{d}5 \) with a strong initiative, Trepp-Kaenel, Biel 1989.

\[ c2) 13 \( \text{a}xd4! \) e5 14 \( \text{d}2! \) with an advantage, Ničevski-Lombard, Polanica Zdroj 1974.

\[ d) 11...\( \text{d}7?! \) (e.g. 12 f5 \( \text{c}5 \) 13 \( \text{w}g3 \) \( \text{h}8 \)) is worthy of attention.

\[ 12 \text{e5}

\[ 12 \text{f5} \text{b4} 13 \( \text{a}ce2 \) \( \text{a}xd4 \) 14 \( \text{a}xd4 \) exf5?! (unclear is 14...e5 15 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{w}b8 \) 16 g4 Sokolov) 15 exf5 \( \text{b}7 \) 16 \( \text{w}h3 \)? (16 \( \text{g}3! \), Sokolov, is unclear again) 16...a5 ± Istratescu-A.Sokolov, Groningen FIDE 1997.

\[ 12 \text{g4} \( \text{a}xd4 \) (possibly 12...b4! is even stronger) 13 \( \text{a}xd4 \) (13 \( \text{a}xd4 \) \( \text{a}d1 \) 12...\( \text{a}xd4 \) b5 13 g4) 13...b4! with counterplay, Perez-Smyslov, Havana 1962.

\[ 12...\( \text{a}xd4 \) 12...\( \text{b}7? \) 13 \( \text{a}xe6 \).

\[ 13 \( \text{a}xd4 \)

\[ 13 \( \text{a}xd4? \) dxe5 14 fxe5 \( \text{w}xe5 \) 15 \( \text{w}xa8 \) \( \text{w}xe3+ \) 16 \( \text{a}d2 \) \( \text{g}4 \) ± A.Sokolov.

\[ 13... \text{xe8} \text{dxe5} \] (13...\( \text{c}6?! \), as suggested by Kasparov/Nikitin, is unclear)

\[ 14 \( \text{a}xe5 \) \( \text{c}e7 \) 15 \( \text{a}b7 \) 16 \( \text{a}b6 \) ±) 15 axb3 \( \text{b}7 \) 15...\( \text{w}xe5?! \) 16 \( \text{a}7 ± \) Yakovich-Ionov, St Petersburg 1995) 16 \( \text{a}7 \) \( \text{g}4 \) (or 16...\( \text{d}7 \) with compensation – Ionov.

\[ 13...\( \text{dxe5!} \)

\[ 13...\( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{w}xa8? \) \( \text{b}7 \) 15 \( \text{a}xb5 \) axb5 16 \( \text{w}a3 \) ±

\[ 14 \( \text{a}xe5 \)

After 14 fxe5, the reply 14...\( \text{d}7 \) is sufficient.

\[ 14...\( \text{w}b7 \) 15 \( \text{w}g3 \) b4 16 \( \text{a}2 \)

16 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 17 \( \text{a}d4 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 18 \( \text{c}c4 \) \( \text{w}b5 \) 19 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{d}8 \) is OK for Black, A.Kovačević-Arsić, Ulcinj 1988.
16...a5 17 \text{a}a4


\textbf{C212)}

10...\text{\textit{\textguillemotright}}xd4 11 \text{\textit{\textguillemotright}}xd4 b5 (D)

This move is better than 11...e5 \pm or 11...\text{a}a5 12 f5 exf5 13 0-0!, Velimirović-Popović, Yugoslav Ch (Budva) 1986.

\begin{center}
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The line with 10...\textit{\textguillemotright}xd4 and 11...b5 was recognized as the strongest after Short-Kasparov (1993). It is easy to understand why in 1999 Kasparov did not play like this against Reinderman: in the main line White has a simple draw and various other tries.

12 \textit{\textguillemotright}xf6

\textbf{Or:}

\begin{itemize}
\item a) 12 e5?! dxe5 13 \textit{\textguillemotright}xe5 (13 fxe5 \textit{\textguillemotright}xd4 14 exf6 \textit{\textguillemotright}c5!, Hermlin-Shamkovich, Viljandi 1972) 13...a7! (but not 13...\textit{\textguillemotright}b6? 14 \textit{\textguillemotright}xa8 \textit{\textguillemotright}b7 15 \textit{\textguillemotright}d4 \textit{\textguillemotright}c6 16 \textit{\textguillemotright}a7 \textit{\textguillemotright}d7 17 \textit{\textguillemotright}e3! \textit{\textguillemotright}c5 18 0-0-0 \textit{\textguillemotright}a8 19 \textit{\textguillemotright}d5 \pm).
\item b) 12 0-0-0?! \textit{\textguillemotright}b7 13 \textit{\textguillemotright}he1 is unclear; e.g., 13...b4?! 14 \textit{\textguillemotright}a4 \textit{\textguillemotright}c6, Honfi-Wells, Budapest 1995.
\item c) 12 a3 \textit{\textguillemotright}b7 (12...\textit{\textguillemotright}b8?! 13 0-0-0 b4 14 axb4 \textit{\textguillemotright}xb4 15 e5 dxe5 16 \textit{\textguillemotright}c5 \textit{\textguillemotright}c7 17 \textit{\textguillemotright}xb4 \textit{\textguillemotright}xb4 with compensation, Istratescu-Milu, Romanian Ch (Bucharest) 1992) 13 0-0-0 (13 0-0 transposes to note ‘c2’ to White’s 12th move in Line C222) has frequently occurred:
\begin{itemize}
\item c1) 13...\textit{\textguillemotright}c8 14 \textit{\textguillemotright}he1 (14 f5 \textit{\textguillemotright}xc3!)
\item c2) 13...a5! 14 \textit{\textguillemotright}xf6 \textit{\textguillemotright}xf6 15 \textit{\textguillemotright}xb5 a4 16 \textit{\textguillemotright}c4! (16 \textit{\textguillemotright}xd6 \textit{\textguillemotright}c8! 17 \textit{\textguillemotright}a2 \textit{\textguillemotright}c5! 18 \textit{\textguillemotright}d3, Istratescu-Buturin, Bucharest 1992, 18...\textit{\textguillemotright}c6! with the point 19 \textit{\textguillemotright}c7 \textit{\textguillemotright}xe4 20 \textit{\textguillemotright}xe4 \textit{\textguillemotright}xb2+ \pm Stoica/Istratescu) 16...d5! (possibly best) 17 e5 (17 exd5 \textit{\textguillemotright}b6! 18 \textit{\textguillemotright}e2 exd5 19 \textit{\textguillemotright}xd5 \textit{\textguillemotright}a8 20 \textit{\textguillemotright}g4 dxe5 21 \textit{\textguillemotright}h3 \textit{\textguillemotright}xb2+! \pm).
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

12...\textit{\textguillemotright}xf6 13 e5 \textit{\textguillemotright}h4+ 14 g3 \textit{\textguillemotright}b8!

\textbf{15 gxh4}

\textbf{Or:}

\begin{itemize}
\item a) 15 exd6 \textit{\textguillemotright}b7 16 \textit{\textguillemotright}e4 f5 17 \textit{\textguillemotright}xe6+ \textit{\textguillemotright}h8 18 \textit{\textguillemotright}xf5 \textit{\textguillemotright}xf5 19 0-0-0 \textit{\textguillemotright}a5!?.
\item b) 15 \textit{\textguillemotright}f1 \textit{\textguillemotright}e7 16 0-0-0 a5!? (also possible is 16...\textit{\textguillemotright}c7) 17 exd6 \textit{\textguillemotright}xd6 18 f5? (18 \textit{\textguillemotright}d3 \textit{\textguillemotright}e7 19 \textit{\textguillemotright}xb5 \textit{\textguillemotright}c7 20 \textit{\textguillemotright}e5 \textit{\textguillemotright}b6 21 \textit{\textguillemotright}a4 \textit{\textguillemotright}a7 with compensation, San Segundo) 18...a4 \pm Morozhevich-San Segundo, Madrid 1996.
\item c) 15 0-0-0!? and then:
c1) 15...b7 16 e4 and now:

c11) 16...xe4 17 wxe4 d5 18 w3 (18 wf3 xe7 19 f5 a5! 20 c3 a4 21 cc2 b4 22 f6 gxf6 23 xh7+ = Ehli-
vest-Medinis, Las Vegas 1998) 18...xe7 19 h4 wa5 (19...a5 20 c3 b4 21 cc2 g6 22 h5 bxc3 23 hxg6 hgx6 24 hh6 +-- Russian Chess Review) 20 f5 ± Morozevich-Mitenkov, Moscow 1991.

c12) 16...e7 17 exd6 (17 f5! ± Borkowski-J.Adamski, Polish Ch 1983) 17...xd6 18 hel a5 with a good game for Black, Hmad-de Firmian, Tunis IZ 1985.

c2) 15...e7! 16 hel? (16 exd6 xc6 17 cc4 e7 transposes to line 'c12') 16...d5 ± Morozevich-de Firmian, Amsterdam 1996.

15...b7 16 e4
16 wg3?! xh1 17 0-0-0 b4?.
16 dx e5
16...w xh4+ 17 wg3 (17 uf1 dxe5
∞) 17...w xg3+ 18 w xg3 xh1 19
xh1 ± Kasparov.

17 wg1 g6!

Other moves are poor; for example:
17...xe4? 18 w e4 w xh4+ 19 uf1
exf4 20 wg2 ± Kasparov; 17...w xh4+?
18 wg3 w xg3+ 19 w xg3 exf4 20 gh5
+- Shamkovich; 17...d4? 18 w f6+
h8 19 wg3 +-. After the text-move (17...g6!), the critical position arises:

a) 18 d1 xe4 19 wxe4 w xh4+ and Black stands no worse, Short-Kas-

b) 18 g5 wd4 19 xe5 (or 19
flg7 20 c3 xf3 21 cxd4 xf6) 19...wg1+ with perpetual check – Kas-
parov.

What else?

c) 18 uf1 f5!? does not seem convi-

C22)
10 0-0 (D)

Via a long winding road, we have reached the Classical Sozin main line.
The principal continuations are:

C221: 10...wc7 143
C222: 10...xd4 147

Other moves:

a) 10...d5?! 11 e5 d67 is hardly sufficient (here it is worth mentioning 12 w h5 xe8? 13 xxd5!! exd5 14
w x f 7 + ! ! -- Troinov-L.Popov, Bul-
garia 1962).

b) 10...a5, and then:

b1) 11 w f 3 b5?! (better is 11...wc7
– 10...wc7 11 w f 3 a5) 12 e5 b7
13 exf6! xf3 14 fe7 x f 7 15 x f 3
(Suetin) is dangerous for Black.

b2) 11 f5 xb3 12 axb3 d7 13
w f 3 (13 g4?! e5 14 g5 exd4 15 xxd4!) 13...b5! = Ki.Georgiev-Xu Jun, Mos-
cow OL 1994.
b3) 11 e5! \(\text{Q}e8\) (11...dxe5 12 fxe5 \(\pm\) \(\text{Q}d7\)? 13 \(\text{Q}xf7\)!), and both 12 \(\text{W}h5\) and 12 \(\text{W}g4\) preserve the initiative.

c) 10...\(\text{d}d7\) requires a precise reaction:

\(\text{c1) 11} \text{W}e2\) b5! = 12 e5 dxe5 13 \(\text{Q}xc6\) \(\text{Q}xc6\) 14 fxe5 \(\text{Q}e4!\) 15 \(\text{W}f3?\) \(\text{W}d7\)! \(\rightarrow\) Padevsky-Larsen, Moscow OL 1956.

\(\text{c2) 11} \text{W}f3\) b5! = (Pritchett-Larsen, Dundee 1967) 12 e5 \(\text{Q}xd4\) 13 \(\text{Q}xd4\) dxe5 14 fxe5 \(\text{Q}c6!\).

\(\text{c3) 11} f5! \(\text{Q}xd4\) (11...\(\text{Q}c8?\) 12 fxe6 \(\pm\) \(\text{Q}xe6?!\) 13 \(\text{Q}xe6\) fxe6 14 \(\text{Q}a4\) \(\rightarrow\) Fischer-Larsen, Denver Ct (3) 1971; 11...\(\text{e}5\) 12 \(\text{Q}de2\) \(\pm\) 12 \(\text{Q}xd4\) (12 \(\text{Q}xd4\) \(\text{Q}g4=\) ) 12...\(\text{exf5}\) (12...\(\text{W}c7\) transposes to note ‘b’ to White’s 11th move in Line C221; 12...\(\text{e}5\) 13 \(\text{Q}\!\!\!e3\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 14 \(\text{W}f3\) b5 15 \(\text{Q}g5\) \(\pm\) 12)...b5 13 \(\text{Q}xf6!,\) K.Müller-Heinemann, German Ch (Altenkirchen) 1999) 13 \(\text{exf5}\) \(\text{W}a5\) (or 13...\(\text{Q}c6\) 14 \(\text{W}e1\) b5 15 \(\text{Q}g3\) \(\text{Q}c8\) 16 \(\text{Q}ae1\) b4 17 \(\text{Q}a4\) \(\text{Q}b5\), Motousis-Greenfeld, Novi Sad OL 1990, 18 \(\text{Q}b6!\) \(\pm\) 14 \(\text{W}d3\) (14 \(\text{W}e1!)\) 14...\(\text{c}6\) 15 \(\text{Q}ae1\) \(\text{Q}ae8\) with the idea of ...\(\text{Q}d8\) gives Black a defensible position, Lendwai-Brunner, Graz 1991.

C221)

10...\(\text{W}c7\) (D)

This occurs two or three times less frequently than 10...\(\text{Q}xd4\), but a comparable amount of material has been accumulated as a consequence of transpositions from an early ...\(\text{W}c7\).

11 \(\text{W}f3\)

Otherwise:

\(\text{a) 11} \text{Q}h1 \text{Q}xd4\) (11...\(\text{Q}a5!?\) 12 \(\text{W}xd4\) b5 (12...\(\text{Q}d7?!\) 13 \(\text{Q}ad1\) \(\text{Q}c5\) 14 f5! \(\pm\) de Firmian-Stefansson, Moscow OL 1996; 12...\(\text{Q}g4\) 13 \(\text{W}b6\) \(\pm\)

Psakhis) 13 f5 transposes to note ‘b’ after Black’s 12th move in Line B2 of Chapter 8.

\(\text{b) A worthy alternative is 11} f5 \text{Q}xd4 (11...\(\text{e}5\) 12 \(\text{Q}de2\) \(\pm\) 12 \(\text{Q}xd4\) 12...\(\text{w}d4\) \(\text{b}5\) transposes to note ‘d1’ to White’s 11th move in Line C12) 12...b5 (12...\(\text{e}5?!\) 13 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 14 \(\text{W}f3\) b5 15 \(\text{Q}g5\) \(\pm\) 12)...b5 13 \(\text{Q}xf6!,\) K.Müller-Heinemann, German Ch (Altenkirchen) 1999) 13 \(\text{exf5}\) \(\text{w}a5\) (or 13...\(\text{Q}c6\) 14 \(\text{W}e1\) b5 15 \(\text{Q}g3\) \(\text{Q}c8\) 16 \(\text{Q}ae1\) b4 17 \(\text{Q}a4\) \(\text{Q}b5\), Motousis-Greenfeld, Novi Sad OL 1990, 18 \(\text{Q}b6!\) \(\pm\) 14 \(\text{W}d3\) (14 \(\text{W}e1!)\) 14...\(\text{c}6\) 15 \(\text{Q}ae1\) \(\text{Q}ae8\) with the idea of ...\(\text{Q}d8\) gives Black a defensible position, Lendwai-Brunner, Graz 1991.

13 a3 and then:

\(\text{b11) 13}\)...\(\text{exf5}?!\) is answered by 14 \(\text{Q}d5!\).

\(\text{b12) 13} \text{Q}d7\) 14 g4 (14 \(\text{w}d3\) \(\text{Q}ac8\) 15 \(\text{Q}h1\) \(\text{w}b7\) = Gorelov-Serper, Russian Ch 1994; 14 \(\text{w}e2!?; 14\text{W}f3?!\) – 11 \(\text{W}f3\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 12 f5 \(\text{Q}xd4\) 13 \(\text{Q}xd4\) b5 14 a3!?) 14...\(\text{h}6\) (14...\(\text{e}5?!\) 15 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 16 \(\text{W}f3\) \(\text{w}b7\) 17 \(\text{Q}d5\) \(\sim\) 15 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{Q}h7\) (Hartston-Suetin, Hastings 1967/8) 16 g5! with a dangerous attack.

b13) 13...\(\text{e}5?!\) and now White faces a typical decision:

\(\text{b131) 14} \text{Q}e3\) \(\text{Q}b7\) and now:
b1312) 15 .require b6?! = Cochrane-Mateus, Dubai OL 1996.

b1313) 15  require g5  require xe4 is satisfactory for Black, Kaminski-Kempinski, Polish Ch (Brzeg Dolny) 1996.

b1314) A curious and risky possibility is 15 g4?!  require xe4 16  require d5  require d8 17  require f3  require c5 18 f6, Roiz-Ahmed, Asturia 1996.

b132) 14  require f2  require b7 and then:  15  require f3 – 11  require f3  require d4 12  require d4 b5 13 a3  require b7 14 f5 e5 15  require f2. However, 15  require e2?! de Firmian-Wharton, Ashville 1990 (15  require e1?! is proposed by Beliavsky and Mikhailchishin) leaves more hope for an advantage.

b14) 13... require b8?! Now both 14  require h1 a5 15 a4 bxa4 16  require xa4  require b4!, Brenjo-Arsovic, Yugoslav Cht 1994, and 14  require d3 b4 15 axb4  require xb4 16 fxe6 fxe6 17  require h1  require h8, Lukin-Aseev, St Petersburg 1996 appear good for Black, though 14 g4?! is not wholly clear.

b2) 13 fxe6 seems most important:  
b21) 13... require xe6 and now:

b211) After 14  require d5  require x d5 15 exd5  require d7 16  require g4  require e5 17  require g3  require ae8, 18 c3 (Bezgodov-Lutsko, Kstovo 1994) is superior to 18 a4 b4 19 a5  require d8! (Ill-escas-Salov, Linares 1990), but hardly gives any real advantage.

b212) Therefore, 14  require d3! is better:  14... require c4?! 15  require g3!; 14... require ae8 15  require h1 (15  require d5?! 15... require d7 16 a4± Mortensen-Radulov, Copenhagen 1991; 14...b4 15  require d5  require x d5 16 exd5  require d7 17 a3 is slightly better for White, Berzinsh-Veingo1d, Tallinn Z 1998.

b22) 13...f xe6 has not been used by grandmasters but still deserves attention:

b221) 14  require d5?! exd5 15  require xf6 gxf6! is unsuccessful for White.

b222) 14  require xf6  require xf6 15  require d5  require a7+! also looks unconvincing for White.

b223) 14 a4?! b4 15  require e2  require h8 16 a5 and now rather than 16... require b7 17  require b6  require c6 18  require d4  require xe4 19  require d2  require d5 20  require xf8+  require f8 21  require e1  require g4?! 22  require xe6  require h4 23  require e2± Golubev-Haist, Biel open 1994, Black may be able to improve with 16... require d7?!.

b224) 14  require e2?! transposes to note ‘d’ to White’s 10th move in Line C2.

We now return to 11  require f3 (D):

11... require x d4

Let us assume, provisionally, that this is the main line. The same positions can be achieved through 11...b5?! after 12 e5  require x d4 (12... require b7? 13  require xe6) 13  require x d4, as well as after 12 a3  require x d4 (or 12... require b7 13 f5  require x d4 14  require x d4) 13  require x d4.

The other lines are:

a) 11... require d7 12 f5  require c5 13  require g3 gives White a small advantage.

b) 11... require a5. Now, White has two tries (and both allow possible transpositions into the... require b7, ... require c5 and... require x b3 lines of the Fischer Attack):

b1) 12 f5 and then:
b11) 12...\(\text{dc}4\) 13 \(\text{dx}c4\) (13 fxe6?!) 13...\(\text{wc}x4\) transposes to note 'b52' to Black's 10th move in Line C12.

b12) 12...\(\text{dx}xb3\) 13 axb3 \(\text{dx}d7\) (or 13...exf5 14 \(\text{dx}f5\) ± Yurtaev-Lerner, Frunze 1989) 14 g4! with an initiative, Morozevich-Dragomaretsky, Alushta 1993.

b13) 12...e5 13 \(\text{de}2\) \(\text{xb}3\) 14 axb3 (14 \(\text{cx}b3\) b5 15 \(\text{ac}1\) and now either 15...\(\text{wd}7\) = Shipov or 15...\(\text{wa}5!\)) 14...b5 15 g4 b4 (15...h6?!?) 16 g5 bxc3 17 gxf6 \(\text{xf}6\) 18 bxc3! ± Fischer-Hamann, Netanya 1968.

b2) 12 g4 and then:

b21) 12...d5 13 e5 and then either 13...\(\text{cd}7\) 14 \(\text{cx}d5!\) exd5 15 \(\text{cx}d5\) \(\text{wd}8\) 16 \(\text{ff}5\) ± (Kimelfeld) or 13...\(\text{de}4\) 14 \(\text{dx}d5\) ±.

b22) 12...\(\text{dc}4\) 13 g5 \(\text{dd}7\) (13...\(\text{de}8\) 14 f5?!) 14 \(\text{df}5\)! ± Golubev-Zahn, Bad Wiessee 1999.

b23) 12...b5 13 g5 \(\text{dd}7\) (13...\(\text{de}8\) 14 f5) 14 \(\text{ex}e6!\) fxe6 15 \(\text{xe}6+\) \(\text{dh}8\) 16 \(\text{cd}5\) \(\text{wd}8\) 17 \(\text{wh}5\) +− Boleslavsky-Aronin, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1949.

b24) 12...\(\text{xb}3\) (the main continuation) 13 \(\text{xb}3\) (13 \(\text{xb}3\)?! e5 14 \(\text{ff}5\) \(\text{xf}5\) 15 exf5 \(\text{wc}6\) 16 g5 \(\text{xf}3\) 17 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{dd}7\) 18 \(\text{dd}5\) \(\text{dd}8\) 19 \(\text{cc}1\) f6 and Black may hold on, Filipowicz-Savon, Moscow 1964) and now:

b241) 13...\(\text{b}8\) is too slow: 14 g5 ± Sozin – Illyin-Zhenevsky, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1931.

b242) 13...\(\text{dd}7\) 14 g5 \(\text{ae}8\) 15 f5 \(\text{de}5\) 16 \(\text{wh}3\) g6 17 \(\text{ff}2\) \(\text{dd}7\) 18 \(\text{af}1\) \(\text{ff}8\) 19 \(\text{ff}4\) ± Yurtaev-Prasad, Cuttack 1998.

b243) 13...e5 is not the most effective way to land a blow in the centre: 14 \(\text{ff}5\) (14 fxe5?!) \(\text{ex}g4\) 15 \(\text{dd}5\) \(\text{wd}8\) 16 e6) 14...\(\text{xf}5\) 15 exf5 (15 gxf5?!) b5 16 \(\text{ff}2\) b4 17 \(\text{dd}5\) \(\text{dd}5\) 18 exd5 \(\text{ff}6\), Golubev-Kudriavtsev, Izhevsk 1997, 19 \(\text{h}1\)!!) 15...\(\text{wc}6\) 16 g5 \(\text{xf}3\) 17 \(\text{xf}3\) is slightly better for White, Honfi-Szily, Budapest 1956.

b244) 13...d5?! 14 e5! (alternatively, 14 exd5 \(\text{dd}5\) 15 \(\text{dd}5\) exd5 16 f5 \(\text{ae}8\) 14...\(\text{de}4!\) 14...\(\text{dd}7\) 15 g5 \(\text{dc}5\) 16 \(\text{wh}5\) ± Vasiukov-Gurgenidze, USSR Ch (Kharkov) 1967) 15 \(\text{exe}4\) dxe4 16 \(\text{exe}4\) \(\text{cc}5\) (Suetin) is not wholly clear.

c) 11...\(\text{dd}7\) is rather a popular plan. Black's relative inactivity makes it possible for White to consider a wide variety of aggressive continuations, but few of them are at all convincing:

c1) 12 g4! \(\text{dd}4\)! 13 \(\text{dd}4\) e5 is unsuccessful for White; e.g., 14 fxe5 dxe5 15 g5?! (15 \(\text{gg}3\) \(\text{cc}6\)?! Khenkin) 15...\(\text{xd}4\) 16 gxf6 dxc3 17 fxe7 \(\text{cc}5+\) ?.

c2) 12 \(\text{dd}a1\) b5! 13 a3 \(\text{dd}4\) 14 \(\text{dd}4\) \(\text{cc}6\) = Boleslavsky.

c3) 12 \(\text{ee}1\) is well met by 12...b5!.

c4) 12 \(\text{hh}1\) b5 13 a3 \(\text{de}5\) (another line is 13...\(\text{dd}4\)?! 14 \(\text{dd}4\) \(\text{cc}6\)!) 14 \(\text{ea}2\) \(\text{dc}4\) 15 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{wc}4\) (15...\(\text{bxc}4\)?)

16 e5 \(\text{dd}5\) 17 \(\text{ff}5\) ± Dembo-Hu Yi, Budapest 1999.

c5) 12...\(\text{de}2\)?! \(\text{de}5\) 13 g4 is interesting.

C6) The main move is 12 f5:

C61) 12...\(\text{hh}8\)?? (consistent!). Now, instead of 13 \(\text{dd}1\) b5 14 a3 \(\text{ee}5\) = Slobodjan-Reddmann, Hamburg 1998, or 13 \(\text{dd}6\) \(\text{cc}6!\)?? 14 \(\text{ee}1\) b5! = Golubev-Reddmann, Hamburg 1999, it is worth investigating 13 \(\text{wh}3\)!! \(\text{dd}4\) 14 \(\text{dd}4\) e5 15 \(\text{ff}2\) \(\text{cc}6\) 16 \(\text{ee}1\) b5 17 \(\text{hh}4\).

C62) 12...\(\text{dd}4\) 13 \(\text{dd}4\) b5 (better than 13...e5?! 14 \(\text{ee}3\) and now 14...b5 15 \(\text{gg}5\) or 14...\(\text{dd}6\) 15 g4) and then:
c621) 14 fxe6!? fxe6 (14...\$ xe6!? 15 \$ d5 \$ xd5 16 exd5 \$ d7 17 \$ g3 \$ e5) 15 \$ f5?! (15 \$ h3 \$ c8 16 \$ ael is also not bad) 15...\$ c8 16 e5 \$ f7 17 \$ f4 dxe5 18 \$ xe5 \$ c6 19 \$ ael \$ \pm Hartley-Bartsch, corr. 1994-6.

c622) 14 g4, and now not 14...h6 15 h4!? \$ h7 16 g5 with a dangerous attack, Bauza Mercere-Moulain, New York 1995, but 14...b4! 15 g5 bxc3 16 gxf6 \$ xf6 17 \$ xf6 gxf6 with good play.

c623) 14 a3!? (a rare case where I find this move interesting – for the explanation see Khenkin’s line below) 14...a5 (14...e5 15 \$ e3/15 \$ f2 \$ c6 – 11...\$ xd4 12 \$ xd4 b5 13 a3 \$ b7 14 f5 e5 15 \$ e3/15 \$ f2 \$ c6?) 15 g4! h6 (15...b4 16 axb4 axb4 17 \$ xa8 \$ xa8 18 g5 bxc3 19 gxf6 \$ xf6 20 \$ xf6 gxf6 21 fxe6 \$ xe6 22 bxc3 \$ Khenkin) 16 h4 (both 16 \$ ael e5!? and 16 \$ ad1 b4 17 axb4 axb4 18 fxe6 are unclear) 16...\$ h7, and now 17 \$ g3 \$ d8 18 fxe6 fxe6 19 g5 hxg5 20 \$ g4 is not clear, V.Nikitin-Smekalin, corr. 1996, but again 17 g5!? looks promising.

12 \$ xd4 b5 (D)

13 f5?! b4 14 fxe6 bxc3 15 exf7+ \$ h8, followed by ...\$ g4, Swan-Muir, St Andrews 1989.

13 a3!? and then:

a) 13...\$ b7. There is only one example here: 14 f5 \$ h8 15 fxe6 fxe6 16 \$ g3 \$ d7 17 e5 dxe5 18 \$ xe5 (Rublevsky-Aseev, St Petersburg 1995) 18...\$ f7? = Aseev.

b) 13...\$ b8!? (also rarely played) 14 \$ ael (14 f5 transposes to note ‘c142’ to White’s 11th move in Line C211) 14...b4 15 e5 bxc3 16 exf6 \$ xf6 17 \$ xf6 gxg6 18 \$ e3 \$ c5 19 \$ h1 \$ b7 (Richardson-Neishtadt, corr. 1990-2) 20 \$ h3!? is all rather unclear.

c) 13...\$ b7 is the predominant choice:

  c1) 14 \$ ael \$ ac8 (14...\$ c6 Anand) 15 \$ g3 \$ h8? 16 \$ h1 \$ c6 17 \$ f3! gives White the initiative. Ljubojević-Anand, Buenos Aires (Sicilian theme) 1994.

  c2) 14 g4 d5 15 e5 \$ c5 with counterplay, Bosch-Rötšagov, Dieren 1997.

  c3) 14 f5 e5 is especially important due to transpositions to the following lines:

  c31) 15 \$ f2 \$ ac8! (15...\$ c6?! appears hazardous for Black after either 16 \$ h4 or 16 g4) 16 \$ fe1 (16 \$ ad1 \$ b8?! 17 \$ fe1 \$ a8; 16 g4 \$ b8?; 16 \$ h4? \$ xe4) 16...h6 17 h3 (17 \$ h4? \$ xe4) 17...\$ c6 18 \$ d3 (1/2–1/2 Ivanchuk-Anand, Linares (3) 1992) 18...\$ b7 19 \$ h4 \$ b7! 20 \$ f2 \$ f6 with a repetition – Anand.

  c32) 15 \$ e3 \$ c6 (15...\$ ac8! appears better, and similar to line ‘c31’; 15...h6!?) Schach-Archiv) and now:

  c321) 16 g4 – 11 f5 \$ xd4 12 \$ xd4 b5 13 a3 \$ d7 14 g4 e5 15 \$ e3 \$ c6 16 \$ f3.
c322) 16 $\text{d}d1?!$ gives Black an agreeable choice between 16...a5 17 g4 b4, Minić-Janošević, Yugoslav Ch (Ljubljana) 1960, and 16...$\text{ab}8$ 17 g4 b4!.

$c323$ 16 $\text{g}5!$ $\text{e}8$ (16...$\text{xe}4?$ 17 $\text{xe}7$ $\text{f}6$ 18 $\text{d}5!$ ± Honfi-Blubaum, Baden-Baden 1979; 16...a5 17 $\text{xf}6$ $\text{xf}6$ 18 $\text{d}5$ b4 19 $\text{xc}6$ $\text{xc}6$ 20 $\text{d}5!$ ± Honfi) 17 $\text{xe}7$ $\text{xe}7$ 18 $\text{d}5$ gives White the initiative.

13...$\text{dxe}5$

Or: 13...$\text{b}7$ 14 $\text{xf}6!$ ±; 13...$\text{d}7$ should, rather than 14 $f5$ $\text{b}7$ 15 $\text{g}3$ $\text{dxe}5$ 16 $\text{fxe}6$ $\text{fxe}6$ 17 $\text{xe}6+$ $\text{h}8$ $\infty$, be met by 14 $\text{exd}6$ ±.

14 $\text{fxe}5$ $\text{d}7$?

Not: 14...$\text{b}7$?! 15 $\text{exf}6!$; 14...$\text{c}5$? 15 $\text{xc}5$ $\text{xc}5+16$ $\text{d}2$ ± Onishchuk-Lerner, Bad Zwesten 1997.

15 $\text{xe}6$!

Not: 15 $\text{e}4$? $\text{b}7$ Veroci-Ioseliani, Donji Milanovac wom Ct (5) 1980; 15 $\text{xa}8$? $\text{b}7$ is also slightly better for Black.

15...$\text{fxe}6$ 16 $\text{xa}8$ $\text{b}7$ 17 $\text{xf}8+$ $\text{xf}8$

17...$\text{xf}8$ is well met by 18 $\text{we}8$! $\text{c}6$ 19 $\text{f}2$ $\text{g}2+20$ $\text{e}1$!. Then there is 20...$\text{b}4$ 21 $\text{xe}6+$ $\text{h}8$ 22 $\text{e}2$ $\text{f}3$ 23 $\text{g}3$ (23 $\text{xa}6$?) 23...$\text{hx}2$ 24 $\text{f}2$ $\text{c}5$ 25 $\text{xc}5 !$ $\text{gx}3+26$ $\text{f}2$ $\text{xe}5+$ 27 $\text{xe}5$ $\text{xe}5$ 28 $a3$ ±, while 20...$\text{wc}6$ 21 $\text{d}1$ $\text{xe}5$ and 20...$\text{h}1+$ 21 $\text{d}2$ $\text{hx}2+$ 22 $\text{e}2$ $\text{xe}5$ 23 $\text{xe}6+$ $\text{f}7$ are also insufficient for Black.

18 $\text{we}8$ $\text{c}5$! 19 $\text{e}2$!

This is better than 19 $\text{d}1$?! $\text{xd}4+20$ $\text{xd}4$ $\text{xe}5$ 21 $\text{d}1$ $\text{g}5$ or 19 $\text{xc}5$ $\text{xc}5+$ 20 $\text{h}1$ (20 $\text{f}1$?! $\text{xe}5$) 20...$\text{f}2$ =.

19...$\text{xd}4+$

Or 19...$\text{xe}5$ 20 $\text{f}1$! $\text{xd}4+21$ $\text{xd}4$ $\text{xd}4+22$ $\text{h}1$, etc.

20 $\text{xd}4$ $\text{xe}5$ 21 $\text{f}1$!

21 c3 $\text{e}4$ =; 21 $\text{f}3$ $\text{e}3+$ = Onischuk-Bologan, Biel 1999.

21...$\text{xd}4+22$ $\text{h}1$ $\text{xc}2+23$ $\text{g}2$ $\text{d}2+$

Now:

a) The stem game, Golubev-Brodsky, Simferopol 1989, continued 24 $\text{g}3$ $\text{g}5+$ 25 $\text{h}3$ $\text{e}3+$ =.

b) 24 $\text{f}3$ ! ± Mowsziszian-Lerner, Bad Wörishofen 1997. Black is obliged to fight for a draw, since 24...$\text{xb}2$? 25 $\text{xe}3$ !-- and 24...$\text{xc}2$? 25 $\text{g}3$! ++ are bad for him.

$\text{C222}$

10...$\text{xd}4$ 11 $\text{xd}4$ $\text{b}5$ (D)

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

12 $\text{e}5$

With other continuations White can scarcely gain an advantage:

a) 12 $\text{e}1$ $\text{b}7$ 13 $\text{d}1$ $\text{c}7$ (or 13...$\text{b}4$ 14 $\text{e}5$ $\text{dxe}5$ 15 $\text{fxe}5$ $\text{d}7$ 16 $\text{e}4$ $\text{xe}4$ 17 $\text{xe}4$ $\text{c}5$ 18 $\text{xc}5$!?) 14 a3 $\text{e}5$ 15 $\text{fxe}5$ $\text{dxe}5$ 16 $\text{g}3$ $\text{c}5$ with equality, G.Kuzmin-Kaplun, Yalta open 1995.

b) 12 $\text{d}3$ $\text{b}7$ 13 $\text{ae}1$ $\text{b}4$ 14 $\text{e}5$

bxc3 15 $\text{fxe}6$ $\text{xf}6$ 16 $\text{xc}3$ $\text{a}5$ =
Kr. Georgiev-Donchev, Bulgarian Ch (Pernik) 1975.

c) 12 a3 \text{\textit{b7}} and then:

c1) 13 \text{\textit{w}}e1 a5!? (or 13...\text{\textit{w}}c7 =) 14 \text{\textit{d}}d1 \text{\textit{b}}4 = Kloovsky-Tavadian, Erevan 1981.

c2) 13 \text{\textit{w}}f3 a5!? 14 \text{\textit{a}}e1 b4 15 axb4 axb4 16 \text{\textit{d}}d1 \text{\textit{c}}7 = Gironella-Pogorelov, St Cugat 1993.

c3) 13 \text{\textit{w}}d3 a5! (13...\text{\textit{w}}c7 can be met by 14 \text{\textit{a}}e1!? or 14 f5 e5 15 \text{\textit{e}}e3 \text{\textit{h}}6! =) and here:

c31) 14 \text{\textit{w}}xb5!? \text{\textit{a}}a6 15 \text{\textit{g}}5 (15 \text{\textit{w}}a4!? 15...\text{\textit{x}}xf1 16 \text{\textit{xf}}1 \text{\textit{w}}c7 17 \text{\textit{w}}g3 \text{\textit{fc}}8 18 \text{\textit{h}}1! a4! is much better for Black, J. Adams-Thompson, corr. 1985.

c32) 14 \text{\textit{a}}e1 b4 15 \text{\textit{b}}5 a4 16 \text{\textit{a}}2 bxa3 17 \text{\textit{x}}a3 d5 18 e5 \text{\textit{e}}e4 with counterplay, K. Müller-D. Gurevich, Bermuda 1998.

c33) 14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5 \text{\textit{d}}d7 16 \text{\textit{x}}xb5 (16 \text{\textit{x}}xf7? \text{\textit{xf}}7 17 \text{\textit{x}}xe6 \text{\textit{xe}}5! —+; 16 \text{\textit{w}}e3!? b4 17 \text{\textit{b}}5 is unclear, Voitsekhovsky-Ulybin, Kstovo 1997) 16...\text{\textit{c}}c5 17 \text{\textit{w}}e3 (17 \text{\textit{x}}xc5 \text{\textit{x}}xc5+ \text{\textit{f}} Fischer-Spassky, Reykjavik Wch (4) 1972) 17...\text{\textit{x}}xb3 18 \text{\textit{w}}xb3 a4! with compensation, Moutousis-Tukmakov, Haifa Echt 1989.

12...dxe5
12...\text{\textit{e}}e8!?.

13 fxe5 \text{\textit{d}}d7

13...\text{\textit{e}}e8 14 \text{\textit{e}}e4 \text{\textit{b}}7 15 \text{\textit{w}}d3 \text{\textit{xe}}4 (15...\text{\textit{c}}c7 16 c3 \text{\textit{d}}8 17 \text{\textit{c}}2 \text{\textit{xe}}4 18 \text{\textit{xe}}4 g6 19 b4 ± Short-Kasparov, Amsterdam 1996) 16 \text{\textit{xe}}4 \text{\textit{c}}8 (16...g6!?, Ehvest-Dlugy, Mazatlan rpd 1988) 17 c3 \text{\textit{c}}c5 ± Short.

14 \text{\textit{e}}e4!

An attack on the kingside does not work here:

a) 14 \text{\textit{g}}4 and then:

a1) 14...\text{\textit{b}}7!? transposes to note 'd122' to Black's 9th move in Line C.

a2) 14...\text{\textit{c}}5!? also seems satisfactory.

a3) 14...\text{\textit{c}}5 and here:

a31) 15 \text{\textit{e}}e2 \text{\textit{xb}}3 (after 15...\text{\textit{b}}7, 16 \text{\textit{g}}3 is well met by 16...\text{\textit{e}}4!, but White can try 16 \text{\textit{d}}d1!? 16 axb3 \text{\textit{w}}d5 17 \text{\textit{c}}3 \text{\textit{d}}7 18 \text{\textit{e}}3 \text{\textit{c}}7 19 \text{\textit{g}}3 \text{\textit{c}}c5 = Yuneev-Aseev, Daugavpils 1989.

a32) 15 \text{\textit{e}}3 \text{\textit{xb}}3 16 axb3 \text{\textit{w}}c7 – 15 \text{\textit{e}}e2 \text{\textit{xb}}3 16 axb3 \text{\textit{w}}d5 17 \text{\textit{c}}3 \text{\textit{d}}7 18 \text{\textit{e}}3 \text{\textit{c}}7.

a33) 15 \text{\textit{d}}d1 \text{\textit{b}}7 16 \text{\textit{h}}1 \text{\textit{xb}}3 (possibly 16...\text{\textit{w}}c7! is simpler) 17 axb3 \text{\textit{w}}c7 18 \text{\textit{d}}3 and now 18...\text{\textit{f}}d8!? (Hort) is good.

b) Nothing is gained by 14 \text{\textit{h}}5 either:

b1) 14...\text{\textit{b}}7!? – 9...\text{\textit{xd}}4 10 \text{\textit{xd}}4 \text{\textit{b}}5 11 e5 dxe5 12 fxe5 \text{\textit{d}}d7 13 0-0 \text{\textit{b}}7!? 14 \text{\textit{w}}h5 0-0.

b2) 14...\text{\textit{c}}5 15 \text{\textit{ad}}1 \text{\textit{b}}7 16 \text{\textit{xc}}5 (16 \text{\textit{f}}4 \text{\textit{f}}) 16...\text{\textit{xc}}5+ 17 \text{\textit{h}}1 \text{\textit{w}}c7 18 \text{\textit{d}}3 \text{\textit{f}}d8 19 \text{\textit{h}}3 h6 20 \text{\textit{g}}3 \text{\textit{f}}2! 21 \text{\textit{e}}e2 \text{\textit{ad}}8 22 \text{\textit{f}}4 \text{\textit{f}}2 \text{\textit{f}} G.Kuzmin-Ermenkov, Varna 1976.

14...\text{\textit{b}}7 15 \text{\textit{d}}6
15 \text{\textit{g}}4 \text{\textit{xe}}4! is good for Black.

15...\text{\textit{xd}}6 16 \text{\textit{exd}}6 \text{\textit{g}}5 (D)
The key position. The white pawn on d6 is as difficult for White to advance as it is for Black to take scotfree – I would call such a situation ‘strategically tense’. After the Fischer-Spassky match, the position was considered advantageous for Black. Recently, White has achieved serious progress but nobody can say that the sides have exhausted their resources...

17 \( \text{xf2} \)

This move became the main one primarily as a result of Bangiev’s efforts. Nevertheless, 17 \( \text{we2} \) still represents a serious alternative:

a) 17...\( \text{xd5} \) 18 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 19 \( \text{axb3} \), followed by c4, is assessed in White’s favour.

b) 17...a5?! is not enough:
   b1) 18 \( \text{xf2} \) – 17 \( \text{xf2} \) a5?! 18 \( \text{we2} \).
   b2) 18 a4 b4 19 \( \text{c4} \) (19 c4 bxc3 20 bxc3 \( \text{a6} \) 21 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 22 \( \text{wb5} \) with compensation, Riemersma-Van der Wiel, Dutch Ch (Amsterdam) 1995; 19 \( \text{xf2} \) – 17 \( \text{xf2} \) a5?! 18 a4 b4 19 \( \text{we2} \) 19...e5 20 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 21 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 22 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{c6} \) 23 \( \text{ad1} \) f5?! 24 \( \text{wc4} \) ± Bezemer-Van der Heijden, Dutch Ch 1996/7.

b3) 18 c3 \( \text{a6} \) and now:
   b31) 19 \( \text{fd1} \)! ? and now Black must avoid 19...\( \text{d8?} \) 20 \( \text{d3} \) e5 21 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h6} \) 22 \( \text{f1} \) ± Hübner-Tischbierek, Bundesliga 1996/7. 19...\( \text{xd6} \) is met by 20 \( \text{e3} ! \), while Byrne and Mednis suggest 19...e5.
   b32) 19 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{xd6} \) (19...a4 20 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 21 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 22 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 23 \( \text{xb5} \) \( \text{a6} \) 24 \( \text{h5} \) g6 25 \( \text{d1} \) ± Sax-Jasnikowski, Næstved 1988) 20 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{xd1} \) 21 \( \text{xd1} \) \( \text{xg7} \) 22 \( \text{xd7} \) \( \text{c6} \) 23 \( \text{d4} \) ± de Firmian-Fishbein, Philadelphia 1997.

c) 17...\( \text{h8?!} \) 18 \( \text{ad1} \) (18 \( \text{f2} \) e5 19 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 20 a4 f5!, Stratil-Lanc, Prague 1985; 18 c4 bxc4 19 \( \text{xc4} \) e5 20 \( \text{c3} \) f5 with counterplay, del Rio-Villavicencio, Spanish Ch (Linares) 1993; 18 a4?! e5 19 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 20 axb5 axb5 21 \( \text{a8} \) \( \text{xa8} \) 22 \( \text{f2} \) ± Vrenegoor-Cifuentes, Antwerp 1993) 18...\( \text{g6} \) (18...f5 19 h4! \( \text{g6} \) 20 h5 \( \text{g5} \) 21 h6 J.Polgar) 19 c4 (19 \( \text{d3} \)?! e5 20 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 21 \( \text{c3} \) f5 ± J.Polgar; 19 a4?! 19...\( \text{bxc4} \) 20 \( \text{xc4} \) f5 21 \( \text{c3} \) f4! with strong counterplay, Illescas-J.Polgar, Dos Hermanas 1997.

d) 17...e5 and then:
   d1) 18 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 19 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{h8} \)! 20 h4 (20 c3 \( \text{e4} ! \), Hamann-Gligoric, Skopje OL 1972) 20...f5 (20...\( \text{xf6} \)! 21 d7! \( \text{g3} \) 22 \( \text{xf6} \) ± Zapata-Am.Rodriguez, Bucaramanga 1992) 21 h5 \( \text{ff6} \) 22 a4 (Browne-Donner, Wijk aan Zee 1974) 22...\( \text{c6} \)! ?

   d2) 18 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g6} \) (18...\( \text{c5} \)?! 19 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 20 \( \text{axb3} \) ±; 18...a5 19 \( \text{ad1} \) b4 20 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 21 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 22 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{e4} \), Bezemer-Van der Heijden, Dutch Ch 1995/6, 23 \( \text{f3} \)! ? gives White an advantage) 19 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{h8} \) 20 \( \text{d5} \) (20 a4 \( \text{xa4} \) 21 \( \text{xa4} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 22 b3 \( \text{ad8} \) 23 d7 \( \text{xa4} \) 24 \( \text{bxax4} \) \( \text{c6} ! \))

20...\( \text{xd5} \) 21 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{we6} \) (21...\( \text{ac8} ! \) ? with the point 22 a4 b4!, Hendriks-Wells, Antwerp 1994) 22 \( \text{fd1} \) \( \text{fc8} \) (22...f5 23 a4 \( \text{xa4} \) 24 \( \text{xa4} \) \( \text{c6} ! \))

20...\( \text{xd5} \) 21 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{we6} \) (21...\( \text{ac8} ! \) ? with the point 22 a4 b4!, Hendriks-Wells, Antwerp 1994) 22 \( \text{fd1} \) \( \text{fc8} \) (22...f5 23 a4 \( \text{xa4} \) 24 \( \text{xa4} \) \( \text{c6} ! \))
17...\text{a5}!!

This active attempt occurs most frequently. The other continuations are:

a) 17...e5?! (here 17 \text{\textit{ff}2} works especially well) 18 \text{\textit{f}c3} \text{\textit{f}f6} (or 18...e4 19 \text{\textit{f}f1}! \text{\textit{g}6} 20 \text{\textit{e}1} ± Bangiev-Shmirin, Volgograd 1973) 19 \text{\textit{f}f1} \text{\textit{b}4} 20 \text{\textit{f}xb4} \text{\textit{h}4} 21 \text{\textit{a}5} \text{\textit{g}4} 22 \text{\textit{h}3} \text{\textit{xf}2} 23 \text{\textit{xf}2} ± Kudrin-Dahlberg, Lone Pine 1981.

b) 17...\text{\textit{d}5} (this move is natural but probably unsuccessful) 18 \text{\textit{d}2} (18 \text{\textit{c}3}?! \text{\textit{b}6} 19 \text{\textit{a}5} \text{\textit{c}4} 20 \text{\textit{xc}4} \text{\textit{bxc}4} 21 \text{\textit{c}7} ± Beliaevsky/Mikhailishin) 18...\text{\textit{xb}3} (18...\text{\textit{c}4}?! - ‘64‘) 19 \text{\textit{axb}3} \text{\textit{c}5} 20 \text{\textit{f}f2} \text{\textit{fc}8} (Bangiev's 20...\text{\textit{fe}8} 21 \text{\textit{fe}2}?! \text{\textit{e}4} 22 \text{\textit{e}3} \text{\textit{g}6} 23 \text{\textit{c}4} \text{\textit{e}5} is insufficient because of 24 \text{\textit{d}5} \text{\textit{w}e}6 25 \text{\textit{d}4} \text{\textit{d}3} 26 \text{\textit{f}1} 21 \text{\textit{we}2} \text{\textit{c}6}?! (21...b4?!?) 22 \text{\textit{e}3}?! (22 \text{\textit{c}4}, Bangiev-Chernikov, Cheliabinsk 1975) 22...\text{\textit{g}6} 23 \text{\textit{wxb}5}! Bangiev.

c) 17...\text{\textit{ae}8} 18 \text{\textit{wd}2} ±.

d) 17...\text{\textit{h}8} 18 \text{\textit{wd}2} is also slightly better for White.

e) 17...\text{\textit{e}5}?! (Leluashvili-Rogozenko, corr. 1988-92), with the point 18 \text{\textit{c}1} \text{\textit{f}3}+! 19 \text{\textit{xf}3} \text{\textit{g}4}, deserves at least some attention.

f) 17...\text{\textit{ac}8} and then:

   f1) 18 a4 \text{\textit{d}5} 19 \text{\textit{xd}5} \text{\textit{wd}5} 20 \text{\textit{axb}5} \text{\textit{e}5}?! 21 \text{\textit{c}3} \text{\textit{wb}5} ∞ Kreiman-Ivanov, USA Ch (Key West) 1994.

   f2) 18 \text{\textit{we}2} \text{\textit{c}5} (18...\text{\textit{d}5}?! 19 \text{\textit{d}1} \text{\textit{xb}3} 20 \text{\textit{xb}3} \text{\textit{e}5} 21 \text{\textit{c}3} \text{\textit{g}6} 22 \text{\textit{c}4} \text{\textit{e}4}!) 19 \text{\textit{h}4} (19 \text{\textit{d}1} \text{\textit{fd}8} 20 \text{\textit{h}4}! \text{\textit{g}6}! ∞ Bangiev-Shakarov, Grozny 1974; 19 \text{\textit{af}1}?) 19...\text{\textit{g}3}! ± with a complicated game (19...\text{\textit{wh}4} 20 \text{\textit{xc}5} \text{\textit{xc}5} 21 \text{\textit{xe}6} \text{\textit{e}4} 22 \text{\textit{af}1}).

   f3) 18 \text{\textit{wd}2}! \text{\textit{wd}2} 19 \text{\textit{xd}2} \text{\textit{xc}5} 20 \text{\textit{xc}5}! \text{\textit{xc}5} 21 a4 with an advantage.

g) 17...\text{\textit{ad}8} and then:

   g1) 18 \text{\textit{wd}2} \text{\textit{wd}2} 19 \text{\textit{xd}2} \text{\textit{f}6} 20 \text{\textit{xf}6} \text{\textit{gx}f6} 21 \text{\textit{a}4} (also after 21 \text{\textit{c}4}?! \text{\textit{bxc}4} 22 \text{\textit{xc}4} \text{\textit{d}7}, it is not easy for White to make progress) 21...\text{\textit{d}5} 22 \text{\textit{xd}5} (or 22 \text{\textit{axb}5} \text{\textit{axb}5} 23 \text{\textit{a}5} \text{\textit{xb}3} 24 \text{\textit{xb}3} \text{\textit{b}8}) 22...\text{\textit{xd}6} = Kaminski-Kacheishvili, Guarapuavajr Wch 1995.

   g2) 18 \text{\textit{we}2} \text{\textit{d}5} (18...\text{\textit{f}6} 19 \text{\textit{xf}6} \text{\textit{gx}f6} 20 \text{\textit{d}1} ±) 19 \text{\textit{d}1} \text{\textit{xb}3} 20 \text{\textit{axb}3} \text{\textit{e}5} 21 \text{\textit{c}3}! (Galdunts-Lauber, Pardubice 1996), and White is probably better.

18 \text{\textit{we}2}

This is the latest height of fashion. Otherwise:

a) 18 \text{\textit{c}4}?! is unsuccessful:

   a1) 18...\text{\textit{e}6} 19 \text{\textit{c}5} \text{\textit{a}4} (19...\text{\textit{e}5}?! can be met by 20 \text{\textit{f}1} or 20 \text{\textit{e}2}!?) 20 \text{\textit{c}2} \text{\textit{xc}5} 21 \text{\textit{h}4} (21 \text{\textit{e}2} \text{\textit{d}7})! 21...\text{\textit{wd}5} 22 \text{\textit{wg}4} 26 \text{\textit{d}1} \text{\textit{xd}6}! with a good game, Vujadinovic-Stoica, Bela Crkva 1986.

   a2) 18...\text{\textit{a}4} 19 \text{\textit{c}2} \text{\textit{bxc}4} 20 \text{\textit{xa}4} \text{\textit{fd}8}! (20...\text{\textit{cc}5}?! 21 \text{\textit{c}2} \text{\textit{e}4} 22 \text{\textit{xe}4} \text{\textit{xe}4} 23 \text{\textit{d}7}!, Sax-Timman,
London 1980, with the point 23...\[d5
24 \[b6 \[xa2 25 \[d2 +\) 21 \[xd7
(21 \[c2 \[a6) 21...\[xd7 22 \[b6 \[c8
\[ Kasparov/Nikitin.

b) Earlier, 18 a4 was commonly played:

b1) 18...e5?! 19 \[e2! (19 \[c3? b4
is good for Black: 20 \[e1 \[e6! 21
\[d3 \[e4 \[ Bangiev-Kaplun, Ukrain-
ian Ch 1974 or 20 \[d2 \[g6 21 \[c3
\[c5 22 \[c2 \[e4!, Yilmaz-Pan-
chenko, Cheliabinsk 1991) 19...\[xd4
20 \[e7 \[ Yriljö.

b2) 18...\[a6 19 axb5 (19 \[e2 – 18
\[e2 \[a6 19 a4) 19...\[xd6 20 \[b2
\[xb5 (20...\[g4 21 \[a4!, Cirić-Sura-
diradja, Belgrade 1977; 20...\[h5 21
\[e3! \[p Mortensen-Tischbierek, Le-
ningrad 1984) 21 \[xa5 \[c6 22 \[f4
\[f6! with an acceptable position.

b3) 18...b4 and then:

b31) 19 \[f1 \[a6 20 \[e1 \[xd6 21
\[c4 \[d5 is good for Black, J.Polgar-Lutz,
Frankfurt rpd 1999.

b32) 19 \[d3 \[c6 20 \[e2 \[d5 21
\[b5 \[f8 22 \[f1 \[xb3 23 \[x3 \[g6
24 \[c1 e5 25 \[e3 with a double-
edged game, Kindermann-Reeh, Bad
Wörishofen 1990.

b33) 19 \[e2 \[a6 (19...\[d5?! – 19
\[d3 \[c6 20 \[e2 \[d5) 20 \[e3?! (20
\[x6 \[xd6 21 \[e3 \[w5 22 \[c4 \[xb2
23 \[e1 \[e5 \[ Morović-Milos, Yopal
1997; 20 \[b5 \[xb5 21 \[xb5 \[xd6 22
\[e3 \[a8 23 \[f4 = Winants-Tukma-
kov, Wijk aan Zee 1993) 20...\[w5,
with double-edged play after 21 \[b5
or 21 \[f4 \[xb2 22 \[d1 – Bangiev.

b34) 19 \[d2 \[xd2 20 \[xd2 \[ac8
(20...\[fd8?! ½-½ de Firmian-Tringov,
Niš 1981; 20...\[a6 21 \[c3 \[xd6 22
\[xb4 \[xb4 23 \[d1 with compensa-
tion) 21 \[e1 \[a6 22 \[c3 \[c4 23 \[xc4
(23 \[d1?!, Bosch-Reeh, Amstelveen
1994) 23...\[xc4 24 \[xb4 \[xb4 25 \[c1
\[xa4 26 \[c7 \[d8 = Oll-Loginov,

b35) 19 \[e1 \[a6?.

18...\[a6

18...a4? 19 \[xe6! \[p Sulskis-Pies-
ina, Riga Z 1995.

18...\[c6 19 c3 a4 20 \[c2 e5 21
\[e3 with an initiative, Renet-Garcia

19 \[c3

Or: 19 \[xe6 \[xd6 20 \[xd7 \[xd7
21 c3 =; 19 a4 bxa4 (19...b4 – 18 a4 b4
19 \[e2 \[a6) 20 \[xa4 \[xd6 21 \[xg7
\[a6! (Bangiev) is good for Black.

The position after the text-move
(19 \[c3) remains difficult to assess:

a) 19...\[xd6?! 20 \[xa5, and White
is better.

b) 19...\[c5?! 20 a3 (20 \[xe6?
fxe6 21 \[xe6+ \[h8; 20 \[h1?! b4;
20 \[g4 \[e5 21 \[g3 \[g6) 20...e5?! (20...b4!
is critical) 21 \[d1 h6 22 \[d2
\[xd6 23 \[xa5 with an advantage for

c) 19...b4 20 \[d2 \[c5 21 \[f4 and then:

cl) 21...\[a8 22 \[d1 (22 \[c4?!;
22 \[d3? bxc3 23 \[c1 a4! 24 \[xc3
axb3!) 22...\[a6, and White has an
advantage: 23 \[w1 \[b5 24 c3 bxc3 (Van
der Wiel-Leitão, Wijk aan Zee 1999)
25 \[e3!, or 23 \[f3! a4! 24 \[xa4 \[e2
25 \[xe2 \[xa4 – Leitão.

c2) 21...\[f6 and now 22 \[d1 \[e4
23 d7 \[d8 24 \[e3 \[w6! 25 \[f4 \[aa8!
is probably better for Black, Kudrin-
Vigorito, Harvard 2000. White could
try 22 \[c4!?, followed by \[d3.
10 5...\( \text{c} \text{c} 6 \) 6 \( \text{c} \text{c} 4 \) \( \text{e} \text{e} 6 \) 7 \( \text{b} \text{b} 3 \) \\
a6 8 \( \text{e} \text{e} 3 \) \( \text{e} \text{e} 7 \) 9 \( \text{e} \text{e} 2 \) (D)

\[ 1 \text{ e} 4 \text{ c} 5 \text{ 2 } \text{d} \text{f} 3 \text{ d} 6 \text{ 3 } \text{d} 4 \text{ cxd} 4 \text{ 4 } \text{c} \text{cxd} 4 \text{ d} 6 \text{f} 6 \text{ 5 } \text{c} \text{c} 3 \text{ e} 6 \text{ 6 } \text{c} \text{c} 4 \text{ e} 6 \text{ 7 } \text{b} \text{b} 3 \text{ a} 6 \text{ 8 } \text{e} \text{e} 3 \text{ e} 7 \text{ 9 } \text{e} \text{e} 2 \] (D)

A: 9...0-0 152
B: 9...\( \text{w} \text{c} 7 \) 159

Here we shall consider 9...\( \text{w} \text{c} 7 \) to be 'the main line', where after 10 0-0-0 Black will have to make a critical choice between 10...\( \text{d} \text{a} 5 \) and 10...0-0. At the same time, the line 9...0-0 10 0-0-0 \( \text{w} \text{c} 7 \) is equivalent to 9...\( \text{w} \text{c} 7 \) 10 0-0-0 0-0, so there is no single main move here.

Continuations such as 9...\( \text{d} \text{a} 5 \) 10 \( \text{d} \text{a} 5 \) b5 11 0-0-0! and 9...\( \text{d} \text{d} 7 \) 10 0-0-0 (or 10 \( \text{g} \text{g} 1 \) !?) are somewhat second-rate. 9...\( \text{d} \text{a} 5 \) is of some interest, though White can simply reply 10 0-0-0 (rather than 10 g4 \( \text{d} \text{x} \text{b} 3 \) 11 axb3 h5).

A)

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

It doesn’t look promising to play 10 \( \text{g} \text{g} 1 \) here. For instance: 10...\( \text{d} \text{d} 4 \) (10...\( \text{w} \text{c} 7 \) – 9...\( \text{w} \text{c} 7 \) 10 \( \text{g} \text{g} 1 \) 0-0; 10...\( \text{d} \text{d} 7 \) !?; 10...d5 !?) 11 \( \text{d} \text{d} 4 \) b5 12 0-0-0 (12 g4 b4! = Krnić-Spassov, Athens 1981) 12...b4 (12...\( \text{b} \text{b} 7 \) !?) 13 e5 dxe5 14 \( \text{a} \text{x} \text{e} 5 \) \( \text{w} \text{b} 6 \), Rantanen-Unzicker, Nice OL 1974) 13 \( \text{a} \text{a} 4 \) \( \text{d} \text{d} 7 \) (13...\( \text{d} \text{d} 7 \) !? Ryskin) 14 e5 (14 \( \text{b} \text{b} 6 \) \( \text{b} \text{b} 5 \) with counterplay, J.Diaz-Spassov, Vrnjačka Banja 1976) 14...\( \text{b} \text{b} 5 \)!
(Valulin-Panchenko, USSR 1987) 15 \( \text{w} \text{e} 3 \) ! =.
Certainly, the main continuation here is 10...\(\text{\textit{wc}}\)c7 (Line B2). Two of Black’s remaining ideas may be singled out:

A1: 10...\(\text{\textit{cd}}\)7!? 153
A2: 10...\(\text{\textit{we}}\)e8 154

Other continuations are hard to recommend:

a) 10...\(\text{\textit{da}}\)a5 11 g4 (or 11 f4).

b) 10...\(\text{\textit{cd}}\)d7 11 f4! (11 \(\text{\textit{hg}}\)g1?! b5!, 11 g4!?) 11...\(\text{\textit{wc}}\)c7 (11...b5 12 e5) 12 g4 \(\text{\textit{cxd}}\)d4 13 \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)d4, Planinc-Musil, Ljubljana 1969.

c) 10...\(\text{\textit{a}}\)a5?! almost never fits together well with ...a6.

d) 10...\(\text{\textit{xd}}\)d4 11 \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)d4 b5 is also a concession of sorts. For instance:

d1) 12 g4 b4! (12...e5? 13 \(\text{\textit{xe}}\)xe5 \(\text{\textit{xg}}\)xg4 14 f3 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e6 15 \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)d6 \(\pm\)) 13 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)a4 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b7 = Rivera-Cifuentes, Villa Gesell 1985.

d2) 12 f4!? transposes to note ‘a’ to White’s 10th move in Line C2 of Chapter 9.

d3) 12 e5 dxe5 13 \(\text{\textit{xe}}\)xe5 \(\text{\textit{wb}}\)b6 14 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)e4 (14 g4 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d7?!. Now, instead of 14...\(\text{\textit{d}}\)d7 15 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d4 (15 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d6 is slightly better for White) 15...\(\text{\textit{wc}}\)c7 16 \(\text{\textit{he}}\)e1 (16 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b1!? Panchenko) 16...\(\text{\textit{b}}\)b8 17 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g4 e5 18 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g3 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b7 19 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c3 \(\text{\textit{xe}}\)xe4 20 \(\text{\textit{xe}}\)xe4 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f6 (Rublevsky-Panchenko, Cheliabinsk 1991) 21 f4 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c5 22 \(\text{\textit{xe}}\)xe5 \(\pm\), it would be interesting to investigate the risky 14...\(\text{\textit{xe}}\)xe4 15 \(\text{\textit{xe}}\)xe4 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g5+ 16 f4 (16 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b1 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b7 17 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g4 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h6) 16...\(\text{\textit{b}}\)b7 17 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e2 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h6, Panukhchian-Ermenkov, Bulgarian Ch 1988, with the point 18 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d6 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c5 19 \(\text{\textit{hd}}\)d1 a5.)

A1)

10...\(\text{\textit{cd}}\)7!?

The drawbacks of this move may be emphasized only by rejecting the plan with g4, as we shall see in the next note.

11 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b1!?

Preventing 11...\(\text{\textit{c}}\)c5??, since this would fail to 12 \(\text{\textit{xc}}\)c6 \(\pm\).

Otherwise:

a) 11 g4 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c5 12 \(\text{\textit{hg}}\)g1 and now:

a1) 12...\(\text{\textit{wc}}\)c7 transposes to Line B23. Black has alternatives though:

a2) 12...\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)xb3+!? 13 axb3 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b4 14 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g3!? \(\text{\textit{wa}}\)a5 15 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b1 (Korneev-Shipov, Moscow 1985) 15...\(\text{\textit{we}}\)e8! Nikitin.

a3) 12...\(\text{\textit{d}}\)d7 13 g5?! (13 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b1!? \(\text{\textit{xb}}\)xb3 14 cxb3 b5 15 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f5, Ardeleanu-Navrotescu, Romanian Ch 1997; 13 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f5?!, Sion Castro-Ragozin, Oviedo rpd 1993) 13...b5! 14 \(\text{\textit{wh}}\)h5 b4 is much better for Black, Ginsburg-Ryskin, Nikolaev Z 1993.

b) 11 f4 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)c5 and then:

b1) 12 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b1 is not entirely logical here.

b2) 12 \(\text{\textit{xc}}\)c6 \(\text{\textit{xb}}\)xb3+ 13 cxb3 bxc6 14 e5 is of interest; e.g., 14...d5 15 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)a4 or 14...\(\text{\textit{wc}}\)c7 15 exd6 \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)d6 16 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f2, Bosch-Lauber, Schoneck 1996.

b3) 12 \(\text{\textit{hf}}\)f1 is a serious option. 12...\(\text{\textit{d}}\)d7 13 f5 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e5 (13...\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)xb3+ 14 axb3 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e5 15 fxe6?! fxe6 16 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{wa}}\)a5! = Emmets-Kovaliov, Eupen ECC 1994;
then 17 \text{\textcopyright}b1? fails to 17...\text{\textcopyright}b5! 14 \text{\textcopyright}f3 (14 \text{\textcopyright}b1 b5!? Yakovich) 14...\text{\textcopyright}xb3+ 15 axb3 \text{\textcopyright}g4! 16 fxe6 fxe6 17 \text{\textcopyright}d4 \pm Yakovich-Filipenko, Belgorod 1989.

\textbf{11...\text{\textcopyright}c7}

Otherwise:

a) 11...\text{\textcopyright}e8 12 f4 \text{\textcopyright}c5 does not solve Black’s problems in view of 13 \text{\textcopyright}h1 \text{\textcopyright}d7 14 f5, Kupreichik-Savon, Odessa 1974.

b) 11...\text{\textcopyright}a5 12 f4 \text{\textcopyright}c5 is likewise not ideal for Black.

c) 11...\text{\textcopyright}xd4 12 \text{\textcopyright}xd4 b5 13 f4 (13 e5 dxe5 14 \text{\textcopyright}xe5 \text{\textcopyright}b6 =) 13...b4 14 \text{\textcopyright}a4 \text{\textcopyright}b7 (14...\text{\textcopyright}a5 15 \text{\textcopyright}d3 \text{\textcopyright}b7 16 \text{\textcopyright}g3 \text{\textcopyright}f6 17 e5! dxe5 18 fxe5 \text{\textcopyright}xe5 19 \text{\textcopyright}g5 \pm Chuprov-Mochalov, Kurgan 1994) 15 \text{\textcopyright}g4 \text{\textcopyright}f6, and instead of 16 e5 dxe5 17 fxe5 \text{\textcopyright}xe5! = M.Pavlovic-R.Scherbakov, Linares open 1996, 16 \text{\textcopyright}he1! is stronger.

\textbf{12 f4!}

Or: 12 \text{\textcopyright}h5 \text{\textcopyright}f6!? =; 12 \text{\textcopyright}g1 - 9...\text{\textcopyright}c7 10 0-0-0-0 11 \text{\textcopyright}g1 \text{\textcopyright}d7 12 \text{\textcopyright}b1.

\textbf{12...\text{\textcopyright}c5 13 f5}

Instead, White gains nothing by 13 \text{\textcopyright}h1 \text{\textcopyright}xb3 = Cvetkovic, but 13 \text{\textcopyright}xc6?! is worth considering.

After the text-move (13 f5), White is a little better:

a) After 13...\text{\textcopyright}xb3 14 axb3 \text{\textcopyright}d7, besides 15 \text{\textcopyright}h1 \text{\textcopyright}e5 (15...\text{\textcopyright}f6!? 16 \text{\textcopyright}f3 (16 g4!? 16...\text{\textcopyright}c6 (16...\text{\textcopyright}b5!? 17 \text{\textcopyright}xe5 dxe5 18 fxe5 fxe6 19 \text{\textcopyright}g4 with an advantage, de Firmian-Ivanchuk, Biel 1989, it is worthwhile to note 15 \text{\textcopyright}xc6, as in Reeh-Borik, Bundesliga 1984/5.

b) 13...\text{\textcopyright}e5 is unsuccessful: 14 \text{\textcopyright}f3 \text{\textcopyright}d7 15 \text{\textcopyright}xe5 dxe5 16 f6! and White is much better, Zapolskis-R.Scherbakov, Warsaw 1991.

c) 13...\text{\textcopyright}a5!? 14 \text{\textcopyright}h1 \text{\textcopyright}f6 15 g4 also seems promising for White.

\textbf{A2)}

\textbf{10...\text{\textcopyright}e8 (D)}

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

This move was successfully introduced by Beliavsky in 1971/2. Like 10...\text{\textcopyright}d7, it appears somewhat artificial. The idea is that after 11 g4 \text{\textcopyright}xd4! Black wins a pawn.

\textbf{11 \text{\textcopyright}g1}

This is the main line, which has been well developed. White also has the plans 11 f4!? \text{\textcopyright}xd4 12 \text{\textcopyright}xd4 and 11 \text{\textcopyright}xc6?!, which have so far rarely been played.

\textbf{11...\text{\textcopyright}d7}

\begin{itemize}
\item Here, dubious is 11...\text{\textcopyright}xd4 12 \text{\textcopyright}xd4 \text{\textcopyright}d7 13 g4 \text{\textcopyright}c5 14 g5 b5 (14...\text{\textcopyright}d7 is scarcely better) 15 \text{\textcopyright}h5 \text{\textcopyright}xb3+ 16 axb3 e5 (16...b4? 17 \text{\textcopyright}f6 ++) 17 \text{\textcopyright}d5 \text{\textcopyright}h8 (M.Lazi\'c-Kosi\'c, Yugoslav Ch (Kladovo) 1990) 18 \text{\textcopyright}c3?! \pm However of some interest is 11...b5 12 g4 b4, similar to Line B222.
\item 12 g4
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item Not much is promised by 12 \text{\textcopyright}h5 \text{\textcopyright}c5 13 g4 \text{\textcopyright}xb3+ 14 axb3 f6, Wahls-Hausner, Bundesliga 1990/1, nor by 12 \text{\textcopyright}xc6 bxc6 13 g4 d5 14 g5 \text{\textcopyright}c5,
G. Todorović-Kosić, Yugoslav Ch (Kladovo) 1990.

12...\textbf{Qc}e5 13 g5 b5 (D)
13...\textbf{Qd}e7 is rare. Then:

a) 14 \textbf{Nc}3!?

b) 14 f4 b5 15 f5 b4 16 f6 bxc3 17 \textbf{Wh}h5 cxb2+ (17...\textbf{Qxd}4 18 \textbf{Qxd}4 \textbf{Qxb}3+ 19 axb3 cxb2+ 20 \textbf{Qxb}2 e5 21 \textbf{Qa}3! \textbf{Qc}8 22 \textbf{Qd}3 Bruzon/Gongora) 18 \textbf{Qxb}2 \textbf{Qxb}3 (18...\textbf{Qxe}4? 19 \textbf{Qdf}1! \pm Velimirović-Vucković, Belgrade 2000) is interesting though unclear.

c) 14 \textbf{Wh}h5 is also interesting; e.g.: c1) 14...b5!? – 13...b5 14 \textbf{Wh}h5 \textbf{Qd}7.

c2) 14...\textbf{Qxb}3+ 15 axb3 and now 15...\textbf{Qxd}4 16 \textbf{Qxd}4 f5 17 g6 or 15...f5 16 g6 hxg6 17 \textbf{Qxg}6 \textbf{Qe}5 18 \textbf{Qxg}7+ \textbf{Qxg}7 19 \textbf{Wh}h6+ \textbf{Qg}8 20 \textbf{Qg}1+ \textbf{Qg}4 21 \textbf{Qd}5!.

\begin{center}
\textbf{W}
\end{center}

The same position though with the queen on c7 arises after 9...\textbf{Qc}7 10 0-0-0 0-0 11 \textbf{Qh}g1 \textbf{Qd}7 12 g4 \textbf{Qc}5 13 g5 b5 in Line B2311. Both there and here White has two possible lines:

\textbf{A21:} 14 \textbf{Qxc}6 155

\textbf{A22:} 14 \textbf{Wh}h5 156

Naturally, after 14 \textbf{Qxc}6 \textbf{Wxc}6, and after 14 \textbf{Wh}h5 b4 15 \textbf{Qxc}6 \textbf{Wxc}6, these variations come to the same thing.

Moreover, in playing 14 \textbf{Qxc}6, White is guided by the position that may also arise after 14 \textbf{Wh}5 b4 15 \textbf{Qxc}6 \textbf{Qxb}3+ 16 axb3 \textbf{Wxc}6 17 \textbf{Qd}4!.

\textbf{A21)}

14 \textbf{Qxc}6 \textbf{Qxb}3+

14...\textbf{Wxc}6!? occurs seldom, so the variations without \textbf{Qxb}3+ are given here to a limited extent:

a) 15 \textbf{Qd}5 exd5 16 \textbf{Qxd}5 looks dubious to me.

b) 15 \textbf{Wh}h5. Now Black can choose between:

b1) 15...\textbf{Qxe}4? 16 \textbf{Qd}5 \textbf{Wb}7 (or 16...\textbf{Qd}8 17 \textbf{Wf}3) and now:

b11) 17 \textbf{Qd}4? exd5 18 \textbf{Qxg}7 = (or 18 g6 hxg6 19 \textbf{Qxd}5 \textbf{Qg}5+ \textbf{Qf}1).

b12) 17 f3! –+ (Burgess).

b2) 15...b4 transposes to note 'b' to Black's 15th move in Line A22.

b3) 15...\textbf{Qxb}3+!? 16 axb3 – 14...\textbf{Qxb}3+ 15 axb3 \textbf{Wxc}6 16 \textbf{Wh}5.

c) 15 \textbf{Qd}4(!) b4 (15...\textbf{Qxb}3+ 16 axb3 – 14...\textbf{Qxb}3+ 15 axb3 \textbf{Wxc}6 16 \textbf{Qd}4; 15...\textbf{Qd}7 16 \textbf{Qd}5 exd5 17 \textbf{Qxd}5 \textbf{Qf}e8 18 \textbf{Wh}5 \textbf{Qa}8 19 c3 \textbf{Qe}6 20 \textbf{Qxg}7 –+ Anand-Wegner, London Lloyds Bank 1987; 15...g6!? (16 \textbf{Wh}5!? – 14 \textbf{Wh}5 b4 15 \textbf{Qxc}6! \textbf{Wxc}6!? 16 \textbf{Qd}4!? and then: c1) 16...\textbf{Wc}7 can be met by 17 \textbf{Qxa}8!? or 17 \textbf{Wh}5 – 14 \textbf{Wb}4 15 \textbf{Qxc}6! \textbf{Wxc}6!? 16 \textbf{Qd}5 \textbf{Wh}4 17 \textbf{Qd}4)

c2) 16...exd5 17 \textbf{Qxd}5 gives White compensation.

15 axb3 \textbf{Wxc}6 16 \textbf{Qd}4!

Or 16 \textbf{Wh}5, and then:

a) 16...b4?! – 14 \textbf{Wh}5 b4 15 \textbf{Qxc}6! \textbf{Qxb}3+ 16 axb3 \textbf{Wxc}6.

b) 16...g6!? 17 \textbf{Wb}6 \textbf{Qe}8 18 \textbf{Qd}4 – 16 \textbf{Qd}4 \textbf{Qe}8!? 17 \textbf{Wb}5 g6 18 \textbf{Wh}6.

c) 16...\textbf{Qd}7!? is interesting; e.g.:
c1) 17...\(\mathcal{d}d4\) 18 \(\mathcal{f}c8!\) 18 \(\mathcal{d}d2\) (18 \(\mathcal{x}g7?\) \(\mathcal{x}g7\) 19 \(\mathcal{w}h6+\) \(\mathcal{h}h8\) \(\mathcal{f}\); 18 \(\mathcal{d}d3\) e5); 18 \(\mathcal{f}6\) b4!; 18 \(\mathcal{g}4\) e5 19 \(\mathcal{h}4\) h6 \(\mathcal{f}\); 18 \(\mathcal{g}3\) e5 19 \(\mathcal{d}d2\) and now 19...\(\mathcal{x}d4\) looks best) 18...b4! 19 \(\mathcal{a}4\) e5 \(\mathcal{f}\) Vaerynen-Portinho, corr. 1990.

c2) 17 \(\mathcal{g}4\) \(\mathcal{a}c8\) (17...b4?! 18 \(\mathcal{d}d4\) transposes to note ‘e’ to Black’s 17th move in Line A22) 18 \(\mathcal{h}h4\) h6 19 \(\mathcal{g}1\) \(\mathcal{e}8\) 20 \(\mathcal{b}1\) (20 gxh6 f5!; 20 \(\mathcal{d}d4\) e5!) 20...b4 21 \(\mathcal{d}d4\) f5! \(\mathcal{f}\) Guyot-Kožul, Graz 1987.

c3) 17 \(\mathcal{g}3!\) \(\mathcal{a}c8!\).

16...\(\mathcal{e}8!\)!

Or:

a) 16...\(\mathcal{d}d7\) 17 \(\mathcal{f}6\) \(\mathcal{f}e8\) 18 \(\mathcal{d}d3!\) b4 19 \(\mathcal{h}3\) with an attack.

b) 16...b4 17 \(\mathcal{f}6?!\) (White should of course play 17 \(\mathcal{w}h5!\)) 17...\(\mathcal{e}8\) 18 \(\mathcal{a}4\) (18 \(\mathcal{d}d3\) bxc3 19 \(\mathcal{h}3\) \(\mathcal{f}8!\), Bonin-Shamkovich, USA 1976) 18...e5 19 \(\mathcal{x}e7\) \(\mathcal{e}7\) with good play, Voitsech-Mochalov, Minsk 1976.

17 \(\mathcal{w}h5\)

Both 17 \(\mathcal{f}6\) \(\mathcal{f}8\) (Kasparov/Nikitin) and 17 \(\mathcal{d}d3\) e5 18 \(\mathcal{e}3\) a5 (18...\(\mathcal{e}6\)) 19 \(\mathcal{d}5\) \(\mathcal{e}6\) 20 \(\mathcal{c}3\) \(\mathcal{x}d5\) 21 \(\mathcal{x}c6\) \(\mathcal{x}c6\), Skrobek-Weglarz, Polish Cht (Mikolajki) 1991, are unclear.

17...\(\mathcal{g}6\)

Not: 17...b4? transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 17th move in Line A22; 17...e5? 18 \(\mathcal{d}5\) exd4 19 \(\mathcal{f}6+\) \(+\).

18 \(\mathcal{w}h6\) \(\mathcal{f}18\) 19 \(\mathcal{w}h4\) b4!

This is far better than: 19...\(\mathcal{e}7?\) 20 \(\mathcal{f}6+\) Balaschov; 19...e5? 20 \(\mathcal{d}5\) \(\mathcal{e}7\) 21 \(\mathcal{f}6+\) (21 \(\mathcal{w}h6!\) is even better) 21...\(\mathcal{x}f6\) 22 gxh6 \(\mathcal{h}8\) 23 \(\mathcal{x}g6\) (23 \(\mathcal{d}3!\) exd4 24 \(\mathcal{g}3!\) \(\mathcal{w}f7\) 25 \(\mathcal{f}4\) 23...\(\mathcal{x}g6\) 24 f7 \(\pm\) Cornu-Heine, corr. 1992.

20 \(\mathcal{d}d3\) h5 21 gxh6 e5! 22 \(\mathcal{d}5\)

exd4 23 \(\mathcal{d}g3\)

23 h7+ \(\mathcal{h}8\) 24 \(\mathcal{f}6+\) \(\mathcal{g}7\) 25 \(\mathcal{w}f7\) \(\mathcal{e}6\) 26 \(\mathcal{x}g6\) \(\mathcal{a}7\) \(\mathcal{f}\); 23 \(\mathcal{f}3\) \(\mathcal{e}6\)? (23...\(\mathcal{a}7\) \(\pm\) Liberson) 24 \(\mathcal{x}g6+\) ! – Sharif-Radishkovitch, Netanya 1977.

23...\(\mathcal{d}3!\)

Not: 23...\(\mathcal{b}5\) 24 \(\mathcal{g}5!?\) \(+\) A.Pereira; 23...\(\mathcal{e}6\) 24 \(\mathcal{x}g6+\) \(\mathcal{x}g6\) 25 \(\mathcal{g}6+\) \(\mathcal{h}7\) 26 \(\mathcal{g}5+\) \(+\); 23...\(\mathcal{e}7\) 24 \(\mathcal{f}6+\) \(\mathcal{h}8\) 25 \(\mathcal{x}g6\) \(\mathcal{f}xg6\) 26 \(\mathcal{g}6\) \(\mathcal{e}6\) 27 \(\mathcal{w}g5\) \(\mathcal{e}7\) 28 h7! 1-0 A.Pereira-Varabieescu, corr. 1981.

After the text-move (23...\(\mathcal{d}3!)\), White can force a draw by 24 \(\mathcal{x}g6+\) \(\mathcal{x}g6\) 25 \(\mathcal{x}g6+\) \(\mathcal{h}7\) 26 \(\mathcal{g}7+\), etc. Instead, 24 \(\mathcal{x}d3\) is unlikely to prove stronger.

A22)

14 \(\mathcal{w}h5\) (\(D\))

As in the position with the queen on c7, this is the most popular move.

14...b4

14...\(\mathcal{d}7?!\), with the point 15 \(\mathcal{g}3\) \(\mathcal{x}d4\) 16 \(\mathcal{x}d4\) f5 (S.Solovioz-Lobinoz, St Petersburg 2001), deserves serious study.

15 \(\mathcal{c}c6!\) \(\mathcal{x}b3+\)

Instead:

a) It is hardly any better to play

15...\(\mathcal{c}c6\) 16 \(\mathcal{b}3\) + (16 \(\mathcal{d}d4\) \(\mathcal{x}b3+\) 17 axb3 – 15...\(\mathcal{x}b3+\) 16 axb3 \(\mathcal{x}c6\) ?)
17 \(\text{\textit{d}4}\) 16...\(\text{\textit{w}}\)xe7 17 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xc5 dxc5 18 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g4! Baljon.

b) However, 15...\(\text{\textit{x}}\)xc6!? is interesting:

b1) 16 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g4? bxc3 17 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h4 cxb2+ 18 \(\text{\textit{v}}\)bl h6 Nikitin.

b2) 16 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d5 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)c7 (16...\text{\textit{e}d}x5 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d8 18 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)f8+ \(\text{\textit{w}}\)xf6 19 gxf6 g6 20 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xc5 dxc5 21 e5 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h8 22 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)h6 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g8 23 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)d8 \(-\text{\textit{v}}\)Tisdall) 17 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)d4 (17 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g4? bxc3 18 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h4 h6 19 gxf6 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)5 \(\text{\textit{n}}\) Nikitin) and then:

b21) It is not easy to prove White’s advantage after 17...\text{\textit{g}}g6! 18 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)h6 e5 19 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xa8 bxc3 20 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xc3 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)4 21 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g3 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xc3 (or the immediate 21...\text{\textit{w}}a7) 22 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xc3 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)a7, Berndt-Hausner, Bundesliga 1993/4.

b22) 17...bxc3 18 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)h6 f6 (18...e5? 19 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g6! \(\text{\textit{n}}\) Kobaliya-L. Guliev, Moscow 1996) and here:

b221) 19 gxf6 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xf6 20 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xa8 (20 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xf6? \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xf6 21 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)xf6 cxb2+! \(\text{\textit{f}}\) Hector-Plaskett, London 1991) and now: 20...cxb2+ 21 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b1 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xd4 22 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xd4 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xf2 23 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)e3 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)7 24 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)g3 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)b6, USSR 1969; 20...\(\text{\textit{h}}\)h8 – 19 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xa8! \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h8! 20 gxf6!? \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xf6.

b222) 19 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xa8! \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h8! (19...cxb2+ 20 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b1 gxh6 21 gxf6+ \(\text{\textit{e}}\)7 22 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g7+ \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e8 23 \(\text{\textit{k}}\)xe7+ \(\text{\textit{w}}\)xe7 24 fxe7 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xe7 25 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)5 \(\text{\textit{v}}\) Plaskett; 19...\text{\textit{w}}b6 20 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xc3 gxh6 21 gxf6+ \(+\)). Now 20 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)xe7+ \(\text{\textit{w}}\)xe7 21 gxf6++ \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h6 22 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)e3+ \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h5 23 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)g5+ \(\text{\textit{h}}\)h4 will bring White a draw after 24 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)dg1, but hardly more than that. Instead, 20 gxf6!? \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xf6 21 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xf6 \(\text{\textit{x}}\)xf6 22 \(\text{\textit{w}}\)e3 cxb2+ 23 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)b1 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)a4 is not entirely clear, Baermann-Montalta, corr. 1998.

b23) 17...\(\text{\textit{b}}\)b7!? is possibly stronger.
b) 17...\(\text{Re8?}\) 18 \(\text{Qxe7!}\) \(\text{Qxe7}\) (or 18...\(\text{bxc3}\) 19 \(\text{g6!}\) \(\text{= Ermenkov-Triana, Cienfuegos 1975}\) 19 \(\text{Wh6+}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) (alternatively, 19...\(\text{Qg8}\) 20 \(\text{g6 fxg6}\) 21 \(\text{Hxg6+ hxg6}\) 22 \(\text{Wh6+}\) \(\text{Qh7}\) 24 \(\text{Wh7+}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 25 \(\text{g1}\) \(\text{= Mochalov}\) 20 \(\text{g6 fxg6}\) 21 \(\text{Qxg6}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) (or 21...\(\text{f8}\) 22 \(\text{Qg8+}\) \(\text{= Balashov}\) 22 \(\text{Qdg1}\) 23 \(\text{Qb7}\) 23 \(\text{Qg7}\) +.)

\(\text{c6d8?}\) 18 \(\text{3d3}\) \(\text{bxc3}\) 19 \(\text{Qf3}\) e5 20 \(\text{Wxf7+}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 21 \(\text{Qxe7}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) 22 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{Wxe4}\) (Grigorov-Spassov, Pernik 1975) 23 \(\text{Wxg7+}\) ! +--

\(\text{d7f8}\) 18 \(\text{Qf6}\) \(\text{Qg6}\) 19 \(\text{Qf8}\) \(\text{exf6}\) 19 \(\text{Qxf6}\) \(\text{f6}\) 20 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{= Nikitin}\).

\(\text{e7\ldots\text{d7?!}}\) 18 \(\text{Qg4}\) (18 \(\text{Qxg7}\) \(\text{Qxg7}\) 19 \(\text{3d3}\) \(\text{bxc3}\) 20 \(\text{Wh6}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 21 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{Wxe4}\) 22 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{Qg5+}\) ! +-) and then:

\(\text{e1)}\) 18...\(\text{Qf8?}\) 19 \(\text{Qh4}\) and here: 19...\(\text{xg5+}\) 20 \(\text{Wxg5}\) e5 21 \(\text{g1}\) g6 22 \(\text{Wf6}\) \(\text{= Golubev-Kožul, Skopje open 1991}\); 19...\(\text{hxh6}\) \(\text{Qh4}\) 21 \(\text{Wh4}\) +--; 19...\(\text{Wh8}\) 20 \(\text{Wh7}\) \(\text{Qxg5+}\) 21 \(\text{f4}\) with a decisive advantage; e.g., 21...\(\text{e5}\) 22 \(\text{fxg5!}\) \(\text{exd4}\) 23 \(\text{Wh8}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 24 \(\text{Qxg7}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 25 \(\text{Qf1}\) !.

\(\text{e2)}\) 18...\(\text{bxc3}\) 19 \(\text{h4}\) \(\text{Qxg5+}\) 20 \(\text{Wxg5}\) and then:

\(\text{e21)}\) 20...\(\text{f6}\) 21 \(\text{Wxh5}\) \(\text{exb2+}\) \(\text{?}\) (21...\(\text{e5}\) 22 \(\text{Qxc3}\) \(\text{\pm}\) 22 \(\text{Qxb2}\) \(\text{h6}\) (22...\(\text{Qxc8}\) 23 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{= Plaskett}\) 23 \(\text{g1}\) \(\text{f7}\) 24 \(\text{Wxh6}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 25 \(\text{Wg7}\) 1-0 Plaskett-Wahls, Hastings 1989/90).

\(\text{e22)}\) After 20...\(\text{cxb2+}\) \(\text{?}\) 21 \(\text{Qxb2}\) \(\text{e5}\) White has not yet demonstrated an advantage: 22 \(\text{Qg1}\) \(\text{g6}\) 23 \(\text{Wf6}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 24 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 25 \(\text{Wxh7+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) with counterplay, Roth-Stanec, Austria 1994, or 22 \(\text{Wf5}\) \(\text{= f6}\) 23 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{c5}\) ! with the point 24 \(\text{Qd5}\) \(\text{Wxf2}\) 25 \(\text{Wxh7}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 26 \(\text{Qxd6}\) \(\text{Qa4}\) !.

\(\text{18\ldots\text{Qf6}}\) !

Note:

a) 18...\(\text{Qf6}\) 21 \(\text{Qf6}\) \(\text{bxc3}\) (18...\(\text{Qf8}\) \(\text{= Mochalov}\) 20 \(\text{Wh6}\) \(\text{exb2}\) + 20 \(\text{Wxb2}\) \(\text{Wxc2}\) + 21 \(\text{Wd4}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) \(\text{= Rudnev-Mochalov, USSR 1976}\).

b) 20...\(\text{Qxg7}\) \(\text{Qxg7}\) 21 \(\text{Wh6}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 20 \(\text{g6 fxg6}\) 21 \(\text{Qxg6}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) (or \(\text{21...\text{f8}\) 22 \(\text{Qg8+}\) \(\text{= Balashov}\) 22 \(\text{Qdg1}\) \(\text{Qb7}\) 23 \(\text{Qg7}\) +.)

c) 18...\(\text{Qg4}\) 21 \(\text{bxc3}\) 19 \(\text{Qh4}\) \(\text{cxb2+}\) 20 \(\text{Qxb2}\) \(\text{Wxe4}\) \(\text{= Mochalov}\).

\(\text{d\ldots\text{exd5}}\) 19 \(\text{Qd3}\) !

This is the only move again. Otherwise: 19...\(\text{Wxe4}\) \(\text{= (a typical counter-sacrifice!) 20\ldots\text{Qf2}\) \(\text{Qxc2}\) \(\text{= Mochalov}\); 19...\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{bxc3}\) 20 \(\text{Qh6}\) \(\text{exb2}\) \(\text{= Mochalov}\) 22 \(\text{Qf4}\) \(\text{+ -- Baljon}\) 20...\(\text{f6}?.\)

\(\text{19\ldots\text{Qf8}}\) 20 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{bxc3}\)

Or:

\(\text{a)}\) 20...\(\text{Qf8}\) 21 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Wxe8}\) 22 \(\text{Qxf7}\) !

\(\text{b)}\) 20...\(\text{Qxe4}\) 21 \(\text{Qf6}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 22 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{h6}\) \(\text{= Pote-Penquisite, corr. 1996-7; 22...\text{fxg6?!}\) 23 \(\text{Wxe7}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 24 \(\text{Qxg6}\) \(\text{= Howell-Wahls, Gausdal jr Wch 1986}\) 23 \(\text{gxf7}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) and now 24 \(\text{Qxf6}\) \(\text{gx6}\) 25 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 26 \(\text{Wxh6}\) \(\text{d5}\) 27 \(\text{fxg6}\) ! \(\text{= (Penquisite)}\) or 24 \(\text{Qxg7}\) \(\text{Qxg7}\) 25 \(\text{Qxd4}\) 25 \(\text{Qxg7}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 26 \(\text{Qf5}\) ! \(\text{= Baljon}\) 22 \(\text{Qh3}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 23 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{h6}\) !
(23...fxg6? 24 $\text{wxh7}$ $\text{e8}$ 25 $\text{hxg6}$ $\text{wd5}$ 26 $\text{exg7}$ 1-0 Hadraba-Necaseny, corr. 1984), and Black has a chance to protect himself; e.g., 24 $\text{gxh7}$ $\text{fxf6}$ 25 $\text{exg7}$? $\text{xd4}$ 26 $\text{he7}$ $\text{xc3}$ +.

b) 21 $\text{h3}$ $\text{cxh2}$ ++ 22 $\text{xb2}$ $\text{wxf8}$

(22...$\text{wc2}$+ 23 $\text{a3}$ $\text{xe4}$? 24 $\text{g6}$) and now 23 $\text{f3}$?! $\text{e8}$ 24 $\text{xf7}$+ $\text{d8}$ is satisfactory for Black, Golubev-Shapiro, Odessa rpd 1983, but 23 $\text{g6}$!? is interesting.

21...$\text{exb2}$ ++ 22 $\text{xb2}$ $\text{wc2}$+

22...$\text{f8}$?! 23 $\text{h3}$ (or 23 $\text{xf7}$+$ \text{h8}$ 24 $\text{g6}$ $\text{wc2}$+ 25 $\text{a3}$ $\text{c7}$ 26 $\text{gxh7}$! ?+ 23...$\text{wc2}$+ 24 $\text{a3}$ $\text{xe4}$ (or 24...$\text{h6}$ 25 $\text{gxh6}$ ++) 25 $\text{g6}$ $\text{fxg6}$ 26 $\text{wxh7}$+ $\text{f7}$ 27 $\text{e3}$! $\text{f5}$ 28 $\text{xcg6}$ +.

23 $\text{a3}$ $\text{f8}$ 24 $\text{h3}$! $\text{xe4}$ 25 $\text{g6}$

$\text{fxg6}$ 26 $\text{wxh7}$+ $\text{f7}$ 27 $\text{xcg7}$!

This is better than 27 $\text{e3}$? $\text{xd4}$ + or 27 $\text{xcg7}$+ $\text{e8}$ 28 $\text{e3}$ $\text{f7}$ =.

After the text-move (27 $\text{xcg7}$!) Black can reach an endgame a pawn down but with some drawing chances:

27...$\text{g5}$ 28 $\text{xc8}$+ $\text{xf7}$ (28...$\text{xc8}$ 29 $\text{h6}$+ ++) 29 $\text{xcg7}$+ $\text{xf8}$ 30 $\text{e1}$ (30 $\text{h4}$!?) 30...$\text{d4}$ 31 $\text{xc7}$ 32 $\text{cb7}$ $\text{g8}$ 34 $\text{bg7}$+ $\text{f8}$ 35 $\text{d7}$ $\text{g8}$.

B)

9...$\text{wc7}$ 10 0-0-0

10 $\text{f4}$ transposes to note 'a' to White's 10th move in Line C1 of Chapter 9.

10 $\text{e1}$!? does not promise an advantage here either, though it carries some poison:

a) 10...$\text{da5}$ 11 $\text{g4}$ $\text{xb3}$ 12 $\text{axb3}$ $\text{d7}$ 13 $\text{g5}$ £

b) 10...0-0 11 $\text{g4}$! is unsafe for Black, even though the line 11...$\text{d7}$

12 $\text{g5}$ (12 0-0-0; 12 $\text{f5}$) 12...$\text{xc5}$ 13 $\text{g3}$ (13 $\text{h5}$!) 13...$\text{xb3}$? (13...$\text{g6}$ 14 $\text{h4}$!?). Camacho-N.Gonzalez, Cuban Ch 1987) 14 $\text{xb3}$ $\text{f5}$ (Hector-Shirov, Val Maubuée 1989) 15 $\text{c4}$ $\text{h8}$

16 $\text{xe6}$ $\text{exe6}$ 17 $\text{xe6}$ $\text{d8}$! turns out well for him.

c) 10...$\text{b5}$ 11 $\text{g4}$ (11 0-0-0 $\text{da5}$!; 11 $\text{xc6}$ $\text{xc6}$ 12 0-0-0 $\text{exe4}$?) 11...$\text{b4}$ with almost unstudied complications arising after 12 $\text{xc6}$? $\text{bxc3}$ 13 $\text{xe7}$ or 12 $\text{a4}$, Lamoureux-Lanka, Paris 1990.

d) 10...$\text{e5}$!? makes sense, Qi Jinxuan-G.Kuzmin, Bled/Portorož 1979.

e) 10...$\text{xd4}$? = Akopian.

We now return to 10 0-0-0 (D):

![Diagram](image)

Black must now make a fundamental decision:

B1: 10...$\text{da5}$ 160

B2: 10...0-0 167

10...$\text{b5}$?! is unsuccessful because of 11 $\text{xc6}$! (11 $\text{g4}$ $\text{da5}$ transposes to Line B1) 11...$\text{xc6}$ 12 $\text{d4}$; for instance, 12...$\text{b7}$ (12...0-0 13 $\text{d5}$! ?) 13 $\text{he1}$ $\text{c8}$ 14 $\text{f4}$ 0-0 15 $\text{d5}$ ± Hübner-Hort, Bamberg 1972.

Also better for White is 10...$\text{d7}$ 11 $\text{g4}$! $\text{xd4}$ 12 $\text{xd4}$.
B1)

10...\(\mathcal{N}a5\)

From now on Black is obliged to play with his king in the centre in almost all variations, and not many 'Classical Sicilian' players like it. Nevertheless, the line remains very playable.

11 g4 b5

Or 11...\(\mathcal{N}xb3+\) 12 axb3, and now:

a) 12...b5 13 g5 – 11...b5 12 g5 \(\mathcal{N}xb3+\) 13 axb3.

b) A rare deviation is 12...g6 13 g5 \(\mathcal{N}h5\) 14 f4 (14 \(\mathcal{N}f5\) exf5 15 \(\mathcal{N}d5\) \(\mathcal{W}c6\)! 16 \(\mathcal{N}d4\) \(\mathcal{N}xg5+\) 17 \(\mathcal{B}b1\) \(\mathcal{G}g8\)!) Kasparov/Nikitin; 14 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) b5 15 \(\mathcal{Q}de2\) \(\mathcal{N}b7\) 16 \(\mathcal{G}g3\) 0-0! 17 \(\mathcal{N}xh5\) g5 18 f3, Van Riemsdijk-Carlier, Dieren 1989, 18...b4! Akopian) 14...b5 (14...\(\mathcal{N}d7\) 15 f5 0-0 16 \(\mathcal{W}f2\) ± Quinteros-Gligorič, Manila 1974; there has also occurred 14...0-0 15 f5 \(\mathcal{A}e8\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}f3\) \(\mathcal{A}f7\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}de2\) b5 18 \(\mathcal{G}g3\) b4 which appears dangerous for Black, because of, for example, 19 \(\mathcal{N}xh5\) g5 19 g6) 15 f5 b4 16 \(\mathcal{N}a4\) 0-0. Now 17 \(\mathcal{W}c4\) is one interesting idea.

12 g5 \(\mathcal{N}xb3+\)

12...\(\mathcal{N}d7??\) 13 \(\mathcal{N}xe6\) fxe6 14 \(\mathcal{Q}xe6\) \(\mathcal{W}c4\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}xg7+\) ±.

13 axb3 \(\mathcal{N}d7\) (D)

This is the key position for 10...\(\mathcal{N}a5\), and White has two well-known moves at his disposal:

B11: 14 \(\mathcal{Q}f5\) 160

B12: 14 h4 163

Rare tries for White:

a) 14 b4? a5! 15 \(\mathcal{N}xb5\) \(\mathcal{W}b8\) 16 bxa5 \(\mathcal{B}xa5\) ± (Velimirović).

b) 14 \(\mathcal{N}hg1\) b4 (14...0-0?! transposes to Line B221; 14...\(\mathcal{N}b7??\)) 15 \(\mathcal{N}a4\) and now both 15...\(\mathcal{N}c5\) and 15...\(\mathcal{N}b7\) are satisfactory, Pukhlev-Lysenko, Cheliabinsk 1974.

c) 14 \(\mathcal{B}b1\) b4 (14...\(\mathcal{N}c5??\) 15 \(\mathcal{N}f5!!\); unclear is 14...\(\mathcal{N}b7\) 15 \(\mathcal{H}h5\) g6 16 \(\mathcal{W}h6\) \(\mathcal{F}f8\) 17 \(\mathcal{W}h3\) – Velimirović) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}a4\) \(\mathcal{Q}c5\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}f4\) (16 h4 – 14 h4 b4! 15 \(\mathcal{Q}a4\) \(\mathcal{Q}c5\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}h1\) 16...\(\mathcal{N}d7\) 17 \(\mathcal{W}xb4\) \(\mathcal{Q}xa4??\) 18 bxa4 \(\mathcal{B}b8\) with good play for Black, Noelzil-Eber, Elb 1987.

d) 14 f4!? b4! 15 \(\mathcal{Q}a4\) \(\mathcal{B}b7\) (after 15...\(\mathcal{Q}c5??\) 16 f5 e5 17 \(\mathcal{Q}xc5\) exd4 18 \(\mathcal{Q}xd4\) dxc5 19 \(\mathcal{A}xg7\) White has compensation, Freise-Rossmann, Rostock 1983) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}d2\) a5 17 \(\mathcal{Q}he1\) 0-0 18 \(\mathcal{B}b1\) \(\mathcal{F}c8\) 19 \(\mathcal{C}c1\) \(\mathcal{Q}c5\) 20 \(\mathcal{W}g2\) (Ham-douchi-A.Sokolov, French Cht 1999) 20...g6!? with adequate counterplay.

e) 14 \(\mathcal{W}h5\) g6! (14...0-0? 15 \(\mathcal{H}g1\) ± is unsuccessful and 14...\(\mathcal{N}c5\) 15 b4 \(\mathcal{Q}a4\) 16 \(\mathcal{N}d3\) = Honfi-Donner, The Hague Z 1966, deserves particular attention) 15 \(\mathcal{W}h6\) \(\mathcal{F}f8\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}h4\) b4 17 \(\mathcal{Q}a4\), and now, for example, 17...\(\mathcal{A}g7\), Mason-Howell, British Ch (Swansea) 1995, and 17...\(\mathcal{N}b7??\) seem very good.

B11)

14 \(\mathcal{Q}f5\)

The positional sacrifice developed by Velimirović.

14...\(\text{exf5}\)
14...b4 appears dubious but has not yet been refuted:

a) 15 ighbors fe8 16  h5 (16 d4 g8!? 16...xg7 17 d4+ g8! (17 e5 18 f4 ±) 18 d5 (18 xh8 xh8 19 xf7 f8 --; 18 h1 e5 19 f4 g6 20 xh8 xh8 21 e2 b7 = Wahl's-Rechlis, Berne 1990) 18...exd5 19 g6 fxg6 20 xd5+ f8 Furhoff-Sanden, Salogernas 1994.

b) 15 d4!? xg5+?! (15..xc3) 16 b1 f6? 17 xf6 xf6 18 xd6+ Prié-Muir, Novi Sad OL 1990.

c) 15 xe7 bxc3 (15..xe7?! is recommended by Rechlis) 16 xe8 cxb2+ 17 xxb2 xxe8 18 d4 (or 18 d2 Boleslavsky) with a slight advantage for White.

15 d5 d8

Possibly attention should be paid to 15...a5; e.g., 16 xf5 (16 xe7??) 16...b7 17 xe7 (17 b6 a1+!). Now bad is 17...xh1? 18 b6! a1+ (18...f3 19 xf3 xb6 20 c6+ xe7 21 xd6+ e8 22 b1! ++) 19 d2xb2 20 c6+ ±, but 17...a1+ 18 d2 a5+! and 17...e5?? are sufficient.

16 xf5 b7!

16...0-0? 17 f6! ± Velimirović-Sofrevski, Titograd 1965.

17 f6

After 17 h1 xe5 18 xd5 0-0! 19 f6 xf6 20 gxf6 xf6 Black stands at least no worse.

17...xf6!

If 17...xd5, it is bad to play 18 fxe7? because of 18...a5!. Interesting is 18 xd5 xf6 19 d4 (19 h1 -- 17...xf6! 18 h1 xd5! 9 xd5) 19...f8 20 h5, as in Gusev-Zotkin, Leningrad 1968, but the most accurate continuation is 18 xg7 g8 19 xd5 xg7 20 f4 f8, when both 21 e1 and 21 h4 give White very strong pressure.

18 h1

18 xf6 xd5 (18...xf6?! 19 b6 xd5 20 xd8 xd8 21 h1 seems to be better for White) 19 xd5 (19 xe7? a5!) 19 xf6 20 f5 g8 (20...xd7?! 21 f3 c8 22 d4 c6 = Reinaldo-Campos, Mondariz 1996) 21 d4 (21 e1 -- 18 h1 xd5! 19 xd5 g8 20 xf6 xf6 21 f5) 21...f8 22 f3 g6 23 h5 and Black defends successfully.

18...xd5!

18...0-0? 19 xf6 xf6 20 g4+ h8 21 xf6 xf6 22 d4 g8 23 e8!! xe8 24 g5 e6 25 g1 ++ Velimirović.

19 xd5 g8 (D)

Black's alternatives are inferior: 19...f8?! 20 xf6 xf6 21 h6+ e8 22 d3 d7 23 f3; 19...e5?! 20 gxf6 xf6 21 f4; 19...0-0? 20 xf6 xf6 21 g1+ h8 22 h5 g7 23 xg7 xg7 24 g4+ --.

![Diagram](image)

By making a series of accurate moves, Black has achieved a position where his extra knight is worth no less than White's activity.
20 gxf6

Or:

a) 20 ♫f5 ♫xg5 ♘e5 – 20 gxf6 ♕xf6 21 ♫f5 ♗g4!? 22 ♘g5 ♘e5.

b) 20 ♘d2 ♗f8! 21 ♘a5 (21 ♗h5 ♗g7?) 21...♗xa5 22 ♗xe7+ ♗g7 is much better for Black, Goljak-Petrushin, USSR 1971.

c) 20 h4 ♘c8 (20...fxg5!? 21 ♘xg5 ♘e5) 21 ♘f4 (21 ♗f4? ♗f8, Ehvest-Tischbierek, Leningrad 1984) 21...♖f8 22 ♘xd6 ♘xd6 23 ♘xd6 ♗xg5 (Yrjölä suggests 23...♖c7) 24 ♗d2 ♘c7 25 ♗b4 ♗g7 26 ♗d4+ ♗f8 = Dashkov-Tseshkovsky, Novorossiysk 1995.

d) 20 ♘f4 ♗f8 (20...♘e5? 21 gxf6 ♘xf6 22 ♘xe5 ♘xe5 23 ♗f4 ± Golubev-Konarev, Ukrainian jr Ch (Alexandria) 1984) and then:

d1) 21 ♗d2 ♘xg5! (21...fxg5? 22 ♘xd6 ♘xd6 23 ♘xd6 – 21 ♘xd6 ♘xd6 22 ♘xd6 ♗xg5? 23 ♗d2 ±) 22 ♘xg5 fxg5 23 h4 a5!, Hector-Fishbein, Stavanger 1991, with the point 24 ♘xb5 ♘c5! ♗f8.

d2) 21 ♗h5 ♗a5!.

d3) 21 ♘xd6 ♘xd6 22 ♘xd6 ♘xg5 (22...fxg5? 23 ♗d2 ♘a7 24 ♗b4! a5 25 ♘xd7+ axb4 26 ♘xd8+ ♗g7 27 ♘xg8+ ♗xg8 28 ♗e5 ± A.Koroliov; 22...♘a7? 23 ♘xf6 ♘g6 24 ♗e3 ♘c7 25 ♗h3; 22...♗c8!? – Kasparov/Nikitin) 23 ♗f4 (23 ♗d2 ♘a7 24 ♗f4 ♗g6 – 23 ♗f4 ♗g6 24 ♗d2 ♘a7) 23...♗g6 and here:

d31) 24 ♗f5 ♘g5 25 ♗d2 (25 h4?! ♘xf5 26 ♗d2 ♘e5!) 25...♘a7 – 24 ♗d2 ♘a7 25 ♗f5 ♘g5.

d32) 24 ♗d2 ♘a7 25 ♗f5 (25 ♗d1 ♗f5?) 25...♗g5 26 h4 ♗g4 (26...♗g7?!) 27 ♘d4 (27 ♗h6+ ♗g8 28 ♘d4 ♗g7!? 29 ♗d2 ♗c8 ♗f Moraru-Ardeleanu, Romanian Cht 1998) 27...h5!? 28 ♗h6+

20...♖xf6 21 ♘f5 ♗g4!?

This is sufficient, but is not the only move:

a) 21...♗g6? 22 ♗b6 ♗d7 23 ♗f3 ♗b8 24 ♘xf6 ♘xb6 25 ♗a8+ ♗d8 26 ♘xe7+ ♗xe7 27 ♗xe7 ♗xe7 28 ♗d4+ ♗f8 = Kupreichik-Beliavsky, USSR 1974.

b) 21...♗b8 22 h4 (A.Frolov-Bagaturov, Biel IZ 1993; 22 ♘a7?! ♗b7 23 ♘d4 ♗g4 24 ♗f3 ♗c8 = Taborov-Korsunsky, Tallinn 1976; 22 ♘d4!) 22...♗g4 23 ♘g5 ♘e5 24 ♗f4 with unclear play.

c) 21...♗d7!? 22 ♘g5 (it is unknown whether White gets compensation after 22 ♗h5; e.g., 22...♗g6 23 ♘h7 and now 23...♘e5 {Schach-Archiv} or 23...♗f6), and now, apart from 22...♘e5 (see 21...♗g4 22 ♘g5 ♘e5), Black should consider the idea 22...♗xg5!? 23 ♘xg5 ♗f8.

22 ♘g5

Black achieves the advantage after other moves:

a) 22 ♗f3 ♘c8 23 ♘d4 ♘e5!, Zapata-Van der Wiel, Wijk aan Zee 1995.

b) 22 ♘g5 ♘xg5 23 ♘xg5 ♘e5 24 ♘xe7 ♘xe7, Howell-Lysenko, Cappelle la Grande 1995.

c) 22 ♗g1 ♗h6! (22...h5? 23 ♘xh5 ♘f6 24 ♘xg8+ ♗xg8 25 ♗g4 ♘f6 26 ♘h8+ ♗f8 27 ♗f3) 23 ♗f5? ♘xg5! –.

d) 22 ♘d4 ♗g6! 23 ♗f3 ♘e5 24 ♘xe5 dxe5 25 ♘xf7 ♘a7!

22...♘e5 23 ♘xe7 ♘xe7 24 ♗f4

A probable draw can be achieved either through 24...♗g2, as in the game Soloviev-Lysenko, Sverdlovsk 1978, or 24...♘d3+ and 24...♗e6 25 ♗e4 ♘d3+, which were played later.
B12)

14 h4 (D)

The most popular plan for White—he intends 15 h5 and 16 g6.

14...b4!

The other possibilities are:

a) Unsuccessful is 14...0-0?! 15 g6! dxc5 (15...hxg6 16 h5), when White has two promising roads: 16 b4 da4 17 dxaxa4 (17 d3! Velimirović) 17...axa4 (Romanishin-Vaiser, USSR 1972) 18 h5!, or 16 gxh7+ dxh7 17 hxg1 dxg6 18 hg5 with an advantage.

b) 14...dxc5!? and now:

b1) 15 dxf5?! exf5 16 d5 db3+ 17 db1 dd7.

b2) After 15 b4 da4 16 d3, we have:

b21) 16 wc4 17 db1! wxb4 18 c3 wa5 19 dc6 wc7 20 dxex7 wxex7 21 dxhd1 favours White, Radulov-Hamann, Lugano OL 1968.

b22) 16...dxd7 can be met by 17 dxf5?! exf5 18 d5 dd8 19 d4—Velimirović.

b23) 16...db7!? is more reliable for Black.

b24) 16 dc3 17 xc3 wd7, as given by Kasparov and Nikitin, also looks safer for Black.

b3) 15 h5 b4 16 da4—14...b4! 15 da4 dc5! 16 h5.

c) 14...db7 is a natural but somewhat inaccurate continuation:

c1) 15 h5 b4 and then:

c11) 16 da4 xe4 17 f3 and here:

c111) 17...db7?? 18 g6 hxg6 19 hxg6 dxh1 20 dxh1 and now, rather than 20...df6? 21 dxex6! — M.Gurevich-Ehlvest, USSR 1978 or 20...dc5! 21 dxex5 dxex5 22 gxex7+ dxf7 23 dxex6!—Podgaets-Butnoriūnas, Odessa 1975, Black should try 20...dxf8?.

c112) 17 d5! 18 db1 de5 (the alternatives for Black are 18...dc8? 19 df5 wc6 and 18...wb7?) 19 dh3 0-0! (Livshits/Lukin) gives Black good chances.

C12) 16 da2! and then:

C121) 16 dc5 17 db4 de4 18 f3 db7 19 g6 ±.

C122) 16 dxex4?! 17 f3 db7 18 dxex4 (18 g6 — Akopian) 18...a5??.

C123) 16 wa5 17 db1 de4 (after 17 dxg5 18 dxg5 wxg5 19 dxex4 White has the initiative, de Firmian-Busquesto, New York 1989) 18 dxex4 19 db5 (18...dxd5 19 dx2! ± Ulybin/Volovik), and now White has an interesting choice:

C1231) 19 dh4 h6 20 dxex4 (20 dc6?!) 20...dxg5 21 dxbc6 dxg5 22 dh4 hxg5 23 dxh1 — Ljubojević-Beliavsky, Las Palmas 1974.

C1232) 19 dc6!? Šahović.

C1233) 19 dxex4 wb4 20 axf5 exf5 21 dxex5 (21...wb5?! Minić; 21...dxh8 22 dh6 ± 22 h6 dxex6 23 hxg7 dxg8 24 dxh6 with compensation, Ljubojević-Hamann, Amsterdam 1975.

C2) 15 f3 and now:

C21) 15 wa5 16 db1 b4 17 da2? d5 18 h5 dxex4 19 g6, Lerner-Petrushin,
Minsk 1971, has been evaluated in White’s favour.

c22) 15...c8 16 h5 b4 17 a4 d5 18 g6 hxg6 19 hxg6 a7h1 20 a7h1 dxe4 21 f4 with the initiative, Radulov-Shamkovitch, Varna 1970.

c23) 15...g6 should probably transpose to line ‘c254’ as after 16 h5 b4, 17 hxg6 bxc3 18 a7xh7 a7h7 19 gxh7 0-0-0 20 g6 a7f6 seems satisfactory for Black.

c24) 15...c5!? 16 a1b1 0-0-0 was suggested by Nisipeanu and Stoica.

c25) 15...b4 16 a4 and then:

c251) 16...d5?! 17 exd5 a7xd5 18 a7f5 ±.

c252) 16...a5 17 a1b1 c5 – 16...c5 17 a1b1 a5.

c253) 16...c5 and here:

c2531) 17 h5 a7xa4 (17...a5 18 a1b1 – 17 a1b1 a5 18 h5) 18 bxa4 a7c8 and now, rather than 19 g6 a7f6!, as in Wedberg-Shamkovitch, Reykjavik 1982, Nunn recommends 19 a1b1! ±.

c2532) 17 a1b1 and now:

c25321) 17...a7xa4 18 bxa4 a7c8 19 a7c1! ± Nunn.

c25322) 17...c8 18 h5 a7xa4 (18...0-0 19 g6 a7f6 20 h2 a7f8 21 a7dg1!? with an attack; 18...a5!? – 17...a5 18 h5 a7c8!? 19 bxa4 d5 20 g6 a7f6 21 gxf7+ a7xf7 (Razuvaev-Shamkovitch, USSR Ch (Baku) 1972) 22 f4 dxe4 23 f5 ±.

c25323) 17...a5 18 h5 (18 e5!? a7xa4??) 18...a7xa4 (18...a7c8!? 19 g6 a7f6) 19 bxa4 a7xa4 (19...a7xg5 20 a7b3 and 19...a7c8 20 g6 favour White) 20 g6 a7c8 (20...a7f6 21 a7c4 ± 21 h6! hxg6 22 hxg7 a7g8 23 a7h8 a7d7 24 a7b3 ± Nunn-Van der Wiel, Wijk aan Zee 1982.

c254) 16...g6!? and then:

c2541) 17 a7f2!?

c2542) 17 d2!? a5 (17...d5!?) 18 h5 0-0-0 19 a1b1, and now not 19...a7b8? 20 hxg6 hxg6 21 a7xh8 a7xh8 22 a7c6++ a7xc6 23 a7d4 +- Nunn-Nokes, Ramsgate 1981, but 19...d5 20 e5!? a7xe5, with complications.

c2543) 17 h5! enables White to fight for the initiative; e.g., 17...e5 18 hxg6 fxg6 19 a7e6; 17...0-0-0 18 a7f2 a5 19 a1b1 a7xc5 19...d5 20 e5! 20 a7f5!, Parligas-Ardeleanu, Romanian Ch 2000; 17...a7f8 18 d2 d5 19 e5!?, P.Petursson-Nykopp, Reykjavik 1984; 17...a7g8 18 a7f2 a7c8 19 hxg6 hxg6 20 a7d2 ± Lukin-Liavdansky, Leningrad 1969.

We now return to 14...b4 (D):

![Diagram](image)

15 a7a4

15 a2 a5! (15...a7b7 16 h5! – 14...a7b7 15 h5 b4 16 a2!; 15...a7c5 16 a7xb4 a7xe4 Kasparov/Nikitin) 16 b5?! (a game with chances for both sides can be obtained through 16 a1b1 or 16 h5 a7a6, followed by a7c8, Wedberg-Yrjölä, Finland-Sweden 1988) 16...a7b8 (or 16...a7c6 17 a7c4 a7c5 18 a7xd6 a7xd6 19 a7xd6+ a7xd6 20 a7xc5 a7c7! Kasparov/Nikitin) 17 a7d3 a7a6
(17...0-0 18 \(\mathcal{d}d6 \mathcal{c}e5!? 19 \mathcal{w}d4 a4) 18 \mathcal{w}c4 \mathcal{d}c5 19 \mathcal{b}b1 (de Firmian-Hellers, Reykjavik 1990) 19...\(\mathcal{a}b7!.

15...\(\mathcal{d}c5!

15...\(\mathcal{a}b7 and then: 16 f3 – 14...\(\mathcal{a}b7 15 f3 b4 16 \mathcal{d}a4; 16 h5 – 14...\(\mathcal{a}b7 15 h5 b4 16 \mathcal{d}a4.

16 \(\mathcal{h}5

The remaining continuations are:

a) 16 \(\mathcal{d}xc5?! dxc5 17 \(\mathcal{d}f3 – 8...\mathcal{w}c7 9 \mathcal{w}e2 \mathcal{d}a5 10 g4 b5 11 g5 \(\mathcal{d}d7 12 0-0-0 b4 13 \mathcal{d}xa4 \(\mathcal{d}xb3+ 14 axb3 \mathcal{d}c5 15 \mathcal{d}xc5 dxc5 16 \mathcal{d}f3 \mathcal{e}e7 17 \(\mathcal{h}4.

b) 16 \mathcal{w}c4 \mathcal{d}d7 (16...\(\mathcal{a}b7 17 e5 \mathcal{d}xa4 18 bxa4 dxe5 19 \mathcal{w}c6 \mathcal{w}c7 20 \mathcal{d}xe5 \mathcal{w}xc4 21 \mathcal{d}xc4 \(\mathcal{a}b7 = Matanovic-Hamann, Vrnjačka Banja 1966) 17 \mathcal{x}xb4 \mathcal{d}xa4! 18 bxa4 0-0 with an excellent position.

c) 16 \mathcal{b}b1 \mathcal{d}xe4 (16...\(\mathcal{d}d7 can be met by 17 f4!? or 17 h5 – 16 h5 \(\mathcal{d}d7 17 \(\mathcal{d}b1) 17 \mathcal{d}f4 and now Schach-Archiv gives 17...e5! \(\mathcal{f} rather than 17...\(\mathcal{d}c5 18 \mathcal{d}f5 \pm Raičević).

d) 16 f3 \(\mathcal{d}d7! 17 \mathcal{b}b1 (17 h5?! can be met by 17...e5! or 17...\(\mathcal{d}xb3+ 18 \mathcal{d}xb3 \mathcal{d}xa4 \(\mathcal{f}) 17...\mathcal{d}xa4 (17...\mathcal{d}xa4 18 bxa4 \mathcal{d}xa4 19 h5 \mathcal{d}c5 \pm Yusain-Sion Castro, Leon 1993) 18 bxa4 \mathcal{d}xa4 19 h5 \(\mathcal{d}7 20 g6 and it is not clear whether White has real compensation. Black can choose between 20...\mathcal{f}6 and 20...fxg6?! 21 hxg6 h6, Dervish-I. Nikolaidis, Erevan Z 2000.

16...\(\mathcal{d}d7

Otherwise:

a) 16...\(\mathcal{a}b7?! is well met by 17 g6!, as in Gufeld-Tukmakov, Moscow 1975, or 17 f3?! – 14...\(\mathcal{a}b7 15 f3 b4 16 \mathcal{d}a4 \(\mathcal{d}c5 17 h5.

b) 16...\mathcal{d}xa4?! 17 bxa4 \mathcal{w}a5 18 g6 \pm Hartston-Mestel, British Ch (Eastbourne) 1973.

c) 16...e5?! 17 \mathcal{d}f5 \pm Nunn-Murshed, Commonwealth Ch (London) 1985.

d) Serious attention should be paid to 16...\(\mathcal{d}xe4?! 17 g6 \mathcal{d}f6 (17...f5 18 \(\mathcal{h}6! \pm I.Zaitsev-Utemov, USSR 1983; 17...\(\mathcal{d}f6?! 18 h6 hxg6 19 hxg7 \mathcal{x}g8 20 \mathcal{h}h8 \mathcal{b}7 21 \mathcal{g}g5 \mathcal{d}d7 22 \mathcal{d}b5 axb5 23 \mathcal{w}xb5+ \mathcal{d}c6 24 \mathcal{d}c5+! --; 17...\(\mathcal{d}d8?!?) 18 gxg7+ (18 \mathcal{w}g4 d5 19 \mathcal{x}xf7+ \mathcal{w}xf7 20 f3 \mathcal{w}g3! with an advantage, Chuprov-Kalugin, St Petersburg 1999; 18 \(\mathcal{d}f4?! e5 19 \mathcal{w}xe4 \mathcal{b}7; 18 h6 hxg6 19 hxg7 \mathcal{x}xg7 20 \mathcal{w}xh8+ \mathcal{d}xh8 also looks dubious; e.g., 21 \mathcal{h}h1 \mathcal{d}f6 22 \mathcal{h}h7 \mathcal{g}5 or 21 \mathcal{w}g4 \mathcal{b}7?) 18...\mathcal{w}xf7 19 \mathcal{h}h1 \pm Emmms-Hennigan, British Ch (Dundee) 1993.

17 \mathcal{b}b1

17 \(\mathcal{d}xc5?! dxc5 18 \mathcal{f}3 \mathcal{b}5 with strong counterplay.

17 g6 \mathcal{x}xb3+! (17...\(\mathcal{d}f6? 18 e5?! \pm Benjamin-Taborov, Schilde 1976) and then:

a) 18 \mathcal{b}b1 \mathcal{d}xd4! (18...\(\mathcal{c}5 19 \(\mathcal{h}6! gives White sufficient compensation, Renet-Am.Rodriguez, Pančevog 1985) 19 \mathcal{d}xd4 \mathcal{d}xa4 20 \mathcal{x}xg7 and now 20...\mathcal{c}8 \pm Hector-Am.Rodriguez, Seville 1986, or 20...\(\mathcal{d}d7.

b) 18 \mathcal{d}xb3 \mathcal{d}xa4 19 \(\mathcal{h}6!? (this does not give an advantage but nobody knows whether there is compensation after 19 gxg7+ \mathcal{x}xg7 or 19 \mathcal{d}d4 \mathcal{f}6 20 gxg7+ \mathcal{x}xg7; e.g., 21 \mathcal{h}6 g6 22 b3 \(\mathcal{d}d7! 23 f4) 19...fxg6 20 hxg6 (20 \mathcal{d}d4 e5?! may well come to the same thing) 20...\mathcal{g}8 21 \mathcal{d}d4 e5 (21...\mathcal{e}8!; e.g., 22 \mathcal{x}xh7? \mathcal{x}xc2! 23 \mathcal{d}xc2 b3 \pm K.Berg-Trepp, Zug 1985, or 22 b3 \mathcal{b}5 23 \mathcal{w}d2 \(\mathcal{d}d7 24 \mathcal{x}xh7 \mathcal{f}6, Langeveld-De Koning, corr. 1991) 22 \mathcal{e}6 \mathcal{w}c6 (22...\mathcal{w}c8!? 23 \mathcal{f}8 \mathcal{x}g7 24...
\( \text{...} \text{Q}xh7 \text{...} \text{Q}e6 25 \text{...} \text{Q}g5 \text{...} \text{Q}a2! \text{ Akopian} \)
23 \text{...} \text{Q}xh7 \text{...} \text{Q}b3! (23...Qc8? 24 Qc5! ±
dxc5? 25 Qc4 +-) 24 Qd5! (24 Qc5
Qf7 25 Qd3 Qxe4 \( \equiv \) Brunner-Van der
Wiel, Lucerne Wch 1989) 24...Qc8
25 Qh8 Qxc2+ (25...Qf7 26 Qc5!
dxc5! 27 exb3 c4! 28 bx4 Qxc4+ =
Rechlis-Piket, Gausdal jr Wch 1986) 26
Qxc2 Qxc2+ 27 Qb1 Qf7 28 Qd3(!)
with a roughly equal endgame according
to Akopian.

17...Qxa4

The prevailing practical choice, al-
though there are some other interesting
moves:

a) 17...Qxe4? 18 g6 f5 19 h6! hxg6
20 f3! Qc5 21 Qxc5 dxc5 22 Qf4! ±

b) 17...Qc8?! 18 g6 Qf6 19 gxf7+
Qxf7 20 e5 Qxe5 21 Qxc5 dxc5 22
Qf3 Qf6 23 Qf4 ± Wolff-Masculo,
Philadelphia 1990.

The initiative) 20 gxf7+ (20 f4?! 0-0-
21 gxf7+ Qxf7 22 Qxe6? Qb7 \( \rightarrow \)
20...Qxf7 (20...Qxf7?! 21 h6! g6 22
Qf3 \( \equiv \) Planinc-Beliavsky, Hastings
1974/5) 21 Qc4 (21 h6?! g6 22 Qc4
0-0 =; 21 f4?! 0-0 22 h6 g6 23 f5 Qxf5
24 Qxf5 Qae8) 21...0-0 22 Qxe6 Qxe6
23 Qxe6 Qf7 (Wang Pin-Chiburdan-
dze, Shanghai wom Ct 1992; 23...Qxb2
=) 24 Qc1 Qc5 =.

b) 18...Qc8 and then:

b1) 19 Qb3?! Qxa4 20 Qd4 and
now 20...Qc3! is even better than
20...Qc5 \( \equiv \) Hector-Cebalo, Montpel-
lier 1985.

b2) 19 g6 Qf6 20 gxf7+ is best met
by 20...Qxf7!. 20...Qxf7 is weaker in
view of 21 f4?! or 21 Qc4 b3 22 Qxb3
Qxa4 23 Qxc7+ Qxc7 24 Qxd6 ±.

b3) 19 f4?! is worth considering.

b4) 19 f3 Qxa4 20 Qxa6 (20 g6
Qf6 21 Qxa6 Qxb2! C.Hansen)
20...Qc5 21 Qb5+ Qd7! (21...Qd7 is
best met by 22 b3! \( \equiv \) Rötşagov-Kein-
gold, Finnish Cht 1996, rather than 22
h6 g6 23 Qxb4 0-0 \( \equiv \)) and then:

b41) 22 Qd2 0-0 23 g6 (23 f4 Qc5
24 f5 Qxe4 25 Qg2 Qa8 26 Qc6 Qfc8
\( \equiv \)) 23...Qc5 (23...Qe5 24 gxf7+ Qxf7
25 Qxe6 Qc4 = Akopian) 24 h6 (24
Qxb4?! Van der Wiel) 24...fxg6 25

18 bxa4 (D)

Here, Black has several possibili-
ties:

a) 18...Qxa4 19 g6 (19 f4! Kuczy-
nski) 19...Qf6 (19...Qc5 20 e5!? with

3Qh7 Qe6 25 Qg5 Qa2! Akopian)
23 Qxh7 Qb3! (23...Qc8? 24 Qc5! ±
dxc5? 25 Qc4 +-) 24 Qd5! (24 Qc5
Qf7 25 Qd3 Qxe4 ≈ Brunner-Van der
Wiel, Lucerne Wch 1989) 24...Qc8
25 Qh8 Qxc2+ (25...Qf7 26 Qc5!
dxc5! 27 exb3 c4! 28 bx4 Qxc4+ =
Rechlis-Piket, Gausdal jr Wch 1986) 26
Qxc2 Qxc2+ 27 Qb1 Qf7 28 Qd3(!!)
with roughly equal endgame according
to Akopian.

17...Qxa4

The prevailing practical choice, al-
though there are some other interesting
moves:

a) 17...Qxe4? 18 g6 f5 19 h6! hxg6
20 f3! Qc5 21 Qxc5 dxc5 22 Qf4! ±

b) 17...Qc8?! 18 g6 Qf6 19 gxf7+
Qxf7 20 e5 Qxe5 21 Qxc5 dxc5 22
Qf3 Qf6 23 Qf4 ± Wolff-Masculo,
Philadelphia 1990.

c) 17...Qb7 and now:

c1) 18 g6 Qxa4 (18...Qf6?! 19
gxf7+ Qxf7 20 h6!, Pugachov-Fehen,
Budapest 1992; 18...hxg6?! 19 hxg6
Qxh1 20 Qxh1 is much better for
White – Wedberg; 18...Qxa4!?) 19
bxa4 – 17...Qxa4 18 bxa4 Qb7 19 g6.

c2) 18 e5 Qxa4 19 exd6 Qxd6 20
bxa4 Qxa4!? ∞ (20...0-0-0 21 Qb3
Qxa4 22 Qa5 Qb5 23 Qc4).

d) 17...Qxa4!? 18 bxa4 Qxa4 (or
18...g6!? Kasparov/Nikitin), and
instead of 19 g6 Qf6, 19 f4!? deserves
attention (c.g. 19...e5 20 fxe5 dxe5 21
Qf5 b3 22 exb3 Qxb3 23 Qd3).

e) 17...g6!?.

18 bxa4 (D)

Here, Black has several possibili-
ties:

a) 18...Qxa4 19 g6 (19 f4! Kuczy-
nski) 19...Qf6 (19...Qc5 20 e5!? with
b42) 22 g6 e5! (22 fxg6? 23 hxg2 ± Hector-Rößsagov, Gothenburg 1997), and here Black has a guaranteed draw: 23 h6 (or 23 gxh7+ g8 24 h5+ g7 25 xg7 h4 26 hxg7 h4 27 e5 =) 25 d5+ e8 26 hxg7 xg7 = = Cu.Hansen.

c) 18...b7 and here:

c1) 19 e5 dxe5 20 b3 cxb3 21 cxb3 0-0 22 a2 cxd8 23 d4 e4 24 g6 f6! ± Nieuwenhuis-Am.Rodriguez, Dieren 1987.

c2) 19 f3!? xf4 20 g6 f6 and now:

c21) 21 gxh7+ and now: 21...xf7 22 c4 0-0 21 c4 0-0 22 gxh7+ xf7; 21...xf7!? transposes to line ‘c323’.

c22) 21 c4 0-0 22 pxg7+ xf7 23 xe6 (23 c6?!?) 23...xe6 24 dxe6 xb2 25 x8d1 x8d1 26 x8d1 x8f8 27 xd6 = de Firmian-D.Gurevich, Philadelphia 1995.

c3) 19 g6 f6 (19 hxg6 20 hxg6 xh1 21 xh1) and then:

c31) 20 f3 and here:

c311) 20 c8 21 b3! hxg6 22 hxg6 xh1 23 gxh7+ xh7 24 xh1 (Wolff-D.Gurevich, New York 1994) 24 d5! (Wolff) gives White good possibilities such as 25 h5!?.

c312) Stronger is 20...xf4! – 19 f3? xf4 20 g6 xg6.

c32) 20 gxh7+ xh7 (20...xf7?! 21 e5! and now 21 b4 22 or 21...e5 22 b5 – Kuczynski) 21 f3 (21 h6 g6; 21 e5 dxe5 22 f5 e4! 23 c4 h8 = Kolomiets-Tsvetkov, corr. 1991; 21 f5?! xe4!?) 22 c4

B2) 10...0-0 (D)

Another very important crossroad.

We shall consider:

B21: 11 g4 168

B22: 11 h1 175

B23: 11 h1 d7 12 g4 179
The last line is a common direction for 11 ₒh_{g1} and 11 g4.

Other moves are not considered as dangerous for Black and are played surprisingly seldom:

a) 11 ₒb1 b5 (11...₫d7 12 g4! ₡xd4 13 ₡xd4; 11...₫d7 transposes to Line A1, which is a little better for White; 11...<&a5? 12 g4 ₡xb3 13 axb3 b5 =; e.g., 14 g5 ₡d7 15 h4 b4 16 ₡a2 &b7, Kengis-Lukin, Sverdlovsk 1984) 12 ₡xc6 &xc6 13 ₡d4 &b7 (13...<&b8? 14 &he1 a5) 14 &he1. Now, instead of 14...b4? 15 ₡d5, 14...<&e8?! 15 f4 ₡d8 16 &d3!? (16 e5!? dxe5 17 &xe5) 16...e5 17 fxe5 dxe5 18 &e3 &xe4 19 &xe4 &xe4 20 &f1 = or 14...&d8 15 e5?! dxe5 16 &xe5, Nunn’s 14...<&c7! 15 a3 &d7!? appears good.

b) 11 f4 is another hybrid of the Velimirović Attack and the Classical Sozin. Now:

b1) 11...<&a5 (not the best) 12 g4! b5 13 g5 &xb3+ (13...<&e8 should be in White’s favour) 14 axb3 &d7 and now:

b11) 15 b4 is well met by 15...b4!.

b12) 15 f5 is best answered by 15...<&e5!, Timman-Langeweg, Amsterdam 1973, rather than 15...b4?! 16 &a4 &c5 17 f6! &d8 18 e5?, Pablo Marin-Cuadras, Roses 1992, though 15...<&c5?! is interesting.

b13) White should play 15 ₒh_{g1}!, transposing to Line B221.

b2) 11...<&xd4 12 &xd4 leads to play with chances for both sides:

b21) 12...<&d7 13 &f1 (13 &d1 b5 14 f5 &c5 15 &d4 &xb3+ 16 axb3 b4?! 17 &a4 &b8, Kaminski-Av.Bykovsky, Katowice 1992; 13 g4 – 11 g4)

b22) 13...<&e5 14 fxe5 &xf5 15 g4 &e6 16 g5 &d7 17 &h5 (17...<&d5!? 17...<&e5?! Lukin) 18 &f1 &g6 19 &d1 &c5 20 &d5 &ab8 21 h4 b4 22 h5!! ± Lukin-Shirov, Daugavpils 1989.

b222) 13...<&b7 14 fxe6?!

b223) 13...&b8 14 g4 b4 15 &a4, and instead of 15...<&b7 16 g5?! &xe4 17 f6 &xf6 18 &xf6 &xe4 19 &d1 &b7 (Lukin), I like 15...&d5, as in Silva-Paoli, Odessa 1976.

b3) 11...b5 appears to be at least an equal alternative:

b31) 12 g4 b4 13 &xc6 bxc3!? with strong counterplay, Radev-Spassov, Albena 1970.

b32) 12 f5 &a5 (12...<&xd4 13 &xd4 – 11...<&xd4 12 &xd4 b5 13 f5; 12...b4 13 &c4!) 13 fxe6 &xb3+ 14 axb3 fxe6 15 &g5 b4 16 &a4 &d7 and Black has no problems, Suetin-T.Petrosian, USSR 1971.

b33) 12 &xc6 &xc6 13 e5 (13 g4 b4 14 &d5 exd5 15 g5 &g4 ± Akopian) 13...dxe5 14 fxe5 &d7 15 &d5, and, quite apart from 15...<&c5 16 &he1, Black also has the promising option 15...&d8?! (Nunn).

B21)

11 g4 (D)
The choice between this move and 11 \( \text{Nh}g1 \) is mostly a matter of taste.

11...\( \text{Qxd4!} \)

This is the most important move – White must now recapture on d4 with the rook. Otherwise:

a) 11...\( \text{Qxa5?!} \) 12 g5 \( \text{Qxb3} + 13 \text{axb3 Qd7} 14 \text{h4} (14 \text{f4 b5} – 11 \text{f4 Qxa5} 12 \text{g4! b5} 13 \text{g5 Qxb3} + 14 \text{axb3 Qd7}; 14 \text{Nhgl} b5 transposes to Line B221) 14...b5 15 g6!.

b) 11...b5?! 12 \( \text{Qxc6} \) (or 12 g5) 12...\( \text{Wxc6} 13 \text{Qd5} \) (Nunn).

c) 11...\( \text{Qd7} \) is the popular alternative:

   c1) 12 \( \text{Qxe6?!} \) fxe6 13 \( \text{Qxe6} + \text{Wh}8 14 \text{Qd5 Wd8}. \)

   c2) 12 \( \text{Nhgl} \) is Line B23.

   c3) After 12 g5 \( \text{Qc5}, 13 \text{Nhgl} \) transposes to Line B231. White hardly has anything better: 13 h4 b5! 14 h5 (14 f3 \( \text{Qd7} \) is slightly better for Black, Fischer-Larsen, Palma de Mallorca IZ 1970) 14...b4! (14...\( \text{Qxd4!!} \)?) 15 \( \text{Qa4 Qxd4} 16 \text{Nh4} 17 \text{Kasparov/Nikitin}; 13 f4 b5! 14 f5 b4 \( \text{cxd4} + 13 \text{Qb1 Qd7} = \) (or 13...\( \text{Qxb3} \)); 13 \( \text{Wh5 Qd7} = \), and White is obliged to play 14 \( \text{Nhgl} \) all the same, which transposes to Line B2312.

c4) 12 f4!? \( \text{Qc5} 13 \text{f5} (13 \text{Qb1 b5!}) 13...b5 14 \text{Qxb5} \) leads to a doubled-edged game; e.g., 14...\( \text{Qd7} (14...\text{Qxb3} 15 \text{axb3} b4 16 \text{Qa4 Qxd4} 17 \text{Qxd4} \text{Qb8} 18 f6!?) \) Ghizdavu) 15 \( \text{Qxc6} (15 \text{fxe6 fxe6} 16 \text{Qf5} = \) 15...\( \text{Wxc6} 16 \text{g5} (16 \text{Qd5? exd5} 17 \text{exd5} \text{Qc8} 18 \text{Qxc5 dxc5} 19 \text{Wxe7} b4) 16...\text{Qxb3} 17 \text{axb3} (17 f6?!?) 17...b4 18 f6 \text{bxc3}! = \) White-Butze, corr. 1986.

   c5) 12 \( \text{Qf5}! \) is very interesting (and probably strong):

   c51) 12...\( \text{Qc5} 13 \text{Qxe7} + \) (the alternatives are 13 \( \text{Qg7}!? \) \( \text{Qg7} 14 \text{g5 Nikitin and 13 \text{Nhgl}?!} \), transposing to Line B232) and now:

   c511) 13...\( \text{Qxe7} 14 \text{Wd2} \) results in a better game for White after 14...\( \text{ed8} 15 \text{Qf4!} (15 \text{e5?!} \text{Qxb3} + 16 \text{axb3 Qd5} + \) 15...\( \text{Qg6} (15...\text{Qxb3} + 16 \text{axb3 e5} 17 \text{Qxe5 Qxg4} 18 \text{Qxg7?! +}) 16 \text{Qxd6 Wc6} 17 \text{f4} ± \) Anand-Salov, Dos Hermanas 1997 or 14...\( \text{Qxb3} + 15 \text{axb3 e5} \) (Anand recommends 15...\( \text{d5} \), which restricts White to a small advantage) 16 \( \text{Nhgl} ± \) Nunn-Spassov, Buenos Aires OL 1978.

   c512) 13...\( \text{Wc7} \) and then:

   c5121) 14 \( \text{Wd2 d8} 15 \text{Qg5} (15 \text{f4?! b5} 16 \text{Wf2 Qb7} 17 \text{Qhe1, Sahl-Novogrudsky, corr. 1991}) 15...f6 16 \text{Qh4} (16 \text{Qe3 b5} 17 \text{g5 b4!}) 16...\( \text{Wh8} 17 \text{g5 Wf5} \) is unclear.

   c5122) 14 \( \text{d2?!} b5 15 \text{Qhd1 d8} 16 \text{Qf4 Qxb3} + 17 \text{axb3 e5} \) (Lind-Degerman, Swedish Ch (Borlange) 1992) 18 \( \text{Qd5?! Wf4} 19 \text{Qe3} \) is another try for White.

   c5123) 14 f4 ± Anand.

   c52) 12...\( \text{Qxf5} 13 \text{Qd5 Wd8} 14 \text{gxf5} \) is critical. Now:

   c521) 14...\( \text{g5} \) 15 \( \text{Nhgl} \text{Qxe3} + 16 \text{Wxe3 Wh8} (16...\text{Wh4} 17 \text{Qg3}) 17 \text{Wg3}
\( \text{Ag}8 \ 18 \text{Qf}4 \text{Qde}5 \ 19 \text{Qh}3 \pm \text{Wedberg-Schutz, Enköping 1991.} \)

\( \text{c}522) \ 14...\text{Da}5 \ 15 \text{Hg}1! \ (15 \text{Qe}7+ \text{Wxe}7 \ 16 \text{Qd}5 \text{Wh}8 \ 17 \text{Hg}1 \text{Qf}6 \ 18 \text{Qf}3 \text{Qxd}5 \ 19 \text{Qxd}5, \text{Velimirović-Bukal, Yugoslav Ch (Portorož) 1971,} \)

and now Nunn gives 19...\text{Qc}6!, which looks unclear) 15...\text{Qxb}3+ 16 axb3 (Velimirović) seems extremely dangerous for Black, although he can try 16...g6!?

\( \text{c}523) \) Possibly critical is 14...\text{Qf}6 \ 15 \text{Hg}1 \ (15 \text{b}6 \text{Wd}7 \ 16 \text{Hg}1 \text{Qxd}5 \ 17 \text{exd}5 \text{Qf}6! \) was equal in Nunn-Liberzon, Hastings 1979/80) 15...\text{Qxd}5 (after 15...\text{Wh}8?!, Nikitin’s suggestion 16 \text{Qb}6 \text{Wd}7 17 \text{Qc}7 \text{Qb}8 18 f4 is unsuccessful in view of 18...\text{Qd}8) 16 \text{Qxd}5 \text{Qf}6 17 \text{Wh}5 (Yakovlevich-Yudasin, Leipzig 1986), and now 17...\text{Wc}7! 18 \text{Qg}3 \text{Qb}4 or 17...\text{Qb}4?! 18 \text{b}3 \text{Wc}7.

It is clear that there is not enough information to draw a definite conclusion on the important line 11...\text{Qd}7 12 \text{Qf}5.

\( 12 \text{Qxd}4 \) \((D)\)

12...\text{Qd}4 e5 is ‘†’ according to Akopian.

Or:

a) 12...b5 13 g5 (13 f4?! \text{Qd}7 \) the alternative 13...\text{Qb}8?! is interesting \)
14 f5?! \text{Qc}5 15 g5 - \text{I2...Qd}7 13 g5 \text{b}5 14 f4?! \text{Qc}5 15 f5?! 16...\text{Qd}7 – \text{I2...Qd}7 13 g5 \text{b}5.

b) 12...e5?! 13 \text{Qc}4! (13 \text{Qd}5? can be met by 13...\text{Qxd}5 14 \text{Qxd}5 \text{Qe}6 \mp or 13...\text{Qxg}4?!\) 13...\text{Wd}8 14 g5 favours White:

b1) 14...\text{Qg}4? 15 \text{Qxc}8!.

b2) 14...\text{Qe}8 15 \text{Qg}1 (15 \text{Qxc}8?!, 15 \text{Qd}5?! \text{Qxg}5 16 \text{Qg}1 \text{Qxe}3+ 17 \text{Wxe}3 \text{Qe}6 18 \text{Qc}3; 15 h4?! \text{Qe}6) 15...\text{Qd}7 (15...\text{Qe}6 16 \text{Qd}5) 16 \text{Qd}5 \text{Qb}5 17 \text{Wg}4!, Fiala-Badura, corr. 1988.

b3) 14...\text{Qd}7 and now:

b31) 15 \text{Qg}1 b5 16 \text{Qxc}8 \text{Qxc}8 17 \text{Wh}5 – 15 \text{Wh}5 b5 16 \text{Qxc}8 \text{Qxc}8 17 \text{Qg}1.

b32) 15 \text{Wh}5 b5 (15...\text{Qc}5 16 \text{Qxc}5! \text{dxc}5 17 \text{Qd}1 \pm \text{Boleslavsky}) 16 \text{Qxc}8 \text{Qxc}8 17 \text{Qg}1 (17 g6 hgx6 18 \text{Qxg}6 \text{Qc}5 19 \text{Qd}5 \text{Qh}4!) 17...\text{Qc}5 18 \text{Qd}5 \text{Qe}6 19 g6 hgx6 20 \text{Qxg}6 \text{Qf}4! = Kuczynski-Staniszewski, Polish Ch 1995.

b33) 15 \text{Qxc}8?! \text{Qxc}8 16 \text{Qd}5 \text{Qd}8 17 h4 (Nikitin) appears good, as do the next two possibilities.

b34) 15 \text{Qd}5?! \text{Qxg}5 16 \text{Qg}1.

b35) 15 h4?! b5 16 \text{Qxc}8.

13 \text{g}5

13 f4 \text{Qc}5 14 f5?! \text{Qf}6 15 g5 \text{Qxd}4 16 \text{Qxd}4 b5 17 \text{Qg}1 \text{Qb}7 \mp de Firmian-Shirov, Tilburg 1993.

\( 13...\text{b}5 \)

13...\text{Qc}5?! is a serious alternative here:

a) 14 h4 b5 – 13...b5 14 h4 \text{Qc}5.

b) 14 f4 f5! (this is a typical idea in all variations with 11 g4 \text{Qxd}4) and then:
5...\(\text{h}c6\) 6 \(\text{c}c4\) e6 7 \(\text{b}b3\) a6 8 \(\text{e}e3\) \(\text{e}e7\) 9 \(\text{w}e2\)

b1) 15 \(\text{g}xf6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 16 e5 \(\text{dxe}5\) 17 \(\text{c}c4\) \(\text{xb}3+\) 18 \(\text{axb}3\) \(\text{w}f7\)! and now 19 \(\text{c}c5\) b5! \(\mp\) Wedberg-Mednis, Copenhagen 1991, or 19 \(\text{d}e4\) b5!.

b2) 15 \(\text{exf}5\) \(\text{xf}5\) is satisfactory for Black.

b3) 15 \(\text{w}h5!??\) \(\text{fxe}4\) 16 \(\text{dxe}4\) \(\text{dxe}4\) 17 \(\text{exe}4\) d5 18 \(\text{d}d4\) \(\text{c}c5\) 19 \(\text{f}f1\) \(\mp\) Sergeev-Veingold, Estonian Ch 1998.

c) 14 e5 (a typical idea for White) 14...\(\text{dxe}5\) (14...d5?! Nikitin) 15 \(\text{h}h4\) g6 (15...f5? 16 \(\text{w}h5\) h6 17 \(\text{g}g1\)), and then:

c1) 16 \(\text{g}g1\) f5 (16...b5? – 13...b5 14 \(\text{g}g1\) \(\text{d}c5\) 15 e5?! \(\text{dxe}5\) 16 \(\text{h}h4\) g6; 16...\(\text{d}d8!!\) Nikitin) 17 \(\text{g}xf6\) \(\text{xf}6\) (17...\(\text{d}xb3+!??\)) 18 \(\text{gh}4\) (Aseev-Arakhnami, London Lloyds Bank 1994; 18 \(\text{xc}5!!?) 18...\(\text{d}xb3+\) 19 \(\text{axb}3\) \(\text{g}g7\) \(\mp\) Aseev.

c2) 16 \(\text{h}h6\) and here:

c21) 16...f5 17 h4 \(\text{d}xb3+\) 18 \(\text{axb}3\) f4 (Bronstein-Lein, USSR Ch (Leningrad) 1971) 19 \(\text{d}d2!!\) is unsafe for Black.

c22) 16...\(\text{d}xb3+\) 17 \(\text{axb}3\) \(\text{d}d8\) 18 \(\text{w}g4\) \(\text{f}f8\) 19 \(\text{d}e4\) \(\text{d}xh6\) 20 \(\text{d}f6+!\) is also perilous for Black, Quadri-Leiros, corr. 1999.

c23) 16...b5! 17 \(\text{d}xc5\) (or 17 h4 \(\text{b}7\) 18 f3 e4!) 17...\(\text{w}xc5\) 18 \(\text{d}e4\) \(\text{w}c6!\) 19 h4 \(\text{b}7\) 20 f3 \(\text{w}d7\) – Nikitin.

d) 14 \(\text{w}h5\) g6!? and then:

d1) 15 \(\text{w}h6\) f5 (the reliability of 15...\(\text{d}d8\) and 15...\(\text{e}e8\) 16 e5?! \(\text{f}8\) 17 \(\text{w}h3\), Nikitin, is unknown) 16 \(\text{g}xf6\) (16 f4 \(\text{w}c6!!\) 17 h4? \(\text{e}e8\) wins for Black) 16...\(\text{w}xf6\) 17 \(\text{d}d1\) \(\text{d}xb3+\) 18 \(\text{axb}3\) \(\text{d}d7\) and Black is OK, Simić-Lanka, Budapest 1991.

d2) 15 \(\text{w}e2\) f5 (15...b5?! – 13...b5 14 \(\text{w}h5\) g6!? 15 \(\text{w}e2!!\) \(\text{c}c5\)) 16 \(\text{exf}5\) \(\text{xf}5\) 17 h4 b5 18 h5 \(\text{d}xb3+\) 19 \(\text{axb}3\) \(\text{b}7\) 20 \(\text{h}h3\) \(\text{f}8\) gives Black quite a solid position, Timoshchenko-L.Grigorjan, Kiev 1970.

e) 14 \(\text{g}g1\) and then:

e1) 14...b5 – 13...b5 14 \(\text{g}g1\) \(\text{c}c5\).

e2) 14...f5 15 \(\text{exf}5\) \(\text{xf}5\) 16 \(\text{h}h4\) (16 \(\text{b}b1\) d5 17 \(\text{h}h4\) g6 18 \(\text{d}d4\) \(\text{d}xb3\) 19 \(\text{axb}3\) \(\mp\) Doghri-Mednis, Cannes 1998) 16...\(\text{d}xb3+\) 17 \(\text{axb}3\) g6 18 \(\text{g}g3\) \(\text{d}d7??\) (18...\(\text{d}f7??\) Ugrinović) 19 \(\text{d}h3\) \(\text{f}7\) 20 \(\text{d}d3!\) ± Szyman-Liberzon, Buenos Aires 1979.

e3) 14...\(\text{d}d7??\) and now:

e31) 15 f4 f5 appears satisfactory for Black.

e32) 15 \(\text{g}g3\) g6 16 h4 (16 e5 \(\mp\) Nikitin) 16...f5! is again OK for Black, Koyias-Atalik, Katerini 1993.

e33) 15 \(\text{w}h5\) \(\text{fc8}\) (15...g6) 16 e5?! g6 17 \(\text{h}h3\) dxe5 18 \(\text{h}h4\) \(\text{d}xb3+\) 19 \(\text{axb}3\) h5 20 \(\text{h}xh5\) \(\text{gxh}5\) 21 \(\text{w}xh5\) \(\text{e}8\) 22 g6 = Delgado-Estremera, Lalin 1994.

e34) 15 e5 is interesting: 15...dxe5 (15...d5??) 16 \(\text{h}h4\) \(\text{xb}3+\) 17 \(\text{axb}3\) g6 18 \(\text{e}4\) f5 19 \(\text{gx}f6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 20 \(\text{h}xh7??\) ± Agopov-Veingold, Finnish Ch 1999.

We now return to 13...b5 (D):

From here, it is difficult to single out the main line.
14 $g1$

Others:

a) 14 e5?! $dxe5$ (14...$d5$?! 15 $h4$; 14...$\Boxxe5$?! 15 $h5$ $\Boxg6$ Nikitin) 15 $h4$ $\Boxd8$! 16 $g1$ (16 $\Boxd5$ exd5 17 $\Boxxd5$ $\Boxf8$! 18 $\Boxxa8$ $\Boxg6$ + was first found by Cvetkovic/Krnic; 16 $w5$ – 14 $wh5$ $\Boxd8$ 15 e5? $dxe5$! 16 $\Boxh4$ +) 16...$\Boxb7$ (16...$g6$ is simpler) 17 $\Boxxh7$ $g6$! (Vagner; 17...$\Boxxh7$? 18 $g6+$ $\Boxxg6$! 19 $\Boxxg6$ +–).

b) 14 h4 $\Boxc5$ 15 h5 (15 f4 $f5$?; after 15 $\Boxb1$ or 15 f3, 15...$\Boxb8$ is strong, with the idea of 16...a5! +) 15...f5! (this is probably most precise; 15...$\Boxb8$ 16 $g6$?) 16 exf5 $\Boxxf5$ is equal, Dely-Paoli, Szombathely 1966.

c) 14 $Wh5$ and then:

c1) 14...$\Boxc5$?! 15 e5! ±.

c2) 14...$\Boxe5$?! 15 f4! ±.

c3) 14...$\Boxb7$ is also unreliable in view of 15 $g1$ g6 (15...$\Boxc8$? 16 g6!) 16 $Wh3$! $\Boxf8$ 17 f4, Rogic-Taggatz, Passau 1999.

c4) 14...$\Boxd8$ is good enough:

c41) 15 $g1$ – 14 $g1$ $\Boxd8$ 15 $Wh5$.

c42) 15 e5? $dxe5$! (15...$\Boxxe5$?! Zak) 16 $Wh4$ $\Boxf8$ 17 $\Boxe4$ $\Boxb7$ 18 $\Boxf6+$ $\Boxxf6$! (18...gx6? 19 $g1$ f5 20 $g6$ ++) 19 gx6 $\Boxxh1$ 20 $fxg7$ $\Boxxg7$ 21 $Wh5$+ (21 $\Boxh6+$ $\Boxg8$ 22 $Wh5+$ $\Boxg6$ 23 $Wh6$ $\Boxd1$+ 24 $\Boxxd1$ $\Boxd8$++) +– Velimirovic) 21...$\Boxg6$! 22 $Wh6+$ $\Boxg8$ 23 $\Boxxh7+$ $\Boxxf8$ 24 $\Boxxe6$ $\Boxd1$+! ±.

c43) 15 $\Boxd5$? exd5 16 $\Boxxd5$ $\Boxe5$ 17 f4 (Dvoirys-Vainshtein [Kasprow], USSR jr Ch (Vilnius) 1975) 17...$\Boxg4$! 18 $Wh4$ (18 $\Boxxf7$+! Zak) 18...$\Boxac8$ 19 c3 h5?! 20 $fxe5$ $dxe5$ 21 $f1$ $\Boxxd5$ 22 $\Boxxd5$ b4 +.

c44) 15 f4?! and now:

c441) After 15...$\Boxc5$ 16 f5 $\Boxxb3$+ 17 $\Boxxb3$, both 17...exf5?! 18 $\Boxd5$ and

17...$\Boxf8$ 18 $f1$ g6 19 $Wh3$ d5 20 exd5 exf5 21 $\Boxf4$, de Firmian-D.Gurevich, USA Ch (Estes Park) 1987, favour White.

15...g6 leads to unclear play:

c4421) 16 $Wh6$ $\Boxb8$ 17 $\Boxd3$?! $\Boxf8$

18 $Wh4$ $\Boxc5$ 19 $\Boxhd1$?! $\Boxxd3$+ 20 $\Boxxd3$ (Valenti-A.Schneider, Reggio Emilia 1975) 20...h5! +–.

c4422) 16 $\Boxe2$ $\Boxc5$ 17 h4 $\Boxb7$ 18 $h5$ $\Boxf8$ ∞ Minasian-Akopian, Erevan 1990.

c4423) 16 $Wh3$ $\Boxc5$ 17 f5 $\Boxb8$ 18 e5 ∞ Hawelko-Mäki, Thessaloniki OL 1988.

c5) 14...g6?! and then:

c51) 15 $\Boxe2$?! $\Boxc5$ 16 h4 leads to unclear play after 16...h5!?, Ulybin-R.Scherbakov, Borzomi 1988, or 16...$\Boxb8$, Yakovich-Panchenko, Sochi 1989.

15 $Wh6$ $\Boxe8$ (possibly stronger than 15...$\Boxd8$ 16 $g1$ – 14 $g1$ $\Boxd8$) 15 $Wh5$ g6! 16 $\Boxh6$) 16 f4 (other attempts: 16 e5 $\Boxf8$ 17 $\Boxh3$ and 16 $g1$ $\Boxf8$ 17 $Wh4$ $\Boxb8$ 18 $\Boxg3$ $\Boxg7$, Vetema-Panchenko, USSR Ch 1979, 19 f4?!) 16...$\Boxf8$ 17 $Wh4$ $\Boxc5$ (the other possibilities are 17...$\Boxg7$ 18 f5?! and 17...$\Boxb8$?! R.Scherbakov) 18 $g1$ $\Boxb8$ 19 $\Boxg3$ b4 and now Scherbakov assesses both 20 $\Boxa4$ $\Boxxb3$+ and 20 $\Boxe2$ e5 (Fedulov-R.Scherbakov, Russian Ch 2000) in Black’s favour.

d) 14 f4?! looks critical: 14...$\Boxc5$ (14...$\Boxb8$?! is interesting) 15 f5! (15 $f1$ b4! 16 $\Boxxb4$ a5 ∞ Yuneev-Lukin, USSR 1984; 15 $\Boxf2$ f5! ∞ Planc-Langeweg, Wijk aan Zee 1974; 15 $g1$ $\Boxb8$ 16 $\Boxb1$ a5! ∞ de Firmian-Lein, New York 1990, with the typical point 17 $\Boxxb5$? $\Boxxb5$ 18 $\Boxxb5$ $\Boxa6$ –) and then:
d1) 15...b4?! 16 \( \text{AXB4} \) d5 17 \( \text{AXD5}! \) ++ Glik-Krachevsky, USSR 1968.

d2) 15...\( \text{B8} \) 16 \( \text{B1} \) ?!

d3) 15...\( \text{DB3} \) + 16 axb3 exf5 17 \( \text{D5} \) \( \text{WD8} \) (17...\( \text{WB7} \) ? fails to 18 \( \text{B1} \) : 18...\( \text{D6} \) 19 \( \text{Df6+} \) \( \text{D8} \) 20 \( \text{DH7} \) ++ or 18...fxe4 19 \( \text{Df6+} \) \( \text{Dh8} \) 20 \( \text{Wh5} \) ! wins for White) 18 \( \text{B1} \) (18 \( \text{Wh5} \) !) 18...\( \text{D8} \) (18...g6 does not equalize in view of 19 h4!, Klundt-Weindl, Bodensee 1995) 19 \( \text{Wh2} \) (19 h4 fxe4?! Nikitin) and here:

d31) After 19...fxe4, 20 \( \text{Bxe4} \) \( b7 \) 21 \( \text{Bb6} \) \( \text{Exd8} \) 22 \( \text{Bxe4} \) 23 \( \text{Bxe7} \) \( \text{Exe7} \) looks like a draw, but interesting is 20 \( \text{Wh4} \) g6 21 \( \text{Cf1} \) \( \text{B5} \) 22 \( \text{Exe4} \) \( c8 \) 23 \( c3 \) with the initiative, Mallee-Dunhaupt, corr. 1992.

d32) 19...g6 20 exf5 \( \text{Df5} \) 21 \( \text{H4} \) (21 \( \text{Df4} \) !?) 21...\( \text{B8} \) 22 \( \text{Wh5} \) gxf5 23 \( \text{Df6+} \) \( \text{Dg7} \) 24 \( \text{Bxh7+} \) \( \text{Dg6} \) 25 \( \text{Hh6+} \) \( \text{Dg7} \) (Wedberg-L.Schneider, Eksjö 1980). Now White has the draw in his pocket, but 26 \( \text{Exe8+} \) ? is interesting.

d4) 15...exf5 16 d5 (no stronger are 16 \( \text{D5} \) \( \text{B8} \) 17 e5?! dxe5! and 16 exf5 \( \text{Df5} \) ) 16...b8 17 exf5 b4 (following 17...\( \text{Exf5} \) 18 \( \text{F1} \) !, as in Wedberg-Trincardi, Eksjö 1979, Black has not yet found any acceptable reply) 18 g6 (18...\( \text{D4} \) 19 \( \text{G3} \) \( \text{D6} \) ± Hübner) 18...hxg6 (18...bxc3? 19 \( \text{Wh5} \) !) 19 fxg6 \( \text{D6} \) and then:

d41) 20 \( \text{D4} \) \( \text{Exd5} \) ? (20...b3 ?) 21 \( \text{Bh5} \) gxf6 22 \( \text{Bxd5} \) \( \text{B7} \)

d42) 20 \( \text{Bc4} \) !? \( \text{Bd7} \) 21 gxf6+ \( \text{Bf7} \) 22 \( \text{Bxe5} \).

d43) 20 \( \text{Bxe6} \) \( \text{Bxe6} \) 21 \( \text{D5} \) \( \text{D4} \) 22 \( \text{Exd4} \) \( \text{G5} \) + 23 \( \text{B1} \) \( \text{B7} \) 24 \( \text{Wh5} \) \( \text{Dh6} \) 25 \( \text{Df6} \) + gxf6 26 \( \text{B1} \) \( \text{fxg6} \) 27 \( \text{Wh6} \) \( \text{F7} \) and Black has achieved approximate equality, Wahls-Hübner, Bundesliga 1989/90.

We now return to 14 \( \text{G1} \) (D):

\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}

\textbf{14...Dc5}

Again, this is just one of the possible options. The rare cases include 14...\( \text{B8} \) (it is then worthwhile to investigate 15 g6 hgx6 16 \( \text{Dg6} \) and 14...b4?!). Others are:

a) 14...b7 15 f4 (15 \( \text{Wh5} \) ? – 14 \( \text{Wh5} \) b7 15 \( \text{G1} \) ) 15...\( \text{Dc5} \) (15...\( \text{B8} \) 16 \( \text{F8} \), Cebalo, seems to be too passive) 16 f5 \( \text{Fe8} \) 17 f6 (17 g6! ; 17 \( \text{D1} \) \( \text{B3} \) 18 axb3 \( \text{F8} \) 19 \( \text{G3} \) g6 20 \( \text{F6} \) \( \text{C6} \) 21 e5!? b4! 22 \( \text{Bx4} \) \( \text{A5} \) 23 \( \text{H4} \) \( \text{Exe5} \) 24 \( \text{Gh3} \) h6, and it appears that Black has successfully defended, de Firmian-Gomez Esteban, New York 1989) 17...f8 18 e5 d5 (a possible improvement here is 18...dxe5 19 \( \text{Dh4} \) g6!? 20 \( \text{G3} \) \( \text{C6} \) ) 19 \( \text{G4} \) \( \text{E5} \) 20 \( \text{G3} \) g6 21 \( \text{F2} \) b4 22 \( \text{D4} \) \( \text{D6} \) 23 \( \text{Gh3} \) h5 24 \( \text{Bxh5} \) + Har-Even – Markland, corr. 1987-92.

b) 14...\( \text{B8} \) ? 15 \( \text{Wh5} \) (15 \( \text{G3} \) g6! , Zuev-Panchenko, Rostov 1985; 15 f4 \( \text{Dc5} \) ? – 14 f4 \( \text{Dc5} \) 15 \( \text{G1} \) \( \text{B8} \) ), and then:

b1) 15...\( \text{D8} \) ? 16 g6! is much better for White – Parma.

b2) 15...b4 16 e5 (16 \( \text{D2} \) g6 17 \( \text{Wh6} \) \( \text{D8} \) 18 \( \text{G3} \) \( \text{F8} \) 19 \( \text{Wh4} \) \( \text{G7} \)}
20 f4 $b5!? \sim Shulga-Serov, corr. 1993-4) and then:

b21) 16...bxc3 17 $h4 $h6 18 gxh6 $g6 19 $xg6+ $h8 20 exd6 $xh6! (20...$xd6? 21 $gl! \sim+) 21 $d4+ $xh4 22 $xh4 fxg6 23 $xg6 $g8 24 $f7! gives White compensation.

b22) 16...$xe5 17 $h4 $h6 18 $e4 $e5 (18...$g6 19 $f6+ $xf6 20 gxg6 $e5 18...$b5 19 $f6+ $xf6 20 gxg6 $g6) 19 $f6+ (19 $e2!? $g6!) 19...$xf6 (19...$h8 20 f4 \pm) 20 gxg6 $e6 21 $f2 (Wang Zili’s 21 fxg7!? is probably stronger) 21...$xh4 22 $xg7+ $h8 23 $g4 $g6! 24 $xh6 $b7 25 $h3 $h1+ 26 $d2 $d5+=.

b3) 15...$g6!? 16 $h6 $d8 deserves attention; e.g., 17 e5 d5 18 $xd5 and now 18...b4 19 $xd7 $xd7 20 $e4 $xe5 21 $c5 $xc5?! , while 18...$f8! is maybe even stronger.

c) 14...$g6!? 15 h4 (15 f4 $c5 16 f5 exf5 17 $d5 $d8 18 e5?! dxe5! Gufeld) 15...$c5 16 h5 (16 f4 $b8 17 h5 b4) 16...$e8 17 e5 (17 $h1!? $b7 18 $g4 $f8 19 f3 and here, rather than 19...$ad8 20 $d2 \pm Dubball-G.Kuzmin, Nice OL 1974, Black should continue 19...$c6! – Baljon) 17...dxe5 18 $h4 $b7 19 f3 $xb3+ 20 axb3 $d6 21 $gh1 $e7 22 $d3 (22 $d1?! Baljon) 22...$f8! 23 $d2 $d7 24 $f1 $a3! = Engel-Sanakoev, corr. 1976-9.

d) 14...$d8 with the following possibilities:

d1) 15 g6 hxg6 16 $xg6 fxg6 17 $xe6+ $f8 18 $d5 $b8 possibly favours Black but is still interesting.

d2) 15 h4!? $b8 16 h5 $c5 17 g6 fxg6 18 hxg6 $h6 \sim Dominguez-Camilleri, Dubai OL 1986.

d3) 15 f4!? deserves attention.

d4) 15 $g3!? with little-studied complications; for example, 15...$c5 (15...$g6!? 16 $h4 $b8 17 h5 a5 Polugaevsky) 16 $h3 (16 e5 d5 17 $h4 $xb3+ 18 axb3 $xe5 19 $d3 $f5! Nikitin) 16...$xb3+ (16...$g6!? with a possible idea being 17 e5 $b7 18 $h4 $xb3+ 19 axb3 $g2) 17 axb3 e5! 18 $d5 $d7 (18...$b7??) 19 $h4 exd4 20 $h5 $h6 21 gxh6 $xb4 22 hxg7 $f6 23 $h8+ $f7 (Bielak-Abramowicz, corr. 1992-4) 24 $xh4!.

d5) 15 $h5 is not too promising:

d51) 15...$c5 16 e5 (16 f4 $b7?! 16 $g3 $g6 17 $h6 $f8 18 $h4 – 15...$g6! 16 $h6 $f8 17 $h4 $c5 18 $g3) 16...$g6, and then:

b51) 17 $h6 $f8 18 $h3 $g7 (18...d5 19 $h4 $xe5!? 20 $d4 $f5 21 $g3 gives White compensation: 21...$d6 22 f4 $b7 23 $b1 h5 24 gxh6 $h7 25 $e3, Kang-Grishchuk, Oropesa del Mar jr Wch 1998) 19 $h4! (19 $xd6?! $b7! \sim de Firmian-Shirov, Biel 1995) 19...d5! (19...h5?! 20 gxh6 $xe5 21 $g5!) 20 $gg4! \sim Shirov.

d512) 17 $h3 d5 (17...$b7? 18 $h4 $xb3+ 19 axb3 h5 20 $xh5 gxh5 21 $xh5 $d8 18 $h4 $xe5 19 $d4 $xb3+?! (19...$f5 is similar to 17 $h6 $f8 18 $h3 d5 19 $h4 $xe5!? 20 $d4 $f5) 20 axb3 $f5 21 $g3! $b7 22 $b1! (22 $h6? $d6 23 $xh7 $f4+!) 22...$d6 23 f4 (23 $xh7?!) 23...h5 24 gxh6 $h7 25 $d1 with an attack, V.Pavlov-Kharitonov, corr. 1986.

d52) 15...$g6! 16 $h6 (16 $h4?! $c5 17 f4 $b8 18 f5 a5 \sim Radulov-Ribli, Kecskemet 1972) and here:

d521) 16...$b8!? – 14...$b8 15 $h5 $g6!? 16 $h6 $d8.
5...\(\text{\&}c6\) 6 \(\text{\&}c4\) \(e6\) 7 \(\text{\&}b3\) \(a6\) 8 \(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\&}e7\) 9 \(\text{\&}e2\)

\[d522\) 16...\(\text{\&}c5\) and now: 17 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}f8\) 18 \(\text{\&}h4\) – 16...\(\text{\&}g8\) 17 \(\text{\&}h4\) \(\text{\&}c5\) 18 \(\text{\&}g3\); 17 \(e5\) – 15...\(\text{\&}c5\) 16 \(e5\) \(g6\) 17 \(\text{\&}h3\).

\[d523\) 16...\(\text{\&}f8\) leads to unclear play: 17 \(\text{\&}h4\) (17 \(\text{\&}h3\)!! \(\text{\&}g7\) 18 \(e5\) \(g6\) V.Pavlov-Poletukhin, corr. 1998) 17...\(\text{\&}c5\) (17...\(\text{\&}e7\)?; 17...\(\text{\&}g7\)?) 18 \(\text{\&}g3\) (18 \(f4\)? Lysenko) and now 18...\(\text{\&}b8\) 19 \(\text{\&}h3\) \(h5\)! 20 \(\text{gxh6}\) \(\text{\&}h7\) (Nikitin), or 18...\(\text{\&}e7\) 19 \(f4\) \(\text{\&}b8\) 20 \(f5\) \(a5\)? (20...\(h5\)) 21 \(f6\) \(\text{\&}f8\) 22 \(\text{\&}xh7+\) \(\text{\&}xh7\) 23 \(\text{\&}h3+\) \(\text{\&}h6\)! 24 \(\text{\&}xh6+\) \(\text{\&}g8\) 25 \(e5\) \(\text{\&}xb3+\) 26 \(axb3\) \(\text{\&}c5\).

We now return to 14...\(\text{\&}c5\) (D):

\[W\]

Now:

a) 15 \(f4\) – 14 \(f4\) \(\text{\&}c5\) 15 \(\text{\&}g1\).

b) After 15 \(\text{\&}h5\) \(g6\) 16 \(\text{\&}h6\), both 16...\(f5\) 17 \(\text{\&}b1\) (17 \(\text{\&}xf6\) \(\text{\&}xf6\) Nunn-Langeweg, Malta OL 1980) 17...\(\text{\&}b8\)? and 16...\(\text{\&}d8\) (see 14...\(\text{\&}d8\) 15 \(\text{\&}h5\) \(g6\) 16 \(\text{\&}h6\) \(\text{\&}c5\)) are satisfactory.

c) 15 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(g6\) (15...\(f5\) 16 \(\text{\&}h3\) \(f4\)!! \(\text{\&}h5\) \(g6\) Lanka) 16...\(\text{\&}e5\) (16...\(d5\) Nikitin) 17 \(\text{\&}g4\) \(f5\) 18 \(\text{\&}g4\) \(\text{\&}xh3+\) 19 \(axb3\) \(\text{\&}xg6\) 20 \(\text{\&}h4\) 21 \(h4\) \(\text{\&}h8\) 22 \(\text{\&}h6\) \(\text{\&}f7\) 23 \(\text{\&}e4\) = Boleslavsky.

d) 15 \(e5\)!! leads to a very tough struggle:

\[d1\) 15...\(\text{\&}xe5\)? 16 \(\text{\&}h4\) \(\text{\&}xb3+\) (or 16...\(\text{\&}g6\) 17 \(\text{\&}xc5!\) \(\text{\&}xc5\) 18 \(\text{\&}e4\) \(\text{\&}c7\) 19 \(\text{\&}f6\) Aseev) 17 \(axb3\) \(g6\) 18 \(\text{\&}e4\) (18 \(\text{\&}f3\) \(e4\) is just slightly better for White) 18...\(f5\) 19 \(\text{\&}xf6\) \(\text{\&}xf6\) 20 \(\text{\&}h4\) \(\text{\&}g7\) 21 \(h4\) \(\text{\&}f5\) 22 \(h5\) \(\text{\&}hxh5\) 23 \(\text{\&}f6+\)! – Grechikhin-Glek, Kuibyshev 1981.

d2) 15...\(\text{\&}xb3+\) 16 \(axb3\) \(d5\) 17 \(\text{\&}h4\) \(g6\) (17...\(\text{\&}xe5\) 18 \(\text{\&}d3\) \(g6\) can be met by 19 \(\text{\&}d4\) \(\text{\&}xg5+\) 20 \(\text{\&}xg5\) \(\text{\&}xg5+\) 21 \(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\&}h4\) 22 \(\text{\&}d4\) \(\text{\&}e7\) 23 \(\text{\&}h6\) or 19 \(f4\)?) 18 \(f4\) (18 \(\text{\&}g3\)!! \(\text{\&}xe5\) 19 \(f4\) 18...\(\text{\&}b7\) (18...\(b4\)?) 19 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}g7\) 20 \(f5\)?? \(\text{\&}xe5\) 21 \(e6\) with an attack, Carr-Markland, corr. 1978.

d3) 15...\(\text{\&}g6\) 16 \(\text{\&}d6\)!! (16 \(\text{\&}h4\) \(\text{\&}g7\) 17 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}xb3+\)? 18 \(axb3\) \(dxe5\) 19 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}g2\)) 16...\(\text{\&}d6\) 17 \(\text{\&}xd6\) \(\text{\&}xd6\) 18 \(\text{\&}d1\) with compensation, Böröcz-Szilardfy, Budapest 1993.

d4) 15...\(\text{\&}d5\)?? 16 \(\text{\&}h4\) (I do not think White achieves anything better by 16 \(f4\), 16 \(\text{\&}h5\) \(\text{\&}xe5\)?, 16 \(\text{\&}d5\) \(\text{\&}xd5\) 17 \(\text{\&}xd5\) \(\text{\&}xe5\) 18 \(f4\) \(\text{\&}e6\) 19 \(f5\) \(\text{\&}e5\) 20 \(f6\) \(d8\)!! or 16 \(\text{\&}d2\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 17 \(\text{\&}h4\) \(g6\) 18 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}c8\)?) 16...\(\text{\&}xe5\) 17 \(\text{\&}g3\), and besides 17...\(\text{\&}f5\) 18 \(\text{\&}g3\) with the point 18...\(\text{\&}xb3+\) 19 \(\text{\&}xb3\) \(\text{\&}e5\) 20 \(\text{\&}xh7\) \(\text{\&}xe3+\) 21 \(\text{\&}xe3\) \(\text{\&}xh7\) 22 \(\text{\&}xh7\) \(\text{\&}xh7\) 23 \(\text{\&}e4\), it is worth studying 17...\(b4\)!

\textbf{Conclusion}: as of now, 13...\(c5\)! (with possibly 14 \(f4\) \(f5\)! or 14 \(\text{\&}g1\) \(b5\)) deserves attention.

\textbf{B22)}

11 \(\text{\&}hgl\) (D)

Now, White can always take on \(d4\) with the bishop. However, 11 \(\text{\&}hgl\) certainly has definite drawbacks as well...
B221: 11...\(\mathcal{a}5\) 176
B222: 11...\(b5\)? 177
B223: 11...\(\mathcal{d}7\) 179

11...\(\mathcal{c}xd4\) 12 \(\mathcal{a}xd4\) b5 (or 12...\(\mathcal{d}7\) 13 g4 – 11...\(\mathcal{c}d7\) 12 g4 \(\mathcal{c}xd4\) 13 \(\mathcal{a}xd4\) 11...\(\mathcal{c}d7\) 12 g4 \(\mathcal{c}xd4\) 13 \(\mathcal{a}xd4\) b5, which are very risky for Black.

B221)

11...\(\mathcal{a}5\) 12 g4 b5 13 g5 \(\mathcal{c}xb3+\)
13...\(\mathcal{d}7\) is worth trying; for example, 14 \(\mathcal{d}5\) \(\mathcal{b}7\)! 15 \(\mathcal{c}xe6\) (15 g6 \(\mathcal{c}xe6\)) 15...\(\mathcal{c}xe6+\) \(\mathcal{h}8\).

14 \(\text{axb}3\) \(\mathcal{d}7\) 15 \(f4\)

Other moves seem unclear:

a) 15 h4 b4 16 \(\mathcal{a}4\) \(\mathcal{b}7\)? (or 16...\(\mathcal{c}5\) 17 h5 \(\mathcal{d}7\) 18 \(\mathcal{b}1\) \(\mathcal{ac}8\) 19 g6 \(\mathcal{f}6\)!, Ehlvest-Yudasin, Kuibyshev 1986) 17 f3 (17 g6?! hgx6 18 h5 e5?) 17...\(\mathcal{c}5\)!

b) 15 \(\mathcal{w}h5\) g6 (15...b4?) 16 \(\mathcal{c}5\) \(\mathcal{e}5\), Velimirović-Cebalo, Titograd 1984; 15...\(\mathcal{b}7\)?) 16 \(\mathcal{w}h6\) \(\mathcal{e}8\) (after 16...\(\mathcal{b}7\) 17 \(\mathcal{g}3\) \(\mathcal{fc}8\) 18 \(\mathcal{h}3\) \(\mathcal{f}8\) 19 \(\mathcal{f}5\) exf5 20 \(\mathcal{d}4\) f6 21 exf5 \(\mathcal{d}8\) 22 gxf6! White is winning, Berlin-Sokolov, Jurmala 1977) 17 \(\mathcal{g}3\) \(\mathcal{f}8\) 18 \(\mathcal{w}h4\) b4!.

c) 15 \(\mathcal{d}5\) exf5 16 \(\mathcal{d}5\) \(\mathcal{w}8\) 17 exf5 \(\mathcal{e}8\) (17...\(\mathcal{b}7\) 18 \(f6\) \(\mathcal{c}xd5\) 19 \(\mathcal{f}7\) 20 \(\mathcal{d}5\) \(\pm\)) 18 \(\mathcal{f}3\) (18 g6?!; 18 \(f6\) \(\mathcal{f}8\) 19 fxg7 \(\mathcal{x}g7\) 20 \(\mathcal{w}h5\) \(\mathcal{b}7\) –) 18...\(\mathcal{b}8\) (18...\(\mathcal{f}8\) 19 \(\mathcal{f}6\) \(\mathcal{xf}6\) 20 \(\mathcal{d}6\) with compensation – Shakerov) 19 \(f6\) \(\mathcal{f}8\) 20 fxg7 (20 \(g6\) hxg6 21 \(\mathcal{x}g6\) \(\mathcal{e}5\) 22 \(\mathcal{x}g7+\) \(\mathcal{x}xg7\) 23 \(\mathcal{w}g3\) \(\mathcal{g}6\) –) 20...\(\mathcal{w}xg7\) 21 \(\mathcal{f}6\) +, Trabattoni-Grimaldi, Tripoli 1976.

d) 15 \(\mathcal{g}3\) and then:

d1) 15...\(\mathcal{b}7\) 16 \(f4\) \(b4\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}5\)!

16...\(\mathcal{f}5\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}5\) \(\mathcal{d}8\) 18 \(\mathcal{f}5\) \(\mathcal{e}8\) 19 \(\mathcal{f}3\) (19 \(f6\) \(\mathcal{f}8\) 20 fxg7 \(\mathcal{x}g7\) 21 \(\mathcal{w}h5\) \(\mathcal{c}xe3\)?) 19...\(\mathcal{f}8\) 20 \(\mathcal{f}6\) \(\mathcal{f}6\) 21 \(\mathcal{f}6\) \(\mathcal{b}8\)! 22 \(\mathcal{f}7\) (22 \(\mathcal{d}4\) \(g6\) 23 \(\mathcal{f}6\) \(\mathcal{h}6+\) \(\mathcal{f}\) Stean) 22...\(\mathcal{c}7\) 23 \(\mathcal{w}f4\) \(\mathcal{a}5\)?! 24 \(f6\) \(\mathcal{f}5\) \(\mathcal{f}\) –

d2) 15...\(\mathcal{b}4\)!? 16 \(\mathcal{f}5\) (16 \(\mathcal{a}4\)?)

16...\(\mathcal{f}5\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}5\) \(\mathcal{d}8\) 18 \(\mathcal{f}5\) \(\mathcal{e}8\) 19 \(\mathcal{f}3\) (19 \(f6\) \(\mathcal{f}8\) 20 fxg7 \(\mathcal{x}g7\) 21 \(\mathcal{w}h5\) \(\mathcal{c}xe3\)?) 19...\(\mathcal{f}8\) 20 \(\mathcal{f}6\) \(\mathcal{f}6\) 21 \(\mathcal{f}6\) \(\mathcal{b}8\)! 22 \(\mathcal{f}7\) (22 \(\mathcal{d}4\) \(g6\) 23 \(\mathcal{f}6\) \(\mathcal{h}6+\) \(\mathcal{f}\) Stean) 22...\(\mathcal{c}7\) 23 \(\mathcal{w}f4\) \(\mathcal{a}5\)?! 24 \(f6\) \(\mathcal{f}5\) \(\mathcal{f}\) –

d3) 15...\(\mathcal{e}8\) 16 \(f4\) (16 \(\mathcal{h}4\)?) 16 \(\mathcal{w}h5\) \(g6\) 17 \(\mathcal{w}h6\) – 15 \(\mathcal{w}h5\) \(g6\) 16 \(\mathcal{w}h6\) \(\mathcal{e}8\) 17 \(\mathcal{g}3\) 16b4 is unclear.

15...b4

Or:

a) 15...\(\mathcal{c}5\) 16 \(\mathcal{f}5\)? \(\mathcal{b}3+\) 17 \(\mathcal{b}1\)! \(\mathcal{e}5\) 18 \(\mathcal{f}5\) \(\mathcal{b}7\) 19 e5! dx5 20 \(\mathcal{f}6+\) \(\mathcal{f}\) – Hoffer-Johnson, corr. 1989.

b) 15...\(\mathcal{b}7\) 16 \(\mathcal{f}5\) (16 \(\mathcal{g}3\)?! – 15 \(\mathcal{g}3\) \(\mathcal{b}7\) 16 \(\mathcal{f}4\)) 16...b4 17 \(\mathcal{a}4\) – 15...b4 16 \(\mathcal{a}4\) \(\mathcal{b}7\) 15 \(\mathcal{f}5\).

c) 15...\(\mathcal{e}8\) 16 \(f5\) (16 \(\mathcal{g}3\) – 15 \(\mathcal{g}3\) \(\mathcal{e}8\) 16 \(\mathcal{f}4\)) 16...\(\mathcal{e}5\) 17 \(\mathcal{h}4\)! gives White the initiative.

d) 15...\(\mathcal{b}7\)

16 \(\mathcal{f}5\) ! Nikitin.

16 \(\mathcal{f}5\)!

This is better than:

a) 16 \(\mathcal{a}2\) \(\mathcal{b}7\) 17 \(f5\) \(e5\) is slightly better for Black, Van der Wiel-Ligterink, Wijk aan Zee 1985.
b) 16 \( \text{Q}a4 \text{B}b7 \) (16...\( \text{Q}c5?! \) 17 \( f5 \) with complications; 16...\( \text{Q}e8 \) 17 \( f5 \) e5?! 18 \( g6?! \); e.g., 18...\( \text{fxg}6 \) 19 \( \text{fxg}6 \) exd4 20 \( \text{gxh}7+ \text{B}h8 \) 21 \( \text{B}xg7 \text{Q}f6?! \) 22 \( \text{B}xd4! \) \( \text{B}xg7 \) 23 \( \text{Wh5} ++ \)) 17 \( f5 \) e5 18 \( f6 \) exd4 19 \( \text{fxe7} \text{Q}e8 \) 20 \( \text{B}xd4 \) \( \text{B}xe7 = \) Velimirović-Ivanović, Yugoslav Ch (Belgrade) 1978.

16...\( \text{exf}5? \)

The knight cannot be captured here but it seems Black faces problems either way:

a) 16...\( \text{Q}d8 \) 17 \( \text{Q}d5! \) (17 \( \text{Q}h6+ \text{Wh8}! \) 18 \( \text{Wh}5 \) \( g6 \); 17 \( \text{Wh}5 \) \( \text{bxc}3 \); 17 \( \text{Q}xg7 \text{bxc}3 \) 18 \( \text{Wh}5 \) \( \text{Q}xg7 \)?) 17...\( \text{exd}5 \) 18 \( \text{Wh}5 \) \( \text{Q}c5 \) 19 \( \text{B}xg7 \) \( d4 \) 20 \( \text{B}xd4 \) \( \text{B}xg7 \) 21 \( \text{Wh}6+ \) \( \text{Q}g8 \) 22 \( f5 \) \( \text{Q}xb3+ \) 23 \( \text{Q}d1 \), with a probable win.

b) 16...\( \text{bxc}3 \) 17 \( \text{Q}xg7+ \text{Q}h8 \) 18 \( f5 \!).

c) 16...\( \text{Q}e8 \) 17 \( \text{Q}h6+ \) with the initiative.

d) 16...\( \text{Q}c5 \) 17 \( \text{Q}xe7+ \) (17 \( \text{Q}h6+?! \) \( \text{Wh}8 \)?) 17...\( \text{Q}xh7 \) 18 \( e5 \)! (18 \( \text{Q}xc5 \)?? \( \text{Q}xc5 \) 19 \( \text{Q}a4 \) \( \text{Q}d7 \) is slightly better for Black) 18...\( \text{bxc}3 \) (18...\( \text{dxe}5 \)?) 19 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{Q}xc5 \) 20 \( \text{Q}e4 \); 18...\( d5 \) 19 \( \text{Q}f2 \), Nunn-Arakhambia, British League (4NCL) 1996/7, 19...\( \text{Q}xb3+ \)?) 19 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{cxb}2 \) (20 \( \text{Q}b1 \)?? \( \text{Q}d8 \) 21 \( \text{Q}xc5 \) \( \text{W}a5 \)?) 20...\( \text{Q}a4+ \) (20...\( \text{W}a7 \) 21 \( \text{Q}d4 \)?) 21 \( \text{Q}a3 \)! (21 \( \text{bxa}4 \)! \( \text{Q}b7+ \) 22 \( \text{Q}c1 \) \( \text{Q}b8 \) Nunn) 21...\( \text{W}e8 \) (21...\( \text{Q}d7 \) 22 \( \text{Q}c4 \)) 22 \( \text{Q}d4 \) \( \text{Q}b5 \) 23 \( \text{Q}e5 \) – da Costa Junior.

17 \( \text{Q}d5 \) \( \text{W}d8 \) 18 \( \text{exf}5 \) \( \text{Q}e8 \) 19 \( \text{Q}d4!! \)

Otherwise, the problems are all White's.

19...\( \text{Q}f8 \)

Or:

a) 19...\( g6 \) 20 \( \text{Q}g5 \)

b) 19...\( \text{Q}f6 \) 20 \( \text{W}xg8 \) \( \text{Q}xe8 \) 21 \( \text{gxf}6 \) \( g6 \) (Nijboer-Winants, Wijk aan Zee 1988) 22 \( \text{Q}g5 \) \( \pm \).

c) 19...\( \text{gb}7 \) loses to 20 \( g6 \): 20...\( \text{hxg}6 \) (20...\( \text{fxg}6 \) 21 \( \text{Q}f6+ \) \( \text{Q}h8 \) 22 \( \text{Q}xg7 \)!) 20...\( f6 \) 21 \( \text{Q}xh7+ \) \( \text{Q}h8 \) 22 \( \text{Q}xg7 \) \( \text{Q}xd5 \) 23 \( \text{Q}d4 \); 20...\( \text{Q}f6 \) 21 \( \text{Q}xh7+ \) \( \text{Q}f6 \) 22 \( \text{Q}xg6 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 23 \( \text{Q}xg7 \) \( \text{Q}d5 \) \( \text{Q}xg7 \) 26 \( \text{Q}xg7 \) \( \text{Q}f3 \) 27 \( \text{Q}g6 \)!

20 \( \text{Q}h5 \) \( \text{Q}e4 \) 21 \( \text{Q}f6 \)

This position arose in the game Wolff-I.Sokolov, Baguio jr Wch 1987. Now 21...\( \text{Q}a5 \) 22 \( g6 \) \( \text{fxg}6 \) 23 \( \text{fxg}6 \) \( h6 \) 24 \( \text{Q}xg7 \) (Nikitin) is much better for White.

B222)

11...\( b5 \)! (\( D \))

This is the critical and biting reply to 11 \( \text{Q}h4 \). Virtually no clear-cut assessments have been made here.

We shall proceed with our discussion along the historical main line, bearing in mind that both sides have significant alternatives at almost every move.

12 \( g4 \)

12...\( \text{Q}c6 \)?? \( \text{Q}xe6 \) 13 \( g4 \) \( \text{Q}xe4 \) 14 \( \text{Q}d5 \).

12...\( \text{Q}a5 \) and 12...\( \text{Q}xd4 \) are less important.
13 \&xc6

Other possibilities:

a) 13 \&a4?! \&xe4 14 \&xe6 \&xe6!

b) 13 g5!? bxc3 14 gx6 is very unclear:

b1) 14...\&xb2+ 15 \&b1 \&xf6 16 \&xc6 (16 \&f3 \&e5 17 \&h6 – 14... \&xf6! 15 \&f3 \&e5 16 \&h6 cxb2+ 17 \&b1) 16...\&xc6 17 \&h6 and now 17...g6 18 f4?! or 17...\&h8 18 e5 gxh6 19 exf6 \&b7 20 \&h5.

b2) 14...\&xf6! is more accurate: 15 \&f3 (15 \&xc6 \&xc6 16 \&h6 can be met by 16...g6 or 16...\&b5!?) 15...\&e5 16 \&h6 cxb2+ 17 \&b1 g6 18 \&c3 (Matulović-Nikitin, Kisolovodsk 1966; 18 \&xc6?! \&xc6 19 \&xf8 \&xf8 20 \&e3) 18...\&b7!? 19 f4 \&f6 20 \&xf8 \&xf8 21 \&a4 \&a5! – Kasparov/Nikitin.

c) 13 \&d5 \&xd5 (13...\&xd5 14 \&xc6 \&xc6 – 13 \&xc6 \&xc6 14 \&d5 exd5) 14 \&xc6 (scarcely any better for White is 14 exd5 \&xd4 15 \&xd4 a5 16 \&c4 \&b8 17 dxe6 \&xe6 18 \&c6 d5, Ljubojević-Korchnoi, Tilburg 1985) 14...\&xe3?! 15 \&xe7+ \&xe7 16 \&xe7 a5 with good play for Black, Stean-Velimirović, Nice OL 1974.

13...\&xc6 (D)

Or 13...bxc3?! 14 \&xe7+ \&xe7 15 \&d4 \&b7! 16 f3 cxb2+ 17 \&xb2 \&fd8, Hamdouchi-Dorfman, French Ch 1996.

14 \&d5 exd5

Or:

a) 14...\&d8?! 15 g5!, Matulović-Simagin, Kisolovodsk 1966.

b) 14...\&xd5?! 15 exd5 \&b7 is interesting and quite reliable. For instance, 16 f4 (16 g5?!; 16 dxe6?! fx6 17 \&d4 d5 18 g5 \&d6, Lyly-Karpatic, corr. 1987), and now:

b1) After 16...a5, 17 dxe6 fxe6 18 f5?! a4! favours Black, but 17 \&d4 a4 18 \&c4 is stronger, Jovičić-Pesl, corr. 1985.

b2) 16...\&e8 17 \&d3 \&f8 18 dxe6 \&xe6 19 \&xe6 \&xe6 seems satisfactory for Black, Kobaliya-Panchenko, Moscow 1996.

15 g5 \&xe4

15...dxe4? 16 gx6 \&xf6 17 \&d5 \&a4 18 \&h5! \&e6 19 \&xg7+! \&xg7 20 \&g1 \&fc8 21 \&xg7+ \&xg7 22 \&h6+ \&g8 23 \&xe4 +– Ostapenko-Yartsev, corr. 1969.

16 \&xd5 \&a4

16...\&c3?! 17 bxc3 \&a4 18 \&b3?! with the point 18...\&a3+ 19 \&b1 bxc3 20 \&c1 – Nikitin.

17 \&xe4!?

Otherwise:

a) 17 \&d4 is not much good in view of 17...\&f5! 18 \&xe4 \&xe4 19 \&xe4 \&xa2?! 20 \&xe7 \&ae8! 21 \&c7! \&e4! 22 \&e3 \&c4 23 \&xd6 b3, Arwedson-Wikström, corr. 1979.

b) 17 \&xa8 gives White no advantage: 17...\&c3 18 bxc3 \&e6 (18...bxc3? 19 \&d4 \&xa2 20 \&d1 ++) 18...\&a3+?! 19 \&b1 \&e6! 20 \&d5 \&xd5 21 c4! 19 \&d4 (19 \&d5 \&xd5! 20 \&xd5?! \&xa2 21 \&d4 \&e8!?) 19 \&e4 \&a3+
19...bxc3 (19...axa8? 20 g6! ++) 20 \( \text{\varphi} \)xc3 axa8 21 g6 hxg6 22 \( \text{\varphi} \)xg6 \( \text{\varphi} \)f4+ 23 \( \text{\varphi} \)d2 (23 \( \text{\varphi} \)d2 fxg6 24 \( \text{\varphi} \)xe6+ \( \text{\varphi} \)f7 =) 23...\( \text{\varphi} \)d4 (23...\( \text{\varphi} \)f5 24 \( \text{\varphi} \)g3 \( \text{\varphi} \)b8!? Nikitin) 24 c3 \( \text{\varphi} \)c5 (24...\( \text{\varphi} \)e5?!?) 25 \( \text{\varphi} \)dg1 \( \text{\varphi} \)a3+ 26 \( \text{\varphi} \)d1 \( \text{\varphi} \)b3+! 27 \( \text{\varphi} \)e1 fxg6 28 axb3 \( \text{\varphi} \)xb3 29 \( \text{\varphi} \)xe7 \( \text{\varphi} \)b1+ 30 \( \text{\varphi} \)e2 \( \text{\varphi} \)xg1 31 \( \text{\varphi} \)e6+ = Nadienić-Sar- enac, corr. 1989.

17...\( \text{\varphi} \)e6 18 \( \text{\varphi} \)d4

After 18 \( \text{\varphi} \)xh7+! \( \text{\varphi} \)xh7 19 \( \text{\varphi} \)h5+ \( \text{\varphi} \)g8 20 g6 fxg6 21 \( \text{\varphi} \)xg6 \( \text{\varphi} \)f6 22 \( \text{\varphi} \)d4 b3!! (Nikitin) 23 axb3 \( \text{\varphi} \)a1+ 24 \( \text{\varphi} \)d2 \( \text{\varphi} \)a5+ 25 \( \text{\varphi} \)c1 Black can choose between 25...\( \text{\varphi} \)a1+ = and 25...\( \text{\varphi} \)xd4!?.

18...g6!

The critical position. Now:

a) 19 f4 gives both sides chances.

b) 19 h4 likewise.

c) 19 \( \text{\varphi} \)xa8 \( \text{\varphi} \)xa8 20 b3 \( \text{\varphi} \)xa2 (Steau-Dueball, Nice OL 1974) is unclear; e.g., 21 \( \text{\varphi} \)b2 \( \text{\varphi} \)c8 22 \( \text{\varphi} \)d2 \( \text{\varphi} \)xb3 23 \( \text{\varphi} \)xa6 \( \text{\varphi} \)f3.

d) 19 b3!? is interesting. After 19...\( \text{\varphi} \)xa2 20 \( \text{\varphi} \)d2 \( \text{\varphi} \)a5 21 \( \text{\varphi} \)a1 \( \text{\varphi} \)d8 22 \( \text{\varphi} \)xa8 \( \text{\varphi} \)xa8 (Tabatadze-Akopian, USSR 1985) and now, e.g., 23 \( \text{\varphi} \)xa6, the onus is on Black to prove his compensation.

B223)

11 \( \text{\varphi} \)hg1 \( \text{\varphi} \)d7 12 g4 (D)

12...\( \text{\varphi} \)c5

The only alternative worth mentioning is the risky 12...\( \text{\varphi} \)xd4 13 \( \text{\varphi} \)xd4 b5 (13...\( \text{\varphi} \)c5 14 g5! – 12...\( \text{\varphi} \)c5 13 g5 \( \text{\varphi} \)xd4 14 \( \text{\varphi} \)xd4) 14 g5!, and then:

a) 14...\( \text{\varphi} \)c5 – 12...\( \text{\varphi} \)c5 13 g5 \( \text{\varphi} \)xd4 14 \( \text{\varphi} \)xd4 b5.

b) 14...\( \text{\varphi} \)d8 15 \( \text{\varphi} \)h5!? g6 16 \( \text{\varphi} \)h6 \( \text{\varphi} \)f8 17 \( \text{\varphi} \)h4 ± Nunn-Podzielny, Groningen jr Ech 1974/5.
c) After 14...\(\text{N}e8\), 15 \(\text{Q}d5?!\) exd5 16 g6 hxg6 17 \(\text{Q}x\text{d}5\) \(\text{Q}b7\) 18 \(\text{Q}xg6\) \(\text{Q}f6\)! (Vaulin-Poluliahkov, Sochi 1988) is probably in Black’s favour, but White could play 15 \(\text{Q}d3\) or 15 \(\text{Wh}5\).

d) 14...b4 15 \(\text{Wh}5\)! (15 \(\text{Q}d5?\) exd5 16 \(\text{Q}x\text{d}5\) \(\text{Q}b7\) 17 g6 \(\text{Q}f6\) 18 \(\text{Wh}5\) \(\text{Q}f8\)! 19 \(\text{Q}xh7+\) \(\text{Q}f8\) 20 \(\text{Q}c8\) \(\text{Q}xh7\) 21 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}d5\) + de Zeeuw; 15 g6?! hxg6 16 \(\text{Q}xg6\) \(\text{Q}d8\)! [Zak] 15...\(\text{Q}e4\) (15...\(\text{Q}x\text{c}3\) 16 \(\text{Q}d3\) with an attack which is difficult to refute, Bosch-D.Gross, Schoeneck 1996) and now 16 \(\text{Q}x\text{e}5?!\) dxe5 17 \(\text{Q}d3\) or Bosch’s 16 f4!? is more promising than 16 \(\text{Q}a4\) \(\text{Q}b7\)?!

e) 14...\(\text{Q}b7\) 15 \(\text{Wh}5\) (15 \(\text{Q}d3\)?! [Zak] 15...\(\text{Q}c5\)! transposes to note ‘d3’ to Black’s 14th move in Line B2311 (Black must avoid 15...b4? 16 g6 ++ and 15...g6? 16 \(\text{Wh}6\) e5 17 \(\text{Q}d3\) ++).

f) 14...g6?! 15 h4 \(\text{Q}c5\) – 12...\(\text{Q}c5\) 13 g5 \(\text{Q}x\text{d}4\) 14 \(\text{Q}x\text{d}4\)! g6?! 15 h4 b5.

Now (after 12...\(\text{Q}c5\)):

B231: 13 g5 180
B232: 13 \(\text{Q}f5\)! 186

There are almost no examples of 13 f4. One of them is: 13...b5 14 f5 b4 15 \(\text{Q}a4\) \(\text{Q}d7\)?! 16 \(\text{Q}x\text{c}6\) \(\text{Q}x\text{b}3\) + 17 axb3 \(\text{Q}x\text{c}6\), and Black stands no worse, Lukin-N.Popov, Daugavpils 1974.

13 \(\text{Q}b1\)?! is not a very strong move but it carries a lot of poison:

a) 13...\(\text{Q}d7\) 14 \(\text{Q}f5\) exf5 15 gxf5 \(\text{Q}d8\)?! 16 \(\text{Q}h6\) leads to an attack for White.

b) 13...b5 14 \(\text{Q}x\text{c}6\)! (better than 14 \(\text{Q}f5\) \(\text{Q}x\text{b}3\)?! 15 cxb3 b4 Gagarin; 14 g5 – 13 g5 b5 14 \(\text{Q}b1\)!) 14...\(\text{Q}x\text{c}6\) 15 \(\text{Q}d5\) and then:

b1) 15...\(\text{Q}d8\)?! 16 g5 \(\text{Q}h8\) (alternatively, 16...\(\text{Q}x\text{b}3\) 17 \(\text{Q}f6\) + gxf6 18 gxf6+ \(\text{Q}h8\) 19 \(\text{Q}g4\) \(\text{Q}x\text{f}6\) 20 \(\text{Q}h6\) +–

Akopian or 16...\(\text{Q}x\text{e}4\) 17 \(\text{Q}f3\) ±) 17 \(\text{Wh}5\) \(\text{Q}x\text{e}4\) 18 \(\text{Q}d4\) ±.

b2) 15...\(\text{Q}a7\) 16 g5 exd5 17 \(\text{Q}x\text{d}5\) \(\text{We}8\) 18 g6 \(\text{Q}f6\) 19 f4 \(\text{Q}x\text{e}4\) 20 \(\text{Wh}5\) hxg6 21 \(\text{Q}x\text{g}6\) \(\text{Q}e6\)!!? 22 \(\text{Q}x\text{e}4\) \(\text{Q}x\text{a}2\) +

23 \(\text{Q}x\text{a}2\) \(\text{Q}x\text{e}4\) 24 \(\text{Q}x\text{f}6\) \(\text{Q}x\text{e}3\) (M.Pavlović-Krakobs, Ubeda 1997) 25 \(\text{Wh}4\) with compensation.

c) 13...\(\text{Q}e8\) 14 g5 \(\text{Q}d7\) 15 f4 b5 16 f5 \(\text{Q}x\text{b}3\) (16...b4 17 g6 fxg6 18 \(\text{Q}d5\))! 17 axb3 b4 (17...\(\text{Q}x\text{d}4\) 18 \(\text{Q}x\text{d}4\) b4 19 g6 fxg6 20 fxg6 h6 21 \(\text{Q}a4\) ±; 17...\(\text{Q}e5\)?! 18 \(\text{Q}f3\) g6 – Brunner) 18 g6! fxg6 19 fxg6 ± (Brunner-Hübner, Bundesliga 1989/90) 19...h6 20 \(\text{Wh}5\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 21 \(\text{Q}x\text{h}6\) \(\text{Q}x\text{h}6\) 22 \(\text{Q}x\text{h}6\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 23 \(\text{Q}f5\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 24 \(\text{Q}x\text{e}7\) + \(\text{Q}x\text{e}7\) (Brunner) 25 \(\text{Q}d1\) +– Burgess.

d) 13...\(\text{Q}x\text{d}4\) 14 \(\text{Q}x\text{d}4\) b5 15 g5 gives White chances but no real advantage:

d1) 15...\(\text{Q}e8\) 16 \(\text{Wh}5\) g6 17 \(\text{Wh}6\) \(\text{Q}f8\) 18 \(\text{Wh}4\) with a slight advantage for White, M.Pavlović-Arakhamia, Greek Ch 1996.

d2) 15...b4 16 \(\text{Wh}5\) bx\(\text{c}3\)? (Black should try 16...\(\text{Q}x\text{b}3\)!!?) 17 \(\text{Wh}6\) +– M.Pavlović-Atalik, Ilioupolis 1995 (17...e5 18 g6!).

d3) 15...\(\text{Q}x\text{b}3\) 16 axb3 b4 17 \(\text{Q}f6\) bx\(\text{c}3\) (17...\(\text{Q}b7\)!) 18 \(\text{Wh}5\) with an attack, Ochoa-Pablo Marín, Almeria 1989.

d4) 15...\(\text{Q}b7\)?! 16 \(\text{Wh}5\) \(\text{Q}x\text{b}3\) 17 axb3 b4 seems adequate, Strauts-Shabalov, Latvian Ch (Riga 1987).

B231)

13 g5 (D)
A standard scheme of attack.

Now:

B2311: 13...b5 181
B2312: 13...\(\text{Q}d7\)! 183
Few other moves have been played here. Exchanges are rather premature:

a) 13...\(\text{Qxd4}\) 14 \(\text{Qxd4}\)! and now:

\text{a1)} 14...\(b5\) 15 \(\text{Wh5}\) (15 \(\text{Qd5}\) – 
\(13..b5\) 14 \(\text{Qd5}\) \(\text{Qxd4}\) 15 \(\text{Qxd4}\); 15 \(\text{Qf6}\) \(\text{Qb7}\); 15 f4?!) – 13...\(b5\) 14 \(\text{Wh5}\) 
\(\text{Qxd4}\) 15 \(\text{Qxd4}\).

\text{a2)} 14...\(\text{Qc8}\) 15 \(\text{Qg3}\) (15 \(\text{Wh5}\)!)
15...\(\text{Qxb3+}\) 16 \(\text{axb3}\) \(\text{Qa5}\) (16...g6!) 17 
\(\text{Qb1}\) \(e5\) 18 \(b4\)\! ± Hellers-Cebalo, Her-
ning 1991.

\text{a3)} 14...g6? 15 \(h4\) (15 \(e5\)!? \(b5\))
15...\(b5\) 16 \(h5\) \(\text{Qxb3+}\) 17 \(\text{axb3}\) \(b4\) 18 
\(\text{Qa4}\) \(e5\) with counter-chances, Tobyas-
Orsag, Czech Ch (Prague) 1992.

b) 13...\(\text{Qxb3+}\) 14 \(\text{axb3}\) (14 \(\text{xb3}\))

\text{b1)} 14...\(b5\) and now 15 \(\text{Qxc6}\) and 
15 \(\text{Wh5}\) are both stronger than 15 \(\text{Qg3}\), 
\(b4\) 16 \(\text{Qc4}\)!? (Parma), which is unclear.

\text{b2)} 14...g6?! is possible.

\text{b3)} 14...\(\text{d7}\)! is again the most re-
liable continuation.

B2311)

13...\(b5\)

This move is difficult to assess. Many of the most important lines from 
here lead to positions that have already 
been considered via 9...0-0 10 0-0-0 
\(\text{Qe8}\) in Line A2.

14 \(\text{Wh5}\)!

This is the most popular. Instead:

\text{a)} 14 \(\text{Qg3}\)!\! b4! (Nunn) favours 
Black.

\text{b)} 14 \(\text{Qb1}\) is harmless; for exam-
ple, 14...\(\text{Qxb3}\) (14...\(\text{Qd7}\) – 13...\(\text{Qd7}\) 
14 \(\text{Qb1}\) \(b5\) 15 axb3 \(\text{Qd7}\) (15...\(b4\) 16 
\(\text{Qa4}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) = Danner/Polajzer) 16 \(f4\) 
\(b4\) 17 \(\text{Qa4}\) \(\text{Qxd4}\) 18 \(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qxa4}\) 19 
\(\text{bxa4}\) \(e5\) = Ljubojević-Korchnoi, Lu-
cerne Wcht 1989.

\text{c)} 14 \(\text{Qd5}\) is unconvincing:

\text{c1)} 14...\(\text{exd5}\)\!? 15 \(\text{Qxd5}\) \(\text{Qxd4}\) 16 
\(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qb7}\), and now 17 \(\text{Qf6}\)\! + \(\text{Qh8}\)!
(17...\(\text{Qxf6}\) 18 \(\text{gxf6}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\) 19 \(\text{Qg7}\) 
\(\text{Qh8}\) 20 \(\text{Qxe4}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\) 21 \(f3\) \(±\) 18 \(\text{Qh5}\) 
\(\text{Qxf6}\) 19 \(\text{gxf6}\) \(g6\) 20 \(\text{Qh6}\) \(\text{Qg8}\)\! 21 
\(\text{Qxc5}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) is not so clear. However, 17 
\(\text{Qh5}\)\!?) and 17 \(\text{Qf6}\) are possible.

\text{c2)} 14...\(\text{Qxd4}\)\!? 15 \(\text{Qxd4}\) is possi-
ble, and now Black may not venture 
on 15...\(\text{exd5}\)\!? 16 \(\text{Qxd5}\). Instead, 15...\(b4\) 
transposes to note ‘c1’ to 
Black’s 14th move in Line A21.

\text{c3)} 14...\(\text{Qb7}\) and now: 15 \(\text{Qf5}\)! – 
13 \(\text{Qf5}\) \(b5\) 14 \(\text{Qd5}\) \(b7\) 15 \(g5\); 15 
\(\text{Qxc6}\) \(\text{Qxc6} \! – 14...\(\text{Qd7}\) 15 \(\text{Qxc6}\)\!?

\text{c4)} 14...\(\text{Qd7}\) 15 \(\text{Qf5}\) (15 \(\text{Qxc6}\)!
\(\text{Qxc6}\) 16 \(\text{Qxc5}\) \(dxc5\) 17 \(\text{Qxc6}\) \(\text{Qxc6}\) 
18 \(e5\) Gufeld) 15...\(\text{exf5}\) 16 \(g6\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 17 
\(\text{exf5}\) \(\text{Qxf5}\) 18 \(\text{gxf7}\)\! + \(\text{Qxf7}\) 19 \(\text{Qxf7}\)\! + 
\(\text{Qxf7}\) and Black is OK, Gdanski-
H.Grünberg, Stara Zagora Z 1990.

\text{d)} 14 \(\text{Qxc6}\)\!? \(\text{Qxc6}\) transposes to 
the note to Black’s 14th move in Line 
A21.

We now return to 14 \(\text{Wh5}\) (D):

14...\(b4\)

This is the ‘main’ move, but is also 
extremely risky. Other ideas:

\text{a)} 14...\(\text{d7}\)\!? 15 \(\text{Qg3} \! – 13...\(\text{Qd7}\) 
14 \(\text{Qg3}\) \(b5\)\!? 15 \(\text{Wh5}\).
b) 14...\textit{xd}8?! 15 \textit{\textit{xc}}6 \textit{\textit{xc}}6?! 16 \textit{\textit{d}}5!, Djurhuus-Kaspersen, Copenhagen 1988.

c) 14...\textit{xe}8 15 \textit{\textit{xc}}6 (other ideas are 15 \textit{\textit{d}}5?! g6 16 \textit{\textit{wh}}6 \textit{\textit{d}}7 17 \textit{\textit{g}}3 \textit{\textit{f}}8 18 \textit{\textit{h}}4, Renet-Piket, Groningen 1984 and 15 \textit{\textit{ef}}5?!) 15...\textit{\textit{xc}}6+! 16 \textit{\textit{xc}}6 \textit{\textit{d}}4 transposes to Line A21.

d) 14...\textit{xd}4 (also risky) 15 \textit{\textit{xd}}4! and then:

d1) 15...b4? allows both 16 \textit{\textit{wh}}6?! ± and 16 \textit{\textit{ff}}6! \textit{\textit{e}}8 17 \textit{\textit{g}}3 \textit{\textit{bc}}3 18 \textit{\textit{h}}3 h6 19 \textit{\textit{wh}}6!! +-.

d2) 15...\textit{\textit{xb}}3+?! 16 \textit{\textit{xb}}3 is difficult for Black: 16...b4 17 \textit{\textit{wh}}6 e5 18 \textit{\textit{d}}5 +-; 16...\textit{\textit{b}}7 17 \textit{\textit{d}}3; or 16...g6 17 \textit{\textit{wh}}6 f6 18 f4 ± C.Hansson-Timmerman, corr. 1982.

d3) 15...\textit{\textit{b}}7! and now:

d31) 16 \textit{\textit{ff}}6 \textit{\textit{fc}}8! 17 \textit{\textit{g}}4 (17 \textit{\textit{dd}}4 \textit{\textit{xb}}3+ 18 \textit{\textit{xb}}3 e5 19 \textit{\textit{dd}}2 b4 20 \textit{\textit{dd}}5 \textit{\textit{xd}}5 21 exd5 a5!) 17...b4! 18 \textit{\textit{h}}4 \textit{\textit{xe}}4 19 \textit{\textit{\textit{xe}}4} \textit{\textit{bxc}}3 20 \textit{\textit{h}}4 \textit{\textit{\textit{xb}}3+ 21 \textit{\textit{eb}}1 \textit{\textit{dd}}2+ 22 \textit{\textit{xd}}2 \textit{\textit{h}}6 23 \textit{\textit{dd}}1 (Bordonada-Mir.

Pavlov, Nice OL 1974) 23...\textit{\textit{cxb}}2 24 c4 \textit{\textit{a}}5! is much better for Black - Akopian.

d32) 16 f3 \textit{\textit{\textit{xb}}3+ 17 \textit{\textit{xb}}3 e5 18 \textit{\textit{g}}3 \textit{\textit{fc}}8 \infty Hodges-Malevich, corr. 1995.

d33) 16 \textit{\textit{g}}4 \textit{\textit{xb}}3+ (16...\textit{fc}8? 17 \textit{\textit{h}}4! h6 18 \textit{\textit{g}}1 +--) 17 \textit{\textit{xb}}3 e5 18

\textit{\textit{e}}3 (scarcely better is 18 \textit{\textit{h}}4 h6 19 \textit{\textit{g}}1 \textit{\textit{xd}}4, Nedeve-Relange, Pula Echt 1997) 18...\textit{\textit{ac}}8 19 \textit{\textit{dd}}2 g6 20 \textit{\textit{wh}}6 f5 21 \textit{\textit{gxf}}6 \textit{\textit{xf}}6 = J.R.Koch-Relange, French Ch (Chambéry) 1994.

d34) 16 \textit{\textit{g}}3 and now:

d341) 16...\textit{\textit{xe}}4?! 17 g6! hxg6 18 \textit{\textit{\textit{xe}}6} fxg6 19 \textit{\textit{\textit{xe}}6+ \textit{\textit{f}}7} 20 \textit{\textit{\textit{xe}}6} \textit{\textit{g}}5+ 21 \textit{\textit{\textit{b}}1} \textit{\textit{f}}8! 22 \textit{\textit{\textit{xe}}4} \textit{\textit{xe}}4 23

\textit{\textit{\textit{xe}}4} \textit{\textit{g}}8 24 \textit{\textit{gg}}6 \textit{\textit{fe}}7 25 \textit{\textit{wh}}7 \textit{\textit{xe}}6 26 \textit{\textit{wh}}8+ \textit{\textit{e}}7 27 \textit{\textit{\textit{xe}}7} \textit{\textit{e}}8 28 \textit{\textit{\textit{xe}}6} \textit{\textit{g}}5+ ±.

d342) 16...\textit{\textit{fc}}8 17 f3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{f}}}} \textit{\textit{d}}3+ 18 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}3} e5 19 \textit{\textit{h}}3 favours White, Valentti-Toth, Reggio Emilia 1975.

d343) 16...\textit{\textit{ac}}8! (Paoli) deserves attention.

\textit{\textit{In conclusion}}: although things are far from clear, 14...\textit{\textit{xd}}4 can hardly be recommended.

e) 14...g6?! (this still seems playable) 15 \textit{\textit{wh}}6 and then:

e1) 15...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{b}}}} \textit{\textit{b}}3+ 16 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}3} f6 17 f4 \textit{\textit{fxg}}5 18 f5! ± Gheorghescu-Tratatorici, Romania 1977.

e2) 15...\textit{\textit{dd}}8 16 \textit{\textit{g}}3 (16 \textit{\textit{d}}5?! \textit{\textit{f}}8 17 \textit{\textit{wh}}4 b4!, Stukaturkin-Goichman, Krasnoiarsk 1974) 16...\textit{\textit{ff}}8 17 \textit{\textit{wh}}4 b4?! (Black should try 17...\textit{\textit{e}}7?) 18


e3) 15...\textit{\textit{\textit{e}}8}! 16 \textit{\textit{g}}3 (16 \textit{\textit{d}}5?! –

14...\textit{\textit{ee}}8 15 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}5}? g6 16 \textit{\textit{wh}}6 16...\textit{\textit{\textit{f}}8} 17 \textit{\textit{wh}}4 b4 (17...\textit{\textit{e}}7?! is possible; then 18 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textit{f}}}} 19 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}3} \textit{\textit{\textit{b}}3+ 19 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}3} e5 20 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}5} \textit{\textit{a}}5 is unconvincing for White) and now:

e31) 18 \textit{\textit{e}}4?! is unclear.

e32) 18 \textit{\textit{\textit{xc}}6}?! \textit{\textit{\textit{xb}}3+ 19 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}3} \textit{\textit{xc}}6 (19...\textit{\textit{\textit{b}}3} 20 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}4} e5 21 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}4} ±)

20 \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}4} (20 \textit{\textit{\textit{a}}3} h5 21 \textit{\textit{g}}x\textit{h}6 e5!)
A. Pereira) 20...h5! (20...e5 21 d5 ±) 21 gxh6 e5 22 d5 exd4 23 d1 transposes to Line A21.

e33) 18 h3!? h5 (18...g7?! 19 wxb7+ w8f8 20 w5?!) 19 g6 h6 20 c6 (better than 20 w6? w7, Magerramov-Tal, Moscow simul 1974) 20...xb3+ 21 axb3 e5! (21...b7 22 w6 w7 23 b6! +=) 22 w3 (22 x4 w5?) 22...e6 23 w4! cxb2+ 24 x2 h7! = V. Khenkin.

Now (after 14...b4):

a) 15 g4? bxc3 16 h4 x3+ 17 axb3 h6 18 x3c6 (18 g1 w5!) 18...wxc6 ++.

b) 15 g3? bxc3 16 h3 h6 (or 16...x3+ first) 17 g1 x3+ 18 cx3 x3d4 (or 18...h8) 19 xd4 cxb2+ 20 x2 e5 = Sideif-Zade-Mochalov, USSR 1974.

c) 15 a4?! d7 (15...x3d4 16 x3d4 cx3+ 17 axb3 e5 = Gufeld; 15...x3+ 16 axb3 d7?!) 17 g3 (f8 18 h6 Mochalov) 16 x3c5 x3d4 (16...x3c5? 17 f5!) 17 x3d4 (17 x3d7 x3b3+ 18 axb3 f8 =) 17...x3c5 18 f6 (18 x3g7 x3g7 19 g4 g8 = Sazn-Georghiou, Trompelosinos 1974) 18...b5 19 e5 fd8 20 x3d8+ x3d8 21 g6 fxg6! 22 x3g6 x3f6 23 x3f6 w4f4+! 24 h1 w5.

d) 15 x3e2 x3b3+ 16 axb3 x3d4 (V. Pavlov) gives Black counterplay.

e) White should play 15 x3c6!:

   e1) 15...x3c6 transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 15th move in Line A22.

   e2) 15...x3b3+ 16 axb3 x3c6 transposes to Line A22.

B2312)

13...d7! (D)

This is the most reliable move.

14 h5
by 16...fxe6 or 16...bxc3!?; 16 $h5 is also inadequate) and then:

b11) 16...hxg6!? and then:
   b111) 17 fxg6 should be met not by 17...bxc3 18 $h5 fxg6 19 $xg6 =
   Golubev-Grasis, USSR jr Cht 1988,
   but 17...$e5!?.
   b112) After 17 $xg6!?, rather than
   17...bxc3 18 $xg6 or 17...$xe6 18
   $xg6, Salov-Slesarev, USSR 1974,
   Black should prefer 17...$xd4! 18
   $xf7+ $xf7 19 $xd4 bxc3, when
   White’s prospects are doubtful.
   b12) 16...fxg6!.
   b13) 16...$xb3+ 17 axb3 fxg6 18
   fxg6 bxc3 19 $h5 (19 gxh7+ $h8 20
   $xg7 $a5! −+) and now, instead of
   19...hxg6 20 $xg6 $f7 (20...$f6 21
   $h6 is equal) 21 $h6 (21 $g5+ $a5!)
   21...gxh6 (Benjamin-Liberzon, Lone
   Pine 1980) 22 $xh6! =, 19...h6 proba-
   bly wins.
   b2) 15 $h5 $fc8 and here:
   b21) 16 f5 g6! (16...$xd4 17 $xd4
   $xb3+ 18 axb3 exf5 19 e5) 17 $h6
   $f8 18 $h4 b4 19 fx6 $xb3+ is much
   better for Black, Salgado-Fow-
   ell, corr. 1979.
   b22) 16 $g3 g6!? 17 $h6 − 14
   $h5 $fc8! 15 $g3 g6 16 $h6 $f8 17
   $h4 $e7 18 f4 b5 19 $h6.
   c) 14 $b1!? probably does not con-
   stitute a real threat for Black:
   c1) 14...$fe8(?!) − 13 $b1 $e8 14
   g5 $d7.
   c2) 14...$fc8 and then:
   c21) 15 $g3 can be answered by
   15...$xb3!? or 15...b5 − 14...b5 15
   $g3 $fc8.
   c22) 15 f4 $xd4 (15...b5!?) 16
   $xd4 b5 17 f5 $xb3 18 axb3 $b4! 19
   g6 fxg6 20 fxg6 h6 21 $xg7! gives
   White a dangerous attack, Panchenko-
   Shestoperov, Cheliabinsk 1977.
   c23) 15 $f5!? leads to unclear
   play.
   c3) 14...g6!? 15 f4 b5 is satisfac-
   tory for Black, Vasiukov-Lukin,
   Uzhgorod 1972.
   c4) 14...$xb3 15 cxb3 b5 16 $h5
   b4 17 $ce2 $≈ Shamkovich.
   c5) 14...b5 and here:
   c51) 15 $g3 $fc8 (15...g6!?) 16
   $f5 and now:
   c511) 16...exf5 17 $xf7+ (White
   can also consider 17 $d5!?) 17...$xf7
   18 $h5+ $g8 19 g6 hxg6 20 $xg6
   $e6!.
   c512) 16...$xb3 17 $xe7+ $xe7
   18 axb3 b4 $≈ Tobyas-Slezka, Czech
   Cht 1994/5.
   c52) 15 $h5 and then:
   c521) 15...$fc8 16 $f5 g6 (but not
   16...$xb3? 17 $h6+ gxh6 18 g6 $h8
   19 $xf7 ±) and now, rather than
   17 $xe7+? $xe7 18 $h6 $xb3 $± Lie-
   pold-Oberst, Bundesliga 1990/1, White
   should play 17 $h6+! ?.
   c522) 15...g6 16 $h6 $fc8 17 $g3
   $f8 18 $h4 $xb3 19 axb3 $c7 (= Danner/Polajzer) 20 $de2! ?.

   We now return to the position after
   14 $h5 (D):

   ![Diagram of chess position]
14...\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}c8!

14...\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}6 15 \textcolor{blue}{\text{wh}}h6 \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}c8 is also possible.

15 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}g3 g6 16 \textcolor{blue}{\text{wh}}h6 \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}8 17 \textcolor{blue}{\text{wh}}4

In this critical position 17...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4!? leads to unclear play, and it brings no benefits for White to decline a draw after 17...\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e7.

17...\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e7

Or:

a) 17...b5?! 18 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xc6 (or 18 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h3!)
18...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xb3+ 19 axb3 \textcolor{red}{\text{xc}}x6 20 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h3 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7 21 e5! (Glenn) ±.

b) 17...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xb3+!? 18 axb3 (18 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xb3 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e7?!) and now:

b1) 18...b5?! 19 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h3 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7 20 \textcolor{blue}{\text{wh}}h7+ \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}8 21 f4 ± Donchev-Semkov, Varna 1978.

b2) 18...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4!? transposes to other lines: 19 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4 – 17...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4 18 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xb3+ 19 axb3; 19 \textcolor{red}{\text{xd}}xd4 – 17...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4 18 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xb3+ 19 axb3.

b3) Following 18...\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e7, White has scarcely any more chances than after 17...\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e7.

c) 17...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4!?! (D) and then:

c1) 18 \textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}xd4!? makes sense here:

c11) 18...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xb3+ 19 axb3 e5 (or 19...\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e7?! 20 f4 h5 21 f5 b5 22 \textcolor{blue}{\text{d}}d2 a5 Mir.Marković) 20 \textcolor{blue}{\text{d}}d2 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}6 (20...\textcolor{blue}{\text{a}}a5!?

21 \textcolor{blue}{\text{b}}b1 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}}xc3 Nikitin) 21 \textcolor{blue}{\text{b}}b1 (21 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h3! h5 22 gxh6 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h7 23 \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}3 Mir.Marković) 21...b5 22 f4 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7 (Velimirović-Mir.Marković, Vrnjačka Banja 1992) 23 fxe5! ± Mir.Marković.

c12) 18...b5 19 f4!? (19 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h3 h5! ± Verőci-Alexandria, Menorca wom 1973) 19...\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7 (19...a5!? 20 \textcolor{blue}{\text{d}}d2 ∞ Rogaliewicz-Capuano, corr. 1995) 20 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h3 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}}xb3+ 21 axb3 e5 22 \textcolor{blue}{\text{wh}}h7+ \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}8 23 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h4 exd4 24 \textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}xg7+ =

c2) 18 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xd4 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}xb3+! 19 axb3 e5 20 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e3 (20 \textcolor{red}{\text{b}}b6 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}6 21 \textcolor{blue}{\text{d}}d2 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}6 22 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e3 a5! ± Noetzel-Lanka, Bundesliga 1991/2) 20...b5 21 \textcolor{blue}{\text{d}}d2 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}6 22 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h3 (or 22 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}d5 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}}xd5 23 exd5 a5 24 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h3 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7!, Cheah-Garcia Paolochi, Novi Sad OL 1990). Now, instead of playing 22...\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7, it is simpler to proceed with 22...h5! 23 gxh6 \textcolor{blue}{\text{h}}h7 (Schumi-Wittmann, Austrian Ch (Gamlitz 1993), with acceptable play.

Now we return to the position after 17...\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}e7 (D):
b) 18 £f5? £xb3+ 19 axb3 exf5 20 £d5 £d8! (20...£a5 21 £xe7+ £xe7 22 £d4 £a1+! = Panchenko-Kochiev, Riga 1972) 21 £f6+ £xf6 22 gxf6 £e5 23 £d4 fxe4 24 £xe5 dxe5 25 £xd7 £xc2+! -- Zak.

c) 18 £c4 h5 (18...b5!? 19 £f5)! 19 £f5 b5! (19...exf5 20 £xc5 dxc5 21 £d5) 20 £h6+ £g7 is probably in Black’s favour, Guseinov-Uusi, USSR Cht 1979.

d) 18 f4 b5 (18...£xb3+!? 19 axb3 b5; 18...£b4!? 19 f5 £xb3+ 20 axb3 e5 Nikitin) and then:

d1) 19 £de2? £xb3+ 20 axb3 £b4 21 £h3 h5 22 £g3 bxc3 23 £hxh5 £d4 --.

d2) 19 f5? £xb3+ 20 axb3 £b4! -- Zak.

d3) 19 £h6 £f8 20 £h4 b4!? (or 20...£e7) 21 £f5 (21 £h3 h5 22 gxf6 £e7! -- Ftačník) 21...£xb3+ 22 axb3 bxc3 £f Pinski-Pedzich, Koszalin 1999.

d4) 19 £xc6 £xc6 (19...£xb3+!?; 19...£xc6!? 20 £d4 (20 £xc5!? 20...h5 (20...£xb3+ 21 axb3 e5?!) 21 £d2? (21 f5 £xb3+! 22 axb3 £b4 T; 21 £xc5!) 21...b4 22 £d5 bxc3! -- Zhiltsova-Lysenko – Ioseliani, USSR 1976.

d5) 19 £f5 £xb3+ 20 axb3, and now 20...h5 21 £h6+ £h7 22 f5 b4!? is interesting. Moreover, it is likely that the continuation 20...exf5 21 £d5 (NCO) 21...£d8! 22 e5 also does not promise White anything after 22...£e6 or 22...dxe5.

e) 18 £de2 and then:

e1) 18...h5 19 f4 (or 19 £f4?!) 19...b5 20 f5 £xb3+ 21 axb3 £b4 22 £f4 bxc3 23 bxc3 £a5 24 fxg6 fxg6 25 £xg6 £g7 (Ostapenko-Nikitin) is, to my mind, not quite convincing.

e2) However, 18...£xb3+ 19 axb3 £b4! (19...h5 20 £f4!? £b4 21 £d4 e5 22 £hx5 exd4 23 £xd4) appears good for Black though the play is rather crazy; e.g., 20 £b1 a5!? 21 £f4 a4 (21...e5) 22 £h3 h5 23 £hxh5 axb3 24 cxb3 £a1+! --; 20 f4 £a5 (or 20...a5) 21 £d2?! e5 22 f5 £b5!? 23 £h3 h5 24 £g3 (Ilincić-Zelić, Yugoslav Cht 1989) 24...£a2!.

**B232)**

**13 £f5! (D)**

Following A.Sokolov's win over Salov in 1983, this move became more topical than 13 g5.

**13...b5**

Others:

a) 13...exf5?! 14 gxf5 £e5 (or 14...£d7 15 £d5 £d8 16 £h5 £h8 17 £xg7! -- S.Sokolov-K.Grigorian, USSR 1978) 15 £d5 £d8 16 £xc5!? dxc5 17 f4 ±.

b) 13...£xb3+ 14 axb3 and then:

b1) 14...exf5?! 15 £d5 (the immediate 15 gxf5! is more precise since then 15...£b4? fails to 16 £xg7! ++) 15...£d8 (15...£a5!? Nikitin) 16 gxf5 f6 (16...£h8 17 £h5 f6 18 £f4 ++) 17 £g3!? £f7 18 £h5 £f8 19 £dg1 wins.
for White, Coleman-Bologan, Biel rpd 1993.

b2) 14...b5 15 \( \text{Q}x\text{e}7+ \text{Q}xe7 \) (after 15...\( \text{W}xe7 \) 16 g5!? White is slightly better). Now White has a small advantage after 16 \( \text{W}d2 \) d5 (16...\( \text{Q}d8 \) 17 \( \text{Q}f4 \) b4 18 \( \text{Q}a4 \) e5 19 \( \text{Q}xe5 \) ± Johansson-Eriksson, Uppsala 1986) 17 exd5 (17 \( \text{Q}f4?! \) offers White a slight advantage) 17...\( \text{Q}xd5 \) (17...b4 Ulybin/Volokitin) 18 \( \text{Q}xd5 \) exd5 19 \( \text{Q}d4 \) (Shirov), or after 16 \( \text{W}d3 \) b4 (16...d5 17 exd5 \( \text{Q}xd5 \) 18 \( \text{Q}xd5 \) exd5 ±) 17 \( \text{Q}d4 \) d5 (17...\( \text{Q}b7 \) 18 \( \text{Q}xd6 \) ± 18 \( \text{Q}c5 \) ±; e.g., 18...dxe4? 19 \( \text{W}g3 \) + Ulybin-Ermolinsky, Simferopol 1988).

c) 13...\( \text{Q}d8?! \) (a recent idea) 14 \( \text{Q}xe7+ \) (14 g5 \( \text{Q}xb3+?! \) 15 axb3 exf5 16 \( \text{Q}d5 \) \( \text{W}a5 \) 17 \( \text{Q}b6 \) \( \text{W}a1+ \) 18 \( \text{Q}d2 \) \( \text{W}xb2 \) 19 \( \text{Q}xe7+ \) \( \text{Q}xe7 \) 20 \( \text{Q}xd8 \) \( \text{Q}c6 \) Yudasin) 14...\( \text{W}xe7 \) (14...\( \text{Q}xe7?! \) Yudasin) 15 g5 b5 16 \( \text{W}h5 \) (16 h4!? Yudasin) 16...\( \text{Q}b7?! \) (16...\( \text{Q}b8 \) 17 \( \text{Q}g3 \) g6 18 \( \text{W}h6 \) \( \text{W}f8 \) 19 \( \text{W}h4 \) a5 Notkin) 17 \( \text{Q}g3 \) g6 18 \( \text{W}h6 \) \( \text{W}f8 \) 19 \( \text{W}h4 \) ± Yudasin-Sher, St Petersburg 1996.

14 \( \text{Q}d5?! \) (D)

14 \( \text{Q}xe7+ \) is less ambitious but also less risky:

a) 14...\( \text{Q}xe7 \) and now:

a1) 15 \( \text{Q}f4 \) \( \text{Q}xb3+ \) (15...e5!?) 16 axb3 e5 17 \( \text{Q}g5 \) f6 (17...\( \text{Q}e6 \) 18 \( \text{Q}b1 \) \( \text{Q}ad8 \) 19 \( \text{Q}xe7 \) \( \text{W}xe7 \) 20 \( \text{Q}d5 \) gives White a slight advantage) 18 \( \text{Q}e3 \) b4 (18...\( \text{Q}e6?! \) 19 \( \text{Q}a4 \) \( \text{Q}e6 \) 20 \( \text{Q}b1 \) (Peelen-Jasnikowski, Bielisko Biala 1986) 20...d5! with unclear play – variations given by Shirov.

a2) 15 \( \text{W}d2! \) \( \text{Q}d8 \) (15...b4 16 \( \text{Q}a4 \) \( \text{Q}xe4 \) 17 \( \text{W}xb4 \) d5 18 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{Q}d6 \) 19 \( \text{Q}f4 \) \( \text{Q}d8 \) 20 \( \text{Q}b1 \) – G.Todorović) 16 e5 (16 \( \text{Q}f4?! \) \( \text{W}c6 \) 17 \( \text{Q}xd6 \) \( \text{Q}g6 \) 18 \( \text{W}d4 \) \( \text{Q}b7 \) 19 e5, Brunner-Hübner, Haifa Echt 1989) 16...\( \text{Q}xb3+ \) (16...d5!? 17 \( \text{f}4 \); 16...b4 17 \( \text{Q}xc5 \) \( \text{W}xc5 \) 18 \( \text{Q}e4 \) \( \text{W}xe5 \) 19 \( \text{Q}xd6 \) – G.Todorović) 17 axb3 b4 18 \( \text{Q}a4 \) \( \text{Q}d5 \) 19 exd6, G.Todorović-Kožul, Brezovica 1988 – in all instances White has some advantage.

b) 14...\( \text{W}xe7 \) and then:

b1) 15 \( \text{Q}f4 \) \( \text{Q}d8 \) 16 \( \text{W}e3 \) \( \text{Q}b7 \) 17 \( \text{Q}g5 \) f6 = Shirov.

b2) 15 \( g5 \) \( \text{Q}b7 \) (15...b4 16 \( \text{Q}a4 \) \( \text{Q}b7?! \) 17 \( \text{Q}xc5 \) dxc5 18 \( \text{W}c4 \) 16 \( \text{W}h5?! \) b4 17 \( \text{Q}a4 \) \( \text{Q}xe4 \) 18 \( f3 \) 16...\( \text{Q}ac8 \) (16...\( \text{Q}f8 \) 17 \( \text{Q}b1 \) \( \text{Q}ab8 \) – Shirov) 17 \( \text{Q}b1 \) \( \text{Q}c7 \) 18 \( \text{Q}d2 \) \( \text{Q}e5 \) with an acceptable position for Black, Rštšagov-Shirov, USSR 1990.

b3) 15 \( \text{W}d2 \) \( \text{Q}d8 \) 16 \( \text{Q}g5 \) f6 17 \( \text{Q}f4 \) \( \text{Q}e5 \) (17...b4 18 \( \text{Q}d5 \)!) 18 \( \text{Q}g5 \) (unclear is 18 \( \text{Q}e3 \) \( \text{Q}b7 \) 19 g5 \( \text{W}h8 \) – Shirov) 18...\( \text{Q}f3 \) 19 \( \text{gxf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 20 \( \text{g}5 \) (20 \( \text{W}e3 \) \( \text{Q}xg1 \) 21 \( \text{Q}g5 \) \( \text{W}f3 \)! ± Hector-Shirov, Torcy 1990) and, instead of 20...\( \text{Q}xd2 \) 21 \( \text{Q}xf6 \) \( \text{Q}xd3+ \) 22 axb3 \( \text{Q}d7 \) 23 b4! ± (Shirov), 20...\( \text{W}f7 \)!! 21 \( \text{W}e3 \) \( \text{Q}f8 \) deserves attention.

\section*{B}

14...\( \text{Q}b7 \)

Otherwise:

a) 14...\( \text{Q}e8 \) 15 \( \text{Q}xe7+ \) \( \text{Q}xe7 \) 16 e5 ± Nijboer-Hon, London Lloyds Bank 1992.
b) The rare 14...exd5!? 15 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)xd5 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)b7 16 e5 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e6 deserves attention:

b1) 17 g5?! dx5 18 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)h5 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)f4?! (or 18...\(\text{	extsc{h}}\)h8?! 19 \(\text{	extsc{f}}\)f6 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xf6 20 gxf6 g6) 19 gxf6+ \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)xe7 20 \(\text{	extsc{f}}\)f6+ gxf6 21 gxf6+ \(\text{	extsc{e}}\)eg6! 22 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)h6 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e6 23 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)e4! 24 \(\text{	extsc{b}}\)h3 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)g4 25 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3+ \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)g6! (25...\(\text{	extsc{d}}\)g6 =).

b2) 17 exd6 \(\text{	extsc{a}}\)d8 and then:

b21) 18 f4 f6 19 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)f2 \(\text{	extsc{h}}\)f7!? and now 20 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)ge1 (\(\text{x}\) Shirov) should be preferred to 20 \(\text{	extsc{b}}\)b6 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xf4 21 \(\text{	extsc{f}}\)fe7+ \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)xe7 22 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xe7 \(\text{	extsc{a}}\)xe7 23 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xd8 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)xd5 \(\text{x}\) Hellers-Mednis, Copenhagen 1991.

b22) 18 g5 \(\text{	extsc{h}}\)h8! (18...\(\text{	extsc{d}}\)d7 19 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)h5 \(\text{	extsc{h}}\)h8 20 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g4 offers compensation, Hjorth-Andersen, corr. 1984) 19 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)d3 (19 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3?! \(\text{	extsc{f}}\)f4! \(\text{x}\) 19...\(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e5 with good prospects for Black; e.g., 20 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)e4 \(\text{	extsc{c}}\)c4 21 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g4 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xe3 22 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xe3 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)a7 23 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)g3 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)c5!?.

b3) 17 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)dx7+!? \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xe7 18 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)xd6, followed by 19 f4, gives White compensation.

Another little-studied option for Black is 14...\(\text{	extsc{e}}\)a7 with the point 15 g5 (15 \(\text{	extsc{e}}\)xc6 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)xc6 16 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xe7+ \(\text{	extsc{h}}\)xe7 17 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)d4 e5?!) 15...exf5 16 g6 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e5.

15 g5 \(\text{	extsc{f}}\)c8 (D)

Or:

a) 15...exf5 16 g6! hxg6 (16...\(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e5 17 exf5 hxg6 18 fxg6 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)cd3+ 19 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xd3! ± Kobaliya-Cherny) 17 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xg6 (17 exf5?! \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e5 – 16...\(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e5 17 exf5 hxg6 ±) 17...\(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e5 18 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xg7+ leads to a terrific attack for White, A.Sokolov-Salov, Nikolaev 1983.

b) 15...b4 16 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)h5 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e5 (16...g6 17 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)h6 gxf5 18 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3! ? +; 16...bxc3 17 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)b6 18 bxc3 exf5 19 \(\text{	extsc{h}}\)h3 +– A.Sokolov; 16...\(\text{	extsc{h}}\)h8 17 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3 exf5 18 g6 fxg6 19 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)xh7 + –; 16...\(\text{	extsc{f}}\)c8 – 15...\(\text{	extsc{f}}\)c8 16 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)h5 b4) 17 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3 exf5 18 exf5 g6 (18...bxc3 19 g6 +– Sion Castro-Rivera, Cordoba 1991; 18...\(\text{	extsc{f}}\)c8!?, Walsh-Raffaele, corr. 1999) 19 fxg6 hxg6 20 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)h6 +– Shirov.

The games that have been played indicate that Black faces serious danger here.

16 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3

We cannot rule out the possibility that 16 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)h5 is stronger:

a) 16...b4 17 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xe6 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xe6 (17...fxe6? 18 g6) 18 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)d5 with an attack.

b) 16...\(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e5 17 f4 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g6 18 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3! (18 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)xg7?! can be countered by Lanka’s 18...b4!? or 18...\(\text{	extsc{w}}\)xg7 19 f5 exd5 20 \(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g3?) 18...b4 19 \(\text{	extsc{h}}\)h3 \(\text{	extsc{f}}\)f8 (19...\(\text{	extsc{f}}\)f8 20 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xh7 \(\text{	extsc{e}}\)e8 21 \(\text{	extsc{a}}\)xc5 dxc5 22 \(\text{	extsc{a}}\)xe6 +– Ginsburg) 20 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)d4! exd5 (20...\(\text{	extsc{d}}\)d8 21 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)h6 f6 22 gxf6! +–) 21 \(\text{	extsc{x}}\)xg7 +– Ginsburg-Lanka, Cappelle la Grande 1997.

c) 16...g6 17 \(\text{	extsc{h}}\)h6+ also looks hazardous for Black; e.g., 17...\(\text{	extsc{g}}\)g7 18 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)f3! \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)e5 19 \(\text{	extsc{d}}\)d4 exd5 20 \(\text{	extsc{w}}\)xf7+ \(\text{	extsc{h}}\)h8 21 f4.

16...\(\text{	extsc{f}}\)f8!?

First suggested by Romero. Other attempts:

a) 16...g6 17 \(\text{	extsc{h}}\)h6+!? with the initiative.
b) 16...\( \text{\&} e5 \) and then:

b1) 17 f4 \( \text{\&} g6 \) (both the following favour White: 17...b4 18 \( \text{\&} x c5 \) and 17...exf5 18 \( \text{\&} x c5 \) \( \text{\&} g6 \) 19 \( \text{\&} e3 \) – Shirov) 18 \( \text{\&} x g7 \) b4!? (18...\( \text{\&} x g7 \) 19 f5 exd5??) 19 \( \text{\&} x c5 \) \( \text{\&} x f4 \) 20 \( \text{\&} f2 \) dxc5 21 \( \text{\&} x b7 \) \( \text{\&} x b7 \) 22 \( \text{\&} d5 \) exd5 (Mezhebitsky-Kirilko, corr. 1996-7)

b2) 17 \( \text{\&} x b7 \) and here:

b21) 17...\( \text{\&} x b7 \) 18 \( \text{\&} x e 7 + \) \( \text{\&} x e 7 \) 19 f4 \( \text{\&} e d 7 \) ! (19...\( \text{\&} c 4 \) !? 20 \( \text{\&} d 4 \) \( \text{\&} d 7 \) 21 \( \text{\&} h 3 \) b4 22 \( \text{\&} h 5 \) \( \text{\&} f 8 \) 23 \( \text{\&} x g 7 ! \) \( \text{\&} x g 7 \) 24 f5! Shirov) 20 a3! ± Bönisch.

b22) 17...\( \text{\&} x b 7 \) 18 \( \text{\&} x e 7 + \) (18 \( \text{\&} b 6 ! \) \( \text{\&} d 7 \) 19 \( \text{\&} d 4 \) Shirov) 18...\( \text{\&} x e 7 \) with roughly equal play, Sion Castro-Shirov, Leon 1995.

b3) 17 \( \text{\&} h 3 \) \( \text{\&} g 6 ? \) 18 \( \text{\&} h 5 \) \( \text{\&} f 8 \) 19 \( \text{\&} x g 7 ! + \) – \( \text{\&} x d 5 \) (19...\( \text{\&} x g 7 \) 20 \( \text{\&} d 4 + \) \( \text{\&} g 8 \) 21 \( \text{\&} h 6 \) 20 \( \text{\&} h 6 \) e5 21 \( \text{\&} h 5 + \) – A.Fedorov-Lanka, Pula Echt 1998.

c) 16...b4 and then:

c1) 17 \( \text{\&} h 3 (? ) \) g6 (17...\( \text{\&} x c 3 \) 18 \( \text{\&} h 5 \) \( \text{\&} f 8 \) 19 \( \text{\&} x g 7 ! \) I.Efimov) 18 \( \text{\&} x c 6 \) (alternatively, 18 \( \text{\&} h 6 + \) \( \text{\&} g 7 \) 19 \( \text{\&} x c 6 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 ! \) ) 18...\( \text{\&} x c 6 \) 19 \( \text{\&} h 6 + \) \( \text{\&} g 7 \) 20 \( \text{\&} f 3 \) \( \text{\&} e 8 \) 21 \( \text{\&} g 4 \) \( \text{\&} x c 3 \) 22 \( \text{\&} f 6 \) \( \text{\&} x f 6 \) 23 \( \text{\&} x f 6 + \) \( \text{\&} g 8 \) –– Kobaliya-Prokopchuk, Kolontaevo 1997.

c2) 17 \( \text{\&} x g 7 ! ? \) \( \text{\&} x g 7 \) (17...\( \text{\&} x c 3 \) 18 \( \text{\&} h 5 \) –– A.Fedorov) 18 \( \text{\&} h 5 \) \( \text{\&} g 8 ! \) (18...\( \text{\&} h 3 \) ? can be met by A.Fedorov's 19 \( \text{\&} x c 5 \), or 19 \( \text{\&} h 6 + \) \( \text{\&} g 8 \) 20 \( \text{\&} x e 6 ! \) \( \text{\&} f 8 \) 21 g6!! –– Lukacs) 19 \( \text{\&} x e 6 ! \) \( \text{\&} x e 6 \) (19...\( \text{\&} x c 3 ? \) 20 \( \text{\&} x f 7 + \) –– A.Fedorov-Kobaliya, Russian Cht 1998) 20 \( \text{\&} d 5 \) \( \text{\&} d 8 \) leads to an insufficiently

explored position: 21 f4 A.Fedorov; 21 \( \text{\&} f 6 \) \( \text{\&} f 8 \) 22 f4 Kodinets; 21 \( \text{\&} b 6 \) Notkin.

d) 16...exf5 17 g6 has not yet been verified either.

Now we return to 16...\( \text{\&} f 8 \) (D):

17 \( \text{\&} h 5 \) g6 18 \( \text{\&} h 6 + \)
18 \( \text{\&} h 4 \) is a possible attempt to improve.

18...\( \text{\&} h 8 \) 19 \( \text{\&} h 4 \) b4 20 \( \text{\&} h 3 \)
Not 20 \( \text{\&} x c 6 ? \) bxc3! ± Onishchuk-Shirov, Bundesliga 1996/7. Instead, 20 \( \text{\&} g 4 \) bxc3 21 \( \text{\&} h 3 \) (not 21 \( \text{\&} f 6 ? \) h6 22 \( \text{\&} g 4 \) h5 23 \( \text{\&} f 6 \) \( \text{\&} x b 2 + \) 24 \( \text{\&} b 1 \) \( \text{\&} g 7 \) 25 \( \text{\&} h 3 \) \( \text{\&} a 4 \) –– Shirov) transposes to the main line.

20...\( \text{\&} x c 3 \) 21 \( \text{\&} g 4 \) f5!
21...h5? 22 \( \text{\&} f 6 .

22 \( \text{\&} f 6 \) h6 23 \( \text{\&} x h 6 + \)

White can try to improve on this incredible line, but Black still has in reserve, at least, 11 \( \text{\&} g 4 \) \( \text{\&} x d 4 ! \) and 11 \( \text{\&} g h 1 \) b5!?.
11 5...dxc6 6 dxc4 e6 7 dxe3 a6 without b3

1 e4 c5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 
5 d5 c3 c6 6 c4 e6 7 e3 a6 (D)

With the move-order of the Sozin, 
5...dxc6 6 dxc4, the set-up 6...e6 7 dxe3 
a6, is, undoubtedly, one of the most 
important. In this chapter we must 
leave aside the lines with b3 because 
8 b3 was completely covered in 
Chapters 8-10. Nevertheless, this 
circumstance does not preclude a discussion of the nuances of the position in 
the diagram (and we should note, first 
of all, that normally this position should not arise out of the Fischer At-
tack, since 5...a6 6 c4 e6 7 e3?! 
d6?! is quite a hypothetical move-
order).

Usually, White wishes to play the Velimirović Attack and to this he has 
two possible introductions: 8 b3 and 
8 w e2. Other moves are rare, although 
8 0-0 (see 7 0-0 a6 8 d3 in Chapter 
12) is quite normal and usually leads to Classical Sozin positions.

Sometimes, White plays 8 a4 and 8 
a3, after which the play usually trans-
poses to the positions of Chapter 12 
(one of the few additional ideas for 
Black is 8 a3 w c7 9 d2 d51?!, 
Minić-Timman, Sombor 1974, and 
this is interesting).

So, 8 b3 or 8 w e2: this is the heart 
of the matter. If 8...d7 is played, it 
makes no particular difference, but a 
difference does occur in the ‘Anti-Veli-
imirović’ lines. After 8 b3, it is 
8...w c7?!, with the point 9 w e2 (9 f4 
transposes to the Classical Sozin) 
9 d5! After 8 w e2 there are both 
8...d5 and 8...w c7 9 0-0-0 d5?!, 
which makes it almost imperative for 
White to reply d3. Personally, I would 
prefer 8 b3 (all the more because the 
Fischer Attack move-order 5...a6 6 d4 
e6 7 b3 d c6 8 d3 does not leave 
White any such choice). Objectively, 
in any case I advise White to arrange w e2 and b3 only in the case where 
the black bishop has already been 
placed on e7. Therefore, choose be-
tween 8 b3 w c7 f4 and 8 w e2 w c7 
(8...d5 9 d3) 9 0-0-0 d5 10 d3.

We pass on to the theoretical part 
of this chapter, consisting of the lines
that could not have been discussed earlier. These include, apart from the lines with an early ...\( \text{a}a5 \), White's attempts to save on \( \text{b}b3 \) (with an early \( \text{h}g1 \) in the main lines with ...\( \text{e}e7 \).

8 \( \text{w}e2 \)

Now:

A: 8...\( \text{a}a5 \) 191

B: 8...\( \text{w}c7 \) (9 0-0-0 \( \text{a}a5!?) \) 192

C: 8...\( \text{w}c7 \) 9 0-0-0 \( \text{e}e7 \) 196

D: 8...\( \text{e}e7 \) 9 0-0-0 0-0 197

We should not forget to mention first two other rare continuations for Black:

a) 8...\( \text{x}d4 \) 9 \( \text{x}d4 \) b5 does not work well here. 10 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 11 0-0-0 0-0 7 \( \text{b}3 \) a6 8 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 9 \( \text{w}e2 \) 0-0 10 0-0-0 \( \text{x}d4 \) 11 \( \text{x}d4 \) b5 \( \text{g} \).

b) 8...\( \text{d}7! \)! is not played at grandmaster level for some reason. Then:

b1) The position after 9 \( \text{b}3 \) (7 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 8 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 9 \( \text{w}e2 \)) was assessed in Chapter 8 (the note to White's 9th move of Line C1) as not very promising for White (9...b5 10 0-0-0 \( \text{a}a5 \) ! or 9...\( \text{e}8 \) !? 10 0-0-0 \( \text{a}a5 \) !).

b2) However, even after 9 0-0-0! it is not easy to avoid such positions: after 9...b5 10 \( \text{x}c6 !? \) \( \text{xc}6 \) White must sacrifice something; 9...\( \text{e}8 \) 10 \( \text{xc}6 !? \); 9...\( \text{a}5 \) 10 \( \text{d}3 !? \) \( \text{c}8 \) 11 \( \text{h}g1 \) b5 (11...\( \text{xc}3 \) !? 12 \text{bxc}3, Ljubojević-Spassky, Turin 1982) 12 g4. All this is not wholly clear and deserves further study.

A)

8...\( \text{a}a5 \) (\( D \))

9 \( \text{d}3 ! \)

Or:

a) 9 0-0-0 \( \text{xc}4 \) 10 \( \text{wc}4 \) \( \text{d}7 ! \) = Karasev-Yudasin, USSR 1984.

b) 9 \( \text{b}3 \) and now:

b1) 9...\( \text{w}c7 \) (followed by 10...b5) transposes to Line C31 of Chapter 8, which suits Black.

b2) 9...b5!? is at least no weaker.

9...\( \text{b}5 \)

Consistent but risky. Others:

a) 9...\( \text{w}c7 \) and now:

a1) 10 0-0-0 simply transposes to Line B, so it is unclear what Black hopes to gain by giving White some additional possibilities.

a2) 10 g4 b5 11 g5 \( \text{d}7 \) 12 \( \text{f}4 \) b4 \( \text{a} = \) Hartston-Liberzon, Reykjavik Z 1975.

a3) 10 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 11 \( \text{f}4 \) should be compared with 10 \( \text{f}4 \).

a4) 10 \( \text{f}4 \) b5 11 0-0 (11 \( \text{a}4 ! ? \) b4 12 \( \text{b}1 \) 11...\( \text{b}7 \) 12 \( \text{a}e1 ! ? \) \( \text{e}7 \) 13 \( \text{h}1 \) enables White to fight for the advantage, Link-Kovaliov, Schwäbisch Gmünd 1994.

b) The rare 9...\( \text{e}7 \) makes a fair amount of sense. For instance:

b1) 10 0-0-0 0-0 (10...b5 11 g4 b4 12 \( \text{b}1 \) Yudasin) 11 g4 (or 11 \( \text{b}3 ! ? \), de Firmian-I.Ivanov, USA Ch (Long Beach) 1989) 11...b5 12 g5 \( \text{d}7 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{h}4 \) b4 15 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 16 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{x}d3 + \) 17 \( \text{w}x3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 18 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{fc}8 \) 19 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{f}8 \) with mutual chances, Yudasin-Garcia Ilundain, Pamplona 1992/3.
b2) The other line is 10 f4 \textit{wc}7 11 0-0, which is similar to line ‘a4’, and looks like a promising version of the Scheveningen for White.

10 a4?! \\
As of now, no recognized main move has been defined.

a) Black’s idea is not questioned by 10 0-0 \textit{db}7 11 a3 \textit{dc}7, Minasian-Epishin, Minsk 1990.

b) 10 g4 does not appear logical to me.

c) 10 f4 can be met by 10...b4!? or 10...\textit{wc}7 - 9...\textit{wc}7 10.f4 b5.

d) 10 0-0-0 b4!? (10...\textit{wc}7 transposes to Line B) 11 \textit{db}1 (11 \textit{da}4?! \textit{dd}7!) is quite interesting and playable for both sides; for example, 11...\textit{wc}7 (11...\textit{db}7!?) 12 \textit{dc}2 \textit{dc}7 13 g4 \textit{dd}7 14 f4 \textit{dc}5 15 \textit{db}1 \textit{dd}7 16 g5 0-0 17 f5 \textit{fc}8 (Brunner-Epishin, Maringa 1991) and now 18 \textit{cc}1! or 18 \textit{dd}2f3! - Epishin.

e) 10 b4!? \textit{dc}4! (10...\textit{db}7 11 0-0 ± Meštrović-Polugaevsky, Varna 1972) 11 \textit{dc}xc4 bxc4 12 \textit{xc}xc4 (a slight advantage might be obtained by continuing 12 a3!? \textit{db}7 13 f3 \textit{wc}7 14 0-0 \textit{dc}7 15 \textit{fd}2, A.Fedorov-Kovaliov, Minsk 1997) 12...\textit{db}7 13 0-0 (13 a3 should be met not by 13...\textit{de}e4 14 \textit{de}xe4 d5 15 \textit{wb}3 dxe4 16 \textit{dd}1 ±, but 13...\textit{dc}8!) 13...\textit{dc}8 14 \textit{wb}3 (14 \textit{dd}3! d5 15 e5 \textit{dd}7 16 \textit{ff}4 \textit{xb}4 17 \textit{de}e2 is interesting, de Firmian-Zaltsman, Lone Pine 1979) 14...\textit{wc}7 15 \textit{wa}4+ \textit{xd}7 16 \textit{wd}7+ \textit{xc}7 17 \textit{de}e2 \textit{ec}4 18 f3 \textit{de}7! with compensation, Solo-

B) Shkin-Ionov, St Petersburg Ch 2000.

10...b4 11 \textit{da}2

This move was recommended by Aseev. 11 \textit{db}1 \textit{de}7 12 \textit{dd}2 0-0 13 0-0 \textit{dc}d7!? 14 f4 \textit{df}6 is satisfactory for Black, A.Sokolov-Aseev, USSR Ch (Odessa) 1989.

11...e5

After 11...d5 12 e5, Black must avoid 12...\textit{dd}7? 13 \textit{xe}6! ++, while after 12...\textit{de}4, White can continue 13 f3 \textit{wh}4+ 14 \textit{dd}1 \textit{gg}3 15 \textit{we}1 ±.

12 \textit{ff}5

The game Lutovinov-Steanov, corr. 1994, appeared to favour White after 12...d5 13 \textit{gg}5 \textit{bb}7 (13...\textit{xf}5 14 \textit{exf}5 \textit{dd}6 15 \textit{xa}6; 13...h6 14 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 15 \textit{ee}3) 14 \textit{dd}1 d4 15 c3. Certainly, Black has other ideas (e.g. 12...b3) which await investigation.

8...\textit{wc}7

This is the most popular continuation as Black keeps both 9...\textit{de}7 and 9...\textit{da}5 in reserve.

Other moves are less important:

a) 9 \textit{gg}1!? runs up against 9...b5! 10 \textit{xc}6 bxc4 11 \textit{xc}6 \textit{db}7 12 \textit{de}5 \textit{xc}4 13 \textit{xc}4 \textit{exe}4, Vujadinović-Le-

b) 9 \textit{bb}3 transposes to Line C31 of Chapter 8.

c) 9 a3 and 9 f4 are possible here though this version is clearly far from being optimal.

d) 9 a4!? has been played by Kuz-

For White, 9...b5? does not work because of 10 \textit{xe}6! \textit{xc}6 (or 10...bxc4 11 \textit{xc}4 \textit{bb}7 12
\( \mathcal{Q}e5 \mathcal{W}xc4 13 \mathcal{Q}xc4 \), attacking the d6-pawn) 11 \( \mathcal{Q}xb5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}a7 \) ±.

b) 9...\( \mathcal{Q}d7 \)?! 10 \( \mathcal{Q}b3 \) transposes to note ‘d’ to Black’s 9th move in Line C31 of Chapter 8.

c) The main continuation here is still 9...\( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) – see Line C.

10 \( \mathcal{Q}d3! \)

White should always try to avoid the position after 10 \( \mathcal{Q}b3 \)?? b5!, where Black has gained the initiative:

a) 11 f3. Now Black often plays 11...\( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 12 g4 0-0 with a doubled-edged position, but at least no weaker is 11...\( \mathcal{Q}d7 \)?! 12 \( \mathcal{Q}xe6 \) (12 g4 \( \mathcal{W}b8 \) 13 g5 \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \) favours Black, Golubev-V. Neverov, Kharkov 1984) 12...\( \mathcal{Q}xe6 \) 13\( \mathcal{Q}xe6 \),\( \mathcal{W}e4 \) 14\( \mathcal{W}xc4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xc4 \), as in the game Gormally-S. Pedersen, Hampstead 1998.

b) 11 g4 b4!?? (11...\( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) transposes to Line B1 of Chapter 10; 11...\( \mathcal{Q}xb3 \) leads, as a rule, to various transpositions; 11...\( \mathcal{Q}b7 \)?! 12 f3 \( \mathcal{W}c8 \) 13 g5 \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 14 h4 is double-edged, Golubev-Borodach, Odessa Ch (1984), and then:

b1) 12 g5 and now:

b11) 12...bxc3!? is interesting: 13 gxf6 cxb2+ 14 \( \mathcal{Q}xb2 \),\( \mathcal{W}b8 \) (14...gxf6!?)

Akopian) 15 \( \mathcal{Q}c1 \),\( \mathcal{G}xf6 \) 16 \( \mathcal{Q}a1 \) with compensation, Parligas-Raceanu, Romania 1999.

b12) 12...\( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) transposes to note ‘e3’ to White’s 12th move in Line C31 of Chapter 8, which is fully satisfactory for Black.

b2) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}a4 \)!?? \( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) (12...\( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \)?) 13 axb3 \( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) (the less consistent move 13...\( \mathcal{Q}b7 \) is answered by 14 f3 =) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) (scarcely better is 14 f4 \( \mathcal{Q}b7 \) 15 f5 e5!, Eames-Hennigan, British League (4NCL) 2000/1) with a complicated position in which Black’s chances are no worse:

b21) 14...\( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}h1 \) e5 (15...g6!? 16 \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) Polugaevsky) 16 g5 \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \),\( \mathcal{B}b8 \) 18 f4 19 g6 \( \mathcal{W}c4 \),\( \mathcal{W}xc4 \) 20 bxc4 \( \mathcal{Q}b7 \) 21 fxe5 dxe5 22 c5 \( \mathcal{R}c8 \) 23 \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) and after 23...\( \mathcal{Q}g7 \) 24 \( \mathcal{Q}b6 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xb6 \) 25 \( \mathcal{Q}xe5 \) (I. Zaitsev & Zlotnik – Polugaevsky & Gukol, Moscow 1968) 25...\( \mathcal{Q}xe5 \) 26 \( \mathcal{W}xe5+ \),\( \mathcal{Q}f8 \) 27 cxb6 h6 or 23...\( \mathcal{Q}xc5 \)!? Black holds on.

b22) 14...\( \mathcal{Q}c5 \)?! 15 \( \mathcal{Q}f5 \) (15 \( \mathcal{W}h1 \) I. Zaitsev) 15...e5, Cherkasov-Lysenko, Krasnodar 1983.

b23) 14...\( \mathcal{Q}b7 \)?! 15 f3 and now 15...e5! was given by Schach-Archiv, while Zaitsev recommended 15...\( \mathcal{Q}d6 \), not fearing 16 \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \)!? or 16 \( \mathcal{Q}b6 \)!?

10...b5! (D)

10...\( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 11 g4! (11 \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \) b5! – 10...b5! 11 \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e7 \)!) and then:

a) 11...\( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) can be met by 12 f4 b5 13 g5!? – 11...b5! 12 \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 13 f4!?.

b) 11...b5 12 g5 \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 13 f4!? (13 \( \mathcal{Q}f5 \)!?\( \mathcal{B}b5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}d5 \),\( \mathcal{W}d8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{Q}d4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}b7 \); 13 h4!?) 13...\( \mathcal{B}b4 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}b1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}x d3 + \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}xd3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}Kuprichik-G. Kuz-\mbox{min}, Moscow 1972.

c) 11...0-0 12 g5 \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 13 f4 \( \mathcal{Q}e8 \) 14 h4 b5. Black is in danger following
the immediate 15 e5, when instead of 15...\textit{c}c5 16 \textit{x}xh7+! \textit{x}xh7 17 \textit{f}f5 exf5 18 \textit{d}d5 \textit{c}6 (Brinck-Claussen - Sher, Copenhagen 1993) 19 \textit{x}xc5! \pm, it is better to play 15...dxe5 16 \textit{xc}e6 fxe6, with the point 17 \textit{h}h5 \textit{f}f8.

This position is hard to assess and is interesting for both sides. With the bishop on d3, the strategic pattern looks, in many ways, like the Scheveningen Variation. Black may consider that he is playing a Scheveningen with the extra tempo ...\textit{a}a5, but in reality the knight being on a5 can prove either an advantage or a problem for Black.

11 a3

The main move. Others:

a) 11 \textit{b}3 b4 12 \textit{b}1 with approximate equality.

b) 11 f4 b4!? (or 11...\textit{b}7: 12 a3 - 11 a3 \textit{b}7 12 f4; 12 \textit{f}2 is scarcely stronger) 12 \textit{b}1 (12 \textit{a}4?! \textit{d}7 13 b3 \textit{xa}4 14 \textit{bxa}4 \textit{e}7) 12...e5! with good counterplay, Ljubojević-Musil, Yugoslavia 1975.

c) 11 \textit{g}5 \textit{c}7! (11...b4 is risky in view of 12 \textit{d}5 exd5 13 exd5; e.g., 13...\textit{e}7 14 \textit{xf}6 gxf6 15 \textit{he}1 \textit{a}7 16 \textit{h}5 \textit{c}5, Milu-Nevednichy, Bucharest 1994, 17 \textit{f}5! \textit{c}7 18 \textit{e}2 Stoica) 12 a3 (12 f4?! b4 13 \textit{b}1 e5! 14 \textit{R}antanan-Reshovsky, Nice OL 1974; 12 \textit{he}1 b4 13 \textit{b}1 e5! 14 b3 \textit{xb}3+ 15 \textit{xb}3, A.Sokolov-Popović, Novi Sad 1984, and now 15...\textit{xe}4 16 \textit{xe}7 \textit{c}5! is enticing) and here:

c1) Possibly it is satisfactory for Black to continue with 12...\textit{d}7 13 f4 \textit{c}4 (13...\textit{e}8!?) 14 \textit{hf}1 (14 \textit{e}1 0-0 15 \textit{xc}4 \textit{xc}4 16 e5 dxe5 17 fxe5 \textit{d}5 18 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 Rublevsky) 14...\textit{e}8 (14...\textit{xa}3 15 e5!; 14...0-0!?) 15 \textit{xc}4 \textit{xc}4 16 \textit{e}1 0-0, Rublevsky-Salov, Oviedo rpd 1992.

c2) 12...\textit{b}7, with the point 13 f4 0-0, also looks playable, as after 13 \textit{xf}6 Black can play 13...\textit{xf}6 14 \textit{xb}5+ \textit{xb}5 15 \textit{xd}b5 \textit{c}5!.

c3) 12...\textit{b}8 13 f4 (13 \textit{e}1 h6! 14 \textit{h}4 g5 15 \textit{g}3 e5 16 \textit{f}5 \textit{xf}5 17 exf5 b4 18 \textit{xb}4 \textit{xb}4 19 h4 g4 20 \textit{e}3 0-0!! gives Black an advantage, Dimitrov-Zviagintsev, Barbera 1996) 13...b4 14 \textit{xb}4 \textit{xb}4 with adequate counterplay, Ehlvest-Lerner, Tallinn 1986.

d) 11 g4 is the most interesting alternative:

d1) 11...\textit{b}7 can be met by 12 g5 \textit{d}7 13 f4 \pm (NCO) or 12 a3 - 11 a3 \textit{b}7 12 g4!.

d2) 11...\textit{e}7 - 10...\textit{e}7 11 g4! b5.

d3) After 11...\textit{d}7?! there is 12 \textit{f}5, Kauppila-Kononen, Oulu 2000.

d4) 11...b4 and then:

d41) 12 g5?! and now:

d411) 12...\textit{d}7 13 \textit{b}1 \textit{c}5 14 \textit{d}2 \textit{b}7 15 f4 d5 16 e5 \textit{xd}3+ 17 \textit{xd}3 \textit{c}4 (17...g6!? Akopian) 18 f5! is much better for White, Ghidavu-Ungureanu, Romania 1971.

d412) 12...bxc3! is critical.

d42) 12 \textit{b}1 and then:
5...\(\textsf{c}6\) 6 \(\textsf{d}c4\) e6 7 \(\textsf{e}3\) a6 WITHOUT \(\textsf{b}b3\)

\(\textsf{d}421\) After 12...\(\textsf{c}b7\) 13 \(\textsf{d}d2\) d5 (or 13...\(\textsf{e}e7\) 14 g5 \(\textsf{d}d7\) 15 f4!) 14 \(\textsf{g}5?\) \(\textsf{x}e4\) 15 \(\textsf{d}xe4\) dxe4 16 \(\textsf{x}e4\) \(\textsf{e}7\) (not 16...\(\textsf{w}e5\)? 17 \(\textsf{d}xe6!\) +-) 17 \(\textsf{x}e7\) Black still has some problems, Bokan-Lysenko, Sverdlowsk 1989.

\(\textsf{d}422\) 12...e5! 13 \(\textsf{f}f5\), and Black stands no worse after 13...g6 14 \(\textsf{g}5\) \(\textsf{d}d7\) (14...\(\textsf{d}xg4?!\) 15 \(\textsf{e}e3\) \(\textsf{b}7\)!, Girkryan-Madl, Moscow wom OL 1994, or after 13...\(\textsf{e}e6\) 14 b3 g6 15 g5 \(\textsf{d}d7\) 16 \(\textsf{h}h6\) \(\textsf{g}7\) 17 h4 \(\textsf{c}c5\), Nunn-Salov, Wijk aan Zee 1992.

\(\textsf{d}43\) 12 \(\textsf{c}c4\) might lead to serious complications:

\(\textsf{d}431\) 12...\(\textsf{d}d7\) 13 g5! \(\textsf{x}a4\) 14 gxf6 gxf6, and White may choose between 15 \(\textsf{b}b1!\) (Vasiesiu-Tomescu, Bucharest 1998), 15 \(\textsf{b}b6\) (\(\pm\) NCO) and 15 \(\textsf{x}a3\) (Lerner).

\(\textsf{d}432\) 12...\(\textsf{c}c6\)! 13 \(\textsf{d}d7!\) (13...\(\textsf{c}c4\)! or 13...\(\textsf{d}d7!\) 13...\(\textsf{c}c4\)! 14 \(\textsf{d}d7!\) 14...\(\textsf{c}c6\) 15 b3! \(\textsf{x}b3+\) 16 axb3 \(\textsf{e}7\) 15 b3 \(\textsf{c}c6\) 15...\(\textsf{c}c6\) 16 \(\textsf{d}d7\) \(\textsf{c}c6\) 17 \(\textsf{c}c5\) \(\textsf{d}xa4\) 18 \(\textsf{x}a4\) \(\textsf{d}xa4\) 19 \(\textsf{b}b6\) \(\textsf{x}a2\) and now 20 \(\textsf{d}d8\) h5! or 20 \(\textsf{d}d4!\) b3! 16 \(\textsf{b}b6\) \(\textsf{d}d7\) 17 \(\textsf{d}d7\) \(\textsf{c}c4\) and White gets a dangerous attack for the piece, Zaichik-Kovaliov, Borzhami 1984.

\(\textsf{d}433\) A calm and satisfactory line for Black is 12...\(\textsf{d}d7!\) 13 \(\textsf{b}b3\) (13 b3 \(\textsf{b}b7\)?) 13...\(\textsf{x}b3+\) 14 axb3 \(\textsf{b}b7\), Stellwagon-Dgebuadze, Wijk aan Zee 2000.

We now return to 11 a3 (D):

\(\textsf{b}1\) 12 \(\textsf{g}5\) \(\textsf{e}7\) – 11 \(\textsf{g}5\) \(\textsf{e}7!\)

\(\textsf{b}2\) 12 \(\textsf{h}e1\) \(\textsf{c}4?!\) 13 \(\textsf{g}5\) \(\textsf{e}7\) 14 f4 0-0 15 e5 dxe5 16 fxe5 \(\textsf{d}d5\) 17 \(\textsf{e}e7\) \(\textsf{c}xe7\) with an acceptable position, Kaidanov-Ubilava, Kuibyshev 1986.

\(\textsf{b}3\) 12 g4 and here:

\(\textsf{b}31\) 12...\(\textsf{e}7\) – 11...\(\textsf{e}7\) 12 g4!

\(\textsf{b}32\) 12...\(\textsf{c}c4\) 13 \(\textsf{xc}4\) (13 \(\textsf{g}5\) \(\textsf{d}d7\) 14 \(\textsf{h}e1?!\) ) 13...\(\textsf{bxc}4\) 14 g5 \(\textsf{d}d7\) 15 f4, and now playable is 15...\(\textsf{e}7\) or maybe 15...\(\textsf{b}7\) 16 \(\textsf{w}c4\) \(\textsf{w}xh2+\) 17 \(\textsf{d}d2\) d5! 18 exd5 \(\textsf{d}b6\).

\(\textsf{b}33\) Quite interesting for Black is 12...\(\textsf{d}d7?!\) 13 f4 \(\textsf{b}6\) 14 f5 \(\textsf{b}c4\) 15 g5 b4 16 axb4 \(\textsf{b}b4\), Forster-Madl, Portorož 1998.

\(\textsf{b}4\) The almost untested 12 f4! is probably the best response for White.

\(\textsf{c}1\) 11...\(\textsf{e}7\) 12 g4! (12 f4 \(\textsf{b}7\) – 11...\(\textsf{b}7\) 12 f4 \(\textsf{e}7\); 12 \(\textsf{g}5\) – 11 \(\textsf{g}5\) \(\textsf{c}7\) 12 a3) and then:

\(\textsf{c}11\) 12...\(\textsf{b}8\) 13 \(\textsf{h}e1\)! ? \(\textsf{c}4\) (if 13...\(\textsf{d}d7\) then 14 \(\textsf{f}5!\) Nunn) 14 g5 \(\textsf{c}3\) (14...\(\textsf{d}d7\) 15 \(\textsf{f}5\) exf5 16 \(\textsf{d}d5\) \(\textsf{e}8\) 17 exf5 0-0 18 \(\textsf{h}5\) \(\pm\) Nunn-Pritchett, Bundesliga 1985/6) 15 \(\textsf{x}e3\) \(\textsf{g}4\) 16 \(\textsf{g}3\) \(\textsf{x}g5\) + 17 f4 e5 18 \(\textsf{d}d5\) \(\pm\) (Akopian).
10 Hhg1

Otherwise:

a) 10 Hb3 transposes to Line B of Chapter 10. Other alternatives are less significant:

b) 10 g4 De5! 11 Hb3 Dxg4 12 Hhg1 Dxg3 13 Wxe3 g6 14 f4 Hd7 15 f5 e5 16 De3 Hf8 17 fxg6 (17 Dh5??) 17...fxg6 18 Db1 0-0-0 D Velimirović-Cebalo, Kavala 1985.

c) 10 f4 0-0 (10...Da5!?) 11 f5 (11 Hb3 transposes to note ‘b’ to White’s 11th move in Line B2 of Chapter 10) 11...Dxd4 (11...Da5!? =) 12 Hxd4 exf5 13 Hhf1 We6 = Kaidanov-Ermlinsky, Kuibyshev 1986.

10...Da5!

White’s main hope is that Black plays 10...0-0, transposing to Line D1 (where 11 g4! is attractive for White).

However, I am not quite sure that 10...b5!? is any weaker than the text-move: 11 Hxc6 Wxc6 12 Hxb5, and, in addition to 12...Dxe4 13 Da7 Wb7 14 Hxc8 Wxc8 (Alburt-Vaiser, Kiev 1970), 12...0-0 and 12...Hd7 are also interesting.

11 Hxd3

11 Hb3?! b5 12 g4 Hxb3+ 13 axb3 b4 14 Da4 Hxe4.

11...b5!

As compared to Line C, here ...De7 and Hhg1 are included, and this circumstance does not allow White to count on any real advantage. For instance:

12 g4

12 a3 Hb8 (12...e5 13 Df5 Hxf5 14 exf5 d5 15 Hg5 0-0-0??, Zvonitsky-Kulinsky, Kharkov 1984) 13 g4 Dc4!?

14 Hxc4 bxc4 15 g5 Hd7 16 f4 Wb7 17 Wxc4 (Kholmov-Zurakhov, USSR Ch (Kharkov) 1967) 17...Wxb2+ 18 Hd2 d5!.

12...b4

Well grounded are 12...Hb7 and, particularly, 12...Hd7!? as 13 Df5 exf5 14 Dd5 Db8 15 gxf5 Hf6 (Sveshnikov-Popović, Novi Sad 1979), looks suspicious, and otherwise White is not getting much use out of the g1-rook.

13 Hb1

Or 13 Ha4 Hd7! (but not 13...Hd7? 14 Hb6!, Sax-Bellin, Teesside 1972).

13...Hb7

Less consistent here is 13...Hd7 14 Hd2 Hc5 15 Hb1.

14 Hd2 d5 15 f3 Dxe4 16 fxe4 Hd7

Black stands no worse, Shvidenko-Kurass, Kiev 1970.

D)

8...De7 9 0-0-0 0-0 10 Hhg1

10 f4 is no better here than in Line C.

10 g4 is possible, and then:

a) 10...Dxd4 11 Hxd4 b5 12 Hb3 transposes to note ‘d1’ to Black’s 10th move in Line A of Chapter 10, which is satisfactory for Black.

b) 10...De5 is even more important. It has the point 11 g5 Dfg4! D.

Now:

D1: 10...Wc7 198

D2: 10...Dxd4! 198
D1)
10...\(\mathbb{W}c7\) 11 g4!
An attack that saves the tempo \(\mathbb{B}b3\) may readily become killing here.
11...\(\mathbb{Q}xe4!?\)
Or:
  a) 11...\(\mathbb{Q}d7\) 12 g5 \(\mathbb{Q}c5\) 13 \(\mathbb{W}h5\) g6 14 \(\mathbb{W}h6\) \(\mathbb{E}e8\) 15 \(\mathbb{G}g3\) \(\mathbb{f}f8\) 16 \(\mathbb{W}h4\) b5?!
  17 \(\mathbb{A}d5!\) \(\mathbb{A}b7\) 18 \(\mathbb{Q}xc6\) \(\mathbb{A}xc6\) 19 \(\mathbb{A}d4\) \(\mathbb{A}d8\) -- Krivov-Upart, Minsk 1977. This is how the early \(\mathbb{A}hg1\) works against stereotype play by Black!
  b) After 11...\(\mathbb{Q}a5\), 12 \(\mathbb{A}b3\) transposes to Line B221 of Chapter 10, which appears promising for White.
  12...\(\mathbb{Q}d3!?\) is also of interest.
  c) 11...\(b5\) 12 g5! (12 \(\mathbb{A}b3\) transposes to Line B222 of Chapter 10) and then:
    c1) 12...\(\mathbb{Q}d7\) 13 \(\mathbb{Q}d5\)! ±.
    c2) 12...\(\mathbb{B}xc4\) 13 \(\mathbb{G}xf6\) \(\mathbb{G}xf6\) 14 \(\mathbb{W}xc4\) (14 \(\mathbb{Q}xc6\) \(\mathbb{W}xc6\) 15 \(\mathbb{Q}d4\) \(\mathbb{Q}xd4\)!
      16 \(\mathbb{Q}xd4\) \(\mathbb{B}b8\) is unclear) 14...\(\mathbb{Q}b7\)
      (14...\(\mathbb{Q}d7\) is equivalent) and now:
      c21) 15 \(\mathbb{Q}f5\) \(\mathbb{E}xf5\) 16 \(\mathbb{Q}d5\) \(\mathbb{W}d8\) 17 \(\mathbb{A}b6\) \(\mathbb{B}xb2\)!
      18 \(\mathbb{Q}xb2\) \(\mathbb{W}h4\) promises little for White, Mariasin-Zborovsky, corr. 1971-2.
      c22) Black can probably hold on after 15 \(\mathbb{Q}xc6\) \(\mathbb{A}xc6\)! (e.g. 16 \(\mathbb{Q}d4\) \(\mathbb{A}e5\) Veličković) as well.
    c3) 15 \(\mathbb{Q}d5\) is interesting; for example, 15...\(\mathbb{Q}xd5\) 16 \(\mathbb{Q}x5\) \(\mathbb{A}e8\) 17 \(\mathbb{Q}xc6\) \(\mathbb{Q}xc6\) 18 \(\mathbb{Q}f5\) d5 19 \(\mathbb{Q}xg7+!?\) \(\mathbb{Q}xg7\)
      20 \(\mathbb{W}g4\) f6 21 \(\mathbb{G}g1\) \(\mathbb{G}h8\) 22 \(\mathbb{W}xg7+\)
      \(\mathbb{W}xg7\) 23 \(\mathbb{A}xg7\) d4?!! 24 \(\mathbb{G}h6\) ±.
  13 \(\mathbb{A}d4\) \(\mathbb{A}xd4\) 14 \(\mathbb{Q}d7\) and then:
  c31) 14 \(\mathbb{Q}d5\) \(\mathbb{Q}xd5\) (14...\(\mathbb{W}d8!?\) is another idea) 15 \(\mathbb{A}xd5\) \(\mathbb{B}b7\) 16 g6 \(\mathbb{A}f6\) 17 \(\mathbb{A}h5\) (Mir.Pavlov-Barbulescu, Romanian Ch 1985) 17...\(\mathbb{A}fc8\)
      deserves detailed analysis.
  c32) 14 g6 \(\mathbb{A}xg6\) 15 \(\mathbb{A}xg6\) \(\mathbb{A}xg6\) 16 \(\mathbb{A}xe6+\) (Shadrina-Prudnikova, Russian wom Ch (Elista) 1995) 16...\(\mathbb{Q}h7\)!
      is also very interesting.
  c33) 14 \(\mathbb{A}b3\) transposes to the note to Black’s 12th move in Line B23 of Chapter 10, where White has a dangerous initiative.
  c) 11...\(\mathbb{Q}d4\) 12 \(\mathbb{A}xd4\) b5 and now: 13 g5 -- 11...\(b5\) 12 g5! \(\mathbb{Q}xd4\) 13 \(\mathbb{A}d4\);
  13 \(\mathbb{A}b3\) \(\mathbb{Q}d7\) again transposes to the note to Black’s 12th move in Line B23 of Chapter 10; 13 \(\mathbb{A}d3!!\) is possible.
 12 \(\mathbb{Q}xe4\) \(d5\)
Now Black can scarcely get full equality after 13 \(\mathbb{A}d3\) \(\mathbb{Q}xe4\) 14 \(\mathbb{A}xe4\) e5 15 \(\mathbb{Q}f5\) \(\mathbb{A}e6\) 16 \(\mathbb{W}f3\) (not 16 \(\mathbb{Q}xg7?\)
      \(\mathbb{A}xg7\) 17 g5 \(\mathbb{A}h8!\), Sax-Ermenkov, Vraca Z 1975) 16...\(\mathbb{A}fd8\) or after 13
  \(\mathbb{A}xd5!?\) \(\mathbb{Q}xd5\) 14 \(\mathbb{Q}c3\).

D2)
10...\(\mathbb{Q}xd4!\)
It is difficult to recommend either 10...\(\mathbb{Q}d7\) 11 g4!, or 10...\(\mathbb{A}e8\) 11 g4!
\(\mathbb{Q}d7\) (or 11...\(b5\) 12 g5) 12 g5 \(\mathbb{Q}c5\) 13 \(\mathbb{W}h5!\), Aleksandrov-Hausner, Mlada
Boleslav 1974.

Little studied is 10...\(\mathbb{Q}d7!?\) with the point 11 g4 \(\mathbb{B}b5\) 12 \(\mathbb{A}b3\) \(b4!\), I.Zaitsev-
11 \(\mathbb{A}xd4\) \(b5!\)
Now:
  a) 12 \(\mathbb{A}b3\) transposes to the note to White’s 10th move in Line A of Chapter 10, which is satisfactory for Black.
  b) No better for White is 12 e5 \(\mathbb{Q}xe5\) 13 \(\mathbb{A}xe5\) \(\mathbb{A}a5!\) 14 \(\mathbb{A}b3\) \(\mathbb{B}b7\), I.Zaitsev-
Grishchuk, St Petersburg 1999.

**Conclusion:** by responding correctly to 10 \(\mathbb{A}hg1\), Black solves his problems. Nevertheless, when played against an unprepared opponent, this idea can have an impressive effect.
12 5...\textit{c}6 6 \textit{c}4 e6 7 0-0 a6 \\ without \textit{b}3

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
1 & e4 & c5 & 2 & f3 & d6 & 3 & d4 \\
& & & & & cxd4 & 4 & xd4 \\
& & & & & f6 & 5 & c3 \\
& & & & & c6 & 6 & c4 e6 7 0-0 a6 (D)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
A: 8 a3 \\
B: 8 a4
\end{center}

Although the difference in the character of the struggle after a3 or a4 is quite evident, these atypical Sozin lines still have much in common. In either case White provides for a sustainable future of the c4-bishop, thereby considerably reducing his strategic risk. Black’s risk is also reduced as White loses an important tempo for preparing his assault. Comparatively slow plans with an early advance of the a-pawn have not attracted wide attention as yet, but one can hardly miss the growing interest in, primarily, the concept with a4 that was first adopted by Kuzmin and V. Gurevich, and then by Emms.

It is worth noting that the lines described in this chapter may arise out of various lines:

\begin{itemize}
\item 5...e6 6 \textit{c}4 \textit{e}7 7 a3!? \textit{c}6 and ...
\item 5...a6 6 \textit{c}4 e6 7 a3 (7 a4) 7...
\item 5...a6 6 \textit{c}4 e6 7 0-0 \textit{e}7 8 a3 (8 a4) 8...
\item 5...c6 6 \textit{c}4 e6 7 \textit{e}3 a6 8 a3 (8 a4);
\item 5...c6 6 \textit{c}4 e6 7 \textit{e}3 a6 8 \textit{e}2 \\
\textit{c}7 9 a4 \textit{e}7 10 0-0; \\
\item 5...c6 6 \textit{c}4 e6 7 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}7 8 0-0 \\
0-0 9 \textit{h}1 (9 a3 a6) 9...a6 10 a4.
\end{itemize}
Moreover, it should be added that the position in the previous diagram may also arise from the Fischer Attack move-order: 5...a6 6 c4 e6 7 0-0 c6.

We might say that the position in the diagram makes a convenient starting point for us to discuss the entire range of positions with 0-0, a3 (a4) for White and ...a6, ...c6 for Black. Let us advance from that starting point onwards.

A)
8 a3 e7 9 a2 0-0 (D)

As a rule, White makes a choice between two options here:
A1: 10 h1 200
A2: 10 e3 201

10 f4 is also possible on the basis of 10...b6?! (10...d5?!?) 11 e3 xb2 12 d3 ±.

A1)
10 h1 c7
This is a convenient but possibly not ideal method of development under the circumstances.

a) 10...b6?! 11 e3!, Teschner-Smyslov, Dortmund 1961.

b) 10...xd4!! 11 xd4 b5 12 f4 (12 g5!? is another idea) 12...b7 13 f5 e5 14 d3, and both the following lines are double-edged: 14..c8 15 g5 xc3, Stanec-Lerner, Vienna 1994, and 14...h6 15 d2 a5 16 xb5 a6 17 c6 xf1 18 xf1, Dvoirys-Cifuentes, Hoogeveen 2000.

c) 10...d7?! 11 f4. Now, besides 11..c8!? and 11...b5 12 f5 (12 e3 c8 – 10 e3 d7 11 f4 c8 12 h1 b5), Black has 11...c8! with the point 12 f5?! xd4 13 xd4 exf5 14 exf5 c5! ± Darga-Marthaler, Graz 1961. White should instead respond with 12 e3 – 10 e3 d7 11 f4 c8 12 h1.

A peculiar way to provoke ...c7 was introduced by Saltaev against Torre: 8 h1!! c7 9 a3 e7 10 a2.

11 f4 d7
11...b5 12 f5 xd4 13 xd4 exf5 (13...e5?! 14 d3 b6 15 d5! xd5 16 xd5 b7 17 xb7 xd7 18 f6! + Saltaev; 13...e8?! 14 exf5 b7 15 g5 h6! 16 h4 c6 with good chances for equalizing, Puc-Nedeljko-
vić, Yugoslav Ch (Sombor) 1957.

12 f5
12 f3?! (in variations with the bishop on b3, this idea as a rule works badly, because of ...a5) and now 12..c8 13 e1 a5 14 e3 h5 15 d1 ± Saltaev-Torre, Erevan OL 1996 or 12...b5 13 e1 b4 14 xb4 xb4 15 b3 a5 16 xd4 b7 17 e5 ± Saltaev-Yudasin, St Petersburg 1997.

12 xd4 13 xd4

Now instead of 13...g4 14 f4! ± or 13...e5 14 d3 c6? 15 g5, Black should look for equality in variations of the type 13 ac8 14 g5 h6 15 h4 exf5 16 xf5 c6 17 aei c8! and 13...h8 14 g5 h6 15 h4 exf5
16 exf5 6 c6 17 c4 e6 7 0-0 a6 WITHOUT b3

Bronstein-Najdorf, Argentina-USSR 1954.

b2) 11 f4 c8 12 h1 (scarcely stronger is 12 c6 bxc6 13 c4 b8, del Rio-Bruzun, Linares open 2001, but 12 f3 seems logical) 12...b5 13 f3 c4 e5 14 xdx4 a5 15 b3 c6 16 c4 b4 17 axb4 axb4 18 b1 with chances for both sides, Saltaev-Ermolinsky, Tashkent 1987.

11 e2

If 11 f4, then instead of 11...d7 12 f5 (12 f3!?) 12...c4 13 cxd4 and 11...c4 12 cxd4 e5 13 e3 exf4 14 ff4 c6, which do not resolve all Black’s problems, it seems better to play 11...b5!? 12 f5 (12 f3 b7 13 f5 c4 14 cxd4! 14 cxd4 e5) 12...c4 13 cxd4, and, after comparing the position with the similar line where the bishop is on b3, it is difficult to explain why altering the bishop’s position by one square improves White’s chances.

11...b5

11...d7 12 f4 b5 13 f5 ± Osnos-Udovčić, Leningrad 1967.

Now (after 11...b5) Saltaev has twice gained some advantage against the world chess grandees:

a) 12 h1 b7 13 f3 f8!? (this move is appropriate in the Sozin only when White threatens f5 and b3 with mate on h7) 14 c4 c6 c6 16 c4 16 d7 (Saltaev-Shirov, Erevan OL 1996) 17 f4! c5 18 b1 (Saltaev).

b) 12 c4 a5 14 c1 b4 (weakening himself rather than his opponent) 15 axb4 cxb4 16 c1, Saltaev-Topalov, Erevan OL 1996.

Playing against those rated 2750, one has nothing to lose, but the plan with f3 seems quite harmless.
White’s strategic task is to create pressure against Black’s position, proceeding step by step while preserving a territorial advantage. To achieve this, he has to be ready to meet ...d5.

8...\textit{a}e7

Or:

a) 8...\textit{c}c7 9 \textit{\textit{a}}2 (9 \textit{\textit{e}}3 \textit{\textit{e}}5!??) 9...\textit{e}7 10 \textit{\textit{e}}3 – 8...\textit{e}7 9 \textit{\textit{e}}3 \textit{\textit{c}}c7 10 \textit{\textit{a}}2.

b) 8...\textit{b}6 is akin to the Benko Variation (i.e. Line B of Chapter 14):

b1) 9 \textit{\textit{e}}3 \textit{\textit{xb}}2 is not correct for White here.

b2) 9 \textit{\textit{b}}3! transposes to the note to Black’s 8th move in Line B52 of Chapter 14, which is a little better for White.

9 \textit{\textit{e}}3

Or:

a) 9 \textit{\textit{h}}1 0-0 (9...\textit{\textit{b}}6!?), and if 10 \textit{f}4?!?, then 10...\textit{d}5! with good play.

b) 9 \textit{\textit{a}}2 0-0 10 \textit{\textit{h}}1 and now:

b1) 10...\textit{c}7 11 \textit{f}4 \textit{\textit{xd}}4 12 \textit{\textit{xd}}4 \textit{\textit{d}}7 (Saltai\textae-Savan, Alushta 1992) 13 \textit{f}5!? \textit{\textit{f}}6 14 \textit{\textit{f}}2.

b2) 10...\textit{\textit{b}}4 11 \textit{\textit{\textit{b}}3} \textit{d}5 12 \textit{e}5 \textit{\textit{d}}7 13 \textit{f}4 \textit{\textit{c}}5 14 \textit{\textit{e}}3 \textit{\textit{c}}7 15 \textit{\textit{d}}2 \textit{\textit{d}}7 (Savon-Poluliahkov, Volgograd 1994) 16 \textit{\textit{a}}e1! is slightly better for White – Beliavsky and Mikhailchishin.

b3) 10...\textit{b}6 11 \textit{\textit{de}}2 \textit{\textit{d}}8 (the alternative 11...\textit{\textit{d}}7 is less flexible) 12 \textit{\textit{e}}3 \textit{\textit{a}}5 13 \textit{\textit{d}}2 \textit{\textit{c}}7 is roughly equal, Saltaev-Dvoirys, Groningen 1992.

9...0-0 (D)

Alternatively:

a) 9...\textit{\textit{b}}4 10 \textit{\textit{b}}3 \textit{e}5 and now 11 \textit{\textit{de}}2 \textit{\textit{e}}6 12 \textit{\textit{g}}5 \textit{\textit{d}}7! turned out to be satisfactory for Black in Emms-Rowson, Port Erin 1999, but 11 \textit{\textit{f}}5!? is interesting; e.g., 11...\textit{\textit{x}}f5 12 exf5 \textit{\textit{d}}7 13 \textit{\textit{g}}5 \textit{\textit{xf}}5 14 \textit{\textit{f}}6.

b) 9...\textit{\textit{c}}7 is not very logical because it weakens the idea of ...\textit{d}5. However, it is difficult at this stage to say whether this factor brings actual benefits to White:

b1) 10 \textit{\textit{a}}2 0-0 11 \textit{f}4 \textit{\textit{d}}7 12 \textit{f}5 (12 \textit{\textit{e}}2!?) 12...\textit{e}5 13 \textit{\textit{xc}}6?! \textit{\textit{xc}}6 14 \textit{\textit{d}}3 \textit{b}5!, Lutikov-Suetin, Minsk 1952.

b2) 10 \textit{\textit{e}}2 (this position arises from the move-order 7 \textit{\textit{e}}3 \textit{a}6 8 \textit{\textit{e}}2 \textit{\textit{c}}7 9 \textit{\textit{a}}4 \textit{\textit{e}}7 10 0-0) 10...0-0 and then:

b21) 11 \textit{\textit{h}}1 – 9...0-0 10 \textit{\textit{h}}1 \textit{\textit{c}}7 11 \textit{\textit{e}}2.

b22) 11 \textit{f}4 \textit{\textit{xd}}4 (11...\textit{\textit{d}}7 12 \textit{f}5 \textit{\textit{ae}}8 13 \textit{\textit{b}}3 \pm; 11...\textit{e}5!?; 11...\textit{\textit{xe}}4!?) 12 \textit{\textit{xd}}4 \textit{e}5 13 \textit{\textit{e}}3 \textit{\textit{e}}6! 14 \textit{\textit{xe}}6 fxe6 and Black had extricated himself very cleverly in Conquest-Tukmakov, Irkliion 1992, as 15 \textit{f}5? \textit{d}5! 16 fxe6 \textit{d}4 17 \textit{\textit{xf}}6 \textit{\textit{xf}}6 18 \textit{\textit{d}}5 \textit{\textit{c}}6 favours him.

b23) 11 \textit{\textit{ad}}1 \textit{\textit{e}}5!? (11...\textit{\textit{d}}7!? 12 \textit{\textit{f}}4 \textit{\textit{xd}}4) 12 \textit{\textit{b}}3 \textit{\textit{eg}}4 13 \textit{\textit{c}}1 \textit{d}5, deserves attention, as in Rachela-Stefan, Slovakian Cht 1994/5.

10 \textit{\textit{h}}1
The main continuation. This preventive move is explained by the lines 10 f4?! d5! and 10 We2 d5! (10...Wc7 - 9...Wc7 10 We2 0-0) 11 Wfd1 (11 exd5 exd5 12 Wb3 Wc8 13 h3 Wc5 with strong counterplay, Emms-Anastasian, Batumi Echt 1999) 11...Wd6 12 exd5 exd5 13 Wxd5 Wxd5 14 Wxd5 Wxh2+ and 15...Wxd5 = Ivanović-Kasparov, Bugojno 1982.

After 10 Wb3, Black generates counterplay by way of 10...Wd7, and then ...Wc5!.

However, it makes sense to play 10 Wb2!?; e.g., 10...Wd7 (10...Wb4 11 Wb3) 11 f4 (11 Wd2 Wc8 12 f4 Wa5 with the curious repetition 13 Wb3 Wc7 14 Wd4 Wa5 occurred in Donchev-Ribli, Thessaloniki OL 1988) 11...Wd4 12 Wxd4 Wc6 13 Wd3.

10...Wd7

Other moves:

a) 10...Wxd4 11 Wxd4 e5 12 Wc3 Wc6 13 Wd3 Wc8 14 Wb3 ± V.Gurevich-Sher, Berlin 1993.

b) 10...d5 11 exd5 exd5, and White can fight for an advantage with 12 Wc2 as well as 12 Wb3 Wc8 13 h3 Wc6 14 Wf3 Wc5 15 We2 Wb4 16 Wxe6 fxe6 17 Wd2, Emms-Krush, Hastings 2000.

c) 10...We8 and now:

   c1) 11 Wd2 Wb4 (11...d5?!) 12 Wb3 e5 13 Wd2 Wc6 14 Wd5 Wbx5 15 exd5 Wf5 16 a5 ± Kudrin-Browne, USA Ch (Greenville) 1983.

   c2) 11 Wb3 (the plan with ...Wd7, ...Wc8, ...Wc5, ...Wb4 is already a bit late here) 11...Wd7 12 f4 Wc8 13 f5 (13 Wf3 Wa5 14 f5 Wxd4 15 Wf3 Wb4 16 Wad1 e5 17 Wc2 Wc5 18 Wc3 Wc7 19 Wc4 ± V.Gurevich-Felsberger, Bratislava ECC 1996) 13...Wxd4 14 Wxd4 e5 15 Wc3 Wc6? (not wholly clear is 15 Wxc3 16 bxc3 Wc6!) 16 Wd3 b5 17 axb5 axb5 18 Wg5 ± Emms-Fressinet, Istanbul OL 2000.

   d) 10...Wc7. This move is very often combined with a later ...Wd7 and a transposition to 10...Wd7, which we (very arbitrarily) have called the main line. Then:


   d2) 11 Wd2 Wd7 (11...Wb4 12 Wb3 b6 13 f4 Wb7 14 Wf3 Wad8 15 Wae1 ± G.Kuzmin-D.Gurevich, Moscow 1992; 11...b6 12 f4 Wb7 13 Wd1 Wxd4 14 Wxd4 e5 15 fxe5 dxe5 16 Wg3 Wd7 ± Galdunts-Nikolaev, St Petersburg 1992) 12 f4 – 10...Wd7 11 f4 Wc7 12 Wc2.

   d3) 11 Wd2 and now Black has tried various moves:

   d31) 11...Wxd4 12 Wxd4 e5 13 Wd3 Wd6 14 Wb3 h6 15 a5 ± Kudrin-King, Berne 1988.

   d32) 11...Wc5 12 Wb3 Wc4 13 f4! Wxe3 14 Wxe3 Wd5 15 Wd3?! Wd7 16 Wad1 Wad8 17 Wc2 ± G.Kuzmin-Ftačnik, Dortmund 1981.

   d33) 11...Wb4 12 Wb3 (12 f4 d5! 13 exd5 Wbx5) 12...e5 13 Wf3 h6 (13...Wg4 14 Wg5 is slightly better for White) 14 a5 Wg4 15 Wb6 Wc8 16
\[ \text{\texttt{\$a4 with an advantage for White, V.Gurevich-Istratescu, Wattens 1993.}} \]
\[ d34) \text{11...}\text{\texttt{\$e8 12 \texttt{\$b3 \texttt{\$c7 13 f4 \texttt{\$d5 14 \texttt{\$a2 \texttt{\$d6 15 \texttt{\$a1 \texttt{\$c4 16 \texttt{\$c1 \texttt{\$b6 17 \texttt{\$xc4 \texttt{\$xd4 18 \texttt{\$b3 \texttt{\$c6} \pm G.Kuzmin-Lerner, St Petersburg 1992.}}}}}}}}}}}} \]
\[ d35) \text{11...\texttt{\$a5} 12 \texttt{\$a2 b6 13 \texttt{\$ad1 \texttt{\$ad7 14 \texttt{\$c1 \texttt{\$d6 15 f4 \texttt{\$d5 16 dxe5 fxe5 17 fxe5 \texttt{\$d5 18 \texttt{\$xd5 \texttt{\$xd5 19 \texttt{\$f5 \texttt{\$xg2+ 20 \texttt{\$xg2 exf5 21 \texttt{\$xf5} \pm Emms-Sutovsky, Harplinge 1998.}}}}}}}}}} \]
\[ d36) \text{11...b6!? 12 f4 \texttt{\$b7 13 \texttt{\$d6 14 \texttt{\$xd5 exd5 15 \texttt{\$b3 \texttt{\$c5 with sufficient counterplay, V.Gurevich-Ionov, Uzhgorod 1988; 13 \texttt{\$ad1 \texttt{\$xd4 14 \texttt{\$xd4 \texttt{\$xe4 15 \texttt{\$xe4 \texttt{\$xe4 16 \texttt{\$xe6 d5!} 17...\texttt{\$b4 (18...\texttt{\$xe4!?; 13...\texttt{\$xd4!} 14 \texttt{\$xd4 \texttt{\$xe4) 15 \texttt{\$c1 \pm Emms-de Firmian, Bundesliga 2000/1.}}}}}}}}}}}} \]
\[ d37) \text{11...\texttt{\$ad8!? with the idea of \texttt{\$d5 was played by GM Browne in the USA in 1994.}}}
\[ d38) \text{11...\texttt{\$d7 12 f4 - 10...\texttt{\$d7 11 f4 \texttt{\$c7?!} 12 \texttt{\$e2.}}]
\[ 11 \texttt{\$f4}
\[ 11 \texttt{\$a2 \texttt{\$c8 12 f4 - 11 f4 \texttt{\$c8 12 \texttt{\$a2.}}]
\[ 11 \texttt{\$e2 \texttt{\$c8 (11...\texttt{\$c7 can be met by 12 \texttt{\$ad1!} or 12 f4 - 11 f4 \texttt{\$c7?!} 12 \texttt{\$e2) and then:}}]
\[ a) \text{12 f4 - 11 f4 \texttt{\$c8 12 \texttt{\$e2.}}]
\[ b) \text{12 \texttt{\$a3 \texttt{\$a5!}.}}]
\[ c) \text{12 \texttt{\$d3 \texttt{\$xd4 13 \texttt{\$xd4 e5 (another idea is 13...\texttt{\$a5!?) 14 \texttt{\$e3 \texttt{\$e6 15 f4 exf4 16 \texttt{\$xf4 \texttt{\$a5 = Nijboer-Dorfman, Hilversum ECC 1993.}}}}}}}}}
\[ d) \text{12 \texttt{\$ad1 \texttt{\$c7 13 \texttt{\$b3 (13 \texttt{\$a2 \texttt{\$xd4!} 14 \texttt{\$xd4 \texttt{\$a5 15 \texttt{\$b3 e5 16 \texttt{\$e3 h6, Kudrin-de Firmian, USA Ch (Long Beach) 1989) 13...\texttt{\$a5 (why not 13...\texttt{\$a5 here?) 14 f4 \texttt{\$xd4 15 \texttt{\$xd4 (15 \texttt{\$xd4!? e5 16 fxe5 dxe5 17 \texttt{\$d5) 15...\texttt{\$c6 16 \texttt{\$d2 \texttt{\$h5 17 \texttt{\$wh5 \texttt{\$xh5 18 f5 with some advantage, Emms-Lutz, Istanbul OL 2000.}}}}}}}}}}}}}}
\[ 11...\texttt{\$e8 (D)}
\[ Or:
\[ a) \text{11...\texttt{\$xe4 12 \texttt{\$xe4 d5 and now:}}]
\[ a1) \text{13 f5 and here Black should avoid 13...\texttt{\$xf5 14 \texttt{\$xd5 fxe4 15 \texttt{\$wh5 \texttt{\$f6 16 \texttt{\$xc6 \texttt{\$xc6 17 \texttt{\$xc6 bxc6 18 \texttt{\$ad1 \texttt{\$we8 19 \texttt{\$xf6 gxf6 (G.Kuzmin-Ree, Bangalore 1981) 20 \texttt{\$g4+ \texttt{\$h8 21 \texttt{\$d4 ++. Instead, 13...\texttt{\$xc4!? 14 f6 gxf6 does not appear bad for Black.}}}}}}}}}}}
\[ a2) \text{Better is 13 \texttt{\$xd5 exd5 14 \texttt{\$c3 \texttt{\$xd4 15 \texttt{\$xd4 \texttt{\$f5 16 \texttt{\$f3 ± Galduzts-Zilbershtein, Moscow 1991.}}}}}}}
\[ b) \text{11...\texttt{\$c7!? is no worse than the text-move:}}]
\[ b1) \text{12 \texttt{\$e2 and then:}}]
\[ b11) \text{12...\texttt{\$xe4 13 \texttt{\$xe4 d5 14 \texttt{\$d3 dxe4 15 \texttt{\$xe4 \texttt{\$f6 16 \texttt{\$ad1} \pm V.Gurevich-Fehrer, Eger 1989.}}}}}
\[ b12) \text{12...\texttt{\$fc8 13 \texttt{\$d3!} \pm V.Gurevich-Palatnik, Kherson 1991.}}}
\[ b13) \text{12...\texttt{\$fe8!? was tried in Pan- bukhchian-Inkiov, Sofia 1989.}}}
\[ b14) \text{12...\texttt{\$ac8 - 11...\texttt{\$c8 12 \texttt{\$e2 \texttt{\$c7.}}}}]
\[ b2) \text{12 \texttt{\$a2 and now:}}]
\[ b21) \text{12...\texttt{\$ac8 - 11...\texttt{\$c8 12 \texttt{\$a2 \texttt{\$c7.}}}}]
\[ b22) \text{12...\texttt{\$xd4 13 \texttt{\$xd4 \texttt{\$c6 14 \texttt{\$e2 is more pleasant for White.}}}}}
\[ b23) \text{Very interesting is 12...\texttt{\$a5 13 \texttt{\$e2 \texttt{\$fc8!? (13...\texttt{\$ac8 - 11...\texttt{\$c8 12 \texttt{\$e2 \texttt{\$c7 13 \texttt{\$a2 \texttt{\$a5) 14 \texttt{\$ad1 b5 15 axb5 axb5 16 f5 e5 17 \texttt{\$dx5 \texttt{\$xb5 18 \texttt{\$xb5 \texttt{\$ab8 19 \texttt{\$d3 \texttt{\$xb2 with chances for both sides, Kaminski-Filipenko, Pardubice 1996.}}}}}}}}}}}}}
\[ 12 \texttt{\$e2}
\[ Or:
5...\(\text{Qc6}\) 6 \(\text{Qc4} e6 7 0-0 a6\) WITHOUT \(\text{Qb3}\)

with an advantage for White, V.Gurevich-Petitcunot, Le Touquet 2000) 16
\(\text{Qxf4} \text{Qfe8} 17 \text{Qg5?!} \text{Qe6} 18 \text{Qxf6} \text{Qxf6} 19 \text{Qxf6 gxf6} 20 \text{Wh5} \) with compen-
sation, Azarić-Djukanović, Budva 1996.

13...\(\text{Qxd4}\)

13...\(\text{Qb4}\) 14 \(\text{Qb3} d5 15 e5 \text{Qe4}\) was suggested by Greengard.

13...\(\text{Qa5}\) 14 \(\text{Qad1}\) (also possible is 14 \(\text{Qae1?!}\)?) 14...\(\text{Qc4}\) 15 \(\text{Qc1}\) and then:

a) 15...\(\text{Qe8}\) 16 \(\text{Qf5} \text{Qf6} 17 \text{Qxd6} \text{Qexd6}\) 18 e5 \(\text{Qe8}\) (if my source is cor-
rect, this happened in Mikhailchischin-
Polajzer, Ptuj 1995) 19 \(\text{Qxc4}++\).

b) 15...\(\text{Qfe8}\) 16 \(\text{Qd3} \text{Qf8}\) 17 \(\text{Qxc4} \text{Qxc4}\) 18 e5 \(\text{Qd5}\) 19 \(\text{Qe4!}\) ± Kudrin-

c) 15...\(\text{Qc5}\) (recommended by Sad-
ler in BCM) 16 e5 \(\text{Qxe5}\) 17 \(\text{Qxe5}\) \(\text{Qxe5}\) 18 \(\text{Qf5}\) 1-0 Emms-Joachim, Bundes-
liga 2000/1.

d) 15...h5?! is an unverified recom-
mandation of Sadler.

e) 15...\(\text{Qfd8}\) 16 g4! (16 e5 \(\text{Qe8}\) 17
\(\text{Qxd6}\) \(\text{Qxd6}\) 18 f5 e5 = G.Kuzmin-
Savon, Moscow 1982), and now, instead
of 16...\(\text{Qc5}\) ? 17 g5 \(\text{Qe8}\) 18 f5 e5
(18...\(\text{Qf8}\) 19 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qxe6}\) 20 b3! and b4
++) 19 \(\text{Qd5} \text{Qf8}\) 20 b4 ++ Emms-
Shipov, Hastings 1998/9, 16...e5 en-
ables Black to continue the struggle.

14 \(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{e5}\)

This idea of Dorfman’s made it possible for Black to equalize in G.Kuz-
min-Shneider, Enakieve 1997 (and
later in Emms-Grishchuk, Esbjerg
2000) after 15 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\) 16 \(\text{Qxf4}\) \(\text{Qe6}\)
17 a5 \(\text{Qxa2}\) 18 \(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Qf4}\) 19 \(\text{Qf3} \text{Qe6}\)
20 \(\text{Qa4}\) \(\text{Qc4}\) =.

a) 12 \(\text{Qb3} \text{Qa5}\) is probably satsis-
factory for Black.

b) 12 \(\text{Qa2}\) and then:

b1) 12...\(\text{Qwa5}?!\).

b2) 12...\(\text{Qc7}\) 13 \(\text{Qe2}\) (13 \(\text{Qf3} \text{Qxd4}\)
14 \(\text{Qxd4}\) e5 15 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qxf4}\) 16 \(\text{Qxf4}\)
\(\text{Qe6}\) = Galduny-K.Grigorian, Belgo-
rod 1989) – 12 \(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 13 \(\text{Qa2}\).

b3) 12...\(\text{Qxd4}\) 13 \(\text{Qxd4}\) (13 \(\text{Qxd4}\)?
\(\text{Qg4}\)!, Ree-Wittmann, Holzoster 1981)
13...\(\text{Qc6}\) 14 \(\text{Qe2}\) b5 = Wittmann.

12...\(\text{Qc7}\)

12...\(\text{Qa5}\) 13 \(\text{Qd3}\)! (13 \(\text{Qa2}\) \(\text{Qxc3}\))
13...\(\text{Qc7} – 12...\(\text{Qc7}\) 13 \(\text{Qd3} \text{Qa5}\).

13 \(\text{Qa2}\)

White has two serious alternatives:

a) 13 \(\text{Qxc6}\) \(\text{Qxc6}\) 14 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qd7}\)
and now rather than 15 \(\text{Qd4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) =
Chiburidze-Popović, Subotica (3)
1986. Chiburidze suggested 15 \(\text{Wh5}\)
± and Popović 15 b4!.

b) 13 \(\text{Qd3} \text{Qxd4}\) (or: 13...\(\text{Qb4}\) 14
\(\text{Qf3}\), V.Gurevich-Ganin, Ukrainian Cht
1998; 13...\(\text{Qa5}\) 14 \(\text{Qae1}\) \(\text{Qc4}\) 15 \(\text{Qc1}\)
is slightly better for White, V.Gurevich-V. Neverov, Kherson 1988) 14
\(\text{Qxd4}\) e5 15 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qxf4}\) (15...\(\text{Qfe8}\) 16
\(\text{Qf3}\)?! \(\text{Qxf4}\) 17 \(\text{Qxf4}\)! \(\text{Qe6}\) 18 \(\text{Qd5}\)!}
13 5...c6 6 c4 e6: Sozin and Velimirović without ...a6

1 e4 c5 2 ∆f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ∆xd4
∆f6 5 ∆c3 ∆c6 6 ∆c4 e6 (D)

This is the basic starting point for the Sozin & Velimirović complex.

We have already discussed all lines with 7...a6 and noticed that in them Black has the plan of ...∆c7, ...∆a5 and ...b5, which makes White seriously consider dropping the Velimirović scheme of ∆e2 and 0-0-0 in favour of Classical Sozin positions with f4. On the other hand, if Black plays 7...∆e7 and 8...0-0 (the main topic of this chapter), everything looks different: if White plays f4 and 0-0, Black can use his omission of ...a6 more effectively, and has more additional ideas than in the case where White plays ∆e3 and ∆e2.

Therefore, it is quite logical that the main introductory move, which occurs much more often than any of the others, is 7 ∆e3 (planning to meet 7...∆e7 with 8 ∆e2).

Still, Fischer preferred the second most popular move 7 ∆b3 as he liked the idea discussed in Chapter 8: 7...a6 8 f4!? (however, it only occurred a few times in his games because his opponents usually answered 7 ∆b3 with 7...∆e7).

It is possible to begin with 7 0-0 (rejecting the Velimirović at once), but this does not make any particular sense – unless White intends to continue with a3 (e.g., 7...∆e7 8 a3 0-0 9 ∆a2, as played by GM Dvoiry's several times recently).

Let us discuss all this in detail and in order:

A: 7 0-0 206
B: 7 ∆b3 207
C: 7 ∆e3 208

After 7 a3!??. 7...∆e7 8 ∆a2 0-0 9 0-0 transposes to Line A.

A)

7 0-0 ∆e7
For 7...a6, see Chapter 12.

8 a3
There is no sense in 8 ∆h1 0-0 9 f4 because of 9...d5!.

8...0-0 9 ∆a2 ∆xd4!?
Otherwise:
a) 9...a6 is also normal, and transposes to Line A of Chapter 12.
b) 9...\(\text{a7}\) 10 \(\text{e3}\) and then:
b1) 10...\(\text{xd4}\) 11 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{c6}\) (not 11...b5?! 12 \(\text{xf6}\)!) 12 \(\text{d3}\) ±.
b2) 10...\(\text{e5}\) is probably playable: 11 \(\text{e2}\) \(\text{eg4}\) (11...\(\text{c8}\) 12 \(\text{ad1}\), in preparation of \(\text{c1}\)) 12 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{b6}\) 13 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{fc8}\) (Medina Garcia-Polugae-

sky, Las Palmas 1974) 14 h3! \(\text{e5}\) 15 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{a6}\)! Polugaevsky.

10 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{b6}\)!

This is not an infrequent idea in positions with the pawn on a7.

11 \(\text{d3}\)

Or:

a) 11 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{a6}\)!? 12 \(\text{fe1}\) \(\text{c7}\) 13 \(\text{ad1}\) \(\text{fd8}\) = Sigurjonsson-Tukmakov, Reykjavik 1976.
b) 11 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{a6}\) 12 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{c7}\), Smir-

nov-Nikitin, Moscow 1966.

11...\(\text{b7}\) 12 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{c8}\)!

The queen is less useful on c7 under the circumstances.

13 \(\text{fe1}\) \(\text{d8}\) 14 \(\text{ad1}\) a6 15 a4 h5!

16 \(\text{xb5}\) \(\text{xb5}\) 17 \(\text{xb5}\)

Now both 17...\(\text{xe4}\) (Dvoirys-Zvi-

agintsev, Samara 1998) and 17...\(\text{xe4}\)! lead to an equal game.

B)

7 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{e7}\) (D)

Or:

a) 7...a6 is the subject of Chapters 8-10.

b) 7...\(\text{a5}\) 8 f4 \(\text{xb3}\) (8...a6 transposes to note ‘c’ after White’s 8th move in Line A of Chapter 8) 9 \(\text{xb3}\) b6 10 f5 \(\text{d7}\) 11 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{e7}\) 12 \(\text{e2}\) 0-0 13 0-0-0 \(\text{d5}\) 14 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 15 \(\text{f6}\)! ± Ivkov-Vasiukov, USSR-Yugo-

slavia 1962.

8 0-0

The main continuation here is 8

\(\text{e3}\), which transposes to Line C2.

8 f4 is less sensible here than after 7...a6. Black has the idea of 8...\(\text{xd4}\)! 9 \(\text{xd4}\) 0-0, when 10 0-0 transposes to the note to Black’s 8th move, and maybe also 8...d5!?, and 8...\(\text{a5}\) 9 0-0 (better is 9 \(\text{d3}\) 0-0 10 \(\text{d2}\), with unclear play) 9...d5! \(\text{c}\) Ničevski-Korch-

noi, Rovinj/Zagreb 1970.

8...0-0

It is possible to play 8...\(\text{xd4}\)! 9 \(\text{xd4}\) 0-0 10 f4 (10 \(\text{h1}\) – 8...0-0 9 \(\text{h1}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 10 \(\text{xd4}\) 11 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{c5}\) 12 \(\text{c5}\) \(\text{g3}\), and after 13...\(\text{g8}\) 14 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{h4}\) 15 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{xb3}\) 16 axb3 \(\text{exf5}\) 17 exf5 \(\text{f6}\) (Lanka) or 13...\(\text{h4}\) 14 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{f6}\) (Kiik-Veingoeld, Finnish Chpt 1999/00) Black’s position appears satisfactory.

9 \(\text{h1}\)

Again, the main move is 9 \(\text{e3}\), which transposes to Line C22.

9 f4 is unsuccessful in view of 9...d5! 10 e5 \(\text{xd4}\) 11 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{g4}\) 12 h3 (12 f5? \(\text{b6}\)! , Estrin-Taimanov, Leningrad 1954) 12...\(\text{a4}\) \(\text{h6}\) (13...\(\text{d7}\)!) 14 f5! Boleslavsky) 14 \(\text{g4}\)
f5 15 g5 ∇f7 16 ∇e3 ∇a6 with counterplay, L.Novikov-Boleslavsky, Minsk 1955.

9...∇xd4!?

Or:

a) 9...a6 transposes to note ‘b’ to White’s 9th move in Line B3 of Chapter 8.

b) Another good alternative for Black is 9...∇a5!? 10 f4 (10 ∇d3 a6 11 ∇g5 b5 = Kruppa-R.Scherbakov, USSR Chl 1988) 10...b6; e.g., 11 e5 ∇e8 12 f5 (12 ∇f3 ∇xb3 13 ∇c6 ∇d7 14 ∇xe7+ ∇xe7 15 axb3 f6 = Neikirkh-Botvinnik, Leipzig OL 1960), and now Geller recommended 12...dxe5 13 fxe6 exd4 14 exf7+ ∇h8 15 fxe8∇ ∇xe8, which looks sufficient, while Black should have other ideas as well.

10 ∇xd4 b6

White now has the following tries at his disposal:

a) 11 f4 ∇a6! 12 ∇f3 d5 13 exd5 ∇c5 14 ∇a4 ∇b7 15 ∇e3 exd5 16 ∇d4 (Fischer-Geller, Curacao Ct 1962) and now 16...a6 gives Black excellent chances; e.g., 17 ∇xf6 gxf6 18 ∇d1 b5 19 ∇xb5 axb5 20 ∇xb5 ∇e7.

b) 11 f3 ∇b7 12 ∇e3 d5 (12...∇c7! Atalik) 13 exd5 ∇xd5 14 ∇xd5 ∇xd5 15 ∇xd5 ∇c5 16 ∇c3 with a small advantage for White, Mirumian-Atalik, Ankara Z 1995.

c) 11 ∇g5 ∇b7 12 f4 ∇c8 is assessed as promising for Black in view of 13 f5 ∇c5!, Ježek-Boleslavsky, Viennae Echt 1957.

Overall, the line with 9 ∇h1 should be placed in the category ‘mostly harmless’.

C)

7 ∇e3 ∇e7

Or:

a) 7...a6 is the subject of Chapter 11.

b) 7...∇a5 8 ∇d3!? (after 8 ∇b3 Black may try something with ...b6) 8...a6. Now 9 ∇e2 transposes to Line A of Chapter 11. Not quite clear is 9 f4!? b5!? 10 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 ∇d5 12 ∇f3 ∇xe3 13 ∇xa8 ∇e7, Yudasin-Rashkovsky, Kuibyshev 1986.

c) Incidentally, the early 7...∇d7!? has not been studied enough. Briefly:

c1) 8 ∇e2 ∇c8 (GM Enders played 8...∇a5 9 ∇d3 a6 several times; another possibility is 8...a6!?, transposing to note ‘b’ to Black’s 8th move in Chapter 11) 9 ∇b3 (after 9 0-0-0, 9...∇a5! 10 ∇d3 e5!?; Brunner-Reeh, Gausdal 1991 is interesting) and now:

c11) 9...∇xd4 10 ∇xd4 b5 is unconvincing, Milu-Nisipeanu, Odorhieu Secuiesc 1993.

c12) 9...∇a5 10 f4!? (10 0-0 ∇e7 11 ∇ad1 0-0 =) 10...∆xc3 (10...e5! ∇ Akopian) 11 bxc3 ∇xe4 12 0-0 ∇e7!? 13 f5! ± (followed by ∇e6!), Palkov-Tischbierek, Budapest 1986.

c13) 9...a6 is quite good, and transposes to note ‘a’ to White’s 9th move in Line C1 of Chapter 8.

c2) 8 f4 ∇xe4?!

c3) 8 0-0 makes sense in connection with a3 or a4, if Black replies 8...a6.

c4) 8 ∇b3! is my recommendation. White takes note of 8...a6 9 f4! b5 10 f5!, transposing to Line C1 of Chapter 8 (±).

We now return to 7...∇e7 (D), after which White has these options:

C1: 8 f4 209

C2: 8 ∇b3 210

C3: 8 ∇e2 216
The last of these (Line C3) is by far the most important.

It is also necessary to mention 8 0-0-0:

a) 9 ążb3 transposes to Line C22.

b) 9 f4?! is unsuccessful due to the typical answer 9...d5!.

c) 9 a3 gives Black a choice between 9...a6 10 ąxa2, transposing to Line A2 of Chapter 12, and Nunn's suggestion 9...wac7! 10 ąxa2 ąe5.

d) 9 wac2 is inaccurate due to 9...a6 10 a4 d5! =.

e) At once 9 a4 is of some interest.

f) 9 ąh1!? a6 (other possibilities are rarely tested) 10 a4 is a fairly interesting move-order, which transposes to Line B of Chapter 12.

**C1)**

8 f4 0-0

8...d5?! is dubious owing to 9 ąb5! ąd7 10 e5.

After 8...a6, the simplest way for White to proceed is 9 ąb3, transposing to Line C of Chapter 9. In the case of 9 wac3, he should be prepared for 9...wbc7?! 10 ąb3 ćxd4 11 ąxd4 b5 as well as 9...ćxd4!? 10 ąxd4 b5.

9 wac3!?

This gives independent value to the move 8 f4. The best response has not yet been defined. Certainly, Black has some ideas here...

**9...e5?!**

Other moves:

a) 9...a6 10 0-0-0! (avoiding 10 ąb3 ćxd4) 10...wac7 (10...ćxd4 11 ąxd4 b5? 12 e5) 11 ąb3 transposes to Line C211 of Chapter 9.

b) 9...wac7 10 ąb3 a6 is probably no more precise than 9...a6.

c) 9...d5 needs substantiation – primarily after 10 exd5 exd5 11 ćxd5.

d) 9...wa5!? seems interesting:

   d1) 10 0-0 ćxd4 11 ćxd4 (11 ćxd4?! e5!) 11...ąd7 (with the idea of 12...b5!), Repkova-Galliamova, Erevan wom OL, 1996.

   d2) After 10 0-0, apart from the transpositional 10...ćxd4 11 ćxd4 – 9...ćxd4 10 ćxd4 wa5 11 0-0, Black may also try 10...wbd4.

   e) 9...ćxd4 (this has occurred most frequently) 10 ćxd4 and then:

      e1) 10...e5 11 fxe5! (11 ąe3 exf4 12 ąxf4 wa5 13 ąb3 ąg4 and now rather than 14 ąd3 d5!, Ankerst-Panchenko, Bled 1992, White could try 14 ąg3?!) 11...dxe5 12 ąxe5 ąg4 13 ąf4 ćxd4 14 ąb3 ąb4 15 ćd1.

      e2) 10...wa5 11 0-0 (11 ąb3 e5 12 ąe3 ąg4 13 ąg3 ąe6 = Howell-Krakops, Senden 1994) 11...e5 12 ąe3 exf4 13 ąxf4 ąe6 14 ąb3 ąh5!? 15 h3 ąg6 16 ąf3. Instead of 16...ąa6 17 e5 ±, Onishchuk-Avrukh, Biel 1999, Avrukh recommended 16...ąfe8!? with good chances of equalizing.

10 ćxc6

10...bxc6 11 f5 ♝a5 12 0-0-0

Now:

a) 12...♗b8 and here 13 ♖b3 ♖xb3! followed by 14...d5 (as in Borkowski-Tupek, Slupsk 1992) appears to me a very promising sacrifice that White should avoid with 13 ♖d2?!.

b) 12...♖b7 13 ♖b3 d5 14 exd5 cxd5 15 ♗xd5 ♘xd5 16 ♖xd5 e4 17 ♖xe4 ♗ab8 18 ♗d5 ♖xb2 19 ♖xb2 ♕xd5 and now, instead of 20 ♖xd5 (where Black has at least a draw: 20...♖a3+ 21 ♖b1 ♖xd5 22 ♖xd5 ♖b8+ = de Firmian-Grishchuk, Esbjerg 2000), White should investigate 20 ♖d4.

C2)

8 ♕b3

7 ♖b3 ♖e7 8 ♖e3 is another way to reach this position.

8...0-0 (D)

Or:

a) 8...a6 transposes to Chapters 9 and 10.

b) 8...♖d7 9 f4 (9 ♖e2 - 8 ♖e2 ♖d7?! 9 ♖b3; in that line, 9 ♖b3 is hardly the best move; 9 g4?! ♖xd4 10 ♖xd4, De Vreugt-Bosboom, Wijk aan Zee 2001; 9 ♖b2 0-0 0-0 transposes to Line C221 of Chapter 13) 9 ♖xd4 (9...0-0 - 8...0-0 9 f4 ♖d7) 10 ♖xd4 ♖c6 11 ♖e2 b5 12 0-0-0 b4 13 ♕xf6?! favours White.

Now (after 8...0-0):

C21: 9 f4 210

C22: 9 0-0 212

C23: 9 ♖e2 215

A good response to 9 ♖g1?! is 9...♖a5! 10 f3 e5 11 ♖de2 ♖e6 12 g4?! d5 = Suetin-Galliamova, Naberezhnye Chelny 1993.
10 \( \mathcal{d}xd4 \)

As of now it is hard to say if 10 \( \mathcal{w}xd4!? \) can revive this old variation.

10...\( \mathcal{g}g4 \) 10...b6 11 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{b}b7 \) 12 \( \mathcal{h}he1 \mathcal{c}c8 \) 13 e5 \( \mathcal{g}g4 \) 14 exd6 \( \mathcal{f}f6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{w}d3 \) ± Mikhailchishin-Kiss, Balatonberenyi 1988; 10...d7 11 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{d}d6 \)

12 \( \mathcal{b}b1 \mathcal{w}a5 \) 13 \( \mathcal{h}hf1 \mathcal{b}5 \) 14 a3! \( \mathcal{a}ab8 \)

15 e5 dxe5 16 fxe5 \( \mathcal{d}d7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{w}xf7! \) ± Istratescu-Hraček, Krynica Z 1998) 11 \( \mathcal{d}d2 \) (11 \( \mathcal{g}g1!? \)) 11...d5!? (calmer is 11...e5 12 \( \mathcal{w}xd3 \) exf4 13 \( \mathcal{a}xf4 \) \( \mathcal{e}e6!? \), as GM Lanka has played twice) 12 exd5 (or 12 e5 b6 with strong counterplay) 12...\( \mathcal{f}f6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{g}g1 \) exd5 14 0-0-0 d4 and Black has hardly any problems, Gi.Hernandez-Vera, Cienfuegos 1996.

10...\( \mathcal{b}b5! \)

10...e5 was suggested by Euwe. Then:

a) 11 fxe5 dxe5 and now:

a1) 12 \( \mathcal{e}e3 \) \( \mathcal{w}xd1+ \) (less precise are 12...\( \mathcal{g}g4 \) 13 \( \mathcal{w}xd8! \) \( \mathcal{w}xd8 \) 14 \( \mathcal{d}d2 \) and 12...\( \mathcal{w}a5 \) 13 0-0 with the point 13...\( \mathcal{g}g4 \) 14 \( \mathcal{w}d5! \)) 13 \( \mathcal{h}xd1 \mathcal{b}b4 \) 14 0-0 \( \mathcal{c}xc3 \) 15 bxc3 \( \mathcal{g}g4 \) 16 \( \mathcal{d}d1 \) \( \mathcal{d}e4 \)

17 \( \mathcal{d}c1 \mathcal{c}c5 \) = 18 \( \mathcal{a}a3 \mathcal{d}xb3 \) 19 \( \mathcal{a}xf8 \) \( \mathcal{d}d2 \) and 20...\( \mathcal{c}c4 \) = Veličković.

a2) 12 \( \mathcal{w}xe5 \) \( \mathcal{w}a5 \) 13 \( \mathcal{a}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{e}xf6 \) 14 0-0, and Black can avoid the idea of 14...\( \mathcal{e}e6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{d}d5!? \) \( \mathcal{a}xb2 \) 16 \( \mathcal{b}b1 \) with a certain initiative (Votava-Stocek, Czech Ch (Lazne Bohdaneč) 1999) through 14...\( \mathcal{a}xc3! \) 15 bxc3 \( \mathcal{e}e6 \).

b) 11 \( \mathcal{e}e3 \) \( \mathcal{g}g4 \) 12 \( \mathcal{c}c1 \) (after 12 \( \mathcal{d}d2 \) \( \mathcal{h}h4+! \) 13 g3 \( \mathcal{c}xb2 \) 14 \( \mathcal{f}f2 \) \( \mathcal{e}xf4 \)

15 \( \mathcal{a}xf4 \) \( \mathcal{g}g4+ \) 16 \( \mathcal{g}g2 \) \( \mathcal{f}f6 \) 17 \( \mathcal{d}d5 \) \( \mathcal{e}e6 \), Black has an extra pawn and enough defensive resources, Mitkov-R.Scherbakov, Belorechensk 1992) 12...\( \mathcal{e}xf4 \) 13 \( \mathcal{a}xf4 \) \( \mathcal{g}g5 \) (13...\( \mathcal{f}f6 \) can be met by 14 \( \mathcal{w}d2 \) ± or 14 \( \mathcal{w}xd6!? \)) 14 0-0 \( \mathcal{e}e6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{h}h1 \) with some advantage for White, Lastin-Scherbakov, Russian Ch (Elista) 1995.

11 \( \mathcal{e}e5 \) \( \mathcal{d}xe5 \) 12 \( \mathcal{f}xe5 \) \( \mathcal{d}d7 \)

In this position White has failed for many years to demonstrate anything substantial:

a) After 13 \( \mathcal{w}e2 \), it seems sufficient to play 13...\( \mathcal{c}c6!? \).

b) 13 0-0 and then:

b1) 13...\( \mathcal{a}a6 \) transposes to Line C222 of Chapter 9.

b2) 13...b4!? 14 \( \mathcal{d}e4 \) \( \mathcal{b}b7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{d}d6 \)

\( \mathcal{w}xd6 \) 16 exd6 \( \mathcal{g}g5 \) 17 \( \mathcal{w}e2 \) and now not 17...\( \mathcal{d}d5!? \) 18 \( \mathcal{a}a1 \), as in Fischer-F.Olafsson, Stockholm IZ 1962, but 17...\( \mathcal{a}a5 \) = Stoica-Tischbierek, Calimanesti 1992.

b3) 13...\( \mathcal{c}c5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{a}xc5 \) \( \mathcal{d}xc5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{w}xd8 \) \( \mathcal{w}xd8 \) 16 \( \mathcal{a}xb5 \) \( \mathcal{a}a6 \) 17 \( \mathcal{d}d4 \)

\( \mathcal{a}ab8 \) (alternatively, 17...\( \mathcal{a}xb5!? \) 18 \( \mathcal{a}xb5 \) \( \mathcal{a}ab8 \), Perez-Geller, Havana 1965) 18 a4 \( \mathcal{c}xa4 \) = Fischer-Geller, Curaçao Ct 1962.

b) 13 \( \mathcal{g}g4 \) \( \mathcal{c}c5 \) (13...\( \mathcal{a}a4 \) 14 \( \mathcal{a}e4 \) \( \mathcal{b}b7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{d}d6 \) \( \mathcal{x}d6 \) 16 exd6 \( \mathcal{a}a6 \), Stein-Gheorghiu, Reykjavik 1972, is an important alternative) 14 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{w}xd4 \)

(14...\( \mathcal{b}b6!? \) 15 \( \mathcal{c}e4! \) \( \mathcal{x}d4 \) 16 \( \mathcal{a}a4 \), Barle-Beliavsky, USSR-Yugoslavia 1971, 16...\( \mathcal{w}h8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{g}g5 \) ± Nunn) 15 \( \mathcal{w}xd4 \) \( \mathcal{g}g5+ \) 16 \( \mathcal{b}b1 \) and now Razuvaev suggests 16...\( \mathcal{a}a8 \) rather than 16...\( \mathcal{w}xe5 \) 17 \( \mathcal{x}xe5 \) \( \mathcal{c}xe5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{a}xb5 \) ± Alexander-Hollis, Hastings 1962/3.

d) 13 \( \mathcal{w}f3 \) \( \mathcal{b}b8 \) 14 0-0-0 (14 \( \mathcal{a}xa7!? \) \( \mathcal{h}h4+! \), Ehlvest-Milos, Bali 2000; 14 \( \mathcal{g}g4 \mathcal{b}b7!? \) and now, instead of 14...\( \mathcal{b}b7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{g}g4 \) b4 16 \( \mathcal{a}xa7 \) \( \mathcal{a}a8 \) (Tatai-Zuckerman, Wijk aan Zee 1968) 17 \( \mathcal{b}b5 \) with the point 17...\( \mathcal{a}xe5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{w}g3 \) \( \mathcal{a}a5 \) 19 \( \mathcal{w}xe5 \) \( \mathcal{a}xa7 \) 20 \( \mathcal{d}d7 \), Black solves his problems by means of
14...\texttt{wc}7!, as has been shown in practice in a number of games.

\textbf{C222)}

\textbf{9 0-0 (D)}

This is a more popular move-order than 9 f4 (in Fischer’s games and in general).

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

After 1972, 9...a6 and later 10 f4 \texttt{cxd}4 (see Chapter 9) came to the fore. The old continuations have now almost disappeared, although this may be rather undeserved.

\textbf{C221: 9...\texttt{d}7 212}

\textbf{C222: 9...\texttt{a}5 214}

Other moves:

\begin{itemize}
\item a) 9...\texttt{c}7 10 f4 \texttt{a}5 11 \texttt{f}3 (or 11 \texttt{f}5!??) is promising for White.
\item b) 9...\texttt{a}5 10 f4 (10 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{c}xd4 11 \texttt{w}xd4 b5 12 a3 \texttt{a}6 \approx Brunner-Korchnoi, Zurich (1) 1996) 10...\texttt{cxd}4 (10...\texttt{h}5 11 \texttt{xh}5 \texttt{c}xh5 12 \texttt{f}5 \pm) 11 \texttt{cxd}4 e5 12 \texttt{f}2 (12 \texttt{e}3!? \texttt{xg}4 13 \texttt{we}2) 12...\texttt{e}4 13 \texttt{d}4 \texttt{g}4 14 \texttt{we}1 is slightly better for White, Cirić-Korchnoi, Yugoslavia-USSR 1965.
\item c) 9...\texttt{cxd}4 10 \texttt{cxd}4 b5 (10...b6 \pm) 11 \texttt{xb}5 \texttt{a}6 (after 11...\texttt{c}xe4, apart from 12 \texttt{x}a7, also good is 12 c4!? a6 13 \texttt{c}2 \texttt{b}7 14 \texttt{c}3 \pm K.Müller-Cullip, Oakham Jr 1992) 12 a4 (no advantage is gained by 12 c4 \texttt{xb}5! 13 cxb5 \texttt{xe}4 14 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{f}6 15 \texttt{we}2, Fischer-Korchnoi, Rovinj/Zagreb 1970, 15...d5 Korchnoi) 12...\texttt{c}xe4 13 c4! \pm (Nunn).
\end{itemize}

\textbf{C221)}

\textbf{9...\texttt{d}7 10 \texttt{f}4!}

If 10 \texttt{we}2, then 10...\texttt{cxd}4 11 \texttt{cxd}4 \texttt{c}6 (or 11...b5 12 \texttt{xb}5 \texttt{xb}5 13 \texttt{w}xb5 \texttt{c}xe4 14 \texttt{ad}1) 12 \texttt{ad}1!? \texttt{a}5 13 f4 e5 14 fxe5 dxe5 15 \texttt{f}5 \texttt{c}5 16 \texttt{f}2 may give White some hope for an advantage, Gligorić-Pomar, Malaga 1961. It is simpler to proceed with 10...a6! 11 f4, transposing to note ‘c1’ to Black’s 10th move in Line C22 of Chapter 9 (=).

\textbf{10...\texttt{c}xe4!}

Or:

\begin{itemize}
\item a) 10...\texttt{c}8 is poor in view of 11 \texttt{db}5!.
\item b) 10...\texttt{c}8 is well met by 11 \texttt{f}5!, Fischer-Larsen, Denver Ct (5) 1971.
\item c) 10...a6 transposes to note ‘c’ to Black’s 10th move in Line C22 of Chapter 9.
\item d) 10...a5 11 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{c}8 and now, rather than 12 g4 \texttt{c}4 13 g5 \texttt{e}8 14 \texttt{xc}4 \texttt{xc}4 15 h4 \texttt{g}6! 16 \texttt{f}5 \texttt{xf}5 17 \texttt{xf}5 e5 \approx Rittner-Simagin, corr. 1968, Nunn suggests 12 \texttt{ad}1!? \texttt{c}4 13 \texttt{c}1 \pm.
\end{itemize}

\textbf{11 \texttt{d}4 (D)}

\textbf{11...\texttt{c}6}

Or 11...b5, and then:

\begin{itemize}
\item a) After 12 e5 the game seems about equal.
\item b) 12 f5 b4 (12...e5 13 \texttt{e}3 b4 14 \texttt{d}5 \texttt{c}xe4!? 13 fxe6 (Stoica-Atalik, Romanian Cht 1996) 13...fxe6 14 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{h}8! is also satisfactory for Black.
\end{itemize}
c) After 12...\textit{xf6}!?, I am unsure whether Black obtains full compensation for the two pawns in the variation 12...\textit{xf6} 13 \textit{xd6} b4 14 \textit{xb4} a5 15 \textit{d6} \textit{xc3} 16 \textit{bxc3} \textit{b5} 17 \textit{xd8} \textit{f8d8} 18 \textit{fb1} \textit{c6}.

12 \textit{We2}

Other continuations lead to chances for both sides:

a) 12 \textit{f3} b5! 13 \textit{ae1} b4 14 \textit{d1} \textit{c7} 15 \textit{g3} (Zs.Polgar-Ashley, New York 1989) 15...a5!?.

b) 12 \textit{d3} b5 13 \textit{xb5} (13 e5 \textit{dxe5} 14 \textit{fxe5} \textit{d7} and now 15 \textit{we3} a5, Lutikov-Tukmakov, Odessa 1976, or 15 \textit{d4} \textit{xe4} 16 \textit{xe4} \textit{xc5}, Christiansen-Yermolinsky, USA Ch (Seattle) 2000) 13...\textit{xe4}!, Szabo-Benko, Hungarian Ch (Budapest) 1951.

c) 12 \textit{we1} b5 13 \textit{d1} \textit{c7}! = (rather than 13...b4 14 e5! =) Benjamin-Kreiman, Connecticut 2000.

12...b5

Not 12...\textit{wa5}?! 13 f5 e5 14 \textit{f2} \pm (Fischer-Pilnik, Santiago 1959) 14...b5 15 a3!.

12...\textit{c7} 13 f5 (better is 13 \textit{ad1} or 13 \textit{ae1}) 13...e5 14 \textit{f2} b5! with counterplay, M.Kiselev-Bologan, St Petersburg 1996.

13 \textit{xb5}

There is no danger for Black in 13 \textit{ad1} b4 14 e5 \textit{bxc3} 15 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 16 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} (16...\textit{xf6} is risky) 17 \textit{xd6} \textit{ac8} (Nezhmetdinov-Geller, Gorky 1954) and if 18 f5, then 18...\textit{e7}!.

13...\textit{xb5}

13...\textit{xe4}? 14 \textit{xa7} ± Fischer-Saidy, New Jersey 1957.

13...e5? 14 \textit{fxe5} \textit{dxe5} 15 \textit{e3} a6 16 \textit{c3} \textit{xe4} 17 \textit{xf7} ± Fischer-Nievergelt, Zurich 1959.

14 \textit{xb5} \textit{xe4}

In 1972 Fischer probably was ready to defend this position as White against Spassky, but we can only guess what he had in mind at the time...

15 f5

15 \textit{d3} d5 16 \textit{c4} \textit{xc4} 17 \textit{xc4} \textit{d6} = Bannik-Boleslavsky, USSR Ch 1955.

15...e5

15...d5?! 16 \textit{fxe6} \textit{fxe6} is not sufficient in view of 17 \textit{xc6}!.

15...\textit{xf6} has occurred rather often:

a) 16 \textit{ad1} \textit{xd4}+ 17 \textit{xd4} d5 = Yudovich-Geller, Gorky 1954.

b) 16 \textit{d3} and now:

b1) 16...d5 17 \textit{xf6} (17 \textit{ad1}!?) 17...\textit{xf6} 18 c4 (Fischer-R.Weinstein, USA Ch (New York) 1958/9) 18...\textit{b6}+ 19 \textit{h1} dxc4 20 \textit{xc4} ± Nunn.

b2) Black can possibly equalize by playing 16...\textit{xd4}+!? 17 \textit{xd4} \textit{xc5}, as in the game Winants-Gershon, Antwerp 1994.

16 \textit{xe4}??

16...\textit{g5} 17 \textit{e2} \textit{xe3}+ 18 \textit{xe3} \textit{f6}

The game is equal, Chandler-Rachels, Manila IZ 1990.
In the 1950s and 1960s, 11...\(\text{c}e8\) 12 \(f5\)! was studied in detail: 12..\(\text{d}xe5\) (12...\(\text{d}xb3\) 13 \(\text{c}c6!\) \(\text{w}c7\) 14 \(\text{d}xe7+\) \(\text{w}xe7\) 15 \(f6\) Geller; 12...\(\text{f}xe5\) can be met by 13 \(e6!\) or 13 \(\text{d}d5?!\)) 13 \(\text{f}xe6\) and now:

a) 13...\(f6?\) 14 \(\text{d}f5\) \(\text{d}xb3\) 15 \(\text{d}d5!\) -- Geller-Vatnikov, Kiev 1950.

b) 13...\(\text{e}x\text{d}4?!\) 14 \(\text{e}f7+\) \(\text{h}h8\) 15 \(\text{f}xe8\) \(\text{w}xe8\) 16 \(\text{d}xd4\), Romanovsky-Shamkovich, USSR 1956.

c) 13...\(\text{f}xe6?!\) should be met by 14 \(\text{f}xf8+!\) (but not 14 \(\text{d}xe6?!\) \(\text{w}xd1\) 15 \(\text{d}xf8+\) \(\text{d}xb3\) 16 \(\text{b}xb1\) \(\text{d}d4\)).

d) 13...\(\text{d}xb3\) 14 \(\text{c}c6!\) \(\text{w}d6!\) 15 \(\text{w}xd6\) (15 \(\text{d}d5?\) \(\text{h}h4!\) is much better for Black, Bilek-T.Petrosian, Oberhausen Echt 1961) 15...\(\text{f}x\text{d}6\) 16 \(\text{a}xb3\) \(\text{d}xe6\) 17 \(\text{f}xa7?!\) with a better ending for White, Fischer-Korchnoi, Curaçao Ct 1962.

12 \(\text{f}xe5\) \(\text{c}e8!\)

The lines 12...\(\text{d}d7\) 13 \(\text{f}xf7\) \(\text{d}xe5\) 14 \(\text{f}xf8+\) \(\text{f}xf8\) 15 \(\text{f}xe6+\) and 12...\(\text{d}d5\) 13 \(\text{d}xd5\) \(\text{e}x\text{d}5\) 14 \(\text{f}f3\) clearly favour White.

After the text-move, the initial position of Scherbakov's variation arises. Up to now he has managed to obtain positions with chances for both sides where Black has cards up his sleeve.

13 \(\text{w}h5?!\)

Black's only weakness is the \(h7\)-pawn, so it is necessary to check whether it could withstand a direct assault. Other moves are less testing:

a) 13 \(\text{w}g4\) \(\text{w}c7\) 14 \(\text{f}f3\) \(\text{d}xb3\) 15 \(\text{c}xb3\) \(\text{a}6\) 16 \(\text{f}d1\) \(\text{d}d8\) 17 \(\text{d}xd8\) \(\text{w}xd8\) 18 \(\text{d}d1\) \(\text{w}c8\) 19 \(\text{d}d4\) 1/2-1/2 Bezugdov-R.Scherbakov, Petropavlovsk 1999.

b) 13 \(\text{w}f3\) \(\text{d}b7\) 14 \(\text{w}g3\) (14 \(\text{f}xe6?\) \(\text{w}c8\)) 14...\(\text{d}xb3\) 15 \(\text{a}xb3\) \(a6\), with a long manoeuvring game ahead.
13...g6
Or:
   a) 13...♗b7!? 14 ♔xe6 ++.
   b) After 13...♗c7, I propose 14 ♔d5!! ♔xd5 15 ♔xd5 ♔g6 16 ♔h6 ♔g7 17 ♔xa8 ♔a6 18 ♔f4.
   c) 13...♕xb3 14 ♔c6 ♔c7 15 ♔xe7+ ♔xe7 16 axb3 is somewhat better for White, Sale-Dizdarević, Osijek 1993.
14 ♔h6
Alternatively:
   a) 14 ♔g4 ♔c7 15 ♔h6 ♔g7 16 ♔ae1 ♔xb3 17 axb3 ♔b7 18 ♔h1 (or 18 ♔xg7 ♔xg7 19 ♔xe6 ♔ad8!? 20 ♔cb5 ♔c5 Cherny) 18...♔ad8 19 ♔f3 ♔d7 20 ♔g5 ♔d2 21 ♔ce4 ♔xc2 22 ♔xg7 h5! is at least no worse for Black, Kotsur-R.Scherbakov, Ekaterinburg 1999.
   b) White’s advantage is not felt either after 14 ♔we2 ♔c7 15 ♔h6 ♔g7 16 ♔h1 a6 17 ♔ad1 ♔xb3 18 axb3 ♔b7, Anisimov-R.Scherbakov, Cheliabinsk 1984.
14...♔c7 15 ♔f3
After 15...♖b7 16 ♔g5 ♔xg5 17 ♔xg5 ♔xe5 18 ♔e7, Black’s compensation has to be proven.

C23)
9 ♔e2 (D)

This position often arises after 7 ♔b3 ♔e7 8 ♔e3 0-0 9 ♔e2, and to make a general assessment of 7 ♔b3, it is important to know whether Black has important additional ideas (advantages) here as compared with 7 ♔e3 ♔e7 8 ♔e2 0-0 9 0-0-0 (Line C3).

We start with the variations where there is little or no difference:
   a) More than half of the games simply transpose to the main lines of the Velimirović Attack via 9...a6 (Line A, Chapter 10) or via 9...♔c7 10 0-0-0 a6 (Line B2, Chapter 10).
   b) 9...♔d5 10 0-0-0 – Line C32.
   c) 9...♔xd4 10 ♔xd4 ♔a5 (10...e5 11 ♔e3 ±) 11 0-0 0-0 – Line C34.
   d) 9...♔a5 10 0-0-0 (10 0-0-0? ♔xd4 11 ♔xd4 b6 12 a4 ± de Firmian-Sosonko, Polanica Zdroj 1995) transposes to Line C34.

Then, two ideas for Black that have not been verified properly:
   e) 9...♔d7!? 10 0-0-0 ♔c5.
   f) 9...e5?!.

Finally, two rather well-known continuations that are claimed to reveal the drawbacks of an early ♔b3:
   g) 9...♔a5!? and now:
      g1) 10 0-0-0 – 7 ♔e3 ♔e7 8 ♔e2 0-0 9 0-0-0 ♔a5 10 ♔b3.
      g2) 10 g4 ♔xb3 11 axb3 d5! 12 e5 ♔e4 13 0-0 (13 ♔xe4 dxe4 14 ♔h5 {14 0-0-0? ♔a5 ±} 14...a6 15 0-0 ♔d7 16 ♔c3 ♔c6 17 ♔fd1 ♔c7, Motylev-Panchenko, Kazan 1995, 18 ♔d4 ♔g5?! 19 ♔xe4 ♔f4 with compensation)
   13...♔xc3 (13...♔d7?! 14 bxc3 ♔c7 15 ♔d2 ♔d7 16 ♔ae1 a5?! 17 ♔wd3 a4 18 ♔e3 a3?! 19 ♔h3 g6 (19...h6??) 20 ♔we3 f6 21 ♔xh7 ♔xh7 22 ♔h6+ ♔g8 23 ♔xg6+ ♔h8 24 ♔e1 (Golubev-Weiler, Leuven 1994) 24...♔xe5! =.
g3) 10 f4 e5!? 11 f3 xxb3 12 axb3 g4 13 0-0-0 a5 14 b1 ac8 with counterplay, A.Ivanov-Mochalov, Minsk 1985.

h) 9...d7!? and then:

h1) 10 0-0-0, transposing to Line C351, may be considered an achievement for Black (in the variation 7 e3 e7 8 w2 0-0 9 0-0-0 d7, instead of 10 b3, 10 f4! is stronger).

h2) 10 0-0 transposes to the note to White’s 10th move in Line C221 (=).

h3) 10 f4!? xd4 11 xd4 b5 (or 11...a5) has hardly been tried at all.

C3)

8 w2 (D)

8...0-0

The other main line is 8...a6 (or, first, 8...c7 and then ...a6; e.g., 9 0-0-0 a6 transposes to Line C of Chapter 11) which transposes to Line D of Chapter 11.

Auxiliary possibilities are:

a) 8...d5 9 0-0-0 0-0 – 8...0-0 9 0-0-0 d5.

b) 8...a5 9 0-0-0 0-0 – 8...0-0 9 0-0-0 a5.

c) 8...xd4 9 xd4 d7 (9...0-0 10 0-0-0 – 8...0-0 9 0-0-0 xd4 10 xd4 10 0-0-0 (10 f4 ±) 10...a5?

10...c8 11 axb5! 0-0 (11...xb5 12 xb5+ 8 f8 13 c4 g5+ 14 b1 xg2 15 hg1 wh3 16 


d) 8...a5 9 d3 (9 b3 d7!? – 8...d7 9 b3 a5; interesting is 9 b5+! 7 d7 10 b4 w7 11 xd7+ 

7 xd7 12 db5) 9...0-0 (9...a6 transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 9th move in Line A of Chapter 11, which is a little better for White; 9...e5 10 b5+ f8 11 b3 a6 12 d3, Ehlvest-L.Ivanov, New York 1990). Now after 10 f4 e5 11 fxe4 fxe4 12 xxe4 e6 13 0-0-0 (13 xd4?!?) 13...c8, Black obtains an acceptable position, Golubev-Lutsko, Kiev 1997, so it is worth considering 10 0-0-0 – 8...0-0 9 0-0-0 a5 10 d3.

e) 8...e5 should perhaps be met by 9 f3 ± rather than 9 f5 xf5 10 exf5 xd4 11 xd4 (11 w3 d5! 12 

xd5 xd5 13 xd4 a5+ is much better for Black) 11...xd4 (Ernst-Kouatly, Manila OL 1992) 12 b5!? 

d5 13 b3 a5+ 14 f1.

f) 8...d7!? gained the support of several grandmasters in the 1990s, and for a while White had trouble getting to grips with it:

f1) 9 b3 a5!? (9...0-0 transposes to Line C23; 9...c8 10 f4 0-0 11 0-0 a5 12 e5 e8 13 wh5 ± 

Vouldis-Atalik, Karditsa 1996) 10 g4 (maybe something else?) 10...xb3 11 axb3 h5 with counterplay, A.Ivanov- 

Atalik, Chicago 1997.

f2) 9 0-0-0 c8 (9...0-0 – 8...0-0 9 0-0-0 d7), and then:
f21) 10 ∆db5 ∆a5! 11 ∆b3 – 10 ∆b3 ∆a5 11 ∆db5.

f22) 10 f4 ∆a5 (10...0–0 – 8...0–0 9 0–0–0 ∆d7 10 f4 ∆c8) 11 ∆d3 ∆xc3 12 bxc3 ∆c7 deserves checking.

f23) 10 ∆xc6 bxc6! (10...∆xc6? 11 e5; 10...∆xc6 11 f3 a6 12 g4 b5 13 ∆b3 Lukacs) 11 g4 (11 f4 ∆a5 = Avrukh) 11...0–0 (11...d5 12 g5! ∆xe4 13 ∆xe4 dxe4, D.Frolov-Ma.Tseitlin, St Petersburg 1997, 14 ∆g4! 0–0 15 h4 ± Avrukh) 12 g5 ∆e8, and now both 13 h4 d5 14 ∆b3 ∆b4! 15 h5 ∆xc3 16 bxc3 ∆d6 17 h6 g6 18 f3 c5, A.Sokolov-Zviagintsev, Russian Ch (St Petersburg) 1998, and 13 f4 d5 14 ∆d3 ∆b4 (Rechlis-Avrukh, Israeli Cht 2000) 15 ∆b1! (Avrukh) seem double-edged.

f24) 10 f3 0–0 (10...∆a5!? can be met by 11 ∆d3!? or 11 ∆b3 – 10 ∆b3 ∆a5 11 f3) 11 g4 (11 ∆xc6 is recommended by Tesarsky) 11...∆xd4 12 ∆xd4 ∆a5 13 ∆b3 b5 14 e5 is slightly better for White, Rogić-Greenfeld, Pardubice 1995.

f25) 10 ∆b3 ∆a5 (10...∆xd4 11 ∆xd4?! with the point 11...e5 12 ∆xa7 ∆a5 13 ∆e3 ∆xc3 14 ∆d2; 10...0–0 transposes to Line C351) 11 f3 (11 g4? ∆xc3; White gains nothing through 11 ∆db5 ∆xb3+ 12 axb3 ∆a5!) 11...∆xb3+ (11...0–0 12 g4 ∆xb3+ will most likely come to the same thing) 12 axb3 (12 ∆xb3 a5?! 13 ∆f2 ∆xc3 14 bxc3 a4 gives Black compensation, Mortensen-Greenfeld, Moscow OL 1994; 12 cxb3?! Mortensen) 12...0–0 13 g4 ∆a5!? 14 ∆b1 ∆e8 15 ∆d2 ∆h8! (avoiding ∆xd5) 16 h4 ∆c7 with the ideas of...d5 or...∆a6 and...∆b4, Menoni-Greenfeld, Montecatini Terme 1997.

f3) Given that f4 is, as a rule, a good response to...∆d7, it is strange that almost nobody has yet played 9 f4.

9 0–0–0 (D)

9 ∆b3 transposes to Line C23.

Should Black not wish to play the main variations of the Velimirović (9...a6 or 9...∆c7 10 ∆b3 a6 – in the latter case, however, 10 ∆hgl1!? is interesting), then he has the following at his disposal:

C31: 9...∆a5 217
C32: 9...d5 218
C33: 9...∆xd4 219
C34: 9...∆a5 219
C35: 9...∆d7 221

C31)

9...∆a5

Now:
a) 10 ∆b3 and then:
a1) 10...∆xb3+ 11 axb3 ∆a5 12 ∆b1 ∆d7 13 g4 transposes to note ‘d3’ to Black’s 10th move in Line C351.

a2) 10...∆d7 – 9...∆d7 10 ∆b3 ∆a5.

b) 10 ∆d3 is probably more accurate. Now 10...a6 transposes to 7...a6
\[ \text{W} e2 \text{ \( \Box \) a5 9 \( \Box \) d3! \( \text{\( \Box \) } e7 \) 10 0-0-0 0-0 (note 'b1' to Black's 9th move in Line A of Chapter 11).} \]

C32) 9...d5 (D)

This move (suggested by Konstantinopolsky in 1966) does not quite equalize.

10 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b3 \)

The other ideas are:

a) 10 \( \text{\( \Box \) }xe6!?? \) (the only way to foist a tactical struggle on Black) 10...fxe6 11 exd5 \( \text{\( \Box \) } a5 \) 12 dxe6, and now both 12...\( \text{\( \Box \) } e8 \) 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b5 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } c6 \) (13...\( \text{\( \Box \) } g6!?? \) 14 \( \text{\( \Box \) } h1 \) a6 15 \( \text{\( \Box \) } c4 \) b5, I.Zaitsev-Bitman, Moscow 1967, and 12...\( \text{\( \Box \) } c7 \) 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } d5 \) (I.Zaitsev-Gik, Moscow 1967) 13...\( \text{\( \Box \) } e6 \) 14 \( \text{\( \Box \) } c4!?? \) lead to a chaotic game.

b) 10 exd5 exd5 is hardly dangerous for Black. Approximate variations: 11 \( \text{\( \Box \) } f3 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } e6 \); 11 \( \text{\( \Box \) } db5 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } e6 \); 11 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b3 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } e8 \) (11...\( \text{\( \Box \) } b4!?? \) 12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } db5 \) {12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b5!?? \) 12...\( \text{\( \Box \) } e6 \) 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } g5 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } e8 \); Konstantinopolsky suggested 11...\( \text{\( \Box \) } a5 \) 12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b5 \) (12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } f3 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } e6 \) 13 h3 \( \text{\( \Box \) } a5 \) 14 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b1 \) a6 Nunn) 12...\( \text{\( \Box \) } b4 \) (12...\( \text{\( \Box \) } a5!? 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xd5 \) 13 a3 a6 14 \( \text{\( \Box \) } e2 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } c6 \) 15 \( \text{\( \Box \) } h1 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } c5 \) Akopian.

c) 10 \( \text{\( \Box \) } f3 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe4!?? \) (10...\( \text{\( \Box \) } b4 \) 11 exd5 \( \text{\( \Box \) } db5 \) 12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } d4 \) \( \pm \) Ostojić-Hartston, Hastings 1967/8) 11 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe4 \), and Black can proceed either by playing 11...\( \text{\( \Box \) } a5 \) 12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } d2 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } a4 \) (12...\( \text{\( \Box \) } b4 \) 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xb4 \) \( \pm \); 12...\( \text{\( \Box \) } b6!?? \) 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } d3 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } xa2!?) (13...dxe4 14 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe4 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe4 \) 15 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe4 \) \( \pm \) Boleslavsky) 14 \( \text{\( \Box \) } c3 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } a1+ \) 15 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b1 \) e5! with compensation, or by 11...\( \text{\( \Box \) } c7 \) 12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } d3 \) (12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } eg5 \) dxc4 =) 12...dxe4 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe4 \) e5! (= Nunn).

d) After 10 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b3 \), 10...\( \text{\( \Box \) } xe4 \) 11 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe4 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } c7 \) is probably again the most accurate and sufficient to equalize.

10...\( \text{\( \Box \) } a5 \)

After 10...\( \text{\( \Box \) } b4 \) 11 \( \text{\( \Box \) } db5!\), 10...\( \text{\( \Box \) } e8 \) 11 \( \text{\( \Box \) } f3 \) or 10...\( \text{\( \Box \) } a5 \) 11 exd5 exd5 12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b5!\), Garibian-Yudovich, USSR 1968, White's chances are better.

11 e5

11 \( \text{\( \Box \) } h1 \) e5 12 \( \text{\( \Box \) } f3 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } b3+ \) 13 axb3 \( \text{\( \Box \) } a5 \) 14 exd5 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b4 \) 15 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b1 \) (15 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe5? \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } xc3 \) 16 bxc3 \( \text{\( \Box \) } e4! \) \( \pm \); 15 \( \text{\( \Box \) } d2?) 15...\( \text{\( \Box \) } xc3 \) 16 bxc3 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xd5 \) 17 \( \text{\( \Box \) } d2 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } xc3+?! \) (17...f6 18 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe5 \) fxe5 19 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe5 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } f5 \) =; 17...\( \text{\( \Box \) } xc3!?) 18 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xc3 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } xc3 \) 19 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xe5! \) gives White a slight advantage, Wedberg-Sosonko, Amsterdam 1984.

11...\( \text{\( \Box \) } d7 \) 12 f4

White has a small advantage. Now the following continuations have been seen:

a) 12...\( \text{\( \Box \) } b6 \) 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b1 \) (13 g4!? NCO) 13...\( \text{\( \Box \) } xe3 \) 14 cxb3 f6 15 exf6 (15 h4!?) 15...\( \text{\( \Box \) } xf6 \) 16 \( \text{\( \Box \) } h1 \) (16 \( \text{\( \Box \) } f3!?) 16...\( \text{\( \Box \) } e8! \) = Hübner-Sosonko, Wijk aan Zee 1984.

b) 12...a6 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } hf1 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } xb3+ \) (13...b5 is met by 14 \( \text{\( \Box \) } xd5!) 14 axb3, Ahlender-L.Schneider, Stockholm 1986.

c) 12...\( \text{\( \Box \) } b4 \) 13 \( \text{\( \Box \) } d2 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } c5 \) 14 \( \text{\( \Box \) } hf1 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } xb3+ \) 15 axb3 a5 16 \( \text{\( \Box \) } b1 \) \( \text{\( \Box \) } xc3 \) 17
\( \text{xc3 } \text{xe4} 18 \text{f3}, \text{de Firmian-Sosonko, Lucerne Wcht 1989.} \)

**C33)**

9...\( \text{cxd4} \)

This is similar to the line 9...\( \text{wa5} \) 10 \( \text{b3 } \text{cxd4} \), but White has some additional ideas.

10 \( \text{xd4} \)
10 \( \text{xd4} !!? \).

10...\( \text{wa5} \)

Now:

a) 11 \( \text{b3} – 9...\( \text{wa5} \) 10 \( \text{b3 } \text{cxd4} \) 11 \( \text{xd4} \) (Line C34).

b) 11 f4?! e5! = Yurtayev-Zhidkov, USSR 1978.

c) 11 e5? dxe5 12 \( \text{xe5 b6} \) (12...\( \text{d7}!? \)) 13 \( \text{d4} \) (13 \( \text{b5 } \text{a6} \) 14 \( \text{c3 } \text{wa4} \) 15 \( \text{b1} \) Nunn) 13...\( \text{b7} \) and now Geller recommended 14 \( \text{xd4} \) (instead of 14 \( \text{b5} \) a6, Velimirović-Geller, Budapest 1973, 15 \( \text{a4 axb5} \) 16 \( \text{xa5 } \text{xa5} \).

d) 11 \( \text{hgl} !!? \) \( \text{d7} \) 12 g4?! \( \text{fc8} \) (12...\( \text{b5} \) 13 \( \text{g5 } \text{xe4} \) 14 \( \text{d3}!! \) Wolff) 13 g5 (13 \( \text{b3} \) transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 12th move in Line C34) 13...\( \text{e8} \) and now 14 \( \text{b1} \) is Christiansen’s improvement over 14 f4 \( \text{xc4}!! \) 15 \( \text{xc4 b5} \) with an unclear position, Brunner-Christiansen, Novi Sad OL 1990.

**C34)**

9...\( \text{wa5} \) (D)

10 \( \text{b3} \)

Otherwise:

a) 10 g4?! is dubious because of 10...\( \text{e5} \)!, Šahović-Geller, Belgrade 1969, while 10...\( \text{d5} \)!!? and 10...\( \text{xd4} \)!! are also interesting.

b) 10 \( \text{b3 } \text{c7} \) 11 f4 a6 12 g4 b5 13 \( \text{d3} \) is a double-edged form of the Anti-Sozin (see the note to White’s 8th move in Line B5 of Chapter 14).

c) 10 f4?! \( \text{xd4} \) (10...\( \text{d7} \) can be met by 11 \( \text{b3} \)!!? or 11 g4?! \( \text{xd4} \) 12 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 13 \( \text{d5} \)) 11 \( \text{xd4} \) a6 (11...\( \text{e5} \) 12 \( \text{d5} \)!!? \( \pm \) 12 \( \text{b3} \) (12 \( \text{a3} \)!!? \( \text{d5} \)!!? \( \pm \) 12 \( \text{xa3} \), A.Ivanov-Dlugy, USA Ch (Jacksonville) 1990).

d) 10 \( \text{hgl} !!? \) is of particular interest: 10...\( \text{xd4} \) 11 \( \text{xd4 } \text{d7} \) transposes to Line C33, and if 10...\( \text{d7} \), then 11 \( \text{b3} \)!!?.

10...\( \text{xd4} \)

10...\( \text{d7} \)!!? is possibly better than its reputation: 11 \( \text{db5} \) (11 g4?! \( \text{xd4} \) 12 \( \text{xd4} \) e5 13 \( \text{d5} \) Yudasin; 11 \( \text{hgl} \)!!?; 11 \( \text{b1} \)!!?) 11...d5 (11...\( \text{e8} \) 12 \( \text{f4} \) clearly favours White) is very interesting. For instance, 12 \( \text{exd5} \) (unsuccessful is 12 \( \text{g5} \)!!? a6; 12 \( \text{d3 } \text{b4} \) 12...\( \text{xe4} \)!!?) 13 e5 \( \text{xe5} \) 14 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 15 a3 \( \text{xc3} \) (15...\( \text{c4} \)!!?) 16 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \pm \) 12...\( \text{exd5} \), and as yet White has not shown anything:

a) 13 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 14 \( \text{xd5 } \text{b4} \) 15 \( \text{c3 } \text{f5} \) 16 \( \text{b3 } \text{e7} \) with the initiative for the pawn, Turlej-Gertz, corr. 1999.

b) 13 \( \text{d2 } \text{b4} \)!!? 14 a3 (or 14 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 15 \( \text{xd5 } \text{ae8} \)!!?) 14...\( \text{fe8} \) 15 \( \text{xf1} \) a6! – Sek.
c) 13 \( \Box x a 7 \) \( \Box x a 7 \) \( 14 \) \( \Box x d 5 \) \( \Box a 8 \) 15 \( \Box b 6 \) (15 \( \Box x f 6 + \) \( \Box x f 6 \) 16 \( \Box x d 7 \) \( \Box b 4 \)!) 15...\( \Box a 6 \) 16 \( \Box c 4 \) \( \Box a 4 \) 17 \( \Box b 3 \) \( \Box a 6 \) with a repetition, Hunter-Dün- haupt, corr. 1970-1.

11 \( \Box x d 4 \)

11 \( \Box x d 4 \)!! \( \Box d 7 \) and then: 12 \( \Box d 3 \) \( \Box c 6 \) 13 \( \Box d 2 \) \( \Box c 7 \) 14 g4 b5 15 g5 \( \Box d 7 \) 16 \( \Box h 3 \) \( \Box f c 8 \) is OK for Black, Dauga- Priditis, corr. 1974; 12 g4?! e5 13 \( \Box d 5 \) Geller; 12 \( \Box h d 1 \)!! \( \Box c 6 \) 13 f4, London-Dlugy, USA (4) 1986.

11...\( \Box d 7 \)

11...\( \Box g 5 + ? \) 12 \( \Box b 1 \) e5 (12...\( \Box x g 2 \) 13 \( \Box h g 1 \) \( \Box x h 2 \) 14 \( \Box h 1 \) \( \Box f 4 \) 15 \( \Box d g 1 \))! 13 h4 \( \Box x g 2 \) 14 \( \Box d g 1 \) \( \Box a 4 \) 15 \( \Box x g 2 \) \( \Box x e 2 \) 16 \( \Box x e 2 \) \( \Box d 4 \) 17 \( \Box x d 4 \) is much better for White – Fischer.

12 \( \Box h g 1 \)

There are some rare alternatives: 12 \( \Box x f 6 ? ! \) \( \Box x f 6 \) 13 \( \Box x d 6 \) \( \Box c 6 \); 12 f4?! e5!; little studied are 12 f3 and 12 \( \Box d 3 ? ! \) \( \Box c 6 \) 13 f4, Sveshnikov-Kogan, lvov 1973.

The known alternative is 12 \( \Box b 1 \), with the following continuations:

a) 12...b5?! 13 \( \Box x f 6 \) ±.

b) 12...\( \Box a d 8 \)?! 13 \( \Box e 3 \) b6? (13...b5 14 a3 ± Fischer; 13...\( \Box c 6 \) 14 \( \Box x a 7 \) \( \Box d 7 \) 15 \( \Box d 4 \) e5 16 \( \Box d 5 \) \( \Box x d 5 \) 17 \( \Box c 3 \) ++) 14 \( \Box x f 6 \) \( \Box x f 6 \) 15 \( \Box d 5 \)! and White is winning, Fischer-Sofresvki, Skopje/Kruševko/Ohrid 1967.

c) 12...\( \Box c 6 \) 13 f4 and now:

c1) 13...e5 14 \( \Box e 3 \) favours White.

c2) 13...b5 14 e5! \( \Box x e 5 \) 15 \( \Box x e 5 \) ± Fischer.

c3) 13...\( \Box x e 8 \) 14 \( \Box h f 1 \) (14 g4? Sosonoko) 14...\( \Box a d 8 \) – 13...\( \Box a d 8 \) 14 \( \Box h f 1 \) \( \Box f 8 \).

c4) 13...\( \Box a d 8 \) 14 \( \Box h f 1 \)!! (14 f5 \( \Box x f 5 \) 15 \( \Box x f 5 \) \( \Box d 7 \) 16 \( \Box h f 1 \) \( \Box d 8 \)!! Shamko- vich; 14 g4 d5) and now:

c41) 14...\( \Box f e 8 \) can be met by 15 g4?! (Sosonoko), or 15 e5 \( \Box x e 5 \) 16 \( \Box x e 5 \) \( \Box d 5 \) 17 \( \Box e 4 \) with a perceptible advantage for White, Rogić-Sosonoko, Bük- fürdo 1995.

c42) 14...b5 15 f5! (15 e5?! is also good) 15...b4 16 \( \Box x e 6 \) \( \Box x c 3 \) 17 \( \Box e 7 + \) \( \Box h 8 \) 19 \( \Box g 4 \) \( \Box b 8 \) 20 \( \Box e 6 \) \( \Box d 8 \) 21 \( \Box f 1 \) \( \Box b 4 \) 22 \( \Box x c 3 \) \( \Box x e 4 \) 23 \( \Box f 6 \) \( \Box e 1 + \) 24 \( \Box x e 1 \) \( \Box x f 6 \) 25 \( \Box a 5 ! \) ++ 17...\( \Box h 8 \) 18 \( \Box f 5 \) \( \Box b 4 \) 19 \( \Box f 1 \)!! \( \Box x e 4 \), and Fischer proved a win for White after 20 \( \Box f 4 \)!! (20 a3? \( \Box b 7 \) 21 \( \Box f 4 \) \( \Box a 4 \)!! wins for Black, Fischer-Geller, Skopje/Kruševko/Ohrid 1967).

d) 12...\( \Box f d 8 \) Geller.

e) 12...\( \Box f c 8 \) 13 f4 e5 14 \( \Box d 5 \) \( \Box x d 5 \) 15 \( \Box x d 5 \) \( \Box x d 5 \) 16 \( \Box x e 3 \) \( \Box d 4 \) 17 \( \Box x e 7 \) d3! 18 \( \Box x d 3 \) \( \Box b 6 \) = Fransen- Stern, corr. 1994.

f) 12...\( \Box a c 8 \) 13 f4 (13 \( \Box e 1 \)??, Moro- zevich-Dlugy, ICC blitz 1999) 13...e5 14 \( \Box d 5 \) \( \Box x d 5 \) 15 \( \Box x d 5 \) \( \Box f 6 \) 16 \( \Box x e 5 \) \( \Box x e 5 \) 17 \( \Box x e 5 \) \( \Box f 8 \) = de Firmian- Dlugy, USA Ch (Estes Park) 1987.

12...\( \Box c 6 \)

Or:

a) 12...b5? 13 e5 \( \Box x e 5 \) 14 \( \Box x e 5 \) \( \Box f c 8 \) (14...\( \Box c 6 \) 15 \( \Box x e 6 \) ++) 15 g4 \( \Box c 7 \) (15...\( \Box c 6 \) 16 g5 \( \Box e 8 \) 17 g6 ++) 16 g5 \( \Box e 8 \) 17 \( \Box d 5 \) ± Yudasin-Fed- orowicz, Novi Sad OL 1990.

b) 12...\( \Box f c 8 \) 13 g4 e5 (13...b5 14 e5! \( \Box e 8 \) 15 \( \Box x d 6 \) favours White, Romanishin-Zakharov, USSR 1974) 14 g5! (14 \( \Box e 3 \) \( \Box x c 3 \) 15 \( \Box d 2 \) is less convincing) 14...\( \Box d 4 \) 15 \( \Box x f 6 \) \( \Box x f 6 \) 16 \( \Box d 5 \) with an attack (Yudasin).

c) 12...\( \Box a c 8 \) 13 g4 e5 14 \( \Box e 3 \) (14 g5 is a serious alternative here) 14...\( \Box x c 3 \) 15 \( \Box d 2 \) \( \Box b 5 \) 16 \( \Box x e 1 \) \( \Box x c 2 + ? \) 17 \( \Box x c 2 \)
wa6 (17...wc7+ 18 wb1!) 18 ag5 cd5 ± A.Ivanov-Dlugy, Philadelphia 1989 (18...ce2!?).
13 g4 cd7
13...e5 can be answered by 14 ac3! cxе4? 15 cxе4 cxе4 16 cd2 +– (Geller) or 14 g5!.
14 ab1
14 g5 axg5+! 15 ab1 af6 = Planinc-Bertok, Novi Sad 1965; 14 f4!?.
14...fe8
Or: 14...b5 15 cd5! (or 15 g5 b4 16 cd5) Bosch; 14...cc5 15 g5 b5 16 af6! ± Bednarsi-Kramer, Wijk aan Zee 1969.
15 g5
Black now finds himself in danger.
We have to mention:
a) 15...b5 and then:
a1) 16 f4!? b4 (16...cc5 17 f5 af8 18 g6 ±) 17 f5 bxc3 18 fxe6 fxe6 19
axe6+ ah8 20 axc3 Bosch.
a2) 16 g6 hxg6 17 mxg6 fxg6 (not 17...af6?, Bosch-Sosonko, Dutch Ch (Amsterdam) 1996, 18 mxf6 gxf6 19
md2 +–) 18 mxe6+ af8 19 ag4 af6
20 axd7 axd7 21 mxd7 md8! and Black just about remains in the game.
  b) 15...cc5 16 mc3 af8 17 mh3
axb3 18 axb3 mxg5 (18...g6?) 19 f4!
with an attack, Van der Wiel-Sosonko, Dutch Ch (Rotterdam) 1998.

C351)
10 ab3 mc8
Or:
a) 10...md4 11 axd4 (11 axd4!? wa5) and here:
a1) 11...mc6 12 f4!? wa5 13 mhf1
b5 14 e5!, Tukmakov-Minkov, USSR 1967.
a2) 11...b5 12 e5! dxex 13 axe5
we8 14 we4.
a3) 11...wa5 transposes to Line C34.
  b) 10...a6 transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 10th move in Line A of Chapter 10.
  c) 10...wb8!? seems playable as of now:
c1) 11 f4 md4! 12 axd4 (scarcely better is 12 mxd4 b5 13 f5 b4 14 fxe6
fxe6, Kholmov-Lein, USSR Ch (Kiev)
1964/5) 12...e5 = Balashov-Bykov,
USSR 1965.
c2) 11 \(b1\) (or 11 \(b1\)) 11...
\(dxd4\) 12 \(dxd4\) b5 13 e5 \(dxe5\) 14 \(dxe5\) \(wb7\) hardly promises anything for White.

c3) 11 g4 \(dxd4\) 12 \(dxd4\) b5 (12...e5!? might be OK: 13 g5 \(exd4\) 14 \(gxf6\) dxc3 or 13 \(axe5\) \(dxe4\) 13 g5 (13 e5!? \(dxe4\) 13...dxe4 14 \(dxe4\) \(wh5\) (14 \(dxe4\))! b4 – 11 \(dxe4\)!! \(dxd4\) 12 \(dxe4\) b5 13 g4 b4 14 g5 \(dxe4\); 14 \(dxe4\)!) 14...b4 15 \(d3\) bxc3! and now both 16 \(d3\) \(dxe5\) + 17 \(dxe5\) e5, Espig-Kirov, Timisoara 1972, and 16 f4 \(d6\)!? 17 \(d6\) \(d7\) b7 are likely to be in Black’s
favour.

c4) 11 \(dxe4\)!! \(dxd4\) 12 \(dxe4\) b5 13 g4 (13 e5 \(dxe5\) 14 \(dxe5\) \(wb7\) 15 g4 \(d6\) 16 g5 \(d7\)) 13...b4 14 g5 \(d8\), and instead of 15 \(d5\)?! \(exd5\) 16 \(d5\) g6!? (T.Petrosian), White should test 15 \(d1\) or 15 \(d4\).

d) 10...\(d5\)!? (there is insufficient material to assess this plan) 11 g4 \(dxb3\) + 12 axb3 and then:

d1) 12...d5!?

d2) 12...\(d6\)?! 13 g5 \(d8\) and now, rather than 14 \(d6\) \(d4\) a4 15 bxa4 \(dxa4\) 16 f4 \(d7\) = Golubev-I.Sokolov, Moscow rp’d 1994, 14 f4?! is interesting.

d3) 12...\(w6\) 13 \(d1\) (Nunn proposes 13 g5?!?) and now:

d31) 13...\(e8\) 14 g5 \(e8\) 15 f4 \(e7\)? (15...b5 16 \(g4\) b4 17 \(d5\) \(d8\) 18 h4 with an attack, Soltis-I.Ivanov, Boston 1988) 16 f5 exf5 17 exf5 \(xg5\) 18 \(xg5\) \(xg5\) 19 \(h1\) with some compensation, Ribeiro-Khuzman, Benasque 1993.

d32) 13...\(h8\) 14 g5 (14 f4 b5 15 e5 \(e8\), Velimirović-Van der Wiel, Reggio Emilia 1986/7) 14...\(e8\) 15 f4 b5 16 \(g4\) b4 17 \(d5\), Nelson-Frederic, corr. 1997.

We now return to 10...\(c8\) (D):

11 \(f4\)

11 f3 \(d5\) (11...\(dxd4\)!! 12 \(dxd4\) – 8...\(d7\) 9 0-0-0 \(c8\) 10 \(b3\) \(d5\) 11 \(f3\) 0-0).

11 \(d5\) \(d8\) and then:

a) It appears that 12 \(d7\) \(d7\) 13 \(d7\) b6 14 \(w6\) \(c6\) 15 \(a4\) \(xh6\)!

b) 12 g4 a6 13 \(d4\) b5 14 h4 \(d5\) 15 g5 \(dxb3\) + 16 axb3 b4 with strong counterplay, Franzen-Kochiev, Stary Smokovec 1982.

c) 12 f4 a6 13 \(d4\) \(d5\) 14 g4 (Zapata-Limp, São Paulo 1997) 14...b5, and Black stands no worse.

11...\(d5\)

11...\(d5\)!! and then:

a) 12 f5 \(dxd4\) 13 \(dxd4\) (13 \(dxd4\)!

b) 12 \(d5\) \(d5\) (12...\(d5\)!!) 13 e5 d5 Anand) 13 f5 dxe4 (13...a6 14 \(d5\)??) 14 \(dxe4\) (as an improvement, Nunn
proposed 14 $\text{e}x\text{d}7!? \text{d}x\text{d}7 15 \text{f}xe6) 14...\text{c}x\text{e}4 15 $\text{e}x\text{d}7 \text{e}x\text{f}5 16 \text{d}x\text{a}7 \text{c}c7 and Black has sufficient resources, Nunn-Dlugy, Wijk aan Zee 1990.

12 e5 $\text{c}x\text{b}3+$

12...\text{e}e8!? deserves some attention.

Now (after 12...\text{c}x\text{b}3+):

a) 13 \text{c}x\text{b}3 dxe5 14 fxe5 \text{d}d5! 15 $\text{e}x\text{d}5 \text{e}x\text{d}5 16 \text{d}x\text{d}5 \text{w}c7 (Boleslavsky), and Black should equalize step by step.

b) 13 axb3 \text{e}e8 (13...dxe5 14 fxe5 and now 14...\text{d}d5 15 $\text{e}x\text{d}5 \text{e}x\text{d}5 \pm or 14...\text{e}e8 15 \text{d}b5 a6 16 \text{d}x\text{d}7! \text{w}x\text{d}7 17 \text{d}d1 – Boleslavsky) 14 \text{b}1 \text{w}a5 15 \text{c}c1 dxe5 16 fxe5 \text{c}c7 17 \text{d}d3 \text{f}d8 18 \text{h}3 \text{e}e8 19 \text{w}e4 f5! 20 \text{e}x\text{f}6 \text{g}6 with sufficient counterplay, Szuk-Fehér, Budapest 1994.

C352)

10 f4! \text{c}c8 (D)

Or:

a) 10...\text{w}b8?! 11 f5 \text{d}x\text{d}4 12 \text{e}x\text{d}4 (12 $\text{e}x\text{d}4 \pm \text{Nunn}) 12...b5 13 fxe6 \pm .

b) 10...\text{w}c8 11 \text{d}f3!? \text{w}c7 (11...a6 12 e5 \text{e}e8 13 h4!, Peters-Dlugy, Los Angeles 1988) 12 \text{b}1 a6 13 \text{d}3 e5 (13...b5 14 e5!) 14 f5 \text{b}4 (Wolff-Dlugy, Toronto 1989) 15 \text{c}c4!? is slightly better for White.

c) 10...\text{w}c7 11 f5!? (11 \text{b}3!? \text{d}x\text{d}4 12 $\text{e}x\text{d}4; 11 \text{d}b5!? \text{w}b8 12 \text{w}d2; 11 \text{h}f1) 11...\text{e}x\text{d}4 12 \text{e}x\text{d}4 \text{e}x\text{f}5 13 \text{e}x\text{f}5 \text{c}c5 14 \text{d}e1 with compensation, Severodvinsk-Prokopievsk, telegraph game between towns, 1967.

d) 10...a6 11 e5 dxe5 12 \text{c}x\text{c}6 bxc6 13 fxe5 \text{d}d5 14 \text{e}e4 \pm Timman-Ljubojević, Novi Sad OL 1990.

e) 10...\text{d}x\text{d}4 11 \text{e}x\text{d}4 \text{c}c6 (not 11...e5? 12 fxe5 \text{g}4 13 \text{e}x\text{f}6!) 12 f5

exf5 13 \text{e}x\text{f}5 d5!? (13...\text{w}e8) 14 \text{e}x\text{f}6 \text{w}f6 15 \text{d}x\text{d}5 \text{c}c5 16 \text{w}c7 \pm Yudasin.

11 e5

Or:

a) 11 \text{b}3 – 10 \text{b}3 \text{c}c8 11 f4.

b) 11 \text{d}b3!? is curious, Borocz-Fehér, Hungarian Chl 1989.

c) 11 f5 \text{d}a5 (11...\text{d}x\text{d}4!? 12 $\text{e}x\text{d}4 \text{e}x\text{f}5 13 \text{e}x\text{f}5 \text{a}5 14 \text{g}4) 12 \text{d}d3 (12 fxe6?? \text{c}c4 13 \text{e}x\text{d}7 \text{w}d7 14 \text{g}5 Kholmov) 12...e5 13 \text{b}3 b5! with a good game for Black, Kholmov-Tal, Riga (1) 1968.

d) 11 \text{c}c6!? bxc6 (11...\text{xc}6 12 \text{xa}7!?) 12 e5 (12 g4?!) 12...\text{d}d5 13 \text{ex}d6 \text{c}x\text{d}6 14 \text{w}d3 with some advantage for White, Ashley-Avrukh, Wijk aan Zee 2000.

11...\text{c}e8

11...dxe5 12 \text{c}x\text{c}6 bxc6 13 fxe5 \text{d}d5 14 \text{e}e4 \pm .

12 \text{c}x\text{c}6 \text{c}x\text{c}6 13 f5 \text{e}x\text{f}5 14 \text{e}6 \text{h}8 15 \text{e}x\text{f}7 \text{d}f6 16 \text{c}e6 \text{d}d7 17 \text{b}3! f4 18 \text{c}x\text{f}4 \text{g}4 19 \text{w}e3 \text{c}c1 20 \text{w}d1

White has more than adequate compensation, Topalov-Leko, Dortmund 1996.
14 Anti-Sozin: 5...\( \text{c6} \) 6 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{b6} \) and 6...\( \text{d7} \)

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{d}f\text{f}3 \) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{c}xd4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 5 \( \text{c}c3 \) \( \text{c}c6 \) 6 \( \text{c}c4 \) (D)

In the previous chapters (1-13) we described a whole range of positions with an early ...e6 (5...e6 6 \( \text{c}c4 \); 5...a6 6 \( \text{c}c4 \) e6; 5...\( \text{c}c6 \) 6 \( \text{c}c4 \) e6) and digressed from this topic just once in Chapter 2 when we considered some rare ideas for Black after 5...a6 6 \( \text{c}c4 \). Now it is time to talk about the avoidance of 6...e6 in the position shown in the diagram.

Two lines are of particular interest:

A: 6...\( \text{d}d7 \) 225

B: 6...\( \text{w}b6 \) 229

The other moves are:

a) 6...a6 – 5...a6 6 \( \text{c}c4 \) \( \text{c}c6 \) (note 'c' to Black's 6th move in Chapter 2).

b) 6...g6?! 7 \( \text{c}xc6! \) bxc6 8 e5 \( \text{c}g4 \).

Now 9 e6?! f5 (Schlechter-Em.Lasker, Berlin Wch (7) 1910) is not clear, but 9 exd6 provides White with better chances, and 9 \( \text{c}f4 \), with the point 9...d5 10 \( \text{c}xd5 \) \( \text{f}f6 \) is even more critical.

c) 6...\( \text{c}xd4 \)?! 7 \( \text{w}xd4 \) e5 (7...e6 8 \( \text{g}g5 \) is a Richter-Rauzer with an extra tempo for White due to the difference between \( \text{w}d1 \text{xd4} \) and \( \text{w}d1 \text{xd2} \text{d4} \)) 8 \( \text{w}d3 \) with an obvious advantage for White.

d) 6...e5 is not especially logical either:

   d1) 7 \( \text{c}f5 \) is interesting but not too convincing. For instance: 7...\( \text{c}x\text{f}5 \) (7...\( \text{e}e6 \) 8 \( \text{e}e3 \)?) 8 \( \text{e}x\text{f}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 9 \( \text{g}g5 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{c}x\text{f}6 \) \( \text{c}x\text{f}6 \) 11 0-0 \( \text{d}d4 \) 12 \( \text{c}c4 \) \( \text{c}c8 \) 13 \( \text{b}b3 \), Morović-Mohamed, Cap d’Agde rpd 1998.

   d2) White gains some advantage through 7 \( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 8 \( \text{b}b3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 9 0-0 10 \( \text{f}f4 \) (or 10 \( \text{h}h1 \)).

   d3) 7 \( \text{f}f3 \) h6 8 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 9 \( \text{e}1 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{d}d5 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 11 \( \text{b}3 \) ±.

e) 6...\( \text{a}a5 \)?! (this is at least better than 6...\( \text{e}5 \)!, after which the black knight will inevitably be attacked later by \( \text{f}4 \)?) 7 \( \text{d}b5 \)?! (7 \( \text{d}d3 \) g6! =; 7 \( \text{e}2 \)?! e6 0-0 yields a little-studied position; 7 \( \text{b}3 \) e6 transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 7th move in Line B of Chapter 13) 7...\( \text{d}d7 \) 8 \( \text{e}2 \) e6 9 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 10 0-0-0 a6 11 \( \text{c}c6 \) \( \text{c}d7 \) 12 \( \text{c}c7 \) \( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{c}c8 \) 13 \( \text{b}3 \).
15 \( \text{wd2} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 16 \( \text{he1} \) 0-0 17 \( \text{e3} \) ± Hraček-Chernyshov, Czech Ch 2000.

A)

6...\( \text{d7} \) \((D)\)

This continuation has not received much attention for a long time though it still occurs occasionally in grandmaster play. By playing 6...\( \text{d7} \), Black preserves the possibility of ...\( \text{e6} \) (with a transposition to some lines with 6...\( \text{e6} \) and ...\( \text{d7} \)) or ...\( \text{g6} \) (if he wishes to obtain Dragon positions). Black used to link 6...\( \text{d7} \) mainly with the latter plan, but it gradually became clear that he encounters some problems there.

\[ \text{W} \]

Now:

A1: 7 \( \text{h3} \) 226
A2: 7 0-0 227

The other continuations are rare although at least two of them (7 \( \text{e3} \) and 7 \( \text{xc6} \)) are of some interest:

a) 7 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g6} \)! = Lipnitsky-Boleslavsky, Moscow 1950.

b) After 7 \( \text{f3} \), Black can happily choose between 7...\( \text{wb6} \)! or any standard set-up with ...\( \text{e6} \).

c) If 7 \( \text{h3} \), the simplest is 7...\( \text{e6} \).!

d) 7 \( \text{g5} \) should not worry Black:

d1) 7...\( \text{xe4} \)! 8 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{a5} \)+ 9 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 10 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 11 \( \text{f4} \) ±.

d2) 7...\( \text{b6} \) 8 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{e6} \) transposes to Line B531.

d3) 7...\( \text{e6} \)! 8 \( \text{db5} \) (8 \( \text{xf6} \)?) \( \text{xf6} \) 9 \( \text{db5} \) 0-0-0! Koblenz, and Black can continue with 8...\( \text{b8} \) (which appears most reliable) or maybe 8...\( \text{b6} \).

d4) 7...\( \text{a5} \) 8 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gx6} \) leads to positions with chances for both sides:

d41) 9 \( \text{d5} \) (Bronstein) 9...\( \text{xd4} \)! 10 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{g7} \).

d42) 9 \( \text{xb3} \) \( \text{g5} \), and now 10 0-0 \( \text{g8} \) 11 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h5} \) 12 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{c8} \) (12...0-0-0!? Nunn) 13 \( \text{f4} \), Geller-Averbakh, Zurich Ct 1953, or 10 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h5} \)! (10...\( \text{f5} \) 11 \( \text{e5} \), Kruppa-Sorokin, Kherson 1991) 11 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g4} \) 12 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 13 \( \text{wd2} \) \( \text{f5} \) 14 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{fxe4} \) 15 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{f5} \), Brodsky-Nevednichy, Bucharest 1994.

e) 7 \( \text{e3} \)! \( \text{g4} \) (it is not consistent to play 7...\( \text{e6} \) or 7...\( \text{g6} \) 8 \( \text{f3} \)!, 7...\( \text{xc8} \) 8 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 9 0-0-0? \( \text{xe3} \)! 10 \( \text{fxe3} \) \( \text{e6} \)! deserves attention) 8 \( \text{xc6} \) (8 0-0?! \( \text{ce5} \)! 9 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 10 \( \text{fxe3} \) \( \text{e6} \) is clearly harmless for Black) 8...\( \text{xc6} \) (8...\( \text{xe3} \)? \( \text{xf7} \)+ +) with a little-studied position; e.g., 9 \( \text{f4} \) (9 \( \text{g5} \)?) \( \text{wb6} \); 9 \( \text{c1} \)!) 9...\( \text{e5} \) 10 \( \text{g3} \) (10 \( \text{d2} \)!! Gofshtein) 10...\( \text{e7} \) 11 \( \text{h3} \)!! (avoiding ideas like 11 \( \text{we2} \) 0-0 12 0-0 \( \text{h5} \)!, Gdanski-Nevednichy, Krynicza Z 1998) 11...\( \text{f6} \) 12 0-0 with the idea of \( \text{h1} \) and \( \text{f4} \).

f) 7 \( \text{xc6} \)!! and then:

f1) 7...\( \text{xc6} \) 8 \( \text{e2} \), and White can struggle for the initiative after 8...\( \text{g6} \) 9 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{g7} \) 10 0-0-0 \( \text{a5} \) 11 \( \text{h4} \)!! (11 \( \text{d5} \) 11...0-0 12 \( \text{b1} \), Gi.Hernandez-J.Armas, Cuba 1992, or 8...\( \text{e6} \) 9 \( \text{f4} \)!, Lein-Averbakh, USSR Ch (Baku) 1961, but 8...\( \text{xe4} \)!! (Gofshtein) deserves attention.
f2) After 7...bxc6!? 8 0-0 e6 9 ♗e2 ♙e7 10 b3 d5 11 ♙d3 (Gi.Hernandez-Korchnoi, Moscow OL 1994) I would prefer to be White.

A1) 7 ♙b3 (D)

B

7...g6

This is the standard response, although Black enjoys a wide choice:

a) 7...♗xd4 8 ♘xd4 g6 is unpleasantly met by 9 ♗c4!, Madl-Gaprindashvili, Kishinev 1998.

b) 7...♕a5 8 0-0 is slightly better for White (e.g. 8...g6 9 h3 ♗g7 10 ♙e3 transposing to a Dragon).

c) 7...♗c8 and now:

c1) 8 ♙g5 ♕a5 9 ♘xf6 gxf6 10 0-0 is unclear; then 10...♕c5! was recommended by Bednarski.

c2) 8 f3!? a6 (8...g6 9 ♙e3!; 8...e6?! 9 ♘db5!) 9 ♙e3 e6 10 g4 =∞.

c3) 8 0-0! is simplest – 7 0-0 ♗c8 8 ♙b3.

d) 7...a6 8 ♙e3 (8 f3 e6!; after 8 ♗g5!?, Taimanov’s 8...♕a5 is not entirely convincing; 8 0-0! – 7 0-0 a6 8 ♙b3 ≈) 8...♗g4 (8...♕a5!? 9 f4 ♘xb3 10 axb3 e5 may be playable, Bogdanović-Taimanov, Budva 1967) and now:

d1) 9 0-0!? ♙xe3 10 fxe3 e6 11 ♘xc6 bxc6 12 e5 d5 (Berzinsh-Antoniewski, Czech Ch 1998) 13 ♗g4! Berzinsh.

d2) 9 ♘xc6 bxc6 10 ♗f3 ♘f6 11 e5 (Kasparov/Nikitin) looks dangerous for Black.

e) 7...♕a5, with the point 8 f4 ♘xb3 9 axb3 e5, is of some interest.

f) 7...e6!? is likely to transpose to lines discussed in Chapter 13, but the moves ...♕d7 and ♙b3 restrict the possibilities of both Black and White. 8 ♙e3 ♗e7 transposes to note 'b' to Black’s 8th move in Line C2 of Chapter 13.

8 f3 (D)

With the idea of transposing to the Yugoslav Attack through 9 ♙e3.

Using the same idea, it is possible to play 8 ♙e3!? (Fischer) 8...♗g4 9 ♘xc6 bxc6 10 ♗f3 (10 ♙d4 e5! is satisfactory for Black, Velimirović-Ivanisević, Yugoslav Ch (Subotica) 2000; 10 ♗d4!? e5 11 ♗c4 ♗e7 12 ♙d2 ♗g7 13 f3 ♗f6 14 0-0-0 0-0 15 ♗g5, Smejkal-Hora, Pardubice 1965), and now:

a) 10...♕e5 11 ♗e2 ♗g7 12 f4 (12 h3 c5!) 12...♗g4 13 ♙d2 0-0 14 0-0 ♗b8 15 ♙h1, Ehlvest-de la Riva, Dos Hermanas open 1998, appears more promising for White.

b) Black can obtain a good game by 10...♗f6!? 11 ♗g5 ♗g7 12 e5 dxe5 13 0-0-0 0-0 14 ♗xf6 exf6!.

Other continuations (i.e. anything except 8 f3 and 8 ♙e3) allow Black to transpose to Dragon lines that are at least satisfactory for him; e.g., 8 h3 ♗g7 (8...♗xd4!?) 9 ♙e3 0-0 10 0-0 ♗c8.

8...♗xd4
8...\(\mathcal{Q}a5\) 9 \(\mathcal{Q}g5!\)?? \(\mathcal{Q}g7\) 10 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) h6
11 \(\mathcal{Q}e3\) \(\mathcal{C}c8\) 12 0-0-0 with an advantage for White, Fischer-Gligorčić, Yugoslavia Ct 1959.

8...\(\mathcal{Q}g7!\)? 9 \(\mathcal{Q}e3\) 0-0-0 leads to a position that results both from the Dragon and the Accelerated Dragon. Due to the early \(\mathcal{Q}b3\), Black has the resource 10 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd4!\)? 11 \(\mathcal{Q}xd4\) b5, and the attempt 10 h4!? has its disadvantages (as in the case of 10 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) \(\mathcal{C}c8\) 11 0-0-0 \(\mathcal{Q}e5\), the main move for White nowadays is not 12 h4 but 12 \(\mathcal{Q}b1\)!

9 \(\mathcal{W}xd4\) \(\mathcal{Q}g7\) 10 \(\mathcal{Q}g5\)
10 \(\mathcal{Q}e3\) 0-0 11 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) b5! gives Black good counterplay.

10-0-0

An unclear alternative is 10...\(\mathcal{W}a5!\)?
11 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) \(\mathcal{C}c8\), and then:

a) 12 \(h4\) \(\mathcal{Q}e6\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) \(\mathcal{W}xd2\) + 14 \(\mathcal{Q}xd2\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) 15 exd5 h6 is not dangerous for Black, Kudrashov-Averbakh, USSR Cht 1968.

b) 12 0-0 \(\mathcal{Q}e6\) (12...\(\mathcal{Q}h5\) Makarychev) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}h6\) with some initiative for White, Renet-Korchnoi, Swiss Cht 1995.

c) 12 0-0-0 \(\mathcal{C}xc3\) 13 bxc3 0-0 (the alternatives are 13...h6 14 \(\mathcal{Q}e3!\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 15 fxe4 \(\mathcal{Q}xc3\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xc3\) \(\mathcal{W}xc3\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}d4\) +-- and 13...\(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 14 fxe4 \(\mathcal{Q}xc3\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}xf7+\) \(\mathcal{Q}xf7\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}d5+\) \(\mathcal{Q}e5\)? 14...\(\mathcal{Q}e8\) (14...\(\mathcal{Q}e6!\)? 15 \(\mathcal{Q}h6\) Makarychev) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}b6\) \(\mathcal{Q}h6\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xh6\) \(\mathcal{C}xc3\) 17 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) ± de Firmian-Makarychev, Oslo 1984.

11 0-0-0!

Black again has adequate counter-chances after 11 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) b5!.

Or 11 \(\mathcal{W}e3\) b5! 12 h4 b4 (12...a5 13 a4 bxa4 14 \(\mathcal{Q}xa4\) \(\mathcal{B}b8\) 15 h5 \(\mathcal{Q}h5\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}f6\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}h6\) \(\mathcal{Q}xa4\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}xe7\) \(\mathcal{Q}g7\) 19 \(\mathcal{X}xa4\) \(\mathcal{B}b5\) Ciocaltea-Stein, Caracas 1970, is probably also satisfactory) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}e2\) a5 14 \(\mathcal{Q}h6\) \(\mathcal{C}c8\) (14...\(\mathcal{Q}h6!\)? and 14...a4!? are other ideas for Black) 15 h5 \(\mathcal{Q}xh6\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xb6\) (Saren-Robatsch, Forss/Helsinki Z 1972), and Black holds on due to 16...a4! with the point 17 hxg6 axb3 18 g7 \(\mathcal{Q}e8\) 19 g4 \(\mathcal{W}b6\)! 20 g5 \(\mathcal{W}e3\) (Florian).

11...h6

Or: 11...b5 12 e5!; 11...\(\mathcal{W}a5\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}d2\); 11...\(\mathcal{Q}e6\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) ± \(\mathcal{W}a5\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}b1\) \(\mathcal{F}c8\)
14 h4 b5 15 h5 \(\mathcal{Q}xb3\) 16 exb3 b4 17 \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) 18 exd5 and White possesses the initiative, Parma-Averbakh, Titovo Užice 1965.

12 \(\mathcal{Q}h4\) \(\mathcal{Q}c6\) 13 \(\mathcal{W}e3\) \(\mathcal{Q}d7?!\)
13...\(\mathcal{W}a5\) ± T.Petrosian.

14 \(\mathcal{X}xd6!\) g5 15 \(\mathcal{G}g6!\) e6 16 \(\mathcal{X}g7+\) \(\mathcal{Q}xg7\) 17 \(\mathcal{W}f2\)

The position favours White, Tal-Stein, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1969.

A2)

7 0-0 (D)

7...g6

This is more dubious here than after 7 \(\mathcal{Q}b3\) (Line A1). Other ideas:

a) 7...a6 8 \(\mathcal{Q}b3!\) (8 \(\mathcal{Q}g5!\)? e6; 8 \(\mathcal{Q}xc6!\) ? \(\mathcal{Q}xc6\) 9 \(\mathcal{Q}e1\) e6 10 \(\mathcal{Q}d5\), Jokišć-Shirazi, New York 1982) 8...e6 (8...g6 9 \(\mathcal{Q}xc6\)! transposes to note 'b'
to Black’s 8th move in Line B of Chapter 8 (±).

b) 7...\eb8 8 \eb3 (8 \eg5!??) and then 8...\e6 9 \e3! ± (less convincing is 9 \exc6!? \exc6 10 \e1 \e6, Soltis-Shirazi, New York 1987) or 8...\g6 9 \exc6! \exc6 (9...\bxc6 10 \f4!) 10 \e1 (or 10 \g5 \g7 11 \d5) 10...\g7 11 \d5 0-0 12 \g5 \xd5 13 \exd5 – 7...\g6 8 \exc6! \exc6 9 \g5 \g7 10 \d5 \xd5 11 \exd5 0-0 12 \e1 \c8 13 \b3 ±.

c) 7...\e6 is more reliable. For instance, 8 \b3 \e7 9 \e3 0-0 transposes to Line C221 of Chapter 13.

8 \exc6! \xc6

After 8...\bxc6 9 \f4! Black has some difficulties with his development:

a) 9...\wc7? 10 \e5! \dxe5 11 \fxe5 \exe5 12 \xf7+! \xf7 13 \xd7 (Bolshovsky).

b) 9...\g4 10 \e2!! is better for White, Koopman-Makarychev, Groningen jr Ech 1973/4.

c) 9...\a5 10 \h1 \g7 (Black should consider 10...\h5!?) 11 \e5! ±.

d) 9...\g4 10 \d3 (10 \e1!? \d5 11 \d3 \dxe4 12 \bxe4 \g7 13 \xf6+ \xf6 14 \f5 gives White a slight advantage, A.Sokolov-Sax, Brussels 1988) 10...\g7 11 \h3 (not wholly clear is 11

e5 \d7 12 \exd6 \b6 13 \a6 0-0, Nunn-Balashov, Toluca IZ 1982)

11...\c8 12 \e5 \d7 13 \exd6 \b6 14 \dxe7 \exe7 (14...\d4+? 15 \e3 \xc4 16 \d8#) 15 \b3 0-0 16 \e3 \d8 17 \e2 (Chandler-Kupreichik, Minsk 1982) and now 17...\xc3 18 \bxc3 \a6 (Chandler) does not promise Black equality.

9 \g5

9 \d5 \g7 10 \g5 comes to the same thing.

A less consistent line is 9 \e2 \g7 10 \g5 (10 \d1 0-0!? 11 \e5 \e8) 10...0-0 11 \ad1 \a5 12 \d5 \xd5 13 \exd5 \e5!, A.Sokolov-Korchnoi, Reykjavik World Cup 1988.

9...\g7 10 \d5 \xd5

10...\e6? 11 \xf6+ \xf6 12 \xf6 \xf6 13 \xd6 \d8 (13...\xb2 14 \ab1 ++) 14 \a3 ±.

10...0-0!? 11 \xf6 gives White some advantage after any recapture on f6 (weaker is 11 \e1 \e6!, when White has nothing better than 12 \xf6+ \xf6 13 \xf6 =).

11 \exd5 0-0

11...\e4?! 12 \b5+ \f8 13 \c1 \h5, Lendwai-Robatsch, Austrian Ch 1995.

12 \e1!

Practice has shown that White enjoys a small advantage here. After 12...\c8 13 \b3 \d7 or 12...\d7 followed by ...\fc8, Black preserves great defensive resources but it is hardly possible to talk about equality.

Summing up: the rare ideas for White on move 7 require more testing. The main continuations, 7 \b3 and 7 0-0, make Black choose between 7...\e6 and 7...\g6. 7...\e6 is satisfactory, but it is hard to say whether it is worthwhile
to begin with 6...\texttt{\textit{d}}d7. As regards 7...g6, this move probably works better after 7 \texttt{\textit{d}}b3 than it does after 7 0-0.

\textbf{B)}

6...\texttt{\textit{w}}b6 (\textit{D})

\begin{center}
\textbf{W}
\end{center}

This currently popular line was introduced by Pal Benko at the end of the 1950s. It is clear that the queen will not stay on b6 for long but Black is ready to lose a tempo in order to disrupt White's attacking scheme.

White has to determine the character of further play by choosing between the main move 7 \texttt{\textit{d}}b3, three topical alternatives (7 \texttt{\textit{d}}xc6, 7 \texttt{\textit{d}}de2 and 7 \texttt{\textit{d}}db5) and the speculative gambit idea of 7 \texttt{\textit{e}}e3.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{B1:} 7 \texttt{\textit{e}}e3?! 229
  \item \textbf{B2:} 7 \texttt{\textit{d}}d6!? 230
  \item \textbf{B3:} 7 \texttt{\textit{d}}de2?! 235
  \item \textbf{B4:} 7 \texttt{\textit{d}}xc6?! 241
  \item \textbf{B5:} 7 \texttt{\textit{d}}b3 247
\end{itemize}

\textbf{B1)}

7 \texttt{\textit{e}}e3?! \texttt{\textit{w}}xb2 8 \texttt{\textit{d}}d5 \texttt{\textit{w}}b4! 9 \texttt{\textit{w}}e2 (\textit{D})

After 9 \texttt{\textit{d}}d3 \texttt{\textit{w}}a5 10 \texttt{\textit{d}}d2 \texttt{\textit{w}}d8 11 \texttt{\textit{d}}d5 \texttt{\textit{d}}xd5 12 exd5 \texttt{\textit{e}}e5 13 \texttt{\textit{e}}e2 a6 14 \texttt{\textit{d}}d4 \texttt{\textit{w}}c7 White obtained no genuine compensation in the game Velimirović-Valvo, Krakow 1964.

\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}

Black now has a number of promising possibilities:

\begin{itemize}
  \item a) 9...\texttt{\textit{e}}e6 10 \texttt{\textit{d}}xe6 fxe6 11 0-0 is unclear, Polzin-Martinić, Austrian Cht 2000/1.
  \item b) 9...\texttt{\textit{d}}e5 10 \texttt{\textit{d}}b3 (10 \texttt{\textit{d}}b1!? \texttt{\textit{w}}xc4 11 \texttt{\textit{w}}xc4 \texttt{\textit{d}}xc4 12 \texttt{\textit{c}}c7+ \texttt{\textit{d}}d8 13 \texttt{\textit{a}}xa8 \texttt{\textit{d}}xe3 14 fxe3 b6 15 0-0 \texttt{\textit{b}}b7 16 \texttt{\textit{d}}xb6 axb6 17 \texttt{\textit{d}}xb6 = i.Zaitsev-Makarov, St Petersburg 1997) 10...a6 11 \texttt{\textit{c}}c7+ (11 \texttt{\textit{d}}d2 axb5 12 \texttt{\textit{d}}xb5 \texttt{\textit{c}}c5 13 \texttt{\textit{e}}e3 and now 13...\texttt{\textit{d}}d4+ offers equality, while 13...\texttt{\textit{d}}d6! 14 \texttt{\textit{d}}d5 \texttt{\textit{w}}d7 15 \texttt{\textit{d}}b6 e6 is also possible) 11...\texttt{\textit{d}}d8 12 \texttt{\textit{d}}d2 \texttt{\textit{d}}c7 13 \texttt{\textit{d}}d5+ \texttt{\textit{d}}xd5 14 \texttt{\textit{d}}xb4 \texttt{\textit{d}}xb4 (Pinski) – Black’s chances are hardly worse.
  \item c) 9...\texttt{\textit{g}}g4!? 10 f3 \texttt{\textit{d}}xe4 (Miserendino-Zarnicki, Villa Martelli 1998) 11 \texttt{\textit{d}}d4! (Oltlh), with uncertain consequences.
  \item d) 9...\texttt{\textit{d}}xe4 and then:
    \begin{itemize}
      \item d1) 10 \texttt{\textit{d}}d4 gives Black a good choice:
        \begin{itemize}
          \item d11) 10...\texttt{\textit{f}}f5 11 a3 \texttt{\textit{d}}xd4 (11...\texttt{\textit{w}}a5 12 0-0-0! \texttt{\textit{d}}xd4 13 \texttt{\textit{d}}xd4 \texttt{\textit{c}}c3 14 \texttt{\textit{d}}xd6+ \texttt{\textit{d}}d8 15 \texttt{\textit{d}}xb7++ \texttt{\textit{c}}c7 16 \texttt{\textit{d}}xa5 \texttt{\textit{d}}xe2+ 17 \texttt{\textit{d}}xe2 ± Dubinski)
        \end{itemize}
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
axb4 3xe2 13 3xe4 2c8 with a good game (Lepeshkin).

d12) 10...3xd4 11 3xe4 3xc2+! (11...2c6 is risky in view of 12 3b1, Maslennikov-Kremenetsky, Moscow 1996, as is 11...e5 due to 12 0-0 0-0 3xc4 13 3xd4 2c6 14 3d5, Dubinsky-Grachev, Moscow 1996) 12 3d1 3f5! (12...f5 13 3c7+ 3d8 14 3xc2! 3xc4 15 3xa8 3d7 is possibly over-optimistic) 13 3xf7+ 3d8! 14 3xf5 (14 3xb7!? 3c8 15 3xa7) 14...3xa1 15 3e8 3xe8 16 3c7+ 3d8 17 3e6+ = Pinski.

d2) 10 3xf7+!? 3xf7 11 3b1 3a5 12 3c4+ e6 (12...e6 13 3xe4 g6 14 0-0 3g7? 15 3xd6+ exd6 16 3xb7+ = Lepeshkin) 13 3xe4 and now:

d21) 13...3e8 can be met by 14 0-0 d5 15 3f3+ 3g8 16 3d4.

d22) 13...d5 14 3f3+ 3g8 15 0-0 3d8 16 3d4 (Dubinski-S.Kiselev, Moscow 1998) 16...a6 17 3c7 3a7 18 3e1 3f6 19 3a4! (Dubinski) is unclear.

d23) Balinov recommended the line 13...3g8 14 3d2 a6 with an advantage.

e) 9...3a5 (the most solid reply) 10 3d2 3d8 11 3d5 3xd5 12 exd5 3e5 13 3b3 (13 f4 3g4 14 3xd6+ exd6 15 3b5+ 3d7 16 fxe5 dxe5 17 3xe5+ 3f7 = Pinski-P.Varga, Budapest 1997; 13 3a3!? I.Zaitsev) 13...a6 14 f4 (14 3a3)! g6 15 f4 3d7 16 3c4 Lepeshkin; 14 3d4 g6 15 f4 3d7 = Ardeleanu-Navedichy, Romanian Chl 1997) 14...3g4! 15 3a3 (15 3d4 g6 16 3a4+ 3d7 17 3e6 fxe6 18 3xd7+ 3xd7 19 dxe6 =) and now:

e1) 15...b5 16 c4! 3d7 17 exb5 axb5 18 3xb5 3b6 19 3c4 is difficult for Black.

e2) 15...3c7 16 3c4 b5 17 3a5 3c5 18 3b6 3b8 19 3xc8 3xc8 20 3c4! also gives Black problems, Pinski-Galliamova, Koszalin 1997.

e3) 15...g6 16 3c3 3g8 17 3c4 b5 18 h3! bxc4 19 3a4+ 3d7 20 3xd7+ 3xd7 21 hxg4 (Pinski-Shishkin, Nadole 1997) 21...3g7 leads to double-edged play.

e4) 15...3f6 may be even stronger, Rosabal-B.Martinez, Placetas 2000.

On the whole, after 7 3e3 it is Black rather than White who is fighting for the advantage.

B2)

7 3d5!? (D)

Though it is not a critical response to 6...3b6, this move gives White good chances of obtaining a position in the usual spirit of the Sozin, and does not give Black relief from some objective opening problems.

Black faces a curious choice:

a) To transpose to a starting position of our Chapter 11 via 7...a6 8 3e3 3d8 9 3d4 e6 with a possible 10 3e2 and the Velimirović Attack.

b) To transpose to the Classical Sozin with an early ...3c7: 7...a6 8
\( \text{\textsection e3 \textw a5 9 \textd d4 e6 10 0-0 \textw c7?!} \) 11 \( \textb b3. \) This is probably the best decision, although not very popular among the advocates of 6...\textw b6.

c) To leave the queen on a5, thus reaching the Classical Sozin with an extra tempo of doubtful value: 7...a6 8 \( \texte e3 \textw a5 9 \textd d4 e6) 10 0-0 \texte e7 11 \( \textb b3) 0-0 - \) here, this will be our main line.

d) Not to agree to the Sozin structure (7...a6 8 \( \texte e3 \textw a5 9 \textd d4 e6) and to seek his fortune by deviating with 9...\textg g4, 9...\texte e5, 8...\textw d8 9 \( \textd d4 \textg g4) or 7...\textg g4.

7...a6

Or 7...\textg g4, and then:

a) 8 \( \textf f3 \textd d7 9 \textw e2 a6 10 \texte e3 \textw a5 11 \textd d4 b5 12 \textb b3 e6) with a double-edged game; e.g., 13 0-0-0 (13 \texta a3; 13 \textw f2) 13...b4! (\textv e\textl i\textm i\textr o\textv i\textc h\texti v\texti c\texti c) 14 \textb b1 (14 \textd d5? \textw e\textd d5 15 \texte x\textd d5 \texte x\textd d5 16 \texte x\textd d5 \texte x\textd d8 Kramnik) 14...\texte e7 15 \textg g4 (15 \textd d2? \textw c7 \textv Kramnik) 15...\textw d7 16 \textw d7 (15...0-0!?) 16 \textg g5 \texte x\textd d4 17 \texte x\textd d4 \texta a5 (18 \textw d2 \texte d7 Kramnik) 16 \texte x\textd d4 e5 17 \textd d1 (\textt o\textp a\textl o\textp a\textl o\textv Kramnik, \textd o\texts \texth e\textm e\textr \textn a\textm a\texth) 17...\textw c7 18 \texte d2 a5 Kramnik.

b) 8 \textd d5! \texte x\textd d5 9 \textw x\textg g4 \textf f6 (a better idea than 9...\textd d4?! 10 \textw e2 \texte e5 11 \textb b3 \textb b3+ 12 \texte x\textd d3 \textw x\textb 5 13 \textd d4! \textv M\texta c\texti e\textj a\textk -\textk r\textu \textm \texth \textk u\texts h\textr, \textp r\texte s\textv o\textr 1999) 10 \textw e2 \textv B\textm c\texti e\textj a\textk -\textk r\textu \textm \textk h\texts \textr, \texty u\textg s\textl a\textv a\textl k Cht 1996.

8 \texte e3 \textw a5

Or 8...\textw d8 9 \textd d4 \textg g4?! (9...e6 transposes to Chapter 11) 10 \texte xc6 (10 0-0 \texte c5 11 \textb b3 \texte x\texte 3 12 \textf x\texte 3 \textw x\textb 5 13 \textd d4 14 \textv M\texta c\texti e\textj a\textk -\textk r\textu \textm \textk h\texts \textr, \textp r\texte s\textv o\textr 1989) 10...\textb b6, and now:

a) 11 \textd d2 g6! (11...\textf f6 12 0-0 e6 13 \textd d3 \textv V\texte l\texti m\texti \texti r\texti o\texti \textc h\texti v\texti c\texti c-B\textm a\textr o\textv l\texta j, \textc e\textt i\textn j\texte 1992) 12 h3 \textf f6 (12...\texte e5?! 13 \textb b3 \textg g7) 13 \textg g5 \textg g7 14 \textw d2 0-0 15 0-0-0 (de \textf i\textm r\texti a\textm i\textn -\text Z\textm o\textr -\textp o\textg l\texta r, \textb e\textr\textm u\textd m\texta 1995) 15...\texte e6?! (\textc u.\text h\texta n\texts n) with good chances for Black.

b) 11 \textf f4 e5 12 \textg g3 \texte e7 13 h3 \textf f6 14 0-0 0-0 15 \texth h1 g6 16 \texth h2 \textg g5 = \textb l\texta s\textk -\textk h\texta l\textl i\textf m\texta n, \textb a\textd d \textm e\textr g\texte n\textt h\texte i\textm \texta m 1989.

c) 11 \texte e5?! \textw b6 (or 11...h6 12 \textd d2?!) 12 \textw d2 h6 13 \texth h4 \textw x\textb 2 (13...g5?! 14 \textg g3 \textg g7) 14 \textb b1 \texta a3 15 \textd d5 \textc x\textd 5 16 \texta a5 \texta a7 17 \textb b3 \textw a4 18 \textw c3 \textd d8 19 \textc c6 \textw x\texta 2 20 \textf f3 \textc c7 21 \textf x\textg g4 \textb b7 22 \textw b7 with a dangerous initiative, \textt o\textm p\texta -\textc s\texto m, \texth u\textn\texta r\texta \textg a\textl a\texth\texti \textm a\textn\textj \textt h\texte \textg a\textl a\texth \texts h\texte \textl a\textm a\texth (\textb u\textg d\texta p\texte s\textt u\texte t) 1976.

d) 11 \textw f3 \texte e5 12 \textw e2 e6 (12...g6 13 \textf f4 \texte x\textc 4 14 \textw x\textc 4 \textg g7 15 \textd d4 \pm \textv T\texto\textd o\textr\texto\textd r\texti \texto\textd r -\text Z\textu\textk v\texto\textd r\texti \textc h\texti c-h, \textY\textu\textg s\textl a\textv a\textl k Cht (\textk l-a\textd d\texto\textd v-o) 1990) 13 0-0-0 (13 \textb b3 \texte e7 14 \textf f4 \textd d7 15 \textg g4?! \texth h4+!, \texto\textn-s\texth\textu\textc h-k -\text s\textu\textl y\textp a, \textD\texto\textn\texta t\textk \textz\textd o\textr 1998) 13...\texte e7 (13...\texte xc4 14 \textw x\textc 4 \textw c7?! \textv I\textv a\textn\textc h-k) 14 \textd d4 (14 \textb b3 a5?! 15 \textf f4 \texta a6 16 \textw d2 \textd d7 \textv G\textf s\texth-f\texte i\textt e\textn) 14...\textw c7 (14...\texte xc4 15 \textw x\textc 4 \textw c7 16 \texta x\textg g8 17 \texth h6 \textx g2 18 \textg g1 \textg g6 = \textv I\textv a\textn\textc h-k) 15 \texta xe5 dxe5 16 \texta a4 0-0 17 \textd d3! (17 \textb b3?! \textd d7?! \textv M\texta c\texti e\textj a-I\textv a\textn\textc h-k, \textp o\textl a\textn\textc a\texth n, \textZ\textr\texto\textd r\texto\textd v 1998) 17...\texta a5 18 \textb b3 \textb b8 19 \textw d2 \textw x\textd 2+ 20 \textw x\textd 2 = \textv I\textv a\textn\textc h-k-K\textm a\textn\textj \textk, \textL\texti\textn\texte\texta\textr\texts 1998. As the game against Macieja was played later, we may assume that Ivanchuk had something in reserve.

9 \textd d4 (D)

Black has won a tempo, but as a rule ...a6 and ...\textw a5 combine poorly in the Sicilian, and the value of this tempo is therefore rather unclear.

9...e6

The alternative tries are:
a) 9...@xe4?! 10 Wf3! and then:
   a1) 10...@xc3? 11 @xc6 Wf5 12 Wxf5 @xf5 13 @d4 ++
   a2) 10...@e5 can be answered by
        11 @xf7+ or 11 Wxe4! @xc4 12 @b3 Wc7 13 @d5 Wc6 14 @d4 Wd7 15
        0-0-0 Boleslavsky.
   a3) 10...@f6 11 @xc6 Wc7 12 @xe7?! gives White a clear advantage.
   a4) 10...f5 11 @xc6 bxc6 12 0-0-0
        d5 13 @xe4 (less convincing is 13
        @xd5??) 13...fxe4 (13...dxe4 14 Wg3
e5 15 @g5 ++) 14 Wh5+ g6 15 Wxe5
        @g8 16 @xd5 cxd5 17 @xd5 Wb5 18
        Wxe4 @f5 19 @c6+ -- Kindermann-
        Züger, Mendoza tt 1985.
   b) 9...g6 10 0-0 (10 f3!? is possible;
e.g., 10...@g7 11 @b3 0-0 12 @d2
        @d7 13 0-0-0 Wf8 14 h4 @e5 15 @b1
        b5 16 @h6) 10...@g7 11 @d5! @xd5
        12 exd5 @e5 13 @b3 0-0 14 h3 ±
   c) 9...@xd4 and then:
      c1) 10 @xd4?! e5 (10...@xe4 11
        0-0 @xc3 12 @xc3 Wc7 13 Wd3 gives
        White compensation – Onischuk) 11
        @e3 @e6 12 Wd3 ± Onischuk-Yerm-
      c2) 10 Wxd4 e6 11 @b3 @e7 12
        0-0 (12 0-0-0 0-0 13 f4 @d7 14 g4
        @c5 ≈ Gi.Hernandez-Damljanović,
        Lyons 1990) 12...0-0 13 f4 @g4 14
        @d2 Wc7 (14...f6?! 15 e5!) 15 @h1
        b5 (de Firman-Damljanović, Erevan
        OL 1996) 16 a4 (Damljanović) with
        the point 16...@f6 17 e5!.
   d) 9...@g4!? and now:
      d1) 10 0-0!? @g5! (10...@xe3 11
        fxe3 @e5 12 Wh5! ±) 11 @b3 @xe3
        12 fxe3 e6 13 Wh5 g6 14 Wh3 and
        now Black should play 14...Wd8?!
        rather than 14...Wc7?! 15 @a4+! ±
        Balzar-Dinstuhl, Bundesliga 2000/1.
      d2) 10 @xc6 bxc6 11 @d2 (11 0-0
        @xe3 12 fxe3 e6 13 Wf3 @a7 14 @d1
        We5 15 @a4!? with a sharp game,
        Ginsburg-Shmuter, Nikolaev Z 1993)
        11...g6 (11...@xf2? can be met by
        Bilek’s 12 Wf3! or Sax’s 12 @xf7+
        @xf7 13 0-0!; 11...@b6 deserves at-
        tention: 12 0-0 Wd4?!, Ehvest-Tella,
        Jyväskylä 1998, or 12 Wc2 @e5 13
        @a4 Wc7 14 @b3 c5, de Firman-Tella,
        Stockholm 1998) and now:
       d21) 12 0-0? Wg5! ⊕ Sax.
       d22) 12 Wc2 @e5 13 f4 (13 @d5
        Wd8 14 @e3 @g7 15 @c3 0-0 16 f4
        Wb6! 17 Wd2 @d7 18 @c4, Atalik-
        Kotornias, Greece 1998, 18...Wc5 Ata-
        lik) 13 @d7 14 @d5 Wd8 15 @c3 e5
        16 @e3 @c5?! 17 @f3 @a4! 18 Wd2
        @b6 (Atalik) appears satisfying for
        Black.
       d23) 12 Wc2 @g7 (12...@e5?! 13
        @b3 @g7 14 f4 @d7 15 Wc4!) and here:
       d231) 13 h3 @e5 14 @b3 Wc7 15
        f4 @d7 16 @e3 0-0 17 0-0 a5 ∞ de
       d232) 13 f4 0-0 14 0-0-0 Wb6 15 h3
        @f6 16 @b3 @e6 (16...a5 17 e5!, de
        Firman-D.Gurevich, USA Ch (Estes
        Park) 1986) 17 e5 @d5 = de Firman-
        Rachels, USA Ch (Long Beach) 1989.
d233) 13 \text{h}b3 0-0 14 0-0 \text{c}e5 15 f4 \text{d}d7 16 e5!? dxe5 17 f5 \text{c}f6 18 fxg6 hxg6 19 \text{c}e4 is awkward for Black, Sax-Radulov, Vrnjačka Banja 1974.

d234) 13 0-0 0-0 0-0 14 \text{h}b3 \text{c}c7 15 h4 h5!? 16 f3 \text{c}e5 17 g4 \text{c}xg4 18 fxg4 \text{c}xg4 and again Black's prospects are vague, M. Pavlović-Zaichik, Protvino 1988.

e) 9...\text{c}e5!? and now:

e1) 10 \text{h}b3? \text{c}xe4.

e2) 10 \text{c}b3 \text{c}c7 11 \text{c}d3 (11 \text{c}e2 e6 transposes to Line B542) 11...e6 (11...g6 12 \text{c}g5!) and then:

e21) 12 0-0 b5! =.

e22) 12 a4 \text{d}d7! 13 \text{c}d2 (13 \text{e}e2 \text{c}c8!) 13...\text{c}c6 14 f4 \text{cx}d3+ 15 \text{c}xd3 d5 16 e5 d4! 17 \text{c}xd4 \text{c}d8, Maciej-Damljanović, Belgrade 1999.

e23) 12 f4 \text{c}c4 13 \text{c}c1!? (13 \text{c}xc4 again transposes to Line B542) 13...b5 14 \text{e}e2 \text{b}7 15 a4 b4 followed by 16...d5 17 e5 \text{c}e4 gives Black sufficient counterchances.

e3) 10 \text{c}d3 \text{c}xg4!? (10...e6 11 f4!? \text{c}xh3+ 12 cxd3 \pm Kramnik; 10...g6!; 10...\text{f}g4!?) 11 \text{c}c1 (11 \text{d}d2? \text{b}6! \mp) 11...g6 (11...\text{b}6 12 0-0! \text{c}xd4? 13 \text{c}b5+) 12 \text{b}3! (12 f4 e5! 13 \text{c}b3 \text{b}6 14 \text{c}e2 exf4 Kramnik) 12...\text{b}6 13 \text{c}e2!? (13 0-0 \text{g}7 14 h3 \text{c}e5) 13...\text{c}g7 14 f4 \text{h}5! ("There is nothing else" – Kramnik) 15 \text{d}d5 (15 \text{f}f3? \text{c}xh2!; 15 \text{d}d2!? \text{c}xh3 16 bxc3 0-0 17 c4 Kramnik) 15...\text{d}d8 16 \text{d}d2 (16 0-0 0-0 17 \text{c}f6 18 \text{c}xf6+ \text{c}xh2 = Kramnik) 16...\text{e}6! 17 \text{a}5 (17 \text{c}xg4 exd5 18 \text{f}3 0-0! Bönisch) 17...\text{h}4+ 18 g3 \text{c}xg3 19 \text{c}c7+ (19 hxg3 \text{c}xg3+ 20 \text{d}d2 exd5 and now 21 exd5+ \text{c}d7! or 21 \text{c}f6 22 exd5+ \text{c}f8 23 \text{b}4 \text{c}g4! – Kramnik) 19...\text{e}7 20 hxg3 \text{c}xg3+ 21 \text{c}d1

\text{f}2+ = Topalov-Kramnik, Belgrade 1995.

10 0-0 \text{c}e7

Or:

a) 10...\text{c}c7!? 11 \text{c}b3 – 6...e6 7 \text{b}3 a6 8 \text{e}3 \text{c}c7 9 0-0 (note ‘a’ to White’s 9th move in Line C3 of Chapter 8).

b) 10...\text{c}e5 11 \text{c}e2 ±.

c) 10...\text{c}d7!? 11 \text{c}b3 \text{c}c8 (alternatively, 11...b5!??) 12 f4 \text{h}5 13 \text{c}xh5 \text{c}xh5 14 f5 \text{c}xd4 15 \text{c}xd4 e5, Kontić-Simonović, Yugoslav Cht 1996.

11 \text{c}b3

11 f4 0-0 12 \text{c}h1 (12 f5? \text{c}c5) 12...\text{c}c7! (12...\text{c}xd4 13 \text{c}xd4 e5 14 \text{c}e3 ± Varavin-Kharlov, Russian Ch (Elista) 1996) and now:

a) 13 a4 – 6...e6 7 0-0 a6 8 a4 \text{c}e7 9 \text{e}3 0-0 10 \text{h}1 \text{c}c7 11 f4?! (note ‘d1’ to Black’s 10th move in Line B of Chapter 12).

b) 13 \text{c}b3 – 6...e6 7 \text{b}3 a6 8 \text{e}3 \text{c}e7 9 f4 0-0 10 0-0 \text{c}c7 11 \text{h}1 (note ‘a’ to White’s 11th move in Line C221 of Chapter 9).

11...0-0

Ricardi’s 11...\text{c}d7 12 f4 \text{c}c8!?, with the point 13 f5 \text{c}xd4 14 \text{c}xd4 e5 and 15...\text{c}xc3, deserves attention.

12 f4 (D)
Black still has an extra tempo but the question remains whether the queen stands better on a5 than on d8.

12...\(\text{\&d}7\)

12...\(\text{\&xd}4\) 13 \(\text{\&xd}4\) (13 \(\text{\&xd}4!\) transposes to note ‘c2’ to Black’s 9th move) 13...e5! (13...b5? does not work with the queen on a5: 14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5 \(\text{\&d}7\) 16 \(\text{\&e}4\) \(\text{\&b}7??\) 17 \(\text{\&f}6+\) Smirin) and then:

a) 14 fxe5 dxe5 15 \(\text{\&e}3\) \(\text{\&g}4??\) (15...\(\text{\&e}6\) =) 16 \(\text{\&d}5!\) ± Gobet-Hort, Biel 1982.

b) 14 \(\text{\&f}2\) exf4 15 \(\text{\&d}4\) \(\text{\&g}5?!\) = Soltis-Whitehead, USA Ch (Greenville) 1983.

c) 14 \(\text{\&e}3\) \(\text{\&g}4\) (14...exf4 15 \(\text{\&xf}4\) \(\text{\&e}6\) 16 \(\text{\&d}4\) ± Velimirović-M.Mihaljičišin, Banja Luka 1981) 15 \(\text{\&e}1\) (15 \(\text{\&d}5\) can be met by 15...\(\text{\&xe}3\), with the point 16 \(\text{\&xe}7+\) \(\text{\&h}8\) 17 \(\text{\&xd}6\) \(\text{\&d}8\) 18 \(\text{\&xe}5?!\) \(\text{\&d}2??\) →) 15...\(\text{\&xe}3\) 16 \(\text{\&xe}3\) exf4 17 \(\text{\&xf}4\) \(\text{\&e}6\) \(1/2-1/2\) Sax-Dueball, Reggio Emilia 1973.

13 \(\text{f}5\)

Otherwise:

a) 13 \(\text{\&e}1\) is met by 13...\(\text{\&g}4\) !?

b) 13 \(\text{\&f}3\) and now:

b1) 13...\(\text{\&h}5\) 14 \(\text{\&hxh}5\) \(\text{\&xh}5\) 15 f5 \(\text{\&xd}4\) 16 \(\text{\&xd}4\) \(\text{\&f}6\) 17 \(\text{\&d}1\) ± Kožul.

b2) 13...\(\text{\&e}8\) 14 \(\text{\&de}2??\) and now rather than 14...\(\text{\&h}8\) 15 g4 g5 16 e5!! ± Velimirović-Kožul, Yugoslav Ch (Banja Vrućica) 1991, Black should try 14...h6!?, as in Korneev-Dokhoian, Berlin 1992.

b3) 13...\(\text{\&xd}4\) 14 \(\text{\&xd}4\) \(\text{\&c}6\) 15 \(\text{\&ae}1\) (alternatively, 15 f5 exf5 = 16 \(\text{\&g}3\) \(\text{\&h}5\) 17 \(\text{\&h}3\) \(\text{\&f}6!\), Golubev-Tukmakov, Odessa blitz 2000) 15...\(\text{\&ae}8\) with the idea of...\(\text{\&d}8\) – Kožul.

c) 13 \(\text{\&h}1\) \(\text{\&e}8\) (13...\(\text{\&c}7\) 14 f5; 13...\(\text{\&xd}4\) 14 \(\text{\&xd}4\) \(\text{\&c}6\) 15 \(\text{\&d}3\) ± Velimirović-Draško, Vrnjačka Banja 1985; 13...b5?! 14 a3 \(\text{\&c}7\) 15 f5 \(\text{\&xd}4\), Ivanović-Čabriolo, Cetinje 1992) 14 \(\text{\&f}3\) ! (14 f5 \(\text{\&xd}4\) 15 \(\text{\&xd}4\) exf5 16 exf5 \(\text{\&c}6\) 17 \(\text{\&d}3\) transposes to note ‘c’ to White’s 17th move) 14...\(\text{\&c}7\) 15 f5, Ivanović-Levin, Podebrady 1993.

13...\(\text{\&xd}4\)

13...e5 14 \(\text{\&f}3\) \(\text{\&g}4\) 15 \(\text{\&d}2\) \(\text{\&c}5+\) 16 \(\text{\&h}1\) \(\text{\&f}2+\) 17 \(\text{\&xf}2\) \(\text{\&xf}2\) 18 \(\text{\&d}5\) ± (Smirin).

14 \(\text{\&xd}4\) \(\text{exf}5\)

Otherwise:

a) 14...b5? 15 \(\text{\&xf}6\) ± Kengis-Lukin, USSR Cht 1990.

b) 14...e5?! 15 \(\text{\&f}2??\) \(\text{\&c}6\) 16 \(\text{\&h}4\), Felsberger-Videki, Vienna 1990.

c) 14...\(\text{\&h}8\) 15 g4!.

d) 14...\(\text{\&ad}8\) 15 \(\text{\&f}3\) b5?! 16 fxe6! fxe6 17 \(\text{\&h}3\) d5 18 exd5 e5! (Korneev-Verat, Paris 1991) 19 d6+ \(\text{\&h}8\) 20 dxe7 \(\text{\&xh}8\) 21 \(\text{\&c}5\) ±.

e) 14...\(\text{\&ac}8\) and now:

e1) 15 fxe6?! \(\text{\&xe}6\) (Bilek-Hort, Gothenburg 1971) 16 \(\text{\&d}3\) ± Bilek.

e2) 15 \(\text{\&e}1\) \(\text{\&c}7\) (15...\(\text{\&fe}8??\)) 16 \(\text{\&h}1\) (16 fxe6!!) 16...b5 (Kindermann-Hjartarson, Thessaloniki OL 1984) 17 fxe6 ± Kindermann.

e3) 15 \(\text{\&f}3\) \(\text{\&h}8\) (15...e5?! 16 \(\text{\&f}2\) \(\text{\&c}6\) 17 \(\text{\&ad}1\); 15...exf5??) 16 \(\text{\&ad}1\) (16 g4! Smirin) 16...b5! 17 \(\text{\&xf}6\) \(\text{\&xf}6\) 18 \(\text{\&xd}6\) \(\text{\&c}6\) 19 fxe6 b4 20 \(\text{\&xc}6\) \(\text{\&xc}6\) 21 e5 \(\text{\&c}5+\) 22 \(\text{\&h}1\) bxc3 23 exf6 fxe6 24 fxg7+ \(\text{\&xg}7\) 25 \(\text{\&g}3+\) = de Firmian-Smirin, Antwerp 1994.

15 exf5

15 \(\text{\&d}5\) \(\text{\&xd}5\) 16 \(\text{\&xd}5\) \(\text{\&ab}8\) 17 \(\text{\&c}3\) \(\text{\&c}5+\) 18 \(\text{\&d}4\) = Gulko.

15...\(\text{\&c}6\) 16 \(\text{\&d}3\)

Or:

a) 16 \(\text{\&e}1\) \(\text{\&ae}8\) (16...\(\text{\&d}8\) 17 \(\text{\&h}1\)) 17 \(\text{\&g}3\) – 16 \(\text{\&d}3\) \(\text{\&ae}8\) 17 \(\text{\&g}3\).
b) 16 \textbf{Wd2} \textbf{Nae8} 17 \textbf{Nad1} \textbf{Nd8} 18 \textbf{Nh1} (18 \textbf{Wf4}?! \textbf{Nd6}!) 18...\textbf{Qd7} 19 \textbf{Wf4} \textbf{Nf6} 20 \textbf{Qxf6} \textbf{Nxf6} 21 \textbf{Nxd6} \textbf{Me7} with compensation, Kengis-Kalinin, Würzburg 1994.

16...\textbf{Nae8}

Alternatively:

a) 16...\textbf{Nec8}?! 17 \textbf{Nae1} \textbf{Wd8}? 18 \textbf{We3} \textbf{Ned8} 19 \textbf{Nbd6} \textbf{Wd7} 20 \textbf{Nc6}! +=.

b) 16...\textbf{Nd7}?! 17 \textbf{Ng3} (17 \textbf{Nad1} can be met by 17...\textbf{f6}! or 17...\textbf{Nae8} – 16...\textbf{Nae8} 17 \textbf{Nad1} \textbf{Nd7} 17...\textbf{Nf6} 18 \textbf{Wxd6} (18 \textbf{Nad1}?!?) 18...\textbf{Nxd4}+ 19 \textbf{Wxd4} \textbf{Nf6}, and now one possibility is 20 \textbf{Nad1} \textbf{Nae8} – 16...\textbf{Nae8} 17 \textbf{Nad1} \textbf{Nd7} 18 \textbf{Wg3} \textbf{Nf6} 19 \textbf{Wxd6} \textbf{Nxd4}+ 20 \textbf{Wxd4} \textbf{Nf6}.

17 \textbf{Nad1}

Instead:

a) 17 \textbf{Nae1}?! \textbf{Nd8} =.

b) 17 \textbf{Wg3} \textbf{Nd8}?! (other ideas are 17...\textbf{Nh5}?! and 17...\textbf{d5}?! 18 \textbf{Nh1} (18 \textbf{Wxd6} \textbf{Nbd6}) 18...\textbf{d5} (with the idea of 19...\textbf{Nc7}) gives Black an acceptable position, Gi.Hernandez-Ivanović, Novi Sad OL 1990.

c) 17 \textbf{Nh1} \textbf{b5} (17...\textbf{Nd8} 18 \textbf{Nad1}! – 17 \textbf{Nad1} \textbf{Nd8} 18 \textbf{Nh1}; 17...\textbf{d5} ±; 17...\textbf{Nd7}! 18 a3! (better than 18 \textbf{Wg3} \textbf{b4}!) 18...\textbf{Nc7} (Kobalia-Gonzalez Garcia, Linares 1998) 19 \textbf{Wg3}? \textbf{Wb7} 20 \textbf{Nad1} \textbf{Nd8} 21 \textbf{Qd5} \textbf{Nh8} 22 \textbf{Qb4}! \textbf{Nc4} 23 \textbf{Nxd5} with an advantage for White – Gonzalez Garcia.

17...\textbf{Nd7}

Or:

a) 17...\textbf{b5}? 18 \textbf{Wg3}! \textbf{Nh5} (18...\textbf{b4} 19 \textbf{Qd5}!) 19 \textbf{Wf2} \textbf{Wd8} 20 \textbf{Nc5} ± Ehlsteyn-Ye Jiangchuan, Beijing 1998.

b) 17...\textbf{d5}?! 18 \textbf{Nh1} ±.

c) 17...\textbf{Nd8} 18 \textbf{Nh1} (18 \textbf{Wg3} \textbf{b6}! ✚ Gulko) 18...\textbf{Nd7} (18...\textbf{Nh8} 19 \textbf{Wg3}) 19 \textbf{Wg3} \textbf{Nf6} 20 \textbf{Nc5}! (stronger than the alternative 20 \textbf{Wxd6} \textbf{Nxd4} 21 \textbf{Wxd4} \textbf{Nf6}, Kindermann-Gulko, Munich 1990) 20...\textbf{Wb4} (20...\textbf{Nxd5} 21 \textbf{Qxd5} \textbf{Qxd4} 22 \textbf{Nxd4} \textbf{Wb5} 23 c4 \textbf{Wxb2} 24 f6 g6 25 \textbf{Wxd6}++; 20...\textbf{Wc7} 21 \textbf{Qxc6} \textbf{Wxc6} 22 \textbf{Qd5} ± de Firman) 21 \textbf{Qxf6} \textbf{Qxf6} 22 \textbf{Qxc6} bxc6 23 \textbf{Nxd6} ± de Firman-Kramnik, Erevan OL 1996.

18 \textbf{Wg3}


18...\textbf{Nf6} 19 \textbf{Wxd6} \textbf{Nxd4}+ 20 \textbf{Wxd4} \textbf{Qf6} 21 \textbf{h3}

21 \textbf{Qd5} \textbf{Qxd5} 22 \textbf{Qxd5} \textbf{Nd8} 23 c4 = \frac{1}{2}–\frac{1}{2} Short-Kramnik, Novgorod 1996.

B3)

7 \textbf{Qd2}!?

In many ways this is quite a sensible continuation. White preserves the bishop on the a2-g8 diagonal and his e2-knight is placed somewhat passively but not badly – it may be activated later via \textbf{Qg3}.

7...\textbf{e6} (D)

Development in the spirit of the Dragon (7...\textbf{g6} 8 \textbf{b3} \textbf{g7} 9 \textbf{e3} \textbf{a5} 10 \textbf{f3} 0–0 11 \textbf{Wd2} \textbf{b5}) seems to be less logical here.

8 \textbf{0–0}

8 a3 \textbf{e7} 9 \textbf{a2} 0–0 10 0–0–0 \textbf{e7} 9 a3 0–0 10 \textbf{a2}. 
Or 8 \( \text{b3 e7} \) (more precise than 8...a6 9 \( \text{g5 e7} \) 10 \( \text{x6} \), Velimirović-Radulov, Vršac 1973), and then:

a) Usually White proceeds with 9 0-0, which is equivalent to 8 0-0 \( \text{e7} \) 9 \( \text{b3} \).

b) 9 \( \text{g5? d4} \), Velimirović-Popović, Zenica 1989.

c) 9 \( \text{e3} \) (taken together with \( \text{d4e2} \), this is a bit out of place) 9...\( \text{wc7} \) 10 f4 (10 \( \text{df4 a6} \) 11 g4 h6 12 \( \text{c2 b5} \) 13 0-0-0 \( \text{e5} \) 14 f3 g5 with counterplay, Ilinčić-Damljanović, Yugoslav Cht 1990) 10...a6 (10...0-0!? 11 \( \text{g3} \) b5, and Black has no problems.

d) 9 \( \text{wd3 a6} \) 9...0-0 10 f4 \( \text{d7} \) 11 \( \text{f3?! a5 12 e5?! c6} \), Velimirović-Komljenović, Umag 1972) 10 \( \text{g3 wc7} \) 11 0-0-0 \( \text{e7} \) 9 \( \text{b3 a6} \) 10 \( \text{wd3 wc7} \) 11 \( \text{g3} \).

e) 9 \( \text{g3?!} \) (a fresh idea) 9...h5 9...a6!?; 9...0-0 10 \( \text{e3 wa5} \) 11 f3 \( \text{d7} \) (11...g5?! Gulko) 12 \( \text{d2 e5} \) 13 0-0 \( \text{c8} \) 14 \( \text{f2} \) ± De Vreugt-Gulko, Wijk aan Zee 2001.

8...\( \text{e7} \) \( (D) \)

There is not much sense in keeping the bishop on f8 any longer. However, Black frequently commences with 8...a6, which is less flexible under the circumstances:

a) 9 \( \text{b3 e7} \) 8...\( \text{e7} \) 9 \( \text{b3 a6} \).

b) 9 a3?! \( \text{e7} \) 8...\( \text{e7} \) 9 a3 a6.

c) 9 \( \text{g5? wc5} \) 10 \( \text{x6 wc4} \) 11 \( \text{h4 d5} \), Ljubojević-Ribli, Las Palmas 1974.

d) 9 \( \text{f4 d5} \) 10 \( \text{b3 e7} \) (Van Riemsdijk-Hort, Bonn 1979; another possibility is 10...\( \text{wc7}?! \), and now the risky 11 \( \text{a4?!} \) (Cvetković) or 11 \( \text{h1} \) with unclear play.

e) 9 \( \text{h1 e7} \) 10 \( \text{g3?!} \) (10 f4!?) 0-0 11 \( \text{wc1 wc7} \) 12 a4, Ljubisavljević-Radulov, Smederevska Palanka 1979) 10...0-0 11 f4 \( \text{wc7} \) 12 a4 \( \text{d7} \) 13 f5 \( \text{e5} \) 14 \( \text{b3 c4} \) 15 \( \text{xc4 xc4} \) 16 \( \text{g5 exf5}?! (16...h6!) 17 e5! +– Dvorys-Andrianov, Ordzhonikidze 1978.

9 \( \text{b3} \)

Here there is a choice. First, we mention several rare moves before moving on to better-established ideas:

a) 9 \( \text{d3?!} \).

b) 9 a4?!.

c) 9 \( \text{d3?! d5} \) 10 \( \text{b5} \) + (Tukmakov).

d) 9 \( \text{g5 wc5} \) 10 \( \text{x6 xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 11 \( \text{b3} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{h1 b5} \) 13 f4 \( \text{a1} \) Velimirović-Al.Khasin, Belgrade 1988.

e) No advantage is gained through 9 \( \text{e3 wc7} \)!. For instance: 10 \( \text{g3} \) (10
\(\text{h}1 \text{g}4\)?) 10...a6 11 f4 (11 \(\text{b}3 - 9 \text{b}3 \text{a}6\)?) 10 \(\text{e}3 \text{w}7 11 \text{g}3; 11 \text{a}4 0-0 12 \text{w}e2 \text{d}7 13 \text{f}4 \text{a}c8 14 \text{d}3 \text{d}a5, \\
\text{Zhang Pengxiang-Gershon, Erevan jr Wch 1999} 11...b5 (11...h5 12 \(\text{e}2! \text{g}6 13 \text{f}3) 12 \text{b}3 \text{d}a5 13 f5 14 \text{d}3 \\
\text{now:}
\]

e1) 13...\text{xb}3 is imprecise: 14 \text{cxb}3 0-0 15 \text{c}1 \text{w}7 16 \text{b}4 \text{a}5 17 \text{a}3, \text{Ivanović-Fedorowicz, Lone Pine 1981.}

e2) 13...0-0! - 9 \(\text{b}3 0-0 10 \text{e}3 \text{w}7 11 \text{g}3 \text{a}6 12 \text{f}4 \text{b}5 13 \text{f}5 \text{d}a5 =.

f) Of some interest is 9 \(\text{h}1 0-0 10 \text{e}3 (10 \text{a}3 - 9 \text{a}3 0-0 10 \text{h}1)
10...\text{w}c7 (10...\text{w}xb2? 11 \text{a}3 \text{g}4 12 \\
\text{b}3) 11 \text{f}4 \text{d}8 (11...a6!?) 12 \text{d}3 \text{a}6 \\
13 \text{w}e1 \text{b}5 14 \text{g}3, \text{Saltaev-Belikov, Moscow 1998.}

g) 9 \text{g}3 is quite possible; e.g.,
9...0-0 10 a3!? - 9 \text{a}3 0-0 10 \text{d}g3.

h) \text{a}3 (the main alternative) 9...0-0 \\
(9...a6 10 \text{a}2 0-0 - 9...0-0 10 \text{a}2 \\
a6) and now:

h1) 10 \text{g}3 \text{a}6 11 \text{h}1 \text{e}5 12 \\
\text{e}2 \text{c}6 13 \text{f}4 \text{g}6 14 \text{d}3 \text{b}5 15 \\
\text{h}5 (15 \text{w}e2?! \text{b}7 16 \text{d}2 is a little \\
better for White - Dvoirys) 15...\text{b}7 16 \text{f}5 (Dvoirys-Lugovoi, Russian Ch \\
(Elista) 1995) and now 16...\text{w}xf5? 17 \\
\text{xf5 \text{x}h5 18 \text{x}h5 \text{e}5 19 \text{d}5 \\
\text{d}8 (Dvoirys) looks sufficient to \\
reach equality.

h2) 10 \text{h}1 \text{xe}4!? (10...a6 11 \\
\text{a}2 - 10 \text{a}2 \text{a}6 11 \text{h}1) 11 \text{xe}4 \\
d5 12 \text{xd}5 \text{ex}d5 13 \text{xd}5 \text{e}6 14 \\
\text{w}h5 \text{c}4 15 \text{b}3 \text{g}6 16 \text{w}f3 \text{d}4 \\
\text{xd}4 \text{xf}1 18 \text{e}3 with compensation \\
(Christiansen).

h3) 10 \text{a}2 and here:

h31) 10...a6 11 \text{h}1 (11 \text{g}3 \text{d}8 \\
12 \text{h}1 - 11 \text{h}1 \text{d}8 12 \text{g}3; 11 \\
\text{d}3!?, \text{A.Sokolov-Petrov, Ohrid Ech} \\
2001) 11...\text{c}7 (11...\text{d}8 12 \text{g}3 ±

Kasparov-Teplitzky, Israel simul 1994;

11...\text{d}7 doesn't quite equalize either) 12 \text{g}3 (12 \text{f}4 \text{b}5 13 \text{f}5 is possibly \\
stronger, Kreiman-Waitzkin, USA \\
jr Ch (New York) 1993) 12...\text{b}5 13 \text{a}5 \\
\text{c}4 15 \text{xc}4 \text{xc}4 16 \\
\text{g}5 (Christiansen-Gulko, USA Ch \\
(Salt Lake City) 1999) 16...\text{h}6! 17 \text{xf}6 \\
\text{xf}6 18 \text{xd}6 \text{xf}5 (18...\text{d}8!?) 19 \\
\text{xf}5 \text{b}7 with compensation - Christiansen.

h32) 10...\text{d}7 and now:

h321) 11 \text{h}1 can be answered by \\
either 11...\text{g}4! (Lalić) or 11...\text{e}5 \\
- 10...\text{e}5 11 \text{h}1 \text{d}7.

h322) 11 \text{w}d3 \text{e}5! 12 \text{w}g3 \text{e}c8 \\
13 \text{h}1 (Saltva-ji-Riemersma, Agios \\
Nikolaos 1995) 13...\text{b}5 gives Black 

strong counterplay.

h323) 11 \text{g}3 \text{e}c8 12 \text{h}1 \text{e}5 \\
13 \text{f}4 (13 \text{w}e2 \text{a}6! Lalić) 13...\text{c}4 14 \\
\text{w}e2 \text{a}6 (14...\text{c}6!? \text{Timman}) 15 \text{e}5 \\
\text{d}8 16 \text{a}4 \text{h}4 17 \text{d}4 \text{d}5 18 \text{d}1! \\
with somewhat the better chances for 

White, Lalić-Timman, Kilkenny 1999.

h33) 10...\text{e}5 11 \text{h}1 (11 \text{h}3 \text{a}7 \\
12 \text{e}3 \text{c}7 13 \text{f}4 \text{c}4 14 \text{xc}4 \text{xc}4 \\
15 \text{e}5 \text{e}4!, \text{Honfi-Driver, Wijk aan 

Zee 1970) 11...\text{d}7 (11...\text{d}7 12 \text{g}3 \\
\text{d}6 13 \text{f}4 ± \text{A.Sokolov-Ruban, St Pet 

ersburg Z 1993) 12 \text{f}4 \text{d}4 13 \text{d}1! \\
(13 \text{d}4 \text{d}4 14 \text{d}4 \text{d}8!! \text{Gul 

laksen-Yakovitch, Gothenburg 2001) \\
13...\text{e}3 14 \text{d}3 \text{d}3 15 \text{d}1 \text{b}6 \\
16 \text{e}5 \text{d}4 17 \text{d}6 \text{f}6 \text{g}ofstein. 

9...0-0}

9...\text{d}7 10 \text{g}5 \text{c}5 11 \text{e}3 (11 \\
\text{d}2!) 11...\text{a}5 12 \text{d}4!? (Hector- 

Damjanović, Palma de Mallorca 

1989) 12...0-0!

Recently, 9...a6!? (preserving the 

possibility of ...\text{h}5) has received 

attention:
a) 10 \( \text{Qg}3 \) h5?! 11 h3 h4 12 \( \text{Qge}2 \) \( \text{Qa}5 \) 13 \( \text{Qh}1 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 14 a4 b6 15 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \) 16 \( \text{Wd}4 \) d5 17 exd5 \( \text{Qc}5 \) gives Black sufficient resources, K.Georgiev-Topalov, Las Palmas 1993.

b) 10 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 11 \( \text{Qg}3 \) h5?! (11...0-0 - 9...0-0 10 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 11 \( \text{Qg}3 \) a6) 12 h3 h4 13 \( \text{Qge}2 \) b5 14 a3 \( \text{Qb}7 \) with double-edged play, R.Gonzalez-Vera, Cienfuegos 1997.

c) 10 \( \text{Qh}1 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) (10...0-0 - 9...0-0 10 \( \text{Qh}1 \) a6) 11 f4 (11 \( \text{Qg}5 \) b5!; 11 \( \text{Qg}3 \) h5??) 11...\( \text{Qa}5 \) 12 f5 0-0 13 \( \text{Qf}4 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 14 axb3 with a roughly equal game, Scholl-Csom, Amsterdam 1969.

d) 10 \( \text{Wd}3 \) and then:

d1) 10...\( \text{Qd}7 \) 11 \( \text{Qh}1 \) (11 \( \text{Wg}3 \) 0-0 12 \( \text{Qh}6 \) \( \text{Qe}8 \) 13 \( \text{Qad}1 \) \( \text{Qe}5 \) = Kelleher-Lazetic, New York 1993) 11...\( \text{Wc}7 \) 12 \( \text{Wg}3 \) b5 13 a3 0-0 14 \( \text{Qh}6 \) \( \text{Qe}8 \) 15 f4 \( \text{Qa}5 \) 16 f5 \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 17 cxb3 \( \text{Wd}8 \) with an acceptable position, Reiderman-Svidler, Wijk aan Zee 1999.

d2) 10...\( \text{Wc}7 \) 11 \( \text{Wg}3 \). This position occurred in two Ljubojevic-Kramnik blindfold games: 11...b5 12 a3 \( \text{Qh}7 \) 13 \( \text{Wxg}7 \) \( \text{Qg}8 \) 14 \( \text{Qh}6 \) 0-0-0 15 f3 (Monaco 1996) seems unclear while 11...g6 12 \( \text{Qh}6 \) b5 13 a4 \( \text{Qh}5 \) 14 \( \text{Wf}4 \) \( \text{Qa}5 \)! 15 \( \text{Qg}7 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) (Monaco 1998) gave Black a good game.

e) 10 \( \text{Qg}5 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) (10...\( \text{Qd}7 \) 11 \( \text{Qg}3 \) 0-0-0??! 12 \( \text{Qe}3 \) and 13 \( \text{Qa}4 \) ± Plachetka-Kolesar, Pardubice 2000) 11 \( \text{Qg}3 \) (11 \( \text{Wd}2 \) 0-0 - 9...0-0 10 \( \text{Qg}5 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 11 \( \text{Wd}2 \) a6) 11...b5 12 \( \text{Qh}5 \) (12 \( \text{Qh}1 \)?? h5! 13 \( \text{Qxf}6 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \) 14 \( \text{Qh}5 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \) = Kasparov-Timman, Manila OL 1992; 12 f4 and 12 \( \text{Wd}2 \) h5?? are unclear) 12...\( \text{Qxh}5 \) 13 \( \text{Qxe}7 \) \( \text{Wxe}7 \) 14 \( \text{Wxh}5 \) 0-0 15 \( \text{Qad}1 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \) 16 f4 \( \text{Qa}5 \) 17 f5 \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 18 f6 \( \text{Qxf}6 \) 19 \( \text{Qd}3 \) f5 20 exf5 ± Arencibia-Becerra Rivera, Havana 1993; e.g., 20...\( \text{Qxf}5 \) 21 axb3, when 21...\( \text{Qe}4 \) 22 \( \text{Qd}5 \) \( \text{Wa}7+ \) 23 \( \text{Qf}2 \) f6 24 \( \text{Qg}3+ \) \( \text{Qh}8 \) 25 \( \text{Qf}4 \) is a possible continuation.

We now return to the position after 9...0-0 (D):

![Diagram](image)

The key position emerges. Here, both sides may play flexibly and, so far, the accumulated material proves only that there is room for further improvements.

10 \( \text{Qg}5 \)

The other continuations are:

a) 10 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 11 \( \text{Qg}3 \) (11 f4 may be met by 11...\( \text{Qg}4 \)! with roughly equal chances; for example:

a1) 11...\( \text{Qa}5 \) 12 \( \text{Wxe}2 \) (12 f4!? is possible) 12...a6 13 f4 b5 14 f5 (14 \( \text{Qad}1 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \) 15 \( \text{Qd}4 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 16 axb3 \( \text{Qac}8 \) 17 \( \text{Qf}2 \), Espig-Pietzsch, Zinnowitz 1967, 17...b4!) 14...\( \text{Qxb}3 \), Filipowicz-Vasiukov, Moscow 1964.

a2) 11...a6 12 f4 b5 (12...\( \text{Qa}5 \) 13 f5 \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 14 axb3 \( \text{Qd}7 \)) 13 f5 \( \text{Qa}5 \) 14 fxe6 fxe6 15 \( \text{Qf}5 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) is equal, Oral-Gabriel, Halle jr Wch 1995.

b) 10 \( \text{Wd}3 !? \) and then:

b1) 10...\( \text{Qd}8 \) 11 \( \text{Qg}3 \) \( \text{Qa}5 \) (11...\( \text{Qd}7 \) 12 \( \text{Qh}6 \) \( \text{Qf}8 \) 13 \( \text{Qad}1 \) ± Vasiukov-S.Kiselev, Moscow 1987) 12 \( \text{Qe}3 \) b5...
13 a3 Ґe5 14 Ґd4 Ґc4 15 a4 Ґd2!
16 axb5 Ʌxf1 17 Ʌxa5 Ʌxg3 18 hxg3 = Solits-Arnason, New York 1989.

b2) 10...a6 11 Ʌg3 Ʌh8 12 Ʌg5 Ʌc5 13 Ʌe3 Ʌa5 14 f4 b5 15 a3 Ʌc7
16 Ʌd4 with chances for both sides, Bronstein-Gulko, Kishinev 1976 (this position can arise from Chapter 6 via the move-order 5...a6 6 Ʌc4 e6 7 Ʌb3
b5 8 0-0 Ʌe7 9 Ʌf3! Ʌc7 10 Ʌg3 0-0
11 a3 Ʌh8!?! 12 Ʌe3 Ʌc6 13 f4).

b3) 10...Ʌa5 11 Ʌe3 (11 Ʌg3!? Ʌh8 12 Ʌe3) 11...Ʌc7 12 Ʌb5 Ʌb8
(12...Ʌc6?! 13 Ʌfd1 a6) 13 Ʌf4 Ʌd8

b4) 10...Ʌd7 11 Ʌg3 and here:

b41) 11...Ʌh8 12 Ʌh1 (12 Ʌe3 Ʌa6! 13 Ʌfd1 Ʌac8 14 Ʌg5 Ʌe5, Sol-
itsu-Kožul, Palma de Mallorca 1989)
12...Ʌa6! 13 Ʌg5 Ʌad8 = Kožul.

b42) 11...Ʌe5?! 12 Ʌe3 Ʌa6! 13 Ʌd4 (13 Ʌae1!! b5 is an alternative)
13...b5?! (13...Ʌxe4 14 Ʌxe4 Ʌxe2
15 Ʌfe1 Ʌa6 16 Ʌxd6 ±) 14 a3 Ʌb7
(Ljubičić-Tukmakov, Pula 1994) 15 f4
Ʌc6 16 Ʌe3 Ʌa5 17 e5 Ʌh5 18 Ʌh3
g6 = Tukmakov.

c) 10 Ʌh1 and then:

c1) 10...a6 11 Ʌg5 (11 Ʌd3 Ʌc7
12 Ʌg3 Ʌh8 = Solits-Waitzkin, New York 1992; 11 Ʌw1!!) 11...Ʌc7 12 f4
b5 13 Ʌg3 Ʌa5 – 10 Ʌg3 a6 11 Ʌh1
Ʌa5 12 Ʌg5 Ʌc7 13 f4 b5.

c2) 10...Ʌa5 and then: 11 Ʌg3 –
10 Ʌg3 Ʌa5 11 Ʌh1; 11 Ʌg5 – 10
Ʌg5 Ʌa5 11 Ʌh1.

c3) 10...Ʌd8 11 f4 d5 12 e5 Ʌg4
13 Ʌe1 with chances for both sides, Zinn-Malich, East German Ch (Mag-
denburg) 1964.

d) 10 Ʌg3 is another attractive option:

d1) 10...a6 and then:

d11) 11 Ʌe3 Ʌc7 – 10 Ʌe3 Ʌc7
11 Ʌg3 a6.

d12) 11 Ʌg5 Ʌd8 (11...Ʌc5 12
Ʌd2 Ʌd4 13 Ʌe2 Ʌc5 14 Ʌe3 ± Sem-
eniuk-Levin, USSR 1989; 11...Ʌc7 –
10 Ʌg5 Ʌc7 11 Ʌg3 a6) 12 Ʌh1 Ʌc7
13 f4 b5 (13...h6 14 Ʌxf6 Ʌxf6 15
Ʌh5) 14 Ʌxf6!? (14 f5 b4 leads to an
unclear position, Lamoureux-M.Sorin,
French Cht 1998) 14...Ʌxf6 15 Ʌh5,
with attacking chances.

d13) 11 Ʌh1 Ʌa5 12 Ʌg5 (12 f4
Ʌc7 13 f5 Ʌxb3 14 axb3 Ʌd7 is equal,
Ma.Ankerst-Minić, Novi Sad 1965)
and here:

d131) 12...Ʌc7 13 f4 b5 14 Ʌe2
gives White some advantage, since af-
after 14...b4, 15 e5! is strong, Donchev-

d132) 12...h6?! 13 Ʌe3 (13 Ʌxf6!)
13...Ʌc6 14 f4 b5 15 e5 Ʌb7 16 Ʌf2
Ʌe8 favours Black, D.Schneider-Gol-

d2) 10...Ʌd8 11 Ʌh1 (11 Ʌg5 – 10
Ʌg5 Ʌd8 11 Ʌg3) 11...Ʌa5 12 f4
Ʌa6!? (also playable is 12...Ʌxb3 13
AXB3 Ʌc6 14 Ʌe2 a6 15 e5 Ʌe8, Gdan-
ski-Kotronias, Moscow OL 1994) 13
Ʌe3 b5 14 f5 Ʌxb3 15 axb3 Ʌc6 16
Ʌg5 (Ki.Georgiev-Arnason, Palma de
Mallorca 1989) 16...b4 17 Ʌce2 e5 =
Arnason.

d3) 10...Ʌd7 11 Ʌh1 Ʌa5 –
10...Ʌa5 11 Ʌh1 Ʌd7.

d4) 10...Ʌa5 11 Ʌh1 (11 Ʌe3 Ʌc6
12 f4 Ʌc4 = Nunn; 11 Ʌh5!? Ʌxh5
12 Ʌxh5 Ʌc5 13 Ʌg4 Ʌc4 14 Ʌe2
Ʌa5 15 Ʌe3 ± K.Müller-Wahls, Ham-
burg 1991) 11...Ʌxb3 (11...a6 – 10...a6
11 Ʌh1 Ʌa5; 11...Ʌc7 12 f4 Ʌd7 13
Ʌe2 Ʌc6 14 e5 with some initiative,
Gdanski-Kalinin, Bundesliga 1994/5;
following 11...\(\text{d}7\), it is possible to play 12 \(f4\) or 12 \(g5\) \(h6\) 13 \(e3\) \(c7\) 14 \(f4\) \(b5\) 15 \(e5\)!, when White definitely has the initiative, Neukirch-Pietrusiak, Rostock 1981) 12 axb3 \(c6\)!? 13 \(g5\) \(h6\) 14 \(xf6\) \(xf6\) 15 \(h5\) \(e7\)!? 16 \(xa7\) \(xa7\) 17 \(d4\) \(e5\) 18 \(xa7\) \(e6\) with compensation, Hector-Plachetka, Copenhagen 1990.

We now return to 10 \(g5\) (D):

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

10...\(a5\)

The other possibilities are:

a) 10...\(a6\)!! 11 \(xf6\), Chandler-Rivas, Minsk 1982.

b) 10...\(c5\) 11 \(e3\) (Saidy) ±.

c) 10...\(e5\) 11 \(g3\) \(h6\) 12 \(xf6\) \(xf6\) 13 \(h5\) \(d7\) 14 \(xf6+\) \(xf6\) 15 \(d3\) ± M. Ankerst-Kožul, Bled 1993.

d) 10...\(c7\) and here:

\begin{itemize}
\item d1) 11 \(d2\) \(a6\) (11...\(a5\))! 12 \(ad1\) \(xb3\) 13 axb3 \(d8\), Wedberg-Fedorowicz, New York 1990) 12 \(ad1\) \(d8\) 13 \(g3\) \(b5\) (13...\(a5\) – 10...\(a5\) 11 \(g3\) \(c7\) 12 \(d2\) \(a6\) 13 \(ad1\) \(d8\)) 14 \(fe1\) (14 \(f4\) \(b4\)?) and then:

\begin{itemize}
\item d11) After 14...\(b7\) 15 \(xf6\)!! \(xf6\) 16 \(h5\) \(c7\) 17 \(e3\) \(h8\), Quinteros-Radulov, Wijk aan Zee 1974, 18 \(xg7\)!! looks dangerous for Black.
\item d12) 14...\(b4\)!!.
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

d13) 14...\(a5\) – 10...\(a5\) 11 \(g3\) \(c7\) 12 \(d2\) \(a6\) 13 \(ad1\) \(d8\) 14 \(fe1\) \(b5\)!

d2) 11 \(g3\) \(a6\) (11...\(a5\) – 10...\(a5\) 11 \(g3\) \(a6\)) 12 \(h5\) with a slight advantage (or maybe 12 \(f4\)?)

e) 10...\(d8\) and then:

\begin{itemize}
\item e1) 11 \(h1\) \(e5\)?! (11...\(a5\) ± Anand) 12 \(f4\) \(eg4\) 13 \(we1\) \(wc5\) 14 \(xc1\)! ± Wahls-Mirallès, Lucerne Wch 1989.
\item e2) 11 \(g3\) and here:

\begin{itemize}
\item e21) 11...\(a5\) 12 \(f4\) \(h6\) (12...\(b5\) 13 \(a3\)!, G.Kuzmin-Furman, Minsk 1976) 13 \(xf6\) \(xf6\) 14 \(h5\) \(xc3\) 15 \(bxc3\) \(wcx3\) 16 \(g4\) with the initiative – Dokhoian.
\item e22) 11...\(d5\) 12 \(exd5\) \(exd5\) 13 \(xd5\) \(exd5\) 14 \(e1\)! ± Ribli.
\item e23) 11...\(h6\) 12 \(e3\) (after 12 \(xf6\) \(xf6\) 13 \(h5\), Dokhoian gives the lines 13...\(xc3\) 14 \(bxc3\) \(wc5\) 15 \(h1\) \(d5\)?? 16 exd5 \(exd5\) 17 \(f4\) \(wcx3\) 18 \(f5\) with compensation and 13...\(e7\) 14 \(g4\) \(f8\) with unclear play) 12...\(a5\) (12...\(c7\) can be met by Dokhoian’s 13 \(f4\) or 13 \(h5\) \(d7\) 14 \(f4\) \(a5\) 15 \(d4\)! ± De Vreught-Gulko, Esbjerg 2000) and now 13 \(h3\)!! gives White slightly the better chances, Levin-Dokhoian, Berlin 1992, and is better than 13 \(f4\) \(d5\)!! 14 \(e5\) \(e8\) 15 \(ce2\) \(d4\)! ± or 13 \(we2\) \(d5\)! (Dokhoian).
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

11 \(g3\)

Or:

\begin{itemize}
\item a) 11 \(d3\) \(c5\) =.
\item b) 11 \(d2\) \(a6\)!! (11...\(xb3\) 12 \(xb3\) \(a6\) 13 \(fd1\) \(d8\) 14 \(e3\) \(c7\) 15 \(f4\) is slightly better for White – Mirallès) 12 \(ad1\) \(c4\)! (12...\(h8\) 13 \(xf6\) \(xf6\) 14 \(h6\) \(xb3\) 15 \(axb3\) \(g8\) 16 \(f4\) \(d7\)! – Mirallès) 13 \(xc4\) \(xc4\) 14 \(xf6\) \(xf6\) 15 \(h6\) \(h8\) 16
\( \text{f}4 \text{g}8 17 \text{xd}6 \text{e}5 \) (Wwedberg-Mirallès, Haifa Echt 1989) 18 \( \text{cd}5! \) ± (Mirallès).

c) 11 \( \text{h}1 \text{c}5 \) (11...a6 12 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 13 \( \text{g}3 – 10 \) \( \text{g}3 \) a6 11 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 12 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \)) 12 \( \text{f}4 \) (12 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{c}7 \) =; 12 \( \text{f}4 \) b5 ½–½ Wahls-Franco, Lucerne Wch 1989) 12...b5 13 \( \text{g}3 \), and here instead of 13...b4?, which is met by 14 e5! dxe5 15 \( \text{xf}6 \) with an extremely dangerous attack for White, Fischer-Benko, Bled/Zagreb/Belgrade Ct 1959, Black must play 13...\( \text{xb}3 \) 14 \( \text{xb}3 \) \( \text{h}5 \) (14...b4!? 15 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{h}8 \) = (Fischer), or, at once, 13...\( \text{b}7 \) 14 \( \text{h}5 \) (14 f5?!)) 14...\( \text{h}8 \) (Kasparov and Nikitin’s suggestion 14...b4!? is less convincing) with chances for both sides, Scholl-Langeweg, Amsterdam 1970.

11...\( \text{wc}5 \)

The following have been tested as well:

a) 11...h6 12 \( \text{e}3 \) (unclear is 12 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 13 \( \text{h}5 \) Dorfman) 12...\( \text{wc}6 \) 13 \( \text{e}2 \) (13 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{c}4 \) = Nunn; probably stronger is 13 \( \text{h}5 \)!!) 13...\( \text{xb}3 \) 14 \( \text{xb}3 \) a6 15 \( \text{f}4 \) b5 16 e5 \( \text{e}8 \) with a good game for Black, Thipsay-Dorfman, New Delhi 1982.

b) 11...\( \text{wc}7 \) 12 \( \text{wd}2 \) a6 13 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 14 \( \text{fe}1 \) b5! 15 \( \text{xf}5 \) (15 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) \( \text{f}6 \) Ribli) 15...\( \text{xf}6 \) 16 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xb}3 \) 17 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 18 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) ! 19 \( \text{xf}6 \) + (19 \( \text{b}6 \)? \( \text{wc}6 \) 20 \( \text{xa}8 \) \( \text{b}7 \)) 19...\( \text{xf}6 \) 20 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{b}7 \)!!; 21 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 22 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 23 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{wc}6 \) 24 \( \text{h}8 \) + \( \text{e}7 \) 25 \( \text{h}x7 \) = Ljubojević-Ribli, Skopje OL 1972.

12 \( \text{wd}2 \) b5 13 \( \text{ad}1 \)

Now, instead of 13...\( \text{xb}3 \)?? 14 \( \text{xb}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 15 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 16 \( \text{h}5 \) ± Ljubojević-Ree, Amsterdam 1975, or 13...\( \text{b}7 \)

14 \( \text{e}3 \) (14 \( \text{h}5 \)!! is also possible) 14...\( \text{wc}6 \) (14...\( \text{xb}3 \)??) 15 \( \text{d}5 \) with the advantage, Minic recommended 13...b4 14 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{b}5 \) with a complicated game.

We may conclude that 7 \( \text{de}2 \) is a good choice for the player who is not well enough prepared for more forcing lines.

B4)

7 \( \text{xc}6 \)?? \( \text{bxc}6 \) 8 0-0 (D)

Like the other responses to 6...\( \text{wb}6 \), 7 \( \text{xc}6 \) has its own pros and cons. Having improved his opponent’s pawn-structure, White is ahead in development. Black urgently needs to develop the f8-bishop by choosing one of three options:

B41: 8...\( \text{e}5 \) 241
B42: 8...\( \text{e}6 \) 242
B43: 8...\( \text{g}6 \) 244

B41)

8...\( \text{e}5 \)

Quite unpopular due to White’s next move:

9 \( \text{g}5 \)!

Quiet development does not bring great advantage to White. For instance:
a) 9 \( \text{Wd}3 \) \( \text{ae}7 \) 10 \( \text{Ag}5 \) 0-0 11 \( \text{b}3 \) (11 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 12 \( \text{Wxd}6 \) \( \text{Wxb}2 \) = Sion Castro-Gi.Hernandez, Cordoba 1995)
11...\( \text{Md}8 \) 12 \( \text{Md}1 \) \( \text{Mg}4 \) 13 \( \text{Me}3 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 14 \( \text{Md}2?! \) \( \text{Mh}5! \), Neelakanthan-Anageldiev, Calcutta 1996.

b) 9 \( \text{Wh}1 \) \( \text{ae}7 \) 10 f4 0-0 11 \( \text{Wd}3 \) (S.B.Hansen-Mortensen, Danish Ch (Esbjerg) 1997) 11...\( \text{Exf}4 \) 12 \( \text{Mxf}4 \) \( \text{Mg}4 \) 13 \( \text{Wg}3 \) \( \text{Wc}5 \) 14 \( \text{Mb}3 \) \( \text{De}5 \) followed by ...\( \text{Me}6 \) (Mortensen).

c) 9 \( \text{Me}3 \) \( \text{Wxb}2 \) 10 \( \text{Wd}3 \) deserves a certain amount of attention.

9...\( \text{Wxb}2 \)
10...\( \text{We}7 \) 11 \( \text{Mf}6 \) \( \text{Wg}6 \) 11 b3 \( \text{Ma}6 \) 12 \( \text{Ma}4 \) \( \text{Wa}5 \) 13 \( \text{Ma}6 \) \( \text{Wxa}6 \) 14 c4 \( \text{Fang}\). Probably the least of all evils here is 9...\( \text{Wc}5!? \) with the idea of 10...\( \text{Me}7 \), as in Tompa-Cserna, Hungarian Ch (Budapest) 1975.

10 \( \text{Mb}3 \) \( \text{Bb}6 \)
10...\( \text{Me}7 \) 11 \( \text{Mf}6 \) \( \text{Mg}6 \) 11 b3 \( \text{Ma}6 \) 12 \( \text{Ma}4 \) \( \text{Wa}5 \) 13 \( \text{Ma}6 \) \( \text{Wxa}6 \) 14 c4 \( \text{Fang}\). Vasilyukov-Pietrusiak, Polish Ch (Zdroj 1965) 13 \( \text{Me}4 \) \( \text{Mf}6 \) 14 \( \text{Mb}1 \) \( \text{Wa}3 \) 15 \( \text{Mb}3 \) is much better for White.

11 \( \text{Mf}6 \) \( \text{Mg}6 \) 12 \( \text{Mb}5 \) \( \text{Wd}8 \) 12...\( \text{Mg}5 \) 13 \( \text{Wxd}5 \) \( \text{Wb}7 \) 14...\( \text{Wb}7 \) +...\( \text{Wb}6 \) +...\( \text{Wb}6 \)

13 \( \text{Mb}1 \) !
13 \( \text{Me}3 \) \( \text{Mb}6 \) (13...\( \text{Mg}8?! \) Bologan)
14 \( \text{Mb}1 \) \( \text{Me}7 \) 15 \( \text{Mb}3 \) \( \text{Mf}2?! \) (Bologan) and now, instead of 15...\( \text{Me}6?! \)
16 \( \text{Mc}4 \) \( \text{d}5?! \) 17 \( \text{Ma}4! \) + -- Topalov-Gavrikov, Geneva rd. 1996, 15...\( \text{Me}3 \) \( \text{Wf}3 \) is correct.

13...\( \text{Me}7 \)

Or: 13...\( \text{Mg}5 \) 14 \( \text{Wxd}5 \) \( \text{Me}6 \) 15 \( \text{Mb}5+ \); 13...\( \text{Mg}6 \) 14 \( \text{Mb}7! \); 13...\( \text{Me}6 \) 14 \( \text{Mb}4! \) + K.Müller-Gabriel, Bundesliga 1997/8.
14 \( \text{Me}7 \)

The retreat of the knight to e3 or b4 also preserves the initiative.

14...\( \text{Mxe}7 \)

Now:

a) White performed ineffectively in Ashley-Waitzkin, Bermuda 1997: 15 f4 \( \text{Wa}5 \) 16 \( \text{Me}1 \) \( \text{Mg}8 \) 17 \( \text{Mxe}7? \) (17 \( \text{Mf}5?! \) Rechlis) 17...\( \text{Mxf}7 \) 18 \( \text{Wxd}6 \) \( \text{Wd}8 \) 19 \( \text{Wxc}6 \) \( \text{Mf}2 \) !, etc.

b) Instead, I recommend 15 \( \text{Wf}3 \) ± as not to let the queen go to a5.

B42)

8...\( \text{e}6 \) (D)

The game Topalov-Kramnik, Novgorod 1996 spoiled the reputation of this continuation.

9 \( \text{Me}2 \)

Otherwise:

a) 9 \( \text{Me}5?! \) is well met by 9...\( \text{Wf}6 \), Stanciu-Mititelu, Romania 1966.

b) 9 \( \text{Me}3 \) 10 \( \text{Me}3 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 11 f4 0-0 followed by ...\( \text{Mg}5 \) !

c) 9 \( \text{Me}3 \) ? \( \text{Mf}6 \) 10 \( \text{Mf}4 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 11 c4 is worth considering.

d) 9 b3 involves the same plan as the text-move, but it may be less accurate: 9...\( \text{Me}7 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 10 cxd5 \( \text{xd}5 \) 11 \( \text{Mb}5+ \) \( \text{Mg}7 \) 12 \( \text{Mxd}7+ \) \( \text{Mxd}7 \) 13 \( \text{Md}5 \) 14 \( \text{Me}1+ \) with an attack -- New in
Chess) 10 b2 0-0 11 We2 with several possibilities for Black:

d1) 11...d5? 12 exd5 cxd5 13 xd5 ±.

d2) 11...d7 – 9 e2 d7 10 b3 e7 11 b2 0-0.

d3) 11...b7 12 e5!.

d4) 11...c7 12 f4! d5 13 d3.

d5) 11...a5 12 a4 d5 13 e5 d7 14 d3 b6 15 c3 b4 16 xb4 xb4 17 c3! ± De Vreught-Van der Wiel, Amsterdam 1996.

d6) 11...e5?! 12 h1 (12 a4?! c7 13 f4 exf4 14 e5 g4 15 e1, Tell-Trygstad, Stockholm 1998) 12...c7 13 a1 (13 f4? exf4 14 xf4 d5) 13...d7 (13...g6! New in Chess) 14 a4 and here, instead of 14...b7 15 d3 fe8 16 c4 g5 17 c2 ± Karpov-Stein, USSR Ch (Leningrad) 1971, Karpov recommended 14...f6!.

e) 9 f4?! is interesting:

e1) 9...d5? 10 exd5 exd5 11 xd5! ±.

e2) 9...c5 10 We2 ±.

e3) 9...xb2 10 d3 b4 (10...e5 11 g5 transposes to Line B4) 11 ab1 c5 12 fd1 with compensation, Fischer-Byrne, New York blitz 1971.

e4) 9...c7 10 d3 (10 We2 e5 11 g5 e7 = Minev) 10...h5!? (not all problems are solved by 10...e7 11 ad1 e5 12 g5, Britton-Speelman, London 1978, or 10...d7 11 g3, Winants-Levin, Bundesliga 1996/7) 11 e3 e7 12 f4 f6 13 ae1 0-0 gives Black an acceptable position, Honfi-Čabrilo, Belgrade 1977.

9...d7

9...e7 10 e5 (10 b3 0-0 11 b2 – 9 b3 e7 10 b2 0-0 11 e2) 10...dxe5 11 xe5 0-0 (11...a6!? 12 e3 b7 13 xa6 bxa6 14 c5? d7 15 xg7 f6 16 Wh6 xc3) 12 a4 (12 e2 b7 13 b3 ad8 14 b2 c5 = B.Knežević-Damljanović, Belgrade 1998; 12 b3?! a6!) 12...wb4 13 b3 with somewhat better chances for White, Nedev-Dorić, Plovdiv 1991.

10 b3

10 a4 a5 (10...c7) 11 b3 e5 12 d2 c7 13 a6 ± Gi.Hernandez-Yermolinsky, Chicago 1997.

10...e7 11 b2

Or 11 a4 c7 12 b2 0-0.

11...0-0 12 a4 c7 13 f4 b7

Or:

a) 13...b6 14 xb6 axb6 15 a4 (15 f3! Krnić) 15...e8 and White only succeeded in drawing in Krnić-Radulov, Vrsac 1973 after 16 f3 b5 17 g3 g6 18 Wh5 (18 f5 bxc4 19 Wh5 e5!, Krnić, also looks like a draw) 18...f8 19 f5 g7 20 xg7 gxh5.

b) 13...d5 14 d3 (14 xd5 cxd5 15 xdx5? c5+) 14...g6 15 c4 f6 (Prié-Mirallès, French Cht 1989) 16 ac1 with an advantage for White – Mirallès.

c) 13...e5!.

14 ad1

This is possibly stronger than the previously played 14 f3 and 14 ae1.

14...ae8

Unsuccessful are 14...c5 15 f5 ± (Khuzman) and 14...d5 15 d3 f6 (15...c5 16 exd5 xdx5 17 f5 ±) 16 e5 with an attack. Comparatively better continuations have been proposed: 14...e8 ± (Kramnik) with the point 15 f5 e5, or 14...ad8 15 d3 d5 (Topalov).

15 d3! c5

Insufficient is 15...f6 16 xf6 (16 e5! dxe5 17 fxe5 xe5 18 xf6 gxf6
19 \( \text{h}3 \pm \text{Har-Zvi} \) 16...\( \text{Qxf6} \) 17 e5 dxe5 18 \( \text{Wxe5} \) (Kramnik) or 15...d5 16 \( \text{Nh3} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 17 e5!? (17 \( \text{d3 dxe4} \) 18 \( \text{Nxe4} \) g6 is much better for White – Topalov) 17...\( \text{Qe4} \) 18 \( \text{d3 c5} \) 19 \( \text{Qc3} \) f5 20 \( \text{Wf5} \)! h6 21 \( \text{Wg6} \).

15...g6 16 \( \text{Nh3} \) \( \pm \) (16 \( \text{Wf5} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)!) \( \infty \); 16 f5 \( \text{exf5} \) \( \approx \) Golubev-Kuznetsov, Ukrainian Ch (Ordzhonikidze) 2001).

16 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{c6} \)

16...\( \text{d8} \) 17 \( \text{Qxd7} \) \( \text{Qxd7} \) 18 \( \text{Wg4} \) g6 19 f5.

17 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Wxe6} \) 18 c4

White is much better, Topalov-Kramnik, Novgorod 1996.

\[ \text{B43} \]

8...g6 (D)

The topical continuation.

9 e5!\

Less radical attempts are:

a) 9 b3 \( \text{Qg7} \) 10 \( \text{b2} \) 0-0 with an equal position.

b) 9 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 10 \( \text{Qa4} \)!? \( \text{Qc7} \) 11 f4 (11 c4 e5!?) (11...0-0 12 f4) 12 f4 \( \text{Qxe4} \) Jokšić 11...0-0 12 c4 gives both sides chances; for example, 12...\( \text{e}5 \) (12...\( \text{h}8 \) 13 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{Qd7} \), Gara-Jovanović, Budapest 1996; 12...\( \text{Qg4} \)!, Velimirović-Damljanović, Ulcinj 1998) 13 f5 (13

\[ \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{Qg4} \)!) 13...d5, A.Kovačević-B.Knežević, Yugoslav Ch (Belgrade) 1998.

c) 9 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 10 \( \text{f4} \) (after 10 \( \text{Qe3} \), 10...\( \text{Wf5} \) 11 f4 0-0 is good enough) 10...\( \text{Qd7} \) (10...0-0 11 e5 dxe5 12 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \pm \) Prié-Mirallès, Chanac 1989; 10...\( \text{Qc7} \) 11 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 12 \( \text{Wd2} \) h6 13 \( \text{Qad1} \) with the better chances for White, del Rio-Kožul, Ubeda 1996; 10...\( \text{Wf5} \) 10...\( \text{a6} \) 11 \( \text{Qg5} \) (11 f3 0-0 12 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) = Kindermann-Pelletier, Portož 1998) 11...\( \text{Qc5} \)!? (or 11...a5 12 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 13 \( \text{Wg3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 14 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 15 \( \text{Qad1} \) and now, rather than 15...\( \text{Qd7} \) 16 e5! \( \pm \) Prié-Tukmakov, Aix-les-Bains 1991, Black should play 15...0-0 or 15...\( \text{Qc4} \)?) 12 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) = del Rio-Pelletier, Medellín jr Wch 1996.

d) 9 \( \text{Qe3} \) and then:

\[ \text{d1} \]

9...\( \text{Wf5} \) 10 \( \text{Qd4} \) e5 (and not 10...\( \text{Wf4} \) 11 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 12 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \pm \) Bosch-Kharlov, Leeuwarden 1993; 10...\( \text{Wb7} \) 11 e5 gives White compensation) 11 \( \text{b1} \) (11 \( \text{Qb5} \)!? should probably be met by 11...\( \text{exd4} \)!) rather than 11...\( \text{Qf4} \) 12 \( \text{Qc7} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 13 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 14 \( \text{Qxa7} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 15 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 16 \( \text{Qc7} \) 11...\( \text{Qa3} \) 12 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qa5} \) 13 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 13...\( \text{Qe7} \) 14 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 15 \( \text{Qxf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 16 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 17 \( \text{Qxf6} \) 0-0 18 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \pm \) M.Berkovich-Petryenko, USSR 1980) 14 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 15 \( \text{Qxf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 16 \( \text{Qf3} \) (Arizmendi-Waitzkin, Bermuda 1999) 16...\( \text{Qg7} \) 17 \( \text{Qd5} \) cx\( \text{d5} \) 18 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 19 \( \text{Qxa8} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 20 cxb3 0-0 21 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \pm \) Gofstein.

d2) 9...\( \text{Qc7} \) 10 f4 \( \text{Qg7} \) 11 \( \text{Qd4} \) (11 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 12 \( \text{Qd4} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{Qd4} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{Qg4} \)) 11...0-0 12 \( \text{Qh1} \) (12 e5 \( \text{Qg4} \)) 13 \( \text{exd6} \) \( \text{Qxd6} \) 14 \( \text{Qxg7} \) \( \text{Qxg7} \) 15 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{exd6} \) 16 \( \text{Qae1} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 17 \( \text{Qe7} \) \( \text{Qd7} \)
= del Rio-Gonzalez Garcia, Linares 1998; 12 h3 \( d7 = \) Emms-Garcia Ilundain, Escalades Z 1998) 12...b8 (12...e5 13 fxe5 dxe5 14 \( c5 \) gives White a slight advantage, G.Todorović-Damljanović, Yugoslav Cht 1999) 13 \( b3 \) \( a6 \) with an equal game.

d3) 9...\( wa5?! \) also seems to be satisfactory: 10 f4 \( g7 \) 11 e5 (11 h3 0-0 12 \( b3 \) \( d7 = \) Vlasov-Akhmadeev, St Petersburg 1999) 11...\( d4 \) 12 \( d4 \) c5!, Berndt-Popović, Austrian Cht 2000/1, with the point 13 \( b5+ \) \( f8 \).

e) 9 \( we2 \) \( d4 \) (9...\( g7?! \) 10 e5 dxe5 11 \( xe5 \) gives White an advantage; e.g., 11...0-0 12 \( xe7 \) \( f5 \) 13 \( b3 \) \( a8 \) 14 \( d6 \) \( g4 \) 15 \( f4 \) \( xc3 \) 16 \( xc3 \) \( e2 \) 17 \( ab1! \) -- Morovic-Becerra Rivero, Cienfuegos 1996; 9...\( d7?! \) 10 \( e3 \) \( xb2 \) 11 \( d4 \) e5 12 \( ab1 \) \( a3 \) 13 \( b3 \) \( a5 \) 14 \( e3 \) with compensation, Al Awadhi-Spraggett, Dubai OL 1986; 9...\( g4 \) 10 \( e1! \), Madl-P.Varga, Budapest 1997).

   e1) 10 b3 \( g7 \) 11 \( h2 \) \( a5 \) with a good game, Giacco-Zarnicki, Villa Gesell 1998.

   e2) 10 h3 \( e5 \) 11 \( e3 \) (11 \( b3 \) is better) 11...\( wb2 \) 12 \( d4 \) \( b4 \) (Goshtsein) favours Black.

   e3) 10 \( h1 \) \( g7 \) 11 f4 0-0 12 \( d3 \) (12 h3? \( d6 \) 13 e5 dxe5 14 fxe5 \( h5 \) 15 \( f3 \) \( d4 \) 16 g4 \( xg4 \) 17 hgx4 \( xg4 \) 18 \( e4 \) \( xe5 \) is much better for Black -- Gershon) 12...a5 (12...\( b8 \) Gershon) 13 \( a4 \) \( d8?! \) with chances for both sides, De Vreught-Gershon, Tel-Aviv 2000. Black intends...e5 and...

   e4) 10 \( e3?! \) \( c7 \) (10...\( xe3?! \) 11 fxe3 f6 Tyomkin) 11 \( d4 \) e5 12 \( e3 \) \( g7 \) 13 \( d1 \) 0-0 14 \( d3 \) d5 15 exd5 16 d6 edx3 17 dxc7 dxc2 and it looks like Black is equal, De Vreught-Bleh, Erevan jr Wch 1999.

   e5) 10 \( b3 \) \( g7 \) and then:

   e51) 11 h3 \( e5 \) 12 \( e3 \) \( a6?! \) (12...\( a5 \) 13 f4 \( a6 \) 14 \( d2 \) \( c4 \), Vasiukov-Mititelu, Budapest 1967, and 12...\( a6?! \) are also good) 13 f4 (13 \( d2 \) \( c4 \) 14 \( xc4 \) \( xc4 \) \( f \) Tyomkin) 13...\( xe2 \) 14 \( xe2 \) \( d7 \) = Dervish-Tyomkin, Verona 2000.

   e52) 11 \( a4 \) \( a6 \) (11...\( b5?! \) is critical, with the point 12 \( c4 \) \( e5! \) -- Tyomkin) 12 \( c4 \) \( b8 \) 13 \( d2 \) with some pressure, T.Thorhallsson-Tyomkin, Paget Parish 2001.

   f) 9 \( e1?! \) \( d4 \) 10 h3 \( e5 \) 11 \( a4 \) \( c7 \) (11...\( d4 \) 12 \( b3 \) with the point 12...\( a6? \) 13 \( d2! \) \( xf1 \) 14 \( c3 \) and White wins) 12 \( c3! \), Scheipl-Freise, Menden 1974.

   9...\( dxe5 \) 10 \( e2 \) (D)

   10...\( d4 \)

Or:

a) 10...\( g7?! \) = 9 \( e2 \) \( g7?! \) 10 e5 dxe5.

b) 10...\( d7?! \) 11 \( e4 \) \( g7 \) 12 \( e3 \) \( ± \) (Morovic).

c) 10...\( a5?! \) 11 f4 \( ± \) (Kantsler).

d) 10...\( c5?! \) 11 \( e3 \) and now 11...\( a5 \) is a playable alternative to
11...\(\text{Wd6}\), which transposes to the main line.

e) 10...\(\text{Wc7}\) 11 \(\text{f4}\) (11 \(\text{Ae1?!}\)) 11...\(\text{e4}\) (11...\(\text{exf4?}\) 12 \(\text{Axf4}\) \(\text{Wb6+}\) 13 \(\text{Ae3}\) \(\text{Ag4}\) 14 \(\text{Ae1}\) with a decisive advantage) 12 \(\text{Qxe4}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\) 13 \(\text{Wxe4}\) \(\text{Ag7}\) 14 \(\text{c3}\) 0-0 15 \(\text{Ae3}\). This position has been tested in a number of games. White probably has a small advantage; for example, 15...\(\text{Ab8}\) 16 \(\text{Af2}\) \(\text{Af5}\) 17 \(\text{Wf3}\) K.Müller-Csom, Lippstadt 1999.

11 \(\text{Ae3}\)

Not 11 \(\text{Ad1?}\) \(\text{Ag4!}\), Stockel-Goloshchakop, Mlada Boleslav 1995.

11...\(\text{Wd6!}\)

11...\(\text{Wh4}\) 12 \(\text{f4!}\) \(\text{e4}\) (Nedev-Kotronias, Korinthos 1997; 12...\(\text{Dg4}\) 13 \(g3\); 12...\(\text{Dg4}\) 13 \(\text{We1}\) \(\text{Wxe1}\) 14 \(\text{Dxe1}\) \(\text{exf4}\) 15 \(\text{Dd4}\) \(\pm\) Tsesarsky) 13 \(\text{Af2!}\) \(\text{Wh5}\) 14 \(\text{Dxe4}\) \(\text{Wxe2}\) 15 \(\text{Dxf6+}\) \(\text{exf6}\) 16 \(\text{Dxe2}\) and White has an advantage.

12 \(\text{Ad1}\)

12 \(\text{Wf3?!}\) is unsuccessful in view of 12...\(\text{Dg4!}\) 13 \(\text{Dg3}\) \(\text{Dg7}\), Jackova-Cmilyte, Erevan girls Wch 1999.

12 \(\text{f4}\) contains a trap:

a) 12...\(\text{e4?!}\) 13 \(\text{Ad1?!}\) (better than 13 \(\text{Ad1?!}\) \(\text{Dg4}\) 14 \(\text{Dxe2}\) \(\text{Dxe4}\) 15 \(\text{Dd1}\)) 13...\(\text{Dg4}\) (13...\(\text{Wc7}\) 14 \(\text{Dxe4}\) \(\text{Dxe4}\) 15 \(\text{Dd4}\) \(\pm\)) 14 \(\text{Dxd6}\) \(\text{Dxe2}\) 15 \(\text{Dxc6}\) (or 15 \(\text{Dxf6}\)) 15...\(\text{Dxc4}\) 16 \(\text{Dxc4}\) \(\pm\) Tsesarsky.

b) However, 12...\(\text{Dg7!}\) is good (this was also pointed out by Tsesarsky): 13 \(\text{fxe5}\) (13 \(\text{Ad1?!}\) \(\text{Dg4}\); 13 \(\text{Df1}\) \(\text{Wc7}\)!) 14 \(\text{Wxe5}\) 14 \(\text{Wf2}\) 0-0, etc.

12...\(\text{Wc7}\) 13 \(\text{f4}\)

Or:

a) 13 \(\text{Dxe1}\) \(\text{Dg7}\) 14 \(\text{Dg5}\) (14 \(\text{Cc5}\) – 15 \(\text{Cc5}\) \(\text{Dg7}\) 14 \(\text{Dxe1}\)) 14...\(\text{h6}\) 15 \(\text{Dh4}\) \(\text{Dh5}\) 16 \(\text{Dc5}\) \(\text{Dxb5}\) 17 \(\text{Dxb5+}\) \(\text{Df8}\) 18 \(\text{Dc4}\) \(\text{Wb6}\) 19 \(\text{Dxe7+}\) \(\text{Dg8}\) 20 \(\text{Dd6}\) \(\text{Dxe6}\) 21 \(\text{De4}\) \(\text{Dxb5}\) 22 \(\text{Dxa8+}\) \(\text{Dh7}\) –+

Florescu-Nevednichy, Miercurea Ciuc 1999.

b) 13 \(\text{Dc5?!}\) \(\text{Dg7}\) (13...\(\text{Df5?!}\)) and now:

b1) After 14 \(\text{Df1}\), both 14...0-0 15 \(\text{Dxe5}\) \(\text{Dxe5}\) 16 \(\text{Dxe5}\) \(\text{Dd7}\) 17 \(\text{Dxd7}\) (Kramnik) and 14...\(\text{Dh5?!}\) should suit Black.

b2) 14 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{Dd7}\) (14...\(\text{Dg4?!}\) 15 \(\text{Dxe5}\) \(\pm\) Hamdouchi-M.Sorin, Montpellier 1999; 14...\(\text{Df4}\)? is also dubious in view of 15 \(\text{Dxe4}\) and now 15 \(\text{Dd3}\) \(\text{Ddb6}\) is good for Black, Kornev-Akhmadeev, Russia 1998, so White should try 15 \(\text{Dxe7}\) \(\text{Dxe7}\) 16 \(\text{fxe5}\) \(\text{Df8}\) 17 \(\text{Dg4}\).

13...\(\text{Dg4}\)

13...\(\text{Dg7?!}\) 14 \(\text{fxe5}\) \(\text{Dxe5}\) 15 \(\text{Db6}\) \(\text{Dxe2}\) 16 \(\text{Dd8}\#).

13...\(\text{e4}\) 14 \(\text{Dxe4}\) \(\text{Dg7}\) (14...\(\text{Dxe4}\) 15 \(\text{Dd4}\) \(\pm\) 15 \(\text{Dd4}\) 0-0 16 \(\text{Dxf6}\) \(\pm\) Lakos-Pelletier, Porto ro 1998.

14 \(\text{Wf2}\)

14...\(\text{Dd5}\) \(\text{Wb7}\) \(\-analytics\) Gofshtein.

14...\(\text{e4}\)

After 14...\(\text{Dxd1?!}\) 15 \(\text{fxe5}\) \(\text{Dxe5}\) (15...\(\text{Dc2}\) 16 \(\text{exf6}\) \(\text{Df5}\) 17 \(\text{g4!}\)) 16 \(\text{Dd4}\) Black lacks a satisfactory defence:

a) 16...\(\text{Dd6}\) 17 \(\text{Dxf6}\) \(\text{Dxf6}\) (alternatively, 17...\(\text{Df6}\) 18 \(\text{De4}\) \(\text{Wxe5}\) 19 \(\text{Dxf6+}\) \(\text{Dd8}\) 20 \(\text{Dxd1+}\) \(\text{Dd6}\) 21 \(\text{De4}!\) ++) 18 \(\text{Dc5}\) e5 19 \(\text{Dxf7+}\) ++ Tsesarsky.

b) 16...\(\text{Dc7}\) 17 \(\text{Dxf6}\) \(\text{exf6}\) 18 \(\text{Dxe1+}\) \(\text{Df7}\) 19 \(\text{Dxf6+}\) 20 \(\text{Dxd2}\) \(\text{Dh5}\) 21 \(\text{Dc5}\) \(\pm\) Mitenkov.

c) 16...\(\text{Df5}\) 17 \(\text{Dc3}\).

d) 16...\(\text{Dg5}\) 17 \(\text{Dxf6}\) \(\text{exf6}\) 18 \(\text{De4}\) \(\text{Dc5}\) 19 \(\text{Dxc5}\) 0-0 0-0 20 \(\text{Dd3}\) \(\text{Db8}\) 21 \(\text{Dxd1}\) \(\text{Dg4}\) 22 \(\text{Wg3}\) \(\pm\).

15 \(\text{Dde1}\) \(\text{f5}\)!

15...\(\text{Dg7}\) 16 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{Df5}\) 17 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{Dc8}\) 18 \(\text{Dc5}\) \(\pm\) Kramnik.

16 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{h5}\) 17 \(\text{Dd4}\) \(\text{Dg7}\) 18 \(\text{b3}\) 0-0
18...h4 19 ∆xf6 ∆xf6 20 ∆xe4 ∆xe4 21 ∆xe4 ♦h5 (Schumi-Atalik, Bled 2001) 22 ♦d3!? is less convincing.

19 ∆xf6 ∆xf6 20 ∆xe4 ∆xe4 21 ∆xe4 ♦b6
½-½ Topalov-Kramnik, Novgorod 1997.

**B5)**

7 ♦b3

This move is played more frequently than all the other moves put together. Whether it is good or bad, the b2-pawn is completely safe now and White is guaranteed a wide choice of continuations as the c1-bishop is free.

7...e6 (D)

Or:

a) 7...g6 gives White at least a possibility to transpose to the position that usually arises out of the Accelerated Dragon through 8 ♦e3 ♦c7 9 ♦e2 ♦g7 10 0-0 0-0 ±.

b) 7...a6!? (avoiding 7...e6 8 ♦f4) 8 0-0 e6 transposes to the note to Black’s 8th move in Line B52.

![Chess Diagram](image)

When the c4-bishop and the black queen have moved to more convenient squares, a huge range of Scheveningen positions may arise on the board. We shall quite briefly consider the continuations 8 ♦e3 and 8 0-0, which often lead to Scheveningen lines, and, in greater detail, more concrete variations with 8 ♦g5 and 8 ♦f4.

So:

**B51:** 8 ♦e3 247
**B52:** 8 0-0 248
**B53:** 8 ♦g5 253
**B54:** 8 ♦f4 261

Out of the other options it is necessary to mention 8 ♦e2. Usually, this move is linked with the idea of casting long: after, for example, 8...a6 9 f4 ♦c7 10 ♦e3 b5 11 ♦d3 followed by 0-0-0, or first g4, an intricate game commences that gives chances for both sides.

**B51)**

8 ♦e3

8 0-0, followed by ♦e3, ♦d3 and f4, is the other possible introduction to the same arrangement (see Line B52).

As compared to 8 0-0 ♦e7 9 ♦e3, with the present move-order 8 ♦e3 the sides have certain additional possibilities. White has ideas with 0-0-0 or an early g4, and Black could try to do without ...♦e7; we shall see these ideas in the notes below.

8...♦c7 9 ♦d3

9 f4 a6 10 ♦d3 comes to the same thing.

9...a6 10 f4 (D)

According to the widely adopted classification, this position and all its ‘derivatives’ are referred to as the Scheveningen. However, in practice they most often arise, as in our case, from the Sozin or from the Taimanov...
Variation. Also, it is curious to note that one may find a couple of hundred games that began 1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Qxd4 wb6, where the position in the diagram arose with White to move. In many such instances Black, whose statistics are far from being catastrophic, was a famous grandmaster.

The most popular continuation is:

10...b5 11 Wf3

White can play 11 g4?! or 11 We2, which should be compared with 8 Wc2.

11...Qb7 12 0-0

12 g4?! is an alternative.

Now (after 12 0-0):

a) 12...g6?! with a possible...Qg7.

b) Black could also try 12...d5 13 exd5 Qb4.

c) 12...Qe7 brings us to an important theoretical position, which we discuss in Line B52.

B52)

8 0-0 (D)

The flexible move. White holds in reserve the plans Qg5 and Qe3, Qd3, f4 (allowing ...b5) in addition to the opportunity to make an early a4 advance.

8...Qe7

Very infrequently does Black play 8...a6, because in this instance 9 a4! gives White somewhat better chances: 9...Qc7 (9...Qa5 10 Qe3 Qc7 11 Qxa5 Qxa5 12 Qd2 Qe7 13 Qfd1 with pressure, Mikhailchishin-Kozul, Slovenian Cht 1999; 9...Qe5 10 Qe2 ?; 9...Qe7 10 a5 Qc7 – 9...Qc7 10 a5! (Qe7) 10 a5! (10 Qe3 b6), and now:

a) It is very risky for Black to play 10...Qxa5 11 Qxa5 b6 12 e5 bxa5 (12...dxe5?! 13 Wf3!) 13 exf6 (13 Qxe6 dxe5!) 13...Qxc4 14 fxg7 (14 Wf3!? is quite unclear, Vasiesiu-Solak, Bucharest 1997) 14...Qxg7 15 Qxd6 Qb7 (15...Qa7 16 Qxa5 ? Nunnen-Vander Wiel, Baden 1980), and now:

a1) 16 Qxa5 Qf6!?.

a2) 16 Qd1 Qc6! 17 Qxc6+ Qxc6 18 Qd6 Qc8!? 19 Qxa5 Qxc3 and now 20 Qc5 (Franco-Marcus, Los Polvorines 1980) 20...Qb4! 21 Qxc6! 0-0! 22 Qxc8 Qxc8 23 Qd4 Qxc2 24 Qh6 Qe7 = Nisipeanu/Stoica, or 20 bxc3 Qg8 with the point 21 Qc5 Qxg2+ 22 Qf1 Qxh2 ==.

a3) 16 Qg5!? (± Nunnen) 16...Wb4 17 Wg3 Qc8 (17...Wxb2? 18 Qd2; 17...0-0? 18 Qf6; 17...Qg8 18 Qa4 Qxb2 19 Qc7 Qf6 20 Qb1 Qxc3 21 Qxb7 Qd8 22 Qc4! Wc5 23 Qc6+ ±)
18 \textbf{f}d1 with the initiative, Panchenko-Zhidkov, Daugavpils 1974.

b) 10...\textbf{e}7 11 \textbf{e}3 and then:

b1) 11...\textbf{d}xe5?! 12 \textbf{d}xe2 \textbf{c}c4 13 \textbf{d}xc4 \textbf{w}xc4 14 \textbf{d}c5! \textbf{d}xe4 15 \textbf{w}g4 (15 \textbf{d}xe4 \textbf{w}xe4 16 \textbf{d}xe6 seems not bad) 15...f5 (15...\textbf{d}xc5?!?) 16 \textbf{w}xg7 \textbf{f}6 17 \textbf{d}xe4 \textbf{w}xf1+ 18 \textbf{w}xf1 \textbf{d}xg7 19 \textbf{d}x6+ \textbf{d}7 20 \textbf{d}d1 \pm Sofieva-Sautina, USSR wom Ch (Erevan) 1985.

b2) 11...\textbf{d}d7 12 \textbf{d}d3 0-0 13 \textbf{a}a4 \pm Nisipeanu/Stoica.

b4) 11...\textbf{d}b4 12 \textbf{d}e2 \textbf{d}d7 13 f4 0-0 14 \textbf{f}f3 e5 (14...\textbf{a}c8 transposes to line ‘c’) 15 \textbf{g}f2 \textbf{xf}4 16 \textbf{d}xh4 \textbf{d}ad8 17 \textbf{d}d2 \pm Nunn-Csorna, Moscow Echt 1977.

c) 10...\textbf{d}d7 11 \textbf{d}e2 \textbf{c}c8 12 f4 \textbf{d}b4 13 \textbf{f}f3 \textbf{e}7 14 \textbf{e}3 0-0 15 \textbf{f}f2 is slightly better for White, Kuczynski-Kozul, Ohrid Ech 2001.

9 \textbf{d}e3

9...\textbf{g}5?! transposes to Line B532.

9 a4 is less sensible here than in the case of 8...a6. After 9...0-0 10 a5 \textbf{w}c7, Black plans 11...\textbf{d}d7 and does not have, as a rule, any real difficulties.

9...\textbf{w}c7 10 f4

An important but not adequately studied position arises after 10 \textbf{d}d3 a6 11 a4?! b6 12 f4. After 12...0-0 13 \textbf{w}f3 (13 g4 d5?! 14 e5 \textbf{d}d7 with counterplay, Marusenko-Zontakh, Kiev 1994) 13...\textbf{b}7 we have:

a) 14 \textbf{g}g3 \textbf{f}e8 15 \textbf{a}e1 (15 f5 \textbf{e}e5 16 fxe6 fxe6 17 \textbf{d}d4 \textbf{d}d8 18 \textbf{h}h3 \textbf{d}d7 Smirin) 15...\textbf{d}d7 16 e5? \textbf{d}b4! with better chances for Black, Nijboer-Smirin, Tilburg 1993.

b) The more typical 14 \textbf{h}h3?! deserves attention; e.g., 14...\textbf{f}e8 15 \textbf{f}f3 \textbf{d}b4 16 \textbf{g}g3 \textbf{x}d3 17 \textbf{x}d3 \textbf{h}8, and a draw was rather charitably accepted by White in V.Gurevich-Skaev, Cappelle la Grande 1997.

10...a6 11 \textbf{d}d3

Again, 11 a4?! is a serious alternative here:

a) After 11...b6, 12 \textbf{d}d3 transposes to 10 \textbf{d}d3 a6 11 a4?! b6 12 f4. Instead, the other version of Scheveningen, 12 \textbf{e}2 \textbf{b}7 13 \textbf{f}3 0-0 = (as in Ilyin-Zhenevsky – Rokhlin, Leningrad 1926) appears to be less promising for White.

b) Black may deviate by playing 11...d5?! 12 exd5 \textbf{d}b4 13 \textbf{d}d3 (after 13 d6, 13...\textbf{d}xd6 14 \textbf{b}5+ \textbf{d}d7 15 \textbf{d}xd7+ \textbf{w}xd7 is sufficient for Black) 13...\textbf{d}xd5 (also possible is 13...\textbf{e}xd5!? 14 \textbf{d}d4 0-0, de Firmian-Csorn, Niš 1981) 14 \textbf{d}xd5 \textbf{d}xd5 15 \textbf{d}d4 (curious is 15 \textbf{d}d2 \textbf{f}6 16 c4 \textbf{w}b6+? 17 \textbf{h}h1 \textbf{e}3? 18 \textbf{x}e3 \textbf{x}e3 19 c5!? 1-0 Elseth-Grønn, Oslo 1991) 15...\textbf{f}6 (after 15...0-0?!, the double sacrifice 16 \textbf{x}h7+ \textbf{x}h7 17 \textbf{h}h5+ \textbf{g}8 18 \textbf{x}g7 \textbf{x}g7 19 \textbf{g}g4+ yields merely a draw) 16 \textbf{e}4?! \textbf{x}d4+ (16...\textbf{x}f4 is critical) 17 \textbf{w}xd4 \pm Nijboer-Mirallès, Lucerne Wch 1989.

11...\textbf{b}5 12 \textbf{f}f3 \textbf{b}7 (D)

Black preserves possibilities of active struggle all over the board, including the kingside. 12...0-0 is considered to be a less flexible continuation here.

This is a standard position that has occurred in hundreds of games. Now:

B521: 13 a3 250
B522: 13 a4 250
B523: 13 \textbf{a}e1 251
B524: 13 \textbf{h}3 252
14...b4!?
15 \textit{Wh}3 \textit{b}4
Black has sufficient counterplay, Kupreichik-Tal, USSR 1970.

B522)
13 a4 (D)

13...\textit{b}4 14 \textit{Q}e2
14 \textit{Q}b1 e5!? 15 \textit{Q}d2 exf4 16 \textit{W}xf4 \textit{Q}e5 17 \textit{Q}d4 g6 with chances for both sides, Morozevich-Ruban, St Petersburg Z 1993.

14...\textit{Q}a5
White has slightly the better prospects in the variations 14...a5 15 c4! (Gutman), 14...d5 15 e5, 14...e5 15 \textit{Q}g3 (Spassky-Marshall, Leningrad 1960), 14...h5 15 a5! (Ghidzavu-Badilles, Skopje OL 1972) and 14...0-0 15 a5 (as in Ghidzavu-Carp, Romania 1972).

15 \textit{Q}xa5 \textit{W}xa5 16 g4
Not dangerous for Black is 16 \textit{Q}d4 e5 (16...0-0 17 g4 e5!, A.Sokolov-Ionov, Russian Ch (Elista) 1995) 17 fxe5 dxe5 18 \textit{W}f5 0-0!, Bogdanović-Szabo, Sarajevo 1972.

16...0-0
Otherwise:
a) 16...h6? 17 \textit{Q}g3 ± Tregubov.
b) 16...d5?! 17 e5 \( \text{Q}e4 \) 18 f5 was given by Bönsch.

c) 16...\( \text{Q}d7 \)!?? 17 g5 \( \text{Q}c5 \), Ghizdavu-Szabo, Romania 1972.

d) 16...\( \text{W}c7 \)!?? 17 g5 \( \text{Q}d7 \) 18 \( \text{Q}d4 \)??
\( (18 \text{Q}d4 \text{g6} \approx \text{Gutman}) \) 18...0-0 19
\( \text{W}h5 \) e5! 20 f5 exd4 21 f6 \( \text{Q}e5 \) 22 \text{Q}f4
\( \text{Q}f8 \) 23 \text{Q}h4 h6 24 \( \text{Q}g3 \text{W}d8 \) 25 \( \text{Q}f1
\( \text{Q}f8 \) 26 \( \text{Q}f5 \) \( \text{Q}e6 \) 27 \( \text{Q}f2 \) d5 28 \( \text{Q}g2
\) (J.Polgar-Damljanović, Wijk aan Zee 1990) 28...dxe4! with a winning
position for Black.

e) 16...\( \text{Q}c8 \)!?? 17 g5 \( \text{Q}d7 \) 18 \( \text{Q}g3
0-0 \) (18...g6)? Tregubov) 19 f5 \( \text{Q}e5 \) 20
\( \text{W}f4 \text{exf5} \) 21 \( \text{Q}xf5 \) \( \text{Q}f8 \) 22 \( \text{Q}d4 \) \( \text{Q}f8 \)
with chances for both sides, Moro-

17 g5 \( \text{Q}d7 \) 18 \( \text{Q}d4 \)

18...\( \text{W}h3 \)! Ruban.

18...\( \text{g}6 \)

18...\( \text{Q}f8 \) is more reliable. For in-
stance, 19 f5 \( \text{Q}e5 \) 20 \( \text{W}h3 \text{exf5} \) 21
\( \text{Q}xf5 \) (Garbett-Jansa, Nice OL 1974)
21...\( \text{Q}f8 \)!

19 \( \text{W}h3 \) \( \text{Q}c5 \) 20 \( \text{f}5 \)

Now, after 20...\( \text{exf5} \) (20...\( \text{Q}xd3 \)!
has the point 21 f6 \( \text{Q}f8 \) 22 \( \text{Q}xe6
\( \text{Q}c5 \) 21 \( \text{Q}d4 \) \( \text{Q}xf5 \) 22 \( \text{Q}xf5 \) \( \text{W}c7 \) (or
22...\( \text{Q}c8 \) 23 \( \text{W}h6 \)!)) 23 \( \text{W}h6 \), Black may
play 23...\( \text{Q}d7 \)!! (instead of 23...d5 24
\( \text{Q}d4 \) \( \text{Q}e6 \) 25 e5 \( \text{Q}c5 \), Mortensen-Tuk-
makov, Reykjavik 1990, 26 \( \text{Q}f6 \)! +-
or 23...\( \text{Q}xd3 \) 24 \( \text{Q}xd3 \) \( \text{Q}xe4 \) ± Zakhartsov-
Ruban, Smolensk 1991), when I do
not see anything better for White than
24 \( \text{Q}d4 \) \( \text{Q}e6 \) 25 \( \text{Q}e3 \).

B523)

13 \( \text{Q}ae1 \) (D)

13...\( \text{Q}b4 \)

Or:

a) 13...h5 14 h3 h4 15 \( \text{W}f2 \) \( \text{Q}h5 \) 16
\( \text{Q}d1 \) \( \text{Q}g3 \) 17 \( \text{Q}b6 \) \( \text{W}c8 \) 18 \( \text{Q}fe1 \) \( \text{Q}f6

19 e5! dxe5 20 \( \text{Q}e4 \) \( \text{Q}xe4 \) 21 \( \text{Q}xe4 \) ±
Ghizdavu-Buza, Bucharest 1970.

b) 13...\( \text{Q}c8 \) 14 \( \text{W}h3 \) \( \text{Q}b4 \) 15 \( \text{Q}d4 !
(15 a3 \( \text{Q}xd3 \) 16 \( \text{Q}xd3 \) e5?! 17 \( \text{Q}g3 \) 0-0
= Gheorghiu-Stein, Moscow 1971)
15...\( \text{Q}xd3 \) (15...0-0 16 g4 A.Froliv;
15...g6 16 \( \text{W}h1 \)! h5 17 \( \text{Q}g1 \) \( \text{Q}xd3 \) 18
\( \text{Q}xd3 \) \( \text{Q}g4 \) 19 f5 \( \text{Q}xg5 \) 20 \( \text{Q}xf5 \) e5 21
\( \text{Q}f6 \)!!; 15...\( \text{Q}d7 \) 16 a3 \( \text{Q}xd3 \) 17 \( \text{Q}xd3 \) g6
18 \( \text{Q}f3 \)! d5 19 \( \text{Q}f5 \)! – Gutman) 16 \( \text{Q}xd3
b4 (16...0-0?! 17 g4) 17 \( \text{Q}d5 \) \( \text{W}a5 \) 18
\( \text{Q}g4 \) h5 19 g5 \( \text{Q}g4 \) 20 g6 with an ad-
vantage for White, A.Froliv-Fine-
gold, Groningen open 1993.

c) The popular alternative here is
13...0-0 14 \( \text{W}h3 \) (after 14 g4 \( \text{Q}b4 \) 15
\( \text{Q}g5 \) \( \text{Q}d7 \) 16 \( \text{W}h5 \), apart from Gutman’s
idea 16...\( \text{Q}f8 \) 17 \( \text{Q}f3 \) \( \text{Q}f8 \) 18 \( \text{Q}h3 \) d5,
16...f5! is good, Berndt-Klebel, Bun-
desliga 1997/8), and then:

c1) 14...g6 – 13 \( \text{W}h3 \) g6 14 \( \text{Q}ae1
0-0.

c2) 14...b4 15 \( \text{Q}e2 ! \) ± Gutman.

c3) 14...\( \text{Q}fd8 \) ?! 15 g4 \( \text{Q}b4 \) (15...b4
16 g5 \( \text{Q}d7 \) 17 \( \text{Q}d5 \)!) 16 g5 \( \text{Q}d7 \) 17
\( \text{Q}d4 ! \) (17 f5 \( \text{Q}xd3 \) 18 \( \text{Q}xd3 \) exf5 19 exf5
\( \text{Q}fe8 \) !) 17...\( \text{Q}fe8 \) 18 \( \text{Q}f3 ! \) – Gutman.
c5) 14...\textit{\#}e8!? 15 g4 $\square$b4 16 g5 $\square$d7 with a complicated game, Ulybin-Popović, Moscow 1989.

c6) 14...$\square$b4 and then:

c61) 15 g4 can be met by 15...d5!? 16 e5 $\square$e4, Parr-Torre, Australia 1975, or 15...\textit{\#}e8 – 14...\textit{\#}e8 15 g4 $\square$b4.

c62) 15 $\square$e4 $\square$ae8!? 16 g4 $\square$d7 17 g5?! $\square$xd3 18 cxd3 $\square$c5 19 $\square$al b4 20 $\square$ce2 f5!, Malakhov-Svidler, Russian Ch (Elista) 1997.

c63) 15 a3 $\square$xd3 16 cxd3 and then:

c631) 16...\textit{\#}c8 17 $\square$e4!? ± Bürenmann-Szymczak, Hamburg 1993.

c632) 16...\textit{\#}e8 17 f5! e5 18 g4 d5 19 $\square$c1 $\square$d8 20 g5 – Gutman.

c633) 16...e5!? transposes to note ‘b’ to White’s 14th move.

\textbf{14 a3}

Or:

a) 14 \textit{\#}g3 g6 (14...0-0 15 f5 ± Espig-Cobo, Timisoara 1972) 15 a3 (15 $\square$d4 ‡ Apicella-Mirallès, French Ch (Angers) 1990) 15...\textit{\#}xd3 16 cxd3 $\square$c8 17 $\square$c1 $\square$d7 18 $\square$e4 $\square$h5! 19 $\square$h3 f5 = Tringov-Gheorghiu, Teesside 1972.

b) 14 $\square$h3 e5! (14...d5 15 e5 $\square$e4 16 f5! ± Baklan-Kveinys, Bundesliga 1999/00; 14...\textit{\#}d7 15 a3 $\square$xd3 16 cxd3 $\square$c5 17 $\square$xc5 dxc5 18 f5 e5 19 \textit{\#}g3 $\square$f6 20 $\square$c1 $\square$d8 21 d4! cxd4 22 $\square$d5 $\square$d6 23 $\square$xf6+ gxf6 24 $\square$d2 ± Ciocaltea-Darga, Germany 1971) 15 a3 $\square$xd3 16 cxd3 0-0 17 $\square$e1 $\square$d8 with an acceptable position for Black, Minić-Csomb, Siegen OL 1970.

c) 14 $\square$e4!? $\square$c8 (14...g6 15 a3 $\square$xd3 16 cxd3 $\square$c8 17 $\square$h3 and now 17...$\square$d7 18 $\square$f3!, Ulybin-Petrienko, Voronež 1987, or 17...h5 18 $\square$h1 $\square$d7 19 $\square$f3 ±) 15 a3 $\square$xd3 16 cxd3 $\square$d7 (16...g6 – 14...g6 15 a3 $\square$xd3 16 cxd3 $\square$c8) 17 $\square$e2!? (17 $\square$g3 g6 18 h3 $\square$h5! 19 $\square$f2 f5, Brenjo-Damljanović, Yugoslav Ch 2001) 17...h5 18 h3 with some advantage for White, Ivanović-Gulko, Novi Sad OL 1990.

\textbf{14...\textit{\#}xd3 15 cxd3 d5!}

Or:

a) 15...$\square$c8 16 f5! e5 17 g4! – Gutman.

b) 15...0-0 16 $\square$e1 (16 $\square$e4 $\square$e8! Gutman; 16 $\square$h3 – 13...0-0 14 $\square$h3 $\square$e4 15 a3 $\square$xd3 16 cxd3) 16...$\square$d8 17 $\square$e4 $\square$d7 18 b4 $\square$c8 19 $\square$e2 with some advantage, Ciocaltea-Bobotsov, Bucharest 1973.

\textbf{16 $\square$e1}

16 $\square$e4 dxe4 17 $\square$xe4 $\square$d5! = Kasparov/Nikitin.

\textbf{16...dxe4 17 $\square$xe4 $\square$xe4 18 dxe4 $\square$h7}

= Gutman.

\textbf{B524)}

\textbf{13 $\square$h3 (D)}

\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}

\textbf{13...$\square$e4}

Other possibilities:

a) 13...e5!?.

b) 13...$\square$e2 ±.

c) 13...$\square$e8 14 $\square$h1 b4 15 $\square$e2 e5 16 $\square$e1! ± Yudasin-Garcia Ilundain, Leon 1992.
d) 13...h5 14 a4 (14 ♖h1 ♗g4 15 ♗g1 g5?! , Mrdja-Zsu.Polgar, Rome 1989) 14...b4 15 ♖d1 ♖a5 (15...d5?! 16 exd5 ♗xd5 17 f5! ± Sax) 16 ♗xa5 ♖xa5 17 ♖f2 ± A.Sokolov-Makarychev, Sochi 1983.

e) 13...♖c8 14 a4 (14 ♖ae1! – 13 ♖ae1 ♖c8 14 ♖h3) 14...b4 15 ♖b1 ♖a5! = 16 ♗xa5 ♖xa5 17 ♖d2 ♖h5 18 ♖xh5 ♗xh5 19 e5 g5 Gutman.

f) 13...g6 14 ♖ae1 0-0 15 f5! exf5 16 exf5 ♗e5 17 ♗g5 ♖ae8 18 ♖h4 (A.Sokolov-Utasi, Moscow 1983) 18...♖d8 19 ♖d4 with an unclear position – Sokolov.

g) 13...0-0 and then:

g1) 14 a3!? – 13 a3 0-0 14 ♖h3.

g2) A fresh idea is 14 ♖f3! b4 15 ♗a4 a5 16 ♗g3 ♖h8 17 ♖f1 ♖a6 18 ♖d2, Ye Jiangchuan-Gulko, US-China (3) 2001.

g3) 14 g4 ♖d7 (14...b4 15 g5 ♖d7 16 ♖d5! exd5 17 exd5 g6 18 dxc6 ♖xc6 19 ♗a5! ± Sax-Movsesian, Bundesliga 1997/8) 15 g5 ♖b4 16 ♖d4 ♖fe8 17 ♖f3 (17 f5 exf5!) 17...e5 18 ♖f5 exf4 19 ♖xf4 ♖xg5 20 ♗g3 with a dangerous initiative, Kozakov-Atalik, L'viv 2000.

14 a3

Or:

a) 14 ♖ae1 – 13 ♖ae1 ♖b4 14 ♖h3.

b) 14 ♖d4 0-0 (14...♖xd3 15 cxd3 g6 16 a3 ♖d7 17 ♖f3 ± Belikov-S.Kisielew, Moscow 1995) 15 a3 ♖xd3 16 cxd3 transposes to the main line.

c) After 14 ♖ac1, instead of either 14...♖d7 15 a3 (15 f5?! e5 16 a3 Baklan) 15...♖xd3 16 cxd3 ♖d7 17 f5 e5?! 18 ♖d5! ± Baklan-Delchev, Istanbul OL 2000, or 14...e5 15 a3 ♖xd3 16 cxd3, which transposes to

the note to Black's 15th move, 14...0-0 is more reliable.

14...♖xd3 15 cxd3 0-0

15...e5 16 ♖ac1 ♖d8 17 ♖d2?! (17 fxe5 dxe5 18 ♖g3 0-0 19 ♖c5 ± Tal; 17 d4?! A.Frolov) 17...0-0 18 d4 ± A.Frolov-Shmuter, Nikolaev Z 1993.

16 ♖d4

This position occurred in Hartston-R.Byrne, Hastings 1971/2 and Belikov-Goldin, Russian Ch (Elista) 1995. White, who has active plans with g4 or ♖f3, ♗g3 and ♖f1, enjoys somewhat the better chances.

B53)

8 ♖g5 (D)

This popular idea has been moderately successful. Note also the move-order 8 0-0 ♖e7 9 ♖g5.

Let us discuss:

B531: 8...♖d7!? 254
B532: 8...♖e7 254
B533: 8...a6 257

If 8...♖e5, then instead of 9 ♖b5+ ♕d7 10 ♖xf6 ♖xb5! 11 ♖xe5 dxe5 12 ♖xb5 ♖xb5 13 ♖e2 ♖a4 14 0-0 ♖e7 with an acceptable position for Black (Lukin-Oll, St Petersburg 1993),
9 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \!) is probably stronger. Then, in the case of 9...\( \mathcal{A}e7 \), 10 \( \mathcal{A}e3 \!) transposes to Line B541, which is advantageous for White.

B531)

8...\( \mathcal{A}d7 \)!

Others:

a) 9 a4 \( \mathcal{A}e5 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 11 f4 \( \mathcal{A}g6 \) 12 f5 \( \mathcal{A}e5 \) 13 a5 \( \mathcal{A}c7 \) 14 0-0 0-0 15 \( \mathcal{A}e1 \) with chances for both sides, Velimirović-Sedlak, Subotica 2000.

b) 9 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) (9...\( \mathcal{A}c8 \)?? 10 f4?! \( \mathcal{A}d4 \)) 11 \( \mathcal{A}xh4 \) \( \mathcal{A}xh4 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}xe7 \) 13 f4 \( \mathcal{A}c7 \) 14 \( \mathcal{A}xe1 \) 0-0 = Armas-Kotronias, Wijk aan Zee 1995.

c) 9 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xg6 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) \( \mathcal{A}g8 \)! (or 10..\( a6 \) – 8..\( a6 \) 9 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xg6 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) \( \mathcal{A}d7 \)) 10...\( \mathcal{A}c8 \) 11 0-0 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{A}g8 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}xh5 \) 11 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}g6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) \( \mathcal{A}xg6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}h4 \) \( \mathcal{A}e7 \)?? 14 \( \mathcal{A}h1 \) f5 15 \( \mathcal{A}xh7 \) f4 16 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) \( \mathcal{A}xh5 \) 17 \( \mathcal{A}h4 \) \( \mathcal{A}xh5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A}xh5 \), Feigelson-Makarov, USSR 1988, 18...0-0 gives Black compensation – Makarov) 12 \( \mathcal{A}h4 \) 0-0 0-0 13 \( \mathcal{A}h1 \) \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) with good chances for Black, Hmadi-Dlugy, Tunis IZ 1985.

9...\( \mathcal{A}e5 \)

Or:

a) 9...\( \mathcal{A}e7 \) – 8...\( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 9 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}d7 \).

b) 9...\( a6 \) – 8...\( a6 \) 9 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}d7 \).

c) 9...\( \mathcal{A}c8 \) (Agopov-Gavrikov, Finnish Cht 1998) 10 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \)! \( \mathcal{A}xg6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) \( \mathcal{A}d4 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}xd3 \) \( \mathcal{A}xh3 \) 13 axb3 \( \mathcal{A}c5 \)! (13...\( a6 \) 14 \( \mathcal{A}h1 \) transposes to note ‘b23’ to White’s 9th move in Line B533) 14 \( \mathcal{A}f3 \)?? \( \mathcal{A}g5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}e1 \) \( \mathcal{A}h8 \) 16 \( \mathcal{A}f1 \)! \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 17 b4?? f5 18 b5 \( \mathcal{A}xe4 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{A}e5 \) and now V.Fedorov gives 20 \( \mathcal{A}f6+ \) \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) 21 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe1 \) 22 \( \mathcal{A}xe1 \) \( \mathcal{A}xb5 \) 23 \( \mathcal{A}xe6+ \) = and 20 c4?!.

10 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \)

Now:

a) 10...\( \mathcal{A}c8 \)?? 11 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}h1 \) h5 13 f4 \( \mathcal{A}c4 \) 14 \( \mathcal{A}xc4 \) \( \mathcal{A}xc4 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) (Wolff-Shamkovich, New York 1992) 15...\( \mathcal{A}c8 \) (Wolff).

b) 10...\( \mathcal{A}e7 \) – 8...\( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 9 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}e5 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) \( \mathcal{A}d7 \).

B532)

8...\( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 9 0-0

This move is of particular interest because of the move-order 8 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{A}g5 \).

However, in this specific position it is more relevant to play 9 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \)! \( \mathcal{A}xg6 \):

a) 10 0-0 and now:

a1) 10...\( a6 \) – 8...\( a6 \) 9 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xg6 \).

a2) 10...0-0 11 \( \mathcal{A}h1 \) (11 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) – 10 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) 0-0 11 0-0) 11...\( \mathcal{A}e5 \) (11...\( \mathcal{A}h8 \) 12 f4 \( \mathcal{A}xg8 \) 13 a4 a6 14 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) \( \mathcal{A}g7 \) 15 a5 \( \mathcal{A}d8 \) 16 \( \mathcal{A}a4 \) ± Brunner-Benjamin, Buenos Aires 1992) 12 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) \( \mathcal{A}h8 \) 13 f4 \( \mathcal{A}g6 \) 14 a4 \( \mathcal{A}g8 \)?? (14...\( \mathcal{A}d7 \) Dlugy) 15 a5 \( \mathcal{A}c7 \) 16 \( \mathcal{A}d2 \) \( \mathcal{A}d7 \) 17 g3 ± de Firmian-Rachels, USA Ch (Jacksonville) 1990.

a3) 10...\( \mathcal{A}d7 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}h1 \) (11 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) – 10 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) \( \mathcal{A}d7 \) 11 0-0) 11...0-0 (11...0-0??) 12 f4 \( \mathcal{A}h8 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) ± Fedorowicz) 12 a4 a6 13 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) \( \mathcal{A}e5 \) 14 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) transposes to note ‘c22’ to Black’s 9th move in Line B533 (±).

b) 10 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) and then:

b1) 10...\( a6 \) 11 0-0 – 8...\( a6 \) 9 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{A}xg6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \).

b2) 10...\( \mathcal{A}d7 \) 11 0-0 \( \mathcal{A}e5 \) (alternatively, 11...0-0, Antić-Timoshchenko, Belgrade GMA 1988, 12 a4??) 12 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) 0-0 0-0 13 \( \mathcal{A}h1 \) \( \mathcal{A}h8 \) 14 f4
\( \text{g6} 15 \text{g3} \pm \text{Emms-Beckhuis, Münster 1995.} \)

b3) 10...0-0 11 0-0 \( \text{wh8} \) (11...\( \text{d5} \) 12 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{wh8} \) 13 \( \text{h1} \) transposes to line 'b32') 12 \( \text{h1} \) and now:

b31) 12...\( \text{d7} \) 13 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g8} \) (13...\( \text{e8} \) 14 \( \text{wh3} \) ! Lukin) 14 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{g6} \) 15 f5 \( \text{h6} \) 16 \( \text{exe6} \) \( \text{f8} \) 17 \( \text{xf8} + \) \( \text{xf8} \) 18 \( \text{xd7} \) \( (\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \text{Howell-Aralandi, Groningen jr Ech 1985}) \) with good prospects for White; e.g., 18...\( \text{e5} \) 19 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{a6} \) 20 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{g4} \) 21 h3 \( \text{we2} \) 22 \( \text{f3} \).

b32) 12...\( \text{e5} \) 13 \( \text{e2} \) (13 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g8} \) 14 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g6} \) 15 \( \text{e2} \) \( \pm \) \text{Fedorowicz}) 13...\( \text{g8} \) (13...\( \text{d7} \) 14 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{a6} \) transposes to note 'c24' to Black's 9th move in Line B533) 14 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g6} \) 15 \( \text{a5} \)! (a fresh idea; 15 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 17 f5 \( \text{e5} \) 18 h3 \( \text{g7} \) is unclear, Van Riemsdijk-Rachels, Manila 1990) 15...\( \text{xa5} \) 16 \( \text{xa5} \) b6 17 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{b7} \) (17...\( \text{f8} \) 18 \( \text{d8} \)! \( \text{g7} \) 19 \( \text{ad1} \) a6 20 \( \text{h5} \) Gofshtein) 18 \( \text{exe7} \) \( \text{exe7} \) 19 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{ad8} \) 20 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{g7} \) \( \pm \) Kaidanov-Fedorowicz, USA Ch (Seattle) 2000.

We now return to 9 0-0 (D):

\[ \]

b) 9...\( \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{h1} \) (10 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 9 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 10 0-0 \( \text{d7} \) 10...\( \text{c8} \)! (10...h6 11 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \), Ma.Tsetlin-Stein, USSR Ch (Leningrad) 1971, 12 \( \text{wh5} \pm \text{Nunn} \) 11 f4 (11 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \)?) 12 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{b4} \) 11...0-0 12 \( \text{we1} \) (12 e5? \( \text{dxe5} \) 13 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 14 \( \text{xd7} \) \( \text{cd8} \); 12 \( \text{xf6} \)?) 12...h6! 13 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{d4} \) 14 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xd3} \) 15 \( \text{cxd3} \) \( \text{f8} \) 16 e5?! \( \text{d5} \) 17 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{dxe5} \) 18 \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{we3} \) \( \pm \) Minasian-Khachian, Armenian Ch 1993.

c) 9...0-0 is another worthy try:

c1) 10 a4 \( \text{e5} \)! 11 \( \text{e2} \) a6 12 \( \text{h1} \) transposes to note 'a' to White's 12th move in Line B533.

c2) 10 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{d8} \) (after 10...\( \text{c7} \) or 10...a6, White can play 11 f4 at once) 11 \( \text{we2} \) (11 f4 \( \text{d5} \), Wang Pin-Wang Zili, Beijing 1993; 11 \( \text{we1} \) h6 12 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 13 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 14 \( \text{g3} \) e5 = \text{Kindermann-Lobron, Dortmund 1990}; 11 \( \text{d3} \) d5 12 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 13 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 14 \( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) = Rublevsky-S.Kiselyev, St Petersburg Z 1993) 11...\( \text{c7} \) (11...\( \text{d7} \)??; 11...a6!; 11...\( \text{e4} \)?) 12 \( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 13 \( \text{xe4} \) d5 14 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 15 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 16 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{d1} \) \( \pm \) Kiselev/Gagarin) 12 f4 h6 13 \( \text{h4} \) a6 14 \( \text{d3} \) b5 15 \( \text{ae1} \) \( \text{b7} \) 16 e5 \( \text{e7} \) 17 \( \text{g3} \) \( \pm \) Ivanović-Damljanović, Vršac 1989.

c3) The critical line is 10 \( \text{xf6} \)!

\( \text{xf6} \) (10...\( \text{gxf6} \) 9 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 10 0-0 0-0) 11 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{d8} \). The pawn sacrifice should be correct, but some questions still remain here: 12 \( \text{g3} \) (12 \( \text{c5} \)?) \( \text{xc5} \) 13 \( \text{xc5} \) b6 favours Black), and now:

c31) 12...a5 13 a4 \( \text{e5} \) 14 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{b4} \) 15 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{c7} \) 16 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{xc4} \) (another idea is 16...\( \text{xe2} \)!) 17 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xc2} \) (17...\( \text{xc2} \)?) 18 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 19

c32) 12...\( w b 4 \) 13 \( \Delta e 2 \) (13 \( \Delta d 3!? \) \( \Delta x c 3 \) 14 \( b x c 3 \) \( w x c 3 \) 15 \( f 4 \) Gorelov)
13...\( \Delta x c 3 \) 14 \( \Delta x c 3 \) \( w x e 4 \) 15 \( \Delta f e 1 \) and then:

c311) 15...\( \Delta b 8 \) 16 \( \Delta f 3 \) \( w b 4 \) 17
\( w x b 4 \) \( \Delta x b 4 \) 18 \( \Delta a d 1 \) \( \Delta e 8 \) 19 \( \Delta e 4 \) ±

c312) 15...\( w e 5 \) 16 \( w x e 5 \) \( \Delta x e 5 \) 17
\( \Delta a d 1 \) \( \Delta d 7 \) 18 \( f 4 \) \( \Delta g 6 \) 19 \( \Delta a 5 \) \( \Delta c 6 \) 20
\( \Delta x c 6 \) \( b x c 6 \) 21 \( \Delta f 3 \) \( \Delta e 7 \) ± Nunn-Sax,

c313 15...\( \Delta d 7 \) 16 \( \Delta a d 1 \) (16 \( \Delta c 5 \)
\( w b 4 \)!) 16...\( w e 5 \) (16...\( w b 4 \) 17 \( w x b 4 \)
\( \Delta x b 4 \) 18 c3 \( \Delta d 5 \) 19 \( \Delta f 3 \) ± A.Kuz-
min-Baikov, Moscow 1988) 17 \( w x e 5 \)
\( \Delta x e 5 \) transposes to line ‘c312’.

c33) 12...\( w e 5 \) 13 \( w h 3 \) \( \Delta d 7 \) (13...a5
14 \( a 4 \) – 12...a5 13 \( a 4 \) \( \Delta e 5 \) 14 \( w h 3 \);
13...\( \Delta b 4 \)?) and now:

c331) 14 \( \Delta a d 1 \) a5! (14...\( \Delta b 4 \) 15
\( \Delta d 2 \)? \( \Delta x c 2 \) 16 \( \Delta b 3 \) \( \Delta d 4 \) 17 \( \Delta c 4 \)
\( w c 7 \) 18 \( w h 5 \) is not so clear) 15 a4 \( \Delta b 4 \)
with excellent compensation, Rublevsky-Gol
din, St Petersburg 1993.

c332) 14 \( \Delta h 1 \) \( w b 4 \) (14...\( \Delta b 4 \) 15 \( f 4 \)
± Kindermann-Gomez Esteban, Palma
de Mallorca 1989) 15 \( \Delta d 3 \) (15 \( \Delta e 2 \)?
\( \Delta x c 3 \) 16 \( b x c 3 \) \( w e 7 \) 17 \( f 4 \) {± Bönsch}
not verified) 15...\( \Delta x c 3 \) 16 a3 (al-
ternatively, 16 \( b x c 3 \) \( w x c 3 \) 17 e5 g6 18
f4 \( \Delta b 4 \), Soltis-Lombardy, New York
1987) 16...\( w e 7 \) 17 \( b x c 3 \) e5 18 \( \Delta e 3 \)
\( \Delta e 6 = \) Brunner-Khalifman, Lucerne
Wcht 1993.

10 \( \Delta e 2 \) (D)

A game with chances for both sides can be obtained through 10 \( \Delta d 3 \) 0-0
11 \( w e 2 \) \( \Delta d 7 \) 12 \( \Delta e 3 \) \( w c 7 \) 13 \( f 4 \) \( \Delta x d 3 \)
14 \( c x d 3 \) b5, Kovaliov-Ruban, Budap-
est 1989, or 10 \( \Delta b 5 +?! \) \( \Delta d 7 \) 11
\( \Delta x d 7 + \) (11 a4 a6 12 a5 \( w c 7 \) 13 \( \Delta d 3 \)
0-0 = Kontić-Levin, Podgorica 1993)
11...\( \Delta x d 7 \) and then, for instance, 12
\( \Delta e 3 \) \( w c 7 \) 13 \( f 4 \) a6 (13...0-0 14 \( w e 2 \)
\( \Delta b 6 \), Golubev-Serper, Leningrad 1989,
15 \( \Delta d 4 \)?) 14 \( w f 3 \) 0-0 15 g4 g6, Van

10...0-0

Or:

a) 10...a6 transposes to Line B533.

b) 10...\( \Delta d 7 \)? and here:

b1) 11 \( \Delta e 3 \)? transposes to note
‘b2’ to White’s 10th move in Line
B543.

b2) 11 a4 0-0 12 a5 \( w c 7 \) 13 \( w d 4 \)
\( \Delta f d 8 \) 14 h3 \( \Delta e 8 \) 15 \( \Delta f 4 \) \( \Delta c 6 \) 16 \( \Delta g 3 \)
\( \Delta g 6 = \) A.Ivanov-Gi.Hernandez,

b3) 11 \( w d 2 \) 0-0 12 \( \Delta a d 1 \) \( \Delta a c 8 \) 13
\( \Delta e 3 \) \( w c 7 \) 14 \( f 4 \) \( \Delta e g 4 \) 15 \( \Delta x g 4 \) \( \Delta x g 4 \)
16 \( \Delta d 4 \) \( \Delta c 6 \) 17 \( \Delta w e 2 \) \( \Delta f 6 \) 18 e5 and
here, rather than 18...dxe5 (Velimirović-Popović, Pršac 1989), 18...\( \Delta e 8 \)
= was recommended.

b4) 11 \( \Delta h 1 \) \( \Delta g 6 \) (11...0-0 – 10...0-0
11 \( \Delta h 1 \) \( \Delta d 7 \); 11...\( \Delta e 8 \)?) 12 \( \Delta e 3 \) \( w c 7 \)
13 \( \Delta d 2 \) 0-0 14 \( f 4 \) \( \Delta g 6 = \) Dimitrov-
Kotronias, Athens 1989) 12 \( \Delta e 3 \) (12
f4? h6 Nunn) 12...\( w c 7 \) 13 \( f 4 \) 0-0 14
\( w e 1 \) (14 a4 \( \Delta c 6 \) 15 \( \Delta d 3 \) \( \Delta d 7 \) 16 \( \Delta d 4 \)
\( \Delta f 6 = \) Arnason-Stefansson, Kopavogur
1994; 14 \( \text{c}d4!! \) 14...\( \text{c}e8 \) (possibly stronger is 14...\( \text{d}5!! \), as in Delacroix-Lucchini, corr. 1989) 15 \( \text{d}d1 \) \( \text{c}6 \)!! 16 \( \text{c}f3 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 17 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{c}e4 \) 18 \( \text{d}d4! \) with an advantage for White, Nunn-Tukmakov, Lugano 1986.

11 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{d}7 \)

Otherwise:

a) 11...\( \text{a}6 \) again transposes to Line B533.

b) 11...\( \text{c}g6?! \) 12 \( \text{e}3 \) (12 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 13 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 14 \( \text{f}4 \) – 10...\( \text{d}7 \) 11 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{c}g6 \) 12 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{a}4 \) =) 12...\( \text{c}c7 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) b6?! (or 13...\( \text{f}d7 \) – 10...\( \text{d}7 \) 11 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 12 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) 0-0) 14 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 15 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}d8 \) 16 \( \text{c}e2 \) \( \text{ac}8 \) and Black will obtain a good game by the manoeuvre ...\( \text{b}8-a8 \), de Firmian-Waitzkin, Las Vegas 1995.

12 \( \text{f}4 \)

12 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{c}4?! \) = Dimitrov-Atalik, Mangalia 1992.

12...\( \text{g}6 \)

White now has a wide choice, but he has not demonstrated an advantage as yet:

a) 13 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 14 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 15 exd6 \( \text{xd}6 \) 16 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 17 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{fd}8 \) = Yudasin-Al.Khasin, Kostroma 1985.

b) 13 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{e}8 \) (13...\( \text{dxe}5 \) 14 \( \text{xf}6 \) 14 \( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) (15 \( \text{d}2?! \)) 15...\( \text{c}6 \) 16 \( \text{h}5?! \) (16 \( \text{e}2 \) = NCO) 16...\( \text{g}6 \) followed by 17...\( \text{f}5 \)! \( \dag \), Minasian-Ruban, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1991.

c) 13 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{hxh}5 \) (13...\( \text{f}d8?! \) 14 \( \text{xg}6 \) fg6! 15 \( \text{w}e2 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 16 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 17 \( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{xe}7 \) = Lukin-Lugovoi, St Petersburg 1994) 14 \( \text{xe}7 \) and then:

   c1) 14...\( \text{g}3+ \) 15 hxg3 \( \text{xe}7 \) 16 \( \text{g}4?! \) and now 16...\( \text{f}5 \) 17 \( \text{exf}5 \) \( \text{exf}5 \) 18 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 19 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 20 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 21 \( \text{e}7+ \) \( \text{f}7 \) 22 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xe}7 \) gives White a slight advantage, Rublevsky-Ruban, Smolensk 1991, or 16...\( \text{d}d8 \) 17 \( \text{d}2 \) = Rublevsky-Lukin, St Peters burg 1994.

   c2) 14...\( \text{xe}7 \) 15 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{f}5 \) with a good game for Black, Panbukhchian-Ruban, Anapa 1992.

d) 13 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \) = Kindermann-Brenke, Lippstadt 1993.

e) 13 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}8 \)! 14 \( \text{e}2 \) (not 14 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{dxe}5 \) 15 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{fxg}6 \) 16 \( \text{fxe}5 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 14...\( \text{h}6 \) 15 \( \text{f}5?! \) \( \text{hxg}6 \) 16 \( \text{fxg}6 \) \( \text{fxg}6 \) 17 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{h}5 \) with better chances, Pruess-Atalik, Los Angeles 2000.

f) 13 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{c}6?! \) (13...\( \text{h}6?! \) 14 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 15 \( \text{e}5 \); 13...\( \text{ad}8?! \) 14 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 15 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 16 \( \text{f}4 \)!, Wahls-Wirthssohn, Hamburg 1991) 14 \( \text{f}5 \) (14 \( \text{ae}1 \) \( \text{d}5?! \), Lapshin-Lagoisky, corr. 1989-90) 14...\( \text{f}5 \)? 15 \( \text{exf}5 \) (15 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{ae}8 \) = Serper) 15...\( \text{e}5 \) 16 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 17 \( \text{ad}1 \) = Paronion-Serper, Tashkent 1992.

g) 13 \( \text{f}5?! \) \( \text{e}5 \) 14 \( \text{d}2 \) (Serper) 14...\( \text{ad}8 \) and Black has quite a solid position.

B533(1)

8...\( \text{a}6 \) (D)

The most frequent answer to 8 \( \text{g}5 \) – in playing this, Black assumes that now 9 \( \text{xf}6 \) will be less effective than in the case of 8...\( \text{e}7 \).

9 \( \text{d}0 \)

Alternatively:

a) 9 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 10 0-0 0-0 11 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 12 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{h}6 \) (12...\( \text{b}5 \) =) 13 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \)! is slightly better for Black, Parma-Saidy, Tel-Aviv OL 1964.

b) 9 \( \text{xf}6?! \) \( \text{gxf}6 \) has not been developed adequately. Some lines:
b1) 10...\(\text{Qe}2!\) (?\(\text{Qd}7\) (10...\(\text{Qc}7\) might be better) 11 0-0 \(\text{Qe}7\) 12 \(\text{Qh}1\) (12 \(\text{Qh}5\) \(\text{Qxe}5\) = Gulko) 12...\(\text{Qd}5\) 13 f4 and now 13...0-0-0 14 a4 \(\text{Qb}8\) 15 a5 \(\text{Qc}7\) 16 \(\text{Qd}2\), Soltis-\(\text{Q}\) Cabrilo, New York 1988, or 13...h4 14 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qa}5\) 15 \(\text{Qxa}5\) \(\text{Qxa}5\) 16 \(\text{Qab}1\) = Fedorowicz-Gulko, USA Ch (Salt Lake City) 1999.

b2) 10 \(\text{Wh}5\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 11 0-0 (here 11 \(\text{Qf}1\)!? deserves attention; e.g., 11...\(\text{Qe}5\) 12 \(\text{Qe}2\) 0-0-0 13 0-0-0 \(\text{Qe}7\) 14 f4 \(\text{Qg}6\) 15 \(\text{Qb}1\) \(\text{Qb}8\) 16 g3 = Anka-Gonzalez Garcia, Budapest 1993 or 11...\(\text{Qc}8\)?? 12 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\text{Qa}7\) 13 0-0-0 b5, Kilti-Kiik, Hyvinkää 1996) and now:

b21) 11...\(\text{Qc}7\) = Kupreichik.

b22) 11...\(\text{Qd}4\) 12 \(\text{Qad}1\) \(\text{Qxc}2\)?! 13 \(\text{Qa}3\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 14 \(\text{Qe}2\) a5 15 \(\text{Qd}5\) = Sutovsky-Shrentzel, Tel-Aviv 1993.

b23) 11...\(\text{Qc}8\) 12 \(\text{Qh}1\) \(\text{Qd}4\) 13 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\text{Qxb}3\) 14 axb3 \(\text{Qc}5\) 15 \(\text{Qh}3\) h5 16 f4 h4 (16...\(\text{Qe}7\) 17 f5 \(\text{Qd}8\) 18 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Qwe}5\) 19 \(\text{Qf}4\), V.Fedorov-Ermolinsky, Leningrad 1980) 17 f5 \(\text{Qe}7\) (17...\(\text{Qe}7\) 18 fxe6 fxe6 19 e5! = 17...\(\text{Qe}5\)?? 18 \(\text{Qd}1\) = V.Fedorov) 18 \(\text{Qf}4\) = V.Fedorov-Kozlov, Erevan 1983.

b24) 11...\(\text{Qe}5\) 12 \(\text{Qe}2\) and then:

b241) 12...\(\text{Qg}6\) 13 g3 and here, instead of 13...0-0-0-0?! (V.Fedorov-Lukin, Leningrad 1983) 14 a4! = (Lukin), Black should play 13...\(\text{Qg}7\)? with the idea of ...0-0, as in V.Fedorov-Kulikov, Leningrad 1980.

b242) 12...\(\text{Qg}8\) 13 \(\text{Qh}1\) \(\text{Qg}6\) 14 \(\text{Qh}4\) (14 \(\text{Qd}3\)?? \(\text{Qg}4\)! 15 \(\text{Qg}1\) \(\text{Qg}5\) 16 \(\text{Qxh}7\) \(\text{Qe}7\), Ehnhov-\(\text{Q}\) Salvo, Leningrad 1984) with the point 14...\(\text{Qh}6\) 15 \(\text{Qf}4\) \(\text{Qg}6\) 16 \(\text{Qd}2\) (Nepomniashay).

9...\(\text{Qe}5\)

9...

b) 9...\(\text{Qc}7\) 10 \(\text{Qxf}6\) (10 a4 \(\text{Qe}7\) has occurred, with roughly equal play) 10...\(\text{Qg}6\) 11 \(\text{Qh}5\) \(\text{Qg}8\)?! (11...\(\text{Qd}7\)??; after 11...b5 12 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\text{Qb}7\) Black has experienced difficulties; e.g., 13 f4 0-0-0 14 f5 \(\text{Qe}7\) 15 \(\text{Qe}2\) d5 16 a4!, Wahls-Lobron, Baden-Baden 1992) 12 \(\text{Qg}6\) 13 \(\text{Qh}1\) (Emms-\(\text{Q}\) Atalik, Hastings 1995) 13...\(\text{Qd}7\) 14 a4 \(\text{Qf}6\) NCO.

c) 9...\(\text{Qe}7\) and now:

c1) 10 \(\text{Qh}1\) \(\text{Qc}7\) (10...\(\text{Qe}5\) 11 \(\text{Qe}2\) = 9...\(\text{Qe}5\) 10 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 11 \(\text{Qh}1\)) with roughly equal play:

c11) 11 \(\text{Qd}3\) and then:

c111) 11...0-0 12 f4 (12 \(\text{Qe}2\) =) 12...h6 (Osto\(\text{Q}\)jic-Polugaevsky, Skopje 1971) 13 \(\text{Qh}4\) \(\text{Qxe}4\) 14 \(\text{Qxe}7\) \(\text{Qxc}3\) 15 \(\text{Qxd}6\) \(\text{Qxd}1\) 16 \(\text{Qxc}7\) \(\text{Qxb}2\) 17 \(\text{Qe}4\) with compensation – Polugaevsky.

c112) 11...b5 12 f4 gives Black a choice between 12...\(\text{Qb}7\) = Drimer-Csom, Lugano OL 1968 and 12...h6?! 13 \(\text{Qxf}6\) \(\text{Qxf}6\) 14 \(\text{Qxb}5\) \(\text{Qxc}3\) (Polugaevsky).
c12) 11 \( \text{e}2 \) b5 12 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 13 f4
(13 a3 0-0 14 f4 b4 15 axb4 \( \text{d}xb4 \) 16
e5 dxe5 17 fxe5 \( \text{d}d5 \) 18 \( \text{dd}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \)
19 \( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{xe}7 = \) Ivanović-Čabrilo,
Yugoslav Ch (Kladovo) 1990) 13...b4?!,
but not 13...h6 14 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \)?! 15
\( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{h}xh4 \) 16 f5! (Čabrilo).

c2) 10 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( gxf6 \) 11 \( \text{w}5 \) (11 a4?! \( \text{a}5 \) 12 \( \text{xa}5 \) \( \text{xa}5 \) 13 \( \text{h}1 \) h5 14 f4
\( \text{d}d7 \) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) h4 16 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 17 \( \text{b}3 \)
\( \text{c}5 \) 18 f5 \( \text{e}5 \) with counterplay, de
with the following possibilities:

c21) 11...\( \text{d}4 \) 12 \( \text{h}1 \)! (12 \( \text{d}x\text{d}4 \) ?
\( \text{xd}4 \) 13 \( \text{b}3 \) b5, Kindermann-Lobron,
Munich 1987; 12 \( \text{fxd}1 \) \( \text{xb}3 \) 13
axb3 \( \text{b}8 \) ! 14 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 15 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{f}8 \)
16 \( \text{xh}7 \) b5 17 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) with comp-
ensation, Nunn-Martinović, Amsterdam
1985) 12...\( \text{xb}3 \) (12...\( \text{x}c2 \) 13
\( \text{ac}1 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 14 f4) 13 axb3 \( \text{e}5 \) (or
13...\( \text{b}8 \) 14 f4 \( \text{c}5 \) 15 f5) 14 \( \text{b}5+ \)
\( \text{d}7 \) 15 \( \text{xd}7+ \) \( \text{xd}7 \) (Arkhangels-
sky-S.Kiselev, USSR 1987) 16 \( \text{w}h3 \)
\( \pm \) Arkhangelsky.

c22) 11...\( \text{d}7 \) 12 \( \text{h}1 \) (another line
is 12 a4? \( \text{d}d4 \)?) 12...\( \text{e}5 \) (12...\( \text{f}8 \) ?
13 f4 0-0-0 Kupreichik; 12...0-0 13
f4 \( \text{d}f8 \) 14 a4 \( \text{w}7 \) 15 a5 \( \text{b}4 \) 16 \( \text{w}e2 \)
\( \pm \) Sveshnikov-Vaiser, Volgodonsk 1983)
13 \( \text{e}2 \) 0-0-0 14 a4 (14 f4 is the alter-
native for White) 14...\( \text{b}8 \) 15 a5 (15
f4 \( \text{g}6 \) 16 \( \text{ad}1 \), Kupreichik-Kovacs,
Stary Smokovec 1975, 16...\( \text{w}c7 \) –
Banas) 15...\( \text{w}c7 \) 16 f4 \( \text{g}6 \) 17 g3 \( \pm \)
Fedorowicz-Rachels, USA Ch (Long
Beach) 1989).

c23) 11...0-0 12 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 13 \( \text{e}2 \)
\(-11...\( \text{e}5 \) 12 \( \text{e}2 \) 0-0 13 \( \text{h}1 \).

c24) 11...\( \text{e}5 \) 12 \( \text{e}2 \) (12 \( \text{d}3 \) ?)
12...0-0 13 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 14 a4 (14 f4
\( \text{g}6 \) 15 \( \text{f}3 \) was given as ‘\( \pm \)’ by
Martinović, but 15...\( \text{g}8 \) 16 f5 \( \text{e}5 \) 17
\( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 18 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{d}8 \) turned out to
be unclear in Topolowski-A.I.Frolow,
corr. 1990) 14...\( \text{d}7 \) 15 a5 \( \text{c}7 \) 16
\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{g}6 \) (16...b5 17 axb6 \( \text{xb}6 \) 18
\( \text{a}2 \) \( \pm \) Kupreichik; 16...\( \text{g}8 \) ?) 17 \( \text{c}4 \)
\( \text{ad}8 \) 18 f4 (Kupreichik-Radulov,
Plovdiv 1980) 18...\( \text{g}8 \) ! with the point
19 f5 \( \text{e}5 \) 20 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{dxe}5 \) 21 \( \text{xf}7 \)
\( \text{g}7 \) 22 \( \text{wh}5 \) \( \text{exf}5 \) – Kupreichik.

10 \( \text{e}2 \)

10...\( \text{e}7 \) 11 \( \text{h}1 \) (D)

Alternatively:

a) 11 \( \text{e}3 \)!? transposes to note ‘a’
to White’s 11th move in Line B542.

b) 11 a4 0-0 12 a5 (12 \( \text{h}1 \) – 11
\( \text{h}1 \) 0-0 12 a4) 12...\( \text{w}7 \) 13 f4 (13
\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 14 f4 \( \text{g}6 \) 15 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 16
f5 \( \text{xe}4 \) 17 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 18 \( \text{xe}7 \)
\( \text{xe}7 \) 19 \( \text{fxe}6 = \) M.Schlosser-Goldin,
Trnava 1989) 13...\( \text{g}6 \) (13...\( \text{d}7 \) 14
\( \text{h}1 \) h6 15 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 16 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{xc}5 \)
17 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \pm \) Tolnai-Gostiša, Maribor
1993) 14 \( \text{d}3 \) h6 15 f5 \( \text{f}0 \) \( \text{v} \) Van Riems-

11...0-0

Or:
a) 11...h6?! 12 \( \text{h}e3 \text{wc7} 13 \text{f4} \) with the initiative, Rublevsky-Baikov, USSR Cht 1991.

b) 11...h5 (Brunner-Lobron, Berne Z 1990) 12 \( \text{h}e3!\) ? \( \text{wc7} 13 \text{f4} \) is also promising for White.

c) 11...\( \text{wc7} 12 \text{f4} \text{ed7} (12...\text{g6}?! \) 13 \( \text{f5} \text{e5} 14 \text{fxe6} \pm \text{Soyulu-Radulov, Athens 1981; 12...\text{c4}?!} \) 13 \( \text{xc4} \text{wc4} 14 \text{e5} \pm; 12...\text{d6}?! \) is playable, as in Pablo Marin-Spraggett, Roses 1992) 13 a4 (in Pablo Marin-Garcia Ilundain, Manresa 1995, White did not manage to make progress after 13 \( \text{f5} 0-0 14 \text{w}e1 \text{b5} 15 \text{a3} \text{e5} 16 \text{g}3 \text{h}8 17 \text{h}4 \text{b7} 18 \text{f}3 \text{ac8} 19 \text{h}3 \text{wd8} 20 \text{f3} \text{xg8} 21 \text{g4} \text{df8} 22 \text{d6} \text{b6} \) 14 \( \text{d3} \text{b7} 15 \text{we2} \text{h6} 16 \text{h}4 \pm \) Minasian-Serper, Kherson 1991.

d) 11...\( \text{g6}?! \) 12 a4 (12 \( \text{f4} \text{h6}!\), Ill-escas-Franco, Leon 1989; 12 \( \text{e3}?! \) \) 12...\( \text{wc7} 13 \text{e3} 0-0 14 \text{f4} \text{d7} 15 \text{we1} \text{b5}! \) deserves attention, Burden-Stefansson, Reykjavik 1996.

\[ \text{12 \text{f4}} \]

\[ \text{Or:} \]

\[ \text{a1} \] 13 \( \text{d2} \text{b6} = 14 \text{e3} \text{b7} 15 \text{f4} \text{ed7} 16 \text{f3} \text{ac8} 17 \text{we2} \text{fe8} 18 \text{g4} ? \text{d5}!, \) Kovaliov-Lerner, Simferopol 1988.

\[ \text{a2} \] 13 \( \text{f4} \text{ed7}?! \) 14 a5 b5 15 axb6 \( \text{xcxb6} 16 \text{wd3} \text{h6} 17 \text{h}4 \text{bb8} \) with good counterplay, D.Rodriguez-Serper, Tunja jr Wch 1989.

\[ \text{a3} \] 13 a5 h6 14 \( \text{e3} \text{d7} \) (better than 14...\( \text{c4}?! \) 15 \( \text{xc4} \text{xc4} 16 \( \text{c5} \text{b4} 17 \text{a4}?! \) 15 \( \text{b6} \text{c8} 16 \text{d4} \text{c6} \) Stefansson-Serper, Arnhem jr Ech 1989.

\[ \text{b2} \] 12 \( \text{we1}?! \text{wc7} (12...\text{g6}?! \) 13 f4 \( \text{g6} 14 \text{g3} \text{h8} 15 \text{ad1} \text{b5} (15...\text{h6} 16 \text{h}3 \text{g8} \) seems risky in view of 17 \( \text{h}6 \text{e3} 16 \text{a3} \text{b7} 17 \text{f5} \text{exf5} 18 \text{exf5} \text{e5} 19 \text{f}4 \text{fe8} 20 \text{h}4 \text{ed7} 21 \text{h}4 \text{f8} 22 \text{f3} \) with a slight advantage for White, Ehlvest-Popović, Belgrade 1989.

\[ \text{12...\text{g6} 13 \text{f5}} \]

Otherwise:

\[ \text{a) 13 \text{d3} \text{h6} 14 \text{f5} \text{e5} 15 \text{h}4 \text{d7} 16 \text{fxe6} (16 \text{w}e2?! \) was suggested in \text{Chess in the USSR} 16...\text{fxe6} 17 \text{we2} \text{f7} 18 \text{f2} \text{wc7} 19 \text{g1} \text{af8} 20 \text{d4} 1/2-1/2 \text{A.Sokolov-Tukmakov, USSR Ch (Odessa) 1989.} \]

\[ \text{b) Probably 13 \text{w}e1 \text{h6}?! \) 14 \( \text{f5} \text{hxg5} 15 \text{fxg6} \text{f6} \) should suit Black.

\[ \text{c) 13 \text{h}5 (Sveshnikov) 13...\text{wc7} (13...\text{dh5} 14 \text{xe7} \pm \text{Brunner-Gulkos, Munich 1990; 13...\text{h6}?!} \) 14 \( \text{g}6 \text{hxg5} 15 \text{xf7}+! \text{xf7} \text{d7} 17 \text{e5}! \) \text{dxe5} 18 \text{gxf6} \text{xf6} 19 \text{e4} \text{c6} 20 \text{g4} \pm \text{Lukin/Sakaev} 14 \text{g}6 \text{hxg6} (14...\text{fxg6}?! \) is more reliable, Tonning-Tukmakov, Copenhagen 1996) 15 \text{w}e1 (15 \text{we2} \text{b5} 16 \text{e5} \text{dxe4} \{16...\text{b4}!\} \) 17 \( \text{xe7} \text{xe7} 18 \text{d}1 \text{b7} 19 \text{d}5 \pm \text{A.Ivanov-Yermolinsky, USA Ch (Los Angeles) 1993} 15...\text{b5} 16 \text{e5} \) (Lukin-Lerner, Kiev 1984; 16 \( \text{wh4}?! \) is met by 16...\text{b4} with the point 17 \( \text{f3} \text{xc3} \) 18 \( \text{xc3} \text{wd7} 19 \text{h}3 \text{e5} 20 \text{xe7} \text{e8} 21 \text{g4} \text{e5} \pm \text{Lukin/Sakaev} 16...\text{b4}! 17 \text{exf6} \text{gxf6} (\text{A.Neverov-Lukin, Blagoveshensk 1988) 18 \text{d5}?! \text{exd5} 19 \text{h}6 \text{e8} 20 \text{f5}! \text{xf5} 21 \text{xe5} 22 \text{e3} \text{gf5} 23 \text{g}3+ \text{h7} 24 \text{d4}?! (24 \text{h}3+ =) \) leads to unclear play – Lukin/Sakaev.

\[ \text{13...\text{e5} 14 \text{wd2}} \]

The other possible development is 14 \( \text{we1}?! \text{d7} 15 \text{g}3 \text{h8} 16 \text{ad1} (16 \text{ae1}?! \) Spraggett; 16 \( \text{f4}?! \) leads to a tense game) 16...\text{e8} (16...\text{ac8}?! \) 17 \( \text{h}3 \text{exf5} 18 \text{exf5} \text{c6}?! \) 19 \( \text{d}4 \)
\( \text{B54) } \)

8.\( \text{f4} \) (D)

The hit of the 1990s.

\( \text{\textcopyright ed7 20} \text{h4 d5?!} \) (20...\( \text{\textcopyright d8} \)!? Spraggett) 21 \( \text{\textcopyright e3} \text{w}c7 22 \text{\textcopyright d4} \text{\textcopyright d6}, \text{Pablo Marin-Spraggett, Barcelona 1993.} \)

14...\( \text{w}c7 \)

14...\( \text{\textcopyright d7} \) 15 \( \text{\textcopyright ad1} \) (15 fxe6?! fxe6 16 \( \text{\textcopyright ad1} \)) 15...\( \text{exf5} \) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright d4} \text{\textcopyright ac8} 17 \text{\textcopyright xf6} \text{\textcopyright xf6} 18 \text{\textcopyright d5} \text{\textcopyright w}d8 \) with equality, \( \text{Emms-H.Jonsson, London Lloyds Bank 1994.} \)

15 \( \text{\textcopyright ad1} \)

Now:

a) 15...\( \text{\textcopyright c4} \)! 16 \( \text{\textcopyright xc4} \text{w}c4 17 \text{\textcopyright xf6} \text{\textcopyright xf6} 18 \text{\textcopyright x}d6 \) with a dangerous initiative.

b) 15...\( \text{\textcopyright h8} \) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright xf6} \text{\textcopyright x}g6 17 \text{\textcopyright d4} \text{\textcopyright g8} \) (17...\( \text{\textcopyright d7} 18 \text{\textcopyright h5}! \) with the idea of 19 \( \text{\textcopyright x}f7 \)!, \( \text{Galdunts-Serper, Kershon 1991) 18 \text{\textcopyright h5 with better chances for White.} \)

c) 15...\( \text{\textcopyright d8} \) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright d4} \)!? \( \pm \) \( \text{Grabic-K.Grosar, Bled wom 1994.} \)

d) 15...b5?! is worth investigating: 16 \( \text{\textcopyright x}d6 \text{\textcopyright x}f6 \) (16...\( \text{\textcopyright g6} 17 \text{\textcopyright h5} \text{\textcopyright h8} 18 \text{\textcopyright d4} \pm \text{Gicev-Kožul, Skopje open 1991) 17 \text{\textcopyright x}d6 \text{\textcopyright x}d6 18 \text{\textcopyright x}d6 \text{\textcopyright e}7 \) (18...\( \text{\textcopyright a}7 \)?) 19 \( \text{\textcopyright d}d1 \text{\textcopyright a}7 \) with compensation (Galdunts).

8...\( \text{\textcopyright e}5 \) 9 \( \text{\textcopyright e}2 \)

9 \( \text{b5}+?! \) has attracted some attention due to the efforts of GM Milos: 9...\( \text{\textcopyright d}7 \) (9...\( \text{\textcopyright fd}7 \)?! is possibly playable) 10 \( \text{\textcopyright x}d7+ \) (Black gets a good game after 10 \( \text{\textcopyright x}e5?! \) \( \text{dxe5} 11 \text{\textcopyright x}d7+ \text{\textcopyright x}d7 12 \text{\textcopyright w}d3 \text{a}6 13 0-0-0 \text{\textcopyright c}7, \text{Istrateanu-Arsović, Belgrade 1994, or 10} \text{a}4 \text{a}6 11 \text{\textcopyright x}d7+ \text{\textcopyright fx}d7 12 \text{\textcopyright e}2 \text{\textcopyright e}7 \) 13 0-0 0-0 14 a5 \( \text{\textcopyright c}7 15 \text{\textcopyright c}1 \text{\textcopyright c}4, \text{Bischoff-Lau, Bundesliga 1992/3) 10} \text{\textcopyright xf}d7 (10...\( \text{\textcopyright ex}d7 \)?! 11 0-0 a6 12 \( \text{\textcopyright e}3 \text{\textcopyright c}7 13 \text{f}4 \text{\textcopyright e}5 = \text{An.Rodriguez-Ricardi, Cordoba Z 1998) 11 \text{\textcopyright w}e2 a6 (11...\( \text{\textcopyright c}8 12 \text{\textcopyright d}1 \text{\textcopyright c}7 13 0-0-0 14 \text{\textcopyright h}1 \text{\textcopyright w}a6 \) \{14...a6 is met by 15 \( \text{\textcopyright c}1 \) with the idea of \text{f4 and \text{\textcopyright d}3} - \text{Milos}\} 15 \text{\textcopyright w}a6 \text{\textcopyright b}xa6 16 \text{\textcopyright c}1 \pm \text{Milos-J.Polgar, Sao Paulo (2) 1996) and now: \)}

a) 12 0-0-0 \( \text{\textcopyright c}7 13 \text{h}4 \text{\textcopyright c}7?! 14 \text{\textcopyright g}5 \text{\textcopyright f}6 15 \text{f}4 \text{\textcopyright c}6 16 \text{h}5 \text{h}6 17 \text{\textcopyright h}4 \text{b}5 18 \text{\textcopyright b}1 \text{b}4 19 \text{\textcopyright a}4 0-0 20 \text{g}4 \pm \text{Milos-Zarnicki, San Luis 1995.} \)

c) 12...\( \text{\textcopyright c}1 \text{g}5?! \text{Yrjölä}) 13 \text{\textcopyright c}1 \text{b}5 14 \text{f}4 \text{\textcopyright c}4 15 \text{\textcopyright d}3 \text{\textcopyright e}7 16 0-0 (\text{Milos-Filgueira, Buenos Aires 1998}) 16...\( \text{\textcopyright f}6 \)?! \text{Yrjölä (16...0-0?! 17 \text{\textcopyright h}1 transposes to line 'c1').}

c) 12 0-0 and then:

cb) 12...\( \text{\textcopyright c}7 13 \text{\textcopyright a}1 \text{b}5 \) has the point 14 \( \text{\textcopyright c}1 \text{b}4! = \) 13...\( \text{\textcopyright c}7 (13...\text{b}5 14 \text{\textcopyright c}1 \text{b}4 15 \text{\textcopyright d}1) 14 \text{\textcopyright c}1 \text{g}5?! \) (\text{Milos-Yermolinsky, Groningen 1996}) 15 \text{f}4! (\text{Yermolinsky}) is critical.

We now return to the position after 9 \( \text{\textcopyright e}2 \) (D):
At first, White plans to attack the knight through $\text{B}e3$ and \text{f}4.

We shall consider:

\textbf{B541: 9...$\text{B}e7$ 262}
\textbf{B542: 9...a6 263}
\textbf{B543: 9...$\text{B}d7$ 265}

\textbf{B541)

9...$\text{B}e7$}

Anand selected this move against Kasparov in 1994. Recently 9...$\text{B}e7$ has not been played in any top-level games.

\textbf{10 $\text{B}d3$!}

10 \text{B}d2 0-0-0! 11 0-0-0-0 a6 (the alternative 11...\text{B}xf2?! 12 \text{B}e3 \text{B}h4 13 \text{B}g5 leads to a draw by repetition) 12 \text{B}hg1 \text{B}c7 13 \text{g}4 \text{b}5 with a good game, Zhao-Gabrielsen, Istanbul OL 2000.

10 \text{g}4 \text{h}6 (10...a6!?) 11 \text{h}4!? (11 \text{B}e3 \text{B}c7 12 \text{f}4 \text{B}c4 13 \text{B}xc4 \text{B}xc4 14 \text{B}f3 e5 15 \text{B}g1 \text{d}5 $\approx$ Bach-Nevednishy, Romania 1995) 11...\text{B}d7 12 \text{B}g1 \text{B}c6 13 \text{B}e3 \text{B}c7 14 \text{B}d4 $\text{B}d7$ 15 0-0-0-0! \text{B}xh4 16 \text{f}4 \text{B}g6 17 \text{B}b5 with the initiative, Kupreichik-Drollinger, Bundesliga 1998/9.

10...\text{B}c7 11 \text{f}4

Unclear is 11 \text{B}b5; e.g., 11...\text{B}b8 (11...\text{B}c6!? Dolmatov) 12 \text{f}4 \text{B}c6 (12...\text{B}g6 13 \text{B}c3 0-0 14 0-0 \text{B}d7) 13

\text{B}c3 0-0 14 \text{g}4 \text{d}5! 15 \text{exd}5 \text{B}d8 Nikitin.

11...\text{B}c4

Or:

a) 11...\text{B}c6 (this is a Scheveningen a tempo down for Black – the aim of 8 \text{B}f4 is completely achieved!) 12 \text{B}f3 a6 13 0-0 0-0 14 \text{a}4 \text{b}6 15 \text{g}4 with an advantage for White, Kasparov-Anand, Linares 1994.

b) 11...\text{B}g6! ?±.

12 \text{B}xa7!

White has mostly tested two other lines, though without particular success:

a) 12 \text{B}xc4 \text{B}xc4 13 \text{B}f3 e5!? (13...0-0 14 0-0-0 \text{B}d7 15 \text{e}5 \text{B}c6 16 \text{exf}6 \text{B}xf3 17 \text{fxe}7 \text{B}xe7 18 \text{exf}8\text{B}+ \text{B}xf8 19 \text{B}xd1 \text{B}c6 is given by Dolmatov; 13...a5!? 14 \text{f}5 \text{b}5 15 \text{B}d2 (15 \text{B}g5?! b4!) 15...\text{B}c6 16 \text{B}g5! b4 (16...\text{B}b7 17 \text{B}xf6 \text{B}xf6 18 \text{B}d3!) 17 \text{B}d5 \text{B}xd5 18 \text{exd}5 \text{B}xc2 19 \text{B}xe7 \text{B}xe7 20 0-0-0 \text{f}6 (Rublevsky-Svidler, Yugoslav Cht 1995; 20...\text{B}xd2? 21 \text{f}6+) 21 \text{B}e4! ? with compensation.

b) 12 \text{B}b5 \text{B}c6 13 \text{B}xc4 \text{B}xc4 14 \text{B}d3 \text{B}c6 and here:

b1) 15 \text{B}a5?! \text{B}d7 and then 16 \text{e}5 \text{B}d5 17 \text{exd}6?! \text{B}d8 18 \text{B}d2 a6 $\mp$ (Kasparov) or 16 \text{B}c4 \text{B}xe4!? 17 \text{B}xa7 b5!, Klimov-Lukin, St Petersburg 1995.

b2) 15 0-0-0 0-0-0 and now 16 \text{B}xd6 \text{B}xd6 17 \text{B}xd6 \text{B}xd6 18 \text{B}xd6 \text{B}xe4 = Lukin-Dranov, St Petersburg 1993, or 16 \text{B}c3 a6!?.

b3) 15 \text{B}d4 \text{B}d7 16 0-0-0-0 0-0 (16...a6 also proved satisfactory for Black in the game Lastin-Lukin, Russian Ch (Elista) 1995) 17 \text{e}5 \text{d}xe5 18 \text{f}xe5 \text{B}g4 19 \text{B}e2 \text{B}xe3 (19...\text{B}xe5? 20 \text{B}f3) 20 \text{B}xe3 = Rublevsky-Nevednichy, Yugoslav Cht 1995.
After the text-move (12 \( \Box x a 7! \))
Black has problems: 12...\( \Box x b 2 \) 13 \( \Box b 5 \) \( W c 6 \) 14 \( W d 4! \) or 12...e5 13 \( \Box b 5 \) \( W c 6 \)
14 \( \Box x c 4 \) \( W x c 4 \) 15 \( W d 3! \) ± Vorobiov-Bakre, Moscow 1999.

**B542)**

9...a6 (D)

\[ W \\

Kramnik successfully played this move in 1993 (against Ivanchuk) but later preferred 9...\( \Box d 7 \).

**10 \( \Box e 3 \)**

Others:

a) 10 g4 \( W c 7 \) 11 g5 \( \Box f d 7 \) 12 \( W d 4 \)
b5 13 0-0-0 \( W x b 8 \) 14 \( W g 3 \) b4 \( \Box f 6 \) Cela-Kotronias, Athens 1996.

b) 10 a4 \( \Box d 7! \)? (10...\( W c 7 \) 11 a5 \( \Box e 7 \)
12 0-0 \( \Box d 7 \) 10...\( \Box d 7 \) 11 a5 \( W c 7 \) 12 0-0 \( \Box e 7 \); 10...\( \Box e 7 \) 11 a5 \( W c 6 \)!, Mil-
avsky-Vovsha, Petach Tikva 1996) 11
a5 (11 0-0 – 9...\( \Box d 7 \) 10 0-0 a6 11 a4 =; 11 \( \Box e 3 \) \( W c 7 \) 12 f4 \( \Box c 4 \) 13 \( \Box x c 4 \)
\( W x c 4 \) 14 \( \Box d 3 \) \( W c 8 \)! \( \Box f 6 \) Dervishi-Kotron-
inas, Istanbul OL 2000) 11...\( W c 7 \) 12 0-0 \( \Box e 7 \) with chances for both sides, Verduaga-Martín del Campo, Merida 1997.

c) 10 \( \Box g 3 \)! and then:

1) 10...\( W c 7 \) 11 f4 \( \Box c 4 \) 12 e5! and now 12...\( \Box x b 2 \) 13 \( W d 4 \) ± or 12...\( d x e 5 \)
13 \( f x e 5 \) \( \Box x e 5 \) 14 \( W d 4 \) \( \Box f d 7 \) 15 0-0-0 ± Kramnik.

c2) 10...\( \Box g 6 \) 11 f4 \( \Box d 7 \) 12 \( W d 2 \)
\( \Box c 6 \) 13 \( \Box f 3 \) \( \Box d 8 \) 14 0-0-0 \( \Box e 7 \) 15
\( \Box d 4 \) 0-0 16 \( \Box f 2 \) \( W c 7 \) 17 f5 with a slight advantage for White, Howell-
Kožul, Bled 1995.

c3) 10...\( \Box e 7 \) 11 f4 \( \Box c 6 \) 12 \( W d 2 \)
\( \Box c 7 \) 13 0-0-0 b5 14 e5! (Gdanski-
Blehm, Warsaw 2001) 14...\( d x e 5 \)! 15
\( f x e 5 \) \( \Box d 7 \).

c4) 10...h5 11 h3 (11 f4? \( \Box e g 4 \); 11
f3 \( W c 7 \) 12 \( W d 4 \) h4 13 \( \Box f 2 \) b5 Kram-
nik) 11...\( W c 7 \) 12 f4 (12 a4 \( \Box d 7 \) 13
\( W d 4 \) \( \Box c 8 \) = or 12 \( W d 4 \) b5 13 a4 \( \Box c 6 \)
14 \( W e 3 \) \( \Box b 4 \) ! 15 \( \Box d 3 \) \( b x a 4 \) 16 \( \Box a 4 \)
\( \Box b 8 \) = Kramnik) 12...\( \Box c 4 \) 13 \( \Box x c 4 \)
(13 \( W d 4 \) b5 and now 14 a4 e5! or 14 e5
dxe5 15 \( f x e 5 \) \( \Box b 7 \) ! Kramnik) 13...\( W x c 4 \)
14 \( W f 3 \) h4 15 \( \Box h 2 \) (15 \( \Box f 2 \) b5! 16 e5
\( \Box d 5 \) =) 15...\( \Box d 7 \) 16 0-0-0 \( W c 8 \) with adequate counterplay, Ivanchuk-Kram-
nik, Linares 1993.

d) 10 0-0 and then:

d1) 10...\( \Box e 7 \) can be met by 11 a4
0-0 = Hamdouchi-Annegeldiev, Mos-
cow OL 1994 or 11 \( \Box e 3 \) \( W c 7 \) – 10
\( \Box e 3 \) \( W c 7 \) 11 0-0 \( \Box e 7 \).

d2) 10...\( W c 7 \) 11 a4 (11 \( \Box e 3 \) – 10
\( \Box e 3 \) \( W c 7 \) 11 0-0) 11...\( \Box d 7 \) (11...b6 12
\( \Box d 2 \) \( \Box b 7 \) 13 \( \Box e 3 \) \( \Box e 7 \) 14 f4 \( \Box d 7 \)
has also been played here) 12 \( \Box d 2 \)
\( \Box e 7 \) 13 a5 \( \Box c 6 \) (13...\( W c 8 \) 14 \( \Box e 3 \) \( \Box c 6 \)
15 f4 \( \Box d 7 \) 16 \( \Box f 3 \) 0-0 17 g4 d5 18 e5
\( \Box e 8 \) 19 \( \Box b 3 \) g6 20 \( \Box d 4 \) f6 is not bad
either, Sion Castro-Gulko, Leon 1992)
14 \( \Box e 3 \) \( \Box d 7 \) 15 f4 \( \Box c 5 \) 16 \( \Box f 3 \) 0-0
17 b4 \( \Box d 7 \) 18 g4 d5! Nikitin.

d3) 10...\( W c 7 \) (D)

11 f4

This position may also arise from Line B2.

11 0-0 is the alternative:
a) 11...\(\text{b}\text{e}7\) 12 \(\text{f}\text{f}4\) \(\text{c}\text{c}4\) 13 \(\text{d}\text{xc}4\) (again, this position can arise by transposition from Line B2) 13...\(\text{w}\text{xc}4\) 14 \(\text{w}\text{f}3\) (14 e5!? \(\text{e}\text{e}4\) 15 \(\text{d}\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}\text{xc}3\) 16 bxc3, Brunner-Verat, Chichy 1991) 14...0-0 15 \(\text{a}\text{ad}1\) e5?! (15...\(\text{w}\text{c}7\)!!) 16 \(\text{f}\text{f}5\) b5 17 \(\text{a}\text{g}5\) ± de Firmian-Sherzer, USA Ch (Jacksonville) 1990.

b) 11...b5?! 12 \(\text{f}\text{f}4\) (Pinski-Banaz, Bojnice 1994) 12...\(\text{d}\text{c}4\)!!, and now the continuation 13 \(\text{a}\text{xc}4\) bxc4 14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5 \(\text{w}\text{xe}5\) 16 \(\text{w}\text{f}3\) cxb3 17 \(\text{w}\text{x}a8\) \(\text{w}\text{xe}3\) + 18 \(\text{h}\text{h}1\) \(\text{c}\text{c}5\) 19 \(\text{a}\text{a}4\) \(\text{w}\text{c}7\) 20 \(\text{b}\text{b}6\) (Pinski-Umansky) seems dubious because of 20...\(\text{c}\text{c}5\)!.

11...\(\text{d}\text{c}4\)

11...\(\text{c}\text{c}6\)?! (as happened in Christiansen-Yermolinsky, USA Ch (Chandler) 1997) leads to a position that usually occurs with Black to move (for example, Tate-Yermolinsky, Chicago 1994).

12 \(\text{d}\text{xc}4\) \(\text{w}\text{xc}4\) 13 \(\text{w}\text{f}3\)

Or 13 \(\text{d}\text{d}3\)!!, and then:

a) 13...\(\text{d}\text{d}5\) 14 e5 \(\text{d}\text{d}7\) 15 \(\text{w}\text{xc}4\) dxc4 16 \(\text{a}\text{a}5\), Galdunts-Wiener, St Ingbert 1994.

b) 13...b5 14 a4 (14 0-0-0? \(\text{b}\text{b}7\) 15 a4 Rechlis) 14...\(\text{w}\text{xd}3\) 15 cxd3 b4 16 \(\text{d}\text{e}2\) with a slight advantage for White, Valerga-Braga, Villa Gesell 1997.

c) 13...\(\text{w}\text{xd}3\) 14 cxd3 \(\text{d}\text{d}7\) ±.

d) Possibly critical is 13...\(\text{w}\text{c}7\)!! (this can arise from Line B2) 14 0-0-0 (14 \(\text{d}\text{d}4\) b5! 15 e5 dxe5 16 \(\text{w}\text{xe}5\) \(\text{w}\text{d}7\) 14...b5 (14...\(\text{e}\text{e}7\) 15 \(\text{d}\text{d}4\)!, Mikhaletz-Privalov, Galychyna 1997) 15 \(\text{d}\text{d}4\) \(\text{b}\text{b}7\) – Kotronias/Papatriyfonos.

13...\(\text{w}\text{c}7\)

There is definitely a choice here:

a) 13...d5?? 14 e5 \(\text{d}\text{d}4\) 15 \(\text{w}\text{xe}4\) \(\text{w}\text{xe}4\) 16 \(\text{w}\text{xe}4\) dxe4 17 0-0-0 with an advantage, I.Zaitsev-Serper, Moscow 1991.

b) 13...e5 14 \(\text{h}\text{h}1\)!! (Mortensen; 14 fxe5?? dxe5 15 \(\text{w}\text{g}3\); 14 f5?! b5! 15 \(\text{w}\text{xe}5\) \(\text{d}\text{d}5\); 14...\(\text{d}\text{d}5\); 14...\(\text{w}\text{xf}4\) 15 \(\text{w}\text{xf}4\) \(\text{e}\text{e}6\) 16 \(\text{d}\text{d}4\) 15 f5!)

c) 13...\(\text{d}\text{d}7\) 14 0-0-0 and then:

a1) 14...b5 15 e5! \(\text{c}\text{c}6\) 16 \(\text{w}\text{h}3\) ±.

a2) 14...\(\text{w}\text{c}7\) 15 g4 \(\text{c}\text{c}6\) 16 g5 and now, rather than 16...\(\text{d}\text{d}7\) 17 \(\text{h}\text{he}1\) (17 \(\text{h}\text{hf}1\)!! Istratescu) 17...\(\text{e}\text{e}7\) 18 \(\text{w}\text{h}3\) 0-0 19 f5 ± Istratescu-Pelletier, Erevan OL 1996, Black could try instead 16...\(\text{w}\text{xe}4\)!! 17 \(\text{w}\text{xe}4\) d5.

a3) 14...\(\text{c}\text{c}8\) and here:

a31) 15 \(\text{d}\text{d}4\) can be met by 15...b5 16 a3 (Ivanchuk-Kramnik, Paris rd 1995) 16...e5? or the immediate 15...e5?.

a32) 15 \(\text{d}\text{d}2\) should be answered by 15...\(\text{w}\text{c}7\), with a rather unclear position, Losev-Belikov, Moscow 1998, rather than 15...b5 16 \(\text{b}\text{b}6\)! \(\text{w}\text{c}6\) 17 \(\text{a}\text{a}5\) \(\text{w}\text{a}8\) 18 \(\text{d}\text{d}1\) \(\text{e}\text{e}7\) 19 \(\text{b}\text{b}4\) ± Sax-Tratar, Feldbach 1997.

d) A double-edged continuation is 13...\(\text{e}\text{e}7\) 14 0-0-0 0-0 (14...\(\text{w}\text{c}7\)!! 15 g4 b5) 15 g4 \(\text{d}\text{d}7\) (15...a5?! 16 g5 \(\text{d}\text{d}7\) 17 a4! was played in Mortensen-Zavoronkov, Erevan OL 1996) 16 g5,
when 16...b5!? 17 e5 d5 could be considered.

14 0-0-0

Or:

a) 14 g4?! b5 15 a3 (15 g5 b4!) and now 15...d5! is Rublevsky's recommendation, while 15...\text{\texttt{B}}b7 is also not bad.

b) 14 \text{\texttt{B}}g3 b5 15 e5 dxe5 16 fxe5 b4!, J.R. Koch-Gi. Hernandez, Tunja jr Wch 1989.

c) 14 f5!? \text{\texttt{B}}b8!? (14...b5 15 fxe6 fxe6 16 e5 \text{\texttt{B}}b7 17 \text{\texttt{B}}h3 dxe5 18 \text{\texttt{B}}xe6+ \text{\texttt{B}}e7 19 \text{\texttt{B}}h3) 15 \text{\texttt{B}}a7 \text{\texttt{B}}a8 16 \text{\texttt{B}}d4 e5 17 \text{\texttt{B}}e3 b5 18 a3 \text{\texttt{B}}b7 19 \text{\texttt{B}}g5 \text{\texttt{B}}d7 20 0-0 h6 21 \text{\texttt{B}}h4 \text{\texttt{B}}e7 22 \text{\texttt{B}}xe7 \text{\texttt{B}}xe7 \approx Nijboer-Van der Wiel, Wijk aan Zee 1996.

14...b5 15 a3 \text{\texttt{B}}b7 16 f5

Both sides have chances in this complicated position. Instead of 16...exf5 17 \text{\texttt{B}}xf5 \text{\texttt{B}}c7 18 \text{\texttt{B}}d4 0-0 19 \text{\texttt{B}}d3 \pm, as in Rublevsky-Levin, Novgorod open 1995, it is better to proceed with 16...e5!? 17 \text{\texttt{B}}g5 \text{\texttt{B}}c8 18 \text{\texttt{B}}d3 \text{\texttt{B}}d7 (Velimirović-Damljanović, Yugoslav Cht 1998) or to choose the sharp 16...\text{\texttt{B}}c8 17 fxe6 fxe6 18 \text{\texttt{B}}d4 (18 \text{\texttt{B}}h3 e5), when Black can continue 18...\text{\texttt{B}}d7 (Cela-Kotronias, Ano Liosia 1997), 18...e5!? or maybe even 18...\text{\texttt{B}}c4 19 \text{\texttt{B}}g5 \text{\texttt{B}}e7 20 \text{\texttt{B}}h3 \text{\texttt{B}}xe4.

B543)

9...\text{\texttt{B}}d7 (D)

This move is somewhat passive but quite reliable and (thanks to Kramnik) the most popular up to now. Note that plans with g4-g5 now make sense as an alternative to f4, since the d7-bishop blocks the retreat of the f6-knight.

10 \text{\texttt{B}}e3

Otherwise:

a) 10 \text{\texttt{B}}g3 \text{\texttt{B}}c8! 11 f4 \text{\texttt{B}}c4.

b) 10 0-0 \text{\texttt{B}}e7 (10...\text{\texttt{B}}c7!?) 10...a6 should be answered not by 11 a4 \text{\texttt{B}}c8 {11...\text{\texttt{B}}c7} 12 a5 \text{\texttt{B}}c7 13 \text{\texttt{B}}g3 \text{\texttt{B}}c4 14 \text{\texttt{B}}xc4 \text{\texttt{B}}xc4 15 \text{\texttt{B}}xd6 \text{\texttt{B}}xe4 16 \text{\texttt{B}}xe4 \text{\texttt{B}}xe4 17 \text{\texttt{B}}xf8 \text{\texttt{B}}xf8 18 \text{\texttt{B}}d4 \text{\texttt{B}}c6 = Jazbinsek-Kožul, Pula open 1997, but 11 \text{\texttt{B}}e3! \text{\texttt{B}}c7 12 f4 \pm) is interesting:

b1) 11 a4 0-0 (11...a6 12 a5 \text{\texttt{B}}c7 13 \text{\texttt{B}}d2 0-0 14 \text{\texttt{B}}e3 \text{\texttt{B}}c6 15 f4 \text{\texttt{B}}ed7 16 \text{\texttt{B}}f3 e5 17 f5 b5 18 axb6 \text{\texttt{B}}xb6 = Svidler-Ruban, Novosibirsk 1995) 12 a5 \text{\texttt{B}}c7 13 a6 \text{\texttt{B}}fb8 (\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} Kasparov-Kramnik, Horgen 1995; 13...\text{\texttt{B}}c6 14 \text{\texttt{B}}d4 b6 15 \text{\texttt{B}}e3! \text{\texttt{B}}g6 16 \text{\texttt{B}}g3 e5 17 \text{\texttt{B}}ad1 \text{\texttt{B}}ad8 18 f4 exf4 19 \text{\texttt{B}}xf4 \text{\texttt{B}}xf4 20 \text{\texttt{B}}xf4 b5! = Rublevsky-Svidler, Novosibirsk 1995) 14 axb7 \text{\texttt{B}}xb7 15 \text{\texttt{B}}e3 \text{\texttt{B}}b4 16 f3 a5 with a good game for Black, J.Polgar-Timman, Wijk aan Zee 2000.

b2) 11 \text{\texttt{B}}e3 \text{\texttt{B}}c7 and then:

b21) 12 \text{\texttt{B}}b5!? \text{\texttt{B}}b8 13 f4 \text{\texttt{B}}c6!? 14 \text{\texttt{B}}c3 0-0 15 g4 d5 16 exd5 \text{\texttt{B}}b4! with compensation for Black, Novgorodskiy-Kupreichik, Nizhny Novgorod 1998.

b22) 12 \text{\texttt{B}}d2 and now Black has two satisfactory options:

b221) 12...\text{\texttt{B}}c6 13 a4 \text{\texttt{B}}ed7 14 f4 0-0 15 \text{\texttt{B}}f3 \text{\texttt{B}}fd8 and now 16 \text{\texttt{B}}e2, as
played in Smirin-Ruban, Tilburg 1994, can be met by 16...\(\text{c}8\)! followed by ...
\(\text{xf6}\) (Ruban). Alternatively, 16 \(\text{xb}5\) \(\text{xb}5\) 17 axb5 d5 18 e5 \(\text{c}5\) 19 \(\text{we}2\) \(\text{e}8\) 20 c3 \(\text{wb}6\) is possible, Smirin-
Yermolinsky, Philadelphia 1996.

b222) 12...0-0 13 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{g}6\) (another idea is 13...\(\text{c}6\)!?) 14 a4 (14 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{c}6\)
15 \(\text{we}1\) d5 16 e5 \(\text{e}4\) 17 \(\text{ex}cxe4\) dxe4
18 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{h}4\) = Smirin-Khalifman, Ischia 1996; 14 \(\text{d}3\) Ruban) 14...b6
(14...\(\text{c}6\) 15 \(\text{b}5\)!, Hamdouchi-Apicella, Tunis 1997) 15 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 16
\(\text{we}2\) \(\text{fe}8\) 17 \(\text{b}3\) a6 18 \(\text{ae}1\) \(\text{b}7\) 19
\(\text{ff}2\) \(\text{d}7\) 20 \(\text{w}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 21 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{c}5\) 22
\(\text{h}3\) \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\) Rublevsky-Makarov, Novo-
sibirsk 1995.

b23) 12 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{c}4\) and now:

b231) 13 \(\text{d}4\)!? and now Black should avoid 13...e5? 14 \(\text{xc}4\), Golubev-Mukhametov, Alushta 1997, and
13...\(\text{xb}2\)!! 14 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{xb}5\) 15 \(\text{xb}5+\)
\(\text{ff}8\) 16 \(\text{xb}2\) \(\text{wb}6\) + 17 \(\text{d}4\) a6 18 e5.
Not so clear is 13...b5 14 \(\text{we}1\)!? b4
(14...0-0 15 e5 dxe5 16 fxe5 \(\text{exe}5\) 17
\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 18 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{g}6\) 19 \(\text{bx}g6\) 15
e5 dxe5 16 fxe5 \(\text{exe}5\) 17 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{xc}3\)
18 \(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{wb}6\) + 19 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}6\) 20 \(\text{w}3\)
\(\text{c}8\). However, after 13...0-0 White has nothing better than 14 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{xc}4\)
\(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{xc}4\) 14 \(\text{d}4\) 0-0.

b232) 13 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{xc}4\) and then:

b2321) 14 e5 \(\text{e}4\)! 15 exd6 \(\text{xd}6\)
16 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{f}5\) 17 \(\text{xe}7\) \(\text{exe}7\)!? (Damlja-

b2322) 14 \(\text{d}4\) 0-0 (14...\(\text{c}8)!?; the fact that Black has the untested
14...\(\text{c}6\)!? may justify, to some extent, the move-order with 13 \(\text{d}4\) 15
\(\text{xf}6\)! 16 e5 \(\text{e}7\) 17
exd6 \(\text{f}6\) 15...\(\text{e}8\) (difficult to assess are
15...\(\text{d}5\)!? and 15...dx\(\text{e}5\) 16 \(\text{xe}5\)
\(\text{d}5\) 17 \(\text{e}4\)!, after which 17...\(\text{e}3\)? is
unsuccessful in view of 18 \(\text{f}6\)!
\(\text{xf}6\) 19 \(\text{xe}3\) \pm) 16 exd6 (hardly advan-
tageous are 16 \(\text{f}3\) f6 17 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{fx}5\)
18 \(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{f}5\), Velimirović-Popović,
Novi Sad 2000, and 16 \(\text{c}5\) ?? \(\text{c}6\)!
17 exd6 \(\text{xd}6\) 18 \(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{d}8\) Lerner)
16...\(\text{xd}6\) (16...\(\text{xd}6\) ? 17 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{w}6\)
18 \(\text{xd}6\) \pm) 17 \(\text{e}4\) and, instead of
17...\(\text{c}6\)? 18 \(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{xd}6\) 19 \(\text{c}5\) \pm
Golubev-Lerner, Senden 1996, the
most precise is probably 17...\(\text{c}7\)! 18
\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{xe}4\) 19 \(\text{xd}7\) \(\text{b}6\) =.

c) 10 \(\text{g}4\) (see comment to Black’s
9th move):

c1) 10...\(\text{g}6\) 11 \(\text{g}1\) (11 \(\text{f}3\)?? \(\text{c}8\)
12 \(\text{d}2\) a6 13 0-0-0 \(\text{c}7\) 14 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{b}5\) 15
\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{h}5\) 16 \(\text{h}2\) \(\text{xg}5\) 17 \(\text{hxg}5\) \(\text{g}6\),
An.Rodriguez-Ricardi, Villa Gesell
1997, 18 a3 \(\text{Re}6\)!! 11...\(\text{g}5\) (Atalik
gives 11...\(\text{a}6\) 12 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 13 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{c}4\)
14 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{xc}4\) 15 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 16 0-0 \(\text{c}8\)
17 \(\text{g}5\) with an attack and 11...
\(\text{c}7\) 12 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{c}6\) 13 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 14 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{w}6\) 15
\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{c}7\) =) 12 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 13 \(\text{h}4!\) (Cela-
Atalik, Ikaria 1996) 13...\(\text{c}6\)! with
counterplay – Atalik.

c2) 10...\(\text{c}6\)! and then:

c21) 11 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 12 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{h}6\) (better
than 12...\(\text{d}5\)!! 13 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{xe}4\) 14 \(\text{f}4\)!
Atali-

22) 11 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 12 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 13 \(\text{ex}d5\)
(13 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{h}5\) 14 \(\text{ex}d5\) \(\text{g}3\) 15 \(\text{hxg}3\)
\(\text{d}8\) 13...\(\text{xd}5\) 14 \(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\) 15
\(\text{wd}4\) \(\text{xd}4\) (15...\(\text{b}4\)! 16 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{wd}4\)
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Short) 16 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b5+! \mp J.Polgar-Short, Novgorod 1996.

d) 10 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d2 is more topical:

d1) 10...a6?! 11 \texttt{\textasciitilde}g5 (critical is 11 0-0-0 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c7) 11...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 12 0-0 b5 13 a3
\texttt{\textasciitilde}e7 14 \texttt{\textasciitilde}ad1 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c4 = Ivanovič-Damljanović, Vrnjačka Banja 1999.

d2) 10...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c8 and now:

d21) 11 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 12 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b5 (consistent, but it does not give White an advantage) 12...\texttt{\textasciitilde}xb5 13 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xb5+ \texttt{\textasciitilde}ed7!
= Onishchuk-Tukmakov, Biel 1996.

d22) 11 f3?!.

d23) 11 0-0-0?! \texttt{\textasciitilde}e7 (11...\texttt{\textasciitilde}xc3? 12
\texttt{\textasciitilde}xc3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xe4 13 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xd4 14 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xd4
\texttt{\textasciitilde}xf2 15 \texttt{\textasciitilde}f1 \texttt{\textasciitilde}fg4 16 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xg4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xg4 17
\texttt{\textasciitilde}xd6 Tukmakov) 12 f3 (or 12 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e3?!) deserves attention.

d3) 10...\texttt{\textasciitilde}e7 11 0-0-0 (11 f3?!
looks promising: 11...0-0 12 g4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 13 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 14 g5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}fd7 15 f4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}g6
16 h4 \mp Balashov-Lopushnoy, Russian Ch't 1998, or 11...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 12 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b5
\texttt{\textasciitilde}xb5 13 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xb5+ \texttt{\textasciitilde}f8 14 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d1 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d8 15
\texttt{\textasciitilde}a5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d7 \mp Gofshtein) and here:

d31) 11...\texttt{\textasciitilde}xf2 12 \texttt{\textasciitilde}hf1 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xf2 13
\texttt{\textasciitilde}g1 (13 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xe5? dxe5 14 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xf6 0-0-0-0!!
→ Balashov) 13...\texttt{\textasciitilde}f2 14 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xg7 with compensation – Kupreichik.

d32) Gofshtein recommended the continuation 11...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c7? 12 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xb5
13 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xb5+ \texttt{\textasciitilde}f8 but I am not sure whether he would play something like that in a tournament.

d33) 11...0-0 12 g4 (12 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c7
13 f4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c4 14 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xc4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xc4 15 e5 dxe5
16 fxe5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d5 17 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xd5 exd5 18 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xd5 \mp
Kupreichik) 12...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 (12...\texttt{\textasciitilde}exg4 13
\texttt{\textasciitilde}xg4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}exg4 14 \texttt{\textasciitilde}hgl favours White; e.g., 14...\texttt{\textasciitilde}f6 15 e5!, Kupreichik-Lopushnoy, Russia Cup (Perm) 1998, or
14...e5 15 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d8 16 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xe7+ \texttt{\textasciitilde}xe7
17 \texttt{\textasciitilde}g3! – Kupreichik) 13 f3 and here:

d331) 13...\texttt{\textasciitilde}fd8 14 h4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 15 g5
\texttt{\textasciitilde}fd7 (15...\texttt{\textasciitilde}h5? 16 \texttt{\textasciitilde}h2) 16 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d4! a6
17 h5 b5 18 \texttt{\textasciitilde}dg1, A.Fedorov-Lopushnoy, St Petersburg 1997.

d332) 13...a5 14 a4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b4 15 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e1!
Gofshtein.

d333) 13...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 14 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d4 (14 h4?!) 14...a6 15 g5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}fd7 16 h4 b5 17 a3 (17
\texttt{\textasciitilde}dg1? b4 18 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d1 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b5 A.Fedorov)
17...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c5 18 h5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}fc8, and, as A.Fed-orov asserts, both 19 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e3!? \texttt{\textasciitilde}ab8 20
g6 and 19 g6 (A.Fedorov-Gershon, St Vincent Ech 2000) 19...\texttt{\textasciitilde}d7 20 gxf7+
\texttt{\textasciitilde}xf7 are unclear.

d34) 11...a6 12 g4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 (Black should avoid 12...\texttt{\textasciitilde}fxg4?! 13 \texttt{\textasciitilde}hg1!
13 f3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 (13...h6?! 14 h4) 14 g5 (14
\texttt{\textasciitilde}d4 b5 \mp Ivanović-Damljanović, Yugoslov Ch't 1999) 14...\texttt{\textasciitilde}fd7 15 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e3
b5 16 f4 \mp \texttt{\textasciitilde}g6? (Konguvel-Bakre, Calcutta 1999) 17 h4!.

d35) 11...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 12 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e3?! (12 f3 a6
13 g4 – 11...a6 12 g4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 13 f3)
12...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 13 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b5 is interesting.

10...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 (D)}

\texttt{\textasciitilde}f4

Or:

\texttt{\textasciitilde}f4

a) 11 g4 d5! 12 exd5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b4 with compensation, Movsesian-Lagunov, Bundesliga 1996/7.
b) 11 \( \textit{Wd4} \) \( \texttt{ce7} \) 12 \( f4 \) \( \texttt{cg6} \) (the alternative 12...\( \texttt{Cc6} \) is also playable, as in the game Klimov-Makarov, St Petersburg 1999) 13 \( 0-0 \) 0-0 14 \( g4 \) e5 15 \( \texttt{Wd2} \) exf4 16 \( \texttt{xf4} \) \( \texttt{fc8} \) 17 \( \texttt{Qd4} \) \( \textit{Wa5} \) 18 \( \texttt{b3} \) \( \textit{Wc7} \) = J.Polgar-Kramnik, Novgorod 1996.

c) 11 \( \texttt{Qb5} \) and now:

c1) 11...\( \textit{Wb8} \) 12 \( f4 \) enables White to keep an edge:

\( \texttt{c11} \) 12...\( \texttt{Qg6} \) 13 \( f5! \)? exf5 (13...\( \texttt{e5} \) 14 0-0 \( \texttt{e7} \) 15 \( \texttt{Qg5} \) 0-0 16 \( \texttt{xf6} \) exf6 17 \( \texttt{Wd2} \) ± Vereshagin-Makarov, Russian Cht 1997) 14 exf5 \( \texttt{e5} \) 15 \( \texttt{Wd4} \) a6 16 \( \texttt{Qc3} \) \( \texttt{xf5} \) 17 0-0 \( \texttt{Qe6} \) 18 \( \texttt{xf6} \) gxf6 19 \( \texttt{Qd5} \) with compensation for White, A.Sokolov-Nevednichy, Yugoslav Cht 1995.

\( \texttt{c12} \) 12...\( \texttt{Qeg4} \) 13 \( \texttt{xg4} \) (not 13 \( \texttt{Qxd6} \)? \( \texttt{Qxd6} \) 14 \( \texttt{Qg4} \) in view of 14...\( \texttt{xf4} \) 13...\( \texttt{Qxb5} \) (13...\( \texttt{Qg4} \)? 14 \( \texttt{Qxd6} \) \( \texttt{Qxd6} \) 15 \( \texttt{Qxg4} \) 14 \( \texttt{Qf3} \) e5 (14...\( \texttt{Qe7} \) 15 \( \texttt{Qd4} \) \( \texttt{d7} \) 16 \( \texttt{Wd3} \) \( \texttt{c7} \) 17 0-0 a6 18 c4 ± A.Sokolov-Al.Khasin, Russian Ch (Elista) 1994) 15 a4 (15 \( f5 \)? \( \texttt{Qc7} \) 16 \( \texttt{Qc1} \) d5 17 exd5 \( \texttt{Qc4} \), Ermikov-Al.Khasin, Omsk 1996; 15 \( \texttt{Wd2} \) \( \texttt{Qe7} \) 16 g4?? Rechlis) 15...\( \texttt{Qc6} \) 16 \( \texttt{Wd3} \) \( \texttt{Qe7} \) 17 c4 0-0 (17...\( \texttt{xf4} \)?) 18 \( f5 \) ± Lastin-Dragomaretsky, Moscow 1995.

c2) 11...\( \texttt{Qxb5} \)! 12 \( \texttt{Qxb5} \) + \( \texttt{Qc6} \) equalizes:

\( \texttt{c21} \) 13 \( \texttt{Qd2} \) can be answered by 13...\( d5 = \) A.Sokolov-Belikov, Russian Ch (Elista) 1995, or 13...a6 14 \( \texttt{Qd3} \) d5.

\( \texttt{c22} \) 13 \( \texttt{Qf3} \) a6 14 \( \texttt{Qd3} \) d5 = J.Polgar-Kramnik, Dortmund 1996.

\( \texttt{c23} \) 13 \( \texttt{Qd3} \) d5 14 exd5 \( \texttt{Qxd5} \) 15 \( \texttt{Qd2} \) \( \texttt{Qe7} \) = Velimirović-Damljanović, Vrnjačka Banja 1999.

\begin{align*}
11&.\texttt{Qc4} \quad 12 \texttt{Qxc4} \quad \textit{Wxc4} \quad (D)
\end{align*}

\begin{enumerate}
\item [13] \( \texttt{Wd3} \)
\item [14] \( \texttt{x}d4 \) \( \texttt{xc4} \) \( \textit{xc6} \) 15 \( \texttt{Qa5} \) \( \texttt{e7} \), Losev-Iskusnykh, Moscow 2001.
\end{enumerate}

Or 13 \( \textit{Wf3} \), and now:

\begin{enumerate}
\item [a] 13...\( \texttt{e5} \)? can be countered in three ways: 14 \( \texttt{Qf1} \)!! Mortensen; 14 \( \texttt{f5} \)? Pupo; or 14 \( fxe5 \)? dxe5 15 \( \texttt{Wg3} \), Blees-Pupo, Cienfuegos 1997.
\item [b] 13...\( \texttt{Qc6} \) 14 \( \texttt{Qd4} \) (14 \( \texttt{Qd4} \) \( \texttt{e7} \) 15 0-0-0? \( d5 \) 16 \( e5 \) \( \texttt{Qe4} \) 17 \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) dxe4 \( \texttt{Wg3} \) \( \texttt{xa2} \) 19 \( \texttt{Qxg7} \) \( \texttt{Qf8} \) 20 \( \texttt{Qxc6} \) \( bxc6 \) 21 \( \texttt{Wxh7} \) \( \texttt{Qb4} \) ! → Saulin-Dragomaretsky, Moscow 1995) 14...\( \texttt{Qe7} \) (14...\( \texttt{Qxe4} \)? 15 \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) \( f5 \) 16 \( \texttt{Wxh5} \)!+ wins for White) 15 0-0-0 0-0 16 \( \texttt{He1} \) a5 (16...\( \texttt{Qfc8} \) Cu.Hansen) 17 \( \texttt{Q3} \) with the better chances for White, Mortensen-Cu.Hansen, Esbjerg 1997.
\item [c] 13...\( b5 \)!!.
\item [d] 13...\( \texttt{Qc7} \)! 14 0-0-0 \( \texttt{Qc8} \) with the initiative – Atalik.
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item [13] \( \texttt{Wxd3} \)
\item [14] \( \texttt{Qxc7} \)!! 14 0-0-0 \( \texttt{Qc8} \) 15 \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) ± Istratescu; 13...\( b5 \) 14 \( \texttt{Qxc4} \) \( bxc4 \) 15 \( \texttt{Qd2} \) d5 16 \( \texttt{Qd4} \) (±) Atalik.
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item [14] \( \texttt{e7} \)
14...h5?! 15 a4 h4 16 h3 a6 (or 16...£h5 17 0-0 £e7 18 £fc1 £d8 19 £d2! b6 20 £f3 £c8 21 £d4 a6 22 b4 ± Istratescu-Atalik, Kastoria 1996) 17 0-0 £e7 18 £a5 £h5 19 £c4 and White has some advantage, Stoica-Gabriel, Romanian Cht 1998.

15 a4

15 £c1 0-0 16 h3 £fc8 (16...h5?!)
17 g4! £c6 18 £h2 (18 £e2 d5 19 e5 £d7 20 £d4 g5 Atalik) 18...e5! 19 £hc2 exf4 20 £xf4 £e8 21 £d4 d5 with an equal position, Istratescu-Atalik, Aegina 1996.

15...0-0 16 h3

Now:

a) 16...£e5?! is well met by 17 0-0 £e6 18 £a5!, Istratescu-S.Kiselev, Bucharest 1998.

b) After 16...£fc8 17 0-0 Black can choose between 17...£h6, as in Dervishi-Efimov, St Vincent Ech 2000, and Stoica’s 17...£d8!?!.

c) 16...h5 17 £d2 h4 18 0-0 (Bruzon-Pupo, Havana 1998) 18...d5 19 e5 £h5 Pupo.

Summing up: Black does not encounter great problems in the variation 6...£b6, but he has plenty of small ones and it is high time White learned how to turn them to good account. I believe that the quite favourable statistics for Black in the Benko Variation are due to the fact that ‘White’ Sozin players pay, as a rule, much more (if not all!) of their attention to more fascinating variations with ...e6, and in practical 6...£b6 games Black is often better prepared.

To conclude the theme of the queen advance and the book as a whole, I offer a statistical sample of the best performances in Sozin games (source: games from the period 1990-2000 taken from the ChessBase Mega Database 2001; the performances achieved by Topalov and Gelfand, who played a small number of games, are shown as an exception).

White

Topalov (10 games) 2796; Short (15) 2781; Rublevsky (22) 2627; de Firmian (39) 2617; Gi.Hernandez (30) 2595; Zapata (35) 2587; Galdunts (15) 2577; Golubev (27) 2575; Rogić (17) 2573; Milos (16) 2553; K.Müller (44) 2545; Saltaev (36) 2544; Mitkov (20) 2544; Emmas (41) 2500; Istratescu (43) 2498 ... Velimirović (30) 2463

Black

Kramnik (15) 2765; Kasparov (16) 2675; Gelfand (9) 2629; Damljanović (19) 2612; Dvoirys (16) 2584; Lerner (14) 2552; Makarov (17) 2542; Atalik (15) 2530; Nevednichy (16) 2499; Kožul (25) 2487; Scherbakov (15) 2487; S.Kiselev (15) 2480; Yermolinsky (15) 2463; Vaulin (19) 2454; D.Gurevich (20) 2450; Cebalo (15) 2448

Though this study is somewhat arbitrary, it is hard to miss the fact that the list of the best performers as Black contains the names of at least eight adepts of 6...£b6. Well... I don’t think that the originator of the attack, Veniamin Sozin, would have been disappointed by such a circumstance.
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Chapter Guide

1 e4 c5 2 d3 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 cxd4 f6 5 c3

Now:
A: 5...a6 6 c4
B: 5...c6 6 c4
Or: 5...e6 6 c4 – Chapter 1

A)

5...a6 6 c4 e6
Other moves – Chapter 2
7 b3
7 0-0 – Chapter 3
Other moves – Chapter 2
Now (after 7 b3):
7...e7 and 7...c7 – Chapter 4
7...b5: Sidelines – Chapter 5
7...b5 8 0-0 e7 9 f3! – Chapter 6
7...bd7! – Chapter 7

B)

5...c6 6 c4 e6
6...b6 and others – Chapter 14
7 b3
7 e3 or 7 0-0 without ...a6 –
Chapter 13
7 e3 a6 without b3 – Chapter 11
7 0-0 a6 without b3 – Chapter 12
7...a6
Other moves without ...a6 – Chapter 13
Now (after 7...a6):
8 e3 e7 without 9 e2 – Chapter 9
8 e3 e7 9 e2 – Chapter 10
Other lines – Chapter 8

1: 5...e6 6 c4 e7
5...e6 6 c4 22 6...e7! 7 b3 a6

23 8 f4 0-0 24 9 f3 c5 10 e3 a5 25

2: 5...a6 6 c4: Introduction to the Fischer Attack
5...a6 6 c4 27

A: 6 b5 27
B: 6...bd7 28
C: 6...e6 29
C1: 7 a4 29
C2: 7 a3 30 b5 8 a2 31: 8...e7 31; 8...b7 32

3: 5...a6 6 c4 e6 7 0-0
5...e6 6 c4 e6 7 0-0 33 7 e7 8
b3 0-0 9 f4 34
A: 9...bd7 34
B: 9...b5! 36 10 e5 dx e5 11 fxe5
f7! 12 e3! xe5! 13 h5
38: 13...c4 38; 13...bc6 38

4: 5...a6 6 c4 e6 7 b3:
7...e7 and 7...c7
5...a6 6 c4 e6 7 b3 40
A: 7...c7! 40
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B: 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash e7 40}}\)
B1: 8 f4 41
B2: 8 g4!? 42: 8...\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash d6 42; 8...0-0 42;}}\)
\(\text{8...h6 43}\)

5: 5...a6 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \textbackslash b3 b5:}}\)
Sidelines
5...a6 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \textbackslash b3 b5 44}}\)
A: 8 f4 44
B: 8 e2 45
C: 8 f3?! 47
D: 8 g5?! 48 e7! 9 f3! 48:
\(9...\text{\textbackslash b6?! 49; 9...\text{\textbackslash c7 50}}\)
E: 8 0-0 51
E1: 8...\text{\textbackslash b7 51}
E2: 8...b4!? 53 e4 53: 9 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash a4 53; 9...\text{\textbackslash dxe4?}}\)
53; 9...\text{\textbackslash e7 54; 9...\text{\textbackslash b7 54;}}\)
\(9...\text{\textbackslash d7 56}\)
E3: 8...e7 58

6: 5...a6 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \textbackslash b3 b5}}\)
8 0-0 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash e7 9 f3!}}\)
5...a6 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \textbackslash b3 b5 8 0-0 \text{\textbackslash e7 9 f3!}}\)
9 f3! 60)
A: 9...\text{\textbackslash b6 61}
A1: 10 g5!? 61: 10...\text{\textbackslash bd7 62;}
10...0-0 63
A2: 10 e3 64 10...\text{\textbackslash b7 11 g3 64:}
11...\text{\textbackslash c6?! 65; 11...0-0 65;}
\(11...\text{\textbackslash bd7?! 67; 11...b4! 69}\)

B: 9...\text{\textbackslash c7 73}
B1: 10 e1! 74
B2: 10...\text{\textbackslash g3 76}
B21: 10...0-0 77 11 b6 e8 12\(\text{\textbackslash e1 d7 80: 13 a3 81; 13 f4 82; 13}
\text{\textit{\textbackslash f3 84}}\)

B22: 10...\text{\textbackslash c6 85 11 xc6 \text{\textbackslash ecx6 12 x1}}
\(\text{\textit{\textbackslash e1 b7! 13 a3 89; 13...0-0 91;}}\)
\(13...\text{\textbackslash d8?! 93}\)

7: 5...a6 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \textbackslash b3 \text{\textbackslash d7!}}\)
5...a6 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \textbackslash b3 \text{\textbackslash d7! 95}}\)
A: 8 e2 96

B: 8 f4 97 8...\text{\textbackslash c5 97}
B1: 9 0-0 98: 9...\text{\textbackslash e7 99; 9...\text{\textbackslash fxe4}}
100
B2: 9 e5 101: 9...\text{\textbackslash dxe5 101;}
\(9...\text{\textbackslash fd7?! 104}\)
B3: 9 f5 105: 9...\text{\textbackslash e7 106; 9...b5 112}
B4: 9...\text{\textbackslash f3 114: 9...b5 115; 9...\text{\textbackslash e7 117}}\)

8: 5...\text{\textbackslash c6 6 \text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \textbackslash b3 a6}}\)
5...\text{\textbackslash c6 6 \text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \textbackslash b3 a6 118}}\)

A: 8 f4!? 118
B: 8 0-0 119: 8...\text{\textbackslash a5 120; 8...\text{\textbackslash c7}}
120; 8...\text{\textbackslash e7 121}
C: 8...\text{\textbackslash e3 121}
C1: 8...\text{\textbackslash d7 122}
C2: 8...\text{\textbackslash a5 122}
C3: 8...\text{\textbackslash c7 124: 9 \text{\textbackslash e2 125; 9 f4 127}}\)

9: 5...\text{\textit{\textbackslash c6 6 \text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \textbackslash b3 a6}}\)
8 \text{\textit{\textbackslash e3 \text{\textit{\textbackslash e7 without 9 \text{\textbackslash e2}}}}\)
5...\text{\textit{\textbackslash c6 6 \text{\textit{\textbackslash c4 e6 7 \text{\textbackslash b3 a6 8 \text{\textit{\textbackslash e3 \text{\textit{\textbackslash e7 132}}}}}}}}\)
A: 9 g4!? 132
B: 9 0-0 132
C: 9...\text{\textbackslash f4 133}
C1: 9...\text{\textbackslash c7?! 134: 10 \text{\textbackslash f3 134; 10}
0-0 135}
C2: 9...0-0 137
C21: 10...\text{\textbackslash f3 138: 10...\text{\textbackslash c7 138;}}
10...\text{\textbackslash xd4 141}
C22: 10 0-0 142; 10...\text{wc7} 143; 10...\text{\textdia{xd}4} 147

10: 5...\text{\textdia{c6}} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} e6 7 \text{\textdia{b}3} a6 8 \text{\textdia{e}3} \text{\textdia{e}7} 9 \text{\textdia{w}e2}
5...\text{\textdia{c}6} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} e6 7 \text{\textdia{b}3} a6 8 \text{\textdia{e}3} \text{\textdia{e}7} 9 \text{\textdia{w}e2} 152
A: 9...0-0 152 10 0-0-0 152
A1: 10...\text{\textdia{d}7}!! 153
A2: 10...\text{\textdia{w}e8} 154 11 \text{\textdia{h}g1} \text{\textdia{d}7} 12 \text{\textdia{g}4} \text{\textdia{c}5} 13 \text{\textdia{g}5} \text{\textdia{b}5} 155: 14 \text{\textdia{\textdia{xc}6}} 155; 14 \text{\textdia{w}h5} 156
B: 9...\text{\textdia{w}c7} 159 10 0-0-0 159
B1: 10...\text{\textdia{a}5} 160 11 \text{\textdia{g}4} \text{\textdia{b}5} 12 \text{\textdia{g}5} \text{\textdia{\textdia{x}b}3}+ 13 \text{\textdia{a}xb}3 \text{\textdia{d}7} 160; 14 \text{\textdia{f}5} 160; 14 \text{\textdia{h}4} 163
B2: 10...0-0 167
B21: 11 \text{\textdia{g}4} 168 (11...\text{\textdia{d}7} 12 \text{\textdia{h}g1} 179)
B22: 11 \text{\textdia{h}g1} 175; 11...\text{\textdia{a}5} 176;
11...\text{\textdia{b}5}!! 177; 11...\text{\textdia{d}7} 179 (12 \text{\textdia{g}4} 179)
B23: 11 \text{\textdia{h}g1} \text{\textdia{d}7} 12 \text{\textdia{g}4} 179
12...\text{\textdia{c}5} 179
B231: 13 \text{\textdia{g}5} 180; 13...\text{\textdia{b}5} 181;
13...\text{\textdia{d}7}! 183
B232: 13 \text{\textdia{f}5}! 186

11: 5...\text{\textdia{c}6} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} e6 7 \text{\textdia{e}3} a6 without \text{\textdia{b}3}
5...\text{\textdia{c}6} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} e6 7 \text{\textdia{e}3} a6 190 8 \text{\textdia{w}e2} 191
A: 8...\text{\textdia{a}5} 191
B: 8...\text{\textdia{w}c7} 192 9 0-0-0 \text{\textdia{a}5}!! 192
C: 8...\text{\textdia{w}c7} 9 0-0-0 \text{\textdia{e}7} 196
D: 8...\text{\textdia{e}7} 9 0-0-0 0-0 197 10 \text{\textdia{h}g1} 197; 10...\text{\textdia{w}c7} 198; 10...\text{\textdia{\textdia{xd}4}}! 198

12: 5...\text{\textdia{c}6} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} e6 7 0-0 a6 without \text{\textdia{b}3}
5...\text{\textdia{c}6} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} e6 7 0-0 a6 199
A: 8 \text{\textdia{a}3} 200 8...\text{\textdia{e}7} 9 \text{\textdia{a}2} 0-0 200:
10 \text{\textdia{h}h1} 200; 10 \text{\textdia{e}3} 201
B: 8 \text{\textdia{a}4} 202

13: 5...\text{\textdia{c}6} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} e6: Sozin and Velimirović without ...a6
5...\text{\textdia{c}6} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} e6 206
A: 7 0-0 206
B: 7 \text{\textdia{b}3} 207
C: 7 \text{\textdia{e}3} 208 7...\text{\textdia{e}7} 208
C1: 8 \text{\textdia{f}4} 209
C2: 8 \text{\textdia{b}3} 210 8...0-0 210
C21: 9 \text{\textdia{f}4} 210
C22: 9 0-0 212; 9...\text{\textdia{d}7} 212; 9...\text{\textdia{a}5} 214
C23: 9 \text{\textdia{w}e2} 215
C3: 8 \text{\textdia{w}e2} 216 8...0-0 9 0-0-0 217
C31: 9...\text{\textdia{a}5} 217
C32: 9...\text{\textdia{d}5} 218
C33: 9...\text{\textdia{\textdia{xd}4}} 219
C34: 9...\text{\textdia{w}a5} 219
C35: 9...\text{\textdia{d}7} 221; 10 \text{\textdia{b}3} 221; 10 \text{\textdia{f}4} 223

14: Anti-Sozin: 5...\text{\textdia{c}6} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} \text{\textdia{w}b6} and 6...\text{\textdia{d}7}
5...\text{\textdia{c}6} 6 \text{\textdia{c}4} 224
A: 6...\text{\textdia{d}7} 225; 7 \text{\textdia{b}3} 226; 7 0-0 227
B: 6...\text{\textdia{w}b6} 229
B1: 7 \text{\textdia{e}3}!! 229
B2: 7 \text{\textdia{\textdia{d}b}5}!! 230
B3: 7 \text{\textdia{e}de2}!! 235
B4: 7 \text{\textdia{\textdia{xc}6}}!! 241 7...\text{\textdia{b}xc}6 8 0-0
241: 8...\text{\textdia{e}5} 241; 8...\text{\textdia{e}6} 242; 8...\text{\textdia{g}6} 244
B5: 7 \text{\textdia{b}3} 247 7...\text{\textdia{e}6} 247
B51: 8 \text{\textdia{e}3} 247
B52: 8 0-0 248 8...\text{\textdia{e}7} 9 \text{\textdia{e}3} \text{\textdia{w}c7}
10 \text{\textdia{f}4} \text{\textdia{a}6} 11 \text{\textdia{d}d} 3 \text{\textdia{b}5} 12 \text{\textdia{w}f} 3 \text{\textdia{b}7}
249: 13 \text{\textdia{a}3} 250; 13 \text{\textdia{a}4} 250; 13 \text{\textdia{ee}1} 257; 13 \text{\textdia{w}h} 3 252
B53: 8 \text{\textdia{g}5} 253; 8...\text{\textdia{d}7}!! 254;
8...\text{\textdia{e}7} 254; 8...\text{\textdia{a}6} 257
B54: 8 \text{\textdia{f}4} 261 8...\text{\textdia{e}5} 9 \text{\textdia{e}2} 261
9...\text{\textdia{e}7} 262; 9...\text{\textdia{a}6} 263; 9...\text{\textdia{d}7} 265
The Sozin Attack is White’s most overtly aggressive counter to the Sicilian. White puts his bishop on c4, and often follows up with direct play against the black king. Unless Black defends with the utmost precision, the bishop’s influence often fuels a deadly attack leading to a cascade of sacrifices and a brutal king-hunt.

The Sozin set-up can be employed against the Classical Sicilian, the Najdorf and even the Scheveningen. Mikhail Golubev is a young grandmaster who has employed the Sozin with devastating effect throughout the whole of his adult chess career. Here he explains how White carries out the attack in its various forms (including some relatively positional lines), and presents in detail the theory of all its variations, including the razor-sharp Velimirović Attack.

Mikhail Golubev is a grandmaster from Odessa, Ukraine, who plays regularly in tournaments in eastern and central Europe. He is a noted expert in several sharp and aggressive opening systems, including the King’s Indian and the Dragon. His first book, Easy Guide to the Dragon, has been praised for the quantity and quality of its original analysis, and for Golubev’s objectivity in identifying the critical lines.
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